

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](http://ScienceDirect)

# Personality and Individual Differences

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/paid](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/paid)

## Internalizing emotions: Self-determination as an antecedent of emotional intelligence



Dominique Perreault<sup>a</sup>, Lisa Mask<sup>b</sup>, Melinda Morgan<sup>a</sup>, Céline M. Blanchard<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> School of Psychology, University of Ottawa, 136 Jean-Jacques Lussier St., Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5, Canada

<sup>b</sup> Department of Psychology, Bishop's University, 2600 College St., Sherbrooke, QC J1M 1Z7, Canada

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 30 September 2013

Received in revised form 14 January 2014

Accepted 25 January 2014

Available online 21 February 2014

#### Keywords:

Self-determination

Emotional intelligence

Psychological well-being

### ABSTRACT

An extensive body of literature indicates that people differ in the extent to which they attend to, process, and regulate emotions. The present research sought to build on this knowledge by examining whether general self-determination (GSD) could account for individual variation in emotional intelligence (EI) and psychological well-being (PWB). A simple and multiple mediation model using bootstrap analyses tested these relationships in a sample of students (Study 1,  $N = 283$ ) and workers (Study 2,  $N = 265$ ). Results supported the hypothesized mediating role of EI in the relationship between GSD and PWB across both studies. When the inter-related facets of EI were considered separately, indirect effects emerged for mood regulation/optimism and social skills across both studies as well as for utilization of emotions, albeit negatively, in Study 2. Our findings support and extend past work on the antecedents of EI and have important implications for human functioning across a variety of settings.

© 2014 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. Open access under [CC BY license](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

### 1. Introduction

A wealth of scientific evidence indicates that people vary in the extent to which they use emotion-related information in their day to day lives. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2000) refer to this capacity as emotional intelligence (EI) which they formally define as “the ability to perceive and express emotion, assimilate emotion in thought, understand and reason with emotion, and regulate emotion in the self and in others” (p. 396). To these authors, EI is therefore a set of abilities and should be assessed with maximum performance measures much like traditional intelligence tests (e.g., Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002; Petrides, 2011; Petrides & Furnham, 2000a). A distinct but complementary conceptualization of this construct (Schutte, Malouff, & Bhullar, 2009) defines EI as a set self-perceptions, dispositions, and motivations that are affective in nature and that share some common variance with major personality traits (Petrides, Pita, & Kokkinaki, 2007; Petrides, Pérez-González, & Furnham, 2007). Unlike the ability-model, this trait model of EI captures the inherent subjectivity underlying one's emotional experience and should therefore be assessed via self-report measures (e.g., Petrides & Furnham, 2000a; Petrides & Furnham, 2000b; Schutte et al., 1998).

Notwithstanding these divergent operationalizations, EI has emerged as a viable and important construct in the literature evidenced by the accumulation of handbooks, book chapters, review papers, and meta-analyses on the subject. For instance, those who score high on measures of EI perform better at work (e.g., O'Boyle, Humphrey, Pollack, Hawver, & Story, 2011) and in school (e.g., Petrides, Frederickson, & Furnham, 2004); they also report more positive relationships (e.g., Mavroveli, Petrides, Rieffe, & Bakker, 2007) and better physical health (e.g. Costa, Petrides, & Tillmann, 2014). However, it's the enhancement of emotional health and well-being wherein lies the construct's greatest potentiality and interest. For instance, EI is negatively related to several indices of psychopathology (Malterer, Glass, & Newman, 2008) such as personality disorders (Petrides, Pérez-González, et al., 2007) and anxiety disorders (Summerfeldt, Kloosterman, Antony, McCabe, & Parker, 2011) as well as self-harm (Mikolajczak, Petrides, & Hurry, 2009) and externalizing behaviors in adolescents (Downey, Johnston, Hansen, Birney, & Stough, 2010). In non-clinical samples, EI correlates positively with a variety of well-being indices such as life satisfaction, happiness, optimism, self-esteem, and decreased negative affect (for reviews see Brackett, Rivers, & Salovey, 2011; Petrides, 2011) with a meta-analytic correlation of .34 (Martins, Ramalho, & Morin, 2010).

But why do some people attend to, process, and regulate their emotions with greater ease than others? In other words, what accounts for the individual variation in EI? Consistent with the trait-

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 (613) 562 5800x4886; fax: +1 (613) 562 5147.

E-mail address: [cblancha@uottawa.ca](mailto:cblancha@uottawa.ca) (C.M. Blanchard).

model of EI (e.g., Petrides, Pita, et al., 2007), higher-order personality factors are purported to shape people's affective self-perceptions. For instance, trait EI mediated the relationship between each of the Big Five personality traits and self-reported mental health and well-being (e.g., Johnson, Batey, & Holdsworth, 2009). Other research suggests that trait EI may stem from dispositional differences in quality of attention. Schutte and Malouff (2011) observed that the relationship between mindfulness and various indicators of subjective well-being (i.e., positive affect, negative affect, and life satisfaction) were mediated by trait EI. Significant indirect effects for a specific subcomponent of EI, namely mood regulation have also been documented. For example, Kämpfe and Mitte (2010) observed that mood repair accounted for the relationship between extraversion and life satisfaction as well as between extraversion and happiness. Other research found cognitive reappraisal of emotion to partially explain the relationship between secure attachment and well-being (Karreman & Vingerhoets, 2012). Together, these findings suggest that the ability to perceive and manage one's emotions is partly due to stable individual differences such as one's personality, attachment style (i.e., secure attachment), and mindfulness. In the present research, we investigated self-determination as a plausible antecedent of EI that contributes to psychological well-being (Bhullar, Schutte, & Malouff, 2013).

At the core of self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) lays a motivational perspective of the self which is endowed with integrative capacities toward increasing organization and coherence (Ryan, 1993). The expression of this coalescence is reflected in the degree of perceived autonomy or self-determination underlying the regulation of action. For instance, behaviors which are initiated out of inherent interest and enjoyment for their own sake (intrinsic regulation) are experienced as the most self-determined followed by reasons to act in accordance with one's deepest values (integrated regulation), and then by personal identification with the activity (identified regulation). However, not all behaviors are experienced as authentic and freely chosen; many are initiated out of pressure and obligation to bolster or protect one's sense of self-worth (introjected regulation), to comply with external demands (external regulation) or without any intention (amotivation). These behaviors are experienced as controlling and coercive because the underlying self operates in a fragmented and compartmentalized manner. These six styles of behavior regulation can be combined into a single index, whereby higher scores reflect greater self-determination which is linked to healthier functioning and well-being (e.g., see Deci & Ryan, 2008 for a review).

The integrative capacity for effective and adaptive self-regulation of action is also reflected in the manner with which one meets their moment to moment experiences. According to Hodgins and Knee (2002), greater self-determination endows a person with more openness and less defensiveness toward potentially threatening and difficult events. For instance, when primed with self-determination, people report less desire to escape and engage in fewer self-serving attributions in response to failure (Hodgins, Yacko, & Gottlieb, 2006). Autonomously-oriented individuals also exhibit better emotional regulation and integration of negative affect after viewing a traumatic film clip (Weinstein & Hodgins, 2009) and retrospectively recalling negative life events and identities (Weinstein, Deci, & Ryan, 2011). However, little is known on the skills utilized by those with greater self-determination which promote effective assimilation of emotionally-laden experiences into a more unified and cohesive self. We propose that these skills are attributed in part to the inter-related abilities of EI.

The objective of the present research was to investigate individual variation in EI by examining the determining role of self-determination which was assessed at the dispositional or general level indicative of a more enduring motivational orientation toward the environment (Guay, Mageau, & Vallerand, 2003). To this end,

the inter-related abilities of EI were hypothesized to mediate the relationship between general self-determination (GSD) and psychological well-being (PWB). These relationships were initially tested with a sample of undergraduate students (Study 1) and then replicated with a sample of working adults (Study 2).

## 2. Study 1

### 2.1. Method

#### 2.1.1. Participants and procedure

A sample of 283 undergraduate students of which the majority were female ( $n = 226$ ) took part voluntarily in this two-phase study ( $M_{\text{age}} = 18.95$  years,  $SD_{\text{age}} = 1.75$ ). Participants were recruited from a campus subject pool and received course credit in exchange for their participation. Measures of GSD and EI were completed at the beginning of the semester (Phase 1) while a measure of PWB was completed three months later (Phase 2).

#### 2.1.2. Measures

GSD was assessed with the 18-item General Motivation Scale (GMS; Guay et al., 2003). The six subtypes of motivation proposed by Deci and Ryan (1985) are each represented by three items. Respondents rated the extent to which each item (e.g., "...because I like making interesting discoveries"; intrinsic regulation) corresponded to their reasons as to "why they do things in general" on a scale from 1 (*does not correspond to my reasons at all*) to 7 (*corresponds exactly to my reasons*). Internal consistency estimates ranged from .68 to .84 across subscales. Mean subscale ratings were combined to form a GSD index whereby higher scores indicate greater GSD:  $+3 * (\text{intrinsic}) + 2 * (\text{integrated}) + 1 * (\text{identified}) - 1 * (\text{introjected}) - 2 * (\text{external}) - 3 * (\text{amotivation})$ . Cronbach's alpha for the entire scale was .81.

EI was measured using the Assessing Emotions Scale (AES; Schutte et al., 1998) where responses were rated from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). As to its structure, some suggest the existence of a single global EI factor (e.g., Schutte, Malouff, Simunek, McKenley, & Hollander, 2002) while others propose the existence of four sub-factors (e.g., Petrides & Furnham, 2000a; Saklofske, Austin, & Minski, 2003). Cognizant of this debate, EI was represented by a global EI factor derived by averaging scores across all 33 items as well as by four sub-factors derived by averaging scores across each subscale's respective items. The subscales were derived from the work of Petrides and Furnham (2000a). Internal consistency estimates ranged from .72 to .84 across subscales ( $\alpha = .91$  for the entire scale).

PWB was assessed using Ryff's (1989) short form Scales of Psychological well-being (SPWB) which tap six different facets of positive psychological functioning. Responses were rated on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) and then averaged across all 18 items to represent PWB ( $\alpha = .84$ ).

### 2.2. Results

#### 2.2.1. Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 1. As predicted, positive relationships emerged between GSD, EI, and PWB. On the bivariate level, age did not correlate with any variable. However, gender differences did emerge for certain facets of EI with women scoring higher than men on 'appraisal of emotions' and 'social skills'. Regardless of these observations, both gender and age were controlled for in subsequent analyses for theoretical reasons (e.g., Mavroveli et al., 2007; Petrides & Furnham, 2000b).

**Table 1**  
Descriptive statistics for Study 1 and Study 2.

| Construct                              | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5       | 6       | 7      | 8     | 9      |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|--------|-------|--------|
| <i>M</i>                               | 8.69   | 4.96   | 5.04   | 4.84   | 5.04    | 4.84    | 5.21   | 18.95 |        |
| <i>SD</i>                              | 6.37   | 0.64   | 0.8    | 0.89   | 0.71    | 0.86    | 0.66   | 1.75  |        |
| 1. General self-determination (GSD)    | –      | 0.35** | 0.42** | 0.23** | 0.28**  | 0.12*   | 0.35** | 0.11  | 0.06   |
| 2. Global emotional intelligence (GEI) | 0.31** | –      | 0.78** | 0.85** | 0.87**  | 0.56**  | 0.55** | 0.01  | 0.1    |
| 3. Mood regulation-optimism (MR-O)     | 0.37** | 0.76** | –      | 0.48** | 0.54**  | 0.34**  | 0.59** | 0.03  | –0.07  |
| 4. Appraisal of Emotions (AE)          | 0.21** | 0.81** | 0.44** | –      | 0.68**  | 0.36**  | 0.41** | –0.04 | 0.18** |
| 5. Social skills (SS)                  | 0.24** | 0.88** | 0.56** | 0.62** | –       | 0.39**  | 0.46** | 0.03  | 0.18** |
| 6. Utilization of emotions (UE)        | 0.11   | 0.56** | 0.31** | 0.27** | 0.43**  | –       | 0.17** | 0.01  | –0.05  |
| 7. Psychological well-being (PWB)      | 0.49** | 0.49** | 0.58** | 0.37** | 0.41**  | 0.02    | –      | 0.01  | 0.01   |
| 8. Age                                 | 0.2**  | –0.13* | 0      | –0.1   | –0.16** | –0.18** | 0.09   | –     | –      |
| 9. Gender                              | 0      | 0.19** | 0.07   | 0.16** | 0.21**  | 0.13**  | –0.05  | –     | –      |
| <i>M</i>                               | 11.60  | 3.60   | 3.76   | 3.41   | 3.69    | 3.45    | 4.69   | 32.93 |        |
| <i>SD</i>                              | 7.46   | .46    | .55    | .63    | .52     | .72     | .57    | 12.32 |        |

Note 1: \**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01.

Note 2: Descriptive statistics for Study 1 are above the diagonal and those for Study 2 are below the diagonal.

### 2.2.2. Mediation analyses

The hypothesized mediating role of EI in the relationship between GSD and PWB was tested using the SPSS macro, INDIRECT (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). The macro relies on the resampling method of bootstrapping; a procedure that provides an estimate of the indirect effect in the population by resampling the dataset *k* times in order to obtain the indirect effect's sampling distribution and confidence intervals (CI). An estimate is considered statistically significant if its 95% CI does not include zero.

Testing a simple mediation model, a direct effect emerged for GSD on PWB (*B* = .019, *p* < .001) as did an indirect effect through global EI with a point estimate of .0177, 95% CI [.0111, .0254]. The magnitude of this indirect effect was represented by an index of mediation (Preacher & Kelley, 2011) which was equal to .171. Thus, for every 1 *SD* increase in GSD, PWB would increase by .171 *SDs* through global EI. Effect size was estimated using Kappa<sup>2</sup>; a ratio of the obtained estimate over the maximum possible estimate of the indirect effect (Preacher & Kelley, 2011). In this case, Kappa<sup>2</sup> = .18. Overall, GSD accounted for 33% of the variance in PWB both directly and indirectly through EI, *B* = .037, *p* < .001, *F*(4,278) = 34.86, *p* < .001.

To understand which facet of EI accounts for the relationship between GSD and PWB, a multiple mediation model (MMM) was tested with each of the four sub-factors of EI. These results are reported in Table 2. Indirect effects emerged for 'mood regulation-optimism' and 'social skills'. Pairwise contrasts revealed that the former was greater than the latter. The index of mediation for each

indirect effect indicates that for every 1 *SD* increase in GSD, PWB would increase by .188 and .043 *SDs* through 'mood regulation-optimism' (Kappa<sup>2</sup> = .20) and 'social skills' (Kappa<sup>2</sup> = .05), respectively. In the MMM, GSD accounted for 40% of the variation in PWB both directly and indirectly through the four facets of EI, *F*(7,275) = 25.80, *p* < .001.

## 3. Study 2

### 3.1. Method

#### 3.1.1. Participants, measures and procedure

This community sample was comprised of 265 working adults recruited from multiple work environments using a snowballing strategy, of which 46% were employed in the private sector and the remaining 54 % were employed in the public sector. The majority were women (*n* = 184) and the sample ranged from 18 to 58 years (*M* = 32.93, *SD* = 12.32). Participants took part in this cross-sectional study voluntarily and were invited to complete a questionnaire comprised of the same self-report measures described in Study 1 with the exception of the SPWB for which a mid-length version of the scale was used whereby each factor was represented by nine items instead of three (GMS:  $\alpha$ s ranged from .66 to .84 across subscales, with a Cronbach's alpha for the entire scale of .82; AES:  $\alpha$ s ranged from .69 to .81 across subscales and was equal to .88 for the entire scale; SPWB:  $\alpha$  = .92 for the entire scale).

**Table 2**  
Indirect effects of GSD on PWB through EI for Study 1 and Study 2.

|                         | Study 1                 |           |                          |           | Study 2                 |           |                          |           |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|
|                         | Product of coefficients |           | Bootstrapping BCa 95% CI |           | Product of coefficients |           | Bootstrapping BCa 95% CI |           |
|                         | Point estimate          | <i>SE</i> | <i>LL</i>                | <i>UL</i> | Point estimate          | <i>SE</i> | <i>LL</i>                | <i>UL</i> |
| <i>Indirect effects</i> |                         |           |                          |           |                         |           |                          |           |
| MR-O                    | .0195                   | .0040     | .0125                    | .0282     | .0111                   | .0025     | .0070                    | .0170     |
| AE                      | .0022                   | .0017     | –.0007                   | .0061     | .0016                   | .0010     | .0000                    | .0041     |
| SS                      | .0045                   | .0022     | .0009                    | .0097     | .0033                   | .0015     | .0010                    | .0068     |
| UE                      | –.0012                  | .0010     | –.0041                   | .0001     | –.0024                  | .0012     | –.0051                   | –.0005    |
| TOTAL                   | .0250                   | .0042     | .0171                    | .0338     | .0137                   | .0027     | .0088                    | .0193     |
| <i>Contrasts</i>        |                         |           |                          |           |                         |           |                          |           |
| MR-O vs. AE             | .0173                   | .0042     | .0098                    | .0265     | .0095                   | .0027     | .0050                    | .0155     |
| MR-O vs. SS             | .0150                   | .0048     | .0065                    | .0258     | .0079                   | .0031     | .0023                    | .0148     |
| MR-O vs. UE             | .0207                   | .0042     | .0134                    | .0301     | .0135                   | .0029     | .0083                    | .0199     |
| AE vs. SS               | –.0023                  | .0033     | –.0092                   | .0039     | –.0017                  | .0020     | –.0061                   | .0018     |
| AE vs. UE               | .0034                   | .0021     | –.0001                   | .0080     | .0040                   | .0016     | .0014                    | .0077     |
| SS vs. UE               | .0057                   | .0026     | .0014                    | .0115     | .0057                   | .0022     | .0021                    | .0107     |

Note: BCa, bias corrected and accelerated; CI = confidence interval; *LL* = lower limit, *UL* = upper limit, *k* = 5000.

## 3.2. Results

### 3.2.1. Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics are reported in Table 1. Bivariate relationships between all constructs were consistent with predictions with the exception of ‘utilization of emotions’ which was not significantly related to GSD ( $r = .11$ ,  $p > .05$ ) nor to PWB ( $r = .02$ ,  $p > .05$ ). Age and gender emerged as significant correlates of GSD and EI. Consistent with the results of Study 1, women’s EI scores were higher than men’s on the global factor as well as on all facets of EI except ‘mood regulation-optimism’. Age and gender were controlled in subsequent analyses.

### 3.2.2. Mediation analyses

Testing a simple mediation model, a direct ( $B = .027$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and indirect effect with a point estimate of .0100, 95% CI [.0065, .0144] emerged for the global factor of EI with an index of mediation of .131 ( $Kappa^2 = .14$ ). GSD accounted for 36% of the variance in PWB both directly and indirectly through EI, ( $B = .037$ ,  $p < .001$ ),  $F(4,260) = 37.59$ ,  $p < .001$ .

Next, a MMM was tested, the results of which are reported in Table 2. Indirect effects emerged for all facets of EI with the exception of appraisal of emotions. Pairwise contrasts revealed that the indirect effect through ‘mood regulation-optimism’ was the greatest, followed by ‘social skills’ and then by ‘utilization of emotions’. The index of mediation for these indirect effects indicates that for every 1 SD increase in GSD, PWB would increase respectively by .146 and .043 SDs through ‘mood regulation-optimism’ ( $Kappa^2 = .16$ ) and ‘social skills’ ( $Kappa^2 = .05$ ). Contrarily, for every 1 SD increase in GSD, PWB would decrease by .031 SDs through ‘utilization of emotions’ ( $Kappa^2 = .04$ ). In sum, GSD accounted for 46% of the variation in PWB both directly and indirectly through the four factors of EI,  $F(7,257) = 33.19$ ,  $p < .001$ .

## 4. Discussion

The efficiency and effectiveness with which people can identify, process, and manage their emotions has important implications for their health and well-being. Part of this capacity is attributed to structural factors such as one’s personality (e.g., Johnson et al., 2009). Grounded in the framework of self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), we propose that part of this capacity stems from an underlying self that is motivational in nature, oriented toward greater organization and unity. At the behavioral level, this integrative propensity is manifested as general self-determination (GSD) which endows a person with greater openness and receptivity to their environment (Hodgins & Kneese, 2002). The present research tested this proposition by investigating GSD as a plausible antecedent that may account for individual variation in emotional intelligence (EI) thereby resulting in differing levels of psychological well-being (PWB). Data obtained from two different samples (students vs. workers) support these hypothesized relationships.

First, we examined the mediating role of global EI in the relationship between GSD and PWB. All paths in the model were significant and positive across both studies suggesting that greater GSD is associated with greater PWB, directly and indirectly through increased global EI. Therefore, the more people undertake their daily activities with a sense of volition and autonomy, the more skilled they become in responding to and using emotion-laden information in their day to day decision making processes thereby experiencing greater PWB. Consistent with the trait-model of EI, these findings imply that part of its variability is motivational in nature (Petrides, Pita, et al., 2007) and therefore suitable for intervention work. Indeed, people who underwent an ‘emotional

competence’ training program significantly improved their employability, their subjective well-being and the quality of their relationships post intervention (Kotsou, Nelis, Grégoire, & Mikolajczak, 2011; Nelis et al., 2011). Our findings suggest that intervention efforts might also benefit from targeting people’s GSD. For instance, participants primed with subtle reminders of GSD (i.e., choice, opportunity, freedom) evidenced better emotional integration following exposure to a traumatic film designed to induce negative affect (Weinstein & Hodgins, 2009) and after recalling difficult life events (Weinstein et al., 2011). Thus, participants undergoing an ‘emotional competence’ training program might experience accrued benefits if primed with GSD beforehand.

Second, we sought to better understand which of the four (if not all) inter-related abilities of EI accounted for the relationship between GSD and PWB. Both ‘mood regulation-optimism’ and ‘social skills’ emerged as significant mediators suggesting that effective and adaptive regulation of action is linked to effective and adaptive regulation of emotions, “within the self and in relation to other people” (Vesely, Siegling, & Saklofske, 2013, p. 222). These results emerged in both studies, lending strength to their effect and are in line with the work of Spence, Oades, and Caputi (2004) who noted that mood regulation-optimism was the strongest predictor of emotional well-being in a sample of students.

Our analyses also yielded one surprising result that warrants further discussion. Contrary to expectations, the indirect effect of ‘utilization of emotions’ (UE) was negative and significant in the worker sample but not in the student sample. To be specific, this result suggests that greater GSD is linked to greater UE which in turn is associated with lower levels of PWB. This particular subscale was designed to tap the extent to which one is capable of using emotional information in generating ideas and solving problems. Yet, a closer examination of its individual items ( $n = 4$ ) suggests some bias toward neutral and positive emotions (e.g., “When I am in a positive mood, solving problems is easy for me”). Theoretically, this seems incongruent with the open and non-defensive disposition of someone with greater GSD who is equipped at meeting and internalizing a broad spectrum of emotions, even difficult ones. Stated differently, all emotional inputs (positive and negative) represent potential sources of information in making decisions for someone who initiates their actions based on well-integrated values. Statistically, there’s also the possibility that UE acted as a suppressor in the model. When we tested a simple mediation model linking GSD to PWB through UE, the mediator was not statistically significant. However, when several MMM were tested that included UE, its indirect path became significant. This finding may also be inherent to the subscale itself as other studies noted similar problems (e.g. Gignac, Palmer, Manocha, & Stough, 2005).

A few limitations of the present research are worth noting. First, responses were limited to self-report data. Future work could examine these relationships using a motivational priming procedure and behavioral evidence of emotional integration and well-being (Hodgins et al., 2006). Second, Cronbach’s alphas were low ( $< .70$ ) for some of the subscales of the GMS in Study 1 and 2, an issue that has been reported by other researchers (Julien, Guay, Sénécal, & Poitras, 2009). However, the entire scale was used in the creation of GMS indexes whereby the reliability statistics were respectively .81 and .82. Third, the four-factor solution documented by Petrides and Furnham (2000a) for the AES did not emerge in our data. Attempts were made to keep our factor structure consistent with findings in the literature, but some of the items did not provide the same fit across our samples suggesting potential instability with respect to a four-factor solution. Future research is needed to help elucidate sample differences when examining sub-facets of EI with the AES. Fourth, the longitudinal



nature of Study 1 implies that factors other than GSD and EI assessed during Phase 1 influenced the reporting of PWB assessed at Phase 2. Future studies should include potential covariates of this relationship (e.g., personality factors).

Despite these limitations, findings from the present research contribute to a burgeoning literature on the antecedents of EI given the importance of EI for adaptive and healthy functioning. By investigating the motivational underpinning of EI, our findings lend credence to the growing interest in programs and workshops aimed at increasing EI. Moreover, the present research was grounded in self-determination theory; one of the most validated and comprehensive frameworks of human needs and motivation. Our results support the predictions of Hodgins and Knee (2002) by linking a motivational orientation with specific socio-emotional competencies which are conducive to better emotional integration and therefore enhanced PWB. By uncovering the emotional pathways by which GSD leads to better adjustment, future work might garner a better understanding of how people with varying motivational profiles cope with adversity (e.g., Amiot, Blanchard, & Gaudreau, 2008) across a variety of settings (e.g., school, work, sports).

## References

- Amiot, C. E., Blanchard, C. M., & Gaudreau, P. (2008). The self in change: A longitudinal investigation of coping and self-determination processes. *Self and Identity, 26*, 204–224. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15298860701580793>.
- Bhullar, N., Schutte, N. S., & Malouff, J. M. (2013). The nature of well-being: The roles of hedonic and eudaimonic processes and trait emotional intelligence. *The Journal of Psychology, 147*(1), 1–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2012.667016>.
- Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional intelligence: Implications for personal, social, academic, and workplace success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 5*(1), 88–103. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00334.x>.
- Costa, S., Petrides, K. V., & Tillmann, T. (2014). Trait emotional intelligence and inflammatory diseases. *Psychology, Health & Medicine, 19*(2), 180–189. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2013.802356>.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains. *Canadian Psychology, 49*, 14–23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0708-5591.49.1.14>.
- Downey, L. A., Johnston, P. J., Hansen, K., Birney, J., & Stough, C. (2010). Investigating the mediating effects of emotional intelligence and coping on problem behaviours in adolescents. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 62*(1), 20–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00049530903312873>.
- Gignac, G. E., Palmer, B. R., Manocha, R., & Stough, C. (2005). An examination of the factor structure of the Schutte Self-Report Emotional Intelligence (SSREI) scale via confirmatory factor analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*(6), 1029–1042. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.03.014>.
- Guay, F., Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). On the hierarchical structure of self determined motivation: A test of top-down, bottom-up, reciprocal, and horizontal effects. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 992–1004. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167203253297>.
- Hodgins, H. S., & Knee, C. R. (2002). The integrating self and conscious experience. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 87–100). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- Hodgins, H. S., Yacko, H. A., & Gottlieb, E. (2006). Autonomy and nondefensiveness. *Motivation and Emotion, 30*(4), 283–293. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11031-006-9036-7>.
- Johnson, S. J., Batey, M., & Holdsworth, L. (2009). Personality and health: The mediating role of trait emotional intelligence and work locus of control. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*, 470–475. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.04.025>.
- Julien, E., Guay, F., Sénécal, C., & Poitras, S. C. (2009). Subjective psychological distress among young adults: The role of global and contextual levels of self-determined motivation. *Hellenic Journal of Psychology, 6*, 145–168.
- Kämpfe, N., & Mitte, K. (2010). Tell me who you are, and I will tell you how you feel? *European Journal of Personality, 24*(4), 291–308. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/per.743>.
- Karreman, A., & Vingerhoets, J. J. M. (2012). Attachment and well-being: The mediating role of emotion regulation and resilience. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53*, 821–826. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.06.014>.
- Kotsou, I., Nelis, D., Grégoire, J., & Mikolajczak, M. (2011). Emotional plasticity: Conditions and effects of improving emotional competence in adulthood. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 827–839. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023047>.
- Malterer, M. B., Glass, S. J., & Newman, J. P. (2008). Psychopathy and trait emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*(3), 735–745. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.10.007>.
- Martins, A., Ramalho, N., & Morin, E. (2010). A comprehensive meta-analysis of the relationship between emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and Individual Differences, 49*(6), 554–564. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.05.029>.
- Mavroveli, S., Petrides, K. V., Rieffe, C., & Bakker, F. (2007). Trait emotional intelligence, psychological well-being and peer-rated social competence in adolescence. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 25*(2), 263–275. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/026151006X118577>.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test User's Manual*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (pp. 396–420). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mikolajczak, M., Petrides, K. V., & Hurry, J. (2009). Adolescents choosing self-harm as an emotion regulation strategy: The protective role of trait emotional intelligence. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 48*(2), 181–193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/014466508X386027>.
- Nelis, D., Kotsou, I., Quoidbach, J., Hansenne, M., Weytens, F., Dupuis, P., et al. (2011). Increasing emotional competence improves psychological and physical well-being, social relationships, and employability. *Emotion, 11*, 354–366. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021554>.
- O'Boyle, E. H., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. (2011). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 32*(5), 788–818. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.714>.
- Petrides, K. V. (2011). Ability and trait emotional intelligence. In T. Chamorro-Premuzic, A. Furnham, & S. von Stumm (Eds.), *The Blackwell-Wiley handbook of individual differences* (pp. 656–678). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Petrides, K. V., Frederickson, N., & Furnham, A. (2004). The role of trait emotional intelligence in academic performance and deviant behavior at school. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 277–293. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(03\)00084-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00084-9).
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000a). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*, 313–320. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(99\)00195-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00195-6).
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000b). Gender differences in measured and self-estimated trait emotional intelligence. *Sex Roles, 42*, 449–461. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1007006523133>.
- Petrides, K. V., Pérez-González, J. C., & Furnham, A. (2007). On the criterion and incremental validity of trait emotional intelligence. *Cognition and Emotion, 21*(1), 26–55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699930601038912>.
- Petrides, K. V., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality factor space. *British Journal of Psychology, 98*(2), 273–289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000712606X120618>.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*, 879–891. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/BRM.40.3.879>.
- Preacher, K. J., & Kelley, K. (2011). Effect size measures for mediation models: Quantitative strategies for communicating indirect effects. *Psychological Methods, 16*, 93–115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022658.supp>.
- Ryan, R. M. (1993). Agency and organization: Intrinsic motivation, autonomy and the self in psychological development. In J. Jacobs (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Developmental perspectives on motivation* (Vol. 40, pp. 1–56). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 1069–1081. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069>.
- Saklofske, D. H., Austin, E. J., & Minski, P. S. (2003). Factor structure and validity of a trait emotional intelligence measure. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*, 1091–1100. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(02\)00056-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00056-9).
- Schutte, N. S., & Malouff, J. M. (2011). Emotional intelligence mediates the relationship between mindfulness and subjective well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(7), 1116–1119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.01.037>.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., & Bhullar, N. (2009). The Assessing Emotions Scale. In C. Stough, D. Saklofske, & J. Parker (Eds.), *The Assessment of Emotional Intelligence* (pp. 119–135). New York: Springer Publishing.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., et al. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25*, 167–177. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(98\)00001-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00001-4).
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Simunek, M., McKenley, J., & Hollander, S. (2002). Characteristic emotional intelligence and emotional well-being. *Cognition and Emotion, 16*, 769–785 [doi: 10.8002699930143000482].
- Spence, G., Oades, L. G., & Caputi, P. (2004). Trait emotional intelligence and goal self integration: Important predictors of emotional well-being? *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*, 449–461. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2003.09.001>.
- Summerfeldt, L. J., Kloosterman, P. H., Antony, M. M., McCabe, R. E., & Parker, J. D. (2011). Emotional intelligence in social phobia and other anxiety disorders. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 33*(1), 69–78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10862-010-9199-0>.

- Vesely, A. K., Siegling, A. B., & Saklofske, D. H. (2013). Gender-linked personality and mental health: The role of trait emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54(2), 221–225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.08.038>.
- Weinstein, N., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2011). Motivational determinants of integrating positive and negative past identities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100, 527–544. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0022150>.
- Weinstein, N., & Hodgins, H. S. (2009). The moderating role of autonomy and control on the benefits of written emotion expression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 351–364. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167208328165>.