

**To Reveal or Conceal?  
Managers' disclosures of private information during Emotional Intelligence training**

**Abstract**

To date, emotional intelligence (EI) training interventions have been under-researched. This study responds to this paucity of scholarship by investigating the occurrence of private disclosures during managerial EI training. Whilst an unorthodox practice, this article argues that trainers introduce opportunities to reveal private information to develop participants' EI. The aims of this study are to explore the role of such disclosures and how emotion influences managers' decisions to reveal or conceal private information. Data is drawn from participant observations and interviews with managers and trainers attending three externally provided, 'popular' EI training courses. Applying Petronio's communication privacy management theory and Stiles' fever model of distress disclosure to analyse the data, a typology is presented that suggests managers reveal private information for 'self-awareness' and 'catharsis' and conceal private information for 'self-protection' and 'disengagement'. By applying Petronio's theory to a new work context of training and extending Stiles' model to a range of emotions, the article provides novel insights into managerial control over disclosures, privacy boundary turbulence and how emotions serve as a resource and condition to disclosure practices. These findings have relevance for trainers and their strategies to develop EI.

**Introduction**

“There is a danger to such [Emotional Intelligence] training, of course, and that is exposing people to emotions that they do not wish to feel. There is also a considerable

ethical issue facing trainers: to allow participants to easily opt out, to protect personal disclosures as confidential information and to provide emotional support after the end of the session” (Caruso, Bienn and Kornacki, 2006: 203).

This article explores managers’ disclosures of private information during ‘popular’ emotional intelligence (EI) training courses, which are externally provided by independent management consultancies and are open enrolment. Private information refers to anything disclosed or given access to that results in vulnerability, as perceived by the owner (Child et al, 2011). Self-information may refer to feelings, thoughts and experiences, reflecting issues that matter deeply to the discloser. To date, there is a small but growing body of literature on the topic of work-based disclosures (Allen et al, 2007; Gordon, 2011; Peters and Brown, 2009; Stanton and Stam, 2003). This article represents a contribution to this area of research by exploring a new work context of management training. Whilst disclosure of private information during EI training may reap personal and professional rewards for managers, the argument presented here is that there may also be private and public losses. These losses refer to the (in)voluntary nature of such activities, privacy management to third parties (employer) and whether or not trainers are qualified to manage such confidences. These are important issues for the training and Human Resource Development community in relation to best practices and policies.

Whilst there has been a recent rapid growth of academic and practitioner EI literature including workplace accounts (Cartwright and Pappas, 2008), we know very little about EI training in management studies. This is despite the fact the number of EI training programmes available has proliferated since EI has been linked to organisational performance (Clarke, 2006a). Of those few studies, the focus tends to be on whether EI can be learnt during training and whether this learning has an impact on organisational performance (e.g.

Clarke, 2006a; Groves, McEnrue and Shen, 2008; Slaski and Cartwright, 2003). One key problem is that the type of training (tools and materials), underlying principles, concepts and theory are rarely documented in academic studies (exceptions being Clarke, 2010a, 2010b; Slaski and Cartwright, 2003; Thory, 2013a). Without progressing our understanding of what goes on during EI training, its contribution to how EI is learnt and what training works best remains under-theorised and poorly understood (Schutte, Malouff and Thorsteinsson, 2013).

There are suggestions in the EI literature that personal disclosures enhance the development of one's emotional intelligence (Clarke, 2006a, 2006b; Fineman, 2000; Sparrow and Knight, 2006). The training context, particularly when it is commonly open enrolment, off-site training, is not completely commercial and managers render themselves vulnerable by entering a holistic realm, to explore and reveal the self more broadly within a wider world of emotions (Kunnanatt, 2004). For individuals attending these training courses, the nature of training can be intimate and intense and the impact profound.

There has been no explicit reference to EI as a disclosure practice in scholarly EI accounts (e.g. Matthews, Zeidner and Roberts, 2002). Yet, consultants respond to what they perceive as a demand for this, or because they feel introducing 'deeper' elements reaps better results. There is a body of literature which lends direct support for this idea and refers to the modification of management ideas as they travel from source to practice. It is widely recognized that management knowledge, whether taken from academic theory, industry or management gurus requires translation, mutation and commoditisation (Suddaby and Greenwood, 2001; Benders and Van Veen, 2001; Heusinkveld, Sturdy and Werr, 2011; Røvik, 2011). When a management practice is sufficiently ambiguous it allows for interpretive viability which enables its broader dissemination (Benders and Van Veen, 2001).

Training consultants, as mediators, pick up management ideas and commodify them, operating as active translators to sell their knowledge as specific solutions (Fincham and Evans, 1999). In this way, McCabe (2011) highlights that consumption of management ideas is a risky business because gurus have no control over how their materials are used. Within the realm of EI training, consultants infuse their training with requests for private disclosures to help participants explore, share and reflect openly on one's emotions and experiences to develop EI.

This project investigates the following research questions: why do managers choose to reveal or conceal private information during EI training and what role do emotions play in disclosures? To answer these questions, the paper draws on Petronio's (2000; 2002; 2010) communication privacy management (CPM) theory and Stiles' (1987) fever model of distress disclosure. CPM theory offers an alternative perspective to theories of self-disclosure and self-sensoring (e.g. Rose, 1989; 1996) by providing rich conceptual insights into the protection of the self, the interactive role of disclosers and recipient(s) and when privacy boundaries are breached (Petronio, 2010). Whilst CPM theory views emotion as important in the decision rules associated with disclosure, it has yet to clearly articulate this (Petronio, 2010). In order to capture the function of emotions, the article also draws on Stiles' (1987) fever model of distress disclosure. Stiles' model is useful to show how the escalation of emotion leads to an increased propensity to disclose (Petronio, 2002), given there is a high susceptibility to feeling a range of emotions when revealing or concealing private information.

This is the first study to apply Petronio's CPM theory and Stiles' model to the work context of management training. Data were collected from participant observations and interviews

with managers and trainers attending three EI training courses. From the analysis of data, an empirical typology is presented which shows why managers reveal or conceal private information during EI training. The matrix makes visible two dimensions of managerial disclosure: 'expected outcomes' (gain/loss) and 'emotional state' (comfortable/distressed). This demonstrates that managers reveal private information for 'self-awareness' (gain/comfortable) and 'catharsis' (gain/distressed) and conceal private information for 'self-protection' (loss/distressed) and 'disengagement' (loss/comfortable). Through an analysis of the data, Stiles' fever model is usefully applied and expanded to show how negative and positive emotion is central to decision criteria to reveal or conceal because emotions and expected outcomes interact to shape the function of disclosure. CPM theory demonstrates the dynamic interaction between discloser and recipient and explains situations when privacy boundary turbulence occurs. Implications for best EI training practice and the personal and professional impact of (non) disclosures on training participants are discussed. The article proceeds with a description of EI training and its suggested disclosure practices, followed by an applied discussion of CPM theory and Stiles' fever model to EI training. This section is followed by the methodology, then findings and a discussion of the data. The article finishes with the conclusion and implications for scholarship and practice.

### **Emotional Intelligence Training and the Disclosure of Private Information**

There are many different 'types' or models of emotional intelligence used in academic and business settings. Making sense of these different versions has been helped by scholars who have sought to categorise them into groups. Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2000) first made the distinction between 'mixed' and 'ability' models, terms which have since been widely used. The 'mixed' type denotes Emotional Intelligence models which include a *mixture* of skills,

attributes, traits and aptitudes, and are widely associated with popular writings and literature. The 'ability' models refer to emotional intelligence assessments which view the construct as an ability, not dissimilar to IQ which can be measured under test conditions using expert scorers.

Amongst the mixed or 'popular' EI models, the most frequently used are Bar-On's (2000) Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) and Goleman's Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) (Boyatzis and Sala, 2004). Goleman (1998) describes Emotional Intelligence as the skills or competencies to be able to know one's own emotions, manage one's own emotions, self-motivate as well as recognise others' emotions and handle relationships. According to Bar-On, Emotional Intelligence is defined as: "a cross-section of inter-related emotional and social competencies that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate with them, and cope with daily demands and pressures" (Bar-On, 2004: 117). Core to all popular EI models are the skills in emotional self-awareness, empathy and understanding others' emotions (Matthews, Zeidner and Roberts, 2002). Emotional self-awareness requires an ability to identify and differentiate one's feelings such as anger, fear, happiness and sadness and understand their causes, origins and consequences. To facilitate this awareness, individuals talking openly to others in a group context can achieve reflections and insights. Empathy and understanding others' emotions require active emotional engagement with another person by responding to, being aware of, sensitive to, and taking an interest in his or her feelings and concerns (Matthews, Zeidner and Roberts, 2002). Whilst acknowledging conceptual, theoretical and methodological flaws of popular EI models (e.g. Day and Kelloway, 2004; Matthews, Zeidner and Roberts, 2002; van Rooy and Viswesvaran, 2004), and their clear distinction from scholarly models of ability EI (Mayer, Salovey and Caruso, 2000), the 'mixed' view is highly popular and used in organisations to a

greater extent than ‘ability’ models (Bar-On, 2004; Cartwright and Pappas, 2008; Day and Kelloway, 2004). Thus, the popular models permit some broader generalisations to be made on the effects of EI training and disclosure practices.

Within the realm of EI training this article argues that consultants infuse their courses with disclosure practices because they have personal and psychological value for emotional self-awareness, empathy and understanding. Unsurprisingly, the idea that personal disclosures may support EI development is suggestive in practitioner and scholarly accounts. For example, individuals are asked to think about uncomfortable feelings and consequential actions, think about the range and depth of feelings experienced, explore past feelings in relation to current thinking, feeling and behaviour and explore others’ emotions (Illouz, 2008; Kornacki and Caruso, 2007; Kunnanatt, 2004). According to Lindebaum (2009: 234) successful EI growth may entail that ‘individuals contemplate in detail the genesis of their emotional pain, fears, and anxieties that they can leave their comfort zone to break new grounds’. Such contemplations may lead to public disclosures. More recently, Lindebaum (2012) discusses how high ‘ability’ EI may equate with the free expression of genuine emotions. In a similar vein, Vince (2014: 413) argues that ‘It is important to accept that our attempts to reason with, control, understand, and manage emotion are limited’. Other accounts highlight how formative EI experiences encourage individuals to get their feelings ‘out in the open’ and discuss experiences, attitudes and beliefs in a public arena (Clarke, 2006a, 2006b; Fineman, 2000:111; Sparrow and Knight, 2006). For example, in a qualitative study of EI training, Clarke (2006b) shows that health care workers develop EI through opportunities to share work-related feelings with colleagues and discuss and reflect on how difficult emotional situations have been handled.

Whilst disclosure of private information during EI training may reap personal and professional rewards for managers, there may also be private and public losses. Confidentiality issues regarding how private information is disclosed to third parties within the organisation and the impact such disclosures have on professional success is of concern. Empirical accounts show how employees evade requests to disclose their private emotional lives for work gain when confidentiality assurances are not made by trainers or when there are boundary conflicts (c.f. Martin, Knopoff and Beckman, 1998; Mirvis, 1994). Mirvis (1994) describes how employees may try to sabotage, avoid or interrupt training courses when they seek to engage them on this level. In a practitioner account, Caruso, Bienn and Kornacki (2006) raise concerns over third party disclosure of personal information during EI training and whether participants are given the choice to opt out. This also raises questions as to whether training consultants or HR professionals are equipped to deal with personal and sensitive situations and whether the mishandling of confessionals may have a deleterious effect on individual well-being and EI learning (Thory, 2013b). In aggregate, requests for disclosures during EI training are likely to be met by a variety of responses, and have a range of effects on improving EI.

To help understand the relational, emotional and ethical complexities of disclosures and confidentiality issues highlighted here, the next section turns to Petronio's (2000; 2002; 2010) communication privacy management (CPM) theory and Stiles' (1987) fever model of disclosure.

### **Applying Communication Privacy Management Theory to Emotional Intelligence Training**

Petronio's (2000; 2002; 2010) CPM theory argues that people feel their private information belongs to them and therefore they have the right to control who knows, how much they know, and how these 'co-owners' treat their information (Petronio, 2010; Petronio and Durham, 2008). Petronio offers a means of analysing the complexities of confidentiality regulation as a relational process taking into account both the person disclosing and the recipient of the information (Petronio and Durham, 2008). People choose to disclose on the basis of risk-benefit criteria, cultural values, gender, situational factors or motivations to reach a certain goal (Petronio, 2002; 2010; Petronio and Reiersen, 2009). For example, people reveal for self-clarification, self-validation, impression formation, relationship maintenance, social influence, manipulation or to gain self-awareness (Allen et al, 2007; Metzger, 2007; Petronio, 2002; Petronio and Reiersen, 2009).

When original owners negotiate how they want their authorised co-owners to care for their information, this coordination process typically helps the recipients to know what is expected in terms of confidentiality. However, there are times when negotiations do not take place, or mistakes and miscalculations are made (Petronio, 2010). In these cases, there is the possibility of 'privacy turbulence', meaning the way the owner expects the co-owner to care for the information breaks down calling for a re-calibration of the privacy rules by the owner (Petronio, 2010). Equally, boundary management becomes difficult if sources that do not 'co-own' information try to gain access such as when managers use coercive or legitimate power to force a disclosure. In response, employees use tactics, such as ambiguity, as a strategy to protect privileged positions (Eisenberg, 1984). Personal information may be concealed or withheld at work because disclosure leads to a loss of influence, perception of weakness, or because it creates discomfort and embarrassment in the self.

CPM theory was originally developed to understand privacy issues in interpersonal relationships, in particular, family relationships. Over the last decade family communication research using CPM theory has explored parent-children and marital couples' privacy boundaries, and how family members manoeuvre around moral obligations to disclose genetic information, sexual abuse and AIDs (e.g. Rauscher and Fine, 2012). More recently CPM theory has been used to analyse organisational contexts in relation to electronic surveillance (Allen et al, 2007; Stanton and Stam, 2003), disclosures during exit interviews (Gordon, 2011), mental illness at work (Peters and Brown, 2009) and academic advisors and college students (Thompson, Petronio and Braithwaite, 2012). This demonstrates that CPM is increasingly used in business and management research and, thus, has considerable utility in organisational contexts (Petronio, 2002). Importantly, CPM theory can be used in long term relationships but also interactions with no previous history. For example, when a patient visits a physician or seeks medical care for the first time, he or she must make a choice about how much to reveal in order to receive healthcare.

The particular focus of this study is EI training courses which are externally run by independent management consultancies and offer open enrolments to all organisations. This new research context is different from families or organisations in that participants and trainers are strangers to each other and unlikely to meet again. Thus, there is little fear of damaging longer term social relationships. Because of the fleeting nature of these relationships and the potentially intimate and intense features of the training, revealing private information during EI training may be more likely to occur. Disclosure can be expressive of intrinsic needs such as gaining self-awareness, self-understanding or self-acceptance and as a form of relief or catharsis (Stiles, 1987). Here, the relevance of disclosures to EI training is clear, given the development of emotional self-awareness in such

programmes. Clearly, though, open enrollment EI courses may still encourage disclosure for strategic, longer-term gains such as support seeking, reciprocity, impression management or deepening of an acquaintance.

However, in EI training, lines may be crossed if the trainer solicits information participants are not prepared to give, creating power imbalances, a sense of disparity and discomfort for informants (Petronio and Reiersen, 2009). Emotions play an important part in such cases of privacy turbulence. In situations where people are ‘expected’ to disclose in response to solicitations by EI trainers who hold some power over them, it is likely that the expectation of giving up control over one’s private information results in high stress, embarrassment and emotional capital being expended. Boundary turbulence can also occur when privacy management boundaries are not negotiated and trainers pass on participant disclosures to an employer as an obligation regarding third party dissemination outside of the discloser’s agreement (Petronio and Durham, 2008; Petronio, 2010).

CPM theory views emotion as integral in decision making criteria to communicate private information but emotion is not a theoretical component of CPM (Petronio, 2010). In order to explain the role of emotion, this article also draws on Stiles’ (1987) fever model of disclosure. Stiles’ model shows how intense emotions such as specific distress disclosures focus on intrinsic motivations or gains (catharsis and self-awareness) (Petronio, 2002). Distress disclosures tend to occur when the relationship is perceived as *safe* (Stiles, 1987), in that the relationship and situation must be perceived as trustworthy because disclosure can feel threatening, provoking fears of exposure, engulfment or loss of control (Stiles, 1987). In addition, the discloser’s status relative to the other must be secure (Stiles, 1987). For

example, the discloser must feel assured that the recipient will not take advantage of his or her vulnerability or misuse the confidences within or outwith the relationship.

Stiles' model only focuses on distress disclosures. Yet, we know that other emotions influence disclosure decisions. Grief, sadness, anger and depression may conditionally modify privacy rules (Petronio, 2010). Equally, calm, comfortable and relaxed emotional states may affect decision criteria to reveal or conceal private information. For example, individuals may reveal in comfortable emotional states to develop self-awareness or acquire self-knowledge as part of personal and professional development (Petronio, 2002). In these situations there is less need for catharsis because the individual is not distressed. Whilst Stiles (1987) draws attention to the trust and status conditions of distress disclosure, during non-distressed disclosures individuals are less likely to feel vulnerable or threatened. However, there will still be expectations of co-ownership and recipient responsibility that influence decision making (Petronio, 2002).

In sum, training consultants may infuse their popular EI training courses with disclosure practices. CPM theory enables an exploration of the complexity of such disclosures, and this study provides a new work context for its application. However, whilst CPM theory captures privacy rules, privacy boundaries and boundary turbulence, it has yet to show the explicit role and function of emotions during disclosures. Stiles' model provides scope to understand distressed emotion as a central concept of disclosure. In complement, CPM and Stiles' model provide a deeper understanding of the relational dynamics and role of emotion during EI training disclosures. However, we require a greater understanding of how a range of emotions affect decision criteria to reveal or conceal private information. This article sets out to investigate this aspect more fully by exploring the research questions: why do managers

choose to reveal or conceal private information during EI training and what role do emotions play in disclosures? The next section describes the methodology adopted in this study.

## **Methodology**

The selection criteria for the EI courses in this study were to choose a representative cross-sample of EI programmes available in the marketplace. From an initial desktop research the three courses in this article represented such a sample and were labelled ‘Bar-On’, ‘Goleman’ and ‘Hybrid’, based on the popular EI models they adopt. These courses were typified as ‘open’ programs wherein participant attendance was of a voluntary nature and paid for by each participant’s employer. Table I provides details of the three training providers, the duration and location of the course, content covered during the training, the generic influences of each course and the trainer’s background/experience. As Table I shows, all three training courses focused on developing a wide set of EI capacities which included skills, attributes, traits and aptitudes (e.g. emotional awareness, emotion regulation, empathy, optimism, motivation, self-regard, happiness and social skills). Exercises were sourced from a number of origins. Of particular interest to this study were (non)disclosures which were prompted by four exercises and situations: emotional awareness exercises; review and feedback sessions; EI self-report inventories; and spontaneous, unsolicited disclosures.

INSERT TABLE I HERE

This study adopted a case study approach. Case studies provide insights into contextualised formal and informal organisational processes particularly within exploratory research (Merriam, 1988). Whilst a case study does not enable analytical generalisations (Yin, 1994) it

does permit theoretical understandings. The research methods adopted were 40 hours of participant observation during the training courses where the researcher was fully immersed as a participant, semi-structured interviews and analysis of training documentation (training manuals, supplementary books, hand-outs and other presentational documents). The researcher conducted 31 semi-structured interviews with participants, of which 27 were with training delegates and four with training consultants. Shorter, second interviews were conducted with seven of the participants to clarify and expand on data where necessary. Participants came from a broad cross-section of industries including insurance, banking, energy, local government, pharmaceuticals and management consultancy. Most participants were aged between 35 and 50 and had more than three years of managerial experience. All participants were line, middle or senior managers.

The sampling strategy for interviewees was a self-selection approach involving participants who were interested in the study who responded because of their desire to take part (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2003). Participants were recruited through mixed methods: email invitation from the researcher prior to the training day (Hybrid), recruitment during the training day (Bar-On) or invitation by the trainer prior to the course (Goleman). Most participants attended the training voluntarily, because they had an annual training budget for which they could select appropriate courses. In some cases, friends or colleagues had recommended the EI course. A few participants had been encouraged by their supervisor or mentor to seek specific interpersonal skills training and chose EI. Importantly, attendance in the courses was never part of participants' terms of employment. Given all participants occupied managerial functions, the EI theme was deemed highly appropriate for developing emotional and social skills.

The research study was granted ethical approval by the researcher's university and each participant read a participant information sheet before signing a consent form. Delegate interviews took place three to four months after the training, to give them the opportunity to try out the EI ideas and practices learnt on the course. Trainers were interviewed shortly after the training programme. Each interview lasted between 45 and 90 minutes. All participants agreed to their interviews being tape-recorded. All interviews were transcribed manually in full by the researcher, resulting in 310 pages of interview data. Participant observation notes amounted to just over 100 pages of data.

The interview topic guide with the trainers explored the content, objectives and focus of the course and its genesis. Events that had happened on the training day and previous EI training courses were also explored. Insights were also gained into trainers' opinions on broader issues such as the growing popularity and trends in EI in the UK and its parallel with 'therapeutic practices' (understanding emotions, disclosures, emotional support, reframing problems). This line of discussion enabled the researcher to open up questions around the theme of disclosures and emotions surrounding disclosures, witnessed and recorded during participant observations on the training courses.

The interviews with managers were broken up into three parts to cover: their motivations for attending the EI course; their in-depth experiences/observations of the training courses; learning EI; and their uses of EI at work after the course and related outcomes. Attempts were made to keep questions as open-ended as possible and then explore themes farther as they arose. The therapeutic themes raised by trainers were explored with managers and this prompted many recollections of 'confessionals'. On the training courses, 'live' note taking throughout each training day focused on visible trainer interactions with the whole group and

smaller group work the researcher was personally engaged in. Comprehensive notes were produced because every delegate was seated at a table and engaged in note taking so this was easily and discreetly achieved by the researcher. Notes were fully written up at the end of each training day.

To analyse the material collated around the three exploratory disclosure themes of ‘why?’, ‘to whom?’ and ‘what role of emotions?’ a template analysis approach (King, 2012) was used. This enabled the researcher to manually code the interview data to create sub-themes. The first set of codes which were derived inductively from the data included: the activity which prompted the (non) disclosure; emotions experienced; whether emotions were pre-existing or generated by disclosure incident; the purpose of (non)disclosure; the outcome; who the recipient was (delegate/trainer and individual/small group/whole group); whether privacy lines were crossed; and what impact the activity had on EI skill development. These codes referred to both descriptive themes (e.g. activities which prompted disclosures) and interpretive themes which were harder to define (e.g. emotional states) (King, 2012). Observation notes and training documentation were cross-referenced with the interview data on themes such as emotional states and training activities/situations. At this point, the EI literature was revisited for indications of disclosure practices and appropriate theoretical frameworks were reviewed.

Next, the codes were organised hierarchically (King, 2012). Separate codes relating to ‘purpose’, ‘outcome of (non)disclosure’ and ‘impact on EI skill development’ were incorporated into a single first order code: ‘outcome of disclosure’. A third order code was developed labelled ‘gain/loss’. Separate codes of ‘emotions experienced’ and ‘pre-existing/prompted emotions’ were coded into a super-ordinate code: ‘emotional state’. The

third order code developed from this was ‘distressed/comfortable’. The interview data was then mapped onto the template to ensure each incident was allocated to only one category (Ritchie, Spencer and O’Connor, 2003). Through an iterative process of data-theory interplay, shaped by theoretical insights produced by the data, the coding enabled a typology to slowly evolve which discriminated the dimensions of (non)disclosure (Figure I). It also enabled minor internal variations within some categories. The remaining codes provided layers of insight into each quadrant of the matrix e.g. boundary turbulence, the recipients, type of exercise. These were reported in the findings and discussion as supporting data.

Overall, the rich interview data was triangulated with the participant observation data and training documentation (Elliott, Fischer and Rennie, 1999). In sum, assimilation and analysis of the data was achieved using Petronio’s (2002; 2010) and Stiles’ (1987) framework, and researcher reflexivity (Alvesson, 2003) whilst presenting nuances in the data through the verbal narratives (Elliott, Fischer and Rennie, 1999).

## **Findings**

First, the four types of exercises and situations which prompted (non)disclosures are described. On the Goleman course, a ‘Self Disclosure Exercise’ involved participants identifying several feelings on a list which they had not revealed at work. Each person was then asked by Wilma, the trainer, to reveal these emotions on the training course. The learning point was that emotional honesty and disclosure was integral to developing emotional self-awareness. Review and feedback sessions took place on all three programmes and elicited a number of disclosures from participants. For example, on the Bar-On programme, at the beginning of the third day, several weeks after the first two training days,

participants were asked to split into small groups to review, honestly and openly, what EI aspects worked and did not work during the period away. Also on the Bar-On course, an EI self-report questionnaire which enabled self-mapping of EI was completed online before the training and hard-copy profile reports were provided to participants during the training. In the Hybrid course delegates were introduced to a personality inventory called The Enneagram which included nine personality ‘types’, their inner motivations, thought patterns, basic belief systems and emotional coping mechanisms for each type. During the training day, participants were encouraged to identify which type they might be and talk freely about their core motivations. Spontaneous disclosures were prompted on the Hybrid EI course when, in small groups at the outset, participants were asked to write on a flip chart sheet the ‘issues’ that had brought them to the EI training event. Other discussions and exercises throughout all three training courses provoked natural disclosures.

From the analysis of the data, an empirical typology was developed (Figure I) which shows why managers reveal or conceal private information during EI training and how emotion is used as a resource of, and condition for, disclosure. The matrix makes visible the dimensions of disclosure ‘expected outcomes’ and ‘emotional state’, and suggests four quadrants or functions, ‘self-awareness’, ‘catharsis’, ‘disengagement’ and ‘self-protection’.

INSERT FIGURE I HERE

The typology presents managers’ accounts of revealing private information for ‘self-awareness’ (gain/comfortable) and ‘catharsis’ (gain/distressed) and concealing private information for ‘self-protection’ (loss/distressed) and ‘disengagement’ (loss/comfortable). The rest of the article uses these headings as an analytical tool to show managers’ four types

of (non) disclosure, the trainer-delegate relational complexities and breaches of privacy boundaries within these quadrants (Petronio, 2002; 2010).

### ***Revealing Private Information for Self-Awareness***

Given EI's direct focus on enhancing emotional self-awareness, disclosure practices were frequently adopted for this function, when participants were in a comfortable emotional state. Numerous participants described the opening small group 'issues' exercise on the Hybrid course as a catalyst for spontaneous, deeply personal disclosures. Stan, a Sales and IT manager, attended the EI event to gain insights into: 'what's happened to me in my life and how it's structured me and created who I am'. During the interview he explained pragmatically that experiences on previous courses influenced his willingness to disclose, because he knew they 'worked' in this regard. Here he describes a previous workshop and its stimulus:

“We went in there and were told we had to tell our three partners in our group something about ourselves. And I went in and said ‘I do ballroom dancing’. Then Amanda said ‘I had an abortion four weeks ago because I’m a career minded woman’. Then Pete who was the other turned round and said ‘actually I’ve just thrown my daughter out because she’s just given birth to a black baby’. And I thought ‘ah, I might need to give it a bit more here!’ [laughs]. That was it. After that there was nothing else anyone could give anymore and everything was open. When I went to this EI course, I went with the same mind - these things do work.....” (Stan, Sales and IT Manager, Hybrid).

Carol, a Director of a Special Needs School, had attended numerous EI courses and was studying for a higher qualification in emotional intelligence. She believed: ‘you need to go through a certain amount of process in order to become self-aware’ and that required ‘pulling it [the core of a person] all out and looking at it’. During the interview she commented that she had been comfortable disclosing private information on the course for this reason and believed this enhanced emotional self awareness. Andy, one of the Hybrid trainers, reinforced this process:

“The essence of the programme is to say, yes, you can manage your emotions and yes you can read about how to do it but unless you bring up in yourself the emotions that cause you the most issues and work with them in real time using the stuff then it’ll just remain a theory. In my experience these techniques work indeed” (Andy, Trainer, Hybrid).

In this way, the Hybrid course contained several experiential exercises to surface participants’ emotions to enhance self awareness. At the end of one problem solving game, all delegates was invited to share what they had felt during the task (pressure, anxiety, calmness, excited) and whether this had affected their perceptual and cognitive skills in finding a solution. The learning point was to attune to moment-by-moment emotions and their impact on thinking in pressurised situations. Those delegates interviewed afterwards commented how helpful this had been in increasing their emotional self awareness.

Jim, Head of Benefits Realisation for a bank, was on a ‘mission’ of work-based self-development and the Goleman EI course was one of many self-development courses he had attended. During the Self Disclosure Exercise he conveyed a lot of private information calmly

and candidly, such as frustration with himself in interpersonal interactions at work. During the interview he explained ‘it was all part of that need for self-insight’. During training observations, Mike, a Consultant attending the Bar-On course, comfortably disclosed to peers that his questionnaire based EI score was low in ‘self-regard’, commenting on his training job ‘it’s a very frontline position, it’s a very exposed position and I’m a sensitive, vulnerable soul!’. During the interview he explained that confronting this and other feelings during the course, especially in the small group work, made him more aware of his emotions. In these cases, managers calmly decided to entrust their private information to peers and trainer(s). Whilst never discussed, informants seemed to assume that what was revealed in the room stayed in the room, denoting recipients as a responsible party. The ‘off-site’ independent status of the training, which distanced participants from their work environments, appeared to reinforce this. For example, managers explained that their employers knew very little about the EI course they were attending and the trainers did not have contact information of participants’ line managers. However, other individuals demonstrated more mindful, calibrated responses to EI’s disclosure practices for self-awareness. Sally, a Manufacturing Pharmaceuticals Director noted: “Because I’m happy to share bits of me but I’m not happy to share the whole lot and what I share I choose to share”.

When participants showed willingness to reveal private information about themselves through the EI self-report questionnaires, as part of gaining self-awareness, the information also entered a shared space. However, Pippa, a Hardware Services Manager for a bank, who attended the Bar-On course, commented of her EI scores: ‘I tried to be very honest and unguarded with what I was answering. But the answer wasn’t what I was expecting, I was disappointed’. Nicci, a Learning and Development Manager, said ‘I was quite hurt. I didn’t want to come out as that person’. The EI questionnaires and profiles seemed to provoke

anxiety because Pippa and Nicci could not match up to the ideal ‘profile’. Nicci, Pippa and Mark also commented that there was no opportunity to discuss their profiles with the trainer, through a one-to-one feedback session or informal chat, despite their expectations of this happening. As a consequence Pippa said she would prevent trainers’ attempts to access private information in the future via this method. In this way, when expectations of how the information from EI questionnaires would be treated were not met, participants conveyed hurt because their privacy rules appeared violated.

### ***Revealing Private Information for Catharsis***

The function of catharsis was to bring some personal, intrinsic relief through disclosure whilst in a distressed state. Feelings of distress appeared to act as a catalyst to reveal private information in situations of safety. Nadia, a Marketing Manager, described how contemporaries in her small group voluntarily used the EI training day for personal disclosures as a means of catharsis, as trust was gained in the group:

“It was very interesting because at the beginning of the day people were very guarded about what they talked about and you know people would say ‘yes, I want to lead my team more effectively’ or something like that and as the day went by people’s different problems came up. For example, another lady would say ‘I’ve been trying to have a baby for ten years and I see everyone around me having babies, it makes me really upset; I can’t control my emotions.’ And it became very personal” (Nadia, Marketing Manager, Hybrid).

As part of the introductory 'issues' exercise on the Hybrid course it was observed that Sara, an Office Manager, became quite distraught in her small group. She explained she was at breaking point in her organisation and the EI course was the final attempt to resolve some 'nasty hidden agendas and politics'. She wanted help from the course's emphasis on emotional self-awareness, emotion management and skills to deal with people. During the interview she commented 'it was good to get that out in the open and everyone in my group was so nice'. Other participants reported similar experiences of emotional 'unloading' in their groups, providing visible relief for the disclosers. Wilma, the Goleman trainer, explained how a female participant on a previous EI training course had broken down in tears and shared personal information with the other delegates because:

“clearly her boss was bullying her and so there were times through the course where she got very emotional and cried about things that were happening and the group were very supportive of her and these are people she'd never met before and they talked to her about how she should exit the organisation fairly quickly actually” (Wilma, Goleman Trainer).

The majority of observed and reported distress disclosures took place in small delegate groups rather than to the trainer or to the whole group because the smaller group seemed to be less intimidating and more supportive. This was apparent from the level of relaxed and informal interactions observed in the smaller groups during the training days. By contrast, all the trainers adopted a 'tough love' response to distress disclosures. This was evident in Martin's pragmatic 'so what are you going to do?' approach to delegates' disclosures:

Somebody's actually said to me and they were pretty upset at the time, 'I've got one breast smaller than the other and I've hated it all my life and blah de blah de blah'. You get guys who have got problems with their complexion, psoriasis or something like that. So I said well go and do something about it, you can do it safely these days. What's stopping you?" (Martin, Bar-On Trainer).

By adopting a more pragmatic, supportive approach which differentiated them from therapists, the trainers appeared to avoid accusations of operating outwith their professional domain of expertise.

### ***Concealing Private Information for Disengagement***

The function of disengagement was to conceal private information when training concepts lacked credibility, and seemed unsubstantiated and flawed. Thus, when tools used to facilitate disclosure had low face validity, the perceived benefits of disclosure diminished. This led to disengagement and was observed and reportedly carried out during participants' comfortable emotional states.

Eight participants who attended the Hybrid course, calmly refused to disclose private information in relation to the Enneagram personality model because they felt it was a *slippery* concept. Numerous managers felt it was too simplistic to put people's personalities into 'boxes' and there were concerns about getting the types wrong. June, a Trustee Accounts Manager, noted 'I'm sure that a lot of work has gone into it but I'm a bit loathe to put people into boxes.' She reported feeling very disengaged from this aspect of the course as a consequence. Another manager commented 'The Enneagram is sort of like, yes, we might

well fall into a category but we might be thinking ‘no I do not fall into that category’. In these cases, decisions to conceal referred to the disclosure failing to provide any worthwhile gain. In several cases the Enneagram, which is not typically associated with EI in scholarly accounts, was deemed too crude, ‘psychoanalytical’ and one-dimensional.

In a similar vein, some participants were sceptical of attributing current behaviour to one’s past to gain self insight. All the trainers explained that past feelings affect current emotions, thinking and behaviour. Martin elaborated on this during our interview: “You may be working with people who have substantial defence mechanisms against the damage that has been done to them. So what you’re dealing with are very very clever children in an adult body”. Andy, the trainer on the Hybrid course explained during the EI training: ‘All our emotions are about past experience’. However, Clare, an Office Manager attending the Hybrid course, felt these EI ideas could erroneously attribute current problems to the past self:

“I chose not to say things about myself because making that assumption that it must have gone way back into one’s childhood on something that happened that’s making a person act the way they did; now it may well have done but you get lots of children who are remarkably adaptive adults and they have had a bad childhood” (Clare, Office Manager, Hybrid).

Clare was deeply sceptical of explaining current behaviour through an analysis of family and formative relationships. In this way she, like others, felt some concepts provided false self-understanding. Highlighting other flaws with EI, Adam, Head of Customer Connections for an energy company explained how EI can take away the spontaneity of life:

“If you’re constantly examining and discussing your emotions and constantly examining other peoples’ emotions you could turn the whole process of life, relationships, and talking to people into a total scientific, self-examination and psychoanalysis type process which is not really what life is about”.

He also felt limited in his capacity to reveal private information because it seemed impractical and made him feel vulnerable. Several managers felt EI could go ‘too deep’ and become too therapeutic and invasive which was not suitable for a business context. Because of this they chose to focus less on the emotional skills and more on other aspects of EI. Pippa admitted that the EI questionnaire results did not fit her self-concept but she was also sceptical of the measure’s validity. As a consequence she chose to focus on the happiness theme of the programme rather than developing emotional self awareness skills.

### ***Concealing Private Information for Self-Protection***

As EI trainers Martin, Andy and Angie all seemed to purposefully encourage disclosures and actively sought to be confidants, viewing this as an inevitable part of their professional consultancy work. Angie, a trainer on the ‘Hybrid’ course explained: ‘when you have that much confidence at the front of the room, people are generally more open to sharing some of their issues’. However, this did not always bring about the type of EI learning they envisaged, as this section illustrates.

The function of self-protection was to conceal private information to minimise feelings of vulnerability and exposure whilst in a distressed state. However, two types of concealment were adopted by participants on the basis of self-protection. The first was a refusal to reveal private information due to pre-existing feelings of distress, where the disclosure was actively inhibited because it would make the individual feel more vulnerable. Thus, the expected outcome was a loss. The second was a distressed response to the request for disclosure itself. Turning to the first, numerous participants interviewed explained that they had not wanted to reveal private information during the training. Despite experiencing the day as ‘an eight hour counselling session’ Nadia noted “I didn’t talk about my goals because I didn’t want to”. She later explained that her lack of disclosure was because: “I was also going through a very difficult time personally and my emotions were very, very raw”. Wilma, the Goleman trainer, recounted another situation where revealing private information threatened a participant’s sense of self control:

“I was using some EI themes on a first line manager course where a man asked to talk to me at the break time and he said ‘I really can’t talk about this stuff. I cannot open myself up at work. I have to keep myself a closed book otherwise I would go over the edge completely. So I don’t want to talk about anything in the next session. Please don’t ask me any questions because I’m only just holding it together’” (Wilma, Goleman Trainer).

Angie also recounted situations where participants refused to communicate private information during EI training and this clearly created distress:

“Other people find it quite challenging. We had one lady on our course that day who said oh she didn’t do emotion and then in the next breath she said that these exercises actually make her feel very uncomfortable. We actually asked her some further questions about the reasons that she does that but she just wasn’t ready at that point to explore those emotions. But some people shut down to their emotions through fear or personal experience or they are just scared about what the emotions might make them do or not do” (Angie, Hybrid Trainer).

Sally, a Manufacturing Director who attended the Hybrid course noted: “...not everyone is comfortable with their emotions and comfortable to talk about them. And you saw that in the group – people responded in different ways”. In these cases, EI’s disclosure practices seemed to worsen feelings of vulnerability and anxiety through trainers’ deliberate requests to share private information. Martin, the Bar-On Trainer, who was a qualified outplacement counsellor, was mindful of delineating these boundaries:

“You need people who’ve got solid awareness of where their competency finishes and where they’re going to refer people to or at least ask people pertinent questions at that boundary, and not leave them or wave bye-bye to them on the other side of the fence: ‘sorry I can’t climb over this fence, bye-bye, see you’. You’ve got to say ‘can you talk to your GP about this? Who are you talking to?’” (Martin, Bar-On Trainer).

Some participants on Martin’s course were also conscious of this boundary management, as Malcolm observed:

“If something comes up, and this can happen on a course, if you come up against a situation where a person is not sufficiently resourceful and there is psychological stuff involved you have to learn to not get involved in ways that might not be helpful and instead to steer the person towards, suggest they talk to someone professional”  
(Malcolm, Consultant, Bar-On).

Wendy pointed out that she had recommended the very agitated male delegate (described earlier) should seek professional help via a company employee assistance programme because it would be helpful for him but she was unsure whether he had followed this up.

### **Discussion**

This study set out to answer: Why do managers choose to reveal or conceal private information during EI training and what role do emotions play in these disclosures? The typology offers four clear functions for (non)disclosures which capture the role of both positive and negative emotions as a condition for, and resource of, disclosure. When managers revealed private information (thoughts, emotions and behaviours) for self-awareness they saw clear gains and felt safe and equal to the co-owners of their information (Stiles, 1997). In numerous cases these disclosures appeared to help managers develop emotional self-awareness and insights as core aspects of EI. For example, Carol believed that ‘pulling it all out’ and sharing this information increased emotional self awareness. The experiential emotions exercises on the Hybrid course also developed self awareness. Crucially, these disclosures took place when participants were in a comfortable (relaxed, calm) state.

However, feelings were sometimes so strong and salient that they overwhelmed other thinking (Stiles, 1987). Many accounts of catharsis were reported, often as spontaneous disclosures which produced ‘relief’ for participants. There is considerable evidence that disclosures during distressing times have a positive effect on health and wellbeing (Petronio, 2002). Sara and others reportedly benefitted from this uninhibited sharing of personal information. Clearly, in distress disclosures participants are also motivated strategically to gain temporary support (Petronio, 2002) and this was evident in the case of Nadia’s contemporaries, Sara’s revelation and the delegate who was being bullied by her manager. Distress disclosure is powerfully constrained by relationships and roles which offer or threaten safety (Stiles, 1987: 276). Many distress disclosures took place in ‘confidential cocoons’ (Petronio and Reiersen, 2009: 370). These were particularly evident in small delegate groups which produced a safety level based on trust and equal status, for example, during small group introductory and review sessions. These group members appeared to act as boundary insiders (Petronio and Reiersen, 2009), who became privileged confidants, free to discuss confidential and often emotional matters within the groups. Co-operation and trust were additionally developed because different individuals contributed to the ‘collective whole’ (Petronio and Reiersen, 2009: 370). This reciprocity appeared to be based on recipients’ desire to be empathic, a skill emphasised on the EI training course itself, and an obligation to work through the discloser’s problems (Petronio and Reiersen, 2009). Other examples demonstrate incremental disclosures, as reported by Nadia. This happened when individuals gauged the receptiveness of the target audience over time, assessing the likelihood for negative reactions and breaches of trust (Petronio, 2010).

When participants were exposed to what they believed to be poorly conceptualised tools and techniques they chose to conceal private information on the basis that they did not provide

gains such as self-awareness or acquisition of self-knowledge (Petronio, 2002). Managers also rejected training methods which requested an exploration of one's emotional history/formative relationships. This was exemplified in Clare's composed response and consequential disengagement. These findings demonstrate how discerning managers are of unorthodox (low face validity) or invasive exercises and on this basis such methods are less likely to increase willingness to disclose. Managers who engaged in concealment to disengage did so in comfortable, calm and relaxed emotional states. When participants concealed private information for self-protection, granting others access to that 'rawness' jeopardised composure, self-control and perceived positive impression management (Stiles, 1987; Petronio, 2002). This was exemplified in Nadia's account of her own painful emotions and trainers' previous experiences with delegates. These situations delineate thick boundaries where high risk episodes require more tightly held boundaries which may cause shame, threat or embarrassment (Petronio, 2002). Indeed, requests for disclosure to enhance EI in pre-existing distressed states can induce denial, avoidance, anxiety and repression. Equally, requests for disclosure can generate distress itself.

The empirical typology in this article shows how different emotional states are also central to decision criteria to reveal or conceal, as a resource of, and condition for, disclosure. In this way, the typology highlights that a rapid shift or change in an emotional state could alter the function or motive of (non)disclosure. Equally, a calm disclosure which promises increased self-awareness (gain) could quickly become a cathartic disclosure if the information shared provokes distress but emotional release is an expected gain. This finding makes an important contribution to Stiles' (1987) fever model of disclosure by providing a more complex understanding of how positive and negative emotions *strongly* influence the purpose of disclosure, dependent on expected gains and losses.

On all three training courses, EI trainers adopted roles as deliberate confidants (Petronio and Reiersen, 2009) because they requested private information from participants. This was exemplified in Anne's request for disclosure when a participant was highly distraught, Wilma's use of the Self Disclosure Exercise and Martin's Review sessions. Although their tough love approach was contra-indicative of a therapist's style, they assumed they could have access to the information and in that way they operated not dissimilarly to therapists or clinicians (Petronio and Reiersen, 2009). However, in some cases it is possible this undermined participants' feelings of safety in two ways. First it may have demoted their status, making them feel somewhat inferior (Petronio, 2010; Stiles, 1987); and, second, it could have undermined the relationship's trustworthiness because participants felt exposed. For example, Anna, one of the Hybrid trainers accounted for one angry 'therapeutic' emotional outburst on the basis of a delegate's personality type but equally, this anger may have been in response to feeling vulnerable (Stiles, 1987) or angry about the request for disclosure in an unfamiliar environment.

As Petronio (2010) notes errors, miscalculations or intrusions take place when there are clashes of boundary expectations, largely because they are not stipulated, co-constructed or negotiated. Privacy boundaries were breached by trainers when they failed to treat the information in accordance with managerial expectations. For example when EI questionnaires were not discussed, as in the case of Pippa, these critical incidents acted as catalysts for boundary shifts and 'shut-downs' to more tightly protect their private information (Petronio, 2010). Participants' privacy rules were also breached when their EI questionnaires produced information which made them uncomfortable and there was no opportunity to reconcile or discuss this. Interestingly, none of the participants were concerned

about third party dissemination to their employer. This was accounted for by the independent and off-site nature of the training which created distance from their employer as demonstrated by the lack of information participants' managers had about the course or trainer contact details.

Finally, it is useful to offer some interpretations on whether disclosures enhance EI. Disclosures to achieve goals of emotional self-awareness (in comfortable states) appear to contribute to developing EI. Communicating private information for catharsis would seem to also benefit EI development given that the suppression of intense negative emotions impedes listening, memory and undermines health and well-being (e.g. Lindebaum, 2012). Releasing unwanted emotions can also alleviate stress. It is also likely that catharsis helps recipients practice their empathy, understanding and emotional problem solving skills as part of their own EI development. Opportunities to practice and develop these EI skills were observed across all three training courses. However, pursuit of disclosures against owners' wishes undermined safety (trust/status), caused distress and wariness, which are likely to increase emotional suppression. Given negative emotions obstruct learning (Fineman 1997) requesting disclosures against informants' wishes to disclose could have a deleterious effect on EI development. Equally, poorly designed (low face validity) training methods fail to improve EI and are also likely to jeopardise receptiveness to future EI learning.

### **Conclusion**

Using Petronio's CPM theory and Stiles' fever model of disclosure, this article extends conceptual knowledge of the complex tension of private-public information (Petronio, 2004) to a new work context of management training. In doing so, it gives new insights into what

goes on during EI training (methods and practices). The analytical typology shows that managers develop criteria to reveal and conceal private information based on achieving certain goals: self-awareness, catharsis, disengagement and self-protection. Stiles' fever model is usefully applied and expanded to show how negative and positive emotion is central to decision criteria to reveal or conceal because emotions and expected outcomes interact to shape the function of disclosure. CPM theory demonstrates that this process is not straightforward because there are relational complexities and clashes in boundary management between discloser and recipient. The study also suggests how disclosures help and hinder the development of EI.

There is substantial evidence that management consultants adapt, 'mutate' and translate guru and academic ideas to meet their own interests and client needs (e.g. Heusinkveld, Sturdy and Werr, 2011). This study demonstrates that the three EI training courses studied were infused with disclosure practices, despite their unorthodoxy (Matthews, Zeidner and Roberts, 2002). Thus, it could be argued that this is not uncommon. Based on these findings, several important recommendations are made to the HRD community. First, training delegates should be interviewed pre-training to explore their level of emotional readiness for EI training, their capacity for self-reflection and receive a full brief of the training. Only those who are ready for EI training should be invited to attend. Second, practitioners and participants should mutually agree upon the general types of disclosure exercises and privacy boundaries adopted at the outset of training. Third, agreements should be made on how disclosed information is treated during training. Fourth, practitioners should be trained to recognise when to refer participants to appropriate professional counselors. Caruso, Bienn and Kornacki (2006) highlight these as major concerns and this study has found empirical

evidence to support their concerns. Fifth, it is advised that trainers avoid poorly designed EI training tools and materials as this will influence the level of participant engagement.

A key limitation to this study was the inability of the researcher to observe all the small group work during the training courses, particularly on the Hybrid course where the number of participants was almost 50. The data presented in this article give a clear understanding of disclosure practices; however, further examples of the phenomenon may have been missed which may have shed additional light on privacy management. It is recommended that future research examines the disclosure practices on ability EI training courses to compare findings against popular EI training. In addition, further research could compare 'open enrolment' with 'in-house' EI training as there are likely to be more privacy boundary conflicts, heightened emotions and tensions related to confidentiality and strategic decision criteria during corporate 'in-house' training. In addition, studies should examine longer EI training periods to explore whether self-protection could shift to catharsis or self-awareness over time.

## References

- Alvesson, M. (2003). Beyond neopositivists, romantics and localists: A reflexive approach to interviews in organisational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(1), 13-33.
- Allen, M.W., Walker, K.L., Coopman, S.J. & Hart, J.L. (2007). Workplace surveillance and managing privacy boundaries. *Management Communication Quarterly*. 21(2), 172-200.
- Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQi). In R. Bar-On & J.D.A Parker (Eds.). *The Handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Bar-On, R. (2004). The Bar-On emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i): rationale, description and summary of psychometric properties. In G. Geher, (Ed), *Measuring emotional intelligence: common ground and controversy*. Hauppauge, N.Y: Nova Science Publishing.
- Benders, J. & Van Veen, K. (2001). What's in a fashion? Interpretative viability and management fashions. *Organization*., 8(1), 33-53.

- Boyatzis, R.E. and Sala, F. (2004). The Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI). In G. Geher (Ed.), *Measuring emotional intelligence: common ground and controversy*. Hauppauge, N.Y: Nova Science Publishing.
- Cartwright, S. & Pappas, C. (2008). 'Emotional intelligence, its measurement and implications for the workplace', *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 10(2), 149-171.
- Caruso, D.R., Bienn, B. & Kornacki, S.A. (2006). Emotional intelligence in the workplace. In Ciarrochi, J., Forgas, J.P. & Mayer, J.D. (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence in everyday life*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Child, J.T., Petronio, S., Agyeman-Budu, E.A. and Westermann, D.A. (2011). Blog scrubbing: Exploring triggers that change privacy rules, *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 27: 2017-2027.
- Clarke, N. (2006a). Emotional intelligence training: a case of caveat emptor. *Human Resource Development Review*. 5(4), 422-441.
- Clarke, N. (2006b). Developing emotional intelligence through workplace learning: findings from a case study in healthcare. *Human Resource Development International*. 9(4), 447-465.
- Clarke, N. (2010a). The impact of a training programme designed to target the emotional intelligence abilities of project managers. *International Journal of Project Management*. 28 (5), 461-468.
- Clarke, N. (2010b). Developing emotional intelligence abilities through team-based learning, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 21 (2), 119-138.
- Day, A.L. & Kelloway, E.K. (2004). Emotional intelligence in the workplace: rhetoric and reality. In G. Geher (Ed.), *Measuring emotional intelligence: common ground and controversy*. Hauppauge, N.Y: Nova Science Publishing.
- Eisenberg, E.M. (1984). Ambiguity as strategy in organisational communication. *Communication Monographs*. 51, 227-242.
- Elliott, R., Fischer, C.T., & Rennie, D.L. (1999). Evolving guidelines for publication of qualitative research studies in psychology and related fields. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 38(3), 215-229.
- Fincham, R. & Evans, M. (1999). The consultants' offensive: reengineering – from fad to technique. *New Technology, Work and Employment*. 14(1), 32-44.
- Fineman, S. (1997). Emotion and management learning. *Management Learning*. 28(1), 13-25.
- Fineman, S. (2000). Commodifying the emotionally intelligent. In Fineman, S. (Ed.), *Emotions in organizations*. London: Sage.

- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Gordon, M.E. (2011). The dialectics of the exit interview: a fresh look at conversations about organizational disengagement. *Management Communication Quarterly*. 25(1), 59-86.
- Groves, K.S., McEnrue, M.P. & Shen, W. (2008). Developing and measuring the emotional intelligence of leaders. *Journal of Management Development*. 27, 225-250.
- Heusinkveld, S., Sturdy, A. & Werr, A. (2011). The co-consumption of management ideas and practices. *Management Learning*. 42(2), 139-147.
- Illouz, E. (2008). *Saving the modern soul: therapy, emotions, and the culture of self-help*. London: University of California Press.
- King, N. (2012) Doing template analysis. In Symon.G. & Cassell, C. (Eds.), *Qualitative organisational research: core methods and current challenges*. London: Sage publications.
- Kornacki, S. A., & Caruso, D. R. (2007). A theory-based, practical approach to emotional intelligence training: Ten ways to increase emotional skills. In J. Ciarrochi & J. D. Mayer (Eds.), *Applying emotional intelligence: A practitioner's guide*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Kunnanatt, J.T. (2004). Emotional intelligence: the new science of interpersonal effectiveness. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*. 15(4), 489-495.
- Lindebaum, D. (2009). Rhetoric or remedy? A critique on developing emotional intelligence. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*. 8, 225-137.
- Lindebaum, D. (2012). I rebel – therefore we exist: Emotional standardisation in organisations and the emotionally intelligent individual. *Journal of Management Inquiry*. 21(3), 262–277.
- Martin,J., Knopoff, K. & Beckman, C. (1998). An alternative to bureaucratic impersonality and emotional labor: bounded emotionality at The Body Shop. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. June: 429-69.
- Matthews, G., Zeidner, M. & Roberts. R.D. (2002). *Emotional intelligence: science and myth*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P. & Caruso. D. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCabe, D. (2011). Opening Pandora's box: The unintended consequences of Stephen Covey's effectiveness movement. *Management Learning*. 42(2), 183-197.
- Merriam, S.B. (1988). *Case Study Research in Education*, London: Jossey Bass.
- Metzger, M.J. (2007). Communication privacy management in electronic commerce. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communications*. 12, 335-361.

- Mirvis, P. (1994). Human development or depersonalisation? The company as total community. In F.W. Heuberger, F.W. & L.L.Nash (Eds.). *A fatal embrace? Assessing holistic trends in human resources programs*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction.
- Peters, H. & Brown, T. C. (2009). Mental illness at work: An assessment of co-worker reactions. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*. 26(1), 38-53.
- Petronio, S. (2000). The boundary of privacy: praxis of everyday life. In Petronio, S. (Ed.). *Balancing the secrets of private disclosures*. London, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Petronio, S. (2002). *Boundaries of privacy: dialectics of disclosure*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Petronio, S. (2010). Communication privacy management theory: what do we know about family privacy regulation? *Journal of Family Theory and Review*. 2, 175-196.
- Petronio, S. & Durham, W.T. (2008). Communication privacy management theory: significance for interpersonal communication. In L.A. Baxter, & D.O. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: multiple perspectives*. London: Sage Publications.
- Petronio, S. & Reiersen, J. (2009). Regulating the privacy of confidentiality: grasping the complexities through communication privacy management theory. In T.D. Afifi, and W.A. Afifi (Eds.). *Uncertainty, information management, and disclosure decisions: theories and applications*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Rauscher, E.A. & Fine, M.A. (2012). The role of privacy in families created through assisted reproductive technology: examining existing literature using communication privacy management theory, *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 4(3), 220–234.
- Ritchie, J., Spencer, L. & O'Connor, W. (2003). Carrying out qualitative analysis. In Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J. (eds). *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage.
- Rose, N. (1989). *Governing the soul: the shaping of the private self*. London: Routledge.
- Rose, N. (1996). *Inventing our selves: psychology, power and personhood*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Røvik, K. A. (2011). From fashion to virus: An alternative theory of organizations' handling of management ideas. *Organization Studies*, 32(5), 631-653.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, V. (2003). *Research methods for business students*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Schutte, N.S., Malouff, J.M. & Thorsteinsson, E.B. (2013). Increasing emotional intelligence through training: Current status and future directions. *The International Journal of Emotional Education*, 5(1), 56-72.

Slaski, M. & Cartwright, S. (2003). Emotional intelligence training and its implications for stress, health and performance. *Stress and Health, 19*, 233-239.

Sparrow, T. & Knight, A. (2006). *Applied EI: the importance of attitudes in developing emotional intelligence*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Stanton, J.M. & Stam, K.R. (2003). Information technology, privacy, and power within organisations: a view from boundary theory and social exchange perspectives. *Surveillance and Society, 1*(2), 152-190.

Stiles, W.B. (1987). "I have to talk to somebody": A fever model of disclosure. In V. Derlega & J. Berg. (Eds.). *Self-disclosure: Theory, research and therapy*. New York: Plenum Press.

Suddaby, R. & Greenwood, R. 2001. Colonizing knowledge: Commodification as a dynamic of jurisdictional expansion in professional service firms. *Human Relations, 54*(7), 933-953.

Thompson, J., Petronio, S., & Braithwaite, D. O. (2012). An examination of privacy rules for athletic/academic advisors and college student athletes: A communication privacy management perspective. *Communication Studies, 63*, 54-76.

Thory, K. (2013a). Teaching managers to regulate their emotions better: Insights from emotional intelligence training and work-based application. *Human Resource Development International, 16*(1), 4-21.

Thory, K. (2013b). A gendered analysis of emotional intelligence in the workplace: Issues and concerns for Human Resource Development. *Human Resource Development Review, 12*(2), 221-244.

van Rooy, D.L. & Viswesvaran, C. (2004). Emotional intelligence: A meta-analytic investigation of predictive validity and nomological net. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 65*, 71-95.

Vince, R. (2014). What do HRD scholars and practitioners need to know about power, emotion, and HRD?, *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 25* (4), 409-420.

Yin, R.K. (1994). *Case Study Research*, London: Sage.

Table I: Emotional Intelligence Training Courses

	<b>Goleman</b>	<b>Bar-On</b>	<b>Hybrid</b>
<b>Consultancy</b>	Manchester (UK) based, small training consultancy  1 female trainer	Edinburgh (UK) based, executive education centre within a university business school  1 male trainer	London (UK) based, large training consultancy  1 male trainer, 1 female trainer
<b>Duration and location</b>	1 day, training consultancy premises	3 days, executive education suite on university premises	1 day, London hotel, corporate suite
<b>Content ('Skill' focus)</b>	Emotional awareness Emotional regulation (self) Optimism Motivation Empathy Social skills Accepting individual differences	Emotional awareness Understanding, using and regulating emotions (self) Optimism Happiness Self-regard Empathy Assertiveness Independence Stress tolerance Goal setting Social responsibility Authenticity Having a meaningful life and work/self-actualisation	Five key themes: Knowing your world, knowing yourself (mindfulness/present moment awareness), freeing yourself (emotional awareness and regulation), being yourself (finding and accepting your natural state) and creating yourself (motivation and goal setting).
<b>Influences and origins</b>	Content directly from Goleman's (1998) work with exercises taken from a variety of sources	Course based on Bar-On's (2004) model with exercises taken from a variety of sources	Emotional self-awareness and control models developed by trainers. Personality model – Enneagram.
<b>Trainer Experience</b>	Experienced consultant No counselling training	20 years in management & leadership development Trained outplacement/ redundancy counsellor	6 years training experience No counselling training

Figure I: An Empirical Model of Disclosure Functions

<b>Emotional state</b>	Distressed	<b>Self Protection</b>	<b>Catharsis</b>
	Comfortable	<b>Disengagement</b>	<b>Self Awareness</b>
		Losses (Conceal)	Gains (Reveal)

***Expected outcome of disclosure***