

Short Communication

Ability emotional intelligence and mental health: Social support as a mediator



Moshe Zeidner^{a,*}, Gerald Matthews^b

^a University of Haifa, Israel

^b University of Central Florida, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 1 March 2016

Received in revised form 2 May 2016

Accepted 4 May 2016

Available online xxxx

Keywords:

Emotional intelligence

Ability

Social support

Wellbeing

Distress

Mediation model

ABSTRACT

The mediating role of perceived social support availability is examined in the observed association between ability emotional intelligence (EI) and psychological distress. 185 Israeli undergraduate students completed measures of ability EI, social support, and distress. As predicted, path analyses demonstrated that social support was a significant mediator of the effects of EI on distress. These data suggest that the adaptive benefits of high EI should be understood from a social perspective.

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Broadly defined, EI represents a set of hierarchically organized core competencies for identifying, processing, and regulating emotions—both in self and others (Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2002). EI predicts a wide array of affective outcomes (Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts, 2012), but the mediating factors in the EI-adaptive outcome nexus need clarification. Recent studies (Kong, Zhao, & You, 2012a, 2012b; Zeidner, Matthews, & Olenick-Shemesh, 2015) suggest that the benefits of being emotionally intelligent partly reside in greater perceived social support. This paper examines the mediating role of perceived social support in the association between ability-based EI and adaptive outcomes.

EI is robustly associated with lower stress and higher well-being (Zeidner et al., 2012). Research has used scales for both ability EI, conceptualized as a form of intelligence, and trait EI, which is assigned to the personality sphere (Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts, 2009). Two meta-analyses (Martins, Ramalho, & Morin, 2010; Sánchez-Álvarez, Extremera, & Fernández-Berrocal, 2015) estimated adaptive outcomes to correlate at 0.17–0.22 with ability EI and at 0.32–0.36 with trait EI. Both forms of EI may contribute to mental health, but ability and trait EI scales do not correlate strongly, and their impacts on adaptive outcomes may reflect different mechanisms (Zeidner et al., 2009). Our

focus here is on ability EI, as measured by the MSCEIT (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2012; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003).

Zeidner et al. (2015) discriminate two broad perspectives on the adaptive benefits of high EI. The *individual* perspective emphasizes the person's ability to process emotive events accurately and constructively, and to implement effective coping. It is supported by evidence linking EI to stress processes such as appraisal, coping and emotion regulation (e.g., Matthews et al., 2006). The *social perspective* emphasizes the benefits of supportive relationships with others, consistent with evidence that the MSCEIT is associated with a variety of measures of social competence and interpersonal functioning (Rivers, Brackett, Salovey, & Mayer, 2007; Zeidner, Kloda, & Matthews, 2013). The two perspectives are not exclusive – effective emotion-regulation may smooth social interaction, for example – but they do suggest different research strategies for identifying mediators of EI effects on wellbeing.

Social support is a promising candidate for a mediator variable. It is defined as the extent of the person's social integration, including various forms of functional support, including emotional and instrumental support (Taylor, 2011). Both actual and perceived supports enhance wellbeing beyond stress-buffering effects (Taylor, 2011). Social support mediates associations between trait EI and life satisfaction, together with self-esteem (Kong et al., 2012a, 2012b), but it is unknown whether support plays a similar role for ability EI.

Several studies link ability EI to higher levels of social support. The MSCEIT predicts the self-perceived quality of interpersonal relationships (Rivers et al., 2007), as well as external measures of social interaction quality provided by rating (Lopes et al., 2004) and observational

* Corresponding author at: Laboratory for Research on Emotions and Personality, University of Haifa, Mt. Carmel 31905, Israel.
E-mail address: Zeidner@edu.haifa.ac.il (M. Zeidner).

data (Brackett, Rivers, Shiffman, Lerner, & Salovey, 2006). Research by Di Fabio and Kenny (2012) among 309 Italian high school students found that EI, measured both as trait and ability, predicted social support, even when statistically controlling for personality factors. Those evaluating their social support to be higher may also recognize, understand, and manage emotion more effectively. Overall, studies suggest consistently that emotional competency is linked to social engagement and that social support may mediate the benefits of EI on adaptive outcomes.

In a recent study of 203 Israeli high school students, Zeidner et al. (2015) found that EI was associated with several social support scales, as well as social skills, consistent with theoretical perspectives that emphasize the importance of social engagement in adolescence. However, EI did not predict wellbeing in this study, so a mediation hypothesis could not be tested.

1.1. Goals and hypotheses

This study was conducted to test the hypothesis that the effects of ability EI on mental health are mediated by social support. We measured verbal ability and gender as potential confounds, given that the MSCEIT is reliably related to these variables (Mayer et al., 2012).

2. Method

2.1. Participants

185 undergraduate students (62% female) at a Northern Israeli university participated in this study. Participants' mean age was 23.39 (SD = 2.98).

2.2. Variables and measures

A brief, capsule description of the instruments employed in this study follows. Where necessary, the original English scales were translated into Hebrew by a bilingual psychologist and then back-translated to English by a second bilingual psychologist to assure correspondence. Measures were administered to participants in a university lab under controlled conditions.

Emotional intelligence was assessed via a Hebrew adaptation of the 141-item MSCEIT V 2.0, an ability-based EI measure (Mayer et al., 2003). It assesses four branches of EI: i.e., Emotion Identification, Assimilation of Emotions in Thought, Emotion Understanding and Emotion Management or Regulation; alpha coefficients respectively were 0.86, 0.78, 0.70, and 0.74. Total score alpha was 0.90. All tests were proportion consensus-scored with consensus weights determined from the entire sample, as recommended by Mayer et al. (2003, 2012).

Verbal ability was assessed by the 25-item *Vocabulary* subtest of the MILTA verbal ability measure (Level III - Form B; Ortat, 1966). The MILTA is modeled after the Lorge-Thorndike verbal intelligence scale ($\alpha = 0.83$).

Social Support Availability was measured by the *Interpersonal Social Evaluation List* (ISEL; Cohen, Mermelstein, Karack, & Hoberman, 1985). It assesses four facets of support: tangible, appraisal (someone to talk to), self-esteem support and belonging support (availability of people you can do things with). Respondents rate agreement with 40 statements concerning the perceived availability of potential sources of support (e.g., "There is someone I could turn to for advice about making career plans or changing my job"; $\alpha = 0.76$).

Mental health was assessed via two subscales from the 38-item *Mental Health Inventory* (Veit & Ware, 1983). Two separate factors were used: *Wellbeing* (e.g., "During the past month, how much of the time have you felt that the future looks hopeful and promising"; $\alpha = 0.95$) and *Distress* (e.g., "During the past month, how often did you get rattled, upset or flustered?" $\alpha = 0.91$).

Table 1
Intercorrelations among variables.

| Scale | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|-------------------|---------|--------|---------|---------|------|
| 1. EI total | – | | | | |
| 2. Verbal ability | 0.46** | – | | | |
| 3. Social support | .47** | 0.27** | – | | |
| 4. Wellbeing | 0.17* | –0.11 | 0.37** | – | |
| 5. Distress | –0.24** | –0.11 | –0.48** | –0.74** | – |
| Mean | 0.35 | 10.15 | 7.32 | 3.97 | 2.60 |
| SD | 0.05 | 5.08 | 0.60 | 0.99 | 0.89 |

Note: $n = 185$.

* $p < 0.05$.

** $p < 0.01$.

3. Results

Table 1 presents bivariate inter-correlations among study variables, along with variable means. EI and social support were significantly correlated, as hypothesized, and both variables related to lower distress. Verbal ability was significantly associated with both social support and ability EI, but not to distress.

Women scored significantly higher on ability EI than men, $398 (0.05) > 0.378 (0.05)$, $t (184) = -2.56$, $d = -0.40$, with gender differences accounting for 3% of the EI variance. There were no significant gender differences on any other study variables. Tests for gender differences in the relation between EI and social support (males: $r = 0.52$, females: $r = 0.41$), social support and distress (males: $r = -0.51$, females: $r = -0.47$), and EI and distress (males: $r = -0.20$, females: $r = -0.31$), failed to find significant differences among the correlations for men and women.

Using the observed measures of EI, social support, and distress, we employed Hayes (2013) PROCESS module to test for the indirect effects of total EI scores on distress, controlling for gender and verbal ability (as covariates) in the analysis. The regression of social support on EI yielded significant effects, $B = 0.46 (0.08)$, $t = 5.39$, $p < 0.001$, CI: 0.26 to 0.55. When distress was regressed on both social support and EI, controlling for ability gender in the model, the effects for EI were nil and nonsignificant, whereas social support was shown to have a strong effect, $B = -0.47 (0.07)$, $t = -6.34$, $p < 0.001$, CI: -0.62 to -0.33 . The significant indirect effects for EI on distress were almost entirely mediated via the effects of social support (path coefficient = $-0.18 (0.05)$, CI: -0.30 to -0.11). The direct effect of EI (-0.06) on distress was nonsignificant. Similar results were found when testing for the indirect effects of EI on well-being as dependent variable. The indirect effects of EI on well-being (via social support) was 0.16 (SE = 0.043), with 95% bootstrap estimates ranging from 0.091 to 0.265. The direct effects of EI were nonsignificant.

3.1. Structural equation modeling

Next, we tested a linear structural equation model for the mediating effects of social support, as latent variable, on the relationship between EI and mental health, as latent variables (see Fig. 1). EI was represented by the three facets of perception, understanding, and regulation, which are the most stable MSCEIT factors (Zeidner et al., 2009). Mental health was represented by distress and well-being facets, whereas social support was assessed by two indicators, based on the four ISEL subscales—tangible and appraisal support (indicator 1) and self-esteem and belonging support (indicator 2). Analyses were conducted with Mplus Version 7.0 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2012).

Overall, the model showed a satisfactory fit to the data, $\chi^2 (18) = 19.91$, $p = 0.28$, CF = 0.99, NFI = 0.97, RMSEA = 0.046, SRMR = 0.03, AIC = 77.57. Paths between social support and both EI and well-being were statistically significant. The total standardized effect of EI on mental health (path coefficient = 0.272) was fully accounted for




Fig. 1. Structural equation model for predicting mental health, controlling for verbal ability.

by the mediating effect of social support. The direct effect of EI on mental health (path coefficient = -0.13) was not statistically significant.

We also analyzed an alternative model testing for the mediating effects of EI in the relationship between social support and distress, all as latent variables. The model showed a poor fit, $\chi^2(18) = 51.21$, $p < 0.001$, with unacceptable fit levels (e.g., RMSEA = 0.110). Given that the models compared were not nested, a chi-square difference test was not performed.

4. Discussion

This study examined the mediating role of social support in the relationship between ability EI and adaptive outcomes. Consistent with previous findings (Zeidner et al., 2012), ability EI was associated with better mental health. The effect size was consistent with meta-analytic findings (Martins et al., 2010; Sánchez-Álvarez et al., 2015). The association between MSCEIT and social support was also consistent with previous findings (Di Fabio, 2015; Rivers et al., 2007; Zeidner et al., 2015). The study added to previous work by using multivariate modeling to show that the benefits of high EI can be directly attributed to higher perceived social support. The strength of the EI – support association here ($r = 0.47$) was stronger than in the Zeidner et al. (2015) study of adolescents ($r = 0.16$), suggesting that age group may be a moderating variable to be tested in future research.

Social support is a plausible mediator of EI effects on psychological health, given evidence for various relationships between EI and superior social functioning (Rivers et al., 2007; Zeidner et al., 2013, 2015). Findings also suggest that ability EI and trait EI share some common paths towards adaptive outcomes, given that support also mediates trait EI effects (Kong et al., 2012a, 2012b). Thus, our findings are compatible with a social perspective on ability EI (Zeidner et al., 2015).

We acknowledge that the study has the usual limitations of self-report measures and a cross-sectional design. However, it suggests four distinct, though potentially complementary, social-psychological mechanisms that future research could address.

1. *Constructive social appraisal.* Perceived social support is as important for better mental health and lower distress as enacted support or size of social network (Taylor, 2011). Those high in EI may be happier simply because they appraise others as more supportive. At the extreme, this might simply reflect an optimism bias. Consistent with this hypothesis, Zeidner et al. (2013) found that EI predicted personal marital satisfaction, but not the satisfaction of the person's partner: EI produced 'selfish' rather than mutual benefits.

2. *Objective social skill.* Against a pure optimism bias hypothesis, the social skills of those high in EI are visible to others (Brackett et al., 2006). Thus, self-reported social support may in fact be a marker for objective skills that allow the more emotionally intelligent person to derive more benefits from interaction with others.

3. *Social construction of EI.* From an ecological perspective, EI might be a property of the social networks within which the person is embedded, consistent with a social constructivist perspective, with the sharing of emotions important for community cohesion and social trust (Helliwell & Putnam, 2004; Rimé, 2009). If EI is a collective attribute of emotionally-supportive groups, an individual assessment such as the MSCEIT may provide only a limited window into the relevant social processes.

4. *Emotional conformity.* Ability EI may reflect the degree of emotional conformity with others, given that the MSCEIT is scored as consensus with group normative responses. Sharing common assumptions about social-emotional functioning may enhance social interaction and wellbeing (Matthews et al., 2002), irrespective of the content or validity of those assumptions. By contrast, holding unusual views may lead to conflicts with others.

Thus, much remains to be discovered about the inter-relationships of EI, social support and mental health. It remains to be determined (1) whether EI primarily influences self-appraisals or objective social competency, (2) whether EI is an atomistic characteristic of the individual or socially constructed by multiple persons, and (3) whether EI supports active shaping of social environments or passive receipt of social benefits. However, we suspect that the benefits of EI may be expressed

through some broad, emergent quality of positive social engagement, rather than through any single mechanism.

References

- Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Shiffman, S., Lerner, N., & Salovey, P. (2006). Relating emotional abilities to social functioning: A comparison of self-report and performance measures of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 780–795.
- Cohen, S., Mermelstein, R., Karack, T., & Hoberman, H. M. (1985). Measuring the functional components of social support. In I. Sarason, & B. Sarason (Eds.), *Social support: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 73–94). Boston: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Di Fabio, A. (2015). Beyond fluid intelligence and personality traits in social support: The role of ability based emotional intelligence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6.
- Di Fabio, A., & Kenny, M. E. (2012). Emotional intelligence and perceived social support among Italian high school students. *Journal of Career Development*, 39, 461–475.
- Hayes, A. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Helliwell, J. F., & Putnam, R. D. (2004). The social context of well-being. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series B: Biological Sciences*, 359, 1435–1446.
- Kong, F., Zhao, J., & You, X. (2012a). Social support mediates the impact of emotional intelligence on mental distress and life satisfaction in Chinese young adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53, 513–517.
- Kong, F., Zhao, J., & You, X. (2012b). Emotional intelligence and life satisfaction in Chinese university students: The mediating role of self-esteem and social support. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53, 1039–1043.
- Lopes, P. N., Brackett, M. A., Nezlek, J. B., Schütz, A., Sellin, I., & Salovey, P. (2004). Emotional intelligence and social interaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1018–1034.
- Martins, A., Ramalho, N., & Morin, E. (2010). A comprehensive meta-analysis of the relationship between emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49, 554–564.
- Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R. D. (2002). *Emotional intelligence: Science or myth?* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Matthews, G., Emo, A., Funke, G., Zeidner, M., Roberts, R. D., Costa, P. T., & Schulze, R. (2006). Emotional intelligence, personality, and task-induced stress. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 12, 96–107.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. *Emotion*, 3, 97–105.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2012). The validity of the MSCEIT: Additional analyses and evidence. *Emotion Review*, 4, 403–408.
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998–2012). *Mplus user's guide* (7th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Ortar, G. (1966). *MILTA intelligence test*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University.
- Rimé, B. (2009). Emotion elicits the social sharing of emotion: Theory and empirical review. *Emotion Review*, 1, 60–85.
- Rivers, S. E., Brackett, M. A., Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (2007). Measuring emotional intelligence as a set of mental abilities. In G. Matthews, M. Zeidner, & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *The science of emotional intelligence: Knowns and unknowns* (pp. 230–257). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sánchez-Álvarez, N., Extremera, N., & Fernández-Berrocá, P. (2015). The relation between emotional intelligence and subjective well-being: A meta-analytic investigation. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1–10.
- Taylor, S. (2011). Social support: A review. In H. Friedman (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of health psychology* (pp. 189–204). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Veit, C. T., & Ware, J. E. (1983). The structure of psychological distress and well-being in general populations. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 51, 730–742.
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2009). *What we know about emotional intelligence: How it affects learning, work, relationships, and our mental health*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2012). The emotional intelligence, health, and well-being nexus: What have we learned and what have we missed? *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being*, 4, 1–30.
- Zeidner, M., Kloda, I., & Matthews, G. (2013). Does dyadic coping mediate the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and marital quality? *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27, 795–805.
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Olenick-Shemesh, D. (2015). Cognitive-social sources of wellbeing: Differentiating the roles of coping style, social support, and emotional intelligence. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10902-015-9703-z>.