2026 Volume: 02 Issue: 07 www.ijrpa.com ISSN 2456-9995 Review Article

International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-10

AN INVESTIGATION OF HOW EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AFFECTS COMPETITIVE INTELLIGENCE SCANNING OF IT WORKERS IN CHENNAI

*[1]Dr. D. K. Hemamalini, [2]Dr. K. Kowsalya

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, School of Management Vels Institute of Science, Technology & Advanced Studies (VISTAS), Pallavaram, Chennai.

[2]Research Scholar, Vels institute of Science Technilogy and Advanced Studies (VISTAS) Chennai Pallavaram,

Article Received: 13 June 2026
Article Revised: 03 July 2026
Published on: 23 July 2026

***Corresponding Author: Dr. D. K. Hemamalini**
Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, School of Management Vels Institute of Science, Technology & Advanced Studies (VISTAS), Pallavaram, Chennai.

DOI: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.1566

ABSTRACT

Additionally, as learning occurs in social relationships among the participants in a practice, through which they exchange experiences, knowledge, and meanings, upward influence relates to organisational learning through the relationship between upward influence and informal exchange. The sample size of this study was 204 employees of IT private sector Chennai. and the samples type used in this study is random sampling under probability method. For measuring the opinion Likert's scale is used. The constructions' descriptive statistics are shown. Multiple regression analysis in the structural equation model is based on the concepts of skewness and kurtosis. Descriptive analysis and multiple regression using SEM is used in this study.

INTRODUCTION

By engaging in learning activities, organisations can enhance their marketing capabilities and boost competitive intelligence (CI), which is defined as the ability to identify and react to ch anges in the market by identifying and focusing on information that is both favourable and unfavourable to the organisation competing in the race (Day, 1994).

It has been demonstrated how the gradual development of learning mechanisms and the integ ration of the learning of each individual member of the organisation builds the collective bene fits of organisational learning (Huang and Kim, 2011).

According to Garcıa-Morales et al. (2011), internal communication has an effect on organisational learning. Therefore, using upward influence as a means of internal communication can deepen organisational learning. Additionally, as learning occurs in social relationships among the participants in a practice, through which they exchange experiences, knowledge, and meanings, upward influence relates to organisational learning through the relationship between upward influence and informal exchange (Howell and Higgins, 1990). (O¨rtenblad, 2001).

Objectives of the study

- To determine the factors of Emotional intelligence, upwards influence behaviour, organizational learning and Competitive intelligence scanning.
- To find the relationship between the Emotional intelligence and upwards influence behaviour.
- To find relationship between the upwards influence behaviour and organizational learning
- To find organizational learning influences Competitive intelligence scanning.

Statement of the problem

This research aims to find out the relationship between the dimensions of Emotional intelligence, upwards influence behaviour, organizational learning and Competitive intelligence scanning. Also aims to find the relationship between the Emotional Intelligence and upwards influence behaviour, relationship between the upwards influence behaviour and organizational learning. To determine whether the organizational learning influences Competitive intelligence scanning.

Literature Review

EI and upwards influence behaviour

According to Mayer et al. (2008), emotional intelligence (EI) is the ability to apply sophisticated information processing about emotions and emotion-relevant inputs and to use this information as a guide to thinking and behaviour. Emotions and concern for others are fostered by aspects of emotional intelligence (EI), such as self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and social skills. People with high emotional intelligence (EI) try to manage their own unhealthy feelings and attitudes. Members with high self-management elements of emotional intelligence (EI) are able to control their own feelings and impulses,

particularly harmful or dysfunctional ones (Robbins and Judge, 2007). As a result, individuals typically refrain from engaging in harmful behaviours on an internal level. In order to act compassionately, EI is essential (Freshwater and Stickley, 2004).

Additionally, according to Kristjansson (2006), EI fosters empathy, and empathy generates compassion, altruism, and care. Pfeiffer (2001) sees emotional intelligence (EI) as a tool to help us become more compassionate, loving, and responsible. Members who exhibit high levels of self-awareness and empathy in their emotional intelligence (EI) are therefore able to comprehend and show concern for both their own and others' feelings and worries, which in turn helps them to comprehend the interests of other stakeholders in the organisation. Compared to members with low EI, those with high EI are better at judging the morality of other people's behaviour and are less likely to act unethically themselves (Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010).

Furthermore, because of their great social skills, they are able to help others regulate their self-indulgent feelings, which can prevent them from acting in a self-indulgent or even destructive manner. As a result, they can aid in the organization's efforts to decrease dysfunctional behaviour and improve functional behaviour. Moreover, a high degree of EI's self-motivation component aids participants in maintaining their own drive to act morally towards other stakeholders.

Their self-motivation enables them to overcome obstacles in life, including financial hardships and temptations, as opposed to pursuing their own interests and possibly endangering other stakeholders and the organisation as a whole.

Upwards influence behaviour and organizational learning

Building blocks of the learning organisation are described by Garvin et al. (2008) as consisting of actual learning procedures and practices, a conducive learning environment, and reinforcing leadership behaviour. Inquiry learning and exploitative learning are the two components of a comprehensive organisational learning system (Nevis et al., 1995). Moreover, a number of research have concluded that the idea of organisational learning is dichotomous (Tosey et al., 2012). Many words have been used to describe this dichotomy, including single-loop and double-loop (e.g. Argyris and Scho¨n, 1974). Double-loop learning occurs "when mismatches are corrected by first examining and altering the governing variables and then the actions," whereas single-loop learning occurs "whenever an error is detected and corrected without questioning or altering the underlying values of the system" (Argyris, 1999)

According to the theory of double-loop learning, context and organisational experience interact to develop knowledge. Learning takes place in the context, which is thought to have both an active and a latent component (Argote and Miron-Spektor, 2011). One such hidden and active component is upward influence behaviour. According to Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) knowledge conversation model, social interaction between implicit and explicit knowledge—which might foster upward impact as an interaction direction—is another way that new information is created.

On the other hand, upwardly influential behaviours that prioritise self-interest and benefit individuals or the organisation as a whole, have the tendency to maintain the status quo and prevent new knowledge from becoming useful. Furthermore, upward influence behaviours that have such a negative momentum among stakeholders can endanger the organization's current culture of learning and motivation. Such self-centred upward influence behaviours also support learning privileges for select individuals, as opposed to offering equal learning opportunities to all members of the organisation. Examples of such practices include sending select high-ranking individuals to training sessions or adopting new ideas solely from select influential individuals. Furthermore, it has been discovered that organisational learning is adversely correlated with the value of self-direction, which is characterised by an emphasis on the person (Cohen et al., 2011).

Organizational learning and CI

A framework for gathering and analysing information regarding rival activity is provided by competitive intelligence (CI) (Wright et al., 2009). While CI is a component of the entire process and a lever of both strategy and success in the marketplace, it may not be sufficient for an organisation to handle the issue of how to best produce values for consumers (Berry, 2003; Lackman et al., 2000). Put differently, learning fosters competitive advantage (CI) by offering a vital source of information about competitors' past, present, and future actions as well as the broader business environment (Vedder and Guynes, 2002). The relationship between culture and knowledge transmission (Luu, 2012c), in addition to the impact of leaders on organisational learning (Yukl, 2009), is essential for long-lasting organisational learning (Hoe and McShane, 2010). An internal environment and leadership that encourage experimentation while tolerating a certain amount of errors or risks, as well as opportunities to increase information capital through coaching and training, can help members become more competent in deciphering the factors that contribute to other players' success in the marketplace and identifying the root causes of their illnesses from which they can protect

themselves. In addition to facilitating this kind of decoding, organisational learning's constituents—a leadership that encourages learning and a friendly learning environment—also help people to develop their competency skills.

Validating the measurement.

The sample are the Private sector IT employees and the samples type used in this study is random sampling under probability method. The sample size of this study was 204 employees of IT private sector Chennai. For measuring the opinion Likert's scale is used.

The constructions' descriptive statistics are shown. Multiple regression analysis in the structural equation model is based on the concepts of skewness and kurtosis, which indicate how far a variable deviates from a normal distribution. The extent kurtosis measures the steepness of a frequency distribution, which indicates if there are too many or too few data lying close to the mean (Leech et al., 2008). Skewness measures the degree of symmetry in a probability frequency distribution. As per Hair et al. (1998), a notable deviation from the normal distribution happens when the values of kurtosis and skewness are not within the range of +1 to -1. Given that none of the eight interval variables' skewness or kurtosis values exceeded the allowable. Cronbach alpha coefficients were used to evaluate the dependability of each construct and its particular dimensions.

Every research variable has a reliability score between 0.77 and 0.94, which is higher than the 0.6 suggested by Bagozzi and Yi (1988). Additionally, convergent validity was achieved since, contrary to Fornell and Larcker's (1981) suggestion, the average variance extracted for each measure ranged from 0.678 to 0.832, above 0.50.

Descriptive statistics

Dimensions	No of items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Cronbach	Average Variance Extracted
Emotional Intelligence	32	3.53	0.47	-0.584	-0.073	0.81	0.765
Organizationally beneficial behavior	08	6.51	0.38	-0.231	-0.307	0.92	0.832
self-indulgent behaviour	09	6.56	0.47	-0.642	0.414	0.85	0.678
Destructive behaviour	08	6.68	0.48	0.078	0.323	0.87	0.744
organizational learning	26	5.54	0.39	-0.407	-0.005	0.78	0.725
Competitive intelligence scanning	17	3.54	0.41	0.216	0.082	0.88	0.788

H1: EI relates to Upward influence behaviour .

H 1a: EI relates to Organizationally beneficial behavior

H 1b: EI relates to Destructive behaviour

H1c: EI relates to self-indulgent behaviour

H2: Upward influence behaviour relates to organizational learning

H2a: Organizationally beneficial behaviour relates to organizational learning

H2b: Self-indulgent behaviour relates to organizational learning

H2c: Destructive behaviour relates to organizational learning

H3: Organizational learning positively relates to CI

Structural Equation Model

Hypothesis	Description of path	Path Coefficient	Z statistics
H1a	High level of EI-→organizationally beneficial behavior	0.098	2.38* (S)
H1b	High level of EI → self-indulgent behavior	-0.458	-1.35* (S)
H1c	High level of EI → destructive behavior	-0.509	-4.55** (S)
H2a	Organizationally beneficial behavior → organizational learning	0.308	3.45** (S)
H2b	Self-indulgent behavior →organizational learning	-0.138	-1.75*(S)
H2c	Destructive behavior → organizational learning	-0.195	-2.42 (S)
H3	Organizational learning →competitive intelligence scanning	0.182	2.68 * *(S)

FINDINGS

It was discovered that organizationally helpful behaviour positively correlated with a high level of EI (0.098; p< 0:05), supporting H1a. The negative and significant relationships between high EI and destructive behaviour (-0.509; p<0:01) (H1b) and between high EI and self-indulgent behaviour (-0.458; p, 0:05) (H1c) demonstrate that high EI does not encourage destructive or self-indulgent behaviour. High social and personal intelligence competencies among employees indicate a high level of emotional intelligence (Goleman et al., 2002). These two types of intellectual competencies work well together and balance each other out when it comes to managing one's own emotions as well as those of others. A healthy balance between self- and other-care sentiments reduces egoism.

It has been proved that there is positive and significant coefficient between organizationally beneficial behaviour and organizational learning (0.308; p<, 0:01).

On the other hand, the results show that destructive behaviour (- 0.195; p < 0:01) or self-indulgent behaviour (- 0.138; p< 0:05) was adversely correlated with organisational learning. Individuals may have an upward influence on stakeholder or self-orientation.(H2)

Leaders and staff alike are often led on this "meaning building" path by upwardly influential behaviours that are organizationally helpful and create additional meaning for the organisation. Shipton and Sillince (2012), drawing on personal construct theory, view organisational learning as the collective re-construal of meaning in the organisation. This means that the drive to learn new things and build meanings for the organization's growth activates the drive to learn, and knowledge from learning that spreads across the layers of the organisation will increase the capability to decipher more meanings in their own acts and others'.

Conversely, self-directed upward influence behaviour that includes damaging and self-indulgent behaviour yields greater rewards for people as opposed to other organisation stakeholders. Furthermore, rather than sharing knowledge or opportunities for learning with other members, individuals that exhibit self-oriented upward influence behaviours are more likely to look for opportunities for themselves, including learning opportunities through upward influence. As Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) emphasise, their self-interest is not only above the interests of other stakeholders but also differs from the interests of the organisation as a whole since they only create knowledge silos rather than transforming individual knowledge into organisational knowledge.

According to Santos-Vijande et al. (2012), an essential strategic advantage for modern markets is the ability of an organisation to learn. The positive and significant coefficient (0.182; p< 0.01) supported the link between learning and CI (H5). According to De Geus (1988), an organisation can only maintain its competitive advantage by learning faster and more efficiently than its rivals in the market.

Implications

According to Alegre and Chiva (2008), organisational learning encourages experimentation, risk-taking, and connection with the outside world. These activities raise awareness of external pressures and inspire people to try out novel strategies for overcoming them—in other words, they boost CI. Engaging with the outside world facilitates scanning the periphery and spotting weak signals that may have an impact on the business environment in the future (Yoon, 2012). Additionally, March 1991 states that the organisation must explore new avenues for competition and learn from mistakes made as a result of taking risks in order

to increase its competitive opportunities (Kouzes and Posner, 1987). In contrast, the learning organisation consists of the environmental system-related aspects, the process-oriented aspects of organisational learning are present.

All three forms of organisational learning are significantly influenced by the organisation. procedures: the most significant influence on a person's learning process.The learning process at the organisation level and at the group/team level (Song et al., 2011). Through these strategic learning procedures, organisational learning transitions from gaining for the development of internal stakeholders and promoting universal learning stakeholders' expansion, members gain knowledge to boost the organization's competitive advantage by enticing and drawing in the contributions of all parties involved to the organization's value chain, as opposed to taking advantage of the shortcomings of stakeholders, particularly clients and rival businesses that also support the brand performance of the company as an organisational learning culture (Luu, 2012) creates members.

Additionally, managers ought to be agents of change who help members alter their behaviour patterns (Luu, 2010), particularly upward influence behaviours. Supervisors ought to open their doors agape to the greater inflow of members' upward influence. Initiatives from this organizationally advantageous upwards impact should be rewarded and acknowledged, and this upwards influence for organisational purposes should even be measured in the assessment system. The organization's interaction network flourishes further when this upward direction of contact is maintained (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995), which helps to convert individual knowledge into organisational knowledge and raises the level of organisational learning.

According to Luu (2012g), upward influence also promotes knowledge sharing among interaction network members by fostering knowledge-based trust.

In various places within this interaction network, managers should cultivate change agents who encourage and serve as role models for other participants to learn and share information. McShane and Von Glinow (2008) identified four intrinsic human motivational drives, one of which is the need to learn. When an organisation embraces learning as a core principle, its individuals gain constant knowledge and become more proactive in creating possibilities for the organisation to compete.

CONCLUSION

It has been demonstrated that upward influence behaviour that benefits the organisation is favourably correlated with high EI. It was discovered that upward impact behaviour that benefits the organisation has a favourable relationship with organisational learning, which in turn encourages CI scanning.

Despite extensive study efforts, there were still several potential restrictions present. The cross-sectional design of the study and the use of perceptual measurements are two of its weaknesses, which call for additional testing of the results obtained from the empirical questionnaire survey. Researchers may therefore be interested in learning and marketing effectiveness in organisations.

Organisational learning is a key component of a company's capacity for continuous change and renewal (Flores et al., 2012). According to Wang and Ellinger (2011), organisational learning is essential to innovation success at the individual and organisational levels.

Examining the influence of organisational learning on the accomplishment of organisational transformation or the successful use of novel performance metrics like the balanced scorecard (BSC) is thus another line of inquiry for research**.**

REFERENCES

1. Day, G.S. (1994), “The capabilities of market-driven organizations”, Journal of Marketing, Vol. 58, October, pp. 37-52.
2. Garcı´a-Morales, V.J., Matı´as-Reche, F. and Verdu´-Jover, A.J. (2011), “Influence of internal communication on technological proactivity, organizational learning, and organizational innovation in the pharmaceutical sector”, Journal of Communication, Vol. 61 No. 1,pp. 150-177.
3. Howell, J.M. and Higgins, C.A. (1990), “Champions of technological innovation”, AdministrativeScience Quarterly, Vol. 35 No. 2, pp. 317-341.
4. Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P. and Caruso, D.R. (2008), “Emotional intelligence: new ability or eclectic traits?”, American Psychologist, Vol. 63 No. 6, pp. 503-517
5. O¨ rtenblad, A. (2001), “On differences between organizational learning and learning organization”, The Learning Organization, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 125-133.
6. Robbins, S.P. and Judge, T.A. (2007), Organizational Behavior, 12th ed., Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
7. Bagozzi, R.P. and Yi, Y. (1988), “On the evaluation for structural equation models”, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 74-94.

8. Fornell, C. and Larcker, D.F. (1981), “Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable and measurement errors”, Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 39-50
9. Luu, T.T. (2010), “Organisational culture, leadership and performance measurement integratedness”, International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 251-275.
10. Luu, T.T. (2010), “Organisational culture, leadership and performance measurement integratedness”, International Journal of Management and Enterprise Development, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 251-275.
11. Argyris, C. and Scho¨n, D.A. (1974), Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
12. Fornell, C. and Larcker, D.F. (1981), “Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable and measurement errors”, Journal of Marketing Research, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 39-50.
13. Freshwater, D. and Stickley, T. (2004), “The heart of the art: emotional intelligence in nurse education”, Nursing Inquiry, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 91-98.
14. Henderson, D. (2005), “The role of business in the world today”, Journal of Corporate Citizenship, No. 17, pp. 30-32.