

This is the author-created version of the following work:

**Thompson, Claire, Kuah, Adrian, Foong, Regina, and Ng, Eddy (2020) *The development of emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and locus of control in MBA students*. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 31 (1) pp. 113-31.**

Access to this file is available from:

<https://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/59829/>

© 2019 Wiley Periodicals, Inc. In conformance with the publisher's policies, the Accepted Manuscript version of this publication will be available Open Access from ResearchOnline@JCU.edu.au from 16 June 2020.

Please refer to the original source for the final version of this work:

<https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21375>



Human Resource  
Development Quarterly

**The Development of Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy  
and Locus of Control in MBA Students**

Journal:	<i>Human Resource Development Quarterly</i>
Manuscript ID	HRDQ-19-0030.R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Quantitative Study
Keywords:	Emotional Intelligence, Employee Development, Management Development, Vocational Training and Education
Method Keywords:	Hierarchical Regression, MANOVA, Repeated measures

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## The Development of Emotional Intelligence, Self-Efficacy and Locus of Control in MBA Students

### Abstract

Successful managers must develop strong interpersonal skills alongside their ability to achieve personal and organizational goals. For educational institutions to stay relevant, courses must equip students with necessary psychological competencies in addition to technical knowledge, skills and abilities for the constantly evolving business climate. We explored whether Master of Business Administration (MBA) programs aid in the development of psychological competencies, given that MBAs are a popular management development tool. Specifically, we investigated changes in MBA candidates' emotional intelligence ability (EI), self-efficacy (SE) and locus of control (LoC) in a pre-post survey design over the course of a one-year MBA educational program and explored the relationship of candidate's baseline psychological status to their academic success in the MBA educational program. Participants were recruited from newly enrolled students at an international university in Asia. The study participants (53 MBA students, plus 26 psychology students and 34 non-students as comparison groups) completed self-report measures of EI, SE and LoC at the beginning and end of a one-year MBA period. The MBA candidates showed significant improvement in EI, SE and LoC-internality, as well as an increase in LoC-powerful others during the program. LoC-powerful others at the beginning of the program also predicted MBA students' academic performance. The findings provide evidence that psychological competencies that may positively affect work performance are key benefits of MBA education.

**Keywords:** emotional intelligence; self-efficacy; locus of control; MBA education; academic performance

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 2

**Introduction**

One of our students, who was a Master of Business Administration (MBA) candidate at an international university in Asia, approached his lecturer about a failed final examination. His lecturer explained the weaknesses of his attempt, but the student still did not pass a supplementary examination and appealed to the Head of School, who denied the appeal. The student then filed a higher appeal to the course director who upheld the failed grade. We noted the student's tendency to appeal to higher levels of power within the university structure, seeming not to acknowledge his own level of ability or performance, instead reflecting a belief that his fate was the result of the will of more powerful others rather than his own efforts. This type of perspective is aligned with the psychological construct of *locus of control* (LoC; Levenson, 1974, 1981), which is the extent to which people believe that consequences of events are either a result of their own behavior (internal LoC) or determined by chance or by the influence of other people. This student specifically demonstrates an external LoC for *powerful others* (LoC-P), i.e., the belief that outcomes in life are determined by those more powerful than oneself. This student's story raises some important questions about LoC and the concomitant psychological competencies of *emotional intelligence* (EI), which is a person's capacity to monitor their own emotions and perceive and appropriately respond to others' emotions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), and *self-efficacy* (SE), which is the belief about one's own capability to perform activities and achieve specific goals (Bandura, 1977). These are important qualities in a successful manager or leader (Sur & Ng, 2014). Having observed MBA candidates like this student, we ask whether the process of working toward an MBA leads to any detectable changes in MBA candidates' psychological competencies (i.e., EI, SE and LoC). It seems likely that growth in EI, SE and LoC would occur during an MBA education and possibly that students' baseline levels of these

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 3

competencies when commencing MBA candidature may impact on their academic achievement in the MBA educational program.

The growth of the MBA degree around the world has been fueled by its widespread acceptance by many employers and its almost certain return on investment (Byrne, 2014) as top tier MBA graduates are in high demand to become future leaders of organizations (Björkman, Ehrnrooth, Mäkelä, Smale, & Sumelius, 2013). From an HRD perspective, MBAs are considered to be the choice management development tool for prospective managers in the west and in developing economies (Kuchinke, 2007; Wang & Wang, 2006). Employers value functional expertise (e.g., accounting, finance, marketing) commonly found in MBA programs (Pfeffer & Fong, 2002). However, the continually changing nature of work and organizations would render much of the functional knowledge acquired during MBA education obsolete (Allen & Van den Velden, 2002; Burke & Ng, 2006). Success in leading people and organizations requires “sense-making, interpretation, intuition, wisdom, and experience” (Kuchinke, 2007; p. 115) which entails the development of psychological competencies such as emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, and locus of control. Emotional intelligence promotes interpersonal effectiveness (Kunnamatt, 2004; Opengart, 2005), which in turn contributes to building leadership competencies (Fambrough & Kaye Hart, 2008). The development of self-efficacy also aids in training success and knowledge transfer (see Brown & Warren, 2009; Chiaburu & Lindsay 2009). Locus of control -- internal and external -- is related to empowerment, training transfer, and planned change (Kormanik & Rocco, 2008). However, little is known about the development of these psychological competencies, necessary for the practice of management, during MBA programs (see Kuchinke 2007).

The development of a student’s psychological competencies, although not specified as a learning outcome of the MBA, is likely to occur through the four phases of experiential learning (Kolb, 1984; Kolb, Boyatzis, & Mainemelis, 2001) throughout the

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 4

1  
2  
3  
4 MBA education program: (1) concrete experience, (2) reflective observation, (3) abstract  
5  
6 conceptualization and (4) active experimentation. The delivery of ideas about business  
7  
8 practice and their application to business performance and the acquisition of collaborative  
9  
10 and leadership skills throughout the MBA program serve to link theories with interpersonal  
11  
12 skills required to meet concrete business needs. Table 1 shows the compulsory core  
13  
14 subjects taken in the MBA educational program (with different majors or specialization).  
15  
16 While this program does not include direct instruction in EI, SE or LoC, we have identified  
17  
18 specific activities that may lead to potential growth in EI, SE and LoC, as well as how  
19  
20 these core subjects contribute to different stages of Kolb's learning cycle. The utilization of  
21  
22 these core subjects contribute to different stages of Kolb's learning cycle. The utilization of  
23  
24 cognitive resources in combination with these 'soft skills' bridges logical analysis with  
25  
26 ethical and intuitive reflection and understanding in a way that should enhance candidates'  
27  
28 psychological competencies. Mastery experiences have been shown to predict academic  
29  
30 performance (Bandura, 1977; Lent, Brown, & Larkin, 1987) and 'mind-set' may be more  
31  
32 important than pure academic potential to MBA candidates' suitability for completing the  
33  
34 program (Shepherd, Douglas, & Fitzsimmons, 2008). Thus, the present study contributes to  
35  
36 the HRD literature by exploring how MBA education may be a tool to develop  
37  
38 psychological competencies deemed critical for management practice, and if these  
39  
40 psychological competencies may aid in educational success in MBA programs. Our  
41  
42 findings also have the potential to inform HRD professionals on identifying the appropriate  
43  
44 training to improve the psychological competencies we tested in this study. Inspired by the  
45  
46 student in our introduction, we specifically investigate whether: (1) emotional intelligence  
47  
48 (EI), self-efficacy (SE), and locus of control (LoC) would improve through enrolment in an  
49  
50 MBA educational program, and (2) whether baseline EI, SE, and LOC is related to final  
51  
52 MBA GPA (i.e., predicting educational success).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Emotional intelligence.**

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 5

1  
2  
3  
4 The EI construct reflects a person's capacity to monitor their own emotions and  
5  
6 perceive and appropriately respond to others' emotions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). This  
7  
8 *ability* view of EI involves the cognitive abilities of perceiving, understanding, and  
9  
10 utilizing emotions for emotional expression, self-motivation, and in interactions with  
11  
12 others (Mayer & Salovey, 2008). In contrast, the *traits and skills* view of EI reflects a non-  
13  
14 cognitive constellation of emotional and behavioral self-perceptions, including empathy,  
15  
16 emotional expression, and self-control (Bar-On, 1997). These conceptualizations of EI  
17  
18 vary in the extent to which EI is considered to be an element of personality, ability, or a  
19  
20 combination of these (see Muiya, 2009 for a review of models and measurement of EI).  
21  
22 These differing conceptualizations of EI are reflected in different approaches to  
23  
24 measurement of EI. Performance tests of EI are direct measures of ability EI. Self-report  
25  
26 measures assess the self-perception of EI traits and skills and thus aim to cover the entire  
27  
28 EI construct, but are limited by the multitude of influences on self-reports. The EI  
29  
30 construct is sometimes conceptualized as a 3-factor model of appraisal of emotion,  
31  
32 regulation of emotion, and utilization of emotion in problem-solving (Salovey & Mayer,  
33  
34 1990). While EI models of 1, 4 and 6-factors have been suggested, Schutte, et al. (1998)  
35  
36 identified a strong single factor which included items from all branches of the model.  
37  
38 Schutte et al. (1998) therefore recommend using total scores on the 33-item scale as a  
39  
40 unitary construct. Several other studies have also found a single-factor solution (Brackett  
41  
42 & Mayer, 2003), although the 3-factor model has also been supported by some research  
43  
44 evidence (Kun, Balazs, Kapitany, Urban, & Demetrovics, 2010).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Theoretically, ability EI is changeable in response to experiences, whereas trait EI  
53  
54 may develop over time (Bar-On, 1997) but is less amenable to change through training  
55  
56 (McCrae, 2000; Petrides, Pita, & Kokkinaki, 2007). However, improvements in trait EI as  
57  
58 a result of training have been documented (Ashkanasy & Dasborough, 2003; Dearborn,  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 6

2002; Freshwater & Stickley, 2004; Goleman, 1998; Groves, Pat McEnrue, & Shen, 2008; Hawkins & Dulewicz, 2007; Nelis, Quoidbach, Mikolajczak, & Hansenne, 2009), although trait EI may also be a naturally evolving phenomenon (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008). EI has sometimes shown positive changes as a result of training. For example, Muiya and Kacirek (2009) evaluated EI changes one year after participants had undertaken a 9-day leadership training program that included specific ability EI training. No significant changes in EI were found at the one-year follow up as compared to the pre-training scores in any of Bar-On's (1997) dimensions of EI, although some medium to large effect sizes were noted. It is possible that the training period was too brief, or that the power to detect effects of the training were diminished by the one-year follow-up period introducing too much variability in outcomes. More immediate post-training measurement has shown the effect of training, for example, a group of 121 students who took a 16-week undergraduate management skills training program showed significant gains in EI (Campbell Clark, Callister, & Wallace, 2003). We therefore expect this growth should be detectable by measuring EI at the beginning and end of an MBA education program.

**Self-efficacy.**

SE is the belief about one's own capability to perform activities and achieve specific goals, and is at least partially determined by the environment (Bandura, 1977). Bandura identified four key contributors to SE: (1) mastery experiences, where having success at a task will build self-belief in that area, whereas failure will undermine efficacy belief; (2) vicarious experiences, where observation of salient role models succeeding raises beliefs that one can succeed; (3) verbal persuasion, where influential people (parents, teachers, managers) strengthen beliefs that one can succeed, thereby making sustained effort to succeed more likely; and (4) emotional and physiological arousal, where negative



## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 7

1  
2  
3  
4 emotions such as stress and depression dampen confidence and increase vulnerability to  
5  
6 poor performance, whereas positive emotions boost confidence in one's skills. Mastery  
7  
8 experiences are considered to be the most potent contributors to SE (see Table 1 for  
9  
10 elements of the MBA educational program where these four contributors to SE occur). A  
11  
12 meta-analysis of 114 studies showed a significant correlation between self-efficacy and  
13  
14 work performance which, according to the authors, translates into a 28% improvement in  
15  
16 work performance (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). In entrepreneurship, SE affects motivation,  
17  
18 perseverance and interest, with outcomes providing feedback leading to further evaluation  
19  
20 and development of SE (Chen, Greene, & Crick, 1998; Cervone, 1993). Therefore, SE  
21  
22 should improve in MBA candidates as students' increasing mastery of management  
23  
24 education content potentially builds their SE (Onu, Obeta, & Asogwa, 2013).  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 SE was found to be the strongest correlate with university grade point average  
30  
31 (GPA) of 50 measures considered in a meta-analytic study (Richardson, Abraham, &  
32  
33 Bond, 2012) and a recent review of SE studies of university students showed that SE is  
34  
35 strongly associated with student achievement (Bartimote-Aufflick, Bridgeman, Walker,  
36  
37 Sharma, & Smith, 2016; Macaskill & Denovan, 2013), although these findings are not  
38  
39 specific to students in an MBA educational program. The current study aims to take this a  
40  
41 step further: we aim to measure the growth in SE during the MBA educational program  
42  
43 and to evaluate the impact of SE on academic outcomes in the MBA.  
44  
45  
46  
47

**Locus of control.**

48  
49  
50 LoC (Levenson, 1974, 1981) is the extent to which people believe that  
51  
52 consequences of events are either a result of their own behavior (internal LoC) or  
53  
54 determined by chance or by the influence of other people (external LoC). Levenson (1981)  
55  
56 developed the LoC model, which consists of three subscales: internality (LoC-I), chance  
57  
58 (LoC-C) and powerful others (LoC-P). She suggests that higher LoC-I leads people to  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 8

1  
2  
3  
4 believe that they have a significant role in influencing and directing their lives to achieve  
5 their desired goals. Individuals with high LoC-C perceive the world as unpredictable and  
6 their desired goals. Individuals with high LoC-C perceive the world as unpredictable and  
7 chaotic, whereas those with high LoC-P believe that their lives are ultimately determined  
8 by the influence of powerful individuals (as demonstrated by our encounter with our  
9 student).

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 LoC is an important to several academic disciplines, including clinical and social  
17 psychology, adult development, education and learning theory, business and management,  
18 and human resource development, in explaining people's differential performance in  
19 personal, academic and professional environments (Kormanik & Rocco, 2009), with higher  
20 LoC-I, lower LoC-C and lower LoC-P generally being associated with better outcomes.  
21  
22 LoC has been noted to overlap with the other dimensions of self-evaluation, such as self-  
23 esteem, generalized self-efficacy, and emotional stability, although it relates more to the  
24 individual's evaluation of the environment rather than themselves (Galvin, Randel, Collins,  
25 & Johnson, 2016). It has also been suggested that internality and externality should be  
26 considered (and measured) as separate constructs, and although depicted as a trait, a  
27 substantial amount of research has shown temporal variability, thus suggesting LoC is a  
28 state rather than a trait (see Galvin, Randel, Collins, & Johnson, 2016, for a review),  
29 thereby implying it is amenable to change in response to experiences.

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 A substantial amount of research evidence has documented the relationship  
47 between LoC and academic performance (e.g., Wang et al. 1999; Heckman & Kautz 2012;  
48 Mendolia & Walker 2014b). For example, educators have documented improvements in  
49 students' LoC-I by showing them video testimonials of confederates that emphasize taking  
50 control of academic outcomes to succeed (Noel, Forsyth, & Kelley, 1987) and describing  
51 the importance of effort and persistence in attaining academic success (Perry, Raymond, &  
52 Penner, 1990). Boggiano, Main, and Katz (1988) found that in the absence of evaluative  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 9

1  
2  
3  
4 pressure there were no differences in the motivation of children with high and low  
5  
6 perceptions of control. Krampen (1987) found that different kinds of feedback (social,  
7  
8 individual, and factual) affected performance outcome and altered LoC orientation in  
9  
10 schoolchildren. Individual (non-comparative) feedback was the most beneficial for  
11  
12 students both in terms of achievement outcomes and in changes of LoC orientations in the  
13  
14 direction of increased internality. LoC was related to SE and achievement in a college  
15  
16 English course (Jones, 2008), and was a more powerful predictor than SE of first-year  
17  
18 students' achievement (McKenzie, Gow, & Schweitzer, 2004).  
19  
20  
21

**EI, SE, LoC and the MBA.**

22  
23  
24  
25 To date, limited research has explored changes in EI, SE or LoC during an MBA  
26  
27 program (see Kuchinke, 2007 for a critique of MBA programs). One study of self-reported  
28  
29 perceived behavioral changes found improvements in critical-thinking processes, broadened  
30  
31 worldviews, enhanced perceptions of self and more creative and collaborative approaches to  
32  
33 problem solving (Hilgert, 1995). Another study using a self-report measure of 'interpersonal  
34  
35 skills' found improvements in 'helping skills' and 'leadership skills', but no significant  
36  
37 differences in 'relationship skills' (Kretovics, 1999). However, this latter study involved  
38  
39 different groups of entering and exiting MBA students who were combined and assessed at  
40  
41 the same time, rather than longitudinal gain scores. A longitudinal study using the same  
42  
43 measure found significant improvements in helping, leadership and relationship skills  
44  
45 (Leonard, 2008). While the measure of 'interpersonal skills' is not identical to the constructs  
46  
47 of EI, SE or LoC, this does show that psychological development can occur during such  
48  
49 programs.  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 Several studies do directly demonstrate EI improvement, such as Boyatzis and  
56  
57 colleagues (Boyatzis, 2006; Boyatzis, Stubbs, & Taylor, 2002) who showed EI improvement  
58  
59 with a competency-based, outcome-oriented MBA program based on Intentional Change  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 10

1  
2  
3  
4 Theory. Improvements were detected across a range of cognitive and emotional  
5  
6 competencies in several cohorts of MBA students. While the competencies assessed certainly  
7  
8 relate to EI, they are not using any specific definition of EI or evaluating any changes in SE  
9  
10 or LoC. In addition, no control groups were used, so it is uncertain how much the MBA  
11  
12 educational program contributed to the development of EI, compared with being a part of any  
13  
14 postgraduate program of study or simply the passing of time.  
15  
16

17  
18 In summary, many of the studies to date do not focus on specific psychological  
19  
20 changes (EI, SE or LoC) over time or use appropriate control groups such as other students  
21  
22 as well as non-students. They are typically US-centric and do not account for other parts of  
23  
24 the world (Lund Dean & Forray, 2017). However, these studies suggest that some  
25  
26 psychological changes do indeed occur, and these changes are consistent with  
27  
28 improvements in psychological functioning while undertaking an MBA educational  
29  
30 program. Thus, our study aims to build on prior evidence by measuring EI, SE and LoC at  
31  
32 the beginning and end of an MBA educational program, to evaluate psychological growth  
33  
34 and to explore whether these psychological competencies influence academic achievement.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 We gathered data using validated pre- and post- self-report measures of EI, SE and  
40  
41 LoC from two consecutive cohorts of MBA candidates on an international university campus  
42  
43 located in Asia. A group of similar-aged participants enrolled in a psychology program on the  
44  
45 same campus and a third group of participants who were not undertaking an educational  
46  
47 program acted as comparison groups, helping ensure that any changes are specific to the  
48  
49 MBA educational program, rather than the experience of being in a university program or  
50  
51 simply the passing of time. The first control group of psychology honors students ensures  
52  
53 equivalence in terms of complexity associated with a one-year program of study. The  
54  
55 psychology honors program is a postgraduate program of similar duration and complexity,  
56  
57 but unlike the MBA program, it focuses on research education. Both the MBA and the  
58  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 11

1  
2  
3  
4 psychology honors students are typically in their fourth year of tertiary education, have  
5  
6 completed a three-year undergraduate degree and are admitted to their respective programs  
7  
8 on the basis of merit. We used a third group of non-students of comparable age to control for  
9  
10 the effects of time.  
11  
12

13  
14 Given the above evidence that EI, SE and LoC are amenable to change, combined  
15  
16 with the reviewed evidence of this change occurring in management education and training  
17  
18 programs, we sought to determine whether such changes were occurring in our MBA  
19  
20 educational program despite EI, SE, and LoC not being specifically taught in the program.  
21  
22 We first hypothesized that any improvements in EI, SE and LoC of the MBA candidates  
23  
24 would be significantly greater than any changes detected in the two comparison groups over  
25  
26 the one-year period. In addition, as our experience with students suggests (e.g., the student  
27  
28 from the example in the introduction), we expected that initial levels of EI, SE and LoC  
29  
30 would predict academic achievement, thus our second hypothesis was that MBA candidates  
31  
32 with lower LoC-P and LoC-C and higher LoC-I, EI and SE would have higher final GPAs.  
33  
34  
35

## 36 Method

### 37 Participants.

38  
39 The student samples were recruited from a newly enrolled student population at the  
40  
41 start of an academic year. All newly-enrolled students were invited during their first lecture  
42  
43 to participate in the study with participation being optional and voluntary. Similarly,  
44  
45 volunteer non-students, i.e. members of the public, were recruited via friends and networks of  
46  
47 the researchers. There were 274 participants (82 men, 192 women) recruited at Time 1 from  
48  
49 two cohorts of MBA students enrolling in first and second term of one academic year ( $n =$   
50  
51 122 of 131 candidates) and enrolling psychology students ( $n = 49$  of 79 candidates) starting  
52  
53 in their respective programs. The non-student controls ( $n = 103$ ) were a convenience sample,  
54  
55 not participating in any educational program while taking part in the current study.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 12

Time 2 is defined as 10 months after time 1, i.e. one academic calendar year later. At Time 2, we retained 118 participants (53 MBA candidates:  $M_{\text{age}} = 24.77$ ,  $SD = 3.91$ , 69.8% female; 27 psychology honors students:  $M_{\text{age}} = 23.65$ ,  $SD = 3.31$ , 65.5% female; and 38 non-students:  $M_{\text{age}} = 25.56$ ,  $SD = 2.65$ , 79.4% female). There were no significant differences (all  $ps > .05$ ) between participants who completed Time 2 measures and those who withdrew after Time 1 on any of the five dependent variables (SE, LoC-I, LoC-P, LoC-C and EI). There were also no significant differences among the final three groups in terms of age,  $F(2, 110) = 2.26$ ,  $p > .05$ , or gender,  $\chi^2 = 1.60$ ,  $p > .05$ . However, the country of origin for the MBA students differed significantly from the control groups,  $\chi^2 = 112.15$ ,  $p < .05$ . The majority of the participants in the control groups were from Singapore ( $n = 52$ ) and the MBA students were mostly made up of students from India ( $n = 18$ ), China ( $n = 9$ ) and Indonesia ( $n = 9$ ) with the remainder from other parts of Asia and Europe.

**Measures.**

**Emotional Intelligence.** We measured EI using the Assessing Emotions Scale (AES; Schutte, et al., 2009), a 33-item self-report ability EI measure. Statements such as “*I know when to speak about my personal problems to others*” are rated on a five-point Likert scale from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”, yielding total scores ranging from 33 to 165, with higher scores indicating higher EI. The AES has been used widely across numerous studies of EI and cited in over 200 publications. It has excellent reliability, yielding Cronbach’s alphas in our study at Time 1 and Time 2 of .90 and .91, respectively.

**Self-Efficacy.** The New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSE; Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001) is an eight-item instrument measuring work-related SE. The items (e.g., *I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself*) are rated on a five-point Likert scale from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly agree”, then averaged to produce an overall SE score ranging from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating higher SE. This

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 13

instrument has shown strong evidence of convergent construct validity with a strong positive correlation between NGSE and occupational task-specific SE (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). Cronbach's alphas for Time 1 and Time 2 were .87 and .88, respectively.

**Locus of Control.** The Internality (I), Powerful Others (P), and Chance (C) Scales (IPCS; Levenson, 1981) are a 24-item measure of the extent to which a person perceives events as being either contingent on his or her own behavior (internal control) or due to chance or powerful others (external control). The instrument consists of three subscales: Internality (e.g., *Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability*); Powerful Others (e.g., *I feel like what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful people*); Chance (e.g., *To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings*). All items are rated on a six-point scale from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". Scores for each subscale range from 0 to 48. Higher scores for I indicate a higher internal LoC, and higher scores for P and C indicate higher external LoC. Levenson (1974) found the internal consistency to be moderately high even when the items were sampled across diverse situations. Cronbach's alphas for Time 1 and Time 2 were .81 and .78, respectively.

**Procedure.**

We obtained Human Research Ethics Committee approval and participants' informed consent before any data collection. Participants completed all measures at the beginning (Time 1) and end (Time 2) of the one-year MBA educational program or equivalent period. Qualtrics was used as a tool to collect the survey in the classroom. This was supplemented by a paper survey for any participants who preferred this. We used student identification numbers to match participants at Time 1 and Time 2 and retrieved grades for MBA students from school records.

**Design and analysis.**

We collected data from the three groups (MBA students, psychology students and

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 14

1  
2  
3  
4 non-students) across two timepoints corresponding to the beginning and the end of the  
5  
6 MBA or Psychology program. By having both psychology students and non-student  
7  
8 comparison groups, we aim to identify observed changes in the outcome variables as  
9  
10 occurring in the MBA students only, or in all students compared to non-students. In this  
11  
12 way, we seek to clarify whether any changes are related to the MBA specifically, or  
13  
14 related to an educational experience but not exclusively to the MBA. Total or average  
15  
16 scores were calculated in accordance with each test manual. Assumption testing showed  
17  
18 no outliers or violations of normality, linearity or multicollinearity.  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 A confirmatory factor analysis testing for the three-factor structure of the AES was  
24  
25 conducted using principal components extraction with oblimin rotation for the 33 AES  
26  
27 questionnaire items. Initial eigenvalues indicated the three-factor solution explained  
28  
29 37.98% of the variance, however, consistent with Schutte, et al. (1998), a strong unitary  
30  
31 factor was also identified in factor 1, which included items from all branches of the model.  
32  
33 The factor loadings above .250 are shown in Table 2. Based on these CFA results and the  
34  
35 recommendation of Schutte, et al. (1998), we have analysed the AES data as a unitary  
36  
37 construct.  
38  
39

40  
41 Correlations for EI, SE and LoC for each group and for the entire sample at Time 1  
42  
43 and Time 2 appear in Table 3. Given the large number of significant correlations between  
44  
45 EI, SE, and LoC at each timepoint, we chose MANOVA to control for experiment-wise  
46  
47 type-1 error in the analysis. We therefore tested our first hypothesis, that EI, SE and LoC  
48  
49 improve during the course of an MBA educational program, using a 3×2 mixed  
50  
51 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), with the between-groups independent  
52  
53 variable of Group (MBA candidates, psychology students, non-students) and the within-  
54  
55 group independent variable of Time (Time 1 and Time 2, at the beginning and end of the  
56  
57 program, respectively) with the five dependent variables of SE, LoC-I, LoC-P, LoC-C and  
58  
59  
60



## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 15

1  
2  
3  
4 EI. Age, gender and local/international student status served as covariates. The MANOVA  
5 was followed by group comparisons for each dependent variable in turn. We evaluated the  
6  
7 second hypothesis, that lower LoC-P and LoC-C and higher LoC-I, EI and SE at baseline  
8  
9 (Time 1) would be predictive of better academic outcomes, with hierarchical multiple  
10  
11 regression, using the MBA students' demographics and baseline data as predictors of their  
12  
13 final GPA.  
14  
15  
16

**Results**

17  
18  
19  
20 Means and standard deviations for the dependent variables appear in Table 4. The  
21  
22 results of the MANOVA, which tested the first hypothesis, whether MBA candidates would  
23  
24 show greater improvements in EI, SE and LoC over the course of the program than the two  
25  
26 comparison groups, yielded a significant interaction of Group with Time,  $F(10, 224) = 2.14$ ,  
27  
28  $p = .023$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .09$ .  
29  
30  
31

32 When we considered each dependent variable separately, there was, as hypothesized,  
33  
34 a significant interaction of Group with Time for EI,  $F(2, 113) = 5.83$ ,  $p = .004$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .09$ .  
35  
36 Post hoc *t*-tests for each group separately showed that the improvement in EI was significant  
37  
38 for the MBA candidates,  $t(52) = 3.37$ ,  $p = .001$ , but not for the psychology students,  $t(25) =$   
39  
40  $.05$ ,  $p > .05$ , or for the non-students,  $t(33) = 0.48$ ,  $p > .05$ . There was also a significant  
41  
42 interaction of Group with Time for SE,  $F(2, 113) = 2.69$ ,  $p = .028$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .06$ . Post hoc *t*-tests  
43  
44 showed significant improvements in SE for the MBA candidates,  $t(52) = 3.34$ ,  $p = .002$ , and  
45  
46 for the psychology students,  $t(25) = 2.51$ ,  $p = .019$ , but not for the non-students,  $t(33) = .48$ ,  
47  
48  $p > .05$ . There was also a significant interaction of Group with Time for LoC-I,  $F(2, 113) =$   
49  
50  $5.05$ ,  $p = .008$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .08$ . Post hoc *t*-tests showed a significant increase in LoC-I for the  
51  
52 MBA candidates,  $t(52) = 2.91$ ,  $p = .005$ , but not for the psychology students,  $t(25) = 1.72$ ,  $p$   
53  
54  $> .05$ , or for the non-students,  $t(33) = 1.67$ ,  $p > .05$ . There was no significant interaction  
55  
56 between Group and Time for LoC-P,  $F(2, 113) = .59$ ,  $p > .05$ , or for LoC-C,  $F(2, 113) = .25$ ,  
57  
58  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 16

$p > .05$ , despite a significant increase in LoC-P across time for MBA candidates,  $t(52) = 2.05$ ,  $p = .045$ , with no significant changes in LoC-P across time for the psychology students,  $t(25) = .61$ ,  $p > .05$ , or for the non-students,  $t(33) = 1.17$ ,  $p > .05$ . Essentially, the significant increase in LoC-P for MBA candidates was not significantly larger than the non-significant increases in LoC-P for both the psychology students and the non-students; thus, there was no interaction effect for LoC-P. There were no significant changes in LoC-C for any of the groups.

The hierarchical multiple regression tested the second hypothesis by entering the covariates of age, gender and international student status in the first step and LoC-P, LoC-C, LoC-I, EI and SE in the second step as predictors of final GPA. After adding the demographic variables in the first step, the model was significant,  $R = .32$ ,  $F(3, 112) = 4.12$ ,  $p = .008$ , explaining 10% of the variance in final GPA, with gender being the only significant predictor in this step,  $\beta$  coefficient = .62,  $t(114) = 3.07$ ,  $p = .003$ ; being female associated with higher GPA. When the psychological variables were added to the model in Step 2, the full model was again significant,  $R = .38$ ,  $F(4, 111) = 4.67$ ,  $p = .002$ , and explained 14.4% of the variance in GPA. LoC-P was the only additional significant predictor of GPA,  $\beta = -.21$ ,  $t(111) = -2.40$ ,  $p = .018$  (see Table 5). We also explored regressions for the prediction of first-semester GPA and the ability of any change in psychological variables to predict final GPA; however, these did not reveal any significant predictors (all  $ps > .05$ ).

**Discussion**

We investigated changes in MBA candidates' EI, SE and LoC, hypothesizing that these would show improvements over the course of the MBA educational program. The first hypothesis was partially supported. We found the expected pattern for EI and LoC-I; specifically, there were significant improvements only for the MBA group. We found only

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 17

1  
2  
3  
4 partial support for the hypothesis with regard to SE; specifically, there were significant  
5  
6 improvements for both the MBA group and the psychology group. We found no support with  
7  
8 regard to LoC-P (despite a significant increase in LoC-P across time for MBA candidates, all  
9  
10 three groups showed small increases and thus there was no significant interaction of group  
11  
12 and time) or LoC-C (no significant changes for any group). Thus, the evidence suggests that  
13  
14 the MBA educational program helps candidates develop higher EI and LoC-I, while SE may  
15  
16 simply increase with any course of study rather than being specific to the MBA program.  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Taken together, these results suggest that the one-year MBA educational program  
22  
23 enabled students to improve their interpersonal competencies and cultivate the belief that they  
24  
25 have the power to achieve their goals and influence their life outcomes. These beliefs may in  
26  
27 turn increase MBA candidates' volitional effort, thereby enhancing the rate of success in  
28  
29 meeting their goals. Thus, an improved LoC-I may help cultivate a mastery of academic  
30  
31 content (Kirkpatrick, Stant, Downes, & Gaither, 2008). These findings reflect a positive  
32  
33 psychological impact of the MBA educational program, consistent with the previously  
34  
35 reported research showing improvements in EI (Boyatzis, 2006) and interpersonal skills  
36  
37 (Kretovics, 1999; Leonard, 2008). The psychology program is focused on theory and research  
38  
39 competency rather than interpersonal competencies. Given the absence of effects on EI or  
40  
41 LoC-I for the psychology participants, it is plausible that the specific education in the MBA  
42  
43 program is the causative factor in the psychological changes.  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 The goal-setting literature provides a better understanding of the possible underlying  
49  
50 processes that contribute to the improvements in EI, SE and LoC-I in MBA candidates (e.g.,  
51  
52 Brown & Latham, 2006; Brown & Warren, 2009). The communication of key learning  
53  
54 outcomes for specific assignments helps define the purpose of the tasks and may have  
55  
56 directed the MBA candidates' efforts and behaviors toward activities that encourage the  
57  
58 development of emotional and social competencies (Locke, 1968). Intentional change  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 18

1  
2  
3  
4 theory recognizes that complex competencies can be nurtured and developed within a  
5  
6 conducive learning environment (Boyatzis, 1995). The MBA educational program tends to  
7  
8 emphasize abilities such as collaboration, teamwork and leadership, critical and creative  
9  
10 thinking, communication, awareness of personal and professional development, and the  
11  
12 application of business models and research to meet real organizational needs. These skills  
13  
14 are conceivably enhanced by EI, being dependent on appraisal and expression of emotion,  
15  
16 regulation of emotion, and utilization of emotion in problem-solving, consistent with the 3-  
17  
18 factor model of EI mentioned earlier (Salovey & Mayer, 1990) despite the absence of this  
19  
20 clear factor structure in the data. This emphasis may be the key aspect of the MBA leading  
21  
22 to the development of psychological competencies, given the evidence that psychological  
23  
24 attributes must be addressed directly and self-perception does not always develop via  
25  
26 traditional academic endeavors.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32       Ideally, we would be able to identify exactly which components of an MBA  
33  
34 educational program, and in what quantities, contribute to psychological growth. As a first  
35  
36 step toward this, we identified specific activities that may lead to potential growth in EI, SE  
37  
38 and LoC (Table 1). The focus on self-reflective and interpersonal competencies during the  
39  
40 MBA educational program may prompt MBA candidates to cultivate the emotional and  
41  
42 social competencies examined in this study. Given the differing pattern of results for the  
43  
44 MBA candidates compared with the other groups, it seems reasonable to conclude that the  
45  
46 MBA educational program serves as a stimulus and provides opportunities for candidates to  
47  
48 enhance EI, SE and LoC-I.  
49  
50  
51

52       The psychological development of the MBA candidates may be further explained by  
53  
54 the four phases in the experiential learning model (Kolb, 1984) used in the MBA educational  
55  
56 program: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization and active  
57  
58 experimentation. The delivery of the curriculum through theory, practice and reflection may  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 19

1  
2  
3  
4 activate the utilization of cognitive resources together with EI, combining logical thought  
5  
6 with ethical and intuitive reflection to make good managerial decisions. The development of  
7  
8 EI, SE and LoC-I has obvious benefits for organizations that employ MBA graduates and  
9  
10 managers, in which balancing business profitability and relationships requires the  
11  
12 management of one's own emotions and behaviors. Managers' EI can also influence the  
13  
14 emotional climate of the work environment (Joyner & Mann, 2011). From a theoretical  
15  
16 standpoint, the findings also support the ability EI model, suggesting that EI is an ability that  
17  
18 can be developed using targeted educational interventions.  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 The second hypothesis we investigated concerns the informational value of the  
24  
25 baseline measures of LoC, SE and EI. Our observations of the student, as described in the  
26  
27 introduction of this article, made us question whether the psychological state of candidates at  
28  
29 the beginning of an MBA educational program has any impact on their outcomes. The results  
30  
31 are important for two reasons. First, we found that LoC-P levels at the beginning of the  
32  
33 program best predicted students' final GPA, even after accounting for demographic factors.  
34  
35 This is entirely consistent with our experience of the student, whose apparent belief in  
36  
37 powerful others seems to underlie his determination to use every possible avenue of appeal in  
38  
39 the quest to overturn his failed result. Second, there was a general increase in LoC-P over the  
40  
41 study period in the MBA group. While there was a concurrent increase for the other two  
42  
43 groups (meaning that the increased LoC-P may have been due to external events), it is  
44  
45 concerning to us as educators that students may hold such strong beliefs in the power of  
46  
47 others, even while cultivating a strong belief in their own ability to determine their own fate,  
48  
49 as evidenced by the increases in LoC-I, EI and SE. We therefore suggest that future research  
50  
51 should target LoC-P via education, using components of the MBA educational program  
52  
53 emphasizing self-awareness. It is also worth noting the absence of any significant correlation  
54  
55 between LoC-I and the other LoCs, indicating that individuals may believe in personal  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 20

control simultaneously with the power of others or chance.

This study is the first of its kind conducted in an Australasian setting, although the participant pool consisted of both local and international students. When compared with European or US contexts in which other studies have taken place, Asian societies are considered more collectivist, with greater acceptance of external control and interdependence in the social environment (Cheng, Cheung, Chio, & Chan, 2013) and a desire to avoid interpersonal conflict (Spector, Sanchez, Siu, Salgado, & Ma, 2004). This may be an explanation for the increase in LoC-I and no reduction in LoC-P that we found in this study. Asians who believe in powerful others do not necessarily perceive themselves as having less control over life outcomes (Weisz, Eastman, & McCarty, 1996). LoC-I may include the ability to modify one's behaviors to adapt to surroundings and ensure greater interpersonal harmony (Morling & Kitayama, 2008). In essence, this may reflect a growing awareness through education and training that one has personal responsibility for actions and outcomes, while still accepting the presence of more powerful others.

In interpreting the results of this study, a few limitations should be noted. First, we conducted this study using students from just one MBA program, which may limit generalizability of the findings. Other MBA programs may vary in length and content, which may produce different results. Second, the two comparison groups of non-students and psychology students, while providing an opportunity to explore whether the observed changes in MBA candidates may be attributable to any educational experience or to the passing of time alone, do not provide a true control group. The psychology program technically sits between a three-year undergraduate program and fifth-year postgraduate specialist training, although it is the same (fourth) year of study as the MBA program and admits students of similar age and experience to the MBA candidates. Third, we had significant attrition of respondents, a common problem which threatens internal validity in

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 21

1  
2  
3  
4 longitudinal research and resulted in a small final sample size. We tested and found no  
5  
6 significant differences between those lost to attrition and those who completed the Time 2  
7  
8 measures. Fourth, all measures were self-reports, so findings interpreted based on these scales  
9  
10 should be considered tentative. Finally, the results of the study suggest that MBA education  
11  
12 may be associated with improvements in EI, SE and LoC-I, but this does not predict how the  
13  
14 MBA graduates would apply these psychological competencies in their careers. This  
15  
16 important bridge between study and practice (i.e., knowledge transfer) points to another  
17  
18 direction for further research, which might investigate the relationship between the  
19  
20 psychological characteristics of EI, SE and LoC and work performance after completing the  
21  
22 MBA, ideally using longitudinal methods to track candidates not only throughout their MBA  
23  
24 program, but beyond graduation to evaluate whether increases in EI, SE and LoC-I translate  
25  
26 into more effective performance in the workplace.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 Our study suggests that MBA education can play an important role in helping students  
33  
34 develop and enhance the specific psychological attributes of SE, EI and LoC-I. People with  
35  
36 these attributes appear to have a higher ability to identify important social cues in their  
37  
38 environment and benefit from incidental learning situations (Lefcourt, 1976), which in turn  
39  
40 helps them be more adaptive in the workplace with higher EI being associated with higher  
41  
42 leadership effectiveness (Rosete, & Ciarrochi, 2005) and LoC-I being related to a wide range  
43  
44 of positive work-related outcomes (Galvin, Randel, Collins, & Johnson, 2016). Importantly,  
45  
46 the findings show that psychological competencies in EI, SE and LoC-I can be developed,  
47  
48 which may help refine MBA educational programs in their continuing effort to develop key  
49  
50 knowledge, skills and ability outcomes. From an HRD perspective, our findings suggest that  
51  
52 EI, SE and LoC-I can be developed to enhance individual performance. HRD professionals  
53  
54 can utilize this information to provide the appropriate training to improve these psychological  
55  
56 competencies to improve organizational performance. This understanding can also help  
57  
58  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 22

1  
2  
3  
4 educational institutions to stay relevant and competitive by equipping students with necessary  
5  
6 competencies for a constantly evolving business climate. This study contributes to the  
7  
8 evidence regarding the key benefits of MBA education, which is particularly important in the  
9  
10 educational marketplace where MBAs are costly and thus must be able to demonstrate  
11  
12 graduate competencies that are desirable outcomes.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review



**References**

- Allen, J., & Van Der Velden, R. (2002). When do skills become obsolete, and when does it matter? In *The Economics of Skills Obsolescence*, 27-50. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. doi:10.1016/s0147-9121(02)21004-3
- Ashkanasy, N. M., & Dasborough, M. T. (2003). Emotional awareness and emotional intelligence in leadership teaching. *Journal of Education for Business*, 79, 18-22. doi:10.1080/08832320309599082
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191. doi:10.1037/h0034968
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Technical Manual* Toronto: Multi-Health Systems. doi:10.1037/t04985-000
- Bartimote-Aufflick, K., Bridgeman, A., Walker, R., Sharma, M., & Smith, L. (2016). The study, evaluation, and improvement of university student self-efficacy. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41, 1918-1942. doi:10.1080/03075079.2014.999319
- Boggiano, A. K., Main, D. S., & Katz, P. A. (1988). Children's preference for challenge: The role of perceived competence and control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 134-141. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.54.1.134
- Boyatzis, R. E. (1995). Cornerstones of change: Building the path for self-directed learning. In R. E. Boyatzis, S. S. Cowen, & D. A. Kolb (Eds.), *Innovation in Professional Education: Steps on a Journey from Teaching to Learning* (pp. 50-94). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyatzis, R. E. (2006). An overview of intentional change from a complexity perspective. *Journal of Management Development*, 25, 607-623. doi:10.1108/02621710610678445

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 24

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Boyatzis, R. E., Stubbs, E. C., & Taylor, S. N. (2002). Learning cognitive and emotional  
5 intelligence competencies through graduate management education. *Academy of*  
6  
7 *Management Learning & Education, 1*, 150-162. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2002.8509345  
8  
9  
10  
11 Brown, T. C., & Warren, A. M. (2009). Distal goal and proximal goal transfer of training  
12 interventions in an executive education program. *Human Resource Development*  
13 *Quarterly, 20*, 265-284. doi:10.1002/hrdq.20021  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 Burke, R. J., & Ng, E. (2006). The changing nature of work and organizations: Implications  
19 for human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review, 16*, 86-94.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Byrne, J. A. (2014). Why the MBA has become the most popular master's degree in the US. *Fortune: Management*. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com/2014/05/31/mba-popular-masters-degree/>
- Campbell Clark, S., Callister, R., & Wallace, R. (2003). Undergraduate management skills courses and students' emotional intelligence. *Journal of Management Education, 27*, 3-23. doi:10.1177/1052562902239246
- Cervone, D. (1993). The role of self-referent cognitions in goal setting, motivation, and performance. In M. Rabinowitz (Ed.), *Cognitive Science Foundations of Instruction* (pp. 57-95). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Chen, C. C., Greene, P. G., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of Business Venturing, 13*, 295-316. doi:10.1016/S0883-9026(97)00029-3
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*, 62-83. doi:10.1177/109442810141004
- Cheng, C., Cheung, S.-F., Chio, J. H.-M., & Chan, M.-P. S. (2013). Cultural meaning of perceived control: a meta-analysis of locus of control and psychological symptoms

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 25

1  
2  
3  
4 across 18 cultural regions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139, 152-188.

5  
6 doi:10.1037/a0028596

7  
8  
9 Chiaburu, D. S., & Lindsay, D. R. (2008). Can do or will do? The importance of self-efficacy

10 and instrumentality for training transfer. *Human Resource Development*

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

*International*, 11, 199-206. doi:10.1080/13678860801933004

Dearborn, K. (2002). Studies in emotional intelligence redefine our approach to leadership

development. *Public Personnel Management*, 31, 523-530.

doi:10.1177/009102600203100408

Dollinger, S. J., & Taub, S. I. (1977). The interaction of locus of control expectancies and

providing purpose on children's motivation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 11,

118-127. doi:10.1016/0092-6566(77)90035-6

Fambrough, M. J., & Kaye Hart, R. (2008). Emotions in leadership development: A critique

of emotional intelligence. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 10, 740-758.

doi:10.1177/1523422308323542

Freshwater, D., & Stickley, T. (2004). The heart of the art: emotional intelligence in nurse

education. *Nursing Inquiry*, 11, 91-98. doi:10.1111/j.1440-1800.2004.00198.x

Galvin, B.M., Randel, A.E., Collins, B.J., & Johnson, R.E. (2018). Changing the focus of

locus (of control): A targeted review of the locus of control literature and agenda for

future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39, 820– 833.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2275>

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam.

Groves, K. S., Pat McEnrue, M., & Shen, W. (2008). Developing and measuring the

emotional intelligence of leaders. *Journal of Management Development*, 27, 225-250.

doi:10.1108/02621710810849353

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 26

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Hawkins, J., & Dulewicz, V. (2007). The relationship between performance as a leader and  
5  
6 emotional intelligence, intellectual and managerial competences. *Journal of General*  
7  
8 *Management*, 33, 55-78. doi:10.1177/030630700703300205  
9  
10  
11 Jones, E. (2008). Predicting performance in first-semester college basic writers: Revisiting  
12  
13 the role of self-beliefs. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33, 209-238.  
14  
15 doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2006.11.001  
16  
17  
18 Joyner, F. F., & Mann, D. T. (2011). Developing emotional intelligence in MBA students: A  
19  
20 case study of one program's success. *American Journal of Business Education*, 4, 59.  
21  
22 doi:http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1056648.pdf  
23  
24  
25 Kirkpatrick, M. A., Stant, K., Downes, S., & Gaither, L. (2008). Perceived locus of control  
26  
27 and academic performance: Broadening the construct's applicability. *Journal of*  
28  
29 *College Student Development*, 49, 486-496. doi:https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ812146  
30  
31  
32 Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and*  
33  
34 *Development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.  
35  
36  
37 Kolb, D. A., Boyatzis, R. E., & Mainemelis, C. (2001). Experiential learning theory: Previous  
38  
39 research and new directions. In L. Zhang (Ed.), *Perspectives on Thinking, Learning,*  
40  
41 *and Cognitive Styles*, 227-247. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.  
42  
43 doi:10.4324/9781410605986-9  
44  
45  
46 Kormanik, M. B., & Rocco, T. S. (2009). Internal versus external control of reinforcement: A  
47  
48 review of the locus of control construct. *Human Resource Development Review*, 8,  
49  
50 463-483. doi:10.1177/1534484309342080  
51  
52  
53 Krampen, G. (1987). Differential effects of teacher comments. *Journal of Educational*  
54  
55 *Psychology*, 79, 137-146. doi:10.1037//0022-0663.79.2.137  
56  
57  
58 Kretovics, M. A. (1999). Assessing the MBA: what do our students learn? *Journal of*  
59  
60 *Management Development*, 18, 125-136. doi:10.1108/EUM0000000004550

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 27

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Kuchinke, K. P. (2007). Birds of a feather? The critique of the North American business  
5  
6 school and its implications for educating HRD practitioners. *Human Resource*  
7  
8 *Development Review*, 6, 111-126. doi:10.1177/1534484307300175  
9  
10  
11 Kun, B., Balazs, H., Kapitany, M., Urban, R., & Demetrovics, Z. (2010). Confirmation of the  
12  
13 three-factor model of the Assessing Emotions Scale (AES): Verification of the  
14  
15 theoretical starting point. *Behavior Research Methods*, 42, 596-606.  
16  
17 doi:10.3758/brm.42.2.596  
18  
19  
20  
21 Kunnanatt, J. T. (2004). Emotional intelligence: The new science of interpersonal  
22  
23 effectiveness. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15, 489-495.  
24  
25 doi:10.1002/hrdq.1117  
26  
27  
28 Lefcourt, H. M. (1976). *Locus of Control: Current Trends in Theory and Research*. Hillsdale,  
29  
30 NJ: Erlbaum.  
31  
32  
33 Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Larkin, K. C. (1987). Comparison of three theoretically derived  
34  
35 variables in predicting career and academic behavior: Self-efficacy, interest  
36  
37 congruence, and consequence thinking. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34, 293.  
38  
39 doi:10.1037/0022-0167.34.3.293  
40  
41  
42 Leonard, D. C. (2008). The impact of learning goals on emotional, social, and cognitive  
43  
44 intelligence competency development. *Journal of Management Development*, 27,  
45  
46 109-128. doi:10.1108/02621710810840794  
47  
48  
49 Levenson, H. (1974). Activism and powerful others: Distinctions within the concept of  
50  
51 internal-external control. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 38, 377-383.  
52  
53 doi:10.1080/00223891.1974.10119988  
54  
55  
56 Levenson, H. (1981). Differentiating among internality, powerful others, and chance. In H.  
57  
58 M. Lefcourt (Ed.), *Research with the Locus of Control Construct*, 15-63. Academic  
59  
60 Press. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-443201-7.50006-3

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 28

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Latham, G. P., & Brown, T. C. (2006). The effect of learning vs. outcome goals on  
5 self-Efficacy, satisfaction and performance in an MBA program. *Applied*  
6  
7 *Psychology*, 55, 606-623. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2006.00246.x  
8  
9  
10  
11 Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational*  
12  
13 *Behavior and Human Performance*, 3, 157-189. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(68)90004-4  
14  
15  
16 Lund Dean, K., & Forray, J. M. (2017). You're Just WEIRD. *Journal of Management*  
17  
18 *Education*, 41, 175-180. doi:10.1177/1052562917689891  
19  
20  
21 Macaskill, A., & Denovan, A. (2013). Developing autonomous learning in first year  
22  
23 university students using perspectives from positive psychology. *Studies in Higher*  
24  
25 *Education*, 38, 124-142. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.566325  
26  
27  
28 Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings,  
29  
30 and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 197-215.  
31  
32 doi:10.1207/s15327965pli1503\_02  
33  
34  
35 Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2008). Emotional intelligence: New ability or  
36  
37 eclectic traits? *American Psychologist*, 63, 503. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.63.6.503  
38  
39  
40 McCrae, R. R. (2000). Emotional intelligence from the perspective of the five-factor model  
41  
42 of personality. In R. Bar-On & J. D. Parker (Eds.), *The Handbook of Emotional*  
43  
44 *Intelligence: Theory, Development, Assessment, and Application at Home, School,*  
45  
46 *and in the Workplace* (pp. 263-276). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.  
47  
48  
49 McKenzie, K., Gow, K., & Schweitzer, R. (2004). Exploring first-year academic achievement  
50  
51 through structural equation modelling. *Higher Education Research & Development*,  
52  
53 23, 95–112. doi:10.1080/0729436032000168513  
54  
55  
56 Morling, B., & Kitayama, S. (2008). Culture and motivation. In J. Y. Shah, W. L. Gardner,  
57  
58 (Eds.), *Handbook of Motivation Science* (pp. 417-433).  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 29

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Muyia, H. M. (2009). Approaches to and instruments for measuring emotional intelligence: A review of selected literature. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11*, 690–702. doi.org/10.1177/1523422309360843
- Muyia, H. M., & Kacirek, K. (2009). An empirical study of a leadership development training program and its impact on emotional intelligence quotient (EQ) scores. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 11*, 703–718. doi.org/10.1177/1523422309360844
- Nelis, D., Quoidbach, J., Mikolajczak, M., & Hansenne, M. (2009). Increasing emotional intelligence: (How) is it possible? *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*, 36–41. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.01.046
- Noel, J., Forsyth, D. R., & Kelley, K. (1987). Improving the performance of failing students by overcoming their self-serving attributional biases. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 8*, 151-162. doi:10.1080/01973533.1987.9645882
- Onu, F. M., Obetta, E. J., & Asogwa, V. C. (2013). Emotional intelligence, locus of control and self-efficacy as determinants of graduates' self employment in agricultural occupations in South-East Nigeria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies, 4*, 872-877. doi:hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC148731
- Opengart, R. (2005). Emotional intelligence and emotion work: Examining constructs from an interdisciplinary framework. *Human Resource Development Review, 4*, 49-62. doi:10.1177/1534484304273817
- Perry, E., Raymond, P., & Penner, K. S. (1990). Enhancing academic achievement in college students through attributional retraining and instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*, 262-271. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.82.2.262

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 30

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Petrides, K. V., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence  
5  
6 in personality factor space. *British Journal of Psychology*, *98*, 273-289.  
7  
8 doi:10.1348/000712606x120618  
9
- 10  
11 Pfeffer, J., & Fong, C. T. (2002). The end of business schools? Less success than meets the  
12  
13 eye. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *1*, 78-95.  
14  
15 doi:10.5465/amle.2002.7373679  
16
- 17  
18 Richardson, M., Abraham, C., & Bond, R. (2012). Psychological Correlates of University  
19  
20 Students' Academic Performance: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.  
21  
22 *Psychological Bulletin*, *138*, 353–387. doi:10.1037/a0026838  
23
- 24  
25 Rosete, D., & Ciarrochi, J. (2005). Emotional intelligence and its relationship to workplace  
26  
27 performance outcomes of leadership effectiveness. *Leadership & Organization*  
28  
29 *Development Journal*, *26*, 388-399. doi:10.1108/01437730510607871  
30
- 31  
32 Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and*  
33  
34 *Personality*, *9*, 185-211. doi:10.2190/dugg-p24e-52wk-6cdg  
35
- 36  
37 Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., & Bhullar, N. (2009). The Assessing Emotions Scale. In C.  
38  
39 Stough, D. Saklofske, & J. Parker (Eds.), *The Assessment of Emotional Intelligence*  
40  
41 (pp. 119–135.). New York: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-0-387-88370-0\_7  
42
- 43  
44 Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M., Hall, L.E., Haggerty, D.J., Cooper, J.T., Golden, C.J., &  
45  
46 Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional  
47  
48 intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *25*, 167-177. doi:10.1016/S0191-  
49  
50 8869(98)00001-4  
51
- 52  
53 Shepherd, D. A., Douglas, E. J., & Fitzsimmons, J. R. (2008). MBA Admission Criteria and  
54  
55 an Entrepreneurial Mind-Set: Evidence from "Western" Style MBAs in India and  
56  
57 Thailand. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *7*, 158-172.  
58  
59 doi:10.5465/AMLE.2008.32712615  
60



## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 31

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Spector, P. E., Sanchez, J. I., Siu, O. L., Salgado, J., & Ma, J. (2004). Eastern versus Western  
5  
6 Control Beliefs at Work: An Investigation of Secondary Control, Socioinstrumental  
7  
8 Control, and Work Locus of Control in China and the US. *Applied Psychology*, 53,  
9  
10 38-60. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2004.00160.x  
11  
12  
13 Stajkovic, A.D. and Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work-related performance: a meta-  
14  
15 analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 240-261. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.124.2.240  
16  
17  
18 Sur, S., & Ng, E. S. (2014). Extending theory on job stress: The interaction between the  
19  
20 “other 3” and “big 5” personality traits on job stress. *Human Resource Development*  
21  
22 *Review*, 13(1), 79-101. doi: 10.1177/1534484313492332  
23  
24  
25 Wang, J., & Wang, G. G. (2006). Participation in management training in a transitioning  
26  
27 context: A case of China. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 17, 443-473.  
28  
29 doi:10.1002/hrdq.1185  
30  
31  
32 Weisz, J. R., Eastman, K. L., & McCarty, C. A. (1996). Primary and Secondary Control in  
33  
34 East Asia: Comments on Oerter et al. (1996). *Culture & Psychology*, 2, 63-76.  
35  
36 doi:10.1177/1354067X9621004  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 32

Table 1. Interventions that facilitate changes to EI, SE and LoC.

Core Subjects	Context	Specific activities	Elements that may contribute to growth in LoC-I, EI or SE	Stages of the Kolb's Learning Cycle
<b>Basic Core:</b> Accounting and finance for managers	Cognate and non-cognate degree holders work together in class. Undertake a group project on financial reporting and systems.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="705 408 1220 520">1. Cognate degree holders play a lead role in helping others from non-cognate disciplines understand accounting, facilitated by experienced faculty.</li> <li data-bbox="705 520 1220 608">2. In cross-cultural teams, groups work on a project to help companies set up financial systems.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1220 408 1736 496">1. Social feedback (social, individual, and factual) affected performance outcome and altered locus of control orientation.</li> <li data-bbox="1220 496 1736 608">2. Competency-based task in a team raises self-awareness, and mastery of the subject enhances self-efficacy.</li> </ol>	<b>Concrete Experience:</b> Candidate learns a situation that serves as the basis for observation. where another new experience arises, it creates an opportunity for learning
<b>Basic Core:</b> Current business issues	Candidates from different majors meet in class undertake a group negotiation exercise and individuals investigate and report contemporary business problems.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="705 632 1220 775">1. Work in a negotiating team to anticipate opposing arguments and prepare counterstrategies. Prepare a strategy for bottom-line acceptance and how to achieve a win-win situation.</li> <li data-bbox="705 775 1220 911">2. Each student from different countries presents business perspectives from a cross-cultural context, facilitated by a practitioner-academic, who provides a briefing to each student's presentation in facilitating cross-learning.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1220 632 1736 743">1. Requires understanding of own and others' perspectives, collaboration within a team with negotiation and influencing skills acquired enhances emotional intelligence.</li> <li data-bbox="1220 743 1736 855">2. Individual feedback beneficial both in terms of achievement outcomes and changes internal locus of control</li> </ol>	<b>Concrete Experience:</b> Candidate enjoys another new experience that creates an opportunity for learning  <b>Reflective Observation:</b> Candidate reflects on experience before making any judgements; reviews situation; and finds meaning behind the experience.
<b>Basic Core:</b> Managing business in a global context	Candidates of different nationalities group together in class to undertake subject on multinational business issues.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="705 943 1220 1078">1. Weekly in-class discussions of topical issues over 10 weeks in marketing, operations, finance and economic issues. Marks awarded for individual participation and contribution to discussion.</li> <li data-bbox="705 1078 1220 1270">2. Cross-cultural teams formed to investigate multinational business problems in different countries. Groups present in lecture settings over a 10-week period, facilitated by a practitioner-academic, who provide feedback to team presentation to facilitate cross-learning.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1220 943 1736 1110">1. Individual feedback beneficial both in terms of achievement outcomes and changes internal locus of control. Participation and communication skills, with recognition and appreciation of others' perspectives improves emotional intelligence.</li> <li data-bbox="1220 1110 1736 1246">2. Group preparation requires interpersonal skills, 'live' feedback beneficial both in terms of achievement outcomes and changes of internal locus of control (powerful others and internal).</li> </ol>	<b>Concrete Experience:</b> Candidate shares experiences and enjoys another new experience that provides another learning opportunity  <b>Abstract Conceptualization:</b> Candidate develops theories to explain their experience, giving rise to a new idea or changing a preexisting concept.

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 33

<b>Advance Core:</b> Strategy and leadership	Candidates from different majors meet in class to undertake this penultimate subject involving group project on business leadership/strategy.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Industry speakers invited to share their experiences on business strategy and leadership over a 10-week period.</li> <li>2. Group analyses issues on business leadership and strategy of their choice of industry/company and present findings in a poster conference that is assessed by peers and faculty judges, together with the submission of a full consultancy report.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vicarious experiential learning in leadership development improves self efficacy, while perspective taking enhances emotional intelligence.</li> <li>2. Mastery experiences in integrating MBA learning to analyze business issues and presenting to external audience.</li> </ol>	<b>Active Experimentation:</b> Candidates apply what they learned to another situation. They use their theories to solve problems, make decisions and influence people and/or events.
<b>Advance Core:</b> Business plan: application of strategy	Capstone subject where candidates in different majors work together in teams on problem-based learning.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Members of a newly formed team reach consensus on addressing a business problem or create an entrepreneurial business plan. Formulate a team contract and agreement as a basis to operate and elect a team leader.</li> <li>2. Team maintains online discussion and regular meetings, supervised and monitored by faculty.</li> <li>3. Team pitches their business ideas to an external panel of expert judges and receives feedback on ideas before submitting a final report.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Interpersonal skills for teamwork, collaboration, leadership and problem-solving skills under pressure. Builds upon other team members' skills and perspectives. Heightened awareness of personal and professional development.</li> <li>2. Verbal persuasion and influencing skills needed for pitching ideas within team and with external judges.</li> <li>3. 'Live' feedback beneficial both in terms of achievement outcomes and in changes of internal locus of control.</li> </ol>	<b>Active Experimentation:</b> Candidates apply what they learned to another situation. They use their theories to solve problems, make decisions and influence people and/or events.

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 34

Table 2. Factor loadings of AES items on a 3-factor Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

	Appraisal of Emotions	Regulation of Emotions	Utilization of Emotions
EQ1	.375	.419	-.306
EQ2	<i>.420</i>		
EQ3		<b>.665</b>	
EQ4	.434		
EQ5	<b>.679</b>		
EQ6	<i>.319</i>		
EQ7			<b>.258</b>
EQ8		.454	
EQ9	.400		
EQ10		<b>.590</b>	
EQ11			.516
EQ12		<b>.472</b>	
EQ13			.467
EQ14		<b>.572</b>	
EQ15	<b>.403</b>		
EQ16		.305	
EQ17		<i>.613</i>	
EQ18	<b>.610</b>		
EQ19	<i>.563</i>		
EQ20		<i>.466</i>	<b>.329</b>
EQ21	<i>.436</i>		
EQ22	<i>.599</i>		
EQ23		<i>.624</i>	
EQ24		<i>.294</i>	<b>.265</b>
EQ25	<b>.659</b>		
EQ26			.468
EQ27			<b>.518</b>
EQ28	<i>.360</i>	<b>.326</b>	-.483
EQ29	<b>.463</b>		.552
EQ30		<i>.374</i>	
EQ31		<i>.713</i>	
EQ32	<b>.561</b>		
EQ33	<b>.660</b>		

Note: **Bold font** indicates an item loading onto a factor as expected. *Italic font* indicates significant loadings that are not on the expected factor.

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 35

Table 3. Correlations between EI, SE and LoC at Time 1 and Time 2 for each group and the total sample.

		SE	LoC-I	LoC-P	LoC-C
Time 1					
MBA students	EI	.38**	.31*	-.18	-.04
	SE	—	.08	-.23	-.18
	LoC-I	—	—	.12	.20
	LoC-P	—	—	—	.71**
Psychology students	EI	.56*	.43*	-.12	.09
	SE	—	.48*	-.32	-.37
	LoC-I	—	—	-.24	-.55**
	LoC-P	—	—	—	.12
Non-students	EI	.45**	.35*	-.42*	-.29
	SE	—	.27	-.23	-.33
	LoC-I	—	—	-.23	-.18
	LoC-P	—	—	—	.34
Total sample	EI	.42**	.33**	-.21*	-.08
	SE	—	.22*	-.30**	-.32**
	LoC-I	—	—	-.04	-.07
	LoC-P	—	—	—	.58**
Time 2					
MBA students	EI	.59**	.57**	-.20	-.20
	SE	—	.42**	-.29*	-.22
	LoC-I	—	—	-.06	-.06
	LoC-P	—	—	—	.74**
Psychology students	EI	.43*	.49*	-.35	.03
	SE	—	.50*	-.35	-.12
	LoC-I	—	—	-.18	-.39*
	LoC-P	—	—	—	.38
Non-students	EI	.22	.21	-.34*	-.44**
	SE	—	.55**	-.21	.02
	LoC-I	—	—	-.26	-.36*
	LoC-P	—	—	—	.35*
Total sample	EI	.47**	.46**	-.13	-.03
	SE	—	.48**	-.23*	-.10
	LoC-I	—	—	-.08	-.13
	LoC-P	—	—	—	.63**

Note: \* indicates  $p < .05$ ; \*\* indicates  $p < .01$ .

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 36

Table 4. Means and standard deviations for EI, SE and LoC at Time 1 and Time 2.

	MBA students				Psychology students				Non-students			
	Time 1		Time 2		Time 1		Time 2		Time 1		Time 2	
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	M	(SD)
EI	125.17	(17.40)	133.21**	(13.46)	124.62	(11.37)	124.69	(10.36)	125.12	(13.69)	125.88	(13.04)
SE	3.59	(0.58)	3.88**	(0.57)	3.56	(0.64)	3.67*	(0.63)	3.86	(0.42)	3.84	(0.44)
LoC-I	34.94	(4.70)	37.06**	(4.47)	34.50	(5.80)	32.46	(5.46)	34.03	(7.33)	35.71	(6.10)
LoC-P	23.09	(8.35)	25.58*	(8.01)	21.35	(6.38)	21.96	(5.70)	17.06	(6.13)	18.44	(7.80)
LoC-C	26.08	(7.14)	26.96	(7.25)	22.69	(7.23)	22.58	(8.01)	16.71	(7.33)	16.76	(6.21)

Note: EI = emotional intelligence, SE = self-efficacy, LoC-I = locus of control-internality, LoC-P = locus of control-powerful others and LoC-C = locus of control=chance. \* indicates  $p < .05$ ; \*\* indicates  $p < .01$ .

## EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE, SELF-EFFICACY &amp; LOCUS OF CONTROL 37

Table 5. Regression models predicting final GPA from EI, SE and LoC.

Step	Predictor	B	SE	$\beta$	<i>t</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value
1	(Constant)	2.68	.90			
	Age	.04	.03	.10	1.08	.282
	Gender	.62	.20	.28	3.07	.003*
	Local/international status	.76	.78	.09	0.98	.332
2	(Constant)	3.42	.93			
	Age	.04	.03	.10	1.11	.272
	Gender	.56	.20	.25	2.81	.006*
	Local/international status	.62	.77	.07	0.81	.423
	LoC-P	-.03	.01	-.21	-2.40	.018*
	LoC-C	.03			0.28	.782
	LoC-I	-.04			-0.41	.681
	SE	-.01			-0.08	.888
	EI	-.03			-0.37	.710