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ABSTRACT

By Noor Maya Salleh

This study seeks to investigate the role of emotional intelligence in merger. Much of the existing literatures state that merger between organizations is a stressful event that affects the emotions of employees and thus have implication on the degree of support and attitudes towards merger. It is suggested that in changing circumstances such as merger, emotional ability could significantly assist individual employees to better deal with change, adapt to, and cope with changing surroundings. This study therefore used emotional intelligence as emotion-focused coping strategy to buffer negative emotional responses and to acquire positive attitudes towards merger. A two time points longitudinal study was conducted aimed to examine employees’ responses at four months post merger and ten months post merger. MSCEIT ability-based model measurement was used to measure the emotional intelligence of employees. Questionnaires were administered to obtain statistical data on the emotional responses, degree of support and attitudes towards merger. Qualitative data was also collected from interviews in order to tap first hand emotional responses of employees experiencing merger. At the same time emotional intelligence training was conducted in order to investigate whether emotional intelligence can be developed using training intervention. This study found relationships between emotional intelligence and degree of supports. This suggests that individual employees were more able to regulate their emotion and accept merger after ten months merger. The training intervention and Islamic culture could have influence the employees’ positive emotions and support for merger.
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Table 1: Tabulation on the validity studies of emotional intelligence using ability models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Leadership effectiveness</td>
<td>Kerr et al. (2006)</td>
<td>The overall results of the data analysis suggest that half of the MSCEIT scores may act as a strong predictor of leadership effectiveness, particularly the branches within the experiential EI domain ($r = 0.50$, $p &lt; 0.001$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace performance</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Relationship between EI, personality, cognitive intelligence and leadership effectiveness</td>
<td>Rosete and Ciarrochi (2005)</td>
<td>Higher EI was associated with higher leadership effectiveness and EI explained variance not explained by either personality or IQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td>MEIS</td>
<td>EI as distinct from IQ</td>
<td>Ciarrochi et al. (2000)</td>
<td>EI is not related to IQ but was related to specific personality measures and to other criteria (for example, life satisfaction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social relationship</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Testing the validity of EI subscales</td>
<td>Lopes et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Positive relationships between the ability to manage emotions and the quality of social interactions, supporting the predictive and incremental validity of an ability measure of emotional intelligence. The main findings remained statistically significant after controlling for Big Five personality traits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Researcher(s)</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interactions</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Emotion regulation abilities</td>
<td>Lopes et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Emotion regulation abilities were associated with both self-reports and peer nominations of interpersonal sensitivity and prosocial tendencies, the proportion of positive versus negative peer nominations and reciprocal friendship nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>TMMS</td>
<td>Effective leadership</td>
<td>Palmer et al. (2001)</td>
<td>Significant relationships were found between selected components of transformational leadership and EI subscales – the ability to monitor and manage emotion in oneself and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI construct and social deviance</td>
<td>MSCEIT, EQ-i and SREIT</td>
<td>Convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of competing measures of emotional intelligence</td>
<td>Brackett and Mayer (2003)</td>
<td>The MSCEIT showed minimal relations to the EQ-i and SREIT. MSCEIT was discriminable from personality and well-being measures. MSCEIT was predictive of social deviance. Results showed that ability EI and self-report EI are weakly related and yield different measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Researcher(s)</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of EI and occupational</td>
<td>MSCEIT and MEIS</td>
<td>reviews conceptualisations and empirical evidence in support of EI and its claimed role in the occupational environment.</td>
<td>Zeidner et al. (2004)</td>
<td>provides a number of practical guidelines for the development and implementation of EI measures within occupational settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>occupational environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI as Traditional Standard</td>
<td>MEIS</td>
<td>Investigate the reliability and validity content of EI</td>
<td>Roberts et al. (2001)</td>
<td>Ability model found to have good discriminate validity with low correlation with Big 5 personality factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of EI</td>
<td>MSCEIT and SREIS</td>
<td>A Comparison of Performance-Based and Self-Report Methodologies</td>
<td>Goldenberg et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Both MSCEIT and SREIS and their respective subscales were found to be weakly related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>MEIS</td>
<td>EI as distinct from personality</td>
<td>Caruso et al. (2002)</td>
<td>EI was measured reliably and was relatively independent of personality traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Researcher(s)</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring EI</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Focus on the discriminant, convergent predictive, and incremental validity of MSCEIT</td>
<td>Brackett and Salovey (2006)</td>
<td>Low correlation between MSCEIT scores and self-report measures of EI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive validity of ability model</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Commentaries between EI and cognitive intelligence</td>
<td>Janovics and Christiansen (2001)</td>
<td>no foundation for the use of the test in applied settings nor is there evidence indicating that the test measures an important dimension of individual differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted/non-gifted</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Compare EI mean score, relations between EI and ability</td>
<td>Zeidner et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Gifted students scored higher on the MSCEIT, but lower on the SSRI. Findings suggest that individual differences are measure dependent, with the profile of scores variable across EI assessment procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Tabulation of the empirical studies of emotional intelligence using ability models in workplace settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Transformational leadership styles</td>
<td>Leban and Zulauf (2004)</td>
<td>A project manager's transformational leadership style has a positive impact on actual project performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Relationship between managerial EI levels and a rating of leadership effectiveness (subordinate ratings)</td>
<td>Kerr et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Half of the MSCEIT scores act as a strong predictor of leadership effectiveness, particularly the branches within the experiential EI domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Ability to connect thoughts to emotions</td>
<td>Mayer and Geher (1996)</td>
<td>Participants who agreed more highly with the group consensus and with the target group scored higher than the other participants on scales of empathy and self-reported SAT scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-based learning</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Workplace learning, participation in teams</td>
<td>Clarke (2007)</td>
<td>Intensity in team participation developed individuals' emotional knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Emotions During Team Problem Solving</td>
<td>WEIP</td>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>Jordan and Troth (2002)</td>
<td>EI indicators were positively linked with team performance and were differentially linked to conflict resolution methods. Individuals with high EI preferred to seek collaborative solutions when confronted with conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Researcher(s)</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Ability to connect thoughts to emotions</td>
<td>Mayer and Geher (1996)</td>
<td>Participants who agreed more highly with the group consensus and with the target group scored higher than the other participants on scales of empathy and self-reported SAT scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music performance</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Assess individual differences using hypothetical scenarios that are conveyed pictorially or in writing.</td>
<td>Resnicow et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Significantly correlated ($r = 0.54$) which suggests that identification of emotion in music performance draws on some of the same sensibilities that make up everyday EI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales performance</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Test a model of emotional intelligence and a measure of sales performance.</td>
<td>Bryant and Doug (2005)</td>
<td>Showed that no relationship exists between sales performance and emotional intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>TMMS</td>
<td>Effective leadership</td>
<td>Palmer et al. (2001)</td>
<td>Significant relationships were found between selected components of transformational leadership and EI subscales – the ability to monitor and manage emotion in oneself and others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Tabulation of the empirical studies of emotional intelligence using ability models in workplace settings (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance on work-related tasks</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>to predict individual performance, group performance, and group citizenship behaviours</td>
<td>Day and Carroll (2004)</td>
<td>There were some gender and experience differences in the MSCEIT subscales. The MSCEIT subscales were modestly correlated with personality, unrelated to individual-level citizenship behaviour, and somewhat related to group-level citizenship behaviour. Only the Emotional Perception Scale of the MSCEIT was correlated with performance on a cognitive decision-making task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making and negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td>to identify whether EI relates to counterpart outcome satisfaction in negotiation contexts.</td>
<td>Mueller and Curhan (2007)</td>
<td>Multi-level models revealed that a participant's ability to understand emotion positively predicted his or her counterpart's outcome satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday behaviour</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Life space: self-care behaviours, leisure pursuits, academic activities, interpersonal relations</td>
<td>Brackett et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Women scored higher in EI than men. EI, however, was more predictive of the life space criteria for men than for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>EI and job performance</td>
<td>Bradberry and Su (2006)</td>
<td>No significant relationship was found between MSCEIT and job performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Tabulation of the empirical studies of emotional intelligence using ability models in workplace settings (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Job performance, affect and attitudes at work</td>
<td>Lopes and Galovey (2006)</td>
<td>Emotionally intelligent individuals receive greater merit increases, hold higher company rank, receive better peer/ and or supervisor rankings of interpersonal facilitation and stress tolerance than their counterparts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>WLEIS</td>
<td>EI and job satisfaction</td>
<td>Kafetsios and Zampetakis (2008)</td>
<td>Positive and negative affects at work mediate the relationship between EI and job satisfaction with positive affects exerting a stronger influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion and leader</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership effectiveness</td>
<td>George (2000)</td>
<td>An analysis of the four branches of the ability model suggesting the consideration of EI in followers and its effects on the leadership process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>MEIS</td>
<td>Individual performance</td>
<td>Lam and Kirby (2002)</td>
<td>Overall EI, emotional perceptions and emotional regulations explained, individual cognitive-based performance over and beyond the level attributable to general intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Researcher(s)</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interactions</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Emotion regulation abilities</td>
<td>Lopes et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Emotion regulation abilities were associated with both self-reports and peer nominations of interpersonal sensitivity and prosocial tendencies, the proportion of positive versus negative peer nominations and reciprocal friendship nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>TMMS</td>
<td>Effective leadership</td>
<td>Palmer et al. (2001)</td>
<td>Significant relationships were found between selected components of transformational leadership and EI subscales – the ability to monitor and manage emotion in oneself and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday behaviour</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Life space: self-care behaviours, leisure pursuits, academic activities, interpersonal relations</td>
<td>Brackett et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Women scored higher in EI than men. EI, however, was more predictive of the life space criteria for men than for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted/non-gifted</td>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>Compare EI mean score, relations between EI and ability</td>
<td>Zeidner et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Gifted students scored higher on the MSCEIT, but lower on the SSRI. Findings suggest that individual differences are measure-dependent, with the profile of scores variable across EI assessment procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2006</td>
<td>April 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quantitative data**
- EI measures (MSCEIT) (N=90)
- Degree of support measures (N=90)
- Job Attitudes measures (N=90)

**Quantitative data**
- EI measures (MSCEIT) (N=90)
- Degree of support measures (N=90)
- Job Attitudes measures (N=90)
- Emotion measures (N=90)

**Qualitative data**
- Interview (N=33)

N = Number of samples
EI = Emotional Intelligence
Table 4: Inter-correlations among emotional responses, degree of support, job attitudes variables, and emotional intelligence at Time 1 (four months post merger)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job insecurity</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>37.97</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>–0.40**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Withdrawal intention</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>–0.54**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational commitment</td>
<td>41.58</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>–0.15</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>–0.56**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Resistance to change</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>–0.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>–0.22*</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Support for change</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>–0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>–0.17</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>–0.37**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Loneliness</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>–0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>–0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Depression</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>–0.21*</td>
<td>–0.17</td>
<td>–0.10</td>
<td>–0.01</td>
<td>–0.11</td>
<td>–0.01</td>
<td>–0.29**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Happiness</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>–0.01</td>
<td>–0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.46**</td>
<td>–0.17</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Anger</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>–0.14</td>
<td>–0.34**</td>
<td>–0.22*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>–0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>–0.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>–0.35**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Branch 1</td>
<td>84.01</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>–0.03</td>
<td>–0.05</td>
<td>–0.08</td>
<td>–0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>–0.10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Branch 2</td>
<td>83.89</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>–0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>–0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>–0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Branch 3</td>
<td>80.72</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>–0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>–0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>–0.17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>–0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Branch 4</td>
<td>81.08</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>–0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>–0.00</td>
<td>–0.02</td>
<td>–0.16</td>
<td>–0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Total EI</td>
<td>76.77</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>–0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>–0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>–0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>–0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td>0.78**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01, *p < 0.05
Table 5(a) : Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Attitudes for Time 1 (four months post merger)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of job insecurity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.34**</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of organizational commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for change</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of withdrawal intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.005

Step 1: Emotion
Step 2: Degree of support
Step 3: EI
Determinants: Job attitudes

Table 5(b) : Results of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Attitudes for Time 1 (four months post merger)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.44*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of organizational commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for change</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.57*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05

Block 1: Age and length of Service
Block 2: Emotion
Block 3: Degree of Support
Block 4: EI
Determinants: Job attitudes
Table 6: Inter-correlations among emotional responses, degree of support, job attitudes variables and emotional intelligence at Time 2 (ten months post merger)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Job insecurity</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Job satisfaction</td>
<td>41.01</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>−0.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Withdrawal intention</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>−0.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Organizational commitment</td>
<td>42.79</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>−0.25**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>−0.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Resistance to change</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>−0.33**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>−0.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Support for change</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>−0.21**</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>−0.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Loneliness</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>−0.19</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>−0.35**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>−0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Depression</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>−0.36**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>−0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>−0.26*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Happiness</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>−0.39**</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>−0.53**</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>−0.30**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>−0.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Anger</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>−0.32**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>−0.16</td>
<td>−0.17</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>−0.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Branch 1</td>
<td>86.57</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>−0.07</td>
<td>−0.07</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>−0.27*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Branch 2</td>
<td>89.02</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>−0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Branch 3</td>
<td>83.26</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>−0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>−0.04</td>
<td>−0.13</td>
<td>0.27**</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>−0.02</td>
<td>−0.19</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Branch 4</td>
<td>84.02</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>−0.02</td>
<td>−0.28**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>−0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Total EI</td>
<td>80.96</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>−0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>−0.04</td>
<td>−0.17</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>−0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>−0.23*</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.005
Table 7(a) : Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Attitudes for Time 2 (ten months post merger)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of job insecurity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.39**</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.30**</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for change</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of organizational commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.31**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of withdrawal intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.41**</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.005; ***p < 0.10
Step 1: Emotion
Step 2: Degree of support
Step 3: EI
Determinants: Job attitudes
Table 7(b): Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of Job Attitudes for Time 2 (ten months post merger)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of job insecurity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.58**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of job satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.80*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.75*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.51*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of organizational commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.74*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Determinants of withdrawal intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.39**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-0.16***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.005; ***p < 0.10

Block 1: Age and length of Service
Block 2: Emotion
Block 3: Degree of Support
Block 4: EI
Determinants: Job attitudes
### Table 8(a): Result of Independent-samples T-Test of Emotional Intelligence for the Training and Control Groups Pre-Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Training</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>77.70</td>
<td>14.735</td>
<td>85.59</td>
<td>15.806</td>
<td>7.889</td>
<td>−1.918</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>87.33</td>
<td>20.974</td>
<td>83.03</td>
<td>14.186</td>
<td>4.297</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td>21.045</td>
<td>0.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>83.01</td>
<td>9.566</td>
<td>80.14</td>
<td>9.327</td>
<td>2.866</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>78.93</td>
<td>6.732</td>
<td>81.62</td>
<td>10.836</td>
<td>−2.695</td>
<td>−1.323</td>
<td>41.944</td>
<td>0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total EI</td>
<td>75.49</td>
<td>12.152</td>
<td>77.09</td>
<td>12.131</td>
<td>−1.598</td>
<td>−0.500</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B1 = Perceiving emotions, B2 = Using emotions, B3 = Understanding emotions, B4 = Managing emotions;

Training Group (N = 18); Control Group (N = 72)

p < 0.05

Note: When the variances for both groups are the same and the significance level of Levene’s test is larger than .05, values at Equal variances assumed are taken. If, p=.05 or less, values at Equal variances not assumed are referred to.
Table 8(b): Result of Independent-samples T-Test of Emotional Intelligence for the Training and Control Groups Post-Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>81.56</td>
<td>13.923</td>
<td>87.82</td>
<td>14.879</td>
<td></td>
<td>−6.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>−1.616</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>92.33</td>
<td>15.851</td>
<td>88.19</td>
<td>17.031</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>86.31</td>
<td>8.503</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>11.833</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>83.45</td>
<td>6.468</td>
<td>84.17</td>
<td>10.252</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.370</td>
<td>41.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variance not assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total EI</td>
<td>80.85</td>
<td>11.446</td>
<td>80.99</td>
<td>13.324</td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>−0.040</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B1 = Perceiving emotions, B2 = Using emotions, B3 = Understanding emotions, B4 = Managing emotions;

Training Group (N = 18); Control Group (N = 72)

P < 0.05

Note: When the variances for both groups are the same and the significance level of Levene's test is larger than .05, values at Equal variances assumed are taken. If, p=.05 or less, values at Equal variances not assumed are referred to.
Table 9(a): Result of T-Test for differences in Emotional Intelligence scores between Pre and Post-training for the Training Group (N = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired statistics</th>
<th>Paired differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1B1 – T2B1</td>
<td>77.70 14.735</td>
<td>-3.861</td>
<td>14.583</td>
<td>-1.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B2 – T2B2</td>
<td>87.33 20.974</td>
<td>-4.994</td>
<td>17.581</td>
<td>-1.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B3 – T2B3</td>
<td>83.01 9.566</td>
<td>-3.299</td>
<td>7.118</td>
<td>-1.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B4 – T2B4</td>
<td>78.93 6.732</td>
<td>-4.518</td>
<td>8.589</td>
<td>-2.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1Total EI – T2 Total EI</td>
<td>75.49 12.152</td>
<td>-5.361</td>
<td>9.006</td>
<td>-2.525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1 = pre-training, T2 = Post-training, B1 = Perceiving emotions, B2 = Using emotions, B3 = Understanding emotions, B4 = Managing emotions
Table 9(b) : Result of T-Test for differences in Emotional Intelligence scores between Pre and Post- training for the Control Group (N = 72)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paired statistics</th>
<th>Paired differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B1</td>
<td>85.59</td>
<td>15.806</td>
<td>-2.230</td>
<td>18.543</td>
<td>-1.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2B1</td>
<td>87.82</td>
<td>14.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B2</td>
<td>83.03</td>
<td>14.186</td>
<td>-5.161</td>
<td>17.249</td>
<td>-2.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2B2</td>
<td>88.19</td>
<td>17.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B3</td>
<td>80.14</td>
<td>9.327</td>
<td>-2.358</td>
<td>12.348</td>
<td>-1.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2B3</td>
<td>82.52</td>
<td>11.833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B4</td>
<td>81.62</td>
<td>10.836</td>
<td>-2.543</td>
<td>11.909</td>
<td>-1.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2B4</td>
<td>84.17</td>
<td>10.252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1Total EI</td>
<td>77.09</td>
<td>12.131</td>
<td>-3.900</td>
<td>14.670</td>
<td>-2.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 Total EI</td>
<td>80.99</td>
<td>13.324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1 = Pre-training, T2 = Post-training, B1 = Perceiving emotions, B2 = Using emotions, B3 = Understanding emotions, B4 = Managing emotions
Table 10: Multivariate Tests Table TIME*GROUP (Value=Wilks' Lambda)

Between Training and Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch 1</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time effect</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Sig. for time*group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>77.70</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>81.56</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>85.59</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>87.82</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>87.33</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>92.33</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>83.03</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>88.19</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch 2</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time effect</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Sig. for time*group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>83.01</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>86.31</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>80.14</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>78.93</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>83.45</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>81.62</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>84.17</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 3</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Time effect</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Partial Eta Squared</td>
<td>Sig. for time*group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>83.01</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>86.31</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>80.14</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>78.93</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>83.45</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>81.62</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>84.17</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 4</td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Time effect</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Partial Eta Squared</td>
<td>Sig. for time*group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>83.01</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>86.31</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>80.14</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>82.50</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>78.93</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>83.45</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>81.62</td>
<td>10.84</td>
<td>84.17</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total EI</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time effect</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Sig. for time*group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>75.49</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>80.85</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>77.09</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>80.99</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Training and Control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branch 1</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>796820.683</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>796820.683</td>
<td>2653.098</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1441.114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1441.114</td>
<td>4.798</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>26429.560</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>300.336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 2</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>886462.861</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>886462.861</td>
<td>2332.732</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>511.464</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>511.464</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>33440.935</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>380.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 3</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>793402.511</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>793402.511</td>
<td>5345.876</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>320.508</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>320.508</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>13060.428</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>148.414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 4</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>775385.047</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>775385.047</td>
<td>5872.637</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>83.985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83.985</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>11618.951</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>132.034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total EI</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>711737.425</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>711737.425</td>
<td>3218.127</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>21.690</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.690</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>19462.529</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>221.165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 1: Branch 1 (Perceiving Emotion)

Graph 2: Branch 2 (Using Emotions)
Graph 3: Branch 3 (Understanding Emotions)

Graph 4: Branch 4 (Managing Emotions)
Graph 5: Estimated Marginal Means of MEASURE_1
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Graph 5: Total EI
Table 12(a) : Result of Independent-samples T-Test of Emotional Intelligence for the IBB and IDBB Employees at Pre-Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IBB</th>
<th>IBB</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>81.89</td>
<td>12.284</td>
<td>71.12</td>
<td>16.768</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.762</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>6.833</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>90.05</td>
<td>23.211</td>
<td>83.06</td>
<td>17.712</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.986</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>10.306</td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>84.98</td>
<td>10.729</td>
<td>79.91</td>
<td>7.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.071</td>
<td>1.103</td>
<td>4.596</td>
<td>0.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>80.43</td>
<td>6.703</td>
<td>76.57</td>
<td>6.548</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.862</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>3.213</td>
<td>0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total EI</td>
<td>78.76</td>
<td>13.110</td>
<td>70.35</td>
<td>12.974</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.415</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>5.679</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B1 = Perceiving emotions, B2 = Using emotions, B3 = Understanding emotions,
B4 = Managing emotions;
IBB (N = 11); IDBB (N = 7)
p < 0.05

Note: When the variances for both groups are the same and the significance level of Levene's test is larger than .05, values at Equal variances assumed are taken. If, p=.05 or less, values at Equal variances not assumed are referred to.
Table 12(b) : Result of Independent-samples T-Test of Emotional Intelligence for the IBB and IDBB Employees at Post-Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IBB</th>
<th>IDBB</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>85.09</td>
<td>13.906</td>
<td>76.02</td>
<td>12.974</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>93.70</td>
<td>14.400</td>
<td>90.16</td>
<td>18.904</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>86.45</td>
<td>9.053</td>
<td>86.08</td>
<td>8.256</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>85.52</td>
<td>6.670</td>
<td>80.19</td>
<td>4.919</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total EI</td>
<td>83.46</td>
<td>11.474</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>10.939</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B1 = Perceiving emotions, B2 = Using emotions, B3 = Understanding emotions, B4 = Managing emotions;
IBB (N = 11); IDBB (N = 7)
p < 0.05

Note: When the variances for both groups are the same and the significance level of Levene’s test is larger than .05, values at Equal variances assumed are taken. If, p=.05 or less, values at Equal variances not assumed are referred to.
Table 13(a) : Result of T-Test for differences in Emotional Intelligence scores between Pre and Post- training for the IBB Training Participants (N = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired statistics</th>
<th>Paired differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B1 – T2B1</td>
<td>81.89</td>
<td>12.284</td>
<td>3.202</td>
<td>8.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B2 – T2B2</td>
<td>90.05</td>
<td>23.211</td>
<td>3.654</td>
<td>20.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B3 – T2B3</td>
<td>84.98</td>
<td>10.729</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>7.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B4 – T2B4</td>
<td>80.43</td>
<td>6.703</td>
<td>5.086</td>
<td>8.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1Total EI – T2EI</td>
<td>78.76</td>
<td>13.110</td>
<td>4.698</td>
<td>7.799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1 = Pre-training, T2 = Post-training, B1 = Perceiving emotions, B2 = Using emotions, B3 = Understanding emotions, B4 = Managing emotions
Table 13(b): Result of T-Test for differences in Emotional Intelligence scores between Pre and Post-training for the IDBB Training Participants (N = 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired statistics</th>
<th>Paired differences</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B1 – T2B1</td>
<td>71.12</td>
<td>16.768</td>
<td>4.895</td>
<td>21.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2B2</td>
<td>76.02</td>
<td>12.974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B2 – T2B2</td>
<td>83.06</td>
<td>17.712</td>
<td>7.101</td>
<td>12.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2B3</td>
<td>90.16</td>
<td>18.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B3 – T2B3</td>
<td>79.91</td>
<td>7.006</td>
<td>6.175</td>
<td>5.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2B4</td>
<td>86.08</td>
<td>8.256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1B4 – T2B4</td>
<td>76.57</td>
<td>6.548</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>8.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2Total EI – T1Total EI</td>
<td>70.35</td>
<td>9.024</td>
<td>6.403</td>
<td>11.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2 Total EI</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>10.939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T1 = Pre-training, T2 = Post-training, B1 = Perceiving emotions, B2 = Using emotions, B3 = Understanding emotions, B4 = Managing emotions
### Table 14: Multivariate Tests Table TIME*GROUP (Value=Wilks’ Lambda)

**Between IBB and IDBB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Partial Eta Squared</td>
<td>Sig. for time*group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBB</td>
<td>81.89</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>85.09</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDBB</td>
<td>71.12</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>76.02</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Partial Eta Squared</td>
<td>Sig. for time*group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBB</td>
<td>90.05</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>93.70</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDBB</td>
<td>83.06</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>90.16</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Partial Eta Squared</td>
<td>Sig. for time*group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBB</td>
<td>84.98</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>86.45</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDBB</td>
<td>79.91</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>86.08</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch 4</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Partial Eta Squared</td>
<td>Sig. for time*group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBB</td>
<td>80.43</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>85.52</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDBB</td>
<td>76.57</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>80.19</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total EI</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Partial Eta Squared</td>
<td>Sig. for time*group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBB</td>
<td>78.76</td>
<td>13.11</td>
<td>83.46</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDBB</td>
<td>70.35</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>76.75</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects For IBB and IDBB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Branch 1</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>211041.726</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>211041.726</td>
<td>778.373</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>841.092</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>841.092</td>
<td>3.102</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4338.108</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>271.132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 2</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>272559.266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>272559.266</td>
<td>490.776</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>236.934</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236.934</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>8885.828</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>555.364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 3</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>243517.928</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>243517.928</td>
<td>1700.740</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>63.158</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63.158</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>2290.936</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>143.184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch 4</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>222745.659</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>222745.659</td>
<td>5286.317</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>180.468</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180.468</td>
<td>4.283</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>647.180</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42.136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total EI</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>204634.950</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>204634.950</td>
<td>920.041</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>489.303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>489.303</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>3558.710</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>222.419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 6: Branch 1 (Perceiving Emotion)

Graph 7: Branch 2 (Using Emotions)
Graph 8: Branch 3 (Understanding Emotions)

Graph 9: Branch 4 (Managing Emotions)
Graph 10: Total EI
Figure 1: Theoretical model of the relationships between emotional intelligence, emotional responses, degree of support and job attitudes
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background
The background to this study concerns two companies experiencing a merger in Brunei. According to the organizational change literature, merger is one example of organizational transformation. For Kiefer (2005), a merger is categorized as a large-scale and fundamental organizational transformation that involves alteration to an organization’s structure, processes and/or social systems. As a result merger or any organizational change has become more than ever an important means of organizational survival. However, the process of change is far from easy. For organizations to initiate and implement change successfully requires substantial demands on the employees involved. Radical change requires employees to learn new skills in order to deal with new tasks and meet new desired and expected behaviours. The change literature also suggests that change can create a sense of personal loss to employees, such as loss of work colleagues, reduced job status, loss of job, loss of a culture with which they identify and a threat to employees’ self-esteem. Individuals can thus become stressed and disturbed as a result of intended and unintended change.

Change initiatives can therefore have both direct and indirect impact on employees’ emotions and feelings as well as on their behaviour, attitudes and work performance. Huy (1999) proposed that radical change often triggers strong emotional responses and actions as a consequence among affected employees. As a result, managing individuals’ emotional responses to change may be equally crucial for the success of change (Vakola et al., 2004). Indeed, Iacovini (1993) argues that acknowledging the human needs of employees and the effective management of their emotional vulnerability is the secret to successful change.
1.1 Rationale of the Study

The ‘people issues’ concerned with change (Higgs and Dulewicz, 2000) arouse the interests of many scholars nowadays because the impact of change is the most keenly felt by the individual employees involved. However, despite the increasing number of publications over the last two decades on the phenomenon of mergers, relatively minimal attention has been given to its impact on those employees affected. As a result, researchers have more recently called for a greater focus at the micro-level processes associated with organizational change, yet such research still remains limited (Bray, 1994; Judge et al., 1999). It is argued that the literature on organizational change is curiously silent about the impact of major organizational transitions on employees or the ways employees attempt to cope with these situations.

More recently researchers have begun to direct their attention to the emotional undercurrents of change (Mossholder et al., 2000). There have been claims suggesting that emotional intelligence may influence employees' emotions and behaviour during change situation. Emotional intelligence has been defined as a set of abilities, that is ability to perceive, understand and express our feelings accurately and to control our emotions so that they work for us, and not against us (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). It has been suggested that individuals with high emotional intelligence experience less stress and therefore able to cope with the changing environment far more effectively compared to those with low emotional intelligence. Indeed, according to notable scholars such as Goleman (1998) and Mayer and Salovey (1997), individuals with high emotional intelligence may be more effective in managing change than individuals with low emotional intelligence.

Increasingly studies examining the impact of emotional intelligence in the organization are appearing in the literature. More seminal writings on emotional intelligence examining its implications for individuals, employees at work, work performance and satisfaction are beginning to gain the attention of scholars. Emotional intelligence can lead to productive outcomes at both the individual and the organizational level (Weisinger, 1998). For example, emotional intelligence has been shown to play an important role in career success (Lopes et al., 2006b). Empirical
evidence has also found emotional intelligence to be related to positive outcomes such as prosocial behaviour, parental warmth and positive peer and family relations (Mayer et al., 1999; Salovey et al., 2001), to result in effective team performance (Jordan et al., 2002b) and to have relationships with life outcomes including satisfying the need for personal relationships and achieving success at work (Salovey and Grewal, 2005).

Despite its popularity, the scientific study of emotional intelligence is still in its infancy. Furthermore, the study of emotional intelligence in the organizational change context is modest compared to studies of emotional intelligence in educational and psychological settings. Therefore an investigation as to whether emotional intelligence influences employees’ behaviour in response to change is significant.

Throughout the study of this construct, it is also argued that individuals’ and teams’ emotional intelligence can be measured. Based on very few researches, employees with high emotional intelligence outperform employees with low emotional intelligence (for example, Jordan et al., 2002). There is also ongoing debate as to the best way to measure an individual’s emotional intelligence, although no agreement has yet been made on which measure should be used. One of the reasons for this is the difficulty in choosing an appropriate model of emotional intelligence from among the many constructs of emotional intelligence which frequently overlap. Models of emotional intelligence have also been extensively developed over the years. There is scientific evidence to show that the ability model is a reliable and more promising measurement tool with which to assess individuals’ emotional intelligence when compared to the current extended models such as the personality and mixed models.

In addition to problems with its measurement, there have also been debates over whether emotional intelligence can be developed or not. Some argue that it is possible from an early stage of life, whereas others argue that only emotional skills and knowledge can be developed and that this can be achieved by means of training. Thus developing emotional intelligence through training may assist individual employees to cope with turbulent change in their organization. However,
no study has yet been reported that has used the ability model in emotional intelligence training as a means to determine whether employees affected by change are able to better manage their emotional response to major organizational change.

1.2 Research Aims and Questions

This study aims to identify the role, if any, of emotional intelligence in response to organizational change and offers insights into how emotional intelligence may play such a role. In particular, this study aims to examine the emotional responses of employees during a merger in a Brunei context. To date, no studies have appeared that have specifically examined ability model of emotional intelligence and its role in change management. This study therefore seeks to address the following research questions:

Q1. Is there a relationship between employees' emotional responses to merger and their degree of support for change (either supportive of or resistant to change) and job attitudes (job insecurity, job satisfaction, withdrawal intention and organizational commitment) over time?

Q2. Is there a relationship between employees' emotional intelligence and their degree of support for change (either supportive of or resistant to change)?

Q3. Is there a relationship between the degree of support for change and job attitudes over time?

This study also aims to identify whether national culture of Brunei and training effectiveness has positive implication on individual employees' emotional intelligence in managing change.

Q4. How does national culture influence employees' response to change in a Brunei context?

Q5. Can emotional intelligence be developed using training as an intervention?
1.3 Research Approach

In conducting this research, a longitudinal study was carried out collecting data from 90 employees in two merging companies in Brunei, obtaining measures of their emotional intelligence at four and ten months post merger. It has been argued by previous researchers that longitudinal studies in change management are rare and suggested for further research using longitudinal study (Madsen et al., 2005). The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso-Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) ability based-model was used to measure the emotional intelligence level of the participants. At the same time, the participants were divided into two groups. Training Group was given training on emotional intelligence, the aim of which was to examine whether emotional intelligence can be developed through training and which would then impact on the employees’ responses to change. Control Group, on the other hand, remained as the control group and did not receive any training.

Both groups completed the MSCEIT test and provided measures of emotional response (anger, loneliness, happiness and depression), degree of support for change (support for change and resistance to change), and job attitudes (job insecurity, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and withdrawal intention). Both qualitative and quantitative research methods were used to collect the data. According to Woodman and Pasmore (1989), there are major advantages from combining both methods in change research as neither method alone can fully capture organizational change processes, particularly nuances in how the magnitude and significance of change affects those involved. Moreover, triangulation gained from using this mixed method enabled the researcher to collect data from different angles and thus gain more comprehensive data (Neuman, 2006). Several statistical analyses were used to obtain the findings including Pearson’s Coefficient correlation in order to seek relationships between emotional intelligence, emotional responses, degree of support and attitudes towards change. T-test analyses were also used to compare the mean score of participants on emotional intelligence between both groups and between four and ten months post merger.

Overall, this study has four major aims: (1) to investigate whether emotional intelligence can be developed using the ability-based model of emotional intelligence; (2) to use training as an emotional intelligence intervention; (3) to carry
out a longitudinal study to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the impact of change on employees; and (4) to examine a potential role for emotional intelligence during major change. This study will therefore be the first of its kind that has specifically examined the role of ability emotional intelligence in change management.

1.4 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis begins by providing a review of the relevant literature. Chapter 2 will emphasize the emotional intelligence literature and focus on the importance of emotions in organizations. It will continue by highlighting the importance of emotional intelligence in the workplace and provide a brief account of other emotional intelligence-related studies. Furthermore, the origins of the emotional intelligence construct will be outlined together with the different and sometimes conflicting constructs that can be found in the literature. This chapter will also present the different models and the measurement of emotional intelligence.

The following chapter, Chapter 3, will focus on the relationship between emotional intelligence and change management, and will be divided into two parts. The first part will focus on emotional intelligence and change management in organizations, and begin by highlighting the importance of change in organizations. The different approaches to understanding organizational change will also be discussed. This chapter will also examine merger activity in organizations and its impact on affected employees. Change can cause a loss to employees in terms of position, power and even overall employment. As a result employees may experience negative emotions such as frustration, resistance, anger, despair, grief and stress (Carr, 2001). The emotional experience will further influence employees’ attitudes towards change in terms of whether to resist or support change. This will then be followed by an examination of employees’ degree of support to change. The relationships between emotional intelligence and change management will be outlined in this chapter. This chapter will continue the critical review of the relevant literature, specifically on the development of emotional intelligence which has been debated nowadays. The appropriate and careful selection of training content in developing emotional intelligence is given attention in this part.
Chapter 4, the methodology chapter, will focus on the research methodology which comprises research methods, the aims and objectives in conducting this research, the research background, drawing out the theoretical model, methods used in data collection, the research strategy and the measures required in data collection. This chapter provides a rationale of the measures used in the study. The different statistical tools and techniques employed to analyse the data are clearly explained. This chapter also describes the mixed research approach and its advantages. The framework for conducting this study using longitudinal study is also explained. The participants’ background, ethical issues and problems encountered during both data collection and throughout the research will also be highlighted in this chapter. This chapter also provides details of how the training was conducted, with emphasis on the content of the training relevant to the four branches of ability-based model of emotional intelligence.

Chapter 5 will present the findings derived from both quantitative and qualitative research. This chapter will be divided into two parts. The first part will focus on the results obtained from the quantitative data whereas the second part will focus on the results collected through qualitative the data.

Discussions of the relationship between emotional intelligence and change for this study, the effectiveness of training, and role of culture will then be presented in Chapter 6.

At the end of the research journey, Chapter 7 draws an overall conclusion to encapsulate the thesis. The contribution and implication of this study are presented in this chapter. Suggestions for further research to enhance the findings from and methods used in this study are included in this chapter.
CHAPTER 2  
EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

2.0 Introduction

This chapter is organised into several sections. The first section reviews the significance of emotion in organizations. The second section provides insights into the literature of emotional intelligence, demonstrates the significance of the emotional intelligence concept to the workplace and discusses early conceptualizations and origins of the term. A critical analysis of competing models of emotional intelligence then follows. A comprehensive argument on the reliability and validity of the ability model of emotional intelligence is then offered supporting the use of this model in emotional intelligence research. Finally studies examining emotional intelligence and its relationships with key life and workplace criteria are then presented.

2.1 Emotions in Work Life

Emotions refer to psychobiological responses that link socially embedded cognitive appraisals, physiological reactions, action tendencies and subjective experiences (Lazarus, 1991) which can be expressed verbally or non-verbally (through facial displays) (Sanchez-Burks and Huy, 2007). Cox (1997) stated that the concept of emotion is often defined in terms of deviation from what is desired or aimed for from a management perspective. The reasons for this could be that the emotions that individuals harbour or express have the potential to reveal how they feel about ongoing events in the organization and how they may react to these events. This study of emotion in organizations is therefore one of the most difficult areas for empirical research, as emotions are so well hidden and multilayered (Turnbull, 1999). Emotional issues in organizational life have traditionally been largely avoided (Turnbull, 1999), neglected (Eriksson, 2004) or considered negative and irrational (Fineman, 1993) and seen as a weakness and an inability to control oneself (Brotheridge and Lee, 2008).
Organizational researchers have recently begun to demonstrate a serious interest in the role of emotions in the workplace (Turnbull 1999; Domagalski, 1999; Fineman, 1997; Fisher and Ashkanasy, 2000; Jordan and Troth, 2002; Brief and Weiss, 2002).

Emotions are assumed to fall within the ‘texture’ of organizing (Fineman, 1993) and organizations affect the thoughts, feelings and affections of the people in the workplace (Brief and Weiss, 2002). Many studies that have focused on emotion in organizations have claimed that organizations are ‘emotional places’ (Armstrong, 2000), ‘emotional arenas’ (Fineman, 2000) or ‘incubators of emotions’ (Muchinsky, 2000) and always arouse anxiety and uncertainty (French, 2001). There have, however, been relatively few studies on how emotions are experienced at work (see Pekrun and Frese, 1992, for a review), including workplace envy and stress (Fineman, 2000). Moreover, the very essence of the ‘organization’ of work concerns what people do with their feelings (Fineman, 1993) since feelings and emotions are at the core of the human experience (Muchinsky, 2000). Armstrong (2000) refers to human beings as the subject to anger, fear, surprise, disgust, happiness or joy, ease and unease.

Work affect is an important aspect of work performance (Kafetsios and Zampetakis, 2008). The workplace is said to bring out a wide variety of emotions, from the most gratifying experiences of our lifetimes (positive) to the most vexing and hurtful (negative) (Muchinsky, 2000). There are two aspects to the relationship between organization and people’s feelings. Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) proposed the Affective Events Theory where affective or emotional experiences in the work environment generate cognition which in turn shapes workers’ job-related behaviour. Just as organizations in which people work affect their thoughts, feelings and actions in the workplace, people’s thoughts, feelings and actions can also affect the organizations in which they work (Brief and Weiss, 2002).

Because the workplace is an emotion-eliciting organization, people are therefore required to employ ‘emotional labour’. Emotional labour is defined as ‘the management of feeling to create a publicly observable facial and bodily display for a wage’ (Hochschild, 1983). An employee ought to play act or display a role or become
someone they are not in order to comply with an organization’s rules and procedure, or even to please clients or someone in the organization (Turnbull, 1999).

Emotions in the workplace can also be contagious and thus affect other people at work. Emotional contagion is an automatic, non-conscious psychological mechanism through which people experience shared emotions (Sanchez-Burks and Huy, 2007). When people at work interact, emotions are spread or transferred from one person to another (Eriksson, 2004). Perceived emotions can lead to similar emotional states in the perceivers. The more cohesive the group, the stronger is the sharing of emotions (Goleman et al., 2001). The increasing recognition of this emotional side of work appears to be one of the major drivers behind the growth of interest in the concept of emotional intelligence.

2.2 Emotional Intelligence: Concept, Construct Development and Debate

The origins of emotional intelligence as a concept can be found in the early work of researchers on intelligence such as Binet, Thorndike, Guilford and Gardner. Gardner (1983) developed the concept of social intelligence as a means to explain the variance in outcome measures not accounted for by IQ. Later Gardner and Hatch (1989) developed the term multiple intelligences for a similar reason. However, they were unable to find any significant relationship between multiple intelligence and IQ measures. This led to the conclusion that there was an ‘other’ intelligence which was a distinctly different construct from the IQ (Dulewicz and Higgs, 2000).

However, the term emotional intelligence was already in use in the 1960s by Ghent and Leuner (Mayer et al., 2004a). And in 1985, the term emotional intelligence was again used by Wayne Payne in his doctoral thesis, titled ‘A Study of Emotion: Developing Emotional Intelligence’, although this has never been published. Only five years later two articles on emotional intelligence were published by Mayer et al. (1990) and Mayer and Salovey (1990) that explicitly defined the construct, developed the emotional intelligence theory and demonstrated the measurement of emotional intelligence (Mayer et al., 2004, 2006). Arguably, then, Mayer and Salovey were the first scholars to coin the term emotional intelligence. They viewed the concept as a set of individual abilities, specifically as a learned ability to perceive, understand and
express our feelings accurately and to control our emotions so that they work for us, and not against us (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). Their definition viewed emotional intelligence as a type 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 action.

The release of the best-selling book entitled *Emotional Intelligence* by Goleman (1996) captured the interest of many people and scholars. Since then the concept of emotional intelligence has been extensively used and has also received considerable attention (Mayer and Salovey 1997) in various books, popular newspapers, magazines (for example, *Time Magazine* (Gibbs, 1995)) as well as numerous journals (Mayer and Salovey 1997). Goleman (1998) further extended the work of Mayer and Salovey in 1990 and Gardner in 1983 to make emotional intelligence relevant to the workplace context. The term emotional intelligence then became a ‘buzzword’ (Fisher and Ashkanasy, 2000).

Goleman’s popular work, however, differs from that of Mayer and Salovey’s. Whereas Mayer and Salovey (1997) considered emotional intelligence as consisting of a number of abilities that link emotions to cognition, Goleman (1995) argued that emotional intelligence comprised a number of emotional competencies and ambitiously placed many competencies under one roof. Goleman placed his early conceptualization of emotional intelligence into a comprehensive model of organizational management and leadership. Much of his writing has subsequently been criticized. There are concerns that the writings of Goleman (1996 and 1998) are not based on empirical evidence but are instead just a collection of anecdotal and non-proven discourses. Landy (2005), for example, notes that proponents such as Goleman support their ideas with selective anecdotal evidence that is not subject to scientific scrutiny. This has also been highlighted by Bar-On et al. (2006), who suggest that the claims regarding the impact of emotional intelligence on human performance in Goleman’s book are mere supposition rather than having a basis in scientific research. Fisher and Ashkanasy (2000) have also argued that much of Goleman’s thinking remains speculative and based on an inadequate conceptualization and measure of emotional intelligence.
Besides Goleman, other scholars have also enthusiastically attempted to define the construct of emotional intelligence. For instance, Eagly and Chaiken (1998) defined emotional intelligence as individuals’ feelings about the attitude that range from strong positive emotions (excitement, happiness) to strong negative emotions (anger, fear). For Weisinger (1998) emotional intelligence is the intelligent use of emotions, where you intentionally make your emotions work for you and use them to help guide your behaviour and thinking in ways that enhance your results. Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) defined emotional intelligence as the set of abilities (verbal and non-verbal) that enable a person to generate, recognize, express, understand and evaluate their own and others’ emotions in order to guide thinking and action that successfully cope with environmental demands and pressures. Martinez (1997) defines emotional intelligence as an array of non-cognitive skills, capabilities and competencies that influence a person’s ability to cope with environmental demands and pressures. This array of definitions and constructs of emotional intelligence have generated further public and commercial perceptions of the emotional intelligence construct and have added considerable variance to the original definition of the construct given by Mayer and Salovey (Ashkanasy and Daus, 2005). Landy (2005) refers to this as ‘taking a product to market before it was ready’. Moreover, the different dimensions given to emotional intelligence were argued by Mayer and Salovey (1997) as focusing on motivational characteristics such as zeal and persistence rather than on emotion. As a result, the different definitions of the emotional intelligence construct do not necessarily match well (Tischler et al., 2002).

These highly popularised accounts of the concept have caused concern and generated considerable debate among scholars (Mayer, 1999). A number of challenges and criticisms have therefore appeared in the literature covering emotional intelligence. For example, Roberts et al. (2001) have criticized ‘emotional intelligence’ as an elusive concept. According to Locke (2005), the existing research on emotional intelligence is fragmented, inadequately defined, contradictory and ambiguous. Locke (2005) further criticizes the research and application of emotional intelligence as the concept appears to be constantly changing. Spector (2005) has also commented that controversy exists between emotional intelligence researchers and their critics who doubt the value of the construct. Adding to this confusion, various terms of emotional intelligence have been used interchangeably including
emotional quotient, emotional literacy, emotional intelligence and social intelligence. Yet, arguably, they refer to quite different perceptions of the nature of emotional intelligence (Spector, 2005). The systematic scientific investigation of a clearly identified construct of emotional intelligence is therefore frustrated (Roberts et al., 2001). The overlapping constructs of emotional intelligence thus result in bewilderment to the observer. This has also made the definition of emotional intelligence so broad and inclusive that for some commentators it has no intelligible meaning (Locke, 2005).

The debate and confusion surrounding the emotional intelligence construct prompted Mayer and Salovey to clarify the concept further in 1997. According to Mayer and Salovey (1997), emotional intelligence should in some way refer to heightened emotional or mental abilities involving reasoning about emotion, such as knowing what another person is feeling, and that this should involve considerable thinking rather than preferred ways of behaving (such as being sociable or warm). Their amended definition of emotional intelligence was then put forward as the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth. This seemed to make more sense because it connected intelligence and emotion. In essence emotion makes thinking more intelligent and one thinks more intelligently about emotions (Mayer et al., 2004a; Salovey, 2006). In this way emotional intelligence is the association of cognition and physiology (Opengart, 2005).

The term intelligence has been adopted by Mayer and Salovey (1997) from Alfred Binet’s classic definition from the early twentieth century: ‘to judge well, to comprehend well, and to reason well’, these being the essentials of intelligence. This approach to intelligence therefore captures abilities such as the ‘power to combine and separate’ concepts, to judge and to reason, and to engage in abstract thought. Meanwhile emotion is viewed as a useful source of information that helps one to make sense of and navigate the social environment (Salovey and Grewal, 2005). Emotions take place inside the individual but they can trigger signals that are visible from outside (Kusstatcher and Cooper, 2005). Thus a person can be emotionally
intelligent by having both emotion and the ability to make judgments using emotion (Opengart, 2005).

Mayer and Salovey (1997) argued that emotional intelligence is distinct from traits (characteristics or preferred ways of behaving, such as extroversion and shyness), and talents (non-intellectual abilities such as skills at sports). Mayer et al. (2000) and Salovey (2006) have also argued that emotional intelligence should be clearly distinguished from related constructs such as more cognitively oriented intelligences (for example, analytic and verbal), personality traits, social skills and a collection of ‘good attributes’ that only tangentially involve emotion (for example, zeal, persistence, appreciating diversity).

Based upon these justifications, Mayer and Salovey’s construct of emotional intelligence has since been legitimately accepted by other researchers, including Daus and Ashkanasy (2005) and Jordan et al. (2002). To some extent a number of other authors have made it clear that they do not endorse Goleman’s (1995) or Bar-On’s (1997) approach to studying emotional intelligence in the workplace (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005). Nonetheless, the introduction of emotional intelligence to the public owes much to the credit of Goleman who has made ‘emotional intelligence’ popular through his marketable publications. Goleman had popularized the notion of viewing the experience and expression of emotions as a domain of intelligence (Schutte et al., 1998) and his contribution should not therefore go unrecognized.

In summary, since its emergence, the construct of emotional intelligence has invited debate over its definition, nature and measurement and its application to appropriate criteria (Spector, 2005). Mayer and Salovey (1997) commented that each new discussion of the concept seems to employ a different definition or make a different claim for its importance. By contrast other writers have viewed the debate on the developing construct of emotional intelligence as a healthy process in scientific research (Jordan et al., 2002), arguing that it helps readers and interested parties to weigh the construct critically.

2.3 The Competing Models of Emotional Intelligence
There have been a number of competing and overlapping models of emotional intelligence (Schutte et al., 1998). The more established categorization of emotional intelligence models today involves the segregation of current models into mixed and ability models (Mayer et al., 2000; Caruso, et al., 2002; Day and Caroll, 2008; Hedlund and Sterberg, 2000; Goldenberg et al., 2006); trait and ability models (Petrides and Furnham, 2000; Petrides et al., 2007); and ability and mixed or trait models (Freudenthaler and Neubauer, 2005). This study divides the models of emotional intelligence into three different categories: the personality, mixed and ability models of emotional intelligence.

2.3.1 Personality Models
Goleman's model of emotional intelligence is perhaps the best known personality model. Goleman (1995) defined emotional intelligence as having five parts: knowing emotions, managing emotions, motivating emotions, motivating oneself, recognizing emotions in others and handling relationships. This model includes both social and emotional competencies (Goleman, 1995). Goleman together with Cherniss (1998) further broke down the construct of emotional intelligence into 25 emotional competencies.

Goleman's work, however, has been criticized as being based on anecdotal and unsubstantiated claims. For example, Mayer et al. (2000) argue that Goleman's work is non-scientific, is personality instead of intelligence based and therefore adds nothing to the existing literature on individual differences. Goleman's scale also shows some content overlap with the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) of Mayer et al. (2000). Others such as Davies et al. (1998) have also criticized Goleman's scale as unacceptable because of its low rate of reliability (alpha coefficient = 0.18).

2.3.2 Mixed Models
Another category of emotional intelligence model is the mixed or dispositional emotional intelligence model. This type of model combines abilities with non-ability components of personality. In other words, these mixed trait-ability models acknowledge the importance of multiple aspects of personality that may relate to emotion (Goldenberg et al., 2006). These mixed models incorporate a diverse range
of abilities, behaviours, and personality traits within an overall emotional intelligence framework (Mayer et al., 2000a). These mixed models also treat mental abilities and a variety of other characteristics such as motivation, states of consciousness and social activity as a single entity. Dulewicz and Higgs’s model of emotional intelligence is an example of a mixed model. Their model was derived from empirical research on emotionally and socially competent behaviour and was called the emotional intelligence personal factors model (Dulewicz and Higgs, 2004). Their proposal on the competency-based construct of emotional intelligence was reinforced by the work of prominent authors such as Boyatzis (1983) and his concept of competency that includes individual traits, values and behaviours; Goleman (1997) on the connection between emotional intelligence and workplace competency; Fineman (1997) on the linkage between emotion and competencies; and Dulewicz’s (1994) ‘supra-competencies’ that include persuasiveness, assertiveness and decisiveness, sensitivity and oral communication (Dulewicz and Higgs, 2000).

Bar-On (1997) characterized emotional intelligence as ‘an array of non-cognitive abilities, competencies and skills that influence one’s ability to succeed in coping with environmental demands and pressures’ (p.14). Bar-On’s theoretical work also combines mental abilities (for example, emotional self-awareness) with other characteristics that are considered separable from mental ability and correspond more to personality, such as empathy, personal independence, self-regard and mood (Mayer et al., 2000). Bar-On’s Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQi) is a 133-item self-report measure which consists of 15 distinct scales that were developed based on Bar-On’s professional experience and his review of the literature. The scales include emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization, independence, empathy, intrapersonal relationships, social responsibility, problem-solving, reality testing, flexibility, stress tolerance, impulse control, happiness and optimism. Mayer et al. (2000) divided Bar-On’s model into two distinct dimensions, the first representing cognitive skills which include adaptability skills such as problem-solving, reality testing and flexibility, the other representing interpersonal relatedness which includes interpersonal skills such as interpersonal relationships, social responsibility and empathy. Mixed models
characteristics therefore comprise a multitude of components of emotional intelligence.

Furthermore, the individual aspects of mixed models also share some overlap with specific areas of the Big Five personality dimensions (see, for example, McCrae and Costa, 1986). In this sense these models do appear to have potential for predicting success (Mayer et al., 2000). However, one cannot be certain that this is not simply due to personality dimensions as opposed to emotional intelligence itself. For example, Schutte et al. (1998) argued that the claim of the mixed model self-report scale predict academic achievement independently of traditional measures of analytical intelligence is provocative. However, there is not yet evidence that self-report scales of emotional intelligence add variance beyond the existing personality measures (Mayer et al., 2000). Indeed, Bryant (2001) has suggested that these broader definitions within the mixed models framework result in a series of descriptions of prosocial behaviours and personality traits and not a more restrictive definition of emotional intelligence, while others have commented that these mixed models include constructs not considered true forms of intelligence such as motivation, global and social functioning and dispositions or traits (Shulman and Hemenover, 2006). Nonetheless, many researchers have adopted the mixed model of emotional intelligence within their research methodology (Kerr et al., 2006).

2.3.3 Ability Models

Compared to other models, the ability model offers a more focused, limited definition of emotional intelligence and is thus more tightly defined (Weinberger, 2002). Importantly, the components are not accounted for by existing personality theories and measures. Ability models of emotional intelligence are strongly correlated with measures of general cognitive ability unlike trait models (Petrides et al., 2007). Ability models focus exclusively on cognitive aptitudes and more closely consider emotional intelligence as a distinct form of intelligence. Emotional intelligence here is perceived as a set of interrelated skills that allow people to process emotionally relevant information efficiently and accurately (Mayer et al., 1999). This model also views emotional intelligence as focusing on the private or internal emotions of individuals which are important for personal growth. This is different from other types of intelligence such as social intelligence as suggested by Gardner (1983), which give
attention to social growth only. Mayer et al. (2000) argue that emotional intelligence pertains primarily to the emotional aspects of problems instead of social or political aspects. For Lopes et al. (2006), emotional intelligence, emotional abilities or emotional skills are the capacities that involve emotional informational processing and range from general intelligence to the specific (skills such as relaxation and empathetic).

The ability model therefore focuses on emotions themselves and their interactions with thought (Mayer and Salovey, 1997; Salovey and Mayer, 1990). The model also fits far more with the field of research examining emotional and cognitive interactions (Sternberg, 2000). Salovey and Mayer (1990) put forward three adaptive abilities of emotional intelligence. Firstly, emotional intelligence consists of the appraisal and expression components of emotion in the self and the appraisal of emotions in others such as through verbal and non-verbal perception. The second ability is regulation where emotional intelligence has the components of regulation of emotions in the self and in others. The third ability refers to the utilization of emotion and includes the components of flexible planning, creative thinking, redirected attention and motivation.

Whereas the earlier ability model provides three branches of emotional intelligence and focuses on emotions, social and cognitive, the revised model consists of four branches of emotional intelligence and gives more emphasis to emotional intelligence as having the potential for intellectual and emotional growth. In 1997 Mayer and Salovey refined their earlier definition of emotional intelligence (1990) and categorized emotional intelligence as comprising four abilities that are distinct yet related: (a) perceiving emotions; (b) using emotions to facilitate thought; (c) understanding emotions; and (d) managing emotions in a way that enhances personal growth and social relations (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). These branches are arranged hierarchically, with perceiving emotion being the lowest branch and managing emotion the highest. Perceiving of emotions involves the ability to perceive and identify emotions in oneself and others, as well as the environment. This includes identifying emotions through facial expressions and other non-verbal body language. Emotions according to the functionalist perspective can be recognized from facial expressions. According to Salovey and Grewal (2005) it is the
ability to detect and decipher emotions in faces, voices and cultural artefacts that makes all other processing of emotional information possible.

The second ability is using emotions to facilitate thinking. This involves the capacity to generate, use and feel emotion in order to focus attention, reason and communicate (Lopes et al., 2006). It also refers to the ability to harness emotions to facilitate various cognitive activities, such as thinking and problem-solving (Salovey and Grewal, 2005). This second ability also prompts individuals to react to the environment and make deductive reasoning, solve problems and stimulate creative thinking. For example, when angry, a person may find the root of the situation and thus be better able to solve the problem. The positive emotions such as joy, interest, contentment and love can guide applications and interventions that might improve individual psychological well-being, physical health and social relationships. This is because the experience of positive emotion is central to human nature and contributes richly to the quality of people’s life (Myers and Diener, 1995; Fredrickson, 1998). Within this branch, the emotionally intelligent person can capitalize fully upon his or her changing moods in order to best fit the task at hand (Salovey and Grewal, 2005).

The third ability is understanding emotion and involves the understanding of emotional processes that particular events trigger, for example what causes a person to be angry or demonstrate angry behaviour. Emotional intelligence will help the person to reason about such emotional reactions accordingly. It is the ability to comprehend emotional language and to appreciate complicated relationships among differing emotions. This includes being sensitive to slight variations between emotions, such as the difference between happy and ecstatic (Salovey and Grewal, 2005). It also includes the ability to recognize and describe how emotions evolve over time, such as how shock can turn into grief (Salovey and Grewal, 2005). Feldman Barett et al. (2001), for example, suggest that negative emotions such as anger, sadness and fear signal the need to change or adjust one’s current state as failure to do so can be very costly. This ability is thus found to be most allied with cognitive processing and abstract reasoning (Mayer et al., 2001).
The fourth branch placed at the top of the ability hierarchy is managing emotions. This is about managing emotions in oneself and in emotionally challenging interpersonal situations (Lopes et al., 2006), such as knowing how to calm down after feeling angry (Mayer et al., 2000) and how to provide feedback without hurting another's feelings (Lopes et al., 2006). An emotionally intelligent person can thus harness both negative and positive emotions and use them to achieve intended goals (Salovey and Grewal, 2005).

Since the mental ability model is also categorized as intelligence, this model also makes predictions about the internal structure of intelligence and its implications for a person's life (Mayer et al., 2000). Mayer et al. (2000) argue that emotional intelligence must meet key criteria similar to cognitive forms of intelligence in order to be valid. This means it must reflect true mental abilities rather than perceived ability, self-esteem or preferred behavioural patterns. These suggest that the mental ability of emotional intelligence must meet three empirical criteria (Mayer et al., 2000) to qualify as intelligence: firstly, that emotional intelligence increases with age; secondly, that measured skills correlate with other measures of mental ability; thirdly, that these cognitive problems should have right or wrong answers as assessed by the convergence of alternative scoring methods (Mayer et al., 2000). Intelligence researchers such as Mayer et al. (2000) are vocal in defending their claim that traits cannot be considered as intelligence and empirical findings have consistently shown that mental abilities are unrelated to or uncorrelated with other personality traits (Mayer et al., 2000). Caruso (1999) has suggested that the ability models are defined as a set of skills, or competencies, which provide human resources professionals, managers, and any one in the world of work with a comprehensive tool to define, measure and develop emotional skills. The ability-based tests of emotional intelligence do therefore seem to be reliable in measuring skills that are relatively distinct from commonly assessed aspects of personality.

Overall the ability-based model of emotional intelligence are more promising (Mayer and Salovey, 2000) than the personality and mixed model and as a result are likely to receive continued attention (Conte, 2005). Ashkanasy and Daus (2005), for example, have acknowledged that the four-branch model of emotional intelligence seems to best address their research and applied needs of the role of individual
differences in the way that people at work deal their own and others’ emotions. Furthermore, research using the ability model of emotional intelligence in organizational settings has found significant associations with work performance, leadership, emotional labour, social interaction, and group performance (for example, George, 2000; Weinberger, 2002; Lam and Kirby, 2002; Leban and Zulauf, 2004; Kerr et al., 2006; Mayer and Geher, 1996; Lopes et al., 2005). Brown and Moshavi (2005) has argued that it is likely that ability-based scales that measure how well people perform tasks and solve emotional problems will be more likely to stand the test of academic scrutiny than scales which rely exclusively on self-assessment of emotional skills. The ability model of emotional intelligence thus seems to deserve the most credit in terms of its reliability, suitability for general usage and meets intelligence properties.

2.4 Measuring Emotional Intelligence Using Ability Models: Assessment Tools, Validity and Reliability

A number of assessment devices purporting to measure emotional intelligence have been developed over the past decade and this has led to a considerable debate on the most appropriate approach for the measurement of the emotional intelligence construct (Goldenberg et al., 2006). These different tests all claim to be effective assessments of an individual’s emotional intelligence (Kerr et al., 2006). In a recent review, Kerr et al. (2006) summarized these measures of emotional intelligence as:

1. the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS; Mayer et al., 1999);
2. the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer et al., 2000);
3. the Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI; Goleman, 1998);
4. the Emotion-Quotient Inventory (EQ-I; Bar-On, 1997);
5. the Emotional Intelligence Quotient (EIQ; Dulewicz and Higgs, 1999)
6. the Emotional Intelligence Quotient Map (EQ-MAP; Cooper and Sawaf, 1997);
7. the Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test (SREIT; Schutte et al., 1998);
8. the Swinburne Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT/Genos EI Assessment; Palmer and Stough, 2001)
9. the Trait Meta Mood Scale (TMMS; Salovey et al., 1995); and
These devices, however, use different measurement approaches including self-report measures and performance-based tests. The validity studies of emotional intelligence using ability models are summarised in Table 1.

2.4.1 Self-Report Measures
Self-report measures tap into many aspects of personality and other non-cognitive characteristics (Goldenberg et al., 2006) and ask people to report their own level of emotional intelligence (Ciarrochi et al., 2001; Schutte et al., 1998). Therefore in assessing their emotional intelligence, individuals have to reflect perceived rather than actual levels of emotionally intelligent functioning (Goldenberg et al., 2006). Furthermore, when using self-report measures, individuals must have a certain level of self-knowledge or insight into their own abilities to accurately report on them (Ciarrochi et al., 2001). According to Mayer et al. (2000) and Lopes et al. (2006) most studies of emotional intelligence in the workplace conducted to date have relied on self-reported measures of emotional intelligence. One reason could be that self-reported emotional intelligence scores are found to have incremental validity, accounting for unique variances in outcomes (happiness, life satisfaction, loneliness and depression) not accounted for by personality (Saklofske et al., 2003, in Goldenberg et al., 2006). Examples of self-report measures are the trait meta mood scales (Salovey et al., 1995), SREIS (Schutte et al., 1998) and WEIP (Jordan et al., 2002).

Workgroup Emotional Intelligence Profile, Version 3 (WEIP-3) (Jordan et al., 2002)
This measure was designed specifically to profile the emotional intelligence of individuals in work teams. Jordan et al. (2002) have argued that WEIP-3 has the potential to provide insights into some personal factors that contribute to team performance. WEIP’s conceptualization of emotional intelligence is consistent with the construct of emotional intelligence as defined by Mayer and Salovey (1997).
Freudenthaler and Neubauer Emotional Intelligence Performance Test
(Freudenthaler and Neubauer 2003)
This emotional intelligence is a self-report measure that consists of 49 items for the measurement of self-assessed emotional abilities concerning the perceptions of one’s own emotions, perception of the emotions of others, control over the expressions of emotions, the masking of emotions and the regulation of one’s own emotions. Responses were scored on a Likert scale ranging from ‘not true’ to ‘very true’. Both the subscales (intrapersonal and interpersonal emotional abilities) showed satisfactory reliabilities and convergent and discriminant relations to both the trait meta mood scales and peer ratings of emotional abilities (Freudenthaler and Neubauer, 2005).

Trait Meta Mood Scales (TMMS) (Salovey et al., 1995)
Trait meta mood scales were designed to assess how people reflect on their moods. TMMS has three primary domains: (1) attention to feelings, (2) clarity in discrimination, and (3) mood repair. According to Salovey et al. (1995) scales based on these factors appeared to be reliable. The revised TMMS comprises 30 items, which are responded to on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Self-Report Emotional Intelligence Test (SREIS) (Schutte et al., 1998)
The SREIS was developed to reflect Salovey and Mayer's (1990) original ability model of emotional intelligence. This test was validated in relation to dimensions of the trait meta mood scales (Salovey et al., 1995). It has a 33-item emotional intelligence scale which assesses multiple aspects of emotional intelligence including the appraisal and expression of emotions, the regulation of emotion and the utilization of emotion. Participants are rated using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This measure is reported to have good internal consistency and test-retest reliability (Schutte et al., 1998). It also demonstrates predictive validity between men and women (Goldenberg et al., 2006).

However, when assessing emotional intelligence using self-report, it allows individuals to be deceptive and fake their own abilities (Mayer et al., 2000; Lopes et al., 2006) because self-reporting asks people to report their own emotional
intelligence (Goldenberg et al., 2006; Ciarrochi et al., 2001; Schutte et al., 1998). It should also be noted that people are generally overconfident of their accuracy in judgments about themselves. Yet the most confident judgments are not the most accurate (Sanchez-Burks and Huy, 2007).

2.4.2 Objective Performance Measures
The problems of the self-reported measures that have been noted have therefore led to the development of performance-based ability tests of emotional intelligence to provide a more objective assessment of people’s actual abilities and performance level on a task (Lopes et al., 2006; Ciarrochi et al., 2001; Mayer, 2001). Performance-based tests of emotional intelligence present individuals with problems that are thought to have correct responses (Mayer, 2001; Mayer et al., 2004). Performance measures also elicit responses that can be evaluated against objective and predetermined scoring criteria (Ciarrochi et al., 2001; Goldenberg et al., 2006). Evidence is also accumulating that emotional intelligence is a distinct mental ability that can be reliably measured (Bracket and Mayer, 2003; Ciarrochi et al., 2001; Mayer et al., 1999; Mayer et al., 2003). Therefore, if emotional intelligence is to be conceptualized as a type of ability, performance-based measures are more valid than self-reported measures (Ciarrochi et al., 2001; Mayer, 2001).

The distinction between the self-reported and performance-based measurements are claimed to have theoretical and practical implications. There have been arguments elsewhere in the literature on how best to measure emotional intelligence. It has been claimed that the most direct assessment is expected to be gained from performance-based measures that exhibit better predictive validity than self-reported measures (Mayer et al., 2000) although there are issues with respect to their psychometric properties (Matthews et al., 2002), and performance-based measurements are lengthy to administer, taking between 45 and 60 minutes to complete, and costly (Goldenberg et al., 2006). MEIS and MSCEIT are two mental of the ability measures so far that meet the performance-based criteria.
Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) (Mayer et al., 1999)

The MEIS consists of 12 ability measures of emotional intelligence and is divided into four branches of abilities. These include perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotion. Perceiving emotion measures emotional perception in Faces, Music, Designs and Stories. The facilitation branch of emotion measures Synesthesia Judgements (for example, ‘How hot is anger?’) and Feeling Biases. The third branch, the understanding of emotion, is measured with Blends and Changes tasks. Blending is where respondents identify different emotions to create other emotions. For example, the combination of envy and aggression results in malice (Mayer et al., 2003). The changes task is where respondents select an emotion that results from the intensification of another feeling. For example, depression is selected for its consequences of intensified sadness and fatigue (Mayer et al., 2003).

The fourth branch (managing emotion) measures management in the self and management in others.

The MEIS has been found to achieve a full scale reliability of $r = 0.96$ (Mayer et al., 2000; Ciarrochi et al., 2000). The 12 ability tasks were also found to be generally positively intercorrelated with one another. Mayer et al. (1999) and Roberts et al. (2001) reported that the MEIS subscales were only moderately correlated with verbal intelligence. Ciarrochi et al. (2000) found that the MEIS has no significant correlation with non-verbal intelligence but that the MEIS was related to specific personality measures. Ciarrochi et al. (2000) therefore were sceptical about the potential contribution of the MEIS to an understanding of human performance.

Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) (Mayer et al., 2000)

A more recent assessment tool to measure emotional intelligence is the MSCEIT. The MSCEIT was initially developed in as an attempt to improve on the psychometric qualities of the MEIS discussed above (Mayer et al., 2000). It is a 141-item ability scale that uses tasks similar to those of the MEIS to measure the four branches of emotional intelligence (Mayer et al., 2001). The Cronbach’s alpha of the factor-based scale representing the entire test was 0.96 (Mayer et al., 1999). It takes about 30–40 minutes to complete and has been found to be predictive of a variety of important outcomes at work and in life. The MSCEIT test is based on the idea that emotional intelligence involves problem-solving with and about emotions (Mayer et al., 2003).
The scores of each of the four branches (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions) correlate modestly with one another, and the branch and overall scores are reliable (Mayer et al., 2003). It was also found that the MSCEIT does not correlate with scales that measure a person’s likelihood to respond in socially desirable ways and does not appear to test personality traits. Only small positive correlations between scores on the MSCEIT and the Big Five traits of agreeableness and conscientiousness have previously been found (Lopes et al., 2003). Other empirical evidence showing the MSCEIT as independent is based on the work of Brackett et al. (2004). Their study found zero-order correlations among the MSCEIT, Big Five and measures of academic achievement. MSCEIT scores were mostly modestly correlated with just two of the Big Five dimensions: Agreeableness and Intellect ($r < 0.24$). The correlations between MSCEIT scores and verbal SAT scores is $r = 0.35$. Their findings have offered further proof that the MSCEIT has discriminant validity and that the MSCEIT is tapping into information about personal differences that is not contained in the Big Five or measures of academic achievement (Brackett et al., 2004). According to Palmer et al. (2004) and Mayer et al. (2003), factor analyses confirm that there is evidence of a unitary, overall emotional intelligence factor (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005). This validity argument is also supported by Mayer et al. (2004a), Mayer et al. (2003), Palmer et al. (2001) and Roberts et al. (2001) who confirm that the four-factor solutions representing each of the four branches present an excellent fit to the data.

However, one criticism of the MSCEIT is that it may well be tapping into knowledge of appropriate responses rather than into people’s actual capacity to implement these responses in real life (Lopes et al., 2006). This has also been extended in relation to actual meaning of the managing emotion branch scores within an organizational setting. For example, Kerr et al. (2006) and Matthews et al. (2002) found that the ability to understand emotions and the ability to act effectively on this understanding are only marginally related. Other criticisms have included that a paper-based test cannot assess all there is to emotional intelligence. Moreover, there are no absolute right and wrong answers to many emotionally challenging situations. Therefore this has led a number of authors to raise questions about the interpretation of test scores (Matthews et al., 2002).
A number of other authors (Davies et al., 1998; Roberts et al., 2001) have gone further arguing the ability test reliability particularly whether there is one set of correct answers for an emotional intelligence test; (2) about the expert and general opinions that diverge too much; and (3) whether the factor structure of such tests was fully understood and consistent with theory. Conte (2008) also criticised the validity of MSCEIT which according to him as lack of incremental validity. Bracket and Mayer (2003) and Barchard (2003) reported that no incremental validity was found on performance outcome. Moreover, no correlations between MEIS and MSCEIT have been examined and that the validity of MSCEIT relied on MEIS (Conte, 2003).

Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) are also doubtful on the scoring method. The consensus scoring determined the correct answers by pooling the judgement of thousands of people. This technique assesses the extent to which test takers’ choice matches majority by opinion. The problem with this is cultural variations. The normative data population may have different culture than the test takers from other country. The test may not provide meaningful scores at the high end of emotional intelligence continuum. The expert scoring could also elicit problem in scoring. The expert scoring determines the correct answers by providing the judgment of 21 experts in emotion. The problem with this method is in how this ‘expert’ was chosen when determining the correct answer for emotional intelligence questions and tasks. As a result Roberts et al. (2001) and Izard (2001) have argued that more research is required in order to demonstrate the discriminant and predictive validity of the MSCEIT in the context of rival predictors.

Beyond these more specific criticisms, more global criticisms have been made by Landy (2005), Locke (2005), Conte (2005), Davies et al. (1998), Mathews et al. (2002), Roberts et al. (2001) and Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) who argue that emotional intelligence is not distinct from other types of intelligence and adds no predictive validity beyond cognitive ability. Their rigorous criticism is that emotional intelligence is really little more than a constellation of the Big Five factors and therefore not distinct from personality. However, the critics over-generalized the construct of emotional intelligence and did not separate the ability model (such as MSCEIT) from other measures they examined. When considered independently it
has been shown that the ability model (MSCEIT) is distinct from both cognitive intelligence and personality (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005) and thus is potentially the most valid of all current emotional intelligence measures available. Mayer et al. (1999) presented evidence and argued convincingly that emotional intelligence meets the standards set for something to be called intelligence (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005). The patterns of MSCEIT correlations are similar to those of known intelligences and that it should correlate only modestly with other intelligences and should develop with age (Mayer et al., 1999). The criticisms of Landy and Locke therefore are not wholly justified. They used outdated references (such as Mayer, 1999, and Salovey and Mayer, 1990) to present their cases (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005) and have not looked specifically at the ability model as distinct from other emotional intelligence measures.

Moreover, there is also evidence for the discriminant validity of emotional intelligence (ability-based measures) and personality such that the average correlations across five studies (with sample sizes >150) for each of the five factors and total emotional intelligence ranged from a low of 0.06 for extroversion to 0.21 for agreeableness. The highest single correlation between any branch and a Big Five factor was between management of emotion and agreeableness at 0.39 (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005). By contrast, two widely used measures of emotional intelligence (both self-reporting: EQ-I and Schutte’s) overlap substantially with the Big Five. Bar-On’s EQi (1997) had a multiple R of 0.75, and Schutte’s (Shutte et al., 1998) scale multiple R was 0.52. The ability model of emotional intelligence therefore shows far more discriminant validity from the Big Five model of personality.

In response to concerns regarding whether the MSCEIT is a reliable measurement, Mayer et al. (2003) conducted a study on the reliability of MSCEIT V2.0. They found that the MSCEIT full-test split-half reliability is $r = 0.93$ for general and $0.91$ for expert consensus scoring. Further, the two experiential and strategic area score reliabilities are $r = 0.90$ and $0.90$, and $r = 0.88$ and $0.86$ for general and expert scoring, respectively (Mayer et al., 2003). For both experiential and strategic area types of reliabilities, the four branch scores of perceiving, facilitating, understanding and managing emotion range between 0.76 and 0.91 (Mayer et al., 2003). When test-booklet and on-line administration of MSCEIT tests were compared it was found that
both methods are equivalent and the correlations between responses frequencies for each alternative across the two methods was 0.987 (see Mayer et al., 2003).

Furthermore, emotions experts converged on correct test answers with greater reliability than did members of a general sample. The experts’ convergence was better in areas where more emotions research has been conducted. The consensus method compares a participant’s answers to the remainder of the group and individuals received credit according to their agreement with the group consensus. The expert method compares participants’ answers to an expert criterion while the target method compares participants’ answers with those of the target they were judging. According to Mayer et al. (2001), as more experts are used and their answers aggregated, their performance would resemble that of the consensus of a large general group. The general consensus and expert consensus scoring criteria were compared in response to critics of the consensus scoring (for example, Roberts et al., 2001). The result of the Mayer et al. (2003) study found that the correlation between the two scores sets ranged from $r = 0.96$ to 0.98 across the branches, areas, and the total emotional intelligence scores. Study on the comparison by Mayer et al. (2001) also exhibits superior agreement levels of 21 experts relative to the general sample. They also found that the expert and general consensus criteria often agreed on the same answers as correct ($r = 0.91$). Participants’ MSCEIT scores were also similar according to the two different criteria ($r = 0.98$) (Mayer et al., 2003).

MSCEIT scores have also been found to be unrelated to current mood or to people’s tendency to provide socially acceptable answers (Barchard, 2001; Lopes et al., 2003; Lopes et al., 2006). The MSCEIT has a full-scale reliability of $r = 0.91$. The MSCEIT can therefore be argued to be content valid and possess a factor structure congruent with the four-part model of emotional intelligence (Mayer and Salovey, 1997; Mayer et al., 2003; Brackett et al., 2004).

The MSCEIT was also designed to draw on universal aspects of emotional experience (Lopes et al., 2006). There was high agreement between the response patterns taken from both German and North American samples (Lopes et al., 2006). The correlations ranged from 0.86 to 0.93 for the eight tasks comprising the ability
tests (Lopes et al., 2004; Lopes et al., 2006). On the MSCEIT, women tend to score higher than men (Lopes et al., 2006; Mayer et al., 2002). There are only slight ethnic differences, and neither single group scores higher or lower than others on all the four branches of emotional intelligence (Mayer et al., 2002; Lopes et al., 2006).

2.5 Emotional Intelligence as a Set of Emotional Abilities and Its Relationship with Other Important Criteria

Prior to conducting this research, a search of the literature for studies of emotional intelligence was undertaken using major research databases between 1990 and 2008. Using the Ingenta search engine, it was found that there were only 440 articles on emotional intelligence listed. Out of these, there were only four articles found to use the ability model of emotional intelligence. Further research also found that neither of these articles used MSCEIT or studied emotional intelligence in change management.

Using the Emerald search engine, a larger number of articles on emotional intelligence were found. There were 1630 articles on emotional intelligence found between 1990 and 2008. Of these 986 mentioned the ability model but only 24 articles were found to use the ability model of emotional intelligence. Most of the research was conducted using students in laboratory settings (18 articles) whereas only 14 studies on emotional intelligence were actually conducted in a real-life situation or in workplace settings in order to study the emotional intelligence of employees. The search was narrowed to investigate the number of articles on emotional intelligence related to change management. Only 18 were found although they were in fact focusing on leaders’ emotional intelligence. However, none of these articles were found to study emotional intelligence using a longitudinal study or to study emotional intelligence of employees in merger settings.

From PsycINFO search engines, it was found that there were 3515 items on emotional intelligence. Out of these, there were only 2401 articles found to use the ability-based model. The search was narrowed to emotional intelligence studies using the MSCEIT and only 20 articles were found. Of these studies, 12 were articles
that focused on change management, in particular looking at leadership behaviours. Further searching found that five studies were conducted in the laboratory compared to only two studies conducted in work settings. Out of these, only one study adopted the longitudinal approach and none of these articles investigated emotional intelligence in merger settings.

Despite the increasing number of empirical studies on emotional intelligence, only a few variables have been found to be associated with emotional intelligence in the workplace using the ability-based model. It was also found that more studies on emotional intelligence were conducted in laboratories than in workplace settings. Interestingly, no research has been done on emotional intelligence in merging companies using ability-based models, particularly in the banking sector and using MSCEIT and the longitudinal approach.

Table 2 summarises the studies of emotional intelligence in workplace settings using ability-based models. According to Jordan and Troth (2002), ability-based model of emotional intelligence has potential as a predictor of workplace behaviour in organizations. Clarke (in press) summarises the advances in the development of an appropriate measure to capture the four ability domains of emotional intelligence which has led to an increasing number of studies that have found ability-based emotional intelligence to be associated with a wide range of work-related outcomes including decision-making and negotiation, leadership, effective social relations in the workplace and psychological well-being.

2.5.1 Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Leadership

More recently, empirical and theoretical studies on emotions have expanded to include topics particularly relevant to management development practitioners, such as the empirical relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership (Clarke, 2006; Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005; Groves et al., 2008; Barbuto and Burbach, 2006, Brown and Moshavi, 2005; Barling et al., 2000; Carmeli, 2003; George, 2000; Rosete and Ciarrochi, 2005; Leban and Zulauf, 2004). More positive relationships have been found between emotional intelligence and leadership. For example, Palmer et al. (2001) found that emotional intelligence is correlated with several
components of transformational leadership suggesting that emotional intelligence may be an important component of effective leadership and accounts for how effective leaders monitor and respond to subordinates and make them feel at work. Mandell and Pherwani (2003) also reported similar findings on the significant predictive relationship between transformational leadership style and emotional intelligence although they found no significant difference in the emotional intelligence scores between genders of managers. Gardner and Stough (2002) focused on the effectiveness of different styles of leadership (either transformational, transactional or laissez-faire). They too identified that emotional intelligence is highly correlated with transformational style and components in the understanding of emotions. In this study emotion management was also found to be the best predictor of transformational leadership style. In a study of 44 analysts and clerical employees, Lopes et al. (2004) also found that emotional intelligence was marginally to peer-rated leadership potential and related strongly to supervisor-rated leadership potential, even after controlling for the Big Five, education, cognitive ability and other variables such as age, gender, trait affect and coping approach.

An example of an ability-based study can also be found in the work of Leban and Zulauf (2004). They studied leadership effectiveness in relation to emotional intelligence and found that a project manager’s transformational leadership style has a positive impact on actual project performance and that emotional intelligence ability contributes to the project manager’s transformational leadership style and subsequent actual project performance. Daus and Harris (2003) studied leader emergence, transformational leadership and emotional intelligence (measured with the MEIS). They used a group of students as a sample and found that emotional intelligence predicts emergence and is related to transformational leadership. Specifically, leadership emergence rated by group members was significantly related to the managing others’ emotions branch of emotional intelligence (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005).

Furthermore, Coetzee and Schaap (2004) have reported that transformational and transactional leadership have association with emotional intelligence. They found that transformational leadership was related to overall emotional intelligence as well as to two branches of the ability-based model, identifying emotion and managing emotion. They also found that transactional leadership was related to the managing
emotion branch and non-transactional or ‘laissez-faire’ leadership was inversely related to the using emotion branch (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005). Rubin et al. (2005) examined only the emotion recognition aspect of emotional intelligence and found some interesting relationships. In their study, the research team examined how leader emotion recognition ability and personality characteristics influenced the performance of transformational leadership behaviour (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005). Emotion recognition, positive affectivity and agreeableness positively predicted transformational leadership ability (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005). Extroversion moderated the relationship between emotion recognition and transformational leadership ability, such that increased levels of leader extroversion strengthened the relationship between leader emotional recognition and transformational leader behaviour (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2005).

Moreover, Kerr et al. (2006) also investigated the relationship between supervisory emotional intelligence (as measured by MSCEIT) and a rating of supervisor effectiveness (subordinates’ scores). The overall results of the data analysis indicate that emotional intelligence abilities may indeed be a key determinant of effective leadership. They found that employee perceptions of supervisor effectiveness are strongly related to the emotional intelligence of the supervisor. Together these studies would tend to point to the importance of emotional intelligence as a key dimension of individuals underpinning effective leadership.

2.5.2 Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Social Relations/Well-being

A number of studies using the MSCEIT have found strong relationships between the ability to manage emotion and both the self-perceived quality of interpersonal relationships and whether people are viewed favourably by others (Lopes et al., 2006b). A high score for managing emotions has also been found to be associated with self-reports of more supportive relationships with parents and less conflictive relationships with a close friend (Lopes et al., 2003; Lopes et al., 2004). The study on German students found that students with high scores for managing emotions are more satisfied with their daily interactions with people of the opposite sex and perceived themselves to be more successful at impression management in daily social interactions (Lopes et al., 2004). Emotional intelligence, measured as a set of
abilities, is also found to be associated with important positive work outcomes such as company rank, percentage merit increase, ratings of interpersonal facilitation, and affect and attitudes (Lopes et al., 2006b). More latterly a further study has elucidated further the implication of the ability to manage emotion. Those with high managing emotions reported higher self-perceived interpersonal sensitivity and were more favourably viewed by their residential college classmates (Lopes et al., 2006b). These students also received a higher proportion of positive and/or negative peer nominations for interpersonal sensitivity and reciprocal friendship (Lopes et al., 2006b). However, none of these studies were conducted in workplace settings.

In terms of social relations individuals scoring highly on the managing emotions subscale of the MSCEIT were more likely to report positive relations with others as well as perceived parental support, and less likely to report negative interactions with close friends (Lopes et al., 2003). Lopes et al. (2005) attempted to examine the relationship between emotion regulation abilities, assessed by means of a performance measure of emotional intelligence, and the quality of social relationships, assessed by means of both self- and peer-reports. They found that individuals scoring high on emotion regulation abilities viewed themselves as more interpersonally sensitive and prosocial than their counterparts. The study also found that these individuals were viewed favourably by their peers as indicated by peer nominations for interpersonal sensitivity and personal tendencies, the proportion of positive versus negative peer nominations, and reciprocal friendship nominations. A test similar to MSCEIT has also shown that emotional intelligence is positively associated with self-reported empathy (Ciarochi et al., 2000; Mayer et al., 1999). Another study that used the MSCEIT has also shown that those who are emotionally intelligent are more prosocial than their counterparts (Brackett and Mayer, 2003; Lopes et al., 2003). Rubin (1999) found that adolescents that have high emotional intelligence are rated less aggressive and prosocial by their peers and teachers respectively (Lopes et al., 2006). In terms of gender, males have been found to engage in less violent and physical behaviour if they have high emotional intelligence in a study of college students (Brackett et al., 2004).
2.5.3 Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Life Outcomes

For a number of authors, emotional intelligence may be the one factor that could account for the success of a person (Goleman, 1995; Mayer et al., 2000). Some evidence is beginning to accumulate to support a role for emotional intelligence in career success (Lopes et al., 2006) and life satisfaction (Law et al., 2004). Based on their investigation, Lopes et al. (2006) found that emotionally intelligent individuals received greater merit increases and held higher company rank than their counterparts. These employees also received better peer and/or supervisor ratings of interpersonal facilitation and stress tolerance than their counterparts. Emotional intelligence also appears to predict important external criteria such as adjustment and life outcomes (Brackett et al., 2004). Research by Brackett et al. (2004) suggests that emotional intelligence predicts important behavioural criteria, particularly for the male college students contained in their sample. Males with lower emotional intelligence tended to have less ability to perceive emotions and to use emotions to facilitate thought (Brackett et al., 2004). According to these researchers, the lack of these abilities was associated with negative outcomes including poor relations with friends, as well as on negative life events such as drug and alcohol abuse. Some preliminary findings also suggest that lower emotional intelligence may be related to involvement in self-destructive behaviours and deviant behaviour (Brackett and Mayer, 2003; Rubin, 1999; Trinidad and Johnson, 2002).

Other research has also found that high emotional intelligence is related to positive outcomes such as prosocial behaviour, parental warmth and positive peer and family relations (Mayer et al., 1999; Salovey et al., 2001). Emotional intelligence has also been shown to have an effect on important life outcomes such as forming satisfying personal relationships and achieving success at work (Salovey and Grewal, 2005). Lopes et al. (2004) have conducted a study on the correlations between emotional intelligence and social relationships. It was found that participants who score higher on emotional intelligence reported greater success in their social interactions with members of the opposite sex (Salovey and Grewal, 2005). Lopes et al. (2004) also found that students high in emotional intelligence were more likely to provide them with emotional support in times of need. Emotionally intelligent people may therefore have the capacity to increase favourable reciprocity within a relationship. After investigating the quality of interpersonal relationships such as having a long
conversation with friends, and getting screamed at by a friend, it was found that emotional intelligence was associated with more positive and fewer negative interpersonal events (Brackett et al., 2004; Lopes et al., 2006). Jordan et al. (2002) also conducted a study on how emotional intelligence moderates reactions and negative coping with job insecurity and the ability to cope with the associated stress. They found that employees with low emotional intelligence are more likely to experience negative emotional reactions to job insecurity and to adopt negative coping strategies.

2.5.4 Impact of Emotional Intelligence on Work/Team Performance
Several research projects have also shown that emotional intelligence has a significant impact on work performance, which is promising. For example, emotional intelligence has been found to be significant for effective team performance (Jordan et al., 2002). The study reported that average team emotional intelligence predicted team performance. The study found that teams with high emotional intelligence operated at high levels of performance throughout the study period. There were also increasing empirical and theoretical studies on the relevance of emotional intelligence in related work such as the impact of emotional intelligence in organizational change (Huy, 2002) and the link between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction (Sy et al., 2006), job performance (Côté and Miners, 2006; Semadar et al., 2006) and organizational citizenship behaviour (Côté and Miners, 2006).

2.6 Chapter Summary
Several literatures refer organizations as emotional places because the core organization of work concerns what employees do with their feelings. Emotional expression also becomes a key part of the work role. This gives rise to the concept of emotional intelligence and its impacts on the overall organization. Its popularity however has attracted many researchers and scholars to redefine the term emotional intelligence, develop competing models and measurement, and argue on its significant contributions. Among the different models, ability model provides a more focused definition of emotional intelligence that focus on internal emotions of individuals that is important for personal growth. The model also used objective performance measure to assess people’s actual abilities and performance level.
There have also been many seminal writings on emotional intelligence that examining its implication on individual well being and life outcomes, employees' work performance and leadership. Despite being a popular construct, the study of emotional intelligence is still at its infancy. Few researches have been done on emotional intelligence in particular based on the ability model.
CHAPTER 3
LITERATURE REVIEW: EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND CHANGE IN MERGER

3.0 Introduction

This chapter begins with a review of the literature on change in organizations. This includes the importance of change, approaches and merger in specific. The effects of change on employees’ emotions, attitudes and responses toward change are also included in this section. This will then be followed by a section on the role of emotional intelligence in merger. This chapter also addresses the question of whether emotional intelligence can be developed. This section will include the debate and models used in developing emotional intelligence, as well as the significance of training intervention in developing emotional intelligence.

3.1 Change in Organizations

3.1.1 Importance of Change in Organizations
Many authors agree that organizational change has become an important means of organizational survival (By, 2005; French and Delahaye, 1996; Neves and Caetano, 2006). However, so far, there is no universal definition of what is meant by change (Hughes, 2006) and it is never clearly explained (Dawson, 1994). In much of the management literature rhetorical generalizations about change are the only constants that can often be found (Berquist, 1993; Hughes, 2006). According to French (2001), the constant ‘uncertainties, mysteries, doubts’ that are provoked within organizations by environmental turbulence are often described ironically as the only one constant of organizational life. Change is an ever-present feature of organizational life, at both an operational and strategic level (By, 2005) and has become an increasingly common context for contemporary work (Kiefer, 2005). Change is often unpredictable, reactive, discontinuous, ad hoc and frequently triggered by a situation of organizational crisis (Burnes, 2005).

Change is therefore critical and complex, but at the same time essential (Madsen et al., 2005). Organizations are influenced by both external and internal forces which
today make change indispensable for survival and stability. Burke (2002) notes how
organizations are changing all the time, each and every day. The scale and scope of
change vary depending on the level of management involved in the change, whether
part or the whole organization is affected and the type of change taking place from
the incremental to the large-scale radical change. Incremental change has been
described as ongoing organizational change characterized by the ‘fine tuning’ of the
fit between the organization’s strategy, structure, people and processes. By contrast
radical change entails modular and corporate transformation. Modular transformation
is where organizational change is characterized by a major realignment of one or
more departments or divisions. Corporate transformation is where organizational
change is corporation-wide and implies radical shifts in strategy and revolutionary
changes throughout the whole organization (Dunphy and Stace, 1990; Stace and
Dunphy, 1996; Beugelsdijk et al., 2001).

3.1.2 Approaches to Understanding Organizational Change
The definition of organizational change is itself evolutionary, in that researchers are
continuing to offer definitions of the term. Iacovini (1993), for example, refers to
change as a rational process which is carefully planned and orchestrated to move
organizations from one capacity to another. There have been broad generic
definitions of change offered by several authors. For example, Bartol and Martin
(1994) suggest that change is any alteration of the status quo, Dawson (2003)
defines organizational change as a new way of organizing and working, and Hultman
(1998) defines change as thinking or doing something new or differently.

There have been contradictory theories and approaches to change management
currently available to academics and practitioners, most lacking empirical evidence
and supported by unchallenged hypotheses concerning the nature of contemporary
organizational change management (By, 2005). Change model can be identified as
planned and emergent change (Bamford and Forrester, 2003; Burnes, 1996;
Hughes, 2006; By, 2005). The planned approach framework was first introduced by
Kurt Lewin (1951) and involves three steps: unfreezing, moving and freezing. This
approach explains the process that brings about change, assumes that the
environment is known and that change ought to be done, and proposes that change
is thought through and implemented. According to Bullock and Batten (1985), this model looks at the processes of change, which describe the methods employed to move an organization from one state to another, and the phases of change, which describe the stages an organization must go through to achieve successful implementation. This approach assumes that organizations operate under constant conditions, and move in a pre-planned manner from one stable state to another (Bamford and Forrester, 2003).

This approach and its universal applicability, however, has been criticized and challenged by a number of recent authors of change literature. Wilson (1992) and Burnes (2004) criticize the idea that change can be planned logically and systematically because of the current fast-changing environment. This predictable process controlled largely by the company leader is therefore unrealistic in a contemporary fast-changing, chaotic world (Andreeva, 2008). Hughes (2006) argues that the change process is simultaneously bold and reassuring, and therefore cannot be seen as a smooth transition process from a previously articulated strategic vision towards a future desired state. Burnes (2004) also suggested that organizational change is more an open-ended and continuous process rather than a set of pre-identified set of discrete and self-contained events. Burnes (2004) and Senior (2002) suggest that the planned approach also places emphasis on small-scale change and is therefore not applicable to situations that require rapid and transformational change. The planned approach has also been challenged for ignoring situations which require a more direct approach such as a critical situation requiring a major, rapid change (Burnes, 2004; Kanter et al., 1992).

The planned approach has also been criticized for its assumption that all stakeholders in a change project are willing and interested in implementing change and that a common agreement can be reached, as well as for ignoring organizational politics and conflict which it is assumed can easily be identified and resolved (Bamford and Forrester, 2003; Burnes, 2004). With reference to the nature of the change, many researchers have challenged this approach to change management that suggests a rather reassuring linear evolution of thinking of planned change (Hughes, 2006).
A relatively new approach is the emergent approach according to which change is unpredictable and shaped by a range of variables (Hughes, 2006; By, 2005). The emergent process is often cyclical, spiral, an open system and allows learning to take place (Salaman and Asch, 2003; Wilson, 1992; Altman and Iles, 1998; Davidson and De Marco, 1999). Burnes (2004) and Dawson (1994) argue that the emergent approach emphasizes that change should not be perceived as a series of linear events within a given period of time, but rather as a continuous, open-ended process of adaptation to changing circumstances and conditions. Furthermore, an emergent approach also acknowledges political compromise influenced by cultures and subcultures in comparison to the planned approach (Hughes, 2006). Burnes (2004) therefore suggests that the emergent model is suitable for all organizations, in all situations and at all times. Based on the identification of emergent approach, a merger can therefore be categorized as an emergent model of change.

3.1.3 Organizational Merger as Change
This phenomenon of the merger has increasingly stimulated scientific publications over the last two decades (Kusstatcher and Cooper, 2005). The frequency of organizational mergers has been on the increase in recent years and has become a popular strategic means for organizations to enhance their profitability or simply to survive in the face of fierce global competition (Van Dick et al., 2006). Merger activities have also been an ongoing part of the operational strategy of many organizations for years, and have proven to be a significant and popular means for achieving corporate diversity, growth and rationalization (Cartwright and Cooper, 1993). There are several reasons for companies to merge including: (1) economies of scale and scope or synergy effects; (2) managerial strategies such as diversification; (3) external factors such as market conditions that offer business opportunities; (4) management strategies such as increasing market share; (5) personal interests of shareholders; and (4) psychological factors such as the fear of obsolescence (Kusstatcher and Cooper, 2005).

Commonly, a merger is defined as a complete union or amalgamation of two or more companies in order to become a managerially interwoven, economic and legal unity (Gabler-Verlag, 1993 in Kusstatcher and Cooper, 2005). Integration can take place
at different levels such as the administrative, strategic and operative, and may be classified into four main types: vertical, conglomerate, concentric and horizontal (Kusstatcher and Cooper, 2005; Cartwright and Cooper, 1996; Nahavandi and Malekzadeh, 1993). Kusstatcher and Cooper (2005) described these different forms of merger as follows:

1. Vertical merger refers to the union of companies from successive processes within the same industry, such as organizations present in supplier–customer relationships.

2. Conglomerate merger occurs between companies in completely unrelated business fields with diversification often as the main driving force.

3. Concentric merger is when companies from different but related industries amalgamate. This can happen when an acquirer tries to expand into other fields of business activity.

4. Horizontal or related merger is where two similar companies in a related line of business in the same industry or a number of direct competitors combine.

One concern with integration is that for the companies involved to be fully integrated requires the total absorption of one firm’s culture into that of the other or the creation of a third culture (Baptiste, 2002). According to Buono et al (2002) this means even if the two partners are considered to be equal, in reality most of the cases are an acquisition in which one organization takes over control of the other. Moreover, mergers have often been critically reviewed as examples of strategic change (Hughes, 2006) and perceived as a quantum change where the change itself involves many elements at once instead of piece by piece (Iacovini, 1993). Mergers together with layoffs and restructuring are categorized as large-scale and fundamental transformations (Reilly et al., 1993). Merger therefore seems to fit with the definition of radical change and with definitions of corporate transformation. However, very little is known about approaches to change that lead to successful mergers (Hitt et al., 2001). Although many managers today are increasingly coming to terms with the need for carefully designed and implemented programmes for change, in most cases mergers and acquisitions do not seem to lead to higher performance (King et al., 2004). Change programmes often do not result in successful change despite being highly developed, visible and expensive processes (Beer et al., 1990).
One of the reasons suggested for the failure of change in mergers is that leaders and employees have conflicting objectives and see change rather differently (Garside, 1998). For leaders, change is an opportunity and a survival strategy whereas for employees change is seen as disruptive and intrusive (Strebel, 1996). Secondly, for most executives their decision to merge is often motivated, evaluated and justified by economic factors (Ivancevich et al., 1987; Marks, 1988;). Financial factors seem to be emphasized heavily and success is measured too often in financial terms only (Kusstatcher and Cooper, 2005). Several scholars have also documented that merging companies are either financially unsuccessful or show no significant increase in terms of financial return (Buono et al., 2002; Cooper and Gregory, 2003; Marks, 1988). Lack of pre-planning, strategic and financial mismatch, and unpredicted changes in market conditions further trigger the failure of mergers (Cartwright and Cooper, 1990).

The third reason for mergers to fail appears to be that senior managers often tend to ignore and underestimate the ‘softer issues’ or human factors in their merger change programmes (Woodward and Hendry, 2004; Kusstatscher and Cooper, 2005; Cartwright and Cooper, 1993, 2000; Davy et al., 1989). Most research has focused on how change is implemented during the merger and how stakeholders react to it (Neves and Caetano, 2006) rather than how to survive the merger or how to maintain organizational morale and productivity. According to Kusstatscher and Cooper (2005), despite the growing body of literature on mergers, it is severely limited due to the rather small number of published psychological/behavioural studies on mergers, thus providing little understanding of the human factors involved. Moreover, although the human factors in mergers have attracted increasing attention since the 1980s, the specific human factors involved have generally received far less attention in the merger and acquisition literature (Kusstatscher and Cooper, 2005). Klein (1976) and Thomas (1989) also earlier argued that researchers to date have only taken the perspective of those in charge of implementing change (managers) and not that of the employees who are affected by change. Vakola et al. (2004) have also argued that research dealing with organizational change has mainly focused on organizational factors, neglecting the person-oriented issues. This is supported by Schuler and Jackson (2001) who stated that managers neglect the human issues,
believing that human factors are not crucial for a successful merger or acquisition. Organizations also do not understand the human side nearly as well as they understand the business side (Iacovini, 1993). The failure to sufficiently emphasize the human factors in the merger literature may thus contribute to the failure of change in practice.

Often merger success is measured in terms of behavioural indices such as employee stress, organizational commitment and morale, job satisfaction, mental and physical well-being, sickness absence or fluctuation rates (Kusstatcher and Cooper, 2005). However, the role of emotions in organizational change has not been extensively investigated and the typical organizational change paradigm has tended to focus on problem-based models which underestimate the impact of emotions (Vince and Broussine, 1996). The study of the impact of change on the individual in the organizational change field has therefore not been researched extensively. Too often, organizations give lip service to the human side and focus their attention on the business side, because many top managers find business issues more comfortable to deal with than people issues (Iacovini, 1993). As a result there is little information on individual change in organizations (French and Delahaye, 1996). Furthermore, individual and organization change has been seen as synonymous (Hughes, 2006). Early writers on organizational change were rather ‘narrow minded’, as Randall (2004) argues, in that they see all levels in the organization (organization, groups and individuals) as a seamless series of events. Jones et al. (2005) commented that organizations often move directly into change implementation before the individuals or groups involved in the change are psychologically ready. Hughes (2006) has therefore suggested a need for a greater understanding of change at the individual level in order to obtain a more sophisticated understanding of change management.

3.1.4 Emotional Responses to Change

Many authors have acknowledged that individual change is an integral ingredient of organizational change processes. However, there has been very little work on the emotional impact of change on individuals (Hughes, 2006). The emotional issues in organizational life have traditionally been largely neglected (Erikson, 2004) and it is only relatively recently after a lapse of more than half a century that organizational
researchers have begun to demonstrate a serious interest in moods and emotions in the workplace (Brief and Weiss, 2002).Researchers now have begun to consider the emotional undercurrents to change (Mossholder et al., 2000). It is further emphasized by Huy (1999) that theoretical attempts were made to link large-scale organizational change to changes in intra-organizational processes of thought and feeling, but actions have been modest. Research on emotion in organizations suggests that emotion represents an important dimension in major change processes because emotion is often described as an impairment to clear thinking and effective strategic action (Huy, 2005).

There have been attempts to change emotion through planned change programmes. Turnbull (1999) in her research reported that change programmes expect middle managers to control their emotions by performing emotional labour in order to manage the interface between the senior managers and the employees. A study by Eriksson (2004) specifically reported the effects of change programmes on employees' emotions. This study demonstrated how change programmes provoked emotions and depression among the affected employees. Turnbull (2002) studied the implications of managing emotions through corporate change programmes. The study, however, found that managers' responses tend to be unintended and unexpected and vary from the intended emotion desired by the planned change programme.

There are also discussions on change as presenting a threat and an opportunity, as a cause of mourning and celebration, as being surprising and predictable, controlled and uncontrolled (Antonacopoulou and Gabriel, 2001). According to O'Neill and Lenn (1995) change can trigger a wide range of positive (for example, excitement, creativity) and negative responses (for example, anger, anxiety, cynicism, resentment, resignation). These emotional responses therefore contribute challenges both to those who implement change and those who are affected by it (O'Neill and Lenn, 1995). Huy (2005) also argues that change arouses emotions that motivate action responses. Carr's (2001) study also reports organizational members displaying feelings and emotions of frustration, suspicion, resistance, anger, despair, grief and stress as a result of change. Whenever change happens, many emotions are generated in individuals (French, 2001). When change meets the personal needs
of the employees, joy, happiness and excitement may occur; however, when change is seen as a threat, emotions such as fear, envy, anger, frustration and sadness may follow. Other authors also highlighted similar behaviour as change outcomes. When experiencing change, employees may respond with feelings of stress or reduced commitment (Armenakis and Bedeian, 1999), decreased well-being and deteriorating health (Kusstatscher and Cooper, 2005). Vince (2006) in his studies identified several emotional responses experienced by senior managers as a result of being taken over: pain, anger, shame, powerlessness, purposelessness and fear. Earlier, the emotional experience of change processes had often been seen as ‘being irrational’ (for example, Fineman, 1993). Kets de Vries and Miller (1985) also suggested that organizational change has been a catalyst provoking irrational and neurotic managerial responses. Page (1998) described change as the source of all human progress and all human pain.

Within the literature of organizational change more generally, emotions are often only viewed either in terms of stress that needs to be coped with, or as resistance that needs to be reduced or worked through and managed away in order to implement change successfully (Kiefer, 2002). This is supported by a few texts on organizational change that compared emotions and response to change with individual responses to traumatic changes such as death and grief (Grant et al., 1998; Henderson-Loney, 1996), and as closure or death (Hardy, 1985). Iacovini (1993) stated that when an organization embarks on a major change effort, employees at all levels find themselves floundering in a ‘sea of stress and confusion’. As a result of change members of organizations are often shaken by intensive emotions and therefore find it difficult to cope with change (Appelbaum et al., 2000; Marks and Mirvis, 1986).

There is a wide range of emotions that employees may experience in an organization in response to change from the very negative (unpleasant) to the quite positive (or pleasant); for example, employees may experience joy and pride or may see changes as an opportunity for advancement or a positive move (Eriksson, 2004). According to Eriksson (2004), anyone affected by change will experience some emotional turmoil. Kusstatscher and Cooper (2005) argue that most affected employees feel irritated and insecure because they are not able to see the upcoming
changes as a positive challenge, instead viewing change as a threat. Employees may fear to lose their position, power or even jobs. The emotional consequences of this include anxiety, aggression, helplessness, degradation, impotence and worthlessness, and employees often respond with bitterness, anger and rage against the decision-makers (Kusstatscher and Cooper, 2005). Others also argue that fundamental changes in personal, strategy, identity or other major organizational issues trigger wide ranging emotions (Bartunek, 1984). Emotions such as anxiety can then transfer to their families (partner and children) leading to frustration, depression and a plunge into apathy (Appelbaum et al., 2000; Cartwright and Cooper, 1993).

Emotional reactions could also be due to the loss of the former organizational culture (Cartwright and Cooper, 2000), employees' identification with their company and their commitment are likely to change (Appelbaum et al., 2000; Covin et al., 1996), their identity is being transformed into something new, and the organizational culture of both merging partners is altering (Kusstatscher and Cooper, 2005).

When major organizational change takes place, it involves many different kinds of personal loss for people at all levels (Eriksson, 2004): feelings of insecurity and uncertainty in roles and direction (Woodward and Hendry (2004), deep emotions such as irritation, anger, aggression, frustration or anxieties about losing career opportunities or even one’s job (Kusstatscher and Cooper, 2005), perceived significance of events in terms of potential harm/loss, threat or challenge (Lazarus, 1999), and feelings of equilibrium, denial, anger, bargaining, chaos, depression, resignation, openness, readiness and re-emergence (Crouch et al., 1992). When organizational decisions and managerial actions are deemed unfair, the affected employees can experience feelings of anger, outrage and a desire for retribution (Bies and Tripp, 1996; Folger and Skarlicki, 1999). In some situations, managers tend to isolate themselves from employees because they do not know what to tell their staff or how to tell them (Marks, 1999). Such behaviour in return can create distrust and doubt towards managers and jeopardize employee–supervisor relationship (Marks, 1999). Therefore, the change of identity which occurs in post-merger situations is a highly emotional process, accompanied by stress and uncertainty in response to organizational changes (Cartwright and Cooper, 2000).
Sadly, these general views of emotions in the literature of organizational change are stereotypical. Emotions are often seen as a cause of the problems occurring during the implementation of change. Kiefer (2002), however, disagreed with this and instead views changes as ‘trigger events’ that prompt new behaviours and thoughts and also stir emotions in both employees and managers. She also views emotions as emergent from change processes and as playing an important role in adjustment to change. That is, emotions are viewed as specific reactions to events (Kiefer, 2005). Emotions are also viewed as causing undesirable negative reactions (such as stress) to change (for example, Cartwright and Cooper, 1994) that create irrational reactions or resistance (Piderit, 2000) which further inflict dysfunctional behaviour among employees (Kiefer, 2002). Kiefer (2002) put forward the criticism that emotions are not seen as an expression of the underlying difficulties. She went on to state that the antecedents of emotions are related to how individuals evaluate the relevance of different kinds of triggering events. According to Kiefer (2002) emotions should be understood as a reaction to an event which is cognitively appraised (for example, the significance of the event to personal well-being), as an adaptive function that helps individuals to adjust their behaviour to a specific situation, and discussed as both an individual (for example, the experience of anger and fear) and social phenomenon (for example, social interactions within groups). Kiefer (2002) further argued that individuals acquire emotional experiences differently during change processes and that the emotional experiences ranged from the negative to the positive.

Nonetheless, emotion has up to very recently been viewed as inappropriate for organizational life, as disruptive and illogical, and has generally received relatively little attention as an area of research within organizations (Ashford and Humphrey, 1995; Fineman, 1993; Opengart, 2005). Most of the change literature also focuses on rational and cognitive aspects and views emotions merely as human frailty or the cause of interference with the implementation of change (Kiefer, 2002).
3.1.5 Emotions and Mergers
Lazarus and Lazarus (1994) identified five categories of emotions. The first is the unpleasant set of emotions, which include anger, envy and jealousy. The second set is the existential emotions, and include anxiety, guilt and shame. The third set is emotions provoked by unfavourable life conditions, which include relief, hope, sadness and depression. For example, job loss, experienced or witnessed in others draws out emotions in the contemporary world of work which may include these (Muchinsky, 2000). The fourth set is emotions provoked by favourable life conditions which include happiness, pride and love. Lastly, the empathetic emotions include gratitude and compassion. The first three categories are classified as negative emotions which may lead to negative reactions, whereas the last two categories are classified as positive emotions which can cause positive reactions in the workplace.

There has been interest among practitioners and researchers on employees’ attachment to the organization and the nature of the relationship between employees and organizations as a result of changes such as mergers, acquisitions or layoffs (Neves and Caetano, 2006). It appears from much research that organizational transformations can provoke a wide range of positive and negative responses from organization members (Gilmore et al., 1997; Mossholder et al., 2000). Mossholder et al. (2000) also argues that, regardless the size of change or whether the transformation is a major restructuring or a minor reorganization, organizational change has great potential to elicit emotion.

With regard to organizational phenomena, nowhere is there greater potential for emotion-eliciting events than in conjunction with large-scale organizational transformations such as mergers (Mossholder et al., 2000). There do seem to be differences, however, in the emotional impact depending upon the type of merger. The effect on employees experiencing a conglomerate merger, for example, is not as critical as the effect of a horizontal merger. This has been explained as being due to the unrelated business of the merged companies so that the consequences remain at the senior management level with far fewer effects being felt by the employees. On the other hand, when two direct competitors merge horizontally, employees are more likely to be directly affected. This is because the potential for synergy is larger thus redundancies and power games appear more frequently and become a
significant challenge to change management (Kusstatscher and Cooper, 2005). For example, a merger may affect the employees’ sense of identification because it dissolves two distinct groups into the newly created merged entity and threatens the distinctiveness of the pre-merger group identity (Van Dick et al., 2006).

There has been some reference to different emotions during mergers. However, these emotions are only briefly mentioned and never defined, are poorly described, are hardly ever brought into context (causes and consequences) and are never listed or analysed completely (Kusstatscher and Cooper, 2005). For example, merger creates uncertainty during the negotiation process which thus leads to stress among employees (Schweiger and De Nisi, 1991). Merger has been conceptualized as a stressful life event (Panchal and Cartwright, 2001). The effects of mergers have been found to be similar to those of a black cloud in the sky (Van Dick et al., 2006). According to Kiefer (2002), organizational changes, in particular merger activities, are very emotive events. Mergers constitute difficult emotional experiences because they create uncertainty out of the unknown (Bovey and Hede, 2001) and provoke anxiety, stress and feelings of loss (for example, Marks and Mirvis, 1992; Cartwright et al., 2007). Following the announcement of a merger, negative emotional reactions are believed to be triggered, including feelings of loss and anxiety (Schweiger et al., 1987) and an epidemic of stress (McHugh, 1995). In-group bias (Terry and Callan, 1998), cultural incompatibility and culture clashes are the common sources of merger problems and employee stress (Bakker and Helmink, 2000).

From the employees’ perspective, a merger is a tremendous process of organizational change (Van Dick et al., 2008). The announcement of the merger may result in apprehension and concerns among employees and shareholders (Van Dick et al., 2006). According to Albert and Whetten (1985) mergers challenge an organization’s identity (such as its distinctive enduring features, culture or working style). This challenge will therefore further threaten individual employees’ identity such as through the loss of psychological attachment (Van Dick et al., 2008). Merger can also be a challenge to the social identity. Since a merger brings together an in-group and a former out-group into a larger unit, social identification can become a challenge to the employees.
Elsewhere in the literature it is argued that merger activities fail due to a neglect of human issues and a focus only on financial issues, and as a result management overlook the emotional effect of the merger on their employees. Panchal and Cartwright (2001) summarized the empirical studies on the elevation of stress among employees affected by merger. For example, high stress levels were demonstrated among the employees of an acquired television company in Hong Kong (Siu et al., 1997), among lecturers undergoing change (Gibbons, 1998) and among managers in a post-merger study (Cartwright and Cooper, 1993). Hogan and Overmyer-Day (1994) also support the findings that employees from acquired companies are confronted with higher stress levels than employees from the acquiring company. Thus mergers not only affect the lives of employees in material ways (Van Dick et al., 2006) but also affect their psychological health (Cartwright and Cooper, 2000). The negative reactions among employees to mergers were due to obvious reasons such as the fear of losing one’s job leading to damaging implications of mergers on personal well-being and security (Van Dick et al., 2006).

Besides the negative impact of mergers on emotional responses, elsewhere in the literature on emotions, there are also discussions about positive emotional responses during the merger process. For example, Kiefer (2002) argues that during a merger, employees experience not only negative but also positive emotions. According to the existing literature, employees from the bigger company experience positive emotions compared to the employees of the smaller or acquired company (Kiefer, 2002). On the other hand, it is suggested that employees from the acquired company or smaller merger partner are confronted with more stress because they face longer and more negative change (Hogan and Overmyer-Day, 1994), feel worthless and inferior due to the loss of their autonomy and status (Hambrick and Cannella, 1993) and experience high levels of dissatisfaction with the merger due to stress as a result of the change (Covin et al., 1996).

3.1.6 Employees' Degree of Support for Change
Because they influence so many parts of the organizations involved in such fundamental ways, mergers represent a very difficult organizational change process (Kavanagh and Ashkanasy, 2006). They are highly complex events with a seemingly
infinite number of factors that can lead to success or failure. Successful organizational change takes place when employees have a purpose, a plan for and a part to play in that change and are ready for the change (Bridges, 2003). However, there are many possible influential factors on support for change that have not yet been studied (Madsen et al., 2005). Employee readiness for change can be defined as a cognitive state comprising the beliefs, attitudes and intentions toward a change effort (Armenakis et al., 1999). Change can be implemented more easily if participants accept the new attributes and are able to enact them (Neves and Caetano, 2006). With this positive impact, change can provide a wealth of opportunities for growth and development.

Studies have also shown that positive attitudes to change are essential in achieving organizational goals and in successful change programmes (Eby et al., 2000; Kotter, 1996). A number of researchers have confirmed that for organizational readiness, members must be open, prepared and ready for change (Madsen et al., 2005; Backer, 1995; Eby et al., 2000). Berneath (2004) explained that this is a critical factor in successful change efforts. Based on the existing change literature, organizations can successfully manage change when employees respond positively toward the change and support the change (French and Delahaye, 1996). Hanpachern's (1997) study directly measured social relations and found that it is significantly related to readiness for change and organizational culture (Madsen et al., 2005).

On the other hand, change efforts often run into some form of human resistance (Eriksson, 2002). There have been ample studies on resistance to change compared to support for change. According to Tushman et al. (1988), as an organization grows, becomes more successful and develops internal forces for stability, these same forces eventually produce resistance. Isabellla (1990) argues that this resistance to change is an inherent element of the cognitive transition occurring during change. Ansoff (1990) refers to resistance as the phenomenon that affects the change process, delaying or slowing down its beginning, obstructing or hindering its implementation, and increasing its costs. Maurer (1996) and Rumelt (1995) viewed resistance as equivalent to inertia and the persistent avoidance of change. Hultman (1998) defines resistance as a state of mind that reflects unwillingness or unreceptiveness that is manifested in either active opposition to change or an
attempt to escape or avoid it. Researchers such as Ashkanasy et al. (1993) and Armenakis and Harris (2002) explain that, because of differing cognitive structures, individuals react differently to the same change message (Madsen et al., 2005; Kiefer, 2002). This resistance to change is implicitly assumed to be an irrational and counterproductive behaviour by many writers on change and as a result detrimental to the productive efficiency of the organization (King and Anderson, 1995).

Resistance is also seen as an unavoidable and natural behavioural response to the perceived threat of change (King and Anderson, 1995). People resist change because: (1) they are afraid of losing something of value; (2) misunderstand the change and its implications; (3) believe that change does not make sense; and (4) have low tolerance for change (Kotter and Schlesinger, 1979). Strong beliefs and values also constitute powerful obstacles to change (Eriksson, 2004). When ‘human issues’ in major change are insufficiently attended to, it is likely to generate resistance (Lines, 2004). Resistance generally is a common feature, particularly when people perceive change as a threat, regardless of how large or small the change (Brown, 1986). The widely held belief that people tend to resist change has caused Dent and Goldberg (1999) to challenge the model that presumes organizational change necessarily causes resistance. They argue that people do not resist change per se, but rather the resistance is to the ‘effect’ of change such as loss of status, loss of pay or loss of comfort.

King and Anderson (1995) suggest that previous experience of organizational change will have a significant impact and may cause resistance to change. The social constructivist theories argue that emotional experiences are socially shaped and emerge from the individual’s evaluation of the situation, which is influenced by the person’s socialization and cultural environment. Earlier, Kotter and Schlesinger (1979) also argued that such attitudes can be caused by a lack of trust and a misunderstanding of the intentions of change (as determined by previous experience), by low tolerance of or inflexibility towards change and also through self-interest. Individual factors such as inertia also delay and derail the process of learning and change and form a response to change (Eriksson, 2002). Kanter et al. (1992) argue that people resist change not purely on emotional grounds but for understandable and predictable reasons (Garside, 1998). These include factors such
as loss of power, loss of face, additional workload, loss of income, job insecurity and different perceptions of change as a result of lack of access to information, misunderstanding or lack of trust, and low tolerance for change (for example, Kotter, 1979; Dawson 1996).

Resistance also occurs at the moment when fear overtakes desire as our dominant motive. Hultman (1998) also argued that when people resist change, it is often due to the incompatibility of change with the individual's values, beliefs and attitudes. When reinforced with past experience and learning, individuals further resist major changes. This defensive and fear-the- worst response is generally regarded as a normal and expected human reaction to the experience of major organizational change (Kusstatscher and Cooper, 2005). Resisting change is one way for employees to exercise their power to restore the injustice within the existing power relationships (Jermier et al., 1994). The rational resistance occurs where individuals decide to resist change because change is perceived as detrimental in some way to their working conditions (King and Anderson, 1995).

Much of the research on individual responses to organizational change assumes that resistance will be the universal response and is moderated by several factors. The first factor concerns the way change is managed (Crouch et al., 1992). Poor management includes poor information being passed on, filtered information and the type of information provided, the management style, the degree of participation in decision-making and an autocratic rather than a democratic style of leadership (Hardy, 1985).

The existing literature states that merger creates a threat to the organization's identity and thus to the employees' social identification with that organization which in turn has negative consequences for employees' collective identity and self-esteem (Van Dick et al., 2006). Lines (2004) stated resistance as 'behaviours acted out by recipients in order to slow down or terminate organizational change'. Resistance to change is explained by Folger and Skarlicki (1999) as a response to the treatment employees receive in the change process. Haunschild et al. (1994) reported that groups that had a common identity based on previous interactions showed stronger resistance to the merging of their group than groups with no such shared work
history. Staw et al. (1981) goes on to state that this behavioural response is most likely due to an inability to match the new stimuli with the new behaviour, to managers’ psychological ‘sealing of information’ and to denial or avoidance of the need to act in new ways.

3.1.7 Employees’ Job Attitudes towards Change
According to the change literature, based on their emotional responses, employees will react to change either positively or negatively and therefore support change or resist change. These responses to change will later influence the job attitudes of employees. The outcome may include job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job insecurity and also withdrawal intention. Emotional episodes in the workplace have important attitudinal and behavioural consequences (George and Jones, 1997; Weiss, 2002; Weiss and Cropanzano, 1996). This can include decreased trust and commitment, increased turnover intentions and work slowdowns (for example, Buono and Bowditch, 1989; Hogan and Overmyer-Day, 1994; Paterson and Cary, 2002; Schweiger and De Nisi, 1991), and withdrawal (Fridja, 1994; Wacker et al., 2003). Emotions are therefore key to understanding the negative reactions to organizational change and the success or failure of change attempts (Fugate et al., 2002; Mossholder et al., 2000).

The direct effects of merger on employees’ job attitudes, however, have not been explored extensively. Two articles on the relationship between merger effects and attitudes of affected employees were published by Shirley (1973) and Bourgeois (1985). However, since then most studies are more interested in the implications of merger for the performance of the organization and ignore the impact of mergers on employees. When people cannot tolerate the emotional impact of the ‘uncertainties, mysteries and doubts’ or when they experience the psychological pain of contradiction, they will disperse (Needleman, 1990).

This dispersal takes three forms including explanations, emotional reactions and physical action (Needleman, 1990). These are the defensive-reactive impulses when the environment does not fit with a person’s working and private life. Moreover, when people are committed, it is less likely that they will voluntarily leave the organization
(Allen and Meyer, 1996). A meta-analysis conducted by Meyer et al. (2002) showed that employees with high affective commitment present less turnover and absenteeism, perform better in their job, present more organizational citizenship behaviours and show lower levels of stress and work–family conflict, reflecting its importance to the better functioning of the organization.

Resistance to change or a negative attitude toward change can reduce work satisfaction, which in turn may negatively affect the relationship between the individual and the organization (Ferguson and Cheyne, 1995). Resistance is most commonly linked with negative employee attitudes or with counterproductive behaviours (Waddell and Sohal, 1998). Organizational change may produce high levels of anxiety and stress in employees which in turn may elicit behavioural responses of withdrawal (Staw et al., 1994). Lau and Woodman (1995) argued that attitudes toward organizational change depend on an individual’s change schemata which are defined as mental maps representing knowledge structures of change attributes, and relationships among different change events. This is related to cognitive appraisal theory that regards emotions as acquired from the ‘interpretation’ of the stimulus.

Individuals and groups at any level in the organization are also habit driven (King and Anderson 1995) and have the desire to function according to routine. The emotional turmoil leads to decreased motivation, lower job satisfaction and a reduced commitment towards the organization. Job alternatives are sought, turnover, dismissal and exodus increase, and a rumour mill is generated when top-down communication is unclear (Kusstatscher and Cooper, 2005). Managers do not respond to change with simple resistance but rather favour action such as withdrawal and flight (Crouch et al., 1992). Linked to this has been research on negative affect within change. Negative affect is a general dimension of subjective distress and unpleasurable engagement that subsumes a variety of aversive mood states, including anger, contempt, disgust, guilt, fear and nervousness. If this negative affect is experienced in a work situation, it is likely to encourage behavioural withdrawal from that situation (Pelled and Xin, 1999). Typically negative affect includes unpleasant, uncomfortable emotions that will motivate individuals to
take action, such as withdrawal, i.e. separating oneself from one’s current situation. This is a common action taken in response to negative emotion (Thayer et al., 1994).

In addition, any failure to communicate (the anticipated effects of the change) leaves employees uncertain about their futures, and it is often that uncertainty, rather than the changes themselves that is so stressful for employees (Schweiger and De Nisi, 1991). Failure to communicate with employees as soon as possible after the merger announcement will increase uncertainty and employees’ willingness to rely upon rumours (often inaccurate information), which can further increase anxiety (Schweiger and De Nisi, 1991). The uncertainty and anxiety can lead to such dysfunctional outcomes as stress, job dissatisfaction, low trust in the organization and commitment to it, and increased intentions to leave the organization (see Schweiger and De Nisi, 1991). These dysfunctions can in turn diminish productivity and increase turnover and absenteeism (Schweiger and De Nisi, 1991).

3.2 Role of Emotional Intelligence in Change Management during a merger

Change involves several aspects including the organizational and social context of change and how change is managed, involves all employees in the change process whether change is planned or emergent (Hughes, 2006) and involves, either directly or indirectly, changes in individual behaviour (Cummings, 2004). Hughes (2006) thus defines change management as attending to or managing the organizational transition process at the organizational, group and individual levels. Change management is therefore about people management. When managing change you manage people (Paton and McCalaman, 2000). Despite awareness of the importance of change management for survival in today’s highly competitive and continuously evolving environment, it has been reported that 70% of all change programmes initiated have failed (By, 2005). People-related issues as well as cultural issues have arguably been seen as less important and allocated a secondary role within many change perspectives (Ivancevich et al., 1987; Marks, 1988). According to Kanter et al. (1992), for change to be successful the entire organization is required to participate in the merger effort with mutual understanding, personnel and cultural integration from both partners.
The organizations in which people work affect their thoughts, feelings and affections both in the workplace and outside it (Brief and Weiss, 2002). According to the current literature on change (for example, Buono and Bowditch, 1989; Buono et al., 2002; Cartwright and Cooper, 1990, 1993; Kiefer, 2002; Schuler and Jackson, 2001; Siu et al., 1997) mergers and acquisitions should incorporate human aspects such as the organizational culture, people’s expectations, the compatibility of the two cultures, the impact on job satisfaction, the psychological contract, motivation, commitment and loyalty, unproductive behaviour, absenteeism rates and turnover, lower morale and acts of sabotage. Since organizations consist of people and people arguably do not change, there is no organizational change (Harung, 1997, citing Schneider et al., 1996). So for organizations to change, people must change. For leaders to help people change, they do not need to understand change – they need to understand people (Morrison, 1994). William Bridges’ book on *Surviving Corporate Transition* discusses the human experiences of going through life and work changes (Iacovini, 1993). He describes three phases of the change process – the ending, the neutral zone and the new beginning. His book also stresses the importance of helping people to work through this process during mergers, acquisitions, divestitures and lay-offs, when individuals are struggling to let go of an old paradigm, progress to an impasse – a rocky phase of ‘temporary insanity’ – and finally reach a risk-taking stage that leads to renewal (Iacovini, 1993).

Individuals within organizations have to cope with organizational change and it is axiomatic that it is through individuals that change management takes place (French and Delahaye, 1996). Woodward and Hendry (2004) noted that much of the pressure created by organizational change may be eased if the change agents focused on the people aspects in addition to the strategy and other organizational elements. O’Neill and Lenn (1995) detailed the emotional reactions of middle-level managers to organizational restructuring and downsizing, suggesting that more attention to such responses could lead to a fuller appreciation of managers’ experiences during change as well as a better comprehension of the change process overall. Therefore honouring employees’ needs and helping them to understand and make sense of what is going on can do more than just get them through the change, and under the right conditions, such understanding can enhance employees’
personal and professional growth, add value to their lives and lead to increased loyalty (Iacovini, 1993). However, more often this is not the case.

Cartwright and Panchal (2001) emphasized the need to enable workers to cope with the necessary amount of uncertainty and stress as an important factor in making a merger succeed. A number of existing studies have highlighted the relevance of psychodynamics to better understand the change process. Psychodynamics, according to Hamlin (2001), assists the individual to realize the implications of defensive behaviour. One of the most popular topics among psychologists and organizational consultants currently is ‘emotional intelligence’ (Abraham, 1999; Goleman, 1995; Goleman, 2002). With the definition of emotional intelligence constructed by Mayer and Salovey (1990, 1997), it is assumed that individuals affected by change are able to deal with the change syndrome (such as emotional responses) and thus support the change. Nevertheless, a study conducted by Slaski and Cartwright (2002) proves that emotional intelligence has a significant relationship to well-being and performance. Managers who scored high in emotional intelligence tend to suffer less stress, experience better health and well-being and therefore demonstrate better management performance (Slaski and Cartwright, 2002). Study conducted by Lopes et al. (2005) also found that emotional intelligence has a positive relationship with managing emotions (Branch 4 of the ability model) and the quality of social interactions. In addition to this, for organizational change to be successful, coping needs to be flexible and adapted to the requirements of the situation. Coping is not just a fixed set of strategies that are drawn on whenever they are needed, but a changing pattern that is responsive to what is happening (Muchinsky, 2000).

Mayer and Salovey (1990) also describe the emotionally intelligent character as a well-adjusted, genuine, warm, persistent and optimistic person. Emotional intelligence could psychodynamically support organizational change management by helping individuals to manage change effectively. Researchers to date have neglected research on employees’ inner feelings and emotions, and how emotional intelligence may interact with their feelings behaviour as a result of organizational change. Chapman (2002) emphasizes that the term emotional intelligence seized the attention of individuals and organizations as a result of change. Caruso (1999) has
also provided some suggestions for managing change using the ability model of emotional intelligence. Izard (2001) viewed the construct of emotional intelligence as the ability to adapt to emotion-eliciting circumstances.

Besides Jordan and Troth’s (2002) empirical study that found a link between emotional intelligence and attitudes and behaviours of workers, there is still a lack of empirical evidence linking emotional intelligence to workplace behaviours in general (Huy, 1999; Salovey and Mayer, 1990). Much of the existing articles and researches on emotional intelligence also did not specifically look at emotional intelligence and ‘people issue’ in change. Other articles on emotional intelligence and change (such as Huy, 1999; George and Jones, 2001) were presentation of the theoretical model. Huy (1999), for example, presented a multilevel theory of emotion and change, which focuses on attributes of emotional intelligence at the individual level and emotional capability at the organizational level. Huy’s (1999) theoretical model further suggested that emotional intelligence assists the individual’s adaptation and change in the form of receptivity, mobilization and learning. George and Jones’s (2001) propose that emotionally intelligent employees will be more likely to be adaptable in emotional reactions to discrepancies, signalling the need for change, since these people are more adaptive and responsive to their emotions and moods with better knowledge and understanding of the feelings they are experiencing.

Others such as Higgs and Rowland (2002), Groves (2006) and Chrusciel (2006) focus on leaders’ emotional intelligence and change. Both Higgs and Rowland’s (2002) and Chrusciel (2006) report a relationship between change leadership and emotional intelligence and the study were based on mixed model of emotional intelligence. Higgs’s (2002) article presents data from recent research that empirically demonstrates linkages between leadership and emotional intelligence to stimulate new research utilizing competency model of emotional intelligence. Groves (2006) examines leader’s emotional intelligence based on a self-assessment ‘Social Skills Inventory’ that measures individual’s repertoire of social and emotional communication skills. Vakola, et al (2003) also worked on emotional intelligence and organizational change however put emphasis on individual’s personality traits and assessed participants’ emotional intelligence using a self-report inventories. Huy’s (2002) article builds insights of emotional intelligence attributes such as emotional
awareness and repair. This study however was cross-sectional, examining different change projects. This study also does not utilise any specific model of emotional intelligence. Vakola’s et al (2003) study is a cross-sectional research which includes participants that experiencing different kinds of organizational change such as restructuring, culture change intervention and merger.

In summary, despite the plausible research on how emotional intelligence may assist people at work to manage change effectively, to date, however, little research has been conducted that considers the implications of emotional intelligence for organizational change in particular merger, using ability model of emotional intelligence over time. The literature on change also has not given sufficient attention to emotions, how emotions affect employees’ attitudes to change. Vakola et al (2003) argue that the role of emotions and its impact in organizational change has been underestimated and thus has not been extensively investigated. Most articles also focused on eccentric leadership and hardly looked at employees’ perspective. According to Judge et al (1999), people oriented research in organizational change explored issues of charismatic or transformational leadership, the role of top management in organizational change and the phenomenon of resistance to change, without considering the psychological affect of individuals experiencing the change, which are equally crucial for its success. There is also very little we know about how people attitude to change vary over a period of time. Investigation on individual emotions is a requisite in understanding the implication of merger in the organizational context and how they may vary over time.

Existing relevant literatures are also cross-sectional based. The problem with this cross-sectional study as opposed to longitudinal methodology, it does not allow affirmative causal explanation. However, no one so far looked at emotional intelligence and merger in a longitudinal study. It is also significant to examine the relationships between resistance and support for change relationship with job satisfaction, organizational commitment, job insecurity and intention to withdraw in merger context. Related to this, the implication of emotional intelligence on emotions, attitudes toward change and responses to change would be overwhelming to the literature of emotional intelligence and change. People with high emotional intelligence are more likely to deal with the negative emotion. Riggio (2007) suggest
that managers who are more emotionally expressive are more likely to be perceived as being charismatic and are more likely to generate a positive emotional climate in the workplace. Given the gaps in the literature that had been identified, underneath section focuses on the research methodology that address all the above questions.

3.3 Developing Emotional Intelligence

Some researchers argue that emotions (being a property of emotional intelligence) can be developed (e.g. Lazarus, 1991), so emotional intelligence may potentially be capable of being developed too (Clarke, 2006; Dulewicz and Higgs, 1999; Kusstatscher and Cooper, 2005; Dulewicz and Higgs, 2004; Hopfl and Linstead, 1997; Mayer and Salovey, 1997; Bar-On 2003; Cherniss and Caplan, 2001). Several others even believe that the construct may be developed in the early stages of life (Goleman, 1996; Fineman, 1997). Despite the claims, actual evidence is meagre at best (Clarke, 2006) and very little is known about how this may be achieved (Clarke, 2006a; Wong et al., 2007). Qualter et al. (2007) argue that there is currently little research addressing the developmental determinants of emotional intelligence. Dulewicz and Higgs (2004) also raise question of which elements of emotional intelligence can be developed. The idea of emotional intelligence thus is relatively new in the world of work and very few well-researched training and development interventions explicitly address it (Cherniss and Goleman, 2001). Thus whether or not emotional intelligence can be developed is still the subject of continuing debate. Clarke (2006a) argues that this could be due to the lack of research investigating how emotional abilities are developed.

There have been recent discussions among those in the emotional intelligence field about how emotional intelligence develops (e.g. Matthews et al., 2002; Zeidner et al., 2004; Matthews et al., 2003). Many have increased their efforts to teach and apply the emotional intelligence construct in the workplace (Roberts et al., 2001). There has been much professional enthusiasm among academics, practitioners and managers in developing emotional intelligence (Groves et al., 2008). There have also been calls for a programme of research that specifically examines how emotional intelligence might be developed within the organizational context (Opengart, 2005; Weinberger, 2002).
A number of researchers have suggested different means for developing the emotional intelligence of individuals. For example, Clarke (in press) provides empirical support for the potential of team-based forms of workplace learning to assist in developing the emotional abilities associated with emotional intelligence using MBA students. Another example is experiential learning which, according to Hopfl and Linstead (1997), involves interpersonal interaction and valuable feedback, and may assist in the development of both social and emotional skills. Hopfl and Linstead (1997) advocate the workplace as a logical setting for efforts to improve employees’ competencies associated with emotional intelligence. This is because most adults spend more of their waking hours in the workplace than anywhere else (Cherniss, 2000). Clarke (2006), Moriarty and Buckley (2003) and Groves et al. (2008) also support the role of workplace learning in developing emotional abilities.

Clarke (2006) further proposed several mechanisms for developing emotional abilities, among which are the complex interactions between the individual worker, the nature of the job, social structures and the workplace environment. Salovey (2006) specified a type of controlled experiment with random assignment of participants to a well-specified emotional intelligence intervention or to a comparison group that presents a credible alternative, with follow-up over a period of time. Some other suggestions for interventions for developing emotional intelligence include learning and practice (Goleman, 1998; Cherniss and Goleman, 2001), learning and experience (Lopes et al., 2006; Goleman, 1996) and the perceived supportive quality of the home and school environment (Tiwari and Srivastava, 2004 in Qualter et al. 2007). Others have suggested social factors (Harris, 1999) and genetic factors (Cassidy, 1994; Jausovec et al., 2001) as aspects determinant of emotional development (see Qualter et al. 2007). A study by Wong et al. (2007) found that nature affected the development of one’s emotional intelligence level. That is emotional intelligence development is related to the parents’ level of emotional intelligence and one’s personality traits (neuroticism, agreeableness and conscientiousness). They also suggest that nurture or the specific experiences that a person encounters may have a significant impact on the development of emotional intelligence. Wong et al. (2007) found that the relationship between child and full-time parent and one’s age are related to emotional intelligence level. They argue that parents’ devotion to the children and life experiences affect emotional intelligence
development (Wong et al., 2007). Despite the various models, means and measures used to assess emotional intelligence these studies do support the development of emotional intelligence.

The rigorous efforts to develop emotional intelligence have caused Mayer and Salovey (1997) to caution enthusiastic researchers about the limited potential of teaching emotional intelligence earlier. This is because, in relation to the ability model in particular, emotional intelligence as an aspect of abstract reasoning seems unlikely or at least difficult to change in adulthood (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). Goleman (1996) is also doubtful about the efficacy of learning interventions at later stages in life. However, a recent study by Clarke (2006b) found that emotional abilities are capable of development in adults, through individuals’ participation in team projects. Because the ability model includes cognitive abilities, Qualter et al. (2007) have suggested the importance of teaching social cognitive skills within the family and school environment to develop specific aspects of emotional intelligence. Social-cognitive skill is based on how people think about others and how they interpret their actions during social interactions. Interventions to develop socio-cognitive and interaction skills are likely to have the desired effect of increasing emotional intelligence and hence success in life, including academic success, life satisfaction and social relationships (Qualter et al., 2007).

Despite the complexity, Mayer and Salovey (1997) nevertheless continue to consider it possible to enhance emotional knowledge because it is about acquiring knowledge and teaching information about emotions. They further state that there is little research to date on whether specifically learning emotional knowledge can change or enhance one’s own patterns of success or interpersonal effectiveness (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). Salovey (2006) advocates the need for better studies on the efficacy of interventions designed to enhance the competencies involved in emotional intelligence. Furthermore, no study has yet been published that has shown developments in emotional intelligence using specific ability model measurements or through training interventions (Clarke, 2007). Indeed very little is known about the nature of emotional abilities and about how they develop (Clarke, 2006). To date research examining interventions for developing emotional intelligence still remains very much in its infancy (Law et al., 2004; Clarke, 2006).
3.3.1 Using Training as an Intervention

Training is one of the crucial strategies organizations use to help employees gain the necessary knowledge and skills needed to meet the challenges they face (see Tai, 2006). It is also argued that training is able to contribute to the improvement in performance of individuals (Wege and Moeller, 1995) and groups (Jordan et al., 2002) and to maintain employees’ competencies. According to Carnall (1999), training to learn new skills is important as this gives people the chance to try out new skills for themselves and allows them to build their self-esteem under their own control, while solving problems of change along the way. In relation to developing emotional intelligence and the ability to cope with stressful events in a merger context, previous research supports the positive impact of education on acceptance of organizational change (Vakola et al., 2004). Vakola et al. (2004) further confirm that educational attainment is positively related to attitudes towards organizational change. Iverson (1996) earlier had indicated that organizations must invest in training in order to have a flexible and adaptable workforce able to display greater involvement in organizational change. Developing an individual’s emotional ability to deal with uncertainty and unstable situations as in a merger context is therefore significant.

Given mounting evidence that emotional intelligence predicts a range of positive outcomes, there have been repeated calls in the research literature for empirical studies that establish whether or not emotional intelligence can be trained (Groves et al., 2008; Lopes et al., 2004; Dulewicz and Higgs, 2004; Kerr et al., 2006; Gowing et al., 2005). The significant contribution made by training has influenced the need to develop emotional intelligence through training. Jacobs (2001) argues that it is more practical for an organization to increase emotional intelligence in its current workforce through training and development. It is proposed that the intervention of training in emotional intelligence may assist in developing and enhancing the level of emotional intelligence among individual employees and managers. Wong et al. (2007) argue that it may be possible to develop emotional intelligence as a set of interrelated abilities. However, it is still unclear whether emotional intelligence can be improved or enhanced through training activities and programmes (Wong et al.,
Clarke (2007) has also concluded that little has appeared in the literature that focuses on the effectiveness of emotional intelligence development programmes. Many training programmes adopted by companies aiming to improve organizational performances are based on anecdotal evidence too (Clarke, 2006). In addition, many studies have focused their attention on the development of emotional skills among children and adolescents through school-based programmes. There is still a shortage of research that could yield information on the effectiveness of emotional skills training for adults (Lopes et al., 2006). Clarke (2006) also emphasized the vagueness of substantive evidence that demonstrates the effectiveness of emotional intelligence training.

Even with the debate and uncertainty over developing emotional intelligence, efforts to improve emotional intelligence through training were reported as far back as the 1920s, when scholars and managers were interested in the social aspects of work (Cherniss, 2000). This is shown by broader training programmes such as those that involve social and emotional literacy which have provided some support for the idea that social and emotional qualities can be taught (Mayer et al., 1999). Clarke (2001), in his study on the empowerment of carers, also supported the idea of the training programme as a means to enhance carers’ psychological empowerment if the programme incorporated learning experiences. Hopf and Linstead (1997) suggested that in order to achieve long-term benefits from training, participants’ feelings and concern for others should be given more attention in the training programme. The reason is that this will enhance participants’ understanding of others’ motives and behaviour and therefore may generate more benefits over time as people learn to interact with others more effectively (Lopes et al., 2006). There has been an awareness of the significance of emotional skills training for some time and much existing research in developing social and emotional learning has found favourable effects (Hawkins et al., 1999; Kusche and Greenberg, 2001).

Some training and development interventions that have been developed and evaluated in the past appear to be effective in improving emotional competencies and work performance (Cherniss, 2000; Cherniss and Goleman, 2001). One example of empirical research into developing emotional intelligence through training is the work of Jordan et al. (2002). They found that low emotional intelligence teams
initially performed at a low level but equalled the performance of the high emotional intelligence teams by the end of the study period. They assumed training to be one of the factors that may produce such a result (2002). However, it should be noted that they used their own measurement scale (WEIP-3) which is distinctive from other measures of emotional intelligence and is designed specifically for use in workgroups.

Furthermore, few studies that have been published have rarely examined emotional abilities, but instead have mostly been concerned with personality and mixed model conceptualizations of emotional intelligence (Clarke, 2006). For example, Slaski and Cartwright (2003) found positive outcomes in their study on the development of emotional intelligence through training intervention, although their study was based on the Bar-On EQ-i measurement. Another example is the work of Dulewicz and Higgs (2004). Through their revised EIQ model of emotional intelligence they conducted a study to identify whether elements of emotional intelligence are amenable to development. Their findings show that emotional intelligence scores changed after training, providing further support for the proposition that emotional intelligence is to a certain extent developable (2004). Despite this achievement Dulewicz and Higgs’s (2004) assessment is based on a personal factors model of an individual’s skills rather than being solely based on emotion. There has been indirect evidence in the development of competencies closely related to emotional intelligence through education programmes such as relationship management and interpersonal abilities (for example, Boyatzis et al., 2002). However this study was not measured according to the four ability-based model of emotional intelligence.

There are studies that have used ability models to develop emotional intelligence (for example, Moriarty and Buckley, 2003; Clarke, 2006 and 2008); however, these focus on workplace learning to develop emotional abilities instead of using training as an intervention. Moreover, except for Clarke (in press), these authors also used students as their samples in their studies. Although the study by Groves et al. (2008) demonstrates that it is possible to enhance the emotional intelligence of individuals through deliberate training, they employed university students as research participants and used a self-reported instead of performance-based measurement of emotional intelligence.
Using training as an intervention to help people to enhance their emotional intelligence, however, has its implications and difficulties. For example, the training content may only work for particular people. People with a different disposition or personality such as being introvert or extrovert may need to be influenced and motivated in different ways. Furthermore, some personality attributes are inherited while others are the result of habit and are therefore stable and hard to change (see Lopes et al., 2006). Cumming and Worley (2005) also agree that general change interventions may not be effective for some employees. Individual reactions are based on personality, previous life and work experiences, organizational culture, personal habits, mental processes, logical disposition, immediate circumstances and other factors (Madsen et al., 2005). Instead of drilling and forcing people to change through training, Lopes et al. (2006) therefore point out that the training should emphasize raising awareness, broadening people’s coping repertoires and helping people to learn from experience.

In developing a training programme for the ability model, for the first branch (perceiving emotion) people may be trained to read and understand others’ facial expressions, e.g. anger, fear, sadness, joy. This may help individuals to pay attention to and identify subtle expressions of emotion in real life (Lopes et al., 2006) because facial displays and body language are associated with emotions (Ekman, 1993; Keltner and Haidt, 1999). Another example is the use of real-life situations, films, videotapes and photographs such as the Interpersonal Perception Task (IPT: Archer et al., 2001) and the Duchenne smile (Ekman and O’Sullivan, 1991). The IPT has been widely used in educational settings whereas the latter has been successfully used to help examine the facial signals of emotion and the content of communication and is used by US secret service agents (Lopes et al., 2006).

Secondly, for the using emotion branch, understanding the effect of emotion might enhance one’s ability to use emotion as a guide to think about and make decisions (Lopes et al., 2006). For example, sad individuals process information more systematically (Schwarz, 2001) while fear has the opposite effect (Lerner and Keltner, 2001). An individual having emotional intelligence might forgo making decisions when in a bad mood knowing that this will jeopardise the quality of the
decision (Lopes et al., 2006). Therefore, in order to acquire this ability, one technique is to think rationally and evaluate the effects or consequences of any action before making any decision.

The third ability is understanding emotion. In order to improve workers’ ability to predict and understand their own and others’ emotions, Lopes et al. (2006) suggested several possibilities. One of them is to discuss how emotions combine, progress and shift from one to another. Besides this, individuals could also discuss the similarities and differences among emotions. This includes differences between anger, irritation, fury and rage. Discussing the causes of emotions might also enhance individuals’ ability to understand their own and others’ emotions.

Finally, for managing emotions, Lopes et al. (2006) provided several suggestions, among which were discussions of coping strategies (such as therapy, praying and counselling) and ways to handle particular situations in order to raise awareness about alternative strategies. Secondly, people can broaden their ability to manage their emotions through role play. Thirdly, their interactions with others could be filmed and later used to provide feedback on how they handle stressful situations. A fourth suggestion was to train people to enable them to address interpersonal problems and negotiate conflicts effectively. This includes training them to evaluate problems from other people’s points of view, listening and paying attention to others’ concerns. Other suggestions include engaging in physical activity, seeking emotional support (such as therapy and counselling) and practising meditation to relax. These strategies, according to Lopes et al. (2006), could take the problem off one’s mind. Based on Fredrickson (2000), ideas for training to relax involve breathing exercises, the use of humour and valuing good moments with others. Cherniss and Goleman (2001) also suggested the use of meditation to help people to become aware of how their emotions affect their behaviour. One of the more effective practices is ‘mindfulness meditation’ designed specifically by Kabat-Zinn (1990) to help people become aware of their inner states (Kabat-Zinn, 2003).

Despite many companies offering emotional intelligence training activities, little scientific evidence has been provided to show their effectiveness (Wong et al., 2007). McEnrue et al. (2006) have reviewed both the published and unpublished
empirical studies related to the development of emotional intelligence among managers. They found some limitations in these empirical studies including:

(1) the lack of a control group;
(2) the use of unknown psychometric measures of emotional intelligence;
(3) the measurement of training effects on control and treatment groups at markedly different time periods;
(4) reliance on a conceptually suspect emotional intelligence model;
(5) the involvement of training that does not focus specifically on emotional intelligence;
(6) the use of diagnostic and training criteria that appear devoid of emotional content; and
(7) no provision of information about the training process at all.

Thus while training is an attractive proposition for developing the emotional intelligence of managers, many of the existing empirical studies did not provide solid evidence of emotional intelligence development (McEnrue et al., 2008). These observations helped to frame the evaluation and development of the current study.

Thus, despite the increasing calls for training intervention on emotional intelligence using the ability model, its empirical study is still in its infancy. The implication of emotional intelligence training on employees affected by merger is also vague. Fieldwork on developing emotional intelligence using training as an intervention on victims of merging companies is vital. However, minimal evidence is found to support claims that emotional intelligence trainings are effective (Clarke, 2006a). Many companies have also been offering emotional intelligence training activities, but little scientific evidence has been provided to show their effectiveness (Wong et al., 2007). Moreover, it is also difficult to evaluate the validity of these activities because very little is known about how an individual develops abilities in handling emotions (Wong et al., 2007).

While much of the literature (for example, Matinez, 1997; Farnham, 1996; Harrison, 1997; Cooper, 1997) has been devoted to describing programmes designed to assist individuals to enhance their emotional intelligence, Mayer et al. (1999) have
emphasized that no well-conducted studies have been published to date in relation to developing emotional intelligence using the ability model. Training interventions for developing emotional intelligence still remain very much in their infancy (Law et al., 2004; Clarke, 2006). There have been increasing calls for a more rigorous programme of research to examine the potential for developing employees’ emotional intelligence and the efficacy of interventions for doing so (Clarke, 2006). Researchers are also encouraged to examine whether some elements of emotional intelligence are easier to train than others (Groves et al., 2008). However, despite the increasing calls for training interventions and the increasing doubt over their significance in developing emotional intelligence abilities, their empirical study is still unknown, and therefore requires investigation. To date no empirical research in developing emotional intelligence using an ability-based model has been conducted using training as intervention. Lopes et al. (2006) also support this and state that training programmes that are specifically based on an ability model are unknown. Future research is therefore needed to address more fully the potential impact of instituting emotional intelligence training programmes (Salovey and Grewal, 2005).

### 3.4 Chapter Summary

Organizational change and merger literatures explain that change creates a sense of personal loss to employees and therefore cause employees to experience mixed emotions and responses toward change and to go through a difficult journey. Merger in particular has been perceived as a quantum change where the whole organization might be affected including employees, level of management or work process. However a person with emotional intelligence may be able to avoid emotional burnout and remain productive and motivated during stressful period of organizational change (Lopes, Cote, Salovey, 2006). Emotional intelligence is therefore claimed to provide a positive lens in managing people’s emotions and behaviour during organizational change. There have been empirical studies on the impact of emotional intelligence on life outcomes (Brackett, et al, 2004), prosocial behaviour, parental warmth, and positive peer and family relations (Mayer et al., 1999; Salovey et al, 2001), team work performance (Jordan et al., 2002) and
satisfying personal relationships and achieving success at work (Salovey & Grewal, 2005).

Despite the evidences on the important role that emotional intelligence played, less attention has been given on the impact of emotional intelligence on employees affected by merger. Furthermore, while much of the existing literature has been devoted to describing programmes designed to assist individuals to enhance their emotional intelligence, several researchers in the field of emotional intelligence have emphasized that no well-conducted, published studies have been reported to date in relation to developing emotional intelligence abilities through training.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the research methodology in conducting this study. The first section will focus on the aims and objectives with emphasis on the reason why emotional intelligence is expected to influence individual responses to change. This will then be followed by the research questions, theoretical model, research background, research methods and strategies. Validated measures used for data collection were also included. Data sources will provide the attributes of the participants of this study. How the research was conducted will be presented in the research procedure section. Pilot study, ethical problems and challenges encountered in conducting this research are also presented.

4.1 Aims and Objectives

This study therefore aims to identify the role, if any, emotional intelligence plays in influencing employees’ responses to merger. To date, few studies have examined employees’ emotional responses to merger and how these emotions may be associated with their degree of support for change. The major highlight of this study is to identify the emotional and job attitudes of employees in response to change. When an organization makes changes it will generate emotional responses among employees. As a result these may instigate a response that is either to support or resist the changes. It is therefore reasonable to assume that affected employees who hold negative attitudes toward the desirability of merger will be more resistance to changes necessitated by merger. These responses to change may further affect the job attitudes of employees in terms of job satisfaction, job security, organizational commitment and intention to leave.

A number of authors have suggested that emotional intelligence may play a role in enabling employees to manage change more effectively such as during instances of merger. To date, however, there have been few studies that have specifically examined emotional intelligence and its role in change management as it pertains to
employees. This paper therefore aims to make a contribution to the literature by providing insights into the role that emotions and emotional intelligence played during a merger between two banking institutions in Brunei.

Furthermore, elsewhere in the literature there are suggestions of positive outcomes from training as an intervention to develop or improve the level of individuals’ emotional intelligence. The main aim is therefore to identify whether emotional intelligence can be developed through training programmes. As the level of employees’ emotional intelligence increases, the more likely they are to support change and the less likely to resist it. The purpose of using training as an emotional intelligence intervention is to improve employees’ awareness of the environment, to make them more flexible and adaptable, to enable them to have better social relationships with others and to give them the ability to cope with and manage stressful and difficult situations. The provision of training is therefore assumed to improve the level of emotional intelligence among the participants.

Emphasis on the role of national culture is also given in this study. Existing literatures found that people from western countries tend to be different from those from eastern countries in terms of behavioural responses. This would be a significant research area since this study focus on Brunei culture embedded by Islamic values which have never been done before.

4.2 Research Questions

Several research questions were determined to guide the present study.

Q1. Is there a relationship between employees’ emotional responses to merger and their degree of support for change (either supportive of or resistant to change) and job attitudes to change (job insecurity, job satisfaction, withdrawal intention and organizational commitment) over time?

An organization is an emotional place (see, for example, Turnbull 1999, 2002). The literatures states that employees tend to experience negative emotions in expressing
their difficulties such as fear of losing one’s job that could damage one’s personal well-being and security as a result of change. Furthermore, when organizational decisions and managerial actions are deemed unfair, the affected employees experience feelings of anger, outrage and a desire for retribution (Folger and Skarlicki, 1999). However, despite the increases stimulated in scientific publications on the phenomenon of merger over the last two decades, less attention has been given to its impact on affected employees’ emotions (Kuststatcher and Cooper, 2005). Some earlier researchers (for example, Bray, 1994; Judge et al., 1999) have suggested a greater focus on the micro-level of organizational change. However, such research remains limited.

Q2. Is there a relationship between employees’ emotional intelligence and their degree of support for change and job attitudes?

The concept of emotional intelligence claims to provide a new and positive lens for managing people’s emotions and behaviour in general thus enabling them to support radical change. This is affirmed by Kuststatcher and Cooper (2005) on the significance of emotional intelligence in change management. Lopes et al., (2006) have suggested that a person with the ability to manage emotion may be able to avoid emotional burnout and thus remain productive and motivated during the stressful period of organizational change. As proposed by Jordan et al. (2002), individuals who have high levels of emotional intelligence will be able to ameliorate the effect of job insecurity. They also proposed that emotional intelligence will influence the effect of affective commitment on negative coping behaviour. Moreover, high emotionally intelligent employees also use emotional assimilation to enable them to adopt multiple perspectives and to select from a range of coping strategies that result in amelioration of the emotional reaction to job insecurity in the long term (Jordan et al., 2002). This is compared to low emotional intelligence employees who use short-term strategies such as withdrawal (Jordan et al., 2002).

Brackett et al. (2004) also suggested that emotional intelligence appears to predict important external criteria such as adjustment and life outcomes. According to Salovey et al. (2002), emotional abilities can help people to achieve their goals and succeed in life in terms of good social relationships, maintaining a healthy emotional
balance and being successful at work. Individuals with high emotional intelligence are likely to display high overall satisfaction in the workplace (Carmeli, 2003). Lopes et al. (2006) also proposed that emotional abilities contribute to both task performance and interpersonal facilitations that contribute to a better working environment. Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) and Jordan et al. (2002) suggested on the positive relationship between emotional intelligence and team performance. It is therefore assumed that emotional intelligence can affect the job attitudes in response to change.

Q3. Is there relationship between the degree of support for change (resist or support for change) and job attitudes to change over time?

The change literature explains that change creates a sense of personal loss to employees, e.g. loss of work colleagues, loss of job status, loss of job, loss of a culture with which they identify, and threats to employees' self-esteem. To the leaders, change is an opportunity and a survival strategy but to the employees change is seen as disruptive and intrusive (Strebel, 1996). This change effort therefore often causes resistance among the affected employees (Eriksson, 2002; King and Anderson, 1995). Furthermore, elsewhere in the literature, employees’ resistance to change or support for change could affect the job attitudes of employees in an organization. If a negative affect is experienced in a work situation, it is likely to encourage behavioural withdrawal from that situation (Pelied and Xin, 1999), reduce work commitment and produce job insecurity and less job satisfaction. According to Ferguson and Cheyne (1995) a negative attitude toward change can reduce work satisfaction, which in turn may negatively affect the relationship between the individual and the organization. Managers also do not respond to change with simple resistance but rather favour action such as withdrawal and flight (Crouch et al., 1992).

Q4. Has national culture influence employees’ response to change in a Brunei context?

Culture influences the domain of normative behaviour (such as behaviour that is desirable or condemned), defines roles for individuals in the social structures, and
prescribes guiding principles and values in one’s life (Triandis, 1995). It is also suggested that culture is a primary indicator of physically and/or psychologically based differences that may strongly influence behavioural responses (Middleton and Jones, 2000). However, Mesquita and Fridja (1992) earlier have argued that the assessment of the observed events differs from country to country. Middleton and Jones (2000) further emphasise that strong national differences, and the tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner, are likely to exist between Eastern and Western cultures. Middleton and Jones (2000) conducted a study on the impact of national culture on socially desirable response between Eastern (Asian countries including Hong Kong, Singapore, Thailand, Taiwan, Japan and the People’s Republic of China) and Western countries (United States) based on Hofstede’s (1984) five typology of five cultural dimensions (Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Long Term Time Orientation, Individualism-Collectivism, and Masculinity-Femininity). The results indicate that socially desirable response sets of Western and Eastern subjects differed significantly based on subject’s country of origin (Middleton and Jones, 2000).

A study on culture differences between United States and China conducted by Probst and Lawler (2006) found that cultural values (either collectivism or individualism) held by employees were related to the manner in which employees reacted to organizational announcements of downsizing, their job attitudes and their reported levels of job-related stress. Despite the empirical differences between the Eastern and Western cultures, these existing studies however are limited to Asian countries which are dominantly Buddhist and/or atheists, therefore can not be over generalised to Brunei context where culture is influenced by the Islamic values. It is therefore worthwhile to assess the cultural values in Brunei context and its implication on employees’ responses to change.

**Q4. Can emotional intelligence be developed using training as an intervention?**

Emotional intelligence, according to many scholars, can be developed. However, there is uncertainty among scholars over how this might best be achieved. According to Vakola et al. (2004) human resource management needs to invest in training and development especially for both change agents and employees affected by change.
as a way to implement the institutionalization of organizational change. Jordan et al. (2002) have proposed the need to explore the possibility for training as an intervention to improve the performance of team members. Madsen et al. (2005) have also suggested that specific workplace interventions focused on increasing readiness for change need to be examined. Clarke (2005) studied the mechanisms for developing emotional intelligence and identified the significance of workplace learning mechanisms for developing emotional abilities within these settings. Other existing empirical studies developed emotional intelligence through training interventions, but were based on mixed and/or personality models (Clarke, 2006). No study to date has found the implications of training emotional intelligence abilities. This study therefore proposes to determine the outcome of a training intervention in developing emotional intelligence using an ability-based model of emotional intelligence. It is also assumed that those who attended training have higher levels of emotional intelligence compared to those who did not attend training. Moreover, emotionally intelligent employees will be able to cope with emotional events of merger.

4.3 Theoretical Model

The major highlight of this study is to identify the emotional and attitudinal behavioural responses of employees in the face of change. Following a merger announcement, individual employees and managers make a number of evaluations of the uncertain and ‘unfamiliar’ event. These could either be favourable or threatening, positive or negative, depending upon their evaluation of the merger situation. The ‘victims’ may elicit mixed emotional reactions towards the new situation. Such emotional responses may include anger, happiness, anxiety, depression and loneliness. As a result these may instigate a response to change that is either to support or resist it. This refers to Hypotheses 1 and 2 as shown in Figure 1. It is therefore reasonable to assume that affected employees who hold negative attitudes toward the desirability of merger will be more resistant to changes necessitated by merger, while those who respond positively will support the changes.

\[ H1: \text{Employees’ positive emotional states (happiness) will be negatively related to resistance to change and positively related to support for change.} \]
**H2:** Employees’ negative emotional states (loneliness, depression and anger) will be positively related to resistance to change and negatively related to support for change.

These responses to change may further affect the job attitudes of the employees in terms of job satisfaction, job security, organizational commitment and intention to leave or stay. People who are high in resistance to change and low in support for change are more likely to have negative job attitudes towards change.

**H3:** Resistance to change will be negatively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment but positively related to intention to withdraw and job insecurity.

**H4:** Support for change will be positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment but negatively related to job insecurity and intention to withdraw.

It is also assumed that emotional response to merger has implication on individual employees’ responses to change such as intention to withdraw, job insecurity, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. This can be seen in Figure 1 as H5 and H6.

**H5:** Negative emotions will be associated with intention to withdraw and job insecurity during merger.

**H6:** Positive emotions will be associated with organizational commitment and job satisfaction during merger.

These response processes therefore require tactics to influence the attitudinal behaviour in response to change. As shown in Figure 1, emotional intelligence is assumed to be able to influence the job attitudes of employees towards change. People who are high in emotional intelligence should be able to have better support and so be able to cope with negative effects better thus diminishing their negative feelings towards change. People with emotional intelligence should also be able to
control their negative emotions so they do not get out of control and result in negative job outcomes.

Using the ability model of emotional intelligence, it is assumed that individual employees are able to cope with changes in the organizations’ integration, especially where cultures and identity are different. Using the first branch of the ability model (identifying and perceiving emotions), individuals are aware of their own feelings and emotions. They are also aware of others’ emotions because this is key to working with people. This is critical when companies are integrated and employees are required to work as a team. In addition, feeling for other people and having empathy may be based in part upon individuals’ ability to generate a feeling that other people experience. Individuals can be influenced by the emotional states of the people they interact with (Barsade, 2002; Hatfield et al., 1994). Building social relationships can be achieved by accessing greater social and emotional support (Pennebaker, 1997). Pennebaker (1997) stated that sharing traumatic personal experiences can often help people achieve emotional closure, leading to better long-term emotional and physical health. This could be done by having empathetic feeling when others are sad (Clark et al., 1996; Lopes et al., 2006). Furthermore, people are often unable to express their emotions verbally. Individuals thus may use others’ displays of emotions or facial expressions as guides to understanding their behaviour (Lopes et al., 2006).

Along the second branch, emotions can be used to facilitate certain kinds of cognitive processes (George, 2000). According to Damasio (1994), emotions can be used to choose among options and to make decisions as being able to anticipate how one would feel if certain events took place can help decision-makers choose among multiple options (George, 2000). The affect infusion model (AIM) suggests that affect is particularly likely to influence judgment during substantive processing (Forgas, 1995). Substantive processing occurs when decision-makers are faced with a complex task in need of extensive and constructive information processing, and when ambiguity and uncertainty exist, new information needs to be assimilated and decision-makers desire to make accurate judgments and good decisions (Forgas,
Thus emotional intelligence entails using emotions for these purposes (George, 2000).

The third branch, understanding emotions, requires individuals to know what motivates people, to understand other people’s points of view and to understand and handle team interactions. Emotional knowledge is concerned with understanding both the determinants and consequences of moods and emotions, and how they evolve and change over time. George (2000) provides an example of an emotionally intelligent manager who should be able to understand the initial reactions such as fear and anxiety of the subordinates when restructuring is announced (even with a guarantee of no layoffs). This is crucial especially when people differ in their awareness and understanding of how different situations, events, people and other stimuli generate emotions (George, 2000).

Finally, emotional intelligence may assist employees to be emotionally capable in managing stress, especially during merger situations. A person with the ability to manage their emotions well is believed to be able to avoid emotional burnout and thus remain productive and motivated during stressful periods of organizational change (Lopes et al., 2006). Research suggests that people can manage their own and others’ moods and emotions if they have emotional capabilities (Salovey and Mayer, 1990).

Thus, with emotional intelligence, people are assumed to have more favourable perceptions and evaluations and therefore become self-assured and helpful towards others (see George, 2000). Feelings are intricately bound up in the ways that people think, behave and make decisions (George, 2000), in particular in uncertain and changing circumstances.

*H7: Emotional intelligence will be positively associated with support for change.*

### 4.4 Research Background

By the command of the Sultan of Brunei Darussalam, the Ministry of Finance had announced the merger of two Islamic banks, the Islamic Bank of Brunei (IBB) and
the Islamic Development of Brunei Bank (IDBB). The formation of this new Islamic bank known as the Bank Islam of Brunei Darussalam (BIBD) took over the management, operation and integration of the two banks based on the process which was provided under the law. The merger process had been carried out in stages to ensure the continuity and smooth running of the banks’ operations and transactions so that their services to customers were not affected. The Sultan also consented to the appointment of the board of directors, the Syarie Advisory committee and the managing director of the new Islamic bank. The appointments, for a period of two years, were effective 2nd Muharram 1427 Hijrah corresponding to 1 February 2006.

Among the main reasons to merge were the following:

1. to enhance the position of sole Islamic financial institutions in Brunei;
2. to make this new bank a stronger entity in order to increase cost efficiency by eliminating duplication;
3. to be the largest bank in the country in terms of total assets and the number of account holders in comparison to other conventional banks operating in the country. This would mean that the capability of the bank to support the nation’s diversification programmes such as those being spearheaded by the Brunei Economic Development Board would be enhanced significantly;
4. to be able to provide more complete banking products and services to its retail customers; and
5. to provide a bigger contribution towards enhancing Brunei’s economy especially in the financing sector and Islamic banking.

The two pre-merger banks were not equal in size. IBB had less than 350 employees while IDBB had less than 100 IDBB. The plan for the merger was announced in July 2005 and a clear cut-off was put in place in February 2006. In the announcement, it was made explicit that no retrenchment would take place because of the merger. This meant that more people will be doing similar tasks and therefore employees were facing competition and challenges in the organization. The changes also involved organizational arrangements such as changes in structures and rewards, social factors such as management style and team working, physical setting such as
layout and design, as well as technologies and techniques (such as new technology, work flows and job design). Further challenges faced the employees was when a member of one of the boards of directors of smaller bank became the managing director of the new larger bank.

4.5 Research Method

According to Miles and Huberman (1994), numbers and words are both needed if a researcher is to understand the world. The advantages gained from adopting both methods further influence the decision to combine both qualitative and quantitative research methods for this study.

Quantitative Research Methods

This approach allows the researcher to determine the causal relationships between independent and dependent variables. It employs strategies of inquiry such as experiments and surveys. This method collects data on predetermined instruments that yield statistical data. This method is also more appropriate to the research question proposed and can be used on large samples, allowing inferences to be made to wider populations (Silverman, 2005).

Qualitative Research Methods

The qualitative method works with relatively small numbers of cases and tends to be explorative and interpretative. It avoids the statistical techniques used in the quantitative method. Adopting a qualitative method requires the researcher to make knowledge claims based primarily on a constructivist perspective. This includes the multiple meanings of individual experiences, meanings socially and historically constructed, with the intent to develop a theory or pattern, tell a story or present a line of reasoning. This method thus concerns the exploration of people’s life histories, everyday behaviour and interactions (Silverman, 2005) and provides a concrete, convincing and meaningful story (Miles and Huberman, 1994). This makes qualitative data a well-grounded source of rich descriptions and provides explanations of processes in identifiable local contexts (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Additionally, according to Denzin and Lincoln (2000), qualitative researchers stress
the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape the inquiry.

Just as in the study of emotions, the qualitative method enables the researcher to collect valuable soft data such as facial expressions, impressions, words, sentences, emotions, photos and symbols. Because of this some researchers have suggested the use of qualitative approaches for assessing workplace emotion (for example, Sutton, 1991), as they may permit respondents to express themselves in a more natural manner. Therefore qualitative research methods should be useful for exploring and analysing organizational events such as change. The qualitative approach to data collection and analysis can provide the flexibility necessary for gaining an in-depth understanding of individual employee experiences of organizational change and the relationships and contexts in which these occur.

*Mixed Research Method*

Both quantitative and qualitative research methods are different in many ways, such as in terms of the nature of the data and in the assumptions about social life and different objectives. However, despite the differences, they complement each other and are ‘inextricably intertwined’ at both the level of specific data sets and study design and analysis (Neuman, 2006). Depending on what researchers are trying to find out, neither qualitative nor quantitative methods are therefore better than each other. Having identified the strengths and weaknesses of both quantitative and qualitative research methods this study determined to make use of both methods. This combination of research methods is called the mixed research approach and focuses on collecting and analysing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study (Creswell, 2003). The method enables the researcher to base knowledge claims on pragmatic grounds, such as, for example, the consequence-oriented, problem-centred and pluralistic (Creswell, 2003). The data collection also involves both numeric information as well as text information so that the final database represents both quantitative and qualitative information.
Furthermore, by using mixed methods, the study was able to gain the advantage of triangulation in that the researcher was able to collect data from different angles or viewpoints and thus obtain fuller and more comprehensive data (Neuman, 2006). Triangulation also offers the advantage of improving the validity of the measurement of theoretical concepts by the use of independent measures, including some for which there could be no reaction from respondents. Moreover, the results from one method can help develop or inform the results of the other (Greene et al., 1989). According to Creswell (2003), it assists researcher to expand an understanding from one method to another and to converge or confirm findings from different data sources and cross-validate or corroborate findings within a single study. Thus this method offsets the weaknesses inherent within one method with the strengths of the other (Creswell, 2003). Silverman (2005) also argued that employing quantitative methods allows researchers to document the detail of how people interact in one situation and, using qualitative methods, to identify variance. Therefore the mixed method is advantageous because it can result in well-validated and substantiated findings.

### 4.6 Research Strategies

For the purpose of this research, qualitative and quantitative data was obtained in order to acquire the benefits of both data types. For collecting qualitative data interviews were conducted while questionnaires were administered to obtain quantitative data on employees of the two merging banking institutions in Brunei. Woodman and Pasmore (1989) argues for combined quantitative and qualitative methods in change research because neither method alone can fully capture organizational change processes, particularly nuances in the magnitude and significance of a change.

**Questionnaires**

Quantitative data was collected using survey questionnaires designed in the form of closed questions. Although it may be argued that closed questions are not quite as demanding for respondents compared to open questions, the answers provided in the case of closed questions served to construct the responses obtained. On
occasion this is useful as it avoids a situation where a respondent fails to give a particular answer because it did not occur to them. For this study, questionnaires were sent to the employees accompanied by a covering letter explaining the research purposes and assuring the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants’ responses.

**Interviews**

Previous research studying employees’ behaviour using a questionnaire alone encountered a problem. A questionnaire cannot accurately control for many variables within an organization’s culture or for an individual’s situation (Madsen et al., 2005). Furthermore, it may be argued that questionnaires cannot probe deeply into respondents’ opinions and feelings.

In order to redress this problem interviews were conducted for the present study. Thus, besides the self-report questionnaires, interviews were conducted to complement the quantitative data and to investigate first-hand the emotional reactions of employees. Collecting data by means of interviews remains the most common method of data gathering in qualitative research (King, 2004). King (2004) further stated that the goal of the qualitative research interview (regardless of the type of approach, whether semi-structured, unstructured, in-depth or exploratory) is to see the research topic from the perspective of the interviewee, and to understand how and why they come to have this particular perspective. Using the interview as a means to collect data requires a low degree of structure imposed by the interviewer, a preponderance of open questions and a focus on specific situations and action sequences in the world of the interviewer. Where language is a common channel for communicating emotions and emotional concepts to categorize individuals’ personal and social realities (Mossholder et al., 2000) the interview is an appropriate method to collect such data. These language-based approaches to assessing emotion may also allow for richer, more naturalistic investigations (Mossholder et al., 2000).
4.7 Measures in Data Collection

Four sets of measures were collected in conducting this study. These measures were structured in the form of questionnaires as can be seen in Appendix 1. They include degree of support measures (support for change and resistance to change), emotional responses (anger, happiness, loneliness and depression), job attitudes (job insecurity, organizational commitment, withdrawal intention and job satisfaction) and emotional intelligence. Existing and validated measures have been acquired for the reliability of this study.

(i) Independent Variables
Emotional Responses

Elsewhere in the literature it has been reported that employees developed mixed feelings as a result of organizational change. This study focuses on certain emotional responses to change such as depression, anger, happiness and loneliness.

DEPRESSION

Depression has been described as the most widespread condition of all the psychological disorders (Erikson, 2004). Depressive reactions are associated with the perceived certainty that negative outcomes are unavoidable (Erikson, 2004). Depressed people have low self-esteem and perceive themselves as helpless and situations as hopeless (Ostell, 1996). Research into coping behaviours by Catalano et al. (1977) suggested that employees under stress are most likely to attempt to deal with stressful situations by adopting negative coping behaviours. This 5 items scale was developed by Caplan et al. (1980). The items are about how people may feel about themselves and their job and how much of the time they felt that way. The items are rated on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (never or a little of the time) to 4 (most of the time). The overall reliability for depression was 0.83. Questionnaire for this study includes 4 items: ‘When there is change, I feel unhappy’; ‘When there is change, I feel depressed (down)’; ‘When there is change, I feel nervous’; and ‘When there is change, I feel fidgety (uneasy)’. The scale’s reliability coefficient alpha for Time 1 (four months after merger) was .88 and .86 for Time 2 (ten months after merger).
ANGER

This 38-item scale was developed by Siegel (1985) and reflects the extent to which the individual generally holds his or her anger in when angry. Psychometric analyses of the scale showed that it possessed adequate test-retest reliability ($r = 0.75$) and high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.84$ and 0.89 for the two samples). The validity of the scale was supported by the expected pattern of relations with other inventories designed to assess anger or hostility (Siegel, 1985). The reliability for Time 1 (four months after merger) was .53 and .50 for Time 2 (ten months after merger). The alpha values were quite low due to the short scales and this is common with scales that has fewer than ten items (Pallant, 2005). For all items the response scale ranged from 1 (completely false) to 5 (completely true). This study used 3-items: ‘I try to get even when I’m angry with someone’; ‘When I am angry with someone, I take it out on whoever is around’; and ‘When I hide my anger from others, I think about it for a long time’.

LONELINESS

This measure comprised of 20 items and was developed by Russell et al. (1978). The measure has high internal consistency (coefficient alpha = 0.96) and a test-retest correlation over a two-month period of 0.73. Concurrent and preliminary construct validity is indicated by correlations with self-reports of current loneliness and related emotional states, and by volunteering for a ‘loneliness clinic’. The coefficient alpha for this study was .69 for Time 1 (four months after merger) and .84 for Time 2 (ten months after merger). The questionnaires include 3 items: ‘I have nobody to talk to’; ‘There is no one I can turn to’; and ‘It is difficult for me to make friends’.

HAPPINESS/WELL-BEING

The 12-item version of the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12) was used to measure general psychological well-being. Originally developed by Goldberg (1979) and further reported in Goldberg and Williams (1988), this scale has been widely employed (for example, Isaksson and Johansson, 2000). Banks et al. (1980) recommended the use of the GHQ as an indicator of mental health in studies of work
conditions (Isaksson and Johansson, 2000). It is argued that a GHQ assessment is one of the most reliable indicators of psychological distress or ‘disutility’ (Kilic et al., 1997). It is claimed that the GHQ detects a wide range of psychological disorders, mainly along the anxiety/depression spectrum, and has been shown to be a valid and reliable instrument across cultures (Kilic et al., 1997). The items are rated on a 4-point scale running from ‘disagree strongly’ to ‘agree strongly’. Asterisked items (see attached questionnaires in Appendix 1) are coded in reverse so that 1 corresponds to ‘agree strongly’. A high value on the GHQ represents a high level of distress. The internal consistency of this scale as measured by Cronbach’s alpha was 0.78. 4 items were included in this current study: ‘Have you recently been able to concentrate on whatever you are doing?’; ‘Have you recently been able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities?’; ‘Have you recently been able to face up to your problems?’; and ‘Have you recently been feeling reasonably happy all things considered?’ The Cronbach’s alpha for Time 1 (four months after merger) was .85 and for Time 2 (ten months after merger) was .73.

**Degree of Support for Change (Support and Resistance to Change)**

This measure focuses on the participants’ responses to change such as support for and resistance to change. It is assumed that those who see change as positive (for example, change leads to advancement and privileges) are more ready to support change. On the other hand, those who see change as negative (for example, change runs counter to their personal interest or jeopardize their career opportunities) tend to resist change.

**RESISTANCE TO CHANGE**

The resistance-to-change measurement was originally developed by Oreg (2003). A12-items are used to measure an individual’s dispositional inclination to resist change. The measurement is derived from six sources: reluctance to lose control, cognitive rigidity, lack of psychological resilience, intolerance to the adjustment period involved in change, preference for low levels of stimulation and novelty, and reluctance to give up old habits. The scale and its subscales achieved satisfactory
The resistance-to-change scale is broken down into four factors. The first factor is routine-seeking and pertains to the incorporation of routines into one’s life (Oreg, 2003). This factor measures an individual’s preference and reluctance associated with changes to daily routine. The second factor attempts to measure an individual’s emotional reactions as a reflection of when change is imposed. This factor combines items from the ‘psychological resilience’ and ‘reluctance to lose control’ dimensions. The third factor reflects a short-term focus when addressing change which includes the immediate inconvenience and adverse effects of change. The fourth factor assesses the cognitive rigidity that addresses the ‘changing mind’ dimension. The alphas for the four factors were .89, .86, .71 and .68 respectively. This scale is formatted as 6-point Likert scale which ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The coefficient alpha value for Time 1 (four months after merger) was .65, marginally acceptable because it contain only 5 items. The alpha value for Time 2 (ten months after merger) was .71. 5 items were included in the scale: ‘I generally consider changes to be a negative thing’; ‘I like to do the same old thing rather than try new and different ones’; ‘If I were to be informed that there’s going to be a significant change regarding the way things are done at work, I would probably feel stressed’; ‘Changing plans seems like a real hassle to me’; and ‘Once I’ve come to a conclusion, I’m not likely to change my mind’.

SUPPORT FOR CHANGE

This measurement comprises a 14-item scale. It was originally developed by Hanpachern (1997), which was based in part on McNabb and Sepic (1995) and later...
altered slightly by Madsen et al. (2005) to make the items clear for participants. The items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale which ranges from 1 (very unlikely) to 7 (very likely). Cronbach’s alpha for the scale’s reliability is 0.82. The alpha value for Time 1 (four months after merger) and Time 2 (ten months after merger) were .92 and .87 respectively. 3 sample items included were ‘My willingness or openness to be a part of the change program is’; ‘My willingness or openness to change something even if it appears to be working’; and ‘My willingness or openness to support change is’.

**Emotional Intelligence**

Elsewhere in the literature, emotional intelligence has been found to be positively and significantly related to job satisfaction. Individuals with high emotional intelligence are likely to display high overall satisfaction in the workplace (Carmeli, 2003). It is also believed that those who are emotionally intelligent are better able to manage their emotions thus acquire positive attitude and behaviours.

The level of employees’ emotional intelligence is measured using the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) ability assessment tool. The MSCEIT was developed based on the MEIS by Mayer et al. (2000). The MSCEIT is a 141-item scale designed to measure four specific skills – termed branches – of emotional intelligence: (1) perceiving emotions; (2) facilitating thoughts and emotions; (3) understanding emotions; and (4) managing emotions. Each of these branches is measured with two tasks. The perceiving emotions branch is measured by means of faces and pictures. The facilitating thought is measured by means of sensation and facilitation. The understanding emotion is measured by means of blending tasks and changing tasks. Managing emotions is measured by means of emotion management tasks and emotional relationship tasks (Mayer et al., 2003). Cronbach’s alpha of the factor-based scale representing the entire test was 0.96 (Mayer et al., 1999). It takes about 30 to 40 minutes to complete and is predictive of a variety of important outcomes at work and life. The MSCEIT is based on the idea that emotional intelligence involves problem-solving with and about emotions (Mayer et al., 2003). The MSCEIT was given to participants to complete individually. All the participants took the pencil-and-paper version using scannable answer sheets that
once completed were entered into a database controlled by the Multi-Health Systems (MHS), the publisher.

The reason for choosing the MSCEIT was that it has been found to be predictive of a variety of important outcomes at work and life and is based on the ability based construct of emotional intelligence. Moreover, the MSCEIT is an ability-based model which is distinct from personality and cognitive tests. It has also been found to be potentially the most valid of all the current emotional intelligence measures available and has a good full scale reliability of $r = 0.91$ (Brackett and Mayer, 2003; Lopes et al., 2004; Mayer et al., 2004). Another reason for using the MSCEIT was that no research so far has used this model to measure associations between emotional intelligence and attitudinal behaviour in the study of change. Most of the existing research on emotional intelligence has used a personality or mixed model of emotional intelligence and overlapped with other measures such as personality.

According to Kerr et al. (2006), the MSCEIT is the latest attempt to operationalize the ability model of emotional intelligence which focuses on the assessment of ability. Furthermore, Vakola et al. (2004) have suggested that future studies use other forms of emotional intelligence measures to cross-validate the findings of the relationships between emotional intelligence and organizational change. Clarke (in press) has also suggested that future studies use this measurement since no study has yet been published that has shown developments in emotional intelligence abilities using the MSCEIT. A number of researchers have also suggested that ability testing of emotional abilities is far preferable in studies than the use of self-report tests (Clarke, in press; Wong et al., 2007; Zeidner et al., 2004) and that employing self-report measures of emotional intelligence may lead to poor self-judgments (Clarke, in press; Bracket et al., 2006).

(ii) Dependent Variables
Job Attitudes towards Change

When there is radical change, affected employees display certain job attitudes in response to the change. In order to investigate such behaviours, certain measures were selected. These include withdrawal intentions, organizational commitment, job satisfaction and job insecurity.
WITHDRAWAL INTENTIONS

Withdrawal is one of the negative emotion-focused coping behaviours with potential negative outcomes (Jordan et al., 2002). The scale was drawn from the measure examined by Mobley et al. (1978) and is widely used in the literature (for example, Carmeli, 2003; Michaels and Spector, 1982). This measure assesses the intentions of an employee to withdraw from his or her organization and consists of three items assessed on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This 3-items measure has Cronbach’s alpha of 0.90. 3 items were included in this study: ‘I think a lot about leaving the organization’; ‘I am actively searching for an alternative to the organization’; and ‘As soon as it is possible, I will leave the organization’. The coefficient alpha value was .80 and .78 for Time 1 (four months after merger) and Time 2 (ten months after merger) respectively.

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

This 24-item scale was originally developed by Allen and Meyer (1990) and covers three factors of organizational commitment, namely affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. The affective component of organizational commitment refers to employees’ emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in the organization. The continuance component refers to commitment based on the costs that employees associate with leaving the organization. The normative component refers to employees’ feelings of obligation to remain with the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990). The reliability for each scale is 0.87, 0.75 and 0.79 respectively. This measure has been used by other researchers of similar topics (such as Carmeli, 2003). For the purpose of the present research, only 6 items affective commitment and 6 items continuance commitment were included because of their relevancy. Two sample items for affective commitment were ‘I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own’; and ‘I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization’. Two sample items for continuance commitment were ‘Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire’ and ‘I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization’. The coefficient alpha value was .76 and .79 for Time 1 (four months after merger) and Time 2 (ten months after merger) respectively.
JOB SATISFACTION

This measurement was adopted from the Spector (1997) Job Satisfaction Survey. It is a 36-item summated rating scale to assess employee attitudes about their job and certain aspects of it. Each item is rated along a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 6 (very satisfied). High scores represent high levels of job satisfaction. Coefficient alpha ranges from .91 to .94. The Cronbach’s alpha for Time 1 (four months after merger) was .76 and for Time 2 (ten months after merger) was .82. Three samples of the job satisfaction items were ‘I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do’; ‘I like the people I work with’; ‘Communications seem good within this organization’ and ‘I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated’ (reversed).

JOB INSECURITY

This is a 4-item measure developed by Caplan et al. (1980). However, the present research only uses three items. The scale measures some of the questions about job uncertainty in the future. It is rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very uncertain) to 5 (very certain). All items were reverse scored. The scale has also been used by Mauno and Kinnunen (2002). The Cronbach alpha coefficient for these four items were .72 for men and .76 for the women. The Cronbach alpha for Time 1 (four months after merger) was .84 and .90 for Time 2 (ten months after merger). The three items included were ‘How certain are you about what your future career picture looks like?’; ‘How certain are you of the opportunities for promotion and advancement which will exist in the next few years?’; and ‘How certain are you about what your responsibilities will be six months from now?’.

4.8 Data Sources: Research Participants

A total of 90 participants (male 48.9% and female 51.1%) across 12 branches of the merging companies were recruited as part of the investigation. They were measured at two time points in order to investigate their emotional responses, degree of supports and attitudes toward merger at four months post-merger (Time 1) and ten months post-merger (Time 2). When data was collected at Time 1, there were 153 responses. However, because the research was a panel study, only the 90 named
and completed questionnaires were taken. This gave a total of acceptable 60 per cent response rate. The 90 participants’ mean age for both male and female was 2.72 years (SD = .65) and ranged from 20 to 51 years. Before the merger, these participants were working with two local banks, the IBB (77.8%) and the IDBB (22.2%). However, based on consensus with the participants and to maintain anonymity due to the small number of companies’ population, no specific occupational titles and previous employer (either IBB or IDBB) were identified for individual participants.

The participants selected were those who held positions in both the middle and lower managerial levels. These group of participants were also either being promoted, transferred to other department, work under new departmental boss, reduce job status, or lost privileges. Huy (2002) summarises on how middle management’s contribution are seen as much weaker in planned radical change and how literature tends to de-emphasize the role of middle managers and to portray them in a relatively self-effacing role as compared with executives. For example, middle management is argued as the primary locus for resistance to radical change (Miles, 1997) and interrupts structures and system in incremental-change contexts (Tushman and Romanelli, 1985). According to Turnbull (1999) the middle managers in particular are most at risk of experiencing emotional dissonance as they are required to manage the interface between the senior managers and their subordinates. Huy (2002) also argues that middle managers are structurally closer to their employees and therefore are likely to be more attuned to their subordinates’ emotional needs. Unfortunately, there has been little empirical research on how managers deal with the emotions that fundamental change generates (Huy, 2002). Turnbull (1999) has earlier suggested for future research by HRD practitioners and academics to consider the impact of organizational culture change initiatives on the psychological health of middle managers and their organizations. This is because they are the key loci for emotion management during change (Huy, 2002).

Involving these levels of employees therefore would help an understanding of the wide range of emotional responses experienced as a result of change such as loss of position, withdrawal, reduce job status, job insecurity and job transferral. Cartwright and Cooper (1993) made the criticism that concentrating change efforts at
the senior management level can only lead to the emergence of several cultures throughout the organization, cultural collisions and slow cultural adaptation within the organization. Therefore Cartwright and Cooper (1993) suggested the importance of employees at all levels becoming involved in the integration or change, especially when one of the most common difficulties stems from what might be called ‘cultural differences’. Ashkanasy and Holmes (1995) further supported this view, highlighting the need for management to take account of human and cultural factors in mergers and for management to adopt a proactive approach to reintegration following mergers.

Furthermore, no research has been conducted on the bank sectors’ employees facing merger. Working in a bank is time-demanding, especially when these service sectors are privately owned and profit-oriented. The nature of the working environment may contribute to the variety of emotional responses to change among employees. Working in a bank is full of activity, time demanding and can be tiring. In Brunei in particular, the operating business hours is Monday to Friday from 9am to 3pm, and Saturday and Sunday from 9am to 11am. The office hours for the employees are Monday to Friday from 8.30am to 5pm, and Saturday and Sunday from 8.30am to 12 noon. In addition, the nature of the work itself along with the merger announcement could elicit emotional responses.

Moreover, most of the published research investigating emotional intelligence and performance outcomes has been conducted under laboratory conditions (Lopes et al., 2004) and in an academic setting. This idea had been rejected by Sjöberg (2001) in order to investigate a workplace scenario. This is because students were used as participants as the pretend teams in the true meaning of the team work teams. For that reason, the present study employed real employees affected by a real merger in the investigation.

At the same time, 18 of these participants were given training on emotional intelligence (Training Group), while the other 72 participants were being controlled (Control Group). The aim of conducting training was to develop and increase the emotional intelligence of the participants through training intervention. The purpose of having both groups was to make comparisons on the emotional intelligence mean
scores between those who were trained and those who were not trained, and to see whether those who were trained have higher emotional intelligence than the Control Group. The outcome of the training will provide suggestion on the effectiveness of the training intervention and its implication on the ability of the training participants to manage and cope with merger situation better than the Control Group.

The mean age for the Training Group was 3.11 and ranged from 27 to 50 years old with standard deviation of .58. Eleven of the participants were from IBB and 7 were from IDBB. Due to the close contact during the training session, individual participants' former employer was able to be identified. The participants were equally divided between male and female. All participants held managerial positions and had been in employment more than five years. Participants were given two consecutive days’ training on emotional intelligence for eight hours each day. The reason for this was to ensure that participants focused on the training content and were kept motivated. Appendix 3 shows the schedule and content of the training programme. During training, a brief introduction to merger and emotional intelligence topics was given in order to make the participants aware of the impact of merger on people’s emotional and psychological well-being.

The Control Group (72 participants) comprised those from middle to lower level management with 59 per cent from IBB and 13 per cent from IDBB. However due to confidentiality and fear of being identified, individual participants’ previous employer (either IBB or IDBB) could not be identified. The mean age for Control Group was 2.76 and ranged from 21 to 54 years old with a standard deviation of .66. There were 34 per cent male participants and 38 per cent female participants. Fifty per cent of the participants had been with their former company for more than 6 years, 12 per cent were between 3 and 5 years and 8 per cent between 7 months and 2 years. Being the control group, the participants were not given any training on emotional intelligence.

Another set of participants were 33 participants volunteered to be interviewed. The aim of the interview was to obtain rich information on employees' responses to merger which can not be detected from questionnaires. Due to relatively small population of the merging companies and issues of access, participants of this group
somehow overlap with Training (5 participants) and Control Group (10 participants). Eighteen of the interviewees however were not related to either Training or Control Group. Despite the overlapping, this provides an opportunity for this research to seek wider perspective on impact of merger, especially in terms of emotional responses at Time 1 and Time 2, and the significant of training. Their job positions varied including clerk, officer grade 1 to 3, assistant manager, manager, branch manager, senior manager, Deputy Head of Section, Head of Section and Head of Division. There were 16 females and 17 males and 9 interviewees were from IDBB and 24 from IBB. Their ages ranged from 21 to 44 years old. 7 of the interviewees had been working with their former organization less than 5 years, 8 interviewees between 6 to 10 years, 11 interviewees between 11 to 15 years and 7 interviewees between 16 to 20 years of employment. Many of the interviewees were pioneers of their former organization.

4.9 Research Procedures

Since this study involved change processes, a real-time longitudinal study was carried out. A real-time study of a major change initiative may allow a better and more detailed understanding of the change process. Longitudinal study is where research is conducted at multiple points in time and is suitable for mapping out changes in variables over time and cause-effect relationships between variables. Longitudinal studies in the area of change are rare, and suggested further research in this field in order to better understand the change phenomenon (Madsen et al., 2005). Madsen et al. (2005) further suggested that carefully designed specific research in order to look at changes throughout time can be helpful in understanding the readiness for change, as well as possible interventions resulting from the findings for readiness for change. This is supported by Carmeli (2003) who suggested that future studies on the role of emotional intelligence among employees at different organizational levels may benefit from a longitudinal research design.

Furthermore, as in the case of assessing emotions, longitudinal assessment seems especially important for emotional intelligence theory because it would allow for the
examination of causal mechanisms between emotional intelligence and functioning by examining change over time (Shulman and Hemenover, 2006). However, it is surprising that only a few emotional studies have taken the longitudinal format, and have instead used cross-sectional designs focused on isolated outcomes which thus fail to capture change over time (Shulman and Hemenover, 2006; Cartwright at al., 2008).

In relation to this study, therefore, panel research was used as a special variant of the longitudinal survey. Panel research requires the researcher to observe and measure exactly the same people, group, or organization over different time periods. A well-designed panel study shows the impact of a particular life event. The investigations were spread over two time points as shown in Table 3. Both Control and Training Group were measured at four months after merger (Time 1) and with the Training Group measured immediately before training intervention. All these 90 participants were measured again after ten months merger.

A longitudinal research design was used in order to obtain a result for the impact of the training intervention on individual emotional intelligence at pre-training (Time 1) and post-training (Time 2). A pre-test and post-test emotional intelligence level is required to test training effectiveness (Wong et al., 2007). It was decided not to collect the second data set immediately on completion of the training. This was to give participants time to transfer and practice their learning into the workplace and also to avoid any ‘Hawthorne effect’ (Slaski and Cartwright, 2003).

During the training, a variety of training techniques were used including short lectures on emotional intelligence, the impact of change on emotions and the role of emotional intelligence to enable individuals to cope with unexpected and stressful situations. The way in which a merger is communicated is considered to play a major role in influencing employees’ perceptions of the fairness of the change process (Cartwright, 2005) and in reducing uncertainty and anxiety (Schweiger and DeNisi, 1988). Increasing employee involvement through consultation over the implementation process has been shown to enhance the likelihood of acceptance of the change (Stahl and Mendenhall, 2005). There were also group discussions, role
play and paired exercises involving the relating and sharing of emotional experiences. The training was designed and delivered by a qualified trainer.

In the course of the programme, four workshop exercises (Appendix 4) were given to participants. Exercise 1 was about facial display developed by Paul Ekman. Participants in the training were required to recognize different facial expressions individually. Exercise 2 was about interpersonal relationships and was a group exercise aimed at improving the social skills of participants. Exercise 3 on emotional self-awareness as a prerequisite for other emotional competencies was about understanding one’s own emotions. For Exercise 4, participants were shown an extract on video of Shakespeare’s play *King Lear* which illustrated impulse control. People often make irrational decisions which lead to further irrational behaviour and self-destruction. Exercises 2, 3 and 4 were adapted from Hughes et al. (2005), while exercise 1 was based on Micro Expression Training Tool (METT) (see Appendix 4).

4.10 Pilot Study

A pilot study is a small-scale study using a group of individuals or companies that are comparable to those in the main research, during which researchers test and study the measurement instrument. According to Van der Velde et al. (2004) researchers are required to determine whether the instrument is reliable and valid in their own research. This pre-test also allows researchers to make improvements and amendments before the actual research takes place.

4.10.1 Questionnaires

Several sets of sample questionnaires were administered to the staff of the merging companies being studied. The aim of this piloting was to examine the suitability of the content to the staff of the merging companies. The questionnaires had to go through the human resource departments of both banks to verify the sensitivity of the related issues. The readability of the structure of the questionnaires was also one of the aims of the pilot study.
After the questionnaire samples had been returned, a number amendment was made. Firstly, some inappropriate and sensitive questions had to be excluded. This also helped to shorten the length of the questionnaires. Secondly, questionnaires were restructured for presentation purposes. Thirdly, the instructions were reconstructed for clarity and to avoid vagueness, especially when it was printed in English.

4.10.2 Piloting the Training Programme
For the purpose of this research, before the actual research was carried out, a pilot study had been conducted using the training programme and questionnaires. The main reason was to identify the level of difficulty posed by the instruments for both the MSCEIT and the training exercises. Secondly, allocation of time for each exercise and for completing the MSCEIT was also analysed to see whether any adjustment was required. Thirdly, the contents of the training programme and its appropriateness for the actual research was assessed. Fourthly, the aim was to identify whether a short training session was adequate for developing the emotional intelligence of the participants. Finally the pre-test helped to reveal whether respondents had a clear understanding of the content of the MSCEIT test.

The pilot study took the form of a one-day training programme involving 73 MBA students. The reason for selecting MBA students was that they had workplace knowledge and experience and many of them held managerial positions. Being a manager required them to acquire both intrapersonal and interpersonal skills. Therefore, in order to acquire those competencies, they needed to develop their emotional intelligence. Every individual employee has the capability to increase their self-awareness and therefore their effectiveness when working with others.

The training programme was also designed to provide an introduction to emotional intelligence for anyone in a management role. The programme incorporated the theory as well as the practical application of emotional intelligence, providing participants with fascinating insights into how they relate to colleagues. It also provided them with new impetus for change and an opportunity to take stock of their managerial skills and abilities. By the end of the training programme, participants
were expected to achieve a greater work/life balance through a focus on identifying, understanding, using and managing their emotions. It was also predicted that participants would have a greater sense of self-esteem and self-confidence, and the ability to manage their emotions in challenging situations, to display integrity, honesty and authenticity, to understand how to use positive feedback to others and to be capable of assessing their own current levels of emotional intelligence.

The methodology included both cognitive and experiential learning. The training programme session was interactive in that participants were asked to share their knowledge with group members and other participants, made group presentations of relevant material and held discussions to facilitate an understanding of their role in the organization. Small groups were used incorporating ongoing real-time feedback throughout the one-day training programme. In order to make the training exciting and arouse the interest of participants, multimedia methods such as video were used to provide multiple sources of stimuli. The pilot training programme thus incorporated both lectures and exercises on emotional intelligence, and was divided into three parts. The first part of the programme was a lecture to introduce the term emotional intelligence. In the second part of the programme, the emotional intelligence of participants was tested using the MSCEIT. Participants were given 45 minutes to an hour to complete the assessment. In the third part, three exercises on emotional intelligence competencies were given out. While doing the exercises, participants were encouraged to work with their groups as well as individually. All the selected exercises reflected the ability model of emotional intelligence characteristics.

The first exercise was about emotional self-awareness which means a deep understanding of one’s own emotions as well as one’s strengths and limitations and one’s values and motives (Goleman et al., 2002). It is a requisite for the successful development of other areas such as empathy (Bar-On, 2002). This is because, in order to be empathetic towards others, a person first needs to be aware of their own emotions. The purpose of the emotional self-awareness exercise was to connect individuals with the emotions that drive unproductive behaviour and to offer individuals an opportunity to understand what they are feeling and why. It assists individuals to connect their beliefs, assumptions and values and to better understand themselves. The outcome of the exercise was for participants to be more in touch
with their changing emotions, to develop an understanding of how emotions drive behaviours and to recognize cues that emotions have changed.

The time allocated for this exercise was 35 to 50 minutes with participants working both individually and as a group. At the end of the exercise, there was a group presentation on the exercise that required individuals and teams to identify situations in which they regretted acting the way they did. They had to pinpoint the unproductive behaviours and recall what was going on physiologically at that point in the process. Time for reflection was given at the end of the exercise.

The second exercise was about impulse control, that is control over the urges that compel action which can be both harmful and helpful. According to Bar-On (2002), impulse control is the ability to resist or delay an impulse, drive or temptation to act. Problems in impulse control are manifested by low tolerance of frustration, impulsiveness, anger control problems, abusiveness, loss of self-control and explosive and unpredictable behaviour. The purpose of the exercise was to examine the impact of impulsiveness from a fresh perspective and to show how impulsive urges can have disastrous consequences. The outcome of the exercise was to achieve a new perspective on impulsiveness by looking at it through the lens of fictional history, to achieve an increased awareness of the impacts of impulsiveness and to utilize the learning to improve impulse control. The time allocated was 40 to 60 minutes. This exercise used Shakespeare’s *King Lear* to illustrate and discuss the negative impact of impulsive behaviour. A video clip from *King Lear* was required showing the Earl of Kent stepping in to try to stop Lear from making the unwise decision to divide his kingdom (Act 1, Scene 1). A set of questions related to the consequences of impulsive behaviour was given to the participants who were asked to record the lessons and insights that resonated with their own behaviour.

The third exercise also relevant to competency in emotional intelligence concerned interpersonal relationships, that is the ability to establish and maintain mutually satisfying relationships that are characterized by intimacy and by giving and receiving affection (Stein, 2005). This competence plays a major role in our relationships because to have mutual relationships we have to understand others, anticipate their preferences and satisfy them to some extent. The purpose of this
exercise was to develop a keen awareness of the significant value that respectful
relationships contribute to the workplace. The outcome of the exercise was to
expand an awareness of interpersonal relationships, develop the recognition of
healthy goals and boundaries and lay a foundation for expanding the skills required
for developing and maintaining robust interpersonal relationships. The exercise
required participants to understand the meaning of healthy interpersonal
relationships and the impact they can have. The time allocated for doing this
exercise was 30 to 45 minutes. Participants were asked to create an action plan in
order to ascertain commitment and progress toward enhancing interpersonal
relationships. Debriefing took place at the end of the presentations.

From the pilot training programme, several problems were identified. The outcome of
the pilot training also provided ideas on how to rectify and improve the programme.
For the pilot training programme, the MBA groups comprised a mixture of native
English speakers and students whose English was their second language. The latter
group of students were found to have difficulty comprehending certain words used in
the test and took about an hour to complete it. Extra time needed to be allocated for
all the exercises in the actual training programme. The time given to complete the
141 questions in the MSCEIT also needed to be extended. (A sample of the MSCEIT
questions can be found in Appendix 3.) The time extension enabled participants to
complete all the questions without being put under pressure.

Some students during the pilot also found parts of some questions confusing so they
tended to complete the test simply to get it over with without truly understanding the
questions. Were this to happen in the research study, it could affect the validity of the
overall results so, in order to rectify this, definitions of difficult words were given on a
sheet of paper for each participant.

An additional workshop exercise was also included in the actual training programme
in order to more fully capture each branch of the ability model of Mayer and
Salovey’s (1997) emotional intelligence. The ‘recognizing facial displays’ exercise
reflected the first branch of the ability model, that is the ability to perceive emotions.
Interpersonal relationships were selected for the second branch, using emotions to
facilitate thoughts. The exercise on emotional self-awareness was related to the third
branch, the understanding of emotions. Finally, the 'impulse control' exercise concerned controlling harmful impulses and therefore reflected the fourth branch, managing emotions. Details of the questions for Workshop Exercises 2, 3 and 4 used during the training can be found in Appendix 4. In order to fit in all the programmes and exercises, an additional day was needed for the actual training programme.

After receiving participants' feedback and comments, the instructions in the exercises were also re-worded for clarity. The sensitivity and suitability of the exercises were also taken into consideration. Careful selection of exercises was necessary to avoid insensitive instructions which may be unsuitable to the culture of the Bruneian participants.

4.11 Research Instruments and Data Analysis Techniques

(i) Qualitative Data

In analysing the qualitative data, Miles and Huberman's three processes were undertaken, including data reduction, data display and verification. Data reduction involved the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting and transforming the data into transcripts (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Data reduction helps researchers to summarize, code, memo, cluster and organize data before interpreting and presenting the findings (Miles and Huberman, 1994).

In the case of the present research, raw data was collected through interviews which were recorded. The process of analysing the recorded data included listening to the tapes and transcribing what was said as text. At the same time, the process also involved making notes. Analysing the interviews began with cross-case analysis where answers from different people were grouped together. From the transcripts, significant excerpts or quotations were selected and judgment was made. Then themes were derived from coding stage (stage 2). The reasons for the emotional responses were identified as well. Due to issues of confidentiality and anonymity that must meet the ethical regulation of the company to protect the employees, only
sample on the analysis process could be included in Appendix 6. Appendix 6 presents a sample on the process of data reduction, identifying theme and sub-theme. With taped interviews, however, explanatory gestures, facial expressions and tone of voice could not be typed up. In order to be as close to the actual data, notes were written during the interview by the researcher, such as ‘participant showed a sad face/looked disappointed/was happy’. This helped as a reminder to the researcher during the data analysis stage. Data was also collected based on the researcher’s observations and conversations with the employees during her visits to the merged organization to gain a ‘feel’ from inside the organization of how people were acting and feeling.

(ii) Quantitative Data

In analysing quantitative data, SPSS software (SPSS 15) was used. This software assisted in converting the raw data into numerical values and counting the responses of respondents. A range of statistical analyses were then undertaken in order to test proposed relationships both at Time 1 and Time 2 and between groups.

PEARSON’S CORRELATION

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient is a measure of the linear relationship between two variables and is the most frequently used measure of association between variables (Kerr et al., 2006). This correlation analysis helps to describe and indicate the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two variables, for example, between emotional response and change outcome.

MULTIPLE REGRESSION

Multiple regression was used to explore the relationship between one continuous dependent variable (for example, the job attitude such as withdrawal intention, job satisfaction, job insecurity, and organizational commitment) and a number of independent variables or predictors (such as the emotional response and degree of support for change). The technique helps to show that a set of variables is able to predict a particular outcome. Stepwise multiple regressions were used in order to
allow the program to select which variables to enter and in which order they go into the equation. In the present study, in order to identify interaction effects, regression analysis was used and all variables were entered stepwise and regressed against each of the employees’ job attitudes towards change. Emotional responses were entered in Block 1, and degree of support for change (resistance to and support for change) in Block 2, and emotional intelligence in Block 3. Hierarchical regression test was also computed by controlling age of participants and their length of service for the Training Group. These were entered in Block 1 and followed by entering emotional responses in Block 2, degree of supports in Block 3 and emotional intelligence in Block 4.

**T-TEST**

Since this study required comparisons between two groups of participants (Training/Control and IBB/IDBB) and between Time 1 and Time 2, t-tests were used to compare the mean scores of these variables.

*Between Time 1 (four months after merger / pre-training) and Time 2 (ten months after merger / post-training)*

Dependent t-test or paired samples t-test was used in order to compare the mean scores of the same participants on two different occasions (Time 1 and Time 2). This technique helped to test whether there is significant difference in the mean score of emotional intelligence for the participants before and after training. This test will also examine the effectiveness of the training programme.

*Between the Training / Control Group and IBB / IDBB*

In order to compare the mean scores between groups of participants used in this study, an independent-samples t-test was used. This test will identify which group has obtained higher or lower score. The test aims to identify any variations in emotional intelligence between the two groups as well as to compare which ability branch has been acquired by the groups.
Between Time and Group

In order to make comparisons in the emotional intelligence mean scores between Training and Control Groups and between IBB and IDBB participants, and at two different times (Time 1) and (Time 2), ANOVA analysis was used. This software package assist in identifying which group has higher or lower score of emotional intelligence at Time 1 and Time 2.

4.12 Ethical Issues

The major ethical issue in most social research is related to the treatment of the human respondents or participants (Blaikie, 2004). The present study also encountered ethical issues in that its primary aim was to analyse employees’ emotions, feelings and behavioural responses as a result of radical change. Thus, in conducting this study, judgments had to be made about what was reasonable and appropriate, and informed consent needed to be obtained. Finding appropriate ways to deal with the ethical aspects of a project, however, can create practical problems. For example, the need to inform potential interviewees about the nature of the research could increase the refusal rate and therefore threaten the ability of the study to produce useful findings. Therefore before each interview was conducted, participants were informed on the objective of the research and assurance was given to the interviewees regarding confidentiality and anonymity. Consent was also required before interviewing the participants.

4.13 Problems Encountered

Several problems were encountered while undertaking this research, in particular at the data collection stage. One problem was that the period when the questionnaires were distributed was inappropriate. The questionnaires were administered during the Holy month of Ramadhan, and several prospective participants were on leave in preparation to celebrate Eid after Ramadhan. As a result, the researcher had difficulty in collecting a bigger sample, and only managed to collect data from a small sample of participants. Furthermore, in order to show respect for the Holy month of Ramadhan, all businesses and offices in Brunei were operating shorter working hours throughout the month. Moreover, because of limited time, participants had
time constraints in which to complete the questionnaires. Therefore the data collection period and time for contact with the participants were very limited.

Secondly, it was also difficult to collect data on emotional responses by interview at Time 1. This was because at that time, participants were still staggered by the sudden merger announcement. Soon after the announcement, the two banks were busy integrating work systems thus leaving no time for staff to be interviewed. Additionally, during this critical time, participants tended to be very conscious of whom they talked to and were reticent when talking with strangers, especially about their feelings and emotions in response to the change.

It would be of chief interest if the difference in emotional intelligence score could be provided between IBB and IDBB employees at both Time 1 and Time 2 for Control Group. Unfortunately, the attributes (whether employees came from IBB or IDBB) could not be identified because of confidentiality issue. Participants did not provide information on their previous employers due to fear and feeling of insecurity. Otherwise this would contribute to an interesting and significant contribution between big and small merging partners.

Finally, there was a problem when collecting data immediately after the merger announcement and before the merger took place. The organization was not ready to be studied because of work commitments in preparation for the merger. Otherwise, it would have been of great interest to understand the emotional responses, the attitudes towards change and the responses of the employees at that time. So, because of this difficulty, data collection was only possible four months after the merger.

### 4.14 Chapter Summary

Research questions and hypotheses were developed to guide this study. When merger takes place, it is assumed to affect the emotional responses of employees and they may either support change or to resist change. Those who are emotionally
intelligent may be able to support change and have positive job attitudes towards change.

Three sets of participants were involved in this study. 90 participants were involved in order to investigate the level of employees’ emotional intelligence and the changes in their emotional responses, degree of support for change and job attitudes towards change. From this total, a second data set was identified: the Training Group and was given training on emotional intelligence, and the Control Group who was not given any training. The aim was to identify whether by given training, employees were able to develop their emotional intelligence and thus able to accept merger. The third data set was 33 participants who involved in interviews. Interviews were also conducted in order to understand how merger has affected the employees’ emotions and behaviour. A two timeframe longitudinal study was conducted (four months and ten months post merger). A pilot questionnaire and training programme were conducted and amendments were made before the actual research was carried out.

This study therefore aims to fill in the gap in the literature by focusing on the role of emotional intelligence in influencing the job attitudes of employees affected by merger using employees from two merging companies in Brunei as research participants. This chapter also aims to fill the gap left by existing studies on the ability to train and develop emotional intelligence using MSCEIT by designing a training programme that reflects the four branches of the ability model aimed at developing the emotional intelligence of individuals.
CHAPTER 5
DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter begins by presenting results collected through the quantitative method at both four months and ten months post merger. Differences in the emotional mean scores between Training and Control Groups, and between IBB and IDBB of training participants are also presented. The second section provides quantitative data collected from employees’ emotional responses and attitudes towards merger during early merger and ten months after merger. The final section provides qualitative data in order to obtain data on the actual feel and emotions of employees during merger.

5.1 Quantitative Data

5.1.1 Relationships between variables

In order to investigate the research questions several hypotheses were used. Statistical techniques of data analysis were employed to analyse data including Pearson’s correlation in order to describe the strength of the relationships, and multiple regressions in order to examine relationships between variables. The results for inter-correlations between all measures used are reported in Tables 4 and 5 representing the very early stages of the merger after just four months. Tables 6 and 7 report the inter-correlations between measures collected at ten months post merger.

(i) Relationship between Emotional Responses and Degree of Support for change

H1: Employees’ positive emotional states (happiness) will be negatively related to resistance to change and positively related to support for change.

H2: Employees’ negative emotional states (loneliness, depression and anger) will be positively related to resistance to change and negatively related to support for change.
**Time 1 (four months post merger)**

From Table 4, all the emotional responses were found to be correlated among them. For example, happiness was negatively and significantly correlated with anger ($r = -0.35$, $p < 0.01$). Other relationships were found but as not expected. For example, loneliness was significantly and negatively correlated with depression ($r = -0.29$, $p < 0.01$) and positively correlated with happiness ($r = 0.46$, $p < 0.01$). No correlation was found between loneliness and anger ($r = -0.20$, $p > 0.05$) or depression and happiness ($r = -0.17$, $p > 0.05$) and anger ($r = 0.13$, $p > 0.05$).

Table 4 further shows no relationships between responses to change and emotional responses at four months after merger. For example, resistance to change has no relationship with loneliness ($r = -0.02$, $p > 0.05$), depression ($r = -0.11$, $p > 0.05$), happiness ($r = -0.06$, $p > 0.05$) or anger ($r = -0.01$, $p > 0.05$). Support for change was also found to have no correlation with loneliness ($r = 0.04$, $p > 0.05$), depression ($r = -0.01$, $p > 0.05$), happiness ($r = 0.07$, $p > 0.05$) or anger ($r = 0.09$, $p > 0.05$).

**Time 2 (ten months post merger)**

Attitudes toward change were found to be correlated with emotional responses of employees at ten months post merger (see Table 6). That is, resistance to change was significantly and positively correlated with anger ($r = 0.22$, $p < 0.05$) and negatively correlated with happiness ($r = -0.30$, $p < 0.005$). However, no significant correlation was found between resistance to change and loneliness ($r = -0.09$, $p > 0.05$) and depression ($r = 0.17$, $p > 0.05$). Support for change was also found to have a significant relationship with happiness positively ($r = 0.30$, $p < 0.005$) but not with loneliness ($r = 0.12$, $p > 0.05$), depression ($r = -0.01$, $p > 0.05$) or anger ($r = -0.16$, $p > 0.05$).

**H3: Resistance to change will be negatively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment but positively related to intention to withdraw and job insecurity.**

(ii) **Relationship between Degree of Support for Change and Job Attitudes**

H3: Resistance to change will be negatively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment but positively related to intention to withdraw and job insecurity.
H4: Support for change will be positively related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment but negatively related to job insecurity and intention to withdraw.

Time 1 (four months post merger)

Both statistical analysis (Pearson’s correlation and multiple regression) found significant relationships between job attitudes towards change and the degree of support for change variables (see Table 4). Pearson’s correlation analysis found that resistance to change was significantly correlated negatively with both organizational commitment ($r = -0.22$, $p > 0.05$). Support for change was also found to be significantly correlated positively with organizational commitment ($r = 0.28$, $p > 0.01$). Support for change, however, had no significant relationship with job insecurity ($r = -0.09$, $p > 0.05$), job satisfaction ($r = 0.13$, $p > 0.05$), and withdrawal intention ($r = -0.17$, $p > 0.05$). Resistance to change was also found to have no relationship with job insecurity ($r = 0.04$, $p > 0.05$), job satisfaction ($r = -0.17$, $p > 0.05$) or withdrawal intention ($r = 0.01$, $p > 0.05$) at four months post merger. Nevertheless, the statistical value showed that resistance to change and support for change was negatively correlated significantly ($r = -0.37$, $p > 0.01$).

Stepwise regressions also supports the analysis derived from Pearson’s correlations (see Table 5(a)). Support for change was positively interacted with organizational commitment ($r = 0.28$, $p < 0.05$ with only 8% $R$ square variance). After controlling age and length of service, hierarchical regression (Table 5(b)) reports positive interaction between support for change and organizational commitment ($r = 0.57$, $p < 0.05$ with $R$ square = 0.02).

Time 2 (ten months post merger)

There were relationships between degree of support for change and other variables depicted at ten months after merger. Resistance to change was significantly correlated with all the job attitudes towards change. That is, it has positive relationships with job insecurity ($r = 0.23$, $p < 0.05$) and withdrawal intention ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.005$), and negative relationships with job satisfaction ($r = -0.33$, $p < 0.005$), and organizational commitment ($r = -0.24$, $p < 0.05$). Support for change also
has a relationship with the responses to change at ten months post merger. That is, it has a significant and negative relationship with withdrawal intention \( (r = -0.21, p < 0.005) \) and a significant and positive relationship with organizational commitment \( (r = 0.24, p < 0.05) \). Support for change was also found to be negatively and significantly correlated with resistance to change \( (r = -0.46, p < 0.05) \).

Relationships were also found as shown in Table 7(a) when data was analysed using multiple regression. For example, resistance to change was negatively and significantly related with job satisfaction \( (r = -0.30, p < 0.005 \text{ with R square variance of 34\%}) \). There was also an interaction effect between support for change and job satisfaction which tended to be significant \( (r = -0.23, p < 0.05 \text{ with R square variance of 38\%}) \). Hierarchical regression (Table 7(b)) also reports negative and significant relationship between resistance to change and job satisfaction \( (r = -0.51, p < 0.05 \text{ with R square variance of 4\%}) \).

(iii) Relationship between Emotional Responses and Job Attitudes towards Change (merger)

**H5**: Negative emotions will be associated with intention to withdraw and job insecurity during merger.

**H6**: Positive emotions will be associated with organizational commitment and job satisfaction during merger.

**Time 1 (four months post merger)**

No significant correlations were found between other responses to change (job attitude) and emotional responses to change (Table 4). For example, job insecurity has no significant correlations with loneliness \( (r = 0.19, p > 0.05) \), happiness \( (r = 0.06, p > 0.05) \) and anger \( (r = -0.14, p > 0.05) \). No significant correlation was found between job satisfaction and loneliness \( (r = 0.16, p > 0.05) \), depression \( (r = -0.17, p > 0.05) \) or happiness \( (r = 0.18, p > 0.05) \). Withdrawal intention also found to be not significantly correlated with emotional responses after four months of merger (loneliness \( r = -0.04, p > 0.05 \); depression \( r = -0.10, p > 0.05 \); and happiness \( r = 0.07, p > 0.05 \)). Organizational commitment was not significantly correlated with any of the employees’ emotional responses four months post merger (loneliness \( r = 0.11, \)).
p > 0.05; depression $r = -0.01$, $p > 0.05$; happiness $r = -0.01$, $p > 0.05$; and anger $r = 0.17$, $p > 0.05$). A significant relationship was found between responses to change and employees' emotional responses to change. This is shown in Table 4. Job satisfaction was found to be negatively significant with anger ($r = -0.34$, $p < 0.01$). There were also relationships found between these variables that were rather unusual and unforeseen (see Table 4). For example, job insecurity was found to be negatively significantly correlated with depression ($r = -0.21$, $p < 0.05$) and withdrawal intention was negatively correlated to anger ($r = -0.22$, $p < 0.05$).

Other significant relationships were also found from this preliminary finding among the variables of responses to change (Table 4). For example, there are negative correlations between job insecurity and job satisfaction ($r = -0.40$, $p < 0.01$). Job insecurity is also correlated positively with withdrawal ($r = 0.41$, $p < 0.01$). Job satisfaction is also expected to be positively correlated with organizational commitment ($r = 0.47$, $p < 0.01$). At the same time, job satisfaction is also found to be negatively correlated with withdrawal intentions ($r = -0.54$, $p < 0.01$). Withdrawal intention is found negatively correlated with both organizational commitment ($r = -0.56$, $p < 0.01$). The statistics also found that only job insecurity was not significantly correlated with organizational commitment ($r = -0.15$, $p > 0.05$).

Using multiple regressions (as shown in Table 5(a) and (b)) show that there is a significant negative relationship between job satisfaction and anger ($r = -0.34$, $p < 0.05$) when computed using stepwise, and ($r = -0.44$, $p < 0.05$) when computed using hierarchical regression. The R square change value shows an 11% variance and 7% variance (stepwise and hierarchical respectively) in job satisfaction as a result of being angry with regard to merger. Levels of job satisfaction decrease when people are angry following the announcement of merger. There are also other interactions identified using stepwise regression between responses to change and emotional responses four months after merger, for example between job insecurity and depression ($r = -0.21$, $p < 0.05$ with R square $= 0.04$) and withdrawal intentions and anger ($r = -0.22$, $p < 0.05$ with R square $= 0.05$).
**Time 2 (ten months post merger)**

Interestingly, despite the nil relationships between emotional intelligence and job attitudes, the results found more significant relationships between job attitudes and emotional responses ten months post merger (see Table 6) compared to data collected at four months post merger. For example, job insecurity was negatively correlated with happiness ($r = -0.39, p < 0.005$). This correlation failed to be detected at four months post merger. Job satisfaction was significantly correlated with all the variables of emotional responses. It was negatively correlated with depression ($r = -0.36, p < 0.005$), happiness ($r = 0.48, p < 0.005$) and anger ($r = -0.32, p < 0.005$). Withdrawal intention was also significantly correlated positively with expected variables such as depression ($r = 0.39, p < 0.005$) and anger ($r = 0.35, p < 0.005$), and significantly negatively correlated with happiness ($r = -0.53, p < 0.005$). Organizational commitment was also found to be positively correlated with emotional responses of happiness ($r = 0.31, p < 0.005$). This correlation was not found at four months post merger.

Job insecurity and depression ten months after merger, however, showed no relationship compared to the data collected at four months post merger ($r = 0.19, p > 0.05$). Other variables also showed no correlation with the emotional responses even at ten months post merger. For example, no correlation was found between job insecurity and loneliness ($r = -0.19, p > 0.05$) and anger ($r = 0.04, p > 0.05$). Organizational commitment also showed no relationship with loneliness ($r = 0.14, p > 0.05$), depression ($r = -0.15, p > 0.05$) and anger ($r = -0.06, p > 0.05$).

There were also unforeseen correlations found between job attitudes and the emotional responses to change. For example, job satisfaction was found to be significantly correlated positively with loneliness ($r = 0.38; p < 0.005$) and withdrawal intention was significantly correlated negatively with loneliness ($r = -0.35, p < 0.005$).

The stepwise multiple regressions results (Table 7(a)) also support the results analysed using Pearson’s correlations. At ten months post merger, job insecurity was found to be significantly interacted with happiness ($r = -0.39, p < 0.005$) with the R square change value showing 16% variance. There were also interaction effects...
found between job satisfaction and happiness \((r = 0.38, p < 0.005\) with 23% R square variance). Job satisfaction was unexpectedly interacted positively with loneliness \((r = 0.28, p < 0.005\) with 30% R square variance) and this effect supports the result analysed by Pearson’s correlation. Organizational commitment also has an interaction effect with emotional responses, that is happiness \((r = 0.31, p < 0.005\) with R square = 0.10). Withdrawal intentions have an interaction effect with happiness \((r = –0.41, p < 0.005\) with R square = 0.28), depression \((r = 0.20, p < 0.05\) with R square = 0.33) and loneliness \((r = –0.19, p < 0.005\) with R square = 0.36).

Similar pattern was also found when data was analysed using hierarchical regression (Table 7(b)). At ten months post merger, job insecurity was found to be significantly interacted with happiness \((r = –0.58, p < 0.005)\) with the R square change value showing 1% variance. There were also interaction effects found between job satisfaction and happiness \((r = 0.80, p < 0.05\) with 4% R square variance). Job satisfaction was unexpectedly interacted positively with loneliness \((r = 0.75, p < 0.05\) with 4% R square variance) and this effect supports the result analysed by Pearson’s correlation. Organizational commitment also has an interaction effect with emotional responses, that is happiness \((r = 0.74, p < 0.05\) with R square = 0.02). Withdrawal intentions have an interaction effect with happiness \((r = –0.39, p < 0.005\) with R square = 0.04), depression \((r = 0.17, p < 0.005\) with R square = 0.04) and loneliness \((r = –0.16, p < 0.10\) with R square = 0.04).

There were also more significant correlations found among variables of responses to change ten months post merger (see Table 6) compared to the results four months post merger. Job insecurity was significantly negatively correlated with job satisfaction \((r = –0.47, p < 0.005)\) and organizational commitment \((r = –0.25, p < 0.005)\), and significantly positively correlated with withdrawal intention \((r = 0.51, p < 0.005)\). Job satisfaction was significantly correlated positively with organizational commitment \((r = 0.45, p < 0.005)\), and negatively correlated with withdrawal intention \((r = –0.69, p < 0.005)\). Withdrawal intention was also significantly correlated negatively with organizational commitment \((r = –0.54, p < 0.005)\).
(iv) **Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and other variables**

**H7: Emotional intelligence will be positively associated with support for change.**

**Time 1 (four months post merger)**

Other than the statistical values that have been explicitly stated under each of the research questions, it is also worth emphasizing the relationships among the emotional intelligence variables. At four months post merger, it was found that, on average, the participants had a lower emotional intelligence level than the average emotional intelligence score. The average grade of the overall MSCEIT is 89, which is about one standard deviation below the mean and at the 16th percentile. Each branch (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions) showed no significant effect (see Table 4). Except for Branch 4 (managing emotion), all branches were correlated with each other. Perceiving emotions was significantly correlated with using emotions \((r = 0.45, p < 0.01)\), understanding emotions \((r = 0.44, p < 0.01)\) and Total EI \((r = 0.76, p < 0.01)\). Using emotions was also correlated with understanding emotions \((r = 0.54, p < 0.01)\), managing emotions \((r = 0.33, p < 0.01)\) and Total EI \((r = 0.78, p < 0.01)\). Understanding emotions was found to be correlated with managing emotions \((r = 0.42, p < 0.01)\) and Total EI \((r = 0.77, p < 0.01)\). While managing emotions was also correlated significantly with Total EI \((r = 0.61, p < 0.01)\). Managing emotions, however, had no significant correlation with perceiving emotions \((r = 0.19, p > 0.01)\).

Using Pearson’s correlation, emotional intelligence shows no significant correlation with job attitudes in response to change at four months post merger. Both Table 5 (a) and 5 (b) could not identify any relationship between emotional intelligence and job attitudes. This suggests that emotional intelligence may play a limited role during this early stage of merger, which is, however, inconsistent with the existing literature and extensive claims about the favourable implications of emotional intelligence for individuals or groups. Table 4 shows the results of correlations between emotional intelligence and job attitudes. Branches 1, 2, 3 and 4 (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions respectively) and Total EI were found to be not correlated to job insecurity \((r = 0.12, p > 0.005; r = 0.12, p > 0.005; r = 0.07, p > 0.005; r = 0.03, p > 0.005; r = 0.10, p > 0.005\) respectively). Branches 1, 2, 3 and 4
(perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions respectively) and Total EI were also not correlated to job satisfaction ($r = 0.04$, $p > 0.005$; $r = 0.07$, $p > 0.005$; $r = 0.00$, $p > 0.005$; $r = 0.02$, $p > 0.005$; $r = 0.05$, $p > 0.005$ respectively). Branches 1, 2, 3 and 4 (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions respectively) and Total EI were also not correlated to withdrawal intention ($r = -0.03$, $p > 0.005$; $r = -0.06$, $p > 0.005$; $r = -0.07$, $p > 0.005$; $r = -0.02$, $p > 0.005$; $r = -0.07$, $p > 0.005$ respectively). Table 4 also presents the lack of correlation between the four branches of emotional intelligence and Total EI and organizational commitment ($r = -0.05$, $p > 0.005$; $r = 0.05$, $p > 0.005$; $r = 0.06$, $p > 0.005$; $r = 0.05$, $p > 0.005$; $r = 0.04$, $p > 0.005$ respectively). No correlation was found between Branches 1, 2, 3 and 4 (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions respectively) and Total EI and social relationships ($r = -0.02$, $p > 0.005$; $r = -0.03$, $p > 0.005$; $r = -0.11$, $p > 0.005$; $r = -0.18$, $p > 0.005$; $r = -0.09$, $p > 0.005$ respectively).

It was also found that there was no significant correlation between emotional intelligence and degree of support for change (see Table 4). Branches 1, 2, 3 and 4 (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions respectively) and Total EI had no relationship with resistance to change ($r = -0.08$, $p > 0.05$; $r = 0.01$, $p > 0.05$; $r = -0.11$, $p > 0.05$; $r = -0.00$, $p > 0.05$; and $r = -0.06$, $p > 0.05$ respectively). No correlations were also found between support for change and any of the branches of emotional intelligence (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions) and Total EI ($r = -0.01$, $p > 0.05$; $r = 0.03$, $p > 0.05$; $r = 0.02$, $p > 0.05$; $r = -0.02$, $p > 0.05$; and $r = 0.01$, $p > 0.05$ respectively). These findings imply that at this early stage of merger emotional intelligence has no relationship with either employees’ support for or resistance to change.

Using Pearson’s correlation analysis, it was found that there is no correlation between emotional intelligence (for perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions and Total EI) and emotional responses (anger, depression, loneliness and happiness) at four months post merger. Statistical values (see Table 4) showed no correlation between loneliness and emotional intelligence variables (Perceiving emotions $r = -0.01$, $p > 0.05$; Using emotions $r = -0.04$, $p > 0.05$; Understanding emotions $r = -0.17$, $p > 0.05$; Managing emotions $r = -0.02$, $p > 0.05$; and Total EI $r = -0.05$, $p > 0.05$). No correlations were depicted between feeling depressed and
emotional intelligence (Perceiving emotions $r = 0.10$, $p > 0.05$; Using emotions $r = 0.10$, $p > 0.05$; Understanding emotions $r = 0.02$, $p > 0.05$; Managing emotions $r = -0.16$, $p > 0.05$; and Total EI $r = 0.03$, $p > 0.05$). Emotional intelligence also had no significant correlations with happiness (Perceiving emotions $r = 0.00$, $p > 0.05$; Using emotions $r = -0.18$, $p > 0.05$; Understanding emotions $r = -0.18$, $p > 0.05$; Managing emotions $r = -0.12$, $p > 0.05$; and Total EI $r = -0.11$, $p > 0.05$). At four months post merger, no correlation was found between anger and emotional intelligence (Perceiving emotions $r = -0.10$, $p > 0.05$; Using emotions $r = 0.19$, $p > 0.05$; Understanding emotions $r = 0.05$, $p > 0.05$; Managing emotions $r = 0.02$, $p > 0.05$; and Total EI $r = 0.05$, $p > 0.05$).

**Time 2 (ten months post merger)**

Interestingly, at ten months post merger, several relationships were identified (see Table 6) between emotional intelligence and degree of support for change. All except Perceiving emotions ($r = 0.01$, $p > 0.05$) of emotional intelligence and Total EI were significantly correlated positively with support for change (Using emotions $r = 0.31$, $p < 0.005$; Understanding emotions $r = 0.27$, $p < 0.005$; Managing emotions $r = 0.40$, $p < 0.005$; Total EI $r = 0.30$, $p < 0.005$). On the other hand, all branches of emotional intelligence and Total EI, except Managing emotions ($r = -0.28$, $p < 0.005$), were found to have no correlation with resistance to change (Perceiving emotions $r = -0.07$, $p > 0.05$; Using emotions $r = -0.12$, $p > 0.05$; Understanding emotions $r = -0.13$, $p > 0.05$; Total EI $r = -0.17$, $p > 0.05$).

Table 6 also confirmed relationships between each branch and overall Total EI. Perceiving emotions was positively correlated with all branches (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions) and Total EI ($r = 0.44$, $p < 0.005$; $r = 0.39$, $p < 0.005$; $r = 0.28$, $p < 0.005$; $r = 0.74$, $p < 0.005$ respectively). Using emotions was also positively correlated with Understanding emotions ($r = 0.70$, $p < 0.005$), Managing emotions ($r = 0.45$, $p < 0.005$) and Total EI ($r = 0.84$, $p < 0.005$). Understanding emotions showed a significant relationship with Managing emotions ($r = 0.47$, $p < 0.005$) and with Total EI ($r = 0.81$, $p < 0.005$). The relationship between Managing emotions and Total EI was also found to be significantly correlated ($r = 0.66$, $p < 0.005$).
More relationships were also found between emotional intelligence and other variables. The result showed a significant relationship between anger and emotional intelligence (see Table 6). Both Perceiving emotions and overall Total EI showed a negative correlation with anger ($r = -0.27, p < 0.05$ and $r = -0.23, p < 0.05$ respectively). Still, no significant correlation was found between emotional intelligence variables and loneliness (Perceiving emotions $r = -0.12, p > 0.05$; Using emotions $r = -0.14, p > 0.05$; Understanding emotions $r = -0.12, p > 0.05$; Managing emotions $r = -0.11, p > 0.05$; and Total EI $r = -0.16, p > 0.05$), depression (Perceiving emotions $r = 0.11, p > 0.05$; Using emotions $r = 0.15, p > 0.05$; Understanding emotions $r = 0.16, p > 0.05$; Managing emotions $r = 0.13, p > 0.05$; and Total EI $r = 0.16, p > 0.05$) and happiness (Perceiving emotions $r = -0.03, p > 0.05$; Using emotions $r = 0.03, p > 0.05$; Understanding emotions $r = -0.02, p > 0.05$; Managing emotions $r = 0.12, p > 0.05$; and Total EI $r = 0.01, p > 0.05$) even ten months post merger. Anger was also not correlated with Using emotions ($r = -0.12, p > 0.05$), Understanding emotions ($r = -0.19, p > 0.05$) and Managing emotions ($r = -0.06, p > 0.05$).

The second set of data results also revealed relationships among emotional intelligence and its four branches (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions) and Total EI. It was found that all the four branches and Total EI were not significantly correlated with the job attitudes (job insecurity, job satisfaction, withdrawal intention and organizational commitment). Both Table 7 (a) and Table 7 (b) could not identify any relationship of emotional intelligence with job attitudes. These findings were similar to those found four months post merger. Table 6 reports all the results found at ten months post merger. Branches 1, 2, 3 and 4 (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions respectively) and Total EI were not correlated to job insecurity ($r = 0.05, p > 0.05$; $r = 0.09, p > 0.05$; $r = 0.16, p > 0.05$; $r = 0.03, p > 0.05$; $r = 0.11, p > 0.05$ respectively). Branches 1, 2, 3 and 4 (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions respectively) and Total EI were also not correlated to job satisfaction ($r = -0.01, p > 0.05$; $r = -0.12, p > 0.05$; $r = -0.20, p > 0.05$; $r = 0.03, p > 0.05$; $r = -0.10, p > 0.05$ respectively). Branches 1, 2, 3 and 4 (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions respectively) and Total EI were also found not to be correlated with withdrawal intention ($r = 0.06, p > 0.05$; $r =
0.10, \( p > 0.05 \); \( r = 0.15, \ p > 0.05 \); \( r = 0.08, \ p > 0.05 \); \( r = 0.13, \ p > 0.05 \) respectively). Table 6 also presents the lack of correlation between the four branches of emotional intelligence and total emotional intelligence and organizational commitment \(( r = -0.07, \ p > 0.05 \); \( r = 0.03; \ p > 0.05 \); \( r = -0.04, \ p > 0.05 \); \( r = -0.02, \ p > 0.05 \); \( r = -0.04, \ p > 0.05 \) respectively).

5.1.2 Differences in EI mean scores for Training and Control Group

(i) At Time 1 between Training and Control Group

In order to see whether there was a statistically significant difference in the baseline scores of each branch and the total emotional intelligence between the two groups (Training and Control Group), an independent samples \( t \)-test was conducted. Table 8(a) summarizes the results for both groups prior to the training intervention. The result shows that the Training Group had higher mean score for using emotions to facilitate thinking and understanding emotions than the Control Group at pre-training. The Training Group's mean score for using emotions was \( M = 87.33, \ SD = 20.974 \) while the mean score for the Control Group was \( M = 83.03, \ SD = 14.186 \). For understanding emotions, the score for the Training Group was \( M = 83.01, \ SD = 9.566 \), and for the Control Group was \( M = 80.14, SD = 9.327 \). The emotional intelligence mean scores for these abilities however showed no significant difference between the two groups.

The result shows that the Control Group had a higher emotional intelligence mean score for perceiving emotions, managing emotions and total emotional intelligence to begin with. The mean score for perceiving emotion for the Training Group was \( M = 77.70, \ SD = 14.735 \) while the mean score for the Control Group was \( M = 85.59, \ SD = 15.806 \). The mean score for managing emotions for the Training Group was \( M = 78.93, \ SD = 81.62 \). Whereas the mean score for the Control Group was \( M = 81.62, \ SD = 10.836 \). The results also show that the baseline level of total emotional intelligence prior to training for the Training Group was \( M = 75.49, \ SD = 12.152 \) and for the Control Group was \( M = 77.09, \ SD = 12.131 \). Although the Training Group had lower mean scores for perceiving emotions, managing emotions, and Total EI than Control Group, no significant difference in emotional intelligence abilities was found between the two groups.
(ii) At Time 2 between Training and Control Group
Table 8(b) tabulates the results obtained after conducting independent-samples $t$-tests to compare the mean scores between the Training and the Control Groups at post-training. The results show that the Training Group had higher mean scores for using emotions and understanding emotions than the Control Group. For using emotions, the mean score for the Training Group was $M = 92.33$, $SD = 15.851$, and the mean score for the Control Group was $M = 88.19$, $SD = 17.031$. The mean score for understanding emotions for the Training Group was $M = 86.31$, $SD = 8.503$ and the mean score for the Control Group was $M = 82.50$, $SD = 11.833$. The results show no significant difference between the two groups at post-training.

The Control Group’s mean scores for perceiving emotions, managing emotions and Total EI were found to be higher than the mean scores for the Training Group at post-training. For perceiving emotions, the mean score for the Training Group was $M = 81.56$, $SD = 13.923$ and for the Control Group was $M = 87.82$, $SD = 14.879$. For managing emotions, the mean score for the Training Group was $M = 83.45$, $SD = 6.468$, and the Control Group had a mean score of $M = 84.17$, $SD = 10.252$. The Total EI mean score for Training Group was $M = 80.85$, $SD = 11.446$ and the Control Group was $M = 80.99$, $SD = 13.324$. Overall the emotional intelligence scores at post-training show no significant difference between the two groups.

(iii) At pre- and post-training for Training Group
Table 9(a) reports the emotional intelligence mean scores between pre- and post-training for the Training Group. The results show that managing emotions and Total EI had significant difference and increase between before and after training intervention. For managing emotions at pre-training was $M = 78.93$, $SD = 6.732$ and post-training was $M = 83.45$, $SD = 6.468$; $t(17) = -2.232$, $p = 0.039$. When the eta squared was calculated it showed a value of 0.22 (22%) which was considered a large effect. There was also a significant difference in the Total EI with a significance value of 0.022. This shows that there was a significant increase in the mean score between pre-training $M = 75.49$, $SD = 12.152$ and post-training $M = 80.85$, $SD = 11.446$; $t(17) = -2.525$, $p = 0.022$. The eta squared shows a large effect in the
difference at 0.27 (27%). The \( p \) values for both managing emotions and Total EI were less than and equal to 0.05.

Despite the training intervention, the mean scores for perceiving emotions, using emotions and understanding emotions showed no significant difference. The mean scores did not meet the significant difference before and after the training intervention. With a value of 0.277 for perceiving emotions, 0.245 for using emotions, and 0.066 for understanding emotions, their significant \( p \) values were therefore greater than 0.05.

(iv) At pre-and post-training for Control Group
Table 9(b) reports the emotional intelligence mean scores between pre- and post-training for the Control Group. The result shows that the mean scores for using emotions and Total EI were statistically significant. The significance value for using emotions was 0.013 (\( p < 0.05 \)). This illustrates that there was a significant increase in the mean score of emotional intelligence for using emotions between pre-training (\( M = 83.03, \text{SD} = 14.186 \)) and post-training (\( M = 88.19, \text{SD} = 17.031; t(71) = –2.539, p = 0.013 \)). The eta square showed a moderate effect in the differences (8.3%). The Total EI score also showed a significant difference and increase in the mean score of emotional intelligence (0.027, \( p < 0.05 \)) between pre-training (\( M = 77.09, \text{SD} = 12.131 \)) and post-training (\( M = 80.99, \text{SD} = 13.324; t(71) = –2.256, p = 0.027 \)). The eta squared showed a large effect in the differences (6.7%).

Despite the increase in the mean scores, no significant difference was found for perceiving emotions, understanding emotions and managing emotions between pre- and post-training. The mean scores did not meet the significant difference between the pre- and post-training. With a value of 0.311 for perceiving emotions, 0.110 for understanding emotions, and 0.074 for understanding emotions, their significant \( p \) values were therefore greater than 0.05.

(v) Comparisons in mean scores between groups and time
When results were compared, Training Group surpassed the Control Group on using emotions and understanding emotions at both the baseline and Time 2 measurements. Although this difference did not reach statistical significance, it
suggests a favourable pattern that the levels of emotional intelligence in the Training Group would be higher than in the Control Group. In order to make comparisons in the mean scores for both groups and at different times, ANOVA analysis was conducted to determine which group has higher mean score during the merger process.

Table 10 shows the increase in the mean score for all branches of emotional intelligence including the Total EI across the two time points for both groups. The table reports that the interaction effects of all branches including Total EI for both groups were not statistically significant, despite the increase in their mean scores. The significant levels for Wilks’ Lambda are .73, .97, .76, .51 and .69 for Branch 1, Branch 2, Branch 3, Branch 4 and Total EI respectively. The values for alpha were greater than 0.05.

When the main effects were assessed for each independent variables the value for Wilks’ Lambda for time showed statistically significant effect for time for Branch 2, Branch 4 and Total EI (.95, .94 and .93 respectively). The probability values were .03 for Branch 2, .02 for Branch 4 and .012 for Total EI (p<.05). Thus, there is a statistically significant difference (for time) found among the time periods for Branch 2, Branch 4 and Total EI. This suggests that there was a change in emotional intelligence scores across the two different time periods for Branch 2, Branch 4 and Total EI. The effect sizes of these results were .97, .51 and .69 for Branch 2, Branch 4 and Total EI respectively. Based on the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988), the results suggest a very large effect size. For Branch 3, the different time mean score was almost at significant value (p<0.066). The eta squared when calculated shows a moderate effect size.

For the main effect between-subjects (Table 11), only Branch1 has a significant value less than alpha level of .05 (p = 0.03). This suggests that the main effect for group in perceiving emotions as significant. Thus, there was a significant difference in the perceiving emotion branch between those who attended training and those who did not attend the training. The effect size of the between-subject effect was 0.05 was almost reaching moderate level of Cohen’s (1988) proposal.
Graph (1), (2) and (3) present that the emotional intelligence level for the Training Group were higher than Control Group for perceiving emotions, utilising emotions and understanding emotion. Graph (4) and (5) for managing emotions and the Total EI respectively, suggest that Control Group’s level of emotional intelligence were higher than Training Group’s. These figures also suggest that in Time 2, both groups’ mean score of emotional intelligence were almost at par. The overall score for Training Group shoot up drastically and almost at the same level as the Control Group’s overall score level.

5.1.3 Differences in EI mean scores Between Training participants

(i) At Time 1 (pre-training) between IBB and IDBB
Independent t-test was conducted to identify the differences in the mean scores of training participants between IBB and IDBB employees. Table 12(a) summarises the result. At pre-training stage the results show that IBB employees have higher mean scores of emotional intelligence than IDBB employees for all branches. The IBB’s mean scores for perceiving emotions (Branch 1) was 81.89 with SD = 12.284. Whereas for IDBB, M = 71.12, SD = 16.768. For IBB using emotions (Branch 2), M = 90.05, SD = 23.211 and IDBB M = 83.06, SD = 17.712. For understanding emotions (Branch 3), IBB has means scores of 84.98 and SD = 10.729, and IDBB has M = 79.91, SD = 7.006. The managing emotions (Branch 4) for IBB was M = 80.43, SD = 6.703 and IDBB has M = 76.57 and SD = 6.548. The Total EI for IBB was M = 78.76, SD = 13.110 and IDBB has M = 70.35, SD = 12.974. No significant difference was found between IBB and IDBB at pre-training stage.

(ii) At Time 2 (post-training) between IBB and IDBB
Table 12(b) summarises the result of independent t-test for the mean scores between IBB and IDBB of the training participants at post-training. The results show that the patterns of the result tend to be the same as the results obtained at pre-training. IBB has higher mean scores than IDBB for all the branches. No significant difference was found between the two groups at this stage. The mean scores for IBB for perceiving emotions (Branch 1) was M = 85.09, SD = 13.906 and IDBB has M = 76.02, SD = 12.974. For using emotions (Branch 2), IBB has M = 93.70, SD =
14.400, and IDBB has M = 90.16, SD = 18.904. The mean scores for understanding emotions (Branch 3) for IBB was M = 86.45, SD = 9.053, and IDBB has M = 86.08, SD = 8.256. For managing emotions (Branch 4), IBB has M = 85.52, SD = 6.670, and IDBB has M = 80.19, SD = 4.919. The mean scores for Total EI for IBB was M = 83.46, SD = 11.474, and IDBB has M = 76.75 and SD = 10.939.

(iii) Between pre- and post-training for IBB
Table 13(a) presents the emotional intelligence mean scores for IBB employees participating the training session. The results show that the mean scores for all branches had increased. Perceiving emotions (Branch 1) has M = 81.89 and SD = 12.284 at pre-training and M = 85.09 and SD = 13.906 at post-training. Using emotions (Branch 2) mean score was M = 90.05 and SD = 23.211 at pre-training and M = 93.70 and SD = 14.400 at post-training. Branch 3 (understanding emotions) has M = 84.98, SD 10.729 and M = 86.45, SD = 9.053 at pre and post training respectively. Managing emotions (Branch 4) has M = 80.43, SD = 6.703 at pre-training and M = 85.52, SD = 6.670 at post-training. The Total EI has M = 78.76 and SD = 13.110 at pre-training and M = 83.46 and SD = 11.474 at post-training. Despite the increase in the mean scores, no significant difference was found between pre-training and post-training for IBB employees.

(iv) Between pre- and post-training for IDBB
Table 13(b) summarises the result for the mean scores of IDBB employees before and after the training intervention. The results show that the mean scores for all branches have increased. Perceiving emotions (Branch 1) has M = 71.12 and SD = 116.768 at pre-training and M = 76.02 and SD = 12.974 at post-training. Using emotions (Branch 2) mean score was M = 83.06 and SD = 17.712 at pre-training and M = 90.16 and SD = 18.904 at post-training. Branch 3 (understanding emotions) has M = 79.91, SD 7.006 and M = 86.08, SD = 8.256 at pre and post training respectively. Managing emotions (Branch 4) has M = 76.57, SD = 6.548 at pre-training and M = 80.19, SD = 4.919 at post-training. The Total EI has M = 70.35 and SD = 9.024 at pre-training and M = 76.75 and SD = 10.939 at post-training. Despite the increase in the mean scores, no significant difference was found between pre-training and post-training for IDBB employees. Despite the increase in all the
branches mean scores, only Branch 3 (understanding emotions) found to be significant between pre-training and post-training with $t(6) = 2.981$, $p = 0.025$. When eta squared was calculated to identify the significant effect, the value of $r = 0.77$ (77%) which was considered a large effect. The $p$ value was less than and equal to 0.05.

(v) Comparisons in mean scores between groups and time
Table 14 shows the increase in the mean score for all branches of emotional intelligence including the Total EI across the two time points for both groups. The table reports that the interaction effects of all branches including Total EI for both groups were not statistically significant, despite the increase in their mean scores. The significant level for Wilks' Lambda were 0.82, 0.70, 0.18, 0.74 and 0.71 for Branch 1, Branch 2, Branch 3, Branch 4 and Total EI respectively. The values for alpha were greater than.05.

When the main effects were assessed for each independent variables the value for Wilks' Lambda for time showed statistically significant effect for time for Branch 3 and Total EI (0.75 and 0.72 respectively). The probability values were .04 for Branch 3 and .002 for Total EI ($p<.05$). Thus, there is a statistically significant difference (for time) found among the time periods for Branch 3 and Total EI. This suggests that there was a change in emotional intelligence scores across the two different time periods for understanding emotion and Total EI. The effect sizes of these results were 0.18 and 0.71for Branch 3 and Total EI respectively. Based on the guidelines proposed by Cohen (1988), the results suggest a small effect size for Branch 3 and a very large effect size for Total EI.

For the main effect between-subjects (Table 15), none of the branches has significant difference between pre-training and post-training. Graph (6), (7), (8), (9) and (10) present that the emotional intelligence level of IBB participants were higher than IDBB participants for perceiving emotions, using emotions, understanding emotion and managing emotions.
5.2 Qualitative Data

In order to understand an individual’s emotional ability, semi-structured interviews were conducted with employees of merging companies. The main aim of the interviews was to gain an understanding of the employees’ emotional responses as a result of the merger and how these feelings affected their attitude to change and work.

5.2.1 Mixed Emotions and Responses

At the early stage of merger, employees were uncertain with the movement and tend to have mixed reactions towards merger. Many employees were doubtful and questioned the significant of the merger. Excerpts from the interviews below illustrate this:

Worried about career. Why (merger)? What will happen to our benefit? Who will be my boss? Who will be working with me? Worried.

[Respondent 1: Head of Section]

Shocking, surprise. (Felt) strange too. Unexpected situation to come up.

[Respondent 3: Head of section]

Fear. We were not briefed. Merger was suddenly announced. (I was) surprise. Worried about retrenchment, competition, unfairness. Sad? May be. Working with different people, there are positive and negative people. There is no more opportunity to further study. So not really sure which one is better. The environment is different now.

[Respondent 5: Corporate Secretary]

After merging, we faced problem. Staffs from the other bank are more aggressive. The management is not completely stable. That is what I am worried about. Opportunity to further study is slim. But we still did our work. Just wait and see. I was worried. What’s going to happen to us. People, environment, different management, move together (from different cultures). Although staffs are doing their routine work,
some others are worried too. Some are still not satisfied working with the staff from the smaller bank.

[Respondent 6: Clerk]

 Few staff are still afraid. But mostly, OK. There are still people who do not want to accept change. Not unsatisfied, but just difficult to adapt change. Those who were being transferred to other department may have difficulty to adapt change. They still prefer the previous management. But still, they are here. Not looking for job elsewhere. But it is better not to merge. There is no competition now. There is disadvantage. I am not satisfied with certain rules given by the new management. It is not consistent. I still prefer the former bigger management. (Participant smiled cynically.) Better not to merge. No competition now. There is advantage (if we merge). (But) I am not satisfied with certain rules given by the new management. They are not consistence. (Participant smiles cynically.)

[Respondent 7; Clerk Grade 2]

Surprise, shocked. Expecting what to happen … (customers') account, work, uniforms, will be changed.

[Respondent 9: Assistant Manager]

Shocking. How things are going to be … you know … unexpectedly. Basically, questions about how our fate is going to be. Are we being taken over? Will there be retrenchment? Post merger was chaotic. They were moving people unexpectedly. Handover was not done properly. It happens so fast. (Sound upset) I am not happy with the salary scale. I was given grade 1 (salary scale). I am expecting higher than that. Due to the responsibility that I am holding. It’s not merger’s fault. We have different grades.

[Respondent 10: Assistant Branch Manager]

Confused. (A lot of) Rumours on reasons to merge. (But) not really surprised. Merger (inter-department) has been with us back in 2001. The first thing on my mind was ‘who is going to lead us?’ Mixed emotions. What will happen?

[Respondent 8: Senior Manager]
Some are still worried. I could remember last time this err … management was saying that your job will be secured for two years. So after two years, we don’t know what will happen. Which means they are guaranteeing you for two years only. After that there might be retrenchment. Not sure. That is what has been highlighted. Working environment wise … one of the things I notice is that if you want something to be done, it is a bit … I find it a bit difficult to reach to the person. Some of the things are slow. Probably because it is a bigger bank now. So many branches with so many staffs. So to cater the branch’s need and requirement is a bit slow. If you want to request something, it’s a bit slow.

[Respondent 11: Assistant Branch Manager]

Puzzle … Who will be the head, the Managing Director. Worried if being transferred. (worried about) welfare. Worried about retrenchment one day.

[Respondent 13: Assistant Manager]

Mixed feelings, fear. Too many questions and things to worry.

[Respondent 14: Manager]

Apprehension. Mixed feelings, excited too. Anxiety may be. Feel odd working with somebody I do not know. I was feeling a lot of emotions. Mostly fatigue. Emotions were very scattered.

[Respondent 15: Deputy Head]

Surprise, happy, eager at the same time, looking forward. Happy to meet (and have) new boss. But sad during the cut off. Losing old mates. Others were surprised being transferred.

[Respondent 16: Clerk]

But … aah … worried at first. (like) What will happen … Reshuffling did not across my mind at that time.

[Respondent 17: Officer Grade 1]

Anxious. Nervous. Nervous in the sense that obviously there will be changes. Nervous also on the other hand, is scared of losing my job. Fear of my commitment.
I have a family to support. I have finances to attend to. Anxious part … the entity will be huge, large, bank portfolio will the bigger. To me at that time, if the merger was successful, this becomes a huge bank and you know, I will be part of it. Anxious in the sense that we were viewed as rivals (before).

[Respondent 18; Assistant Manager]

Surprise to hear the news. Really surprise. Felt frustrated when retirement benefit was freezed. Some (staffs) were afraid, fear on what will happen to them and what will happen next.

[Respondent 19: Assistant Manager]

Not shocking but emotional, yes. Worried a bit about welfare. Not thinking of unfairness at that time. I didn’t expect (merger to happen).

[Respondent 22: Senior Manager]

Mixed feelings. Both positive and negative feelings. Some (provide) negative information and make me feel down. At one time I don’t want to go back to Brunei. (I received) not pleasing information. Upon arriving (from study leave overseas), what they said … there were some truth.

[Respondent 27: Senior Manager]

I questioned (myself). Why merger? I can see lost of opportunity. That’s my first impression. (Following the announcement, I was) shocked, concerned, fear … But at that time I was in the process of study leave overseas. And the Managing Director advised that those on study leave will not be affected. So hoping for better future. I was hoping to return to my former department. (But no). I am disappointed.

[Respondent 28: Deputy Head]

We rejected initially. Worried … mixed feelings. Mostly the bad ones. Angry with the management. Feel like dying.

[Respondent 30: Sales Manager]
Surprise. Our management too. (There were) mixed feelings. We don’t know. The bigger bank too. Mixed feelings of rejections. Worries. Don’t know why we (have to) merge. It was extremely sad. If we think about it, the feeling is still there. (Crying.)

[Respondent 32: Manager]

There was also a mixture of emotions: both positive and negative responses towards change. For example, employees were feeling lonely but at the same time were satisfied with their jobs. As participants below said:

Happy (when asked about the reaction towards merger). My friends being transferred … (I) feel sad though (when asked about their feelings of separation).

[Respondent 2: Officer Grade 1]

It’s okay, but there is unhappiness. I may not be required (one day). I am not happy with the retirement benefit. (But) just follow the flow. I am not happy with the job content. It is not my area. It does not match with my education background. The bigger bank was more conservative but provided good privilege for the staff. I am happier before. Now I have to work with the new faces. The new leader is visionary and motivating, but two different cultures. The manager is from the smaller bank. The staffs are from the bigger bank.

[Respondent 4: Assistant Manager]

I like my job … but I don’t feel sense of belonging now.

[Respondent 25: Manager]

5.2.2 Negative Responses
There were also employees who were resistant to change. This was due to several reasons.

1. Frustration/Unhappiness/Job Dissatisfaction

I was promoted from manager to senior manager. So post wise there was an increase. (But) my salary scale stay the same and the welfare has reduced. (And)
less responsibility … My friend and I are the ceremonial figures. We are not appreciated. Before the merger all our basic needs were there. I just need to keep the actualisation part. Now it is almost drop to the basic level. I used to be involved in policy making. But now, nothing at all. I feel like I have been downgraded.

[Respondent 27: Senior Manager, bigger bank, 17 years]

I (feel) I am not required any more by the management. It is not like before. There is less job satisfaction, and less responsibility. I am just as good as a clerk. I don’t feel good. The bank is paying me more. I am also now reporting to me ex-colleague. My new boss is a lady. I am not sexist but it is better if I have a male boss. Because men can think well than women. Men don’t rush in making decision. They listen first before making decision.

[Respondent 8: Senior Manager]

… I think like most of the staff, we were quite reluctant to make the move. We were comfortable where we were. We knew everybody, how everybody work. (showing disgusted facial expression). Even the work ... it’s a routine for us ... so we know what to do. A lot of change (with merger). We didn’t know what’s going to happen. Like myself, I have been moving to a new job. So … a lot of new things to do. A lot of new things to learn. But basically, it was unexpected … I mean … the worry about what to expect … most common reaction among everybody. Unsecured, and reluctant. I think more reluctant. I am not hundred per cent happy. Because I felt that I was in a more senior position before the merge ... I just happened to be the one of the senior people who have to let loose … Discontent. I was not happy (at that time). Angry, too. I don’t know how to put it into words. Sad, one way of putting it. May be a bit of anger. I have no say in what I am doing. It’s something that I am (being) instructed (to do things). Because we know that we were coming from two different cultures. Both had been quite fierce competitors. We were selling the same product in the market. Fighting for the same share in the market. Now with the merger, we have to work (together). It’s like a lot of indirect bad blood. I feel a lot of negativity. A lot of resistance, until now. I am still unsatisfied. But I am making the most of the new position. Head of Branch … Branch Manager. Before, I was the Head of Division. Which is a big difference. I was looking after the whole bank. Now I am only looking after a small branch. I am unhappy with the new position. But in
terms of people, when dealing with the people … It’s a lot better than before. Now I think everyone is getting back to being comfortable, getting back to routine life. But I am still not satisfied. 100 per cent not satisfied. I know a lot of people are not satisfied too. A lot of people are affected by the merger. There are two groups … I am sure one group is very happy, and another group who is not happy. I would say I am happy with security. I am happy with the people. It’s just the work (I am not happy). I have less responsibility now, but I don’t know whether I want to accept less responsibility. Because I feel I can do more. I am not happy. Because it seems that there are a certain few that are controlling. A lot of politics. Overall … in a nut shell … I am not happy. Benefit wise … okay. Financial wise, I am happy. Because there is a lot of benefits. Salary is adjusted positively. So financial wise, I am not complaining. Staff from the smaller bank enjoy it. But in terms of where I am, in terms of the work and how I see myself in the future … that is what I am not happy. I still have the uncertainty feeling. Because I really don’t know what I am going to do next year.

[Respondent 20: Bank Manager]

Worried … Retrenchment not now but two to three years later. Disappointed … retirement benefit is not paid. With new management, we have to prove ourselves to them. It’s like being in a new one (job). It’s difficult. They don’t see you. I would like to leave … yes. But (I) have financial commitments. I’m thinking of venturing into a business. I don’t foresee myself staying (here). We see the downside … the unfair allocation of staff. I want to go to TAIB, another Islamic bank. But not to conventional banks. But there is always the possibility that TAIB might be acquired one day by this bank … So it will be the same story. Once bitten twice shy. Before, our target goal was to have a higher post, but now it’s to settle our loans and find another job. We work hard but only 3 per cent of ex-staff of bigger bank were being promoted. I really want to leave.

[Respondent 21: Branch Manager, bigger bank, 12 years]

I am not comfortable. Because now I have to report to my ex-subordinate who is now promoted as our deputy head. She has only 5 years working experience. I used to give work to her. But now … it is a reverse. Previously (early stage of merger) I had
no feeling of dislike. But now, I do. Sometimes looking forward to leaving, to relax my mind. I feel lazy to go to office. Unlike before, I can feel everybody was in my shoes.

[Respondent 22: Senior Manager]

Shocked. Worried about the new job, structure of (new) management, job security. But not worried if I don’t get back to my old job because I was on study leave at that time, and it is already stated that I will not get my post back. Others were stressful as well. One staff asked for transfer to other department. Now (after six months merger) when we revisited, there is lagging. The staffs from the bigger bank felt unpleasant with the unfairness in promoting staff and revising salary scale. They feel that they can’t develop themselves. Before, I have an opportunity to give opinion and improve something. Not now. You come to the office, and you just do your work. Now to go for study leave, staffs are given two options, to resign or to stay. We have no choice. A lot of welfare were no longer exist. Ours have been reduced. But for the smaller bank, now they have more welfare. Before people didn’t argue to merge, But now after almost a year, people starts to question. We were doing well before compare to now. The smaller bank gains. I am stressful now.

[Respondent 23: Deputy Head]

Surprise and fear. Not anger, just the feeling of resistance to merge. Sad, when leaving my friends. But still looking forward. There is uncertainty.

[Respondent 24: Assistant Manager]

Difficult ... Not comfortable sometimes ... Because now I have to report to my subordinate who is now promoted as our deputy head. She has only 5 years working experience. I used to give work to her, but now it’s a reverse.

[Respondent 25: Manager]

Previous leadership makes us feel secure. When expressing my opinions I was appreciated (by the previous management). Now I have to be careful, whether we will be penalized or … Not independent. No freedom. Hypocrite. I pretend to do work and look busy and happy. But actually we are feeling stress. (I’m) not looking forward to arrive at the office. Keep on imagining all the bad things. At 5 pm I go home. Before, I work extended hours. I was committed. But not now. We don’t know who to
trust when expressing our emotion or thinking. To express … (we are) afraid that we will be penalised by expressing it. There are insiders. Our skills and knowledge are not required and appreciated.

[Respondent 28: Deputy Head, bigger bank, 15 years]

I am disappointed. There is no more retirement benefit. In promoting staff, academic level is not counted any longer. We have more work responsibility, but we are not being promoted. We have to be careful when talking. There are lots of back stabbers. There is also no fairness now.

[Respondent 31: Clerk Grade 3, bigger bank]

2. Unfairness

Some employees also argued that they were treated unfairly by being passed up for promotion. Instead, most promotions were actually given to employees of the smaller company. Interviews conducted with staff often highlighted the negative emotional reactions felt as a result of considering that they were being treated unfairly.

(There is) increase in job status, (but) work responsibility is less. The salary scale has increased a little bit. There are disadvantages. I am not satisfied with the management. I now have low motivation. Staff promotion have not been based on their seniority or qualifications but based on favouritism. Whoever he sees, is promoted. There has been no appraisal. It’s too soon to promote staff … After six months (may be). Ex-staff of smaller bank have more advantage than us

[Respondent 1: Head of Section, bigger bank, 18 years]

Too much bottleneck. (I am) not happy with the benefit compared to what staff from the other bank had received.

[Respondent 8: Senior Manager, bigger bank]

I saw there were some biases … To be honest biased not toward bigger or smaller bank, but toward a particular people, or group of people

[Respondent 20: Assistant Branch Manager, smaller bank]

It’s sad … the majority has become the minority.
[Respondent 21: Branch Manager, bigger bank]

The transition was not looked at properly. Human resources is one thing. Culture change is another. When we want to change, we prepare them first. But when we merge, it was done in a rush. So there were many things which were overlooked and never looked at. The bigger bank’s staffs felt unpleasant with the unfairness in promoting staff and revising salary scale. Everyone wants to leave. They feel they can’t develop themselves here now. Before, let’s say, I was a staff or a clerk, I had the opportunity to give my opinion and improve thing. Not now. You come to the office and do your work and that’s it.

[Respondent 23: Deputy Head, bigger bank]

I feel stressed. I feel we have not been fully compensated. They don’t understand what we are doing. We work until the next morning. So we arrived to the office late the next day. In return, we received warnings from the Human Resource Department for being late to the office. Promotion wise, it was hand picked, based on favouritism and unfair. Human Resource Department is not really functioning. I am disappointed with the HR.

[Respondent 26: Assistant Manager, bigger bank]

The Managing Director is the ex-director of the smaller bank. I don’t blame the situation, but as an employee I want equal opportunity. They are my friend, but working wise … I don’t have the sense of belongingness. (I am) angry, frustrated, stressed out. Frustrated, the most. I don’t feel I am contributing to the bank. I am used to doing policy. Now suddenly I’m only doing small things. They don’t see my seniority. Those promoted were quite junior, some were not fully fledged when holding the post. When management asked questions, they couldn’t (provide the) answers. In terms of work flow, it’s very fragmented. This department has many ex-staff from the smaller bank. My junior has now become my boss. Many don’t feel happy. I have been offered a job somewhere outside Brunei. But I was advised to go back (to Brunei) … who knows the situation might be different. But once I am here … it’s a different story.

[Respondent 27: Senior Manager, bigger bank, 17 years]
It’s been a quite surprise. Fear. Some disappointment in terms of salary scale. The juniors (smaller bank) earn the same as the seniors. Looking at the juniors being promoted, we feel very … angry.

[Respondent 33: Manager, bigger bank]

3. Culture Clash

Excerpts from the interviews below illustrate this:

We are still different … Working together … so far OK. But we are still different. I like ‘us’ before. We have different work cultures. In a particular branch, the staff from the smaller office left the office at any time. But HR is not taking action against them. The smaller bank’s staffs are not happy with the new HR format and rules and regulations. The smaller bank staffs change the format. They still refer ‘we and they’. I see many disadvantages with the merger. Management is chaotic. Decision making just keeps on changing.

[Respondent 6: Clerk, bigger bank]

We can adapt to the change slowly. OK. But sometimes there is still a gap in relationships and socialisation. We keep to ourselves, and they keep to themselves.

[Respondent 7: Clerk, bigger bank]

(Sounds unhappy) Work commitment is very different now. We can have a coffee break at any time now. It’s because of the smaller bank’s culture. We take our sweet time to have a coffee break.

[Respondent 8: Senior Manager, bigger bank]

The cultures have not blended yet. In terms of work, we do it in a different way. They do it in a different way. There is still feeling of ‘you and I’. Basically, due to different opinion and the ways you do your work … people are already comfortable with their work, and how they do things. There is a barrier. Socially, between officers are not really … hmm … among staff in general … okay. In team work, people prefer to work with the same ex-colleagues. Bigger bank with bigger bank. Smaller bank with smaller bank. If we work in the same group, the work will be delayed, or not done at
all. Each one has a different way of doing something. So … work can’t be completed. We have our opinions on what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. Team members are decided by me, or the Managing Director. Sometimes we have to negotiate. Sometimes staff give reasons like … ‘I will be on leave’ and so on. Just any reason in order to get out from being in the team. It is difficult working as a team. Before (merger), we liked the feeling of belongingness. We enjoyed doing the work. Now, we drag ourselves to work. And we are looking forward to 5 pm.

[Respondent 23: Deputy Head]

There is clash of culture. No denying. We have to understand. Understand each other. We have to take which ever practice is the best practice. If we think about it (merger), the feeling was still there. I am still crying. Working with the new faces … at first it was a hard time for me. We have to be very slow, and sensible. We don’t know how they feel. If this is okay, the rest is not. With the previous management, we went straight to the point. Here, I have to observe first before talking. We can’t be so straight forward when talking to the new colleagues. There will be bad impact. The smaller bank is more transparent. Here, is a different scene. Different culture too.

[Respondent 32: Manager]

4. Violation of Psychological Contract

I have been with this bank for 15 years. The management kept on changing. So hopefully there will be changes after 2 years. Hopefully something will happen … Our skills and knowledge are not required and appreciated. Very disappointed with the loss of retirement benefit. It was aimed as the retention strategy.

[Respondent 28: Deputy Head, bigger bank, 15 years]

5. Job insecurity

I don’t know. I don’t know what to expect. Some sort of resistance. But cautious. Whether you will be out of job again. Or will still be working. If yes, what will happen to salary, benefit, welfare. That sort of things come to my mind. Not fear. There is only some anxiety. Common things, like security. But we don’t know whether it will be good or not. We should give it a try. The first week, we really didn’t know what to
Everyone was surprised. We can see, feel the changes. Policy changed. We didn’t feel certain.

[Respondent 26: Assistant Manager]

5.2.3 Positive Responses
Other than by the juniors, the merger was also positively responded and welcomed by many of the affected employees, especially ten months after the merger. For example:

(Feel) the same as before (merger). Happy (with my work). I don’t want to be transferred. I am used to my job. I am comfortable. It is a comfort zone. My ex-boss was lenient. My new boss is a bit strict. But I have a good officer (who) teaches me if I am lost.

[Respondent 2: Officer Grade 1]

It has settled down now. I can adapt working with the smaller bank. Working with new faces is okay.

[Respondent 5: Corporate Secretary]

Happy with ourselves. When something coming in, expect changes. More staff, more retrenchment. But management informed that there will be no laid off … I am not worried who will lead. Who ever come in, just welcome. After all some of them are my friends. I don’t mind to blend with them … Okay for me.

[Respondent 9: Assistant Manager]

(Now) I am not complaining any more. Others too. They do what they have to do. It is OK now. We are learning new things. Take it as a challenge. When something come in, expect new changes. More staff, more retrenchment. But management assured that there will be no laid off. I am not worry who will lead. Who ever come in, just welcome. After all some of them were my friends.

[Respondent 9: Assistant Manager]
I follow it (management decision to merge). Whatever … I am happy with the situation. I am happy with what I have. Alhamdulillah … in terms of working with the staff here, I have no problem.

[Respondent 10: Assistant Branch Manager]

I have been with the bigger bank for a long time. I need changes. I have been doing the same task quite sometime. If there are changes … positive. Boring doing the same old things … Don’t want to leave bank. I support change. No resistance … I was too excited (when merger announced) because I want to know and learn new things and compare our work systems with the smaller bank. We have to look forward. Otherwise, we will be out dated. That is my philosophy.

[Respondent 16: Clerk]

I am happy to be transferred (to other department). Relief a bit. It is something new. There is a different working style.

[Respondent 17: Officer Grade 1]

I am happier now. I have a private space. I was given assignment to lead the team. I take it (change) positively. I look forward to enhancing my career path. We have to change our mind set. Staffs from the bigger bank are now our friend instead of our enemy. We got to stop comparing what we have and what they have.

[Respondent 18: Assistant Manager]

But, I am worried if there will be another reshuffling in two years time. Not scared, but there will be changes. (At the same time) I am happy. I have no problem. (I am) very very happy.

[Respondent 19: Assistant Manager]

I don’t feel depressed. No really. There is increase in salary … Thank God … More or less. But it is better than before merging. So far I am happy. I am happy.

[Respondent 33: Manager]

Many employees response positively for several reasons:
1. Comparing Experience

One reason that could contribute to the support for change was the bad experience of employees under the previous management.

I don’t have problems (with merger). I am okay with everything. You are working under the same supervision. Whether you like it or not, you are at par. You just have to throw yourself into it. You can’t allow your emotions to control you. We merge. It is happening. You know. In the end it is okay. I enjoy the environment now. Before, I thought we were living in a time warp. It was easy going before. Now we are more … looking forward.

[Respondent 15: Deputy Head]

Compared to the bigger bank, we were pushed hard by the management (of smaller bank). Difficult to voice out. Now more relax. Now I feel stable with what I have environmentally and the surroundings. My commitment is not affected.

[Respondent 10: Assistant Branch Manager]

Working with the new boss is nothing compared to the previous management. I can talk about my worries to the new boss. The previous management was very cruel …we stick together when we were oppressed. I used to be condemned, back stabbed etcetera … by my ex boss (smaller bank) … With the previous management, I was under the reign, in the rule of iron fist. My boss (in the smaller bank) put us on our toes. So working with new boss … is nothing compared to the previous management … Our benefits were deprived. No welfare. My boss was very cruel. She was a sick person, very insecure that’s why she threatened us. She was full of envy. She hates people who are happy. She deprived our benefit. She’s like a barracuda.

[Respondent 25: Manager]

There are people who experienced worse than me. That is how I think. As long as my salary does not go down. Although I don’t receive salary increment. I don’t bother to think much of it. Previous management was even worse once. So we have been through this situation. Not a new story. Almost the same.
I am very lucky because our management never have been changed. But you have to think (of) the bigger bank’s management which often change. How do they feel? ... So you have to look at that ...

2. Loyalty/Job Commitment

Being loyal to the previous employer and colleagues also offers emotional support to the affected employees. This feeling and actions consequently motivate and give encouragement to the employees to cope with and adapt to the new working environment, although some of them did not condone the change.

Personally it is difficult to leave. I don’t like that. (But) I am used to work with the new Managing Director. Loyalty could be one.

Leave? Not so much. I guess probably depends on the individual. May be if you are young. May be there is tendency to look for green pasture ... for me ... (laugh) ... it’s hard ... I think ... it’s not so much on me ... Because for others ... they depend so much on their income. For me (laugh) ... You have to adapt to it. (Change) not really headache. Because I have been working with my superior before. So no problems. My colleagues and I sometimes talked, and discuss about it (change). That’s already past. Why do you want to jeer in the past?

I don’t want to leave (this bank). All in all I have been with bank for 20 years. It is a long time. I am used to the working environment. I was working from below, as an office boy. I experienced work pressure.

The senior officers opposed (the change). (Due to) loyalty, may be.

Monetary incentives and other welfare and privileges also contribute to employees’ support for change. Many participants raised the issue of better salary and privileges given under the new management.

*I was promoted from clerk to officer grade 1 and there has been an increase in salary. Welfare is also taken care of. We have privileges now. Staff loan is cheaper compared to the public rate. (I’m) happy.*

[Respondent 2: Officer Grade 1, smaller bank, eight years]

*I am positive. We are given better welfare here. Now we have life allowance. I am given private mobile phone. I am being promoted too. I prefer not to ask questions why we have to merge.*

[Respondent 3: Head of Section]

*Now I am following it. Whatever. After the merger, there is increase in salary. I am happy with the situation now. I am happy with what I have*

[Respondent 10: Assistant Branch Manager]

*OK. Satisfied, so far. Benefits wise depends on how you look at it. (To me) it is better. After merger … we have medical allowance. Last time they appointed certain clinics. We didn’t get cash for it. Now they pay you in advance. There is also medical modest. If you do not take your medical leave, throughout the year, they will pay you medical modest to encourage you not to take medical leave. There is also travelling allowance. After merger, it is slightly increase in terms of benefits. I guess … aaa … to me … you want to have more, but where is your line you are looking at. To me I am happy.*

[Respondent 11: Assistant Branch Manager]

*The bank is an Islamic bank. So I am not worried (about change). To me my job is secured. As long as I perform well. The organization will not take me for granted. His
Majesty also mentioned about no retrenchment. This makes me happy. I am not bothered who will be the new management. As long as the bank keeps on. I don’t care. And then my job is secured. Welfare is available.

[Respondent 13: Assistant Manager]

It is okay now. At first when we heard rumours, we felt angry. But control it. I prefer the old environment though. But the job here is more relaxed.

[Respondent 14: Manager]

Now (I am the) deputy head. Before (merging, I was an), officer. (The effect is) increased post, better welfare. Pay is higher (now). Merger offers new things to come out … Now I am part of the team.

[Respondent 15: Deputy Head]

No other bank offers better than this bank. Conventional bank staffs have to work harder … the salary offered is not much, and yet you are doing the same task. Here, relax a bit and more Islamic (culture) and less stress. (But) if I am transferred to other department, just take it easy. I want to try something new.

[Respondent 17: Officer Level 1]

I was prepared for the worse. To me, if there is rezeki (livelihood), that is my destiny. I was promoted from officer to assistant manager. I did start to look for a new job, and was thinking about returning to my previous employment, but this bank has now offered a much better package. When the new offer letter (job contract) was signed, your position and pay were highlighted. I love it. So long it’s not lower. A little lower might have been OK. But of course if it is higher the better it is. We settled for it. Welfare is very good here. (I’m) happier (now). I have a private space. I was also given an assignment to lead the team.

[Respondent 18: Manager]

… The thing is, I do (have intention to leave). But I don’t know if I will get the same benefits as I get now. That is the only thing. I think I can get a job elsewhere. I am not trying to be over confidence. I think to get a good package as good as that, is the thing. I did surveyed (jobs) somewhere else. But not serious. Just a chit chat. Just
asking. But by the sound of it, they (other employment) can’t afford … because this bank is providing quite a good package. One example … off day in a month … two times.

[Respondent 20: Branch Manager]

I look at the positive side. At first I felt bored when I was transferred to different department. But now, I enjoy it. I have new office. It is a big office. Working environment is okay too. I do not want to go back to the old office. Only if I am stress from too much work. (But) environment wise is okay.

[Respondent 24: Assistant Manager]

I prefer this new management. Our salary now is heaven too. We don’t expect to get what has been given. It is too much.

[Respondent 25: Manager]

…I am thinking of leaving. But who wants to take me. My current salary is too high. If I go to other company, will they pay the same? I have applied but they can’t pay the same (salary scale). Besides, compare to others, I see other people who are even worse. I see myself (in a) better (situation). Despite all the bad things. Being transferred here and there. After all, I will retire soon. I have been with the bank for 15 years. The management kept on changing. So hopefully there will be changes after two years. Hopefully something (positive) will happen. I rather wait. After all, I am already forty-ish, about to retire. So, just wait and see the new management.

[Respondent 28: Deputy Head]

Being transferred to other department is a good opportunity. Salary is set to be at par. It seems fair. It’s better rather than our salary being reduced. I have no problem with change. I am given more responsibility. It is challenging. We are looking for that. There is increased in salary. Thank God … more or less. It (salary) is not reduced. In fact, it is better than before merging.

[Respondent 33: Manager]

4. Financial Commitment
Despite being emotionally affected by the merger, participants did not rush into reaching their judgments. Rather than quitting from the organisation to show discontentment, participants preferred to stay with their current employment. These participants were thinking rationally and had evaluated the consequences before leaving the organization. Most of them, especially senior staff, had financial commitments (such as housing loans) with their employers, and knew that seeking another job would be costly. Such participants would have to pay the higher customer interest rate to the bank rather than the cheaper staff interest rate that they currently paid.

I had thought of leaving, But thinking that I have commitment (financial) … so just wait for the retirement benefits. It could be better … It is difficult to find job elsewhere. So we better stay. I feel uncertain with the future. We don’t mind to be transferred to other department. It depends on the management. They instruct. But we are afraid if the environment is not friendly. I feel weak though. So I kept in mind … to do better. If you can do better, you can keep your job. Few are still afraid (uncertain) with merger. They prefer previous management. But they are still here and not looking for job elsewhere. We have financial commitment.

[Respondent 7: Clerk Grade 2]

I have applied for a new post (different department), but I was rejected. I was angry at first. But may be that is the best for me. May be they still need me here. Find a job elsewhere? I have to think of other things. I have financial commitments. Others feel the same too. And if we leave, the retirement benefit will not be given. I have been here for 11 years. It will all go to waste. Sometimes I know that I have to accept changes. I have to be rational and professional.

[Respondent 8: Senior Manager]

Those who were frustrated and dissatisfied can’t leave the bank due to financial commitments. Where else is there to go. To another bank? The environment will be similar.

[Respondent 17: Officer Level 1]
They accept now. They know that there is nothing much they can do. Even if they want to leave, I think. Perhaps last time what I heard also … that you should know is … a lot of people did want to consider going elsewhere. But they have lots of commitment. They can not do much, because they have loan with the bank. But if they don't have jobs waiting for them (outside), then you will become a defaulter … bad loan. Your record is a victim … I don't know if they have officially wrote (applying jobs elsewhere). They said if they found job, they'll leave. But there was intention to leave. Officially whether they wrote or not, that I don’t know.

[Respondent 20: Branch Manager]

Worried. (Because there might be) retrenchment … two to three years later. Disappointment because benefit not paid. We are sad. We have financial obligation, financial commitment. Otherwise, we moved out form this bank. So now, just follow the flow … I want to leave this bank. But I have financial commitments. I am thinking of venturing into a business. I don’t foresee myself (working here). We see the downside … unfair allocation of staff. If I want to leave, I want to go to other Islamic bank, not conventional banks. But there is the possibility that Islamic bank may be acquired one day by this bank. Same story. Before, our target goal was to have a higher post, but now to settle our loans. Then, find another job. We worked hard, but only 3 per cent of ex-staff of the bigger bank are being promoted. I really want to leave. We have obligation… financial commitment. Otherwise we move out. So just follow the flow.

[Respondent 21: Branch Manager]

I don’t want to leave this job. How can I survive? I have financial commitment. I can leave though, if I really want to. I have good qualification. Compare to my friends, they can’t.

[Respondent 31: Clerk Grade 3]

5. No Job Outside

The difficulty of getting a job outside was also another reason for employees to remain in the organization and supported the merger. For some, jobs outside offered lower pay and poorer benefits in comparison to what they were receiving from their
current employment. In a way, the employees were readjusting their behaviour and attitudes towards the merger challenges by not leaving their current employment.

To find jobs elsewhere is difficult at this time. (So we) have to adjust to the change. I am used to be transferred (job rotation) so, I blend in. (It’s) routine work. Don’t think about things that have not happened yet. Go with the flow. Salary is based on performance. Revised salary scale. Everyone got increment. Basically, no problem. As an individual, it does not affect me when more staffs joining in. As long as everything goes smoothly. Why should I think about this? As long as I perform …

[Respondent 9: Assistant Manager]

… people don’t want to leave. No choice could be one thing. There are many jobless people (outside). It is difficult to simply change job.

[Respondent 10: Assistant Branch Manager]

I have been long here. Besides, there is no good offer outside. Unsuitable job (outside).

[Respondent 30: Sales Manager]

6. Positive Behaviour

Looking back, there is advantage for being transferred. My curriculum vitae are better, versatile too. I have been in different departments.

[Respondent 28: Deputy Head]

I feel positive now. I have change my perceptions towards change. We just do our work and keep quiet. We don’t talk much about politics. The smaller bank was not our rival, but was an option to customers.

[Respondent 30: Sales Manager]

Being transferred is a good opportunity. Salary is at par. It seems fair to me. Rather than salary being reduced. I have no problem. After merger, there is more responsibility. It is challenging. We are looking for that. So far the management has direction. Alhamdulillah (Thank God). We understand what is required.
[Respondent 33: Manager]

Just follow the flow. To leave, have to think twice. Now forgotten already. Has to work. I don’t mind being transferred to other department. I have been here (in this department) for almost 10 years. I am willing to move out.

[Respondent 1: Head of Section]

I have no negative thinking (about merger). I am very sure not to be transferred to other department. (I am) so confident. Need just one Islamic bank. No need to compete. Like it or not, you have to accept it.

[Respondent 2: Officer Grade 1]

(Merger) can be good can be bad. Carry on normal routine. It takes time (to get use). Need to compete with conventional banks to penetrate the market. Can’t be emotional. Think a lot first. Just follow the leader.

[Respondent 4: Assistant Manager]

With the merger … I don’t lose anything. So what if others are promoted, or degraded? As long as salary is nor reduced (I am okay). If my salary is deducted, I must make a calculative statement. If the management is going to reduce someone’s salary, where is their ethical value? Cutting people’s salary is not ethical. It is affecting people’s life. They had a good life, then suddenly … So for me it is not ethical. It is clear now. No point competing. What’s the point for that? It will only show as if the Islamic management is not good. Not shocking. For me, it is a challenge. Expect new management type. Expect new people, venture new area … Positive thinking. Wherever they (want) to put me, I take it. That’s my style. Rezeki (livelihood) is everywhere. Those whose salary has increased, that is their rezeki … I have experienced seven years with no salary increase. We do have to question why others are better. That is part of life.

[Respondent 29: Manager]

Some were able to manage their emotions by not thinking about it, instead focusing on their work or other matters such as therapy, meditation, exercise (jogging,
walking), listening, counselling, relaxing and praying as strategies to manage their emotions.

LISTENING

By listening to their new officemates' experiences with the previous management made them realize how fortunate they were with their own management. In addition to this, socializing with the new staff allowed them to understand more about their new colleagues and form new relationships at work.

I don't want to judge (the new staff and management at this stage. Try to overcome (problems) during meeting.

[Respondent 3: Officer]

Take it as a change. I've been with Human Resource since my first day at work. 6 years. This February, I have just been transferred. Working with smaller bank (staff). What we thought about them and what they thought about us, actually there is nothing. We thought the smaller bank wanted to acquire us. But no, we talked about it with them. Early stage of merger there were rumours about who are being promoted. But in reality (it is) different from what people hear.

[Respondent 5: Corporate Secretary]

PHYSICAL ACTIVITIES

Doing physical activities also seemed to have helped individuals to relieve stress and manage their negative emotions, and hence support the change.

I play with my nieces. My health is more important. So it helps to divert my attention from work. (I am) building a new house. Distract my worries. To me, today is today, tomorrow is next day.

[Respondent 22: Manager]

To release stress … just relax, have fun, have coffee break. Play with my children.

[Respondent 26: Head of Section]

[Respondent 27: Senior Manager]

PERSONALITY
From the interviews, it was also found that participants have different ways of managing their emotions. To some participants, their coping style is influenced by their personality.

*It’s individual’s upbringing. If you want to accept change then it happens. If you don’t want to accept change … repellent. Personally I accept change. You accept the people. it was good. Basically, we were accepting each other. I would say … I am very optimist person.*

[Respondent 10: Assistant Branch Manager]

*I control it (emotion). I have to work for with … what ever … sooner or later … what have been given … I accept it. I slowly able to control my emotions. Surprisingly, our professionalism helps us to control the emotions. Put aside my personal theory. That makes me happy. As long as I don’t do anything wrong… So it makes me motivated instead. It kills all the worries and everything.*

[Respondent 14: Manager]

*My personality … patience. Everything is destiny. If there is a problem, I always think of ‘there is blessings behind’. Just look forward. Don’t look back.*

[Respondent 16: Clerk]

*I think so … I am not the sort of person who can … if I am angry … I don’t shout. I don’t like … I don’t express so openly … I don’t know whether that would be calling myself not expressing my emotion or hiding emotion or what, but that’s how I deal with it. I don’t express it out loud. That’s how I deal with it. Even if I am angry … it’s just … for me. I won’t say it out. If I am not happy I will write it down. I am more expressive in paper … it will help if I can express myself. But sometimes when you want to express about work position, people will thought that they are against … I think a lot of people who want to say a lot. (but they) just keep quiet. They just take
it. Other officers … I don’t know (how they handle their emotions) whether you can call it patience or a bit more. They can control so far. O ya … patience. They can control their emotions. The ladies … hmm … may be not. They are short tempered.

[Respondent 20: Branch Manager]

The staffs of the bigger bank are patience. We used to have management who like to kick people out. But we still hang on. This is how we work.

[Respondent 21: Branch Manager]

I am not the hot tempered person. I will get angry only if I think something is not right. I don’t get angry unnecessarily.

[Respondent 24: Assistant Manager]

I used to be condemned, back stabbed etcetera by my ex-boss from the smaller bank. But I don’t do revenge.

[Respondent 25: Manager]

TRUST AND SUPPORT

Respondents explained how positive perceptions and behaviours towards the merger were shaped by the creation of trust with their new officemates, superiors and new management.

... there are minor issues. The point is, must have patience and be trustworthy. Our culture and religion also thought us to be trustworthy and loyal.

[Respondent 19: Assistant Manager]

When I have problems about change, I just discuss among officers and trusted friends.

[Respondent 33; Manager]

7. Emotional Support

Emotional support also helped employees to manage their emotion and support change. From qualitative data, most participants indicated that they received
emotional support from their spouses, families and friends in order to combat the negative emotions towards organizational change.

I seek my wife’s advice.  

[Respondent 1: Head of Section]

I express my concerns to the ex colleagues. I prefer not to ask questions why we have to merge.

[Respondent 3: Head of Section]

Express concerns to wife, best friends, ex-colleague. Never talked to ex-staff from the smaller bank about merging.

[Respondent 4: Assistant Manager]

I express my worries to my mother and friends. My mom said ‘don’t worry, merging management is like that at early stage. It will cool down. Don’t worry too much’.

[Respondent 6: Clerk]

Express my concern to family, sometimes friends the previous officemates. Only to my ex-colleague.

[Respondent 7: Clerk Grade 2]

I am willing to accept new task. My brother, friends and family supports me.

[Respondent 8: Senior Manager]

I expressed any concerns to my family, of course. Just a matter of releasing or expressing it even though they don’t know the actual story. You just have the questions. It may or may not be answered.

[Respondent 9: Assistant Manager]

I have somebody to talk to. My boss is a good listener.

[Respondent 10: Assistant Branch Manager]
Besides family, my colleague. Sometimes we talked, discuss about it. But sometimes with colleagues a bit hard too. You have to look to whom you talk to. Normally with my wife (laugh) ... she listens to me ...  

[Respondent 11: Assistant Branch Manager]

If there is worry, I express my concerns with my staff (all the staff are from the same previous bank). Boss advices us not to talk about the retirement benefit.  

[Respondent 13: Assistant Manager]

I am supported by my Head. Friends also give motivation.  

[Respondent 14: Manager]

If I have work problem, I talked to my Head. Regarding my emotions, I talk to my husband. I don't express my emotions at work. I certainly think that helps me.  

[Respondent 15: Deputy Head]

I refer to my manager if I am worried. Be transparent. Ask what is going on and seek clarification. I ask every each officer if I am not satisfied with their answers. Certainly not to my family if it is about work. Not even to my husband.  

[Respondent 16: Clerk]

When I have problems, I talked to my ex colleagues.  

[Respondent 17: Officer Level 1]

I think I look at it from a different perspective ... I was advised by my old man. He said 'when you work, you always work for the interest of the entity. Only that can make it happen. If you can do that, Inshaallah (by God’s will)' ... So I believe in that. It has worked so far ... I share my concern with family and friends. (My) Wife obviously ... all gave me the moral support. Especially ... when my wife said if the merging was for the best interest of the government, then I should also work for the best interest of the people who make it happen. So that's the spirit.  

[Respondent 18: Assistant Manager]
I share my concerns with my friends. And during meeting I raise my concerns too. Our boss motivates us to face the challenge.

[Respondent 19; Assistant Manager]

Normally close friends. My family … my family hear a lot of my complaints. I rather tell my family because … it’s family … if within the institutions … sometimes … people talk … but close friends that I trust … ya.

[Respondent 20: Branch Manager]

I am not the only person who experiences this. My husband is working here too. So I express feeling to him.

[Respondent 22: Senior Manager]

Express concern among ex-colleagues only.

[Respondent 23: Head of Section]

Express among ex-colleague. (Or) My husband, but seldom, because office is office, home is home.

[Respondent 24: Assistant Manager]

My husband was very supportive (at that time). He saw me restless that night. He said look at the bright side. Change your mind set. Accept changes. Put positive attention … Don’t keep negative thoughts. Otherwise the ending will be negative too. At first I was sceptical. Our emotion can’t be followed. I put my emotion behind. Put uneasiness behind. But on my mind, how long will I stand. If I follow my emotion, this ship will be wrecked. I am not 100 per cent perfect. There are certain blunders, hurting words. But put it behind … I (also) express my stress to my ex seconded officer. They were like brothers to me.

[Respondent 25: Manager]

I talked about my feelings within our circle.

[Respondent 27; Senior Manager]
I don’t talk to my wife about this job. I just discuss within the circle…with trusted friends.

[Respondent 28: Deputy Head]

I have a supportive husband. So there is nothing to worry.

[Respondent 30: Sales Manager]

8. Length of Service

Most of the employees felt happy following the change announcement. These employees were looking forward to seeing change and many of them were smiling and talking comfortably during the interviews. Most junior officers, especially those with less than three years’ service, felt neutral about the breaking news. For the newer recruits, any changes to the organization did not affect them personally or emotionally. Compared to the juniors, more senior officers were emotionally affected by the merger. Below are interviews with two junior staff members:

OK. Those who serve more than 20 years affected more. Not me. I’m still new … It is a good step forward. Does not really affect me (emotionally) … I am only a new staff. I only prefer career development.

[Respondent 4: Assistant Manager one year]

I am kinda new. Not really shocking. Not shocking. Only worried. Because at that time I was on probation. Probation officer can be retrenched at any time. But the management gave assurance that (there will be) no laid off. Press release (enhanced) no job termination. I am totally happy now.

[Respondent 12: Assistant Manager]

The seconded officers were nervous as they didn’t know what the future would hold for them. My seniors were very emotional, wept few tears when the big sign board was taken down. I was sad too.

[Respondent 18: Manager, smaller bank, two years]

The senior officers were emotional.
The juniors are not worried. Senior staffs, yes.

The pioneers were shocked when they were transferred back to their former office.

5.3 Role of national culture

The Islamic culture that shaped the everyday way of behaviour of the Bruneian participants regardless their religion has somehow influenced the participants’ perceptions and attitudes towards merger. From interviews, participants reported of being more able to cope with uncertainty and manage their emotion during difficult times by believing in faith.

There is benefit behind it (merger). So far, Alhamdulillah (Thank God). Everything is alright. The outcome of merger … increase in salary. So, merger is good. More rezeki (livelihood). Alhamdulillah (Thank God). There are advantages. I don’t really care. Before and after merger is the same (feeling). Only the name (of the bank) is changed. I am thankful to Allah. After merging, what has been given is more than what has been asked for. Frustrated when the retirement benefit was freeze. But thinking back, it’s good because it is good for the future. So I am not worried now … What’s the point of fighting? Salary scale is revised and increased.

I did managed. Just take positive things. Last resort (just recite) Alhamdulillah. What has been given, must be the best for us. I remember what my friend had told me ‘if something happen, even if it is bad, that is the best’. Fate. What ever had happen, there is blessing behind it. There is reason. I believe in Him... You just go with the
flow. Take the good ones. Hope for the best … I make doa’ (prayer) to ease my work (work related).

[Respondent 8: Senior Manager]

… control it. I have to work for with what ever ... sooner or later, what have been given ... accept it. Supported by our head, friends give motivation. Slowly able to control. Surprisingly, our professionalism helps me to control the emotion. Put aside my personal theory. That’s what makes me happy. As long as I did nothing wrong, so it makes me motivated instead. It kills all the worries and everything. May be there is hikmah or blessing (behind the merger). Now it (merger) really happens, we have to follow it. We go back to what’s inside Al-Qur’an and Hadith...if we are sincere, this is what the bank pay us. So just do the work. No cheating. Alhamdulillah (Thank God) … I always have positive side.

[Respondent 14: Manager]

Whatever it is, everything is from Allah. It is rezeki (livelihood). So just accept the reality (for what has been given). When I first started working with bank, I did search for other job, but unsuccessful. So I stay. Here is my rezeki (livelihood). My destiny.

[Respondent 17: Officer Level 1]

But so far Alhamdulillah (Thank God). The point is, must have patience and be trustworthy. Have sense of responsibility. And then, be sincere in doing your work. This is called Rahmat. In Islam, there should be no feeling of against each other. We can’t challenge each other in a negative way. Merging is like marriage. Our family has different culture from our in-laws. So how to make both sides happy? We must have the ability to take people’s heart. It is an adventure. So for me merger is not frightening. It is everyone’s initiative to enlighten the situation. If going through it with the feeling of stress, it is difficult. So it depends on your upbringing ... How you response to it. Just take the positive outcome and ignore the negative. Just follow the rhythm … Thankful to Allah. After merging, what has been given actually is more than what has been asked for.

[Respondent 19: Assistant Manager]
Don’t do revenge ... I have faith ... I believe that Allah is fair. What ever had happen to me has benefits … If I feel like angry, I do zikr (recitation of Al-Qur’an)

[Respondent 25: Manager]

5.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter showed relationships among emotional intelligence, employees’ emotional responses, degree of support for change and job attitudes towards merger obtained through quantitative techniques. At early stage of merger, not many relationships were found among variables. Emotional intelligence in particular was not related to all of the other variables thus rejecting hypothesis 7. Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 nevertheless were partially accepted. After ten months of merging, however, more favourable relationships were found and therefore supporting the hypotheses. Emotional intelligence has relationship with support change and negatively related to resistance to change and anger.

The overall results also show an increase in the mean scores for both the Training and the Control Groups between pre- and post-training. Although all the emotional intelligence abilities mean scores were increased, no significant difference was found between groups. When paired t-tests were analysed, the Training Group had significant difference in the mean score of managing emotions and Total EI. The Control Group on the other hand, had significant difference for using emotions to facilitate thinking and Total EI. Results also show that IBB participants tend to have higher emotional intelligence score than IDBB.

The findings were substantiated by qualitative data. Employees’ expressions and responses could be seen from their non-verbal communication. From the interviews, three themes were identified: mixed emotions, negative and positive emotional responses. From interviews too, the role of Brunei culture in assisting employees to manage their emotional responses and to be able to accept change were also reported. Overall this study shows a transition of employees’ emotions, degree of support and job attitudes towards merger after ten months of merging.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSIONS

6.0 Introduction

This chapter integrates the discussions for both quantitative and qualitative analysis in order to understand how responses collected through these research methods could complement each other. The first section will therefore focus on the statistical results and ‘stories’ obtained and experienced at four months after merger. This will be followed by the responses obtained at ten months after merger. This chapter also discusses the results of emotional intelligence training. How culture plays major role in influencing employees’ responses and attitudes will be presented in third section.

6.1 Mixed Responses and Resistance to change at Time 1

At Time 1 employees were experiencing mixed emotional responses towards merger. This has implications on the data analysed at the early stage of merger. There was lack of correlation between emotional intelligence at four months post merger with other research variables. This could be due to the problem with the measurement. First, the sample was taken from a small size (approximately 20 per cent of the population) with 48.9% male and 51.1% female. Based on existing statistical literature the significance of $r$ is strongly influenced by the size of the sample, and a small sample size may result in moderate correlations that do not reach statistical significance at the traditional $p < 0.05$ (Pallant, 2005).

Secondly, it could also be due to the respondents’ age. Weinberger (2002) suggested that there is a possibility for the result to have no correlations as a result of age. This is because the respondents’ age (when the MSCEIT was developed) was so young (a minimum of 17 years old). For corporate use of this sample, a researcher needs to note that the normative sample is significantly younger than their corporate sample (Weinberger, 2002). This may therefore result in bias as the corporate respondents’ age for the present study was between 21 and 51.
The language barrier also contributes a further reason. When data was collected, the MSCEIT was written in English. Despite English being used as a teaching medium in the Brunei education system, some participants found that the words used in the MSCEIT instruments were too difficult to understand. Thus the non-native English language speakers or the emerging nationals may be affected.

The number of questions in the MSCEIT could be another reason. Participants who wanted to complete the questionnaires faster may not have been focusing on the long questions and cases as well as not being attentive when selecting answers from among the options provided. The outcomes were thus more likely to be unsatisfactory, and participants thereby received scores that do not accurately reflect their true emotional intelligence. Moreover, the baseline measures were collected during the Holy month of Ramadhan. In Brunei, all public offices reduce their working hours from nine to six hours every day during Ramadhan. Employees thus had a limited time in which to answer the MSCEIT which takes at least 30 to 45 minutes to complete. The rushed responses and the lack of focus when answering the MSCEIT may contribute to the lack of validity of the MSCEIT scoring.

The lack of correlations could also be due to the stage of data collection. The banks were just at the early stage of merger. Participants at that time were still having mixed feelings and questions about their future prospects. Some were optimistic while others were pessimistic towards merger. These mixed emotions and feelings are possible for employees experiencing an unstable and uncertain situation. When model of emotional intelligence was proposed, one of the primary purposes was to provide a framework for investigators to explore individual differences in the processing of emotion-relevant information (Salovey and Grewal, 2005). Thus, the findings suggest that people vary in their ability to differentiate their emotions. Some people can recognize fine-grained distinctions in what they are feeling, whereas others can only recognize their feelings in a vague way (Salovey and Grewal, 2005).

Several peculiar associations were also found, for example negative significant relationships between depression and job insecurity, anger and withdrawal intention, and loneliness and depression. There was also a positive significant relationship found between happiness and loneliness. These unexpected results could be due to
the mixed emotional feelings experienced by many participants at this early stage of merger.

Reflections from interviews could support the odd relationships and lack of correlation. Some participants were worried, confused and not sure about what the outcome of the merger would be. They were feeling uncertain with the implication of merger which could either be adverse or beneficial to them in the long run. This was probably due to the sudden announcement and the decisions being made. There were mismatches between jobs and job holders, one example of which was the transfer of a manager to a different department to become the deputy head of that department. Although it was seen as a promotion and there was an adjustment to the salary scale, nevertheless it created disappointment among the affected staff. New skills and tasks have to be learnt while at the same time working with new faces.

Another example concerned the problem of effective communication and lack of information. Staffs were not informed about who was making the decisions about the merger. For example, one manager said that the business merger agreement was made by a local consultant while another said that there was no consultant and that the decision was made by the Ministry of Finance. Several employees were sceptical about the merger announcement. They were confused with the situation, some were worried and sceptical about their future in the organization, while others were frustrated and emotionally affected by the change. When participants were asked how they felt towards change, both positive and negative emotional reactions were expressed through verbal interactions, gestures and facial expressions as well as the tone of their speech.

Most participants further expressed their disappointment, surprise and unhappiness as a result of the merger. The merger announcement was like a bombshell to many employees. Employees who were not ready for change were somewhat agitated and uncomfortable when asked about their emotional reactions towards organizational change. There was disappointment due to the feeling of violation of psychological contract. Moreover, to those who resist the merger see change as a threat to their job and power in the office. Change in leader and management also gave concern to
the employees. Merger was also seen a threat when two merging partners with different culture and identity combined. There was fear of culture clash as a result of merger.

It has been mentioned elsewhere in the emotional intelligence literature that emotional intelligence should be understood in terms of behavioural expressions (Funder, 2001) and faces and voices (Salovey and Grewal, 2005). Through interviews, participants’ emotions and reactions towards merger were reflected on their facial expressions. For those who response negatively to merger looked sad, frustrated, down, had watery eyes and stammered.

Jordan et al. (2002) earlier had also presented four propositions stating that emotional intelligence moderates the links between perceptions of job insecurity and affective reactions, as well as the links between affective reactions and behaviour. However, they noted that their model is neither absolute nor linear. This depends on employee personality (e.g. Roskies et al., 1993), demographics (Krecker, 1994) and organizational climate (Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt, 1984) which can affect the behaviour of employees and their responses to job insecurity (Jordan et al., 2002). These authors also suggested that the systemic aspects of organization such as complex interactions, reciprocity and feedback loops could be further reasons for the lack of a relationship between emotional intelligence and job insecurity (Jordan et al., 2002).

Several examples can be depicted from the current study to support Jordan and his colleagues’ propositions. The existing literature on merger and acquisitions outlined in Chapter 3 suggests that the employees of acquired or smaller companies often experience more stress than those in the acquirer or more dominant company (for example, Kiefer, 2002; Hogan and Overmyer-Day, 1994; Hambrick and Cannella, 1993; Covin et al., 1996). Through statistical analysis, this study reported similar pattern. Smaller bank (IDBB) was found to have lower emotional intelligence in all branches compared to the bigger company, bigger. Existing literature has reported the relationship between emotional intelligence and well-being (example, Slaski and Cartwright, 2002; Lopes et al, 2006; Carmelli, 2003). Nonetheless, this test was run
using a small sample of Training Group (18 participants), thus could not be over
generalised.

Data obtained from qualitative method suggest that employees from the smaller
bank tended to experience far more positive emotions compared to employees from
the larger company who tended to experience far more negative emotions.
Employees of the smaller bank received increases in salary and generous welfare
provisions and privileges. These were notably absent in their previous organization.
In addition to this, many of them were being promoted.

This finding has previously been found in a small number of studies. Terry et al.
(1996), for example, reported that employees of the acquired company had the most
positive reactions to merger, thus supporting the findings of the present study. A
study on merger and stress by Panchal and Cartwright (2001) also found that the
dominant pre-merger company reported higher stress levels and the most negative
work attitudes. This could be due to perception of procedural injustice among the
‘victims’ (employees from the larger bank) as they believed that their loss was the
outcome of change. If change is believed to affect an individual’s position or power,
resistance to change arises (Folger and Skarlicki, 1999).

More existing literatures also support for these mixed responses at early stage of
merger. As Huy (1999) argues radical change often involves major uncertainty and it
is also difficult to evaluate fully the consequences of different alternatives. Huy
(1999) further argues that during such periods, too much analysis may breed
increasing doubt and paralysis. According to Iacovini (1993) the ‘human side’ is not
logical, rational or reasonable because it involves the feelings of employees
(intangible feelings such as fear, uncertainty and doubt) as they attempt to make
sense of change and maintain their self-esteem. Furthermore, according to Vakola et
al. (2004) and Crouch et al. (1992), organizational change causes mixed feelings.
This is because changes are usually not completely understood or developed while,
at the same time, employees prefer a sense of security, familiarity and continuity
(Folger and Skarlicki, 1999).
Kiefer (2002) also argues that during many kinds of change, people are likely to experience both positive and negative emotions. The uncertainty attached to the organizational and personal changes that usually follow mergers and acquisitions creates negative attitudes to change which lead to some dysfunctional outcomes such as low job satisfaction, stress, low organizational commitment and low trust in the organization (Schweiger and DeNisi, 1991). When discomfort takes place, this will challenge individual's integrity. Emotional pain becomes harmful if it is denied, dismissing emotional states as 'irrational' or illegitimate that can cause individuals to resist change (Huy, 1999). According to Jordan et al. (2002) the lack of significance of emotional intelligence as a moderating variable of job insecurity could be due to the unstable (merging) and complex situation of the organization at the time data was collected.

Baron (1993) has also previously reported that organizational change can cause a heightened sensitivity with regard to fairness and employees’ responses to unfairness appear to be especially acute when organizations undergo change. When organizational decisions and managerial actions are deemed unfair, the affected employees often experience feelings of anger, outrage and a desire for retribution (Daly, 1991; Bies and Tripp, 1996). How people are treated and how the change is implemented can therefore have a considerable influence on whether employees resist (Folger and Skarlicki, 1999). In this current study, for example, more junior staff were being promoted following the merger announcement. Some of the job promotions were not based on the level of educational attainment or work experience. Senior staff and long-service employees tend to perceived change as depriving them of their welfare and benefits as well as career development opportunities. Some blamed the merger for their decreased job commitment and feeling less loyal to the organization.

Then, there is the feeling of violation of the psychological contract according to which employees believe they owe the organization and the organization owes them (Folger and Skarlicki, 1999). This violation occurs when there is a perception that one party has not lived up to its bargain (Morrison and Robinson, 1997). For example, in this study, there was the abolition of the retirement benefit which had been promised to retain employees. This caused anger among the more senior
officers affected by the merger and supports the existing literature (Marks and Mirvis, 1985; Siu et al., 1997) that suggests executive managers are especially affected by the post-merger phenomenon.

The clash of differing work cultures between the two groups of staff produced yet more negative emotions. Even four months after the merger, employees continued to use the ‘us’ and ‘them’ concept. Napier et al. (1989), in their study on the merger of two banks, also found that even ten months after the merger, employees still spoke of ‘us’ and ‘them’. Based on the interviews they conducted, employees were uncomfortable working with fellow employees from the other bank, while and a small number of others were reluctant to work as a team. This could also be due to differences in past experience. King and Anderson (1995) indicated that previous bad experiences of change were responsible for high levels of negative attitudes and resistance to change. Employees resist change because of rational arguments over whether the current state is more appropriate while the past serves as a reference for current expectations (Folger and Skarlicki, 1999).

The findings from qualitative data support the statistical findings and suggest that employees with low emotional intelligence tend to be unhappy to work with their ‘rivals’. This is supported by an earlier study that examined the emotional intelligence of 180 couples using MSCEIT. The study suggested that couples having a low score on MSCEIT reported greatest unhappiness with their relationship (Brackett et al., 2005). Another study also found that participants who scored lower on the MSCEIT reported having disatisfying relationships with their friends (Brackett et al., 2004).

6.2 Positive Responses and Support for change at Time 2

Despite the unfavourable statistics portrayed at four months post merger, favourable relationships were found ten months after the merger between emotional intelligence and degree of support for change, and between emotional intelligence and emotional responses. For example, Branch 2 (using emotions), Branch 3 (understanding emotions), Branch 4 (managing emotions) and the Total EI were found to have positive significant relationships with support for change. Managing emotions was negatively and significantly correlated with resistance to change. Perceiving
emotions was also found to be negatively associated with anger. The favourable results may influence employees’ acceptance of change.

The development of emotional abilities for both groups (including Control Group) could be due to test re-test sensitivity. This study administered the research instruments more than once. There is therefore the possibility that the emotional intelligence score increased because participants took the MSCEIT test twice. There is also the possibility that the participants remembered the MSCEIT questions.

Positive feelings, attitudes, perceptions of workplace peers, subordinates and even supervisors facilitate an environment more conducive to individual willingness and openness for involvement in organizational change and supportiveness (Madsen et al., 2005). Most importantly, being able to use emotions in order to develop positive attitudes towards change and increase ability to cope with change (Huy, 1999) is a critical success factor in the change process (Higgs and Rowland, 2002).

The increase in the employees’ emotional intelligence score perhaps had assisted them to be positive and thus able to support change. As Huy’s (1999) model suggested, emotionally intelligent individuals are receptive (in terms of cognition and emotion) to change, effective in mobilizing (action) for change, and able to learn from the results of their initial change efforts and thereby to adjust their cause if necessary. In this study, it was suggested employees were emotionally intelligent because they had acclimatized themselves to the changes (having positive emotions towards and making sense of the merger), and hence came to accept and support change (mobilize and learn).

Backer (1995) also explained that individual support for change involved people’s beliefs, attitudes and intentions regarding the extent to which changes are needed and their perceptions of individual and organizational capacity to successfully make these changes. Backer (1995) further argued that readiness is a state of mind about need. It is apparent in this study that employees’ perceptions of and attitude to the need to feel secure may have influenced the positive correlation between accepting changes and staying with their current employment.
The qualitative data helped to substantiate the statistical findings of participants’ favourable responses towards merger and increase in emotional intelligence mean scores. Participants were more relaxed and pleased when asked about their reactions and emotions ten months after merger. This may suggest that employees are more emotionally intelligent than in the early stage of merger. Their positive emotions could be seen from their facial expressions and gestures such as smiling when they were happy and excited to talk about their experiences. Among the reasons for the interviewees’ ability to support merger include their positive personality, building trust, and the provision of better welfare, normative and continuance commitment, perceived support.

While few were still reluctant, more participants were able to support the change. Burke (2002) has suggested that individuals approach organizational change in different ways with some organization members constantly denying the necessity for change while others embrace change readily and move with it. One contributing factor to this is personality. McCrae and Costa (1986) confirm a positive relationship between openness to experience, tolerance and perceptive (one of the five factors of model of personality-FFM) and effective coping during stressful events in life. Vakola et al. (2004) also suggested that an extrovert individual tends to be positive towards organizational change. According to Salovey and Grewal (2005), individual differences in temperament which affect levels of arousal might influence the application of emotion-related skills. In the interviews participants reported how they tackled the merger situation, such as by displaying patience, accepting their ‘rivals’ and having good relationships with them, and tolerating stress. Although this is self-reporting, the ability model has been found to be related to personality constructs such as extroversion and neuroticism (Brackett and Mayer, 2003). Conceivably this could also be the reason for the significant negative relationship between emotional intelligence and anger found in this current study.

The ability of employees to manage their emotions effectively during merger could also be a result of building trust in their relationships in the organization. Trust according to Neves and Caetano (2006) is a critical factor in change interventions. Trust has been found to mediate negative emotion and withdrawal (Kiefer, 2005). Trust has also been found to be related to organizational commitment. Condrey
(1995) found that managers with greater trust in their organization were more motivated to become involved in the system more positively. Reinke (2003) also pointed out that the level of trust between employees and supervisors provides the strongest predictor of employees’ acceptance of change. Dirks and Ferrin’s (2001) work is much more convincing with regard to the effects of trust in organizational settings. Trust has an effect on positive attitudes, higher levels of cooperation and other forms of workplace behaviour, and superior levels of performance (Dirks and Ferrin, 2001). It is therefore not surprising to find a negative relationship between withdrawal intentions and loneliness. Clarke (2007) describes further factors which account for the development of emotional intelligence. These are social integration, a positive and ‘high care’ climate, mutual trust, empathy, mutual support, access to help and psychological safety.

The interviews revealed how privileges and welfare provided were better under the new management than before. The Islamic bank is ranked third as an employer providing high-quality work standards, welfare and privileges, and security in Brunei, after Brunei Shell Petroleum and government agencies (Brunei Darussalam Statistical Yearbook, 2006). The salary scales were also the highest among the banking institutions in Brunei, and employees were given very good welfare and privileges, including six-monthly bonuses. Under the new management participants gained more opportunities, particularly in career development. This suggests that better welfare and privileges could influence the emotional intelligence score and help employees to support the merger. Higher salary and promotions have been found to be related to high MSCEIT scores (Salovey and Grewal, 2005). The better privileges resulting in organizational commitment are one example of continuance commitment. The provision of better welfare, incentives and a new wage system could therefore have contributed to positive responses towards organizational change.

Interviews also revealed how the feelings of loyalty had caused employees to support the merger and reject any intention to withdraw from the organization. This strength of commitment to the organization was also a measure of employees’ affective attachment and unwillingness to leave the organization (Meyer and Allen, 1984) regardless of any alterations made to that organization. The affective
commitment is where an individual is strongly committed to, identifies with, is involved in and enjoys membership of the organization (Allen and Meyer, 1990). Matthews and Shepherd (2002) also argued that committed employees have a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization’s goals and values, show a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and have a strong desire to maintain membership of the organization.

Many employees in this study had expressed their strong desire to maintain membership in the organization. For example, those who had been in service with the bank since its establishment tend to respond positively and welcome the merger. Van Dick et al. (2006) argue that employees’ emotions are strongly related to organizational identity. Employees who have a strong identification with the merged organization reported greater ‘citizenship behaviour’ (feeling of belonging to organization) and job satisfaction, and also lower turnover intentions and less negative emotions. The literature also pointed out the link between turnover and employees’ commitment which is reflected in their psychological state or affective attachment (Allen and Meyer, 1990).

Among other reason that may suggest for employees support of change and increase in emotional intelligence is perceived support. Perceived support appears to decrease avoidance, withdrawal and denial (Fleishman et al., 2000; Tao et al., 2000). Perceived support could therefore cause employees to accept change despite experiencing low levels of job satisfaction. For example, the belief that ‘family and friends will always be there for them’ may help employees to accept change. The present study depicts a positive link between organizational commitment, happiness and support for change, and a negative relationship with resistance to change. That organizational commitment facilitates a support for change within individual employees makes sense and therefore the increase in organizational commitment heightens employee support for change and organizational commitment. Clarke (2006) in his study also explains the significance of interdependence among organizational members which leads to network commitment. Van Dick et al. (2006) reported on the implications of socio-emotional orientation in that the more employees felt cared for, the more likely they were to show extra-role behaviour and the less likely they were to have turnover intentions.
According to Edmondson (1999) social relationships provide a climate that supports psychological safety. When organizational development takes place, participants tend to look for emotional support from their family and friends at work. According to Clarke (2006) the development of strong relational ties and bonds facilitates emotional knowledge. The strength of social bonds and trusting social relationships and the minimum of conflict further help to generate strong emotional responses or feelings that lead to the development of emotional knowledge (Clarke, 2007). Organizational culture influences the opportunities for emotional learning to take place by creating a climate where individuals are able to discuss freely the emotional content of their work Clarke (2006). The level of support given by individual employees within the work group contributes to the increase in the emotional intelligence score of the participants.

Calvete and Connor-Smith (2006) also suggest that the perceived support or the belief that help is available if needed may increase emotional expression because individuals high in perceived support believe their social network includes someone willing to listen. Moreover, the ability to love is a sign of emotional intelligence (Huy, 1999), the process whereby emotions are accepted and reciprocated (Goleman, 1995). Several researchers have suggested that emotional support could buffer the impact of stress by increasing the effectiveness of coping efforts, which in turn decrease distress (Lakey and Cohen, 2000; Calvete and Connor-Smith, 2006). Uchino (2004) also supported the finding that receiving emotional support and companionship may encourage affective adaptation in individuals facing uncontrollable events. The following transcripts provide evidence of the development of emotional abilities.

_**I have somebody to talk to. My boss (from bigger bank) is a good listener.**_  
[Respondent 10: Assistant branch manager, small bank]

_**We thought (initially) that the smaller bank wanted to acquire us. But no. We talked about it with the ex smaller bank employees.**_  
[Respondent 5: Corporate secretary office, big bank]
Small bank and big bank kept on gossiping each other. But once we know each other, we can get close to each other.

[Respondent 6: Clerk, big bank]

[Respondent 33: Manager, bigger bank]

6.3 Emotional Intelligence and Positive Responses

The increase in emotional intelligence mean scores after 10 months merger may influence the positive emotional responses and support for merger. This study therefore suggests that training intervention and national culture has the potential to influence the development of emotional intelligence.

6.3.1 Emotional Intelligence Training Intervention

Lopes et al. (2006) suggested that for the training of emotional skills to be useful, it must enable people to learn from everyday experience beyond the training period. This type of learning can be defined as learning that occurs informally and naturally in the workplace, learning that is gained by working in teams, by undertaking projects or through secondments, or incidental learning that occurs every day through the undertaking of work itself (Clarke, 2004). Clarke (2006) suggested that emotional abilities associated with job performance could be developed through informal or workplace learning mechanisms such as the complex interactions between individual employees and through participation in the social structures of the workplace environment. Clarke (2006), Groves et al. (2008), Moriarty and Buckley (2003) and Clarke (2008) found that emotional intelligence can be developed through workplace learning.

Moriarty and Buckley (2003) also found that emotional abilities could be developed over a period of 12 weeks participating in team-based learning. Groves et al. (2008) found emotional intelligence development over a period of 11 weeks through the leadership development programme. Clarke (in press) also provides an empirical support that suggests a role for workplace learning in developing emotional intelligence abilities in organizations through team-based learning over a 14-week
period. Clarke (2006) basing his research on healthcare staff, found that the emotional abilities (1) understanding emotions, (2) using emotions to facilitate thinking and (3) managing emotions can be developed over time within the workplace directly as a result of performing the job and through interactions with colleagues. With the exception of Clarke (2006b), these studies used undergraduates as their samples of participants instead of real managers for developing emotional abilities in the workplace. The statistical analysis of this study reported the increase in the emotional intelligence level of employees over a longer period of time that is a period of 24 weeks.

Several other potential reasons are suggested for the increase in the emotional intelligence mean scores of participant. One of them is the construct of emotional intelligence. As a set of abilities, there is a possibility that emotional intelligence may be developed or enhanced by training programmes. This ability model closely meets the criteria of intelligence in terms of its conceptual, correlational and developmental grounds (Clarke, 2006). On a conceptual level, emotional intelligence reflects a set of mental abilities rather than behavioural disposition. Mayer and Cobb (2000) had argued that the ability model is similar to character education and socio-emotional learning and therefore can be taught.

On a correlational level, a number of studies found that ability models have low correlation with personality measures but have moderate correlation with general mental abilities and other measures of intelligence. Cherniss (2000) argues that there is link between emotional intelligence and cognitive ability thus making it possible for the development of emotional intelligence. Zeidner et al. (2004) have argued that the findings of many existing studies on emotional intelligence training are difficult to judge because they do not provide information concerning the reliability and validity of emotional intelligence measures, despite having encouraging pre- and post-training results. However, the current training had used MSCEIT to assess the emotional intelligence of participant and which may also have contributed to the development of emotional intelligence. MSCEIT has been found to be distinctive from personality and cognitive tests and is argued to be potentially the most valid of all current emotional intelligence measures available.
The training intervention may have implication on the positive responses and attitudes of the participants and these were supported by interviews. For example, training participants were able to perceive own and others’ emotions (Branch 1) following merger. During the interviews, these participants were asked to share how others had emotionally felt following the merger announcement based on what and how they perceived.

*Others were worried, confused, sad …*[Respondent 15: Deputy Head]*

*Everybody was shocked, some worried. Some wished, hoping merger not to take place.*

[Respondent 22: Senior Manager]*

*Others … stressful as well. Uncertainty (may be).*

[Respondent 23: Deputy Head]*

*Everyone was the same too, fear. Looking forward at the same time. (They) want to leave. Worried too. Maybe because of benefit being reduced, housing loan rate may be changed at that time (early stage of merger).*

[Respondent 24: Manager]*

*Thinking of retrenchment … We were crying during the cut off.*

[Respondent 25: Manager]*

The trainees are also suggested to have acquired the ability to use emotions to facilitate thinking (Branch 2). This was demonstrated through their ability to use their emotions to facilitate various cognitive activities such as thinking and problem-solving. Their ability to make rational judgement by staying in the organization was due to lack of employment elsewhere. Making this decision may suggest the development of emotional intelligence. Positive emotions can temporarily broaden a person’s repertoire of thoughts, leading to creative problem-solving (Fredrickson, 1998). A happy mood can stimulate creative and innovative thinking (Salovey and Grewal, 2005). The lack of employment increase employees’ perceived costs
associated with leaving the organization (Rusbult and Farell, 1983). When there are fewer alternatives, employees prefer to stay with the organization and are thus strongly committed to their current employer. Many interviewees also preferred to stay in the organization because of the limited options available outside. Financial commitment, the promised retirement benefit and other impressive employee benefits provided by the organization influenced this group of employees to remain in the organization. The better working environment, job security and receipt of good privileges also helped employees to accept change positively with less negative emotions and forgo the intention to withdraw from the organization, especially when there was no better job available outside.

Being empathetic to peers and subordinates may also have the potential to influence employees’ ability to accept radical change. This reflects to the ability to understand own and other’s emotions (Branch 3). Empathy represents a central attribute of emotional intelligence. It is a person’s ability to understand someone else’s feelings and to re-experience them. Empathy determines the success of social support and is a motivator for altruistic behaviour (Salovey and Mayer, 1990). Moreover, being empathetic enables them to accept their ‘rivals’ and work in harmony with them. After all, they all had gone through a similar traumatic situation together. Sharing traumatic personal experiences can often help people achieve emotional closure, leading to better long-term emotional and physical health (Pennebaker, 1997).

Employees’ ability to accept merger may also demonstrate that they have acquired emotional intelligence. Merger has been found to create emotional responses. The ability of the employees to manage and regulate their emotions (Branch 4) was significant in influencing their responses to merger and accepting changes.

Other possible explanation for higher levels of emotional intelligence for these two branches than Control Group is that Training Group contained leaders or employees holding senior positions at the managerial level. This group differs from the Control Group which contained both middle and lower-level managers. This is not unusual in the study of emotional intelligence and the capability of leaders. For example, Kerr et al. (2006), Palmer et al. (2001), Leban and Zulauf (2004) and George (2000), to
name few, have studied the positive relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership using ability models.

That they were holding senior managerial positions also means that these participants were slightly older than the rest. Research has shown that emotional intelligence is related to age (MacPherson, 2002; Moriarty and Buckley, 2003) and their educational attainment. It is possible that cognitive maturity may have led to high emotional intelligence abilities in using and understanding emotions in the Training Group at both timeframes.

Interestingly, despite being controlled, the Control Group has also reported to have increase in their emotional intelligence score. Interactions between the managers who had received training and their subordinates and/or their peers and colleagues could also have taken place. ‘Passing the time of day’ with regard to the training content and exercises could therefore have contributed to the development of emotional intelligence in the Control Group.

According to Gross (1988), supervisors and co-workers have been found to provide significant cues by displaying appropriate emotions in the workplace (Clarke, 2006). Humphrey et al. (2008) also argue that employees are likely to look to their managers’ emotional responses for cues regarding their own displays especially in ambiguous or uncertain situation. Research also suggests that managers should attempt to display positive emotions and encourage such emotions in their employees (Brotheridge and Lee, 2008). This is because emotions are contagious (Sy et al., 2003) making it possible to influence their positive moods onto their employees. Thus, given the increasing prevalence of organizational change and the negative emotions frequently associated with it, managers need to role model appropriate emotional responses to change (Brotheridge and Lee, 2008). This raised an interesting possibility that one’s own emotions can be regulated by replicating others’ emotions and behaviour.

The higher mean score in the ability to perceive others’ emotions and managing emotions may also offer the Control Group a way to cope with the catastrophic merger process. Employees who are able to recognize emotional cues through facial
displays and other non-verbal behaviour may have the capability to manage strategic renewal. A manager or a leader who has acquired ‘emotional aperture’, that is the ability to recognize the distribution of specific emotions in groups may foster strategic renewal (Sanchez-Burks and Huy, 2007).

Emotional intelligence is a type of tacit knowledge which may not be specified in detail. Wong et al. (2007) have suggested as a topic for investigation to identify whether experience or nurture could lead to the development of emotional intelligence and then to use this experience to design effective emotional intelligence training. Wong et al. (2007) also suggest that the effects of nurture are potentially large for enhancing one’s emotional intelligence level. They found that age and full-time parent-children interactions influenced the development of emotional abilities. If nurture (human experiences resulting from their interactions with the physical and social worlds) is important in determining a person’s emotional intelligence, training programmes that organize these experiences in a systematic manner may be effective (Wong et al., 2007).

The current emotional intelligence training activities and programmes had been rigorously evaluated. This may contribute to the effectiveness of the training. The effectiveness of any emotional intelligence development efforts depends not only on the techniques used but also on their design and implementation (Cherniss and Goleman, 2001). The short lecture given during training on the role that emotional intelligence plays, and the common emotional experience of people affected by radical change in organizations suggests further the development of emotional knowledge. As Salovey and Grewal (2005) argue that simply developing the skills of emotional intelligence may not prove fruitful unless the intervention addresses the contextual and motivational factors affecting the use of these skills. The development of emotional intelligence abilities therefore could also be due to the training content.

The content of the training was selected carefully to reflect the emotional content of Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) four-branch ability-based model of emotional intelligence. According to McEnrue et al. (2006), emotional intelligence training and development programmes are often based upon emotional intelligence models comprised mostly of personality traits which are by definition not amenable to
change whereas the ability model measures how well people perform tasks and solve emotional problems. Moriarty and Buckley (2003) suggested that in order to change behaviour, training must be at the deeper level of cognitive sense-making and facilitation of self-awareness.

Furthermore, the particular experiences introduced by the training activities examined whether they are related to one’s abilities in handling emotions as specified by the four emotional intelligence dimensions. The training sessions allowed the participants to develop an understanding of their own emotional abilities and to learn new things about other training participants from the rival banks, as well as to reflect on their own emotional experiences. Using an ability-based model of emotional intelligence in the training may have the potential to raise the participants’ awareness and understanding of the emotions of others (for example, the frustrations and worries of their former ‘rivals’), their ability to perceive others’ emotions, their ability to use emotions in making judgments and their ability to cope with their own emotions throughout the merger process.

As Elfenbein (2006) reported, training can increase the ability to decipher personal emotional displays. The provision of emotional skills training may help people to pay more attention to social and emotional dynamics. This emotion-focused coping strategy intervention was found to be a suitable approach to assisting participants to deal better with emotional situations. Evidence collected from interviews further supports the effectiveness of using training to develop emotional abilities. One training participant provided the following feedback on the two-day training programme:

*Given training (on emotional intelligence) helps me a lot. Thank you. I was worried at first. But after the training, I feel nothing. Everything stays the same. Only minor adjustments required. Everything can be settled down.*

[Respondent 19: Assistant manager, Bigger bank]

*The training session helped a lot. I could meet and understand more employees from the ‘other’ side. We are not that different as I thought earlier. The exercises united us.*
The workshop exercises also required the participants to work as a team despite coming from different former employment. A few studies have found a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and teamwork using the ability model (Clarke, 2007; Jordan et al., 2002). Jordan and Troth (2004) also found emotional intelligence to be positively related to team performance and the use of collaboration and competition in conflict resolution by team members. Clarke (2007), for example, found that managing emotions is associated with open communication within the team, where members of the team are able to openly discuss feelings, opinions and experiences. Attentiveness to team members and teamwork planning were also found to be correlated with using emotions to facilitate thinking (Clarke, 2007). Listening to team members’ views and engaging in task allocation and accomplishment further strengthen the team’s relational ties and bonds (Clarke, 2007). Clarke (2007) also studied how critical reflection was associated with team effectiveness. The processing of emotional information during critical reflection (for example, analysing why situations or problems had occurred in the team) was found to be associated with emotional awareness and using emotions to facilitate thinking (Clarke, 2007). Participating in teams and projects offers individuals significant opportunities for exercising and potentially developing their emotional abilities (Clarke, 2008). Greater participation in social learning structures is likely to develop emotional abilities (Clarke, 2007). The exercises and experiences obtained in the training programme have therefore enabled the trainees to develop their own skills and abilities, resulting in higher emotional intelligence scores.

Clarke (2007) proposes that emotional abilities may be developed through emotional knowledge work, observation of others, reflection on emotional experiences and dialogue with colleagues. Open dialogue, reflection and the sharing of experiences are further means to develop emotional abilities (Clarke, 2006). Although Lopes et al. (2006) argued that a training programme would not be expected to make people more emotionally intelligent in the space of a few days or overnight, the two days of training conducted in this current study has the potential to increase the emotional intelligence of the training participants and their confidence in the face of organizational change. The two days training provided intensity of participation
where trainees met more frequently in order to interpret and give meaning to highly uncertain and complex information. Intensive participation by team members is likely to facilitate the development of stronger relational ties and bonds which facilitates greater exchange of knowledge (Clarke, 2007; Madhavan and Grover, 1998). Stronger relational bonds are likely to facilitate more open dialogue, reflection and sharing of emotional knowledge which further offers the possibility for the development of emotional abilities (Clarke, 2007).

The additional time together is also necessary for the development over time of emotionally competent individual and group norms that are involved in enabling a group to address and discuss emotions (Koman and Wolff, 2008; Clarke, 2007). This may lead to the development of emotional knowledge. Meeting more frequently may also helped participants to learn from their everyday experience and understand the different work cultures of their ‘rivals’, and provided an opportunity for trainees to understand and read emotional cues and give meaning to emotions that arise between employees from different former organizations. The proximity of individuals and an awareness of these emotions and dialogue could help individuals to master emotional skills (Clarke, 2008). This experiential learning involving increased levels of interpersonal interaction and quality feedback thus helps to boost employees’ confidence and develop their social and emotional skills effectively.

The learners’ motivation is further strengthened by the social environment of the organization (Cherniss and Goleman, 2001). At the beginning of the training session, participants were introduced to the implications of change for the emotions of employees. The trainer also emphasized the common feelings and emotions experienced by affected individuals when an organization makes significant changes. The purpose of this was to make the environment safer and more conducive to learning. The safer environment may help to promote trust in the relationship between the trainer and the participants from both companies in the merger. The emotional self-awareness exercise involved participants in exploring, expressing and sharing personal information in a safe environment. These ‘self-disclosing triggers’ (Polzer et al., 2002) can result in very high levels of interpersonal congruence in a group’s life (Clarke, 2007).
6.3.2 Role of National Culture

It could also be culture that participants were exposed to influence their mode of behaviour towards the merger. Reading emotional cues and giving meaning to the emotions that arise in teams is complicated and can be exacerbated when team members are from different cultural backgrounds or where rules of emotional display and emotional management differ (Elfenbein and Ambady, 2002).

The ability to accept emotional and difficult situation may depend on how emotions were associated with interdependence (collectivism) and independence (individualism). Western countries are independence-based and ‘disengaging’ behaviour whereas many Asian countries are associated with interdependence and ‘engaging’ behaviour (Kitayama et al., 2000). Empirical studies have found that individualists have higher levels of well-being than collectivists (Diener and Suh, 1999; Veenhoven, 1993) and Sadri et al. (1996) reported that individuals from less developed countries have poorer well-being than individuals from developed countries (in Liu et al. 2007). In a study, Liu et al. (2007) found that collectivists have a tendency to avoid direct conflict and unpleasant interpersonal situations to protect group harmony and save face whereas individualists tend to use explicit and direct verbal conversation. Liu et al. (2007) also reported that those from developed countries such as Americans more frequently reported anger and frustration than those from less developed countries such as Chinese.

Being a small sovereign state of only about 380,000 people, it has a unique culture in terms of its socialization (Brunei statistics, 2001). Bruneians enjoy a collectivist culture and close-knit family and society. They value interdependence and group harmony, may therefore experience more satisfaction at work and are more likely to tolerate a stressful situation. This may depend on how emotions are associated with interdependence and independence or collectivism and individualism. Kitayama et al (2000) found that there are divergent styles of managing emotions across cultures. Other researchers also agree to this that, the good feelings experienced may differ from one culture to another (e.g. Ellsworth, 1994; Suh et al., 1998; Wierzbicka, 1994). It has also been found that cultural diversity is associated with employees’ health and well-being (Van der Zee and Van der Gang, 2007; Tsui et al., 1992; Van der Zee et al., 2004; Liu et al., 2007).
The West, for example, has a strong culturally shared belief in the independence of the self from others called the independent view of self (Markus and Kitayama, 1991). Westerners display individualism and ‘disengaging’ behaviour (Hofstede, 2001; Kitayama et al., 2000) while many Asian countries such as Japan and the Philippines (Bagozi et al., 2003; Kitayama et al., 2000), China (Schwarts, 1999) and Hong Kong (Kwan et al., 1997) are interdependence based, display collectivism and ‘engaging’ behaviour and value group harmony. In their study, Liu et al. (2007) found that collectivists have a tendency to avoid direct conflict and unpleasant interpersonal situations to protect group harmony and save face whereas individualists tend to use explicit and direct verbal conversation. The conflict management literature has shown that collectivist cultures foster conflict-avoidance styles whereas individualist cultures foster direct-conflict styles (Chua and Gudykunst, 1987).

With Bruneians’ unique way of living which is partly predisposed by the socialization process the close-knit structure of family (both immediate and extended) and friends is liable to influence individuals’ perceptions and decisions. The influence of families and social and cultural civilization caused employees’ commitment (Weiner, 1982). This is also referred to as normative commitment by Allen and Meyer (1990).

However, the impact of strong national identity and cultural variations could influence the lack of correlations between emotional intelligence and other measures used in this study. For example employees did not have to work harder to develop emotional control as a result of the provision of adequate welfare and benefits, job security, job satisfaction and adequate support and relationships in the organization from friends and family. According to Mayer et al. (2002) one predictor for having a low emotional intelligence score is that participants have adequate relationships and perform their jobs sufficiently well. Participants might be satisfied with the relationships they already have and the support they receive from work colleagues, superiors, family and friends.

According to a paper by Minnis (1999), Brunei culture represents a fusion of Malay and Islamic values which makes it somewhat unique in Southeast Asia. The Sultan
and his government have established a nationalistic ideology: the Malay Muslim Monarchy, referred to locally as Melayu Islam Beraja (MIB). The Sultan of Brunei formalized MIB as a concept which upholds Islamic principles and values with the Al-Qur’an and Hadith as the basis of all activities concerning language, Malay culture and the institution of the monarchy as the governing system and administration of Brunei Darussalam. MIB has been constituted as a non-negotiable component of Brunei life which must be honoured and practised by all the people of Brunei, and includes the justification for the preservation of the absolute monarchy and the retention of the traditions of the past, adapted to synthesize the compatible features of modernization and Islamic values in support of the Sultanate.

As the dominant ideology, MIB permeates the small state of Brunei and governs institutional norms and behaviour. That is, MIB plays an integral role in the nation’s identity, preventing the infiltration of unsuitable elements and filtering out undue foreign cultural influences. MIB has legitimized the uncompromising government promotion of Islam in every aspect of life in Brunei, both private and public. Overall, the ideology of the MIB promotes modest behaviour according to Islamic law and loyalty and obedience to the ruler. MIB is thus a powerful tool for shaping the country’s social reality and for instilling a collective conscience within the nation. The Brunei ideology thus helps employees to better tolerate organizational change where any judgments or decisions made are based on Islamic teachings or spiritual belief.

Islam, the official religion of Brunei, could also play a central role in the life of every Muslim in Brunei Darussalam. It has influenced the Bruneian culture and has been adopted as the state ideology and philosophy. Being a believer therefore could influence the ability of the employees to manage their emotions and cope with the stressfulness of the merger situation. Therefore, to some extent it may not be by having emotional intelligence that matters, rather having faith and devoted to one’s religion enable a person to accept change and therefore be able to manage and regulate their emotions. This is reflected in the conversion during interviews where interviewees believed that their ability to regulate their emotions was due to having faith in their religion. Religion may therefore play a role in developing emotional knowledge, especially in managing emotions during a stressful situation. Smith and
Rayment (2007) have noted that spirituality has recently been considered as key to the relationship between well-being and productivity.

Educating and improving oneself is an obligation under Islam. Learning to improve oneself is part of ‘jihad’, a term that has been misinterpreted by many western media as ‘a Holy war’ conjuring up images of the spread of Islam by violence and the punishment of ‘infidels’ (Bushill-Matthews, 2008). Grieve (2006) has also reported that westernized interpretations of the word carry overtones of violence and extremism. However, the core concept of jihad is neither physical nor violent but rather refers to the inner exertion of the individual to improve both himself and his community through moral discipline and commitment to Islam (Grieve, 2006). Nor is jihad associated or equated with the words ‘Holy war’ anywhere in the Qur’an (Esposito and Mogahed, 2008). The word jihad as it appears in the Qur’an actually means ‘to strive in the way of God’. Jihad can also be greater or lesser: the lesser jihad refers to the struggle against oppression and injustice whereas the greater Jihad refers to the more difficult struggle to improve oneself and society, through the heart, the tongue, the pen and the hand. Thus training for self-development is part of the greater jihad whereby employees are urged to improve themselves for their own and society’s benefit.

Having spiritual beliefs, being religious or embracing belief in God has also greatly assisted participants to make everyday judgments and display positive behaviours. Spirituality therefore is an internal experience of the non-material and personal encounter with Allah, God, the Transcendent, the Beyond, the Sacred (Tischler et al., 2002). Zinnbauer et al. (1999) defined spirituality as ‘the paths people take in their efforts to find, conserve, and transform the sacred in their lives’. Spirituality is also defined as the experience of meaning and purpose in our lives and a sense of connectedness with the people and things around us (Syed, 1995). For many this connectedness encompasses a relationship with God or a higher power.

Being spiritual may also provide an explanation for the more positive emotional responses especially on how individual employees regulate their emotions during merger. Those who are spiritual and believe in the existence of an external locus of control tend to accept and deal with uncertainty at work better. An external locus of
control refers to the belief that events in people’s lives are a function of luck, chance, fate, God, powerful others or powers beyond their control (Furnham, 2005).

Spirituality has now become a popular topic of research in psychology (Cohen, 2002). Spiritual well-being has been alleged to provide a significant inner strength to people, especially in times of uncertainty and chaos in life (Tischler et al., 2002). Spirituality is also a popular topic in medical research. For example, according to medical research reviews, spiritual practices have demonstrated many positive physiological and psychological health benefits (Tischler et al., 2002). Other medical research settings also suggest that a patient’s spiritual beliefs wield a significant influence over their health (Furnham, 1994), and some spiritual beliefs may have a direct effect on clinical outcomes (King et al., 1994). Myers and Diener (1995) reported the ‘impressive’ association between religion and mental health and religious people report being happier and more satisfied with life than those without religion.

Koenig et al. (2001) also reported that most studies present a positive association between some measure of religiosity and some measure of well-being, happiness, joy, fulfilment, pleasure and contentment. There has been a study reporting that spirituality, religious coping, and religious belief are better predictors of happiness and quality of life for Protestants and Catholics (Cohen, 2002). Although the association between religion and happiness is well known, it is not known, however, which particular aspects of religion correlate with life satisfaction (Cohen, 2002). It is also not known if the correlations are different for people of different religions (Cohen, 2002). Koenig et al. (2001) argue that not all religious beliefs and practices may have the same impact on health outcomes, and no research has yet comprehensively examined the impact of religion on mental health. Studies are therefore needed to determine whether different religious beliefs have similar effects on mental disorders (Koenig et al., 2001).

The participants in this study, in which the majority were Muslims, were found to be able to cope with the emotional and turbulent situation despite the low score for emotional intelligence. This is reflected in the qualitative data where most participants were relying on their religious belief to manage their emotion during the
merger along with other means such as doing physical exercises, listening and thinking positively. The belief in the existence of Allah plays an important role in helping people to manage their emotions. The everyday activities of most participants were influenced by Islamic teachings and practices. The belief in Allah (SWT) and being spiritual helps believers to manage their emotions. During the merger process, it tested the inner strength of the participants and demanded their patience. Employees displayed emotional authenticity, that is they had the ability to acknowledge, express, and be sincere about their feelings (Huy, 1999). Ten months after merger, employees were more receptive to change and therefore more able to appraise and express their emotions.

The faithful believe that Islamic principles, which are based on the Al-Qur’an and Hadith, are the best form of prevention of and treatment for psychological and social disturbances. God also says that the Al-Qur’an is a guide and a healing power to those who believe (41:44). During times of deep trial, despair and sadness, Muslims are required to seek comfort and guidance in the words of Allah in the Al-Qur’an. Allah reminds the believers that all people will be tried and tested in life, and calls upon Muslims to bear these trials with ‘patient perseverance and prayer’. Thus Islam plays a significant role in satisfying physical as well as spiritual needs. Islam teaches believers a code of behaviour and the conservation of social values, and gives them a meaning for their existence. It helps foster tolerance and the development of adaptive capacities for stressful events in life. It gives the believers a sense of self-respect and teaches them about the virtues of family life and a cohesive society with a sense of brotherhood.

Islamic teachings also call upon Muslims not to let their emotions get the better of them but rather to put their trust in their God (Allah), and not to fall into despair or hopelessness. There are many verses that remind Muslims to be patient and trust in Allah during times of trial. Among them are:

*Seek Allah’s help with patient perseverance and prayer. It is indeed hard except for those who are humble.* (2:45)

*Oh you who believe! Seek help with patient perseverance and prayer, for God is with those who patiently persevere.* (2:153)
Be patient, for your patience is with the help of Allah. (16:127)

No one will be granted such goodness except those who exercise patience and self-restraint, none but persons of the greatest good fortune. (41:35)

Verily man is in loss, except such as have faith, and do righteous deeds, and join together in the mutual enjoining of truth, and of patience and constancy. (103:2–3)

Being a Muslim also requires an individual to be thankful for what they have received. Carman and Streng (1989) have written that gratitude is a highly prized human disposition in Muslim, Christian, Jewish, Buddhist and Hindu thought (Emmons and McCullough, 2003). This gratitude falls under the category of emotions according to earlier theorists and researchers and that gratitude has a positive emotional valence (see Emmons and McCullough, 2003). There has been widespread agreement among the world’s religious and ethical writers that people are morally obligated to feel and express gratitude in response to received benefits (Emmons and McCullough, 2003). Emmons and McCullough’s (2003) study reported that grateful thinking has an effect on psychological well-being and happiness in daily life.

All Muslims must also believe in Al-Qadar (Preordination). Al-Qadar -sometimes referred to as destiny or fate - is the belief that everything (big or small, open or hidden, good or bad) that occurs in Allah’s universe has already been decreed to occur by Him. Belief in Al-Qadar is one of the Six Pillars of Faith:

1. to believe in Allah;
2. to believe in His Angels;
3. to believe in His Books and His Messengers;
4. to believe in the Last Day; and
5. to believe in Preordination.

Al-Qadar is part of Al-ghaib (the unseen). Even though the knowledge of Al-Qadar is with Allah, Muslims must still believe that it exists. Basically, man has power, will and freedom of choice. However, this power, will and freedom of choice is (1) an aspect of his creation granted by Allah, and (2) limited in his nature. That is, Allah has given man power and will, but there are things that are beyond the will of man such as the
weather, the seismic movements of the earth and the functioning of our own bodies. For Muslim believers, their destiny is predetermined. They do not have control over those aspects. What they do have control over is a limited free will, that is their actions, the choice to do good or bad, to believe in God or not to believe in Him, but they have no control over tomorrow's events that are not related to their actions. People have complete freedom to behave however they like. However, they should know that there are consequences for all their evil actions, consequences that they bring upon themselves. For example, a person should be punished for the evil things he has control over and which he has chosen to do. Similarly, Allah will reward those righteous people who choose to do good.

As well as belief in the Pillars of Faith, there must be action. That is, belief and action must go hand in hand. Action is based on five principles called the Five Pillars of Islam. The first pillar is Tawhid or belief in the Oneness of Allah (SWT). Recent scientific research indicates that affirming belief in God or Allah (SWT) makes a critical contribution to our physical health (Syed, 1995). One of the great secrets of Tawhid is the relief of the heart and body lies in obedience to Allah or the inward kindness. Taken from Al-Fawaa'id (translated by Abu Rumaysah):

… inward kindness is that the heart cannot become firm, it cannot find satisfaction and it cannot find tranquillity except by reaching out to Him. It is what the heart attains of tranquillity and satisfaction at the onset of the calamity and the removal of unrest, confusion and despair. Therefore the servant surrenders and submits himself before his Lord and Master and he emerges in a state of complete rest and tranquillity – looking on at Him with his heart, and his soul at peace. His witnessing His Kindness has distracted him from the severity of the situation. His knowledge of Allah’s excellent choice and decision for him diverts him from feeling the calamity just as does his knowledge that he is nothing but a mere servant upon whom the decrees of his Master take effect, and he can either be pleased with them or angry with them. So if he is pleased then he will attain pleasure and if he is displeased then his portion is nothing save displeasure. Therefore this inward kindness is the fruit of this inward action (of being pleased with the decree of Allah), it increases with its increase and decreases with its decrease.
The second pillar is Salat or contract prayer. The Muslim prayer consists of contract prayer (Salat), Zikr or remembrance of Allah and recitation of the Al-Qur’an. These elicit the physiological relaxation response (Syed, 1995). The relaxation response yields many long-term benefits in both health and well-being and can be brought on with Salat, Zikr and recitation of the Al-Qur’an which are related to very simple mental focusing. The effect of contract prayer (Salat) is literally similar to the effect of the practice of ‘transcendental meditation’ which has been found to lead to increased self-actualization (Alexander et al., 1991), general psychological health (Gelderloos et al., 1990), stronger self-identity (Turnbull and Norris, 1982), improved perception of others (Holeman and Seiler, 1979), greater empathy (Griggs, 1979) and orientation towards positive values (Gelderloos et al., 1987) (for a review see Tischler et al., 2002). In Brunei, with its Islamic culture, all organizations both public and private are given the directive to recite Al-Qur’an every morning prior to the start of work. The Islamic culture practiced widely in Brunei help individual employees to regulate their emotions and thus display positive responses to change.

The third pillar is Siyam. Besides the recitation of the Al-Qur’an, the third way to control rage is Siyam or Fasting during the month of Ramadhan. Several studies have already documented the health benefits of fasting during the Holy month of Ramadhan. During Ramadhan, Muslims are required to practise a healthy lifestyle including eating and behaving well which leads to better health and mental well-being (managing emotions such as anger and being patient). The present research was conducted during the Holy month of Ramadhan (four months after merger) which contributed to significant findings such as the negative relationship between anger and withdrawal intention. Despite being emotionally affected by the sudden merger announcement, employees were still able to control their emotions, be patient and accept change, and forgo the intention to leave the organization.

The fourth pillar is Zakah or Charity. Zakah is about sharing one’s wealth and corresponds to altruism. Doing good to others is also Zakah and those who volunteer their work or work sincerely find a marked improvement in their health. In the case of the present study, employees who were doing their work sincerely without expecting too much from the employer were more receptive to change.
Fifth is Hajj or pilgrimage to Mecca. Going for Hajj requires the Muslims to perform congregational prayers. During the pilgrimage, regardless of differences in language, nationality and culture, everyone performs communal prayers and recites their prayers in Arabic. This one language is actually uniting the people. Thousands of Muslims also gather around the Ka’bah to perform prayers. The Ka’bah is the focal point for performing prayers, uniting the diverse Muslim community across time and space as they pray to the One God. Hajj and congregational prayers serve to buffer the adverse effects of stress and anger as well as trigger better health, perhaps via psychoneuroimmunological (PNI) pathways (Syed, 1995). PNI is the study of the interrelationships among behaviour, neural and endocrine function, and the immune system (Syed, 1995).

More pleasant emotions are also mentioned in the Al-Qur’an in relation to the management of emotions. Pleasant emotions include hope and happiness. Hope is an attribute of emotional intelligence, which refers to the belief that one has both the will and the way to accomplish one’s goals, whatever they may be (Huy, 1999). Hope buffers people against depression and apathy, and it strengthens their capacity to withstand defeat and persist in adversity (Goleman, 1995). Hope is from Allah and has to do with good feelings about the future. Tomorrow is better than today. Only those with faith can have a sense of hope because they have a larger picture and see a larger reality. Ozag (2005) found a correlation between hope and organizational commitment. Happiness or elation, whether material or non-material, is frequently mentioned in the Al-Qur’an (2:69, 3:120, 3:170, 3:188, 6:44, 9:50, 9:81, 10:22, 40:58, 11:10, 13:36, 19:26, 20:40, 23:53, 25:74, 27:19, 27:36, 28:9, 28:13, 28:76, 30:4, 30:32, 30:36, 33:17, 33:51, 40:75, 40:83, 42:48, 57:23, 76:11, 80:38, 84:9) as a state of good feeling that is temporary because the challenges of daily life for adults preclude continuous elation. This study found a positive and significant relationship between support for change and happiness with 23% variance. There is an expected negative relationship between job satisfaction and resistance to change. This means that the less they resist organizational change the more satisfied the employees are with their jobs. There is a 34% variance that shows in the relationships.
The present study found a significant negative correlation between anger and emotional intelligence. This unpleasant emotion is also mentioned in many areas in the Al-Qur’an. Anger is also seen as an unpleasant emotion in many verses in the Al-Qur’an (9:58, 21:87, 7:154, 42:37) and Hadith. Rage and aggression are related to drives and emotions. Rage is natural and cannot be avoided. What is needed is self-control to avoid negative side effects. Quarrelling, usually associated with rage, is discouraged. For Muslim believers, belief in the content of the Al-Qur’an and Hadith assists them to control their negative emotions. Muslims therefore are obliged to possess positive instead of negative emotions to buffer the negative emotional discomfort among employees.

6.4 Chapter Summary

Results at Time 1 were rather expected because data was collected at an early stage of the merger. No relationship was found between emotional intelligence and emotional responses, degree of support and job attitudes towards change. The small number of participants, issues related to MSCEIT content, cultural variation and an unstable situation at the time the data were collected were among the reasons for the lack of relationships.

However, ten months after merger, positive responses towards change were found. There were more significant results found such as relationships with emotional intelligence abilities, positive emotional responses and a high degree of support for change. The findings suggest that the personality of individual employees, organizational commitment, emotional support and trust influenced the transition in the emotional ability to handle the challenging and stressful merger situation.

The qualitative data further substantiate the statistical findings and enhance the positive responses towards merger and the ability of employees to regulate and manage their emotions after ten months merger. Culture and religion, mainly, have significant influence in assisting individual employees to manage and regulate their emotions following merger.
There have been increasing calls for the need to examine whether emotional intelligence can be developed. There have also been many suggestions as to how emotional intelligence can be developed and there is also scientific evidence to suggest that such development can be achieved. Groves et al. (2008) argue that emotional intelligence training has emerged as a popular and lucrative field, but empirical evidence for the deliberate development of emotional intelligence has been substantially more elusive. Clarke (2007) also argued that actual evidence for developing emotional intelligence is meagre at best. Clarke (2006a) found minimal evidence to support claims of the effectiveness of training programmes in developing emotional intelligence. The effectiveness of training intervention further support the development of emotional intelligence thus has positive implication on participants’ responses to merger.

This study supports the proposal made by Clarke (2006) that emotional abilities are capable of development. If the suggestions of Groves and his colleagues (2008) on training effectiveness are taken into account, the current study meets their criteria in providing a more robust research design for investigating the development of emotional intelligence. Despite the short duration of the training programme, this study also suggests that all four emotional intelligence abilities of participants have the possibility to be developed. The increase in the level of emotional intelligence before and after training intervention further suggests the effectiveness of the training programme.

The development of the emotional intelligence of the Control Group was unexpected but could be explained as an effect of workplace learning, the culture and religion, and the emotional support that they received. This study therefore further supports the work of Clarke (2006) and Clarke (2007) that emotional abilities has the potential to be developed through workplace learning.

Overall, this study suggests that these employees may be emotionally intelligent because they demonstrated positive behaviours towards change and were more able to accept change and adapt to the uncertainties it brings. Such a person is said to have psychoanalytical thinking or negative capabilities. Keats (1970) describes the term negative capability as ‘being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any
irritable reaching after fact and reason’ (see French, 2001). Negative capability also indicates the capacity to live with and to tolerate ambiguity and paradox, and therefore to engage in a non-defensive way with change, resisting the impulse merely to react to the pressures inherent in risk-taking (see French, 2001). French (2001) argues that the negative capability of appearing chameleon-like implies the capacity to integrate emotional and mental states rather than dissociating oneself from aspects of emotional experience or attempting to cut oneself off from such experience altogether. This chameleon-like ability can assist people to adapt, shift and adjust as necessary, allowing their minds to be changed for the sake of the task (French, 2001). Thus French states that negative capability implies the ability to learn, to allow one’s mind to be changed by others. Negative capability is thus relevant to organisational change management because it represents the ability to absorb and respond creatively to the emotional turmoil which can both arise from and in turn cause change (French, 2001).
7.0 Introduction

This concluding chapter begins with a review on the findings and discussion of this study. Contributions of this study will be presented in the fourth section. The next section analyses the limitations in conducting this study. This research has thrown up many questions in need of further investigation and therefore a section on the recommendation for future research is reserved in the final section.

7.1 Review of Findings

Contrary to expectations, no significant relationship was found between emotional intelligence and emotional responses, degree of support and job attitudes towards merger at four months post merger. The first finding of key importance was that no significant relationship was found between employees’ emotions (either positive or negative emotional responses) and their degree of support for change (either resistance or support for change). This therefore rejects hypotheses 1 and 2.

Hypotheses 3 and 4 were partially supported because several relationships were found between degree of support for change and job attitudes towards merger or change at this early stage of merger. For example, there was negative relationship between support for change and organizational commitment. This was also detected when data was analyzed using multiple regression.

The results also support partially hypotheses 5 and 6 on the relationship between emotional responses and job attitudes. For example, there was inverse relationship between anger and job satisfaction. However, unforeseen relationships were also found at this stage of merger. For example, there were significant inverse relationships between depression and job insecurity and between anger and withdrawal intention.
Another main key finding was that there was lack of relationship found between emotional intelligence and other research variables such as emotional responses, degree of support for change and job attitudes towards change. This therefore rejects hypothesis 7.

Interestingly, after ten months post merger, more relationships were found. Results show that all hypotheses were accepted although not every single measure was associated with the others. For example, for hypotheses 1 and 2, resistance to change was found to be related positively with anger and negatively with happiness. Support for change was also found to be related to happiness.

For hypotheses 3 and 4, resistance to change was found to be positively related to job insecurity and withdrawal intention, and negatively with job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Support for change also has positive relationship with organizational commitment and negative relationship with withdrawal intention.

There were also direct relationships found between emotional responses and job attitudes at ten months after merger. For example, there were negative relationships between happiness and job insecurity, and between job satisfaction and depression and anger. Withdrawal intention was also directly related to depression, anger and happiness. Organizational commitment was also found to be positively related to happiness. These results therefore support hypotheses 5 and 6.

Of chief interest the findings reporting inter-correlations from measures obtained ten months post merger show favorable results. All branches of emotional intelligence (perceiving emotions, using emotions, understanding emotions, managing emotions and Total EI) were found to be associated with emotional responses and degree of support for change. This finding thus supports hypothesis 7. However, no relationship was found between emotional intelligence and job attitudes at this time point. Nonetheless, the results revealed that at ten months post merger employees were more receptive to change and therefore possess positively towards organization change.
The qualitative findings demonstrated the emotional responses disposed by employees following merger announcement (four months post merger). Most participants rejects merger while others were having mixed emotional reactions towards merger. Participants were shocked, surprised, and unhappy and worried with the future outcomes. Culture clashes, mistrust, feelings of betrayed, insecure and mistreatment were among contributing reasons to the negative emotional responses, and thus increase the tendency to resist change. Others were still at ‘wait and see’ stage, and hoping for better future tomorrow. However, after ten months merger, more positive responses were expressed showing employees receptiveness towards merger. Most participants had no intention to leave the organization due to financial and economic factor. The average salary paid to the employees was still higher compared to other conventional banks and other private sectors. There was also fear of retirement benefit not to be granted if they withdraw early from the organization. This would be a great loss to those who had worked in the organization for longer period of time.

When training was conducted, the baseline scores found that the Training Group has higher mean scores for using emotions (Branch 2) and understanding emotions (Branch 3), whereas the Control Group has higher mean scores for perceiving emotions (Branch 1), managing emotions (Branch 4) and Total EI. No significant difference in the mean scores was found between the two groups at pre-training period.

Of chief interest, at post-training period, results found similar outcomes. Training Group has higher mean scores for using emotions (Branch 2) and understanding emotions (Branch 3), whereas the Control Group has higher mean scores for perceiving emotions (Branch 1), managing emotions (Branch 4) and Total EI. No significant difference in the mean scores between the two groups was found too.

However, when the mean scores were compared between pre-training and post-training, several significant differences were found. For the Control Group, their mean scores for using emotions (Branch 2) and Total EI were found to be significantly difference between pre-training and post-training. The results show a significant increase in Branch 2 and Total EI. Significant differences were also found
for the Training Group between pre-training and post-training intervention for managing emotions (Branch 4) and Total EI. The findings suggest that the emotional intelligence of participants attending training (Training Group) has developed thus indicating the effectiveness of the training programme using ability model of emotional intelligence. The results also show that all the four branches of emotional intelligence have increased from pre-training to post-training period for both groups. This suggests that all the dimensions of ability model of emotional intelligence are susceptible to development.

When the mean scores between participants of the training session (between IBB and IDBB) were compared, employees of IBB tend to have higher mean scores than IDBB employees for all branches at both pre-training and post-training.

7.2 Review of Discussion

Results show that there was a lack of relationship between emotional intelligence and emotional responses, degree of support and job attitudes at four months post merger. The small size of participants participating in this study could be the main reason for the lack of relationship. Issues related to MSCEIT such as its content, age of participants, language barrier, culture, and number of questions could also contribute to the absence in the relationships between emotional intelligence and other measures (emotional responses, degree of support and job attitudes). At the same time, the mixed emotions and feelings of employees when measures were collected, also suggested to influence the validity of emotional intelligence scores. When data was collected, it was still at the very early stage of merger. Data collected from interviews also support the present findings. Employees were having mixed and uncertain emotions towards merger due to the violation of psychological contract, unfairness in the welfare distribution among employees, and clash of differing work cultures. These caused negative emotions among employees and thus affecting their contributions to the research.

After ten months of merger, no relationship could also be detected between emotional intelligence and job attitudes toward change. Again, the small sample size was suggested to contribute to the lack of relationship. However, more favourable relationships were found at this stage. Perceiving emotions, using emotions,
understanding emotions, managing emotions and the Total EI were found to be significantly associated with emotional responses, and degree of support toward change. The positive relationship between emotional intelligence and support for change and the inverse relationship with anger and resistance to change suggest that employees were more receptive to change after ten months merger. These findings therefore suggest that employees may be emotionally intelligent at this ten months post merger and thus able to handle and cope with radical change.

From the interviews, employees displayed happy mood and relaxed manner which were reflected on their facial expressions when asked about their reactions towards merger at ten months post merger. They were also happier to work with their former ‘rivals’, and more empathetic on them especially when they all have gone through the same traumatic situations. This therefore suggests that employees have the ability to perceive their own and others’ emotions (Branch 1). Their personality also assists them to be able to accept their ‘rival’. Ability model has been found to be correlated with personality but the correlation was very low. Moreover, feeling of trust, having emotional and perceived support from families and friends, further help the employees to accept change and work harmoniously with new faces.

Having the ability to use emotions to facilitate various cognitive activities such as thinking and problem solving (Branch 2), also assists employees to be committed to the organization. For example, employees who have long service with the organization, and have financial commitment have strong desire to maintain their membership in the organization. Leaving the organization following negative emotions would cause them to lose the retirement benefit.

Employees were also having Branch 3, which is the ability to understand emotion and analyse the emotions, and understand their outcomes. The outcome of being angry at the merger situation and the high intention to withdraw has been evaluated and measured accordingly. Being aware on the difficulty to find job outside, has caused them to stay in the organization.

In order to manage their emotions (Branch 4) to tackle and handle the unstable and challenging situations, employees emphasised on the significant of spirituality,
besides doing physical activities and counselling. Brunei culture is embedded by Islamic religion which has influenced mostly their ability to manage and regulate their emotions. Thus this study suggests that the national and Islamic culture also plays an important role in influencing people’s behaviour to manage emotional and uncertain events. Overall, this study suggests that employees who are emotionally intelligent tend to be able to positively acclimatize their responses to change.

This study also suggests that emotional intelligence can be developed using training as intervention. Those who were given training on emotional intelligence tend to have increased their emotional intelligence mean scores. The development of their level of emotional intelligence could be determined by the provision of formal learning on the role of emotional intelligence. The training also helped to raise participants’ awareness and emotions of their own and others’ emotions. The two days training sessions also encouraged participants to work as a team to accomplish a task together despite coming from different companies. This further strengthened their relationships, increase dialogue and reflections among employees from merging companies. Encouraging and safe training environment also promote trust among the participants from different organizational background. The careful selection of materials and exercises also contributed to the successfulness of training intervention and thus leads to the development of all branches of emotional intelligence among employees when compared between Time 1 (pre-training) and Time 2 (post-training). The training exercises which have been carefully selected and based on the ability model had conceivably played a part in this successful intervention.

Despite not being given any training on emotional intelligence, the Control Group’s emotional intelligence mean scores had increased too. Taking the MSCEIT test twice with only six months gap could contribute to the increase in the emotional intelligence mean scores. The test re-test gave the opportunity to the participants to familiarise the MSCEIT questions. Informal workplace learning could also be part of the development of emotional intelligence. The Training Group was consisted of managers and therefore there was the possibility for the interactions to take place for sharing of information on the content of the training between the trained managers and their subordinates. Moreover, managers displaying positive emotions could
result in improved employee moods, feelings of confidence and optimism, and therefore increase performance (Humphrey et al., 2008). This suggests how the Control Group had increased in their ability to perceive others’ emotions (Branch1). Provision of incentives and privileges, emotional supports and open dialogue and reflection among employees further injected the confidence of employees to face and accept any challenges and helped them to manage their emotions, thus increased their emotional intelligence.

The collectivist culture of Bruneians is also another essential factor influencing the development in the mean scores of emotional intelligence of participants. Support from families and friends helped individual employees to increase their ability to manage emotions in particular during stressful merger situation. Spirituality is also one of the major key players in assisting employees to adapt to such chaotic and emotional circumstances, as well as the major contributor to the increase in the Branch 4 (managing emotion) of individual participants. The culture of Brunei was rooted from the Islamic religion. The day-to-day activities for both the Muslims and the non-Muslims were in accordance to the Muslims customs. The Islamic belief required Muslims to practice in the Five Pillars of Islam and believed in the Six Pillars of Faith. Prescriptions for the management of stress are typically directed at individual such as counselling and meditation (Domagalski, 1999). According to Turnbull (2006) little research has been conducted on emotions and behaviours induced by systematic use of religious imagery in corporate change programmes. She further suggests for the investigation on the contribution of religious beliefs on behaviour during change. Turnbull (2006) argues that there are only few scholars that look at the link between religious behaviour and work life.

### 7.3 Contributions of the study

This study has several major contributions. Firstly, This study shows how merger as an emotional and stressful event could affect the emotions of employees. The emotional responses found to have effect on individuals’ degree of support for change either to support merger or to resist merger which further has implications on individuals’ job attitudes towards merger. There has been emphasis on the need to examine the extent to which emotional intelligence and affect at work interface to
influence work attitudes in occupations with job characteristics different than educators (Kafetsios and Zampetakis (2008). This study appears to show that emotional intelligence plays a significant role in attenuating the responses of employees towards change from negative to positive emotions. The positive emotions therefore lead to the acceptance of radical change or merger. Therefore this study fills an important gap in the literature, linking the ideas embodied in the psychological and change management concept. For example gaps in the literatures on the impact of emotions on degree of supports, the implication of degree of supports on job attitudes, role of emotional intelligence in merger context and implication of emotional intelligence on degree of supports. No study has found any relationship between these variables before.

Secondly, this study is also the first of its kind that has specifically examined the role of emotional intelligence in change management in particular merging banking institutions. No studies have yet appeared in the literature demonstrating the role of emotional intelligence in merging banking institution especially in Brunei context. Brunei collectivist culture along with the Islamic values practiced by the employees had also contributed to the ability of employees to cope and manage traumatic and emotional situation in particular merger. This study also shows how culture influence employees' emotional ability to cope stressful situation. Much existing literatures focus on the differences of emotions between western and eastern culture. None of the measures of emotional intelligence are sensitive to and measure cultural differences in emotional expression as a dimension of emotional intelligence itself (Salovey, 2006). Indeed, items showing cultural differences had been eliminated on the MSCEIT (Salovey, 2006).

Thirdly, this study makes a significant contribution to the literature of spirituality and coping emotions at work. Turnbull (2001) has earlier proposed for future research to focus on developing understanding of the relationship between religion and work. Most of the spirituality literatures to date focused on specific religion such as Christianity and Jews, and none on Islamic religion on how to cope with stress and merging situation. Thus, this study has made a significant contribution to existing literatures.
It is also worth adding to McEnrue and his colleagues’ list that existing studies on training interventions used students as their research participants in order to gain understanding of the managerial scenario (for example, Boyatzis et al., 2002; Groves et al., 2008; Moriarty and Buckley, 2003; Wong et al., 2007; Clarke, 2007; Clarke, in press). This current study, however, has used real managers affected by actual organizational change as the research participants in emotional intelligence training. Students are not a true sample to reflect the attitudes and behaviours of employees. Moreover, students may also be unable to understand the actual impact of merger and therefore be unable to really understand the emotional implications of change for employees.

There are a number of studies that have examined the possibility of developing emotional intelligence through training programmes. However these studies are limited. There has also been curiosity as well whether emotional intelligence can be developed at later stage of life. This study has shown that all the abilities of emotional intelligence can be developed at later stage of life by training employees at middle level management. Salovey and Mayer (1990) support that emotional intelligence is not fixed for life and may be improved with suitable training. Thus, this study suggest the potential for all aspects of emotional abilities (perceiving, using, understanding and managing emotions) can be developed through training intervention.

Most of all, existing studies on developing emotional intelligence were focusing on traits models. Emotional intelligence was not measured according to the four ability-based dimensions (Wong et al. 2007). While other researchers on emotional intelligence and training focused on developing new competencies and skills, this study has used an ability model to develop emotional intelligence abilities. This current study further contribute to provide empirical evidence and support the proposal for future studies on the development of emotional intelligence abilities using MSCEIT (such as Clarke, 2007 and 2008) and training intervention. No publication has shown on the development of emotional intelligence using training based on ability model yet (Clarke, 2008).
The emotional intelligence training intervention has been argued to be able to help managers deal with subordinate insecurity, promote teamwork, and establish productive relationships (Goleman, 1998). Jordan, et al. (2002) suggest the implication of emotional intelligence training intervention as a means to address problems associated with organizational job insecurity, as well as other emotional reactions in the workplace. The increase in the level of emotional intelligence mean scores may contribute to the ability of employees to have positive emotions and support for change.

Furthermore, at the methodology level, there are several ‘one of its kind’ that can be assembled from this study. This study had used longitudinal study in order to analyse the differences in the level of emotional intelligence and its impact on emotions and job attitudes of employees in relations to merging process. No study on this had been conducted before. This research is an empirical assessment of individual emotional responses to change within an organization setting.

Moreover, prior research has recognized that experiments conducted in laboratory settings are less likely to show main effects of psychological constructs such as attitudes, partially because experiments create moderate to strong situations (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993). Many existing research on developing emotional intelligence used undergraduate students as participants in order to understand the behaviour of people at work. However, students are not the true sample and with the lack of knowledge on working environment, the validity and reliability of the findings can be affected. This study however, has used the actual managers and subordinates affected by merger in order to understand their emotional responses towards merger.

The findings of this study also have a number of important implications for future practices. Firstly, any organization that has intention to pursue radical change should pay attention on ‘people issues’ (Higgs and Dulewicz, 2000) and the implication of change on their emotions rather than only on financial or economic factors. This is because if the change causes negative emotional responses, employees may resist to change thus may affect the overall performance of the organization.
Managers who are interested to capitalise and enhance their employees’ level of emotional intelligence, training intervention can be implemented to develop their emotional intelligence ability level. It is thus suggested for managers at all levels to be introduced mechanisms such as emotional intelligence courses to help them deal more successfully with colleagues, their own feelings, their everyday environment, and indeed, their overall well-being (Beer, 2003 in Maree and Eiselen, 2004).

Finally, this study can also be as a ground for other researchers to develop new theories such as on the implication of different religion on emotional intelligence and its affect at work, and on the implication of different culture on emotional intelligence. Literature on leadership will also benefit from this study for example, by studying how culture and religion can affect emotional intelligence of leaders and their followers during merger.

7.4 Limitations of the study

A number of caveats need to be noted regarding the present study. The most important limitation lies in the research methodology process. During the process of conducting this study, several problems were faced especially at the initial stage of collecting data. Real time affect data was supposed to be collected through interviews. However, employees and managers of both banks were reluctant to discuss about their emotions and feelings following merging announcement especially to a stranger (researcher). The merger activity was seen as a sensitive issue with many protocols and red tape involved at the first stage of data collection. Moreover, research is susceptible to viewpoint and memory effects. Participants were having difficulty to provide answers that require them to recall the event. The study also depends on the willingness of the respondents to answer.

Secondly, using longitudinal research is formidable to conduct and very costly. The current study was having difficulty to contact the same participants at the second timeframe of data collection. Tracking employees over time was difficult because some employees were not able to be located while some others had been transferred to other departments and branches.
In relation to this, the current study had to use a convenience small sample of participants. With a small sample size of 90 participants, the results can not show the significant variance in the relationships. Therefore caution must be applied, as the findings might not be transferable to the existing research on MSCEIT. The small number of sample is suggested to cause the lack of relationship between emotional intelligence and job attitudes, and the no significant difference in the mean scores of emotional intelligence between Training and Control Group. Moreover, the study would be more interesting if moderation effect of emotional intelligence could be conducted. The small sample size however, could not determine whether level of emotional intelligence (high or low) could moderate the emotional responses, degree of support and job attitude of employees during merger.

Furthermore, there is problem of common method biases. This refers to any artifactual covariance between the predictor and criterion variable produced by the fact that the responded providing the measure of these variables is the same (Podsakoff et al., 2003). There is a problem of social desirability which refers to the tendency of some people to respond to items more as a result of their social acceptability or to present themselves in a favourable light, regardless of their true feelings about an issue or topic. This tendency is problematic because of its potential to bias the answers of respondents or self-reporting. It is also problematic because it may mask the true relationships between two or more variables. According to Ganster et al (1983), social desirability can produce spurious relationships that hide the true feelings of variables or serve as moderator variables that influence the nature of the relationships between the variables. Thus, having the same respondents for both dependent and independent t-test may be one of the reasons for the absence of significant increase in emotional intelligence mean scores. Obtaining data from supervisors or peers could reduce the issue of common method bias.

The increase in the emotional intelligence score for the Control Group despite not given any training on emotional intelligence and the lack of correlations between emotional intelligence and research variables were very peculiar. This could be due to the measurement used in assessing the level of emotional intelligence of the participants. There have been well-known shortcomings of emotional measures
which have been debated and discuss at length in existing literatures such as problems of scoring and omitting cultural items from the MSCEIT.

McEnrue et al (2006) also criticized the application of MSCEIT in developing emotional intelligence. They argue that MSCEIT’s face and content validity pose difficulties for emotional intelligence training activities. The test items such as sensations, landscape and abstract designs tend to be misunderstood by test takers. Cultural variations may also influence test takers’ responses. Furthermore, measuring Branch 2 or using emotions to facilitate thinking are also difficult to assess. In this study, respondents’ responses are not apparent for many of the items. Thus, despite findings suggest that training emotional intelligence using ability model has the potential to develop employees’ emotional intelligence, this model appears to have limitation with regards to its measurement tool.

The incompatibility of the measurement to Brunei culture could also be another reason for the lack of correlations. In terms of external validity, the cultural bias could have an impact on the low emotional intelligence score of participants. When the MSCEIT was developed, it was assessed based on normative data collected from European, other Western and some Asian countries such as India, Sri Lanka and the Philippines. Wong et al. (2007) also argue that MSCEIT have been developed based on Western samples. Participants from these countries have different values and culture from Bruneian participants.

Furthermore, according to McEnrue and Groves (2006), cultural variations can also lower the emotional intelligence score of participants. They also explain that culture is likely to affect the definitions, expressions of dimensions, measurement, interpretations and perceived value of emotional intelligence (McEnrue and Groves, 2006). Mesquita (2001) also further highlighted the impact of cultural differences on the patterns of emotional expression. Furthermore, according to Ellsworth (1994) culture differs in both the intensity to which people experience common emotions (Kitayama et al., 2000).

Culture is also different in how people react to and self-regulate their emotions (Kitayama et al., 1995; Mesquita, 2001). How and when ‘good feelings’ are
experienced differ from one culture to another (Kitayama et al., 2000). Kitayama et al. (2000) also found that there are cross-culturally divergent styles of managing emotions. This can be seen in several questions in the MSCEIT asking how one feels emotionally when some event occurs (see Section C of the MSCEIT in Appendix 4) which may not have the same effect in Bruneian culture. The pictures depicted in Section E may also lead to cultural discrepancies in terms of differences in participants’ feelings. For example, the colour orange or a picture of a desert may prompt different sensations and emotions for participants from different origins and cultures. Therefore the cultural and background differences between Bruneians and the participants used when the MSCEIT was developed could have an impact on the level of emotional intelligence of participants.

The measurement used also did not favoured by Bruneian participants thus has implications on unfavourable result of emotional intelligence. Some of the questions included in the MSCEIT were also not pertinent to Muslim customs thus affecting the validity of the responses. For example, one of the options under question 4 of Section D was ‘Ed found that relaxing in front of the TV at night, with a beer or two, really helped him to feel better’. Optional answers were provided such as ‘very ineffective’, ‘somewhat ineffective’, ‘neutral’, ‘somewhat effective’ and ‘very effective’. Despite the choices available, the question remains unsuitable for the participants, the majority of whom were Muslims. This restricted the options available to the participants as Muslims are forbidden to drink alcohol because alcohol causes more harm than good both to the individual and to society at large. Participants in the present study therefore complained about the difficulty in answering the question. For this reason, the answers of the participants may affect the overall score.

7.5 Future Research

A number of possible future studies using similar research set up are apparent. Firstly, considerably more work will need to be done to determine the effects of change on the emotions of higher level managers in the organization. Although this study revealed that all group level in the organization were affected by merger, this study mainly focused on the emotions of lower and middle managers affected by change. Kiefer (2002) argues that existing literatures often ignore the emotions of
other key groups such as top level management. In this study, the seconded officers were also emotionally affected by the merger decisions according to the interviewees. More investigation on what trigger emotional responses and how they felt at that time should be done. Therefore it is suggested that the association between these factors among employees of all managerial levels is worth to be investigated in future studies.

More participants are required to be involved in the investigation in order to enhance the validity of the MSCEIT. More information on emotional reactions and its implication on emotional intelligence would help this current study to establish a greater degree of accuracy on this issue. For example, by collecting real time effect data, more accurate emotional responses and reactions towards challenging settings can be obtained. A larger sample is also required to conduct similar study to prove empirically the direct implication of emotional intelligence on the job attitude of employees using ability-based model. This is also essential to analyse moderation effect of emotional intelligence on attitudes towards change. Moreover, large number of samples helps to make comparisons between high and low emotional intelligence of employees and how it affects their responses to change. The number of training participants should also be increased so that comparison on emotional intelligence level and emotional responses to change between two different companies can be determined.

The ‘strange’ results of the Control Group and lack of correlation between emotional intelligence and other variables should instead be seen as a new breakthrough for researchers to improve the measurement of emotional intelligence. Ashkanasy and Dasborough in their letter to Antonakis (refer to Antonakis et al in press) argue that this should be a motivation to continue to forge ahead to develop new, more reliable, more valid, and more relevant measures. Although it has been almost 20 years since Salovey and Mayer (1990) wrote their ground-breaking piece, emotional intelligence is still in a state of turmoil, controversy, and continuing development (Sternberg, 2002). Its measurement development is therefore still ongoing with a view to developing future tests to check out theoretical propositions or claims.
More broadly research is also needed to determine the associations between emotional intelligence and other contributing factors. Future research should measure religion and culture to determine causes and effects relationship with emotional intelligence. Finally, what is now needed is to extend this study with the intention to enhance the reliability and validity of ability model measures of emotional intelligence across different culture and religion. Overall, the findings from this study have a number of important implications for future practice.
APPENDIX 1
Questionnaires on Emotional Responses, Degree of Support, and Job Attitudes towards Merger
**Questionnaires on Emotional Responses, Degree of support for Change, and Job Attitudes Towards Merger**

You are invited to participate in a research project on Change Management. The results will be used in thesis. The research will help the researcher understand the behavioural response to organizational change.

All you need to do is complete this short questionnaire, which should take approximately 15 minutes. Responses will be completely anonymous; your name will not appear anywhere on the survey. Completing and returning the questionnaire constitutes your consent to participate.

**PART 1:** Please put a tick in the appropriate box. Your answers will be confidential. The information in this section will not be reported in a manner that individuals could be identified. Please be honest and open.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Age:</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Gender:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Under 20</td>
<td>☐ Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Between 21 – 30</td>
<td>☐ Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Between 31 – 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Between 41 – 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 50 and above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Marital Status:</strong></td>
<td><strong>4. Former Employer:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Single</td>
<td>☐ IBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Married</td>
<td>☐ IDBB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Divorced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Widowed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Length of time with company:</strong></td>
<td><strong>7. Length of tenure in current position :</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 0-6 months</td>
<td>☐ 0-6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 7-11 months</td>
<td>☐ 7-11 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 1-2 years</td>
<td>☐ 1-2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 3-5 years</td>
<td>☐ 3-5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 6 or more years</td>
<td>☐ 6 or more years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Highest Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ BJCE and below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ High School (ND, ‘O’ and ‘A’ Level)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ HND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Bachelor Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Masters Degree or other advanced or professionals degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 2: Your organization is merging in order to increase effectiveness and enhance productivity. For this change to be accomplished, it requires your resources and energy.

1. Please indicate on the scales where 1=Very Certain
   2=Certain
   3=Undecided
   4=Uncertain, or
   5=Very Uncertain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How certain are you about what your future career picture looks like?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How certain are you of the opportunities for promotion and advancement which will exist in the next few years?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How certain are you about what your responsibilities will be six months from now?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please indicate on the scales where 1=Disagree Very Much
   2=Disagree
   3=Undecided
   4=Agree, or
   5=Agree Very Much

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is really too little chance for promotion on my job*.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive*.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I like the people I work with.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless*.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Communications seem good within this organization.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated*.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape*.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I like doing the things I do at work.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates*.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization*.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My job is enjoyable.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Please indicate on the scales where 1=Strongly Disagree  
2=Disagree  
3=Undecided  
4=Agree, or  
5=Strongly Agree

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I think a lot about leaving the organization</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I am actively searching for an alternative to the organization</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>As soon as it is possible, I will leave the organization</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I generally consider changes to be a negative thing.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I like to do the same old thing rather than try new and different ones.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If I were to be informed that there’s going to be a significant change regarding the way things are done at work, I would probably feel stressed.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Changing plans seems like a real hassle to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Once I’ve come to a conclusion, I’m not likely to change my mind.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I really feel as if this organization’s problems are my own</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I do not feel like ‘part of the family’ at my organization *</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I do not feel ‘emotionally attached’ to this organization *</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization *</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I am not afraid of what might happen if I quit my job without having another one lined up *</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>It wouldn’t be too costly for me to leave my organization *</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice – another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reversed questions*
4. Please indicate on the scales where 1=Very Unlikely
   2=Unlikely
   3=Neutral
   4=Likely, or
   5=Very Likely

   1  2  3  4  5

1. My willingness or openness to be a part of the change program is

2. My willingness or openness to change something even if it appears to be working

3. My willingness or openness to support change is

PART 3: This next set of four questions asks you about the way you feel and your moods. Please state to what extent a particular mood characterises the way you feel now and also think back to what extent you think it characterised the way you felt at the time of the merger (1-4 months after the merger).

1. Please indicate on the scales where 1= I often feel this way
   2= I sometimes feel this way
   3= I rarely feel this way
   4= I never feel this way.

   NOW                          JUST AFTER
   THE MERGER

   1  2  3  4                      1  2  3  4
   □ □ □ □                          □ □ □ □
   1. I have nobody to talk to

   □ □ □ □                          □ □ □ □
   2. There is no one I can turn to

   □ □ □ □                          □ □ □ □
   3. It is difficult for me to make friends

2. Please indicate on the scales where 1=Never or A little of the time
   2=Some of the time
   3=A good part of the time
   4=Most of the time

   NOW                          JUST AFTER
   THE MERGER

   1  2  3  4                      1  2  3  4
   □ □ □ □                          □ □ □ □
   1. When there is change, I feel unhappy.

   □ □ □ □                          □ □ □ □
   2. When there is change, I feel depressed (down)

   □ □ □ □                          □ □ □ □
   3. When there is change, I feel nervous

   □ □ □ □                          □ □ □ □
   4. When there is change, I feel fidgety (uneasy)
3. Please indicate on the scales where 1 = Disagree strongly
   2 = Disagree
   3 = Agree
   4 = Agree Strongly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOW</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>1. Have you recently been able to concentrate on whatever you are doing?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>2. Have you recently been able to enjoy your normal day-to-day activities?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>3. Have you recently been able to face up to your problems?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>4. Have you recently been feeling reasonably happy all things considered?</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUST AFTER THE MERGER</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please indicate on the scales where 1=Completely false
   2=Mostly false
   3=Partly false
   4=Partly true
   5=Completely true.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOW</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>1. I try to get even when I’m angry with someone</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>2. When I am angry with someone, I take it out on whoever is around.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>3. When I hide my anger from others, I think about it for a long time.</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUST AFTER THE MERGER</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU
### i) Reversed questions:

- Part 2 Q2: items 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11
- Part 2 Q3: items 11, 12, 14, 15, 17

### ii) Items

#### Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal Intentions</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to change</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>9-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>15-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to change</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Part 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2
Interview Questions on Emotional Responses on Employees of Merging Banking Institutions
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ON EMOTIONAL RESPONSES ON EMPLOYEES OF MERGING BANKING INSTITUTIONS

1. When did you hear about the change?
2. From where did you hear about the change/merger?
3. Were you informed by the management? Who informed you?
4. What was your reaction when you first heard about the company to merge?
5. How do you feel about merging?
6. **Branch 1: The ability to perceive emotions**
   a. How do you feel at the time? Happy/anger/fear/sad/disgust/surprise
   b. What led up to the situation? (why?)
   c. How do you feel now? And why?
   d. How do you think others felt?
      i. at that time?
      ii. now?
7. **Branch 2: The ability to use emotions to facilitate thought**
   a. Did your emotions at that time change your thought?
8. **Branch 3: The ability to understand emotions**
   a. How do you analyse your emotions?
      i. at that time
      ii. now?
   b. What was the outcome by feeling that way?
9. **Branch 4: The ability to managing emotions**
   a. Were you able to manage your emotions at that time? E.g avoid feelings/reframe appraisals to reassure oneself?
   b. Was this an important factor where you are able to manage your emotion?
   c. Do you think how you manage your emotion enable to help you manage your emotions?
10. How are you affected by the change? job satisfaction/withdrawal intention/working with new members/supervisors/different dept
11. To whom do you express your concern about the change?
12. Do you understand why the organization merger?
13. Is there anything that you are not happy/satisfied with the new structure/systems/etc?
14. What is your reaction/feelings/emotion toward BIBD after 10 months merging?
APPENDIX 3
Training Content
Appendix 3: Two-day Emotional Intelligence Training Programme

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE TRAINING
16 – 17 October 2006

Day 1
Monday – 16/10/2006

9.00 – 9.15 Registration
The training session began with registration.

9.15 – 9.45 Introduction
The training began by the facilitator asking participants to introduce themselves as most had not met each other before. This was also part of the icebreaking session. The facilitator also introduced herself including details of her educational attainments and work experience. This helped to boost the confidence of the participants.

The facilitator also briefly discussed her current research so the participants understood why they were taking part. The aims and objectives of the research were also underlined. The main idea was for the participants to understand the significance of the training and its benefits to the organization and those taking part.

A discussion on the general topic on merger was delivered in order to give a clear understanding of the common psychological effects of mergers on employees. The topic was explained at this early stage so that the participants would feel comfortable and able to participate in the workshops.

9.45 – 11.00 Collect Baseline Measures
The baseline measures were collected by asking the training participants to complete the questionnaires and MSCEIT. First the attitude and responses to change questionnaires were administered and took about 15 minutes to complete.

The MSCEIT was then distributed to the participants. Each participant was given a set of the MSCEIT which comprised the answer sheet and the MSCEIT booklet containing a set of questions on emotional intelligence. Forty-five minutes were allocated to complete the test, although some participants were able to finish the test before the maximum time.

11.00 – 11.30 Emotional Intelligence Lecture
A concise lecture on emotional intelligence was delivered. This gave participants a generic
understanding of emotional intelligence. The first part of the lecture was about individual differences and understanding individuals through personality and emotional intelligence. The lecture then looked at the concept of emotional intelligence in more detail.

11.30 – 12.00 Recognising Facial Displays (Workshop 1)
After the lecture, an exercise on enhancing the ability to recognize facial displays was conducted. This exercise, developed by Paul Ekman and called the Micro Expression Training Tool (METT), had as its aim an understanding of the emotions displayed through facial expression. Participants were required to do the exercise individually. The exercise looked at micro expressions where even the owners of the emotions are sometimes not aware that they are displaying facial reactions. The exercise began with a pre-test given to the training participants. After looking at several pictures they were asked to guess the emotions on the faces in each picture which were sad, happy, contemptuous, surprised, angry, fearful or disgusted. The participants were then asked to count the number of correct guesses. The next stage was the training session itself in which participants were given training in how to read the emotions displayed by each picture. Both movement and sound were displayed during this training session. For example, an expression of contempt is shown when only half of the mouth moves sideways. A practice test was then given. Later, the participants were required to do a post-test to see whether they had developed their skill in recognising others’ facial expressions. As a result of the exercise, some of the participants had developed their ability and skill in perceiving other people’s facial displays.

12.00 – 12.30 Break
A short break was then allowed to restore energy and enthusiasm for the next session. The recess also gave the participants an opportunity to socialize with employees from their former company.

12.30 – 12.45 Introduction on Interpersonal Relationships
This session concentrated on the idea of interpersonal relationships. The topic examined the benefits and implications of good interpersonal relationships for the individual well-being, job performance and the organization overall. Being human we are highly social creatures thus it is important to be connected to others.

12.45 – 2.45 Group Exercise (Workshop 2)
A group exercise based on the previous interpersonal relationships was then conducted. For this exercise, participants were asked to form groups of five or six, with at least one representative from each former organization in each group so that participants could share their experiences and ideas with their new officemates. The objective of this exercise was to develop an awareness of the contribution made by respectful relationships in the
workplace and by maintaining valuable interpersonal relationships both inside and outside the workplace. Each group was given the task of discussing healthy interpersonal relationships. The exercise required each group to create an action plan to facilitate their commitment to enhancing interpersonal relationships. The time allocated for this exercise was 30 minutes. At the end of the session, each group had to give a ten-minute presentation of their work using an overhead projector (OHP), flip chart or PowerPoint show, followed by a question-and-answer session.

2.45 – 3.00 Debriefing
After the presentations, the facilitator summarised the overall idea of maintaining good interpersonal relationships and their contribution to the workplace, as well as summarizing the workplace experiences shared by each group.

Day 2
Tuesday – 17/10/2006

9.00 – 9.15 Registration
The training session began with registration.

9.15 – 9.30 Recap and Introduction on Emotional Self-Awareness
Before the second day’s training session began, the facilitator reviewed what had been done on the first day of training. Then a brief introduction to emotional self-awareness was given. According to Bar-On (2002), emotional self-awareness is a requisite for the successful development of other areas. This skill aims to provide a deep understanding of one’s own emotions and strengths and thus develop individual’s emotional abilities.

9.30 – 11.45 Group Exercise (Workshop 3)
For this exercise, participants were again asked to form groups made up of members from the different banks, though participants were asked to find different group members than before in order to give them the opportunity to get to know everyone in the training session. Each group was given an exercise the purpose of which was to connect with emotions that drive unproductive behaviours. At the end of the exercise, the desired outcome was the ability to understand how emotions drive behaviours and to recognize cues that emotions have changed.

Each group was given 30 minutes to complete the exercise which included recalling a significant situation in which they regretted acting or responding in the way that they had. Participants were asked to discuss their feelings during that situation and explain their bodily responses (for example sweating or folding their arms) related to their emotions at
that time. Later participants were asked what their reactions would be were they to experience the same situation in the future. At the end of the discussion, each group was asked to give a presentation based on a common experience using an OHP or flip chart or through role play. Overall, the exercises were based on participants’ experiences in the workplace.

11.45 – 12.00  Debriefing
After the presentations the facilitator summarized what the exercise was all about. The facilitator also emphasized positive emotional feedback when facing a situation which triggers an emotional outbreak.

12.00 – 12.30  Break
A short break was given to participants to avoid fatigue and exhaustion.

12.30 – 12.45  Introduction on Impulse Control (Workshop 4)
The fourth workshop was about controlling or resisting harmful impulses. People often tend to react before thinking which causes loss of self-control and explosive and unpredictable behaviour. The aim of this session was to instil positive thinking in participants.

12.45 – 2.00  Group Exercise
For this exercise, participants were shown an extract from a video of the Shakespeare play *King Lear*, Act I, scene 1, lines 37–188. The story involves the king’s intention to divide his possessions between his three daughters and goes on to show how the king regrets being unable to control his impulses which causes him to make the wrong decision. Each participant was given a copy of the transcript so that they were able to follow and understand the story. After being shown the video, participants were asked to answer questions based on the information provided. The first part of the exercise was to reflect on the story in the play, and decide whether the characters were acting impulsively or not. In the second part of the exercise participants were required to reflect on their own experiences of impulsive behaviour. The participants were not required to give a presentation but rather to share from their group desk their common experiences.

2.00 – 2.15  Debriefing
After the exercise, the facilitator summarized impulse control behaviour based on the experiences of the participants.

2.15 – 2.30  Reflections and Feedback and End of Training
Before the two-day training session ended, the facilitator provided an overview of what had been covered in the training and exercises. The facilitator also shared her observations of
the participants. For example, an ‘us and them’ culture was seen at the very beginning of
the training session. Participants tended to sit and socialize with colleagues from their
former organizations. However, at the end of the two-day session, participants seemed to
be more relaxed, sociable and communicating freely with everyone regardless of their
different backgrounds or which company they came from. The facilitator also closed the
training session with the comment ‘one company one vision’.
APPENDIX 4
Workshop Exercises
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise</th>
<th>Emotional Self-Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To connect with the emotions that drive unproductive behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>To be more in touch with changing emotions, build understanding of how emotions drive behaviors, recognize cues that emotions have changed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions:**

1. Recall a significant situation (as recent as possible) in which you regret acting or responding in the way you did. Briefly describe the situation in words below.

2. What were your feelings in the above situation? E.g. fearful, defensive, anxious, happy, embarrassed in a positive way (e.g. someone paid you a compliment and you were glad he or she did and felt it was appropriately done) or embarrassed in a negative way (e.g. you were publicly insulted). Other feelings?

3. Why did you feel that way?

4. How did you respond to these feelings you identified above?
   a) Withdrew completely from the situation
   b) Stayed in the situation but tried to steer the interaction in a different direction
   c) Became verbally or physically abusive
   d) Disparaged the other person or people
   e) Tried to out-talk the other person or people
   f) Other ways you responded (please state in space below)

5. How was your body responding while you were feeling in the way you indicated?
   a) Folded arms
   b) Clenched jaws
   c) Sweat-lip, brow, under arms, scalp, palms
   d) Twitching
   e) Tapping foot
   f) Drumming fingers
   g) Stomach clenched
   h) Other ways you can identified

6. Identify how you will act differently in the future when you notice the reactions from step 4 or your physical cues from step 5 above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Exercise</strong></th>
<th><strong>Impulse Control</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>To examine the impact of impulsiveness from a fresh perspective and to show how impulsive urges can have disastrous consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td>New perspective on impulsiveness by looking at it through the lens of fictional history. Increased awareness of the impacts of impulsiveness. Utilize the learning to improve impulse control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**An Overview of King Lear Act, Scene 1**

There are three male roles – King Lear, the Earl of Kent and Albany Cornwall. There are three female roles – Goneril, Cordelia and Regan.

King Lear is in his eighties and appears to be in good health. Knowing that he is eighty he is ‘crawling towards death’, he decides to divide his kingdom now to prevent disputes after his death. He has already decided to divide it into three parts, one for each daughter - Goneril, Regan and Cordelia. King Lear has a map that divides the country into thirds, reflecting his decision. However instead of sticking with his plan, he declares on the spot that whichever daughter professes to love him the most will get the largest segment of his kingdom.

He expects his youngest daughter Cordelia to win this contest. Cordelia has always been his favourite and she is completely devoted to her father. The other daughters are opportunistic and self serving. His plan however backfires. The two older sisters tell bare face lies. They profess profound love for their father. Cordelia, disgusted by her sisters’ hypocrisy, decides not to play this stupid game. King Lear then responds by disinheriting his daughter, Cordelia and is then forced to divide his kingdom between his two eldest daughters Goneril and Regan.

The Earl of Kent, Lear’s trusted advisor loves the King and is completely loyal to him. Kent tries to intervene by telling Lear that he’s engaging in hideous rashness’. For his insubordination, Lear banishes the Earl of Kent from his kingdom. Lear should have listened to the Earl of Kent’s advice:

> “By disinheriting Cordelia, Lear sets his tragedy in motion: the daughters who pledged their undying love turn on him, take away his authority, and drive his entourage from the palace and he goes mad. By the end of the play all Lear has left is Cordelia’s love. And Kent’s love”. (Whitney & Packer, 2001, p.81).”
Questions

1. King Lear was in a very emotional state. He was upset about Cordelia’s response. The Earl of Kent was very emotional about King Lear’s action. Do you think that King Lear acted impulsively?

2. Was Cordelia’s decision to basically ignore her father’s request a question of impulsiveness (the impulse to be in stark contrast to her sister)?

3. Were the Earl of Kent’s comments to the King measured or rash?

4. Was the Earl of Kent acting impulsively by intervening at that moment in the way in which he did?

5. How would you have advised the Earl of Kent to respond? When should he do it? What should he say?

6. What lessons do you think could be learned from both Lear’s and Kent’s behaviour?

7. As a group share examples from your own lives when you reacted impulsively and would have benefitted from a more thoughtful and strategically sound approach.

8. Individually consider what trigger your impulsive behaviour. Is that part of a pattern for you? What could you do in the future to manage your impulsiveness?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise :</th>
<th>Interpersonal Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose   :</td>
<td>To develop a keen awareness of the significant value that respectful relationships contribute to the workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome   :</td>
<td>To expand awareness of the significance of interpersonal relationships for working in teams; to develop recognition of healthy goals and boundaries for intact teams, and to lay a foundation for expanding the skills of developing and maintaining robust interpersonal relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions**

1. As a group develop your own definition of healthy interpersonal relationship.

2. List the pros and cons of strengthening the interpersonal relationships in your team. Try to be honest as possible.

3. As a group discuss what it takes to maintain valuable interpersonal relationships both inside and outside the workplace. You might want to consider what challenges you may experience in some of your valuable relationships due to work demands. What will you need to do to maintain these relationships?

4. As a team create an action plan that applies to the team as a whole in order to facilitate individuals’ commitment to enhancing interpersonal relationships.

5. On your own, reflect on the work of your team in this exercise and what it means to you individually.
APPENDIX 5
Samples of MSCEIT
METT: Facial Expressions

SURPRISE

SAD

HAPPY

ANGER

DISGUST

FEAR

CONTEMPT
APPENDIX 6

Sample of Data Analysis
Stage 1: Sample of Transcribed Interview

- **What was your reaction when you first heard about the company to merge?**
  How can I recall this ah? It’s difficult to recall. Where was I at that time. I didn’t read the newspapers kali. I knew it next day day kali. Of course shocking. IBB was previously our competitor. Now we have to merge. How things are going to be.. you know .. basically mcm ana kitani punya faith.. Are we going to be taken kah. retrenched kah. I think it’s like that. That the first reaction lah. And then.. previously how is everybody going to cope it. Emotionally how are we going to merge the people?.

After the merging 1st july..prior to that we were sort of..training, testing system at IBB headquaters. Personally I was beginning to accept it. Pembayaran sorang2. if you want to accept change, then it happens. If you don’t want to accept change, repellent. Personally, to me I accept change. You accept the people. It was good. Masa prior to 1st July atu kami training sama2, test system sama. So basically, we were accepting each other. I would say. Environmentally we were working it out together.

- **How do you feel about merging?**
  Dulu Branch manger, now assistant manager..ada beza? Ha..ha…I was kana transferred here as asst. manager. I don’t know what to say. At the end you will find me accepting the fate that has been given to me. Masa mula2 sekali? I didn’t feel at all. To me..when I was transferred kemari as asst, manager. I accepted it. We understand IBB officers. Their salary was a little bit higher than us. We know that MD pun ada membagitau nda sama kan. So, the responsibility atu shd be given to somebody who has higher paid. So I accept it. But I told my boss that walaupun I am from IDBB, jgn ragui my commitment to you. I am ready to work with her..I am a positive person… hahaha..

In terms of salary scale after merger. There was an increment. Naik lah. But this part I was not happy. I was only given grade 1. Suppose kan, I was an officer dari tahun 2000, that was not. I am expecting a little bit higher than that. Due to the responsibility you are holding. I don’t ..it’s not the merger punya fault. I would say. Before the merger, when I was in IDBB. I was officer 1.. we have different grade. When we are here, their grade range is different from us. So my range atu goes to 1. sedangkan I was bank officer grade B sudah at that time. When I masuk kemari, grade 1. that’s the part what I was not happy at that time. Of course once your grade is up, your salary is higher. My grade atu mcm kana jadikan I am junior officers semula pulang. So I told that my boss pulang. I said it’s not that I am happy with the appraisal you are doing. It’s is over expectation dari apa yg kita bagi. I think it’s the previous. Not merger punya fault. It’s because of the salary scale atu terpaksa tah diurang turun kan my grade. Job status lah. Tapi now, I follow it. Mana saja lah. After kana naik kan salary December atu lah.

-deleted-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>Effect of merger on job</th>
<th>Early stage of merger</th>
<th>Ten months after merger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>IDBB 12 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Branch manager to asst branch manager</td>
<td>Shocking. How things are going to be...you know...unexpectedly. Basically we questioned about how our faith is going to be? Are we being taken over, or will there be retrenched?</td>
<td>After having training and testing systems prior to merger (1st July), personally I began to accept it (merging). It’s individual’s upbringing. If you want to accept change then it happens. If you don’t want to accept change, repellent. Personally, I accept change. You accept the people. it was good. Basically, we were accepting each other. I would say. Environmentally, we were working it out together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce job status</td>
<td>Post merger – chaotic. They were moving people unexpectedly. Handover was not done properly...it happens so fast. (sound upset)</td>
<td>I was being transferred. I am accepting the situation. I am coping with it. At that time I was on maternity leave, anyway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loyal could be one. Most of those who were crying had been with IDBB since the first time it open. That’s why people don’t want to leave. No choice could be one thing. There are many jobless people. it is difficult to simply change job. Now I feel stable with what I have. Environmentally, surrounding. Except salary wise, but you can’t be bothered. My commitment is not affected.</td>
<td>How I reduce stress? Keep mouth shut. I print that out...that ‘things that I am not happy’. Keep it shut first. HQ has lots of office politics. Too much to hear. Sometimes it is better not to hear things. Of course there are unhappiness...attitude wise. IBB/IDBB is not the issue. The pressure is the same. I think. So put away office politics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many feel like leaving, but can’t due to financial commitment</td>
<td>I am a strict person when come to work. I told my boss. I can’t be bothered about others. I am very optimistic person. I guess so. I told my boss that I am an open minded person. I have somebody to talk to. My boss is a good listener. People accept you the way I see it. If I bothered too much seeing what people think about me...I am ready to move on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You could have hearing things...IBB..IDBB..so and so..I don’t care. We are...give and take here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alhamdulillah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I follow it. What ever. After increase in salary, December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am happy with the situation. I am happy with what I have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Compare to IDBB, we were pushed hard by the mgt. difficult to voice out. Now more relax. Alhamdulillah in terms of working with the staff here, I have no problem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stage 3: Emerging Themes from Transcribed interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed emotions responses</th>
<th>Negative responses</th>
<th>Positive responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| And emotional responses  
  • ‘Worried about future career’  
  • ‘Shocking news’  
  • ‘Surprised news’  
  • ‘Afraid’  
  • ‘More changes and challenges to face’  
  • ‘I was confused’  
  • ‘Puzzled’  
  • ‘Apprehensive’  
  • ‘Anxious’  
  • ‘Mixed feelings, worried but excited’ | Negative responses:  
  • ‘I have been downgraded’  
  • ‘I don’t feel good’  
  • ‘We were reluctant to make a move’  
  • ‘I’m angry’  
  • ‘Sad’  
  • ‘Feel discontent’  
  • ‘Not comfortable’  
  • ‘Disappointed’  
  • ‘Cautious when expressing thoughts about merger’  
  • ‘Too much bottleneck’  
  • ‘I see biases’  
  • ‘I feel stress’  
  • ‘We are different’  
  • ‘We have different work commitment’  
  • ‘Felt like force marriage’  
  • ‘I’m not happy’ | Positive responses:  
  • ‘Satisfied’  
  • ‘Happy’  
  • ‘I have financial commitment, so I stay’  
  • ‘Can’t survive outside’  
  • ‘I’m not complaining’  
  • ‘Take it (merger) as challenge’  
  • ‘Follow management decision’  
  • ‘This management is better than before’  
  • ‘Don’t want to leave’  
  • ‘I have been promoted’  
  • ‘Welfare is good’  
  • ‘I accept change’ |
## Stage 4: Reasons identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mixed responses</th>
<th>Negative and resistance</th>
<th>Positive and support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Array of questions from employees:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Why merge?’</td>
<td>• Frustration</td>
<td>• Belief in God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘What will happen to our welfare?’</td>
<td>• Unhappiness</td>
<td>• Have faith in religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Who will lead us?’</td>
<td>• Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>• Comparing experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Who will be my boss?’</td>
<td>• Unfairness</td>
<td>• Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Who will be working with me?’</td>
<td>• Culture clash</td>
<td>• Job commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Are we going to be taken over?’</td>
<td>• Violation of psychological contract</td>
<td>• Better Welfare and Privilege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Will there be retrenchment?’</td>
<td>• Job insecurity</td>
<td>• Job secured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Longer work environment
- Financial commitment
- No better job outside
- Positive behaviour – Listening, physical activities, personality
- Trust
- Support – emotional and perceived
- Length of service
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