Original Papers

Polish Psychological Bulletin
2019, vol. 50(2) 93–100
DOI - 10.24425/ppb.2019.126023

*Anna Matczak**
*Katarzyna A. Knopp**

Relationship between temperament and the experiential and strategic components of emotional intelligence

Abstract: *The aim of the study was to investigate the relationships between emotional intelligence (EI) and temperament. It was assumed that the two main components of EI – experiential and strategic – have different temperament correlates. One hundred and four Polish university students aged 19 to 26 completed self-descriptive questionnaires of temperament and emotional intelligence. The results confirmed that the relationship with temperament depends on the examined component of EI. Acceptance of emotions (which is a subcomponent of experiential EI) only correlated with two temperamental traits – activity and briskness. Many more dependencies were found in relation to strategic EI. Endurance, strength of inhibition, sensory sensitivity and perseveration turned out to be significant predictors of emotional control, which jointly explained 44% of the variance in results, while perseveration and sensory sensitivity explained 28% of the variance in results on the understanding emotions scale. Based on the results obtained, it can be assumed that the configuration of temperament traits that determines a high capacity for processing stimulation is most conductive to strategic EI. Other propitious traits include those that determine the speed of neural processes, flexibility and ease of adaptation to changing conditions as well as a low sensitivity threshold to sensory stimulus.*

Keywords: *emotional abilities, experiential emotional intelligence, strategic emotional intelligence, temperament, need for stimulation*

Background and purpose of the report

There are substantial discrepancies in defining the concept of *emotional intelligence* (EI). Some authors consider EI to consist of several abilities (instrumental dispositions) that determine one's *capacity* for processing emotional information (the ability model; see Salovey, Mayer, 1990; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, 2000, 2004), while others also include personality traits, i.e., dispositions representing *tendencies* (mixed models; see Goleman, 1995; Bar-On, 1997, 2000). Petrides and Furnham (2000) proposed a distinction between the ability-based and trait-based models of EI, which mainly refers to mixed models. According to them, the principal difference between these two types of EI is that the former is associated with actual abilities and determines *maximal performance* (exhibited by humans under particularly motivating conditions), while the latter is linked to "a constellation of behavioral dispositions and self-perceptions concerning one's ability to recognize, process, and utilize emotion-laden information" (Petrides, Furnham, 2001, p. 278), and determines *typical performance* revealed in everyday situations.

Researchers differ not only in their definitions of EI, but also in how they understand its structure. In their model, Mayer and Salovey (1997) proposed four constituent abilities of EI: perceiving, using, understanding, and managing emotions. The first one means the ability to detect and decipher emotions in faces, pictures, voices, and cultural artifacts, as well as identify one's own emotions. The second one is defined as harnessing emotions to facilitate various cognitive activities, such as thinking and problem solving. The third one is the ability to comprehend emotion language and appreciate complicated relationships among emotions. Finally, the fourth one consists of regulating and managing emotions both in oneself and in others.

The majority of studies on the structure of EI to date (cf. Ciarrochi, Chan, Caputi, 2000; Maul, 2011; Mayer, Salovey, 1997; Mayer, Caruso, Salovey, 1999; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, Sitarenios, 2003; Palmer, Gignac,

* **Instytut Psychologii, Uniwersytet Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie**

Corresponding author: Katarzyna A. Knopp, e-mail: k.knopp@uksw.edu.pl

Manocha, Stough, 2005) have shown that although relatively independent emotional abilities can be distinguished, they are all to some extent interrelated, which points to the existence of *general emotional intelligence* (the *g* factor).

In addition to the *g* factor, research has revealed two lower-order factors (cf. Brackett, Mayer, Warner, 2004; Ciarrochi, Chan, Caputi, 2000; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, Sitarenios, 2003; O'Connor, Little, 2003), each consisting of a pair of abilities from Salovey and Mayer's model (for a more exhaustive description, see Salovey, Mayer, 1990; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, 2000; 2004). One consists of the ability to perceive and express emotions and the ability to emotionally support thinking, while the other is comprised of the ability to understand and analyze emotions and the ability to regulate emotions. The correlation between the experiential and strategic components of emotional intelligence is not very high and they are also differentially related to external variables (cf. Brackett, Mayer, Warner, 2004; O'Connor, Little, 2003). A similar structure of EI also emerges from Polish studies (cf. Jaworowska, Matczak, 2005). At the core of experiential EI lies the ability to recognize and accept emotions as well as to act on the information conveyed by them ("open to emotions and follow their voice"), as well as to have empathy for other people. On the other hand, strategic EI involves the ability to understand, control and regulate emotions, and thus to rationally analyze both emotions themselves and the information provided by them, as well as to consciously use the results of this analysis in regulatory processes.

Regardless of the differences in defining EI, researchers agree that while this kind of intelligence is founded on innate biological underpinnings (structural and functional neurobiological traits; cf. Takeuchi et al., 2011; Tan et al., 2014), it develops during a person's lifetime through social and emotional experiences (cf. Matczak, Knopp, 2013). According to some authors, the aforementioned underpinnings consist of biologically-based temperament (cf. Petrides et al., 2016). Indeed, temperament has been proposed to be the biological basis for the development of EI (e.g. the investment model; Zeidner, Matthews, Roberts, MacCann, 2003; see also Gardner, Qualter, Whiteley, 2011). Furthermore, one of the criticisms raised against EI as a theoretical construct is its insufficient distinctness from temperament (Matthews, Zeidner, Roberts, 2012). In this context, it is surprising that relatively little research to date has been devoted to the relationship between EI and temperament.

Similarly as in the investment model (Zeidner, Matthews, Roberts, MacCann, 2003), it is hereby assumed that temperament is a biological predisposition constituting the foundation and "infrastructure" for the development of emotional abilities. However, we posit that its role in acquiring (learning) emotional abilities is somewhat different from what was previously thought. While Zeidner and colleagues mainly focused on temperament as a factor modifying the effects of the environment on the emotional abilities of a child, we propose that temperament also determines EI development by affecting the intensity and type of an individual's social activity. As a result of that activity, the individual undergoes a kind of natural training which leads to the acquisition and improvement of certain emotional abilities.

Given the aforementioned functions of temperament (biological basis, modifier of environmental effects, and determinant of one's activity levels), in our opinion the relationship between EI and temperament may be considered from a different point of view (cf. Matczak, 2004). First, since social activity is a strong stimulant, it can be assumed that its frequency and intensity depend on stimulation processing capacity as well as on the need for stimulation, both of which are determined by temperament. Numerous studies have shown that individuals undertake actions and prefer situations that are of appropriate stimulating value for them, and reject those that are inconsistent with their temperamental capacity (Strelau, 2002; 2008). Thus, individuals with high stimulation processing capacity exhibit greater social activity, as a result of which they gain experiences potentially conducive to developing EI.

Second, EI can be fostered not only by numerous and intense social contacts enabled by high stimulation processing capacity, but also by those temperament traits that increase sensitivity to one's own and other people's emotions even if they imply a low need for stimulation (cf. Matczak, 2004).

Third, it has been suggested that effective temperament-based regulation of excitation is required for emotions to efficiently "cooperate" with cognition. An individual's level of excitation should allow him or her to act and experience the accompanying emotions without weakening or disrupting cognitive control (cf. Matczak, 2004). Ineffective regulation of stimulation may disrupt the course of cognitive processes, including the processing of emotional information. A tendency for overstimulation, which is more likely in the case of persons with low stimulation processing capacity, appears to be particularly unfavorable. Therefore, it may be concluded that high stimulation processing capacity promotes strategic EI, which in fact consists of the cognitive processing of emotional data.

The purpose of the present study was to identify relationships between EI and temperament. Two concepts of temperament were adopted as the theoretical basis: Strelau's regulative theory of temperament (2002) and Pavlov's typology of the nervous system. Due to space constraints, readers are encouraged to refer to relevant publications offering a broader description of the two theories (see Strelau, 2002, 2008).

As mentioned before, there are relatively few empirical studies verifying the relationships between EI and temperament postulated by scholars. Even less research has been devoted to suggestions that the relationship between temperament traits and EI may differ with respect to the various components of the latter (cf. Gardner, Qualter, Whiteley, 2011). For that reason, the present study was of explorative nature. Nevertheless, based on the aforementioned literature, the following research

hypotheses were adopted: 1) The relationship between EI and temperament depends on a given component of EI; 2) The abilities comprising experiential EI (acceptance of emotions and empathy) correlate with temperament traits conducive to gaining social experiences, that is, strength of excitation, mobility of nervous processes, briskness, endurance, and activity, as well as with the trait increasing sensitivity to emotional experiences, i.e., sensory sensitivity; 3) Understanding and control of emotions (elements of strategic EI) are linked to high stimulation processing capacity; positive correlations exist with strength of excitation and inhibition as well as with endurance, while negative correlations with emotional reactivity and perseveration.

Method

Participants

The research group consisted of a total of 104 Polish second-year students of psychology (81 females, 19 males, 4 did not specify their sex), between the ages of 19 and 28 ($M = 21.12$; $SD = 2.46$).

Measures

Emotional intelligence

EI was measured using the *Popular Questionnaire of Emotional Intelligence* (PKIE) containing 94 self-descriptive items (Jaworowska, Matczak, 2005). In this instrument, respondents rate the degree to which each item applies to them on a 5-point scale. In addition to an overall result, scores can be calculated for the four factor scales, that is: 1) Accepting, expressing, and using one's emotions; 2) Empathy, i.e., understanding and recognizing the emotions of other people; 3) Control, including cognitive control of one's own emotions; and 4) Understanding and awareness of one's own emotions.

Temperament

The *Formal Characteristics of Behavior-Temperament Inventory* (FCB-TI; Strelau, Zawadzki, 1993; 1995) was created based on Strelau's Regulative Theory of Temperament. The instrument is self-descriptive and consists of 120 yes/no items forming 6 scales measuring the following temperament traits: briskness (the tendency to react quickly, to maintain a fast pace in performing activities, and to shift easily between reactions in response to changes in the environment), perseveration (the tendency to continue and repeat behavior or experience emotions after the cessation of stimuli), sensory sensitivity (the ability to react to low-intensity sensory stimuli), emotional reactivity (the tendency to react intensively to emotion-evoking stimuli, expressed in high emotional sensitivity and low emotional endurance), endurance (ability to react adequately in situations demanding long-lasting or highly stimulating activity and under intensive external stimulation) and activity (the tendency to engage in behaviors of high stimulating value or to provide strong external stimulation by means of one's behavior) (Strelau, Zawadzki, 1995).

The *Pavlovian Temperament Survey* (PTS; Strelau, Angleitner, Newberry, 1999) serves to diagnose temperament as defined by Pavlov. It consists of 57 items rated by respondents on a 4-point scale (from *definitely agree* to *definitely disagree*). The items form three basic scales: Strength of Excitation (the capacity of the nervous system to endure long-lasting or short but intense stimulation), Strength of Inhibition (the capacity for conditioned inhibition manifested in the ability to refrain from, delay, or interrupt action), and Mobility of Nervous Processes (the capacity for rapid changes in behavior in response to rapid changes in environmental stimulation).

Procedure

The students were tested in groups ranging from 15 to 30 persons during lectures held at a university lecture hall under quiet and peaceful conditions. The respondents first completed the questionnaire measuring EI, and then the temperament questionnaire on separate occasions and without a time limit). The tests were anonymous, with students providing pseudonyms instead of their names.

Statistical Analysis

The results were entered and coded in Microsoft Excel 2007. SPSS 21 software was used for statistical analysis. Due to the overrepresentation of females, separate analyses were conducted for the female sample. However, since the results did not differ statistically significantly from those for the overall sample, only the latter were used in further analysis. Correlations between the variables were checked by calculating Pearson's r. Multiple regression analysis was performed for each EI indicator as a criterion. When adding predictors to the model, the stepwise method was used with probability F of .05 for entry and .10 for removal. In the last part of analysis, respondents were classified into groups exhibiting high, medium, and low stimulation processing capacity based on configurations of temperament traits determining one's need for stimulation. Their EI was analyzed using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Scheffe's *post hoc* test.

Results

Table 1 presents correlation coefficients between temperament traits and EI (overall and its components).

As can be seen, a significant but weak positive correlation was found between the strategic and experiential components of EI ($r = .26$; $p < .01$). Of particular note are relationships between their subcomponents. Similarly to findings from other Polish studies (Jaworowska, Matczak, 2005), the subcomponents of strategic EI (understanding and control of emotions) were positively correlated with each other, but there was no significant relationship between empathy and recognizing and accepting emotions, which comprise experiential EI. Furthermore, among the examined abilities empathy exhibited the weakest correlation with overall EI.

Overall EI was observed to be positively correlated with mobility of nervous processes, briskness, sensory sen-

Table 1. Study variables' means, standard deviations and inter-correlations (N = 104)

		M	*SD*	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1	OEI	348.21	41.89	.68**	.60**	.62**	.56**	.54**	.27**	.12	.11	.23*	.18*	–.24*	.23*	–.31**	.30**	.05
2	STR	67.13	13.66		.91**	.90**	.26**	.25**	.13	.31**	.26*	.34**	.30*	–.47**	.22*	–.51**	.48**	.07
3	CON	32.30	7.67			.64**	.20*	.20*	.10	.36**	.41**	.37**	.31**	–.43**	.16	–.49**	.53**	.05
4	UND	34.82	7.43				.27**	.25**	.14	.18	.03	.24*	.25*	–.42**	.24*	–.42**	.35**	.07
5	EXP	129.11	14.10					.81**	.68**	.04	–.06	.13	.16	–.11	.16	–.13	.07	.18
6	ACC	56.14	10.39						.12	.09	–.17	.17	.27**	–.05	.08	–.15	.15	.24*
7	EMP	72.96	8.37							–.04	.10	.03	–.07	–.13	.17	–.03	–.07	.00
8	STE	46.49	10.38								.28**	.64**	.66**	–.48**	–.05	–.65**	.67**	.43**
9	STI	49.87	7.32									.18	.12	–.31**	–.02	–.41**	.35**	–.09
10	MNP	55.78	8.54										.50**	–.38**	–.12	–.53**	.57**	.46**
11	BRI	13.85	4.08											–.43**	.08	–.55**	.51**	.40**
12	PER	13.94	3.50												.21*	.65**	–.56**	–.19
13	SES	16.26	3.58													.02	–.12	–.01
14	EMR	11.54	4.65														–.71**	–.38**
15	END	8.86	4.87															.32**
16	ACT	11.38	4.89															

Notes. *M* – mean; *SD* – standard deviation; OEI – overall EI; STR – strategic IE; CON – control of emotions; UND – understanding of emotions; EXP – experiential EI; ACC – acceptance of emotions; EMP – empathy; STE – strength of excitation; STI – strength of inhibition; MNP – mobility of nervous processes; BRI – briskness; PER – perseveration; SES – sensory sensitivity; EMR – emotional reactivity; END – endurance; ACT – activity.

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$.

sitivity, and endurance, and negatively with perseveration and emotional reactivity. No significant relationships were found between temperament and experiential EI. When examining the two subcomponents of experiential EI separately, positive correlations were only identified between acceptance of emotions and briskness and activity. In contrast, strategic EI was associated with all temperament traits except from activity. Both of its subcomponents, i.e., understanding and control of emotions, were positively related to mobility of nervous processes, briskness, and endurance, and negatively to perseveration and emotional reactivity. Additionally, there was a positive correlation between control of emotions and strength of excitation and inhibition, as well as between understanding of emotions and sensory sensitivity.

Table 2 presents the multiple regression models built for various EI indicators (entry method – see *Statistical Analysis*). Only two variables, endurance and sensory sensitivity, were incorporated into the model built for overall EI as a criterion. In total, they explained 16% of the variance in overall PKIE scores. The only significant predictor of experiential EI was sensory sensitivity, but it accounted for as little as 4% of its variance. Attempts to build separate models for experiential EI subcomponents failed for empathy (none of the temperament traits entered in the model met the adopted criteria), whereas the model for acceptance of emotions as the dependent variable contained only one temperament trait – briskness, which accounted for approx. 7% of the variance. A different pattern of associations, with higher correlations, was found for strategic EI. Endurance, sensory sensitivity, and inverse perseveration together explained 41% of the overall score. It should be noted that the model built separately for control of emotions as a criterion incorporated strength of inhibition in addition to the temperament traits significant for the entire strategic component of EI – these traits explained as much as 44% of the variation in the overall score. Furthermore, perseveration (negative

Table 2. Models of linear multiple regression for overall, experiential and strategic EI as criterions and temperamental traits as predictors (N = 104)

Criterion	Predictors	*R*	R^2	Beta	*F*
Overall EI	Endurance	.31	.09	.31	9.43**
	Endurance Sensory sensitivity	.41	.16	.34 .27	8.79***
Strategic EI	Endurance	.51	.26	.51	31.60***
	Endurance Sensory sensitivity	.57	.32	.54 .25	21.08***
	Endurance Sensory sensitivity Perseveration	.64	.41	.35 .32 –.36	20.38***
Control of emotions	Endurance	.55	.31	.55	40.14***
	Endurance Strength of inhibition	.61	.38	.45 .28	27.24***
	Endurance Strength of inhibition Sensory sensitivity	.65	.42	.48 .28 .20	21.10***
	Endurance Strength of inhibition Sensory sensitivity Perseveration	.67	.44	.39 .25 .24 –.20	17.47***
Understanding of emotions	Perseveration	.43	.18	–.43	20.43***
	Perseveration Sensory sensitivity	.53	.28	–.51 .33	17.71***
Experiential EI	Sensory sensitivity	.21	.04	.21	4.19*
Acceptance of emotions	Briskness	.26	.07	.26	6.81*

Note. Stepwise method was used with probability *F* with inputs of .05 and outputs of .10. There are only significant predictors in the table.

* $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

beta) and sensory sensitivity were significant predictors of understanding emotions, accounting for 28% of its score.

Table 3 shows the results of one-way ANOVA and the *post hoc* test used to compare the participants' EI with their stimulation processing capacity. The groups were identified based on a configuration of scores on the endurance and emotional reactivity scales. The criterion was ½ standard deviation from the mean. Individuals scoring high on endurance (more than $M + ½\ SD$) and low on emotional reactivity (less than $M - ½\ SD$) were assigned to the group with high stimulation processing capacity. The group with low stimulation processing capacity contained individuals scoring low on endurance (less than $M - ½\ SD$) and high on emotional reactivity (more than $M + ½\ SD$).

As can be seen, significant differences were found for overall EI, strategic EI, as well as both of its subcomponents examined separately. Individuals with high stimulation processing capacity were characterized by higher overall EI than those with medium or low capacity. Analogous differences were found in relation to strategic EI and understanding and control of emotions – high stimulation processing capacity group exhibited significantly higher levels of each of these abilities as compared to groups with medium and low stimulation processing capacity. No differences in EI were found

Table 3. Comparison of EI of persons with large (n = 26), medium (n = 42) and small (n = 36) capacity for processing stimulation

Indicator of IE	Capacity for processing stimulation	*M*	*SD*	ANOVA: Sum of squares between groups (*df* = 2) within groups (*df* = 101)	ANOVA: Mean square	ANOVA: *F*	ANOVA: Mean difference (Scheffe's tests)
Overall IE	large	370.46	33.21	17643.64 161468.58	8821.82 1598.70	5.52*	A > B; A > C
	medium	345.60	48.39				
	small	337.00	32.91				
Strategic EI	large	79.31	11.72	5232.07 14071.58	2616.04 139.32	18.78***	A > B; A > C
	medium	65.45	13.62				
	small	61.19	9.30				
Control of emotions	large	39.00	7.17	1563.47 4494.29	781.73 44.50	17.57***	A > B; A > C
	medium	31.55	7.50				
	small	29.06	5.08				
Understanding of emotions	large	40.31	5.48	1076.37 4505.46	538.19 44.61	12.07***	A > B; A > C
	medium	33.90	7.74				
	small	32.14	6.09				
Experiential IE	large	132.62	16.02	694.85 18577.31	347.42 183.93	1.89	–
	medium	126.12	12.59				
	small	127.75	12.72				
Acceptance of emotions	large	58.92	12.15	391.18 10888.97	195.59 107.81	1.81	–
	medium	54.05	9.88				
	small	55.28	9.56				
Empathy	large	73.69	8.67	43.32 6917.30	21.66 68.49	.32	–
	medium	72.07	9.52				
	small	72.47	6.15				

Note. A – large capacity for processing stimulation; B – medium capacity for processing stimulation; C – small capacity for processing stimulation.

* $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

between individuals with medium and low stimulation processing capacity. Neither experiential EI nor its subcomponents were differentially correlated with stimulation processing capacity.

Discussion

The results of the present study confirmed the existence of correlations between EI and temperament. However, in line with hypothesis 1, they depended on the examined components of EI. Temperament was primarily correlated with understanding and control of emotions, i.e., the subcomponents of strategic EI. As expected, a positive relationship was found for the temperament traits linked to high stimulation processing capacity and a negative relationship for those linked to low levels of that capacity. ANOVA and Scheffe's test confirmed the significance of correlations between stimulation processing capacity and strategic EI. Individuals scoring high on that capacity were characterized by significantly higher strategic EI than those with medium or low capacity. Furthermore, the absence of intergroup differences between individuals with medium and low stimulation processing capacity suggests that it is a threshold variable, meaning that it enhances strategic EI abilities only after reaching a certain threshold.

Stimulation processing capacity determines resistance to stress and strain. Physical and social demands do not evoke excessive excitation in persons with high stimulation processing capacity, and so they can respond and act efficiently even when exposed to very strong or long-lasting stimuli. In contrast, the same stimuli would lead to overstimulation in individuals with low stimulation processing capacity, impairing the efficiency of their overall and cognitive functioning, as well as entailing other negative consequences (e.g., emotional disturbances). In this context, the positive correlation of emotional control with strength of excitation and endurance, which determine the processing capacity of the nervous system, is not surprising. Strength of inhibition was also found to be a significant predictor of control of emotions, enabling individuals to extinguish, differentiate, or delay reactions in strongly stimulating situations. At the level of behavior, this is for instance manifested in task orientation and the ability to refrain from a socially unacceptable expression of emotions. The negative correlation between stimulation processing capacity and emotional reactivity provides additional support for the significance of the former for EI. The tendency to react strongly to emotion-provoking stimuli is reflected in high sensitivity and low emotional resistance. Individuals with high levels of that trait exhibit high irritability and are prone to react strongly even to small and insignificant events; they are also self-conscious and easily offended. Such persons reveal low emotional resilience, have a tendency to give up when faced with difficulties, and frequently experience emotional tension. All of this is certainly inconsistent with strategic EI.

Of interest is the relationship between strategic EI and sensory sensitivity. The latter was expected to be predominantly associated with the experiential component of EI as individuals with high levels of that temperament trait can recognize even weak stimuli and assess signals of low intensity. However, the hypothesized relationship was not corroborated. Instead, sensory sensitivity turned out to be a significant predictor for understanding and control of emotions. In this context, another interesting finding was the negative correlation of strategic EI with emotional reactivity as the latter implies a low threshold to emotional stimuli as well as low resistance to them. The positive correlation of strategic EI with sensory sensitivity in conjunction with its negative correlation with emotional reactivity suggests that high sensitivity to sensory stimuli with concomitant high emotional resilience is conducive to efficient processing of emotional information. This means that for emotional experiences to be subjected to cognitive processing, they must be recognized, but the accompanying excitation should not be too high.

Furthermore, correlation analysis revealed an unexpected relationship between strategic EI and briskness and mobility of nervous processes, which determine the speed of nervous processes, the ease of shifting from one situation to another and from passive to active states, maintaining a high rate of activity, and accommodation to changes in the environment. At an emotional level, this can enhance task-dependent mood modulation as well as flexibility in thinking. A negative relationship was found between strategic EI and perseveration, that is, the tendency to continue and repeat certain behaviors after the cessation of stimuli. Individuals scoring high on this trait are inclined to excessively concentrate on the past: repeatedly recall and ruminate about past events and experience them emotionally for an extended period of time. This may result in cognition being engaged in processing only one type of experience, or indeed in fixating on the perseverated experiences to the exclusion of others, which makes it difficult to consider the situation at hand from different perspectives.

Few correlations were found between temperament and experiential EI. Contrary to what was expected, its levels were not significantly affected by stimulation processing capacity. No significant relationships were found between temperament and empathy. Still, as hypothesized, acceptance of emotions was correlated with briskness and activity, the two temperament traits that may be decisive in determining the intensity of social training, that is, the number and diversity of interpersonal situations and interactions. On the other hand, only briskness was a significant predictor of the acceptance of emotions, but it accounted for merely 7% of its variance. In light of the available empirical data, it is difficult to explain such a weak relationship between temperament and the experiential component of EI.

The results of the present study indicate the need for further investigation into correlations between temperament and EI as numerous aspects of the relationship between these two constructs remain unclear. In particular, future research should focus on the association between temperament traits and the behavioral component of EI

Also some other individual characteristics (mainly cognitive abilities), which are potential predictors of EI, warrant more comprehensive inquiry. A deeper understanding of the relationship between EI and temperament would shed more light on the development of the former. Such knowledge could then contribute to the implementation of suitable psycho-corrective and psycho-educational programs for individuals exhibiting deficits in EI.

References

Bar-On, R. (1997). *EQ-i. Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory. A measure of emotional intelligence. User's manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory. In R. Bar-On, J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 363–388). San Francisco, CA: Jossey – Bass, Inc.

Brackett, M. A., Mayer, J. D., & Warner, R. M. (2004). Emotional intelligence and its relation to everyday behavior. In P. Salovey, M. A. Brackett, & J. D. Mayer (eds.), *Emotional intelligence. Key readings on the Mayer and Salovey model* (pp. 223–241). Port Chester, New York: Dude Publishing.

Ciarrochi, J. V., Chan, A. Y. C., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *28*, 539–561. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00119-1.

Eisenberg, N. (2000). Empathy and sympathy. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Ed.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 677–691). New York: The Guilford Press.

Gardner, K. J., Qualter, P., & Whiteley, H. (2011). Developmental correlates of emotional intelligence: temperament, family environment and childhood trauma. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *63*, 75–82. doi: 10.1111/j.1742-9536.2011.00010.x

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. Michigan: Bantam Books.

Jaworowska, A., & Matczak, A. (2005). *Popularny Kwestionariusz Inteligencji Emocjonalnej PKIE. Podręcznik*. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych PTP.

Matczak, A. (2004). Temperament a inteligencja emocjonalna. *Psychologia, Etologia, Genetyka*, *10*, 59–82.

Matczak, A., & Knopp, K. A. (2013). *Znaczenie inteligencji emocjonalnej w funkcjonowaniu człowieka*. Warszawa: LiberiLibri.

Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R. D. (2012). Emotional intelligence: a promise unfulfilled? *Japanese Psychological Research*, *54*(2), 105–127. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5884.2011.00502.x

Maul, A. (2011). The factor structure and cross-test convergence of the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso model of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *50*, 457–463. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2010.11.007

Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, *27*, 267–298. doi: 10.1016/S0160-2896(99)00016-1

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3–31). New York: Basic Books.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (pp. 396–420). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.

Mayer J. D., Salovey P., & Caruso D. (2004). Emotional intelligence: theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, *15*, 197–215.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT v2.0. *Emotion*, *3*, 97–105. doi: 10.1037/1528-3542.3.1.97

O'Connor, R. M., & Little, L. S. (2003). Revisiting the predictive validity of emotional intelligence: Self-report versus ability-based measures. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *35*, 1893–1902. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00038-2

Palmer, B. R., Gignac, G., Manocha, R., & Stough, C. (2005). A psychometric evaluation of the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test Version 2.0. *Intelligence*, *33*, 285–305. doi: 10.1016/j.intell.2004.11.003

Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *29*(2), 313–320. doi: 10.1016/s0191-8869(99)00195-6

Petrides, K. V., Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, *15*, 425–448. doi: 10.1002/per.416

Petrides, K. V., Mikolajczak, M., Mavroveli, S., Sanchez-Ruiz, M. J., Furnham, A., & Pérez-González, J. C. (2016). Developments in Trait Emotional Intelligence Research. *Emotion Review*, *8*(4), 335–341. doi: 10.1177/1754073916650493

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, *8*, 185–211.

Strelau, J. (2002). *Temperament: a psychological perspective.* New York, oston, Dordrecht, London, Moscow: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Strelau, J. (2008). *Temperament as a regulator of behavior: after fifty years of research.* New York: Eliot Werner.

Strelau, J., Angleitner, A., & Newberry, B. H. (1999). *The Pavlovian Temperament Survey (PTS): An international handbook.* Goettingen, Germany: Hogrefe.

Strelau, J., & Zawadzki, B. (1993). The Formal Characteristics of Behaviour-Temperament Inventory (FCB-TI): Theoretical assumptions and scale construction. *European Journal of Personality*, *7*, 313–336.

Strelau, J., & Zawadzki, B. (1995). The Formal Characteristics of Behayior—Temperament Inventory (FCB-TI): Validity studies. *European Journal of Personality*, *9*, 207–229.

Takeuchi, H., Taki, Y., Sassa, Y., Hashizume, H., Sekiguchi, A., Fukushima, A., & Kawashima, R. (2011). Regional gray matter density associated with emotional intelligence: Evidence from voxel-based morphometry. *Human Brain Mapping*, *32*, 1497–1510. doi: 10.1002/hbm.21122

Tan, Y., Zhang, Q., Li, W., Wei, D., Qiao, L., Qiu, J., Hitchman, G., & Liu, Y. (2014). The correlation between emotional intelligence and gray matter volume in university students. *Brain and Cognition*, *91*, 100–107. doi: 10.1016/j.bandc.2014.08.007

Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., Roberts, R. D., & MacCann, C. (2003). Development of emotional intelligence: towards a multi-level investment model. *Human Development*, *46*, 69–96. doi: 10.1159/00006858