

A Review and Critique of Emotional Intelligence Measures

V. Mary Pramila Santhi

Principal, St. Antony's College of Arts and Sciences for Women

Abstract:

The capacity to understand anyone on a deeper level measures fluctuate generally in both their substance and in their technique for evaluation. Specifically, the capacity to understand individuals on a deeper level measures will generally utilize either a self-report character based approach, a witness approach, or a capacity based evaluation technique. In this paper, the estimation and psychometric properties of four of the major capacity to understand people on a deeper level measures.

Keywords: Level measures, ECI, EQI

1. Introduction

Interest in capacity to understand people on a deeper level (EI) has expanded significantly throughout the past 10 years. Albeit a few specialists and experts have been very hopeful about the significance of EI in associations, basic inquiries stay about the idea, hypothesis, and estimation of EI (Landy and Conte, 2004; Matthews, Zeidner, and Roberts, 2002). In isolated papers in this issue, Landy and Locke consider historical, logical, and applied worries about EI. The current paper surveys and studies EI measures, which change generally in both their substance and in their strategy for evaluation. In this paper, the estimation and psychometric properties of four of the major EI measures (Profound Skill Stock, Close to home Remainder Stock, Multifaceted Capacity to appreciate anyone on a deeper level Scale, Mayer-Salovey-Caruso The capacity to understand people on a profound level Test V.2) will be thought of, the likeness of these actions will be inspected, and a few ends and ideas for future examination on EI estimates will be given.

2. Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI)

Created by Boyatzis, Goleman, and associates, the ECI is intended to survey close to home abilities and positive social ways of behaving (Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee, 2000; Goleman, 1995; Sala, 2002). The ECI has 110 things and evaluates 20 capabilities that are coordinated into four bunches: (1) Mindfulness, (2) Social Mindfulness, (3) Self-Administration, and (4) Interactive abilities. The ECI incorporates 360-degree appraisal procedures that can incorporate self-evaluations, peer evaluations, and boss evaluations. The inward consistency dependability of the self-appraisal ECI scales goes from 0.61 to 0.85. For the companion and manager rating scales, inside consistency unwavering quality reaches from 0.80 to 0.95 (Gowing, 2001; Sala, 2002). The designers of the ECI recommend that it is upheld by legitimacy proof from the Self-Evaluation Poll (SAQ), which is an ancestor of the ECI. In any case, for exclusive reasons, the designers of the ECI have permitted not many things to be assessed by different scientists. In this way, scarcely any free, peer-explored appraisals of the dependability and legitimacy of the ECI have

been embraced and distributed. Without autonomous replication, these revealed discoveries on the ECI are speculative, best case scenario. Analysts who have analyzed the substance of the ECI capabilities have presumed that they cross-over with four of the Large Five character aspects (Principles, Profound Dependability, Extraversion, and Transparency) and other mental ideas in the inspiration and authority literatures (Matthews et al., 2002; Van Rooy and Viswesvaran, 2004). In general, discriminant and prescient legitimacy proof for the ECI has not been given, and the scale doesn't merit serious consideration until peer-assessed observational examinations utilizing this action are led.

3. Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i)

The EQ-I is a 133-item self-report measure that requires roughly 30 minutes to finish (Bar-On, 2000). The action yields a general EQ score as well as scores for five composite scales: (1) intra-individual, (2) relational, (3) flexibility, (4) general state of mind, and (5) stress the board. Nonetheless, it isn't clear how every one of these composites is connected reasonably to EI. Matthews et al. (2002) noticed that the hypothesis behind this action is unclear, reducing Bar-On's hypothetical methodology down to 'EI is what close to home remainder tests test' (p. 206). Bar-On (2000) revealed that the interior consistency dependability of the general EQ-I was 0.76. The EQ-I has shown sufficient test-retest unwavering quality of 0.85 following multi month and 0.75 following 4 months (Bar-On, 1997). With regards to joined legitimacy, Gowing (2001) detailed that the normal relationship among EQ-I subscales was 0.50, and she noticed that this normal connection is like connections among different parts of conventional knowledge tests. The connection between's the EQ-I and the MEIS was 0.36 in a review detailed by Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (2000). As for discriminant substantiality, the EQ-I related 0.12 with the Wechsler Grown-up Knowledge Scale (Bar-On, 2000), and the affirm age connection between's the EQ-I and the Large Five character measures was roughly 0.50 (Dawda and Hart, 2000). The EQ-I corresponded — 0.77 with the nervousness scale from Cattell's 16PF test (Newsome et al., 2000), showing that this EI measure covers emphatically with a deeply grounded measure of characteristic uneasiness. As far as standard legitimacy, the EQ-I was essentially corresponded with confidence (0.55), stress (— 0.41), general wellbeing (— 0.50), and boss evaluations of execution (0.22) in an investigation of retail supervisors by Slaski and Cartwright (2002). One more significant basis that may be anticipated by EI is scholastic achievement, which is regularly surveyed by means of understudy grade point normal (GPA). In spite of the fact that it very well may be contended that GPA is fundamentally founded on mental (non-close to home) errands and consequently shouldn't really be connected with EI, Bar-On (1997) recommended that the EQ-I estimates non-mental parts of individual working, for example, an understudy's capacity to adapt to natural tensions and requests. In light of unpublished examinations referred to in the EQ-I Specialized Manual, Bar-On (1997) reasoned that EI is a significant indicator of scholarly achievement. What's more, Goleman (1995) recommended that EI could pre-dict achievement both at work and in school as well as or better than conventional knowledge measures. However, in an example of 160 Canadian undergrads, the EQ-I complete score had a relationship of 0.01 with grade point normal (Newsome, Day, and Catano, 2000). Additionally, none of the five composite EQ-I scores was altogether connected with GPA. Conversely, mental capacity (i.e., the Wonderlic Individual Intelligence Test) and some character aspects (e.g., discretion) were huge indicators of GPA. In light of their outcomes, Newsome et al. (2000) reasoned that there is deficient information as of now to legitimize utilization of the EQ-I as a choice gadget. In total, albeit the EQ-I shows satisfactory reliability and some legitimacy proof, it is deficient in discriminant legitimacy proof, and barely any examinations have analyzed whether it gives steady prescient legitimacy over the

commitment of laid out pre-dictors, for example, mental capacity and Huge Five character aspects.

4. MEIS and MSCEIT V.2

As indicated by Mayer et al. (2000), the capacity to understand individuals on a profound level includes the limit or capacity to dissuade and about feelings. They have created two different EI tests, the two of which were created in a knowledge testing custom. In the first place, they fostered the Multifaceted Capacity to understand people on a profound level Scale (MEIS), which had some subscales with low unwavering quality and a few issues with scoring methods. Second, they fostered the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso The ability to understand individuals on a deeper level Test (MSCEIT), which is an update of the MEIS. The latest form of the MSCEIT is Adaptation 2 (V.2). Both EI tests are examined beneath on the grounds that, albeit the MSCEIT V.2 seems to have worked on a portion of the issues of the prior test, the MSCEIT V.2 is new, and hardly any examinations have been distributed utilizing it.

The MEIS incorporates 402 things and produces four subscales: Insight, Digestion, Comprehending, and Dealing with Feelings (Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey, 2000). The MEIS is a capacity test and, thusly, the test designers have attempted various ways to deal with recognize the right responses, including target scoring, agreement scoring, and master scoring. Target scoring includes deciding the right response by asking the individual (i.e., the objective) whose looks are portrayed in a thing how the person really felt or what the person was depicting when participated in some profound movement. Agreement scoring includes deciding the right response by pooling the decisions of many individuals. This scoring method evaluates the degree to which the test taker's decision matches larger part assessment. Hence, agreement scoring strategies are 'in direct difference to customary proportions of intelligence where a goal proportion of truth is thought of' (Matthews et al., 2002, p. 186). Master scoring includes deciding the right response by pooling the decisions of specialists in feelings. This kind of scoring strategy is most like that utilized in mental capacity tests. Generally, deciding the right sort of scoring to use for capacity based EI tests is basic and, as is talked about beneath, controversial. Mayer et al. (2000) revealed that the inward consistency unwavering quality of the general MEIS was 0.95. For agreement scored scales the typical inner consistency dependability was 0.77 across the four branch scores, and for master scored scales the typical interior consistency unwavering quality was 0.62 (Caruso, Mayer, and Salovey, 2002; Matthews et al., 2002). The test-retest unwavering quality of the general MEIS more than a 2-week time span was 0.75. The test-retest dependability of the MEIS branch scores went from 0.60 to 0.68. Interestingly, unwavering quality coefficients for mental capacity tests regularly range from 0.85 to 0.95 (Kaplan and Saccuzzo, 2001; Murphy and Davidshofer, 2001). As far as focalized legitimacy proof, Mayer et al. (2000) revealed that the MEIS had a correlation of 0.36 with the EQ-I, showing that the tests share 13% of their difference. For discriminant legitimacy, relationships between's the MEIS (agreement scores) and the Large Five character aspects went from 0.13 for Transparency and Extraversion to 0.24 for Suitability (Roberts et al., 2001). Information from a few investigations show that the MEIS relates somewhere in the range of 0.30 and 0.40 with conventional proportions of mental capacity (Roberts et al., 2001; Van Rooy and Viswesvaran, 2004). Research led quite a while back tracked down relationships of this greatness between develops like social knowledge and verbal insight (Chase, 1928). Landy's paper in this issue covers the early history of social intelligence research in more detail. The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso The capacity to understand anyone on a profound level Test (MSCEIT) V.2 is likewise intended to gauge the four parts of Mayer and Salovey's (1993, 1997) the capacity to appreciate individuals on a deeper level capacity model. The MSCEIT V.2 gives a complete EI score and four Branch scores: (1) view of feeling, (2) integration and digestion of feeling, (3)

information about feelings, and (4) the executives of feelings. With 141 things, the MSCEIT V.2 is more limited and faster to control than the MEIS, and it gives both agreement and master scores for all Branch scores. While the MEIS has 12 subtests to evaluate the four Branches, the MSCEIT V.2 incorporates two subtests for each Branch (Salovey, Mayer, Caruso, and Lopes, 2003). In a new report by Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, and Sitarenios (2003), reliabilities at the all out scale and Branch levels were all above 0.75. For all scales in the MSCEIT V.2, the typical inward consistency unwavering quality was 0.68 for agreement scoring and 0.71 for master scoring. Considering that this is a capacity measure, the reliabilities of the subscales appear to be not even close to ideal (Matthews et al., 2002). As far as legitimacy, the creators depend essentially on proof from the MEIS to help the MSCEIT V.2. In any case, considering how different the MEIS and MSCEIT V.2 are, scientists and practitioners ought to be mindful about making derivations about the MSCEIT V.2 in light of information from the MEIS.

A few specialists have communicated worries about the shortfall of logical principles for determining the precision of agreement and master scores for the MEIS and the MSCEIT V.2. Moreover, considering that agreement scoring involves the most widely recognized reaction in deciding right solutions to test things, these capacity based tests may not give significant scores at the high finish of the EI continuum while agreement scoring is utilized (Matthews et al., 2002). In the master scoring approach, Matthews et al. (2002) additionally brought up issues about how 'specialists' were picked while deciding the right solutions for the capacity to appreciate people on a deeper level inquiries and undertakings. As far as anyone is concerned, relationships between the MEIS and the MSCEIT V.2 have not been inspected. Given the eminent contrasts between the two measures, research led on the MEIS can't be utilized to help the legitimacy of the MSCEIT V.2. Since the MSCEIT V.2 is excessively new to have been remembered for most EI research or in the meta-examination by Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004), quite a bit of that exploration has analyzed the MEIS. Since the MEIS has been supplanted by the MSCEIT V.2, research directed utilizing the MEIS should be reexamined with the new measure. Almost certainly, the MSCEIT V.2 will exhibit discriminant legitimacy from character measures, yet not incremental legitimacy in anticipating execution results. Truth be told, a new report by Barchard (2003) found that none of the numerous EI estimates she inspected (counting the MSCEIT) showed steady legitimacy for anticipating scholarly accomplishment far beyond mental capacity and character. Despite the fact that Brackett and Mayer (2003) found that the MSCEIT and EQ-I showed some proof of gradual legitimacy in anticipating social aberrance and liquor use, separately, their outcomes demonstrated that neither one of the actions gave steady legitimacy in foreseeing scholastic execution.

6. Comparability of EI Measures

The designers of EI measures have utilized various meanings of the EI develop, which has brought about various kinds and quantities of aspects for the different measures (Gowing, 2001). Maybe of more significance, the actions utilize different reaction designs, including self-report, capacity, and source draws near. Oneself report EI measures (e.g., ECI and EQ-I) test an expansive scope of individual contrast ences, yet virtually all of oneself report scales that have palatable reliabilities connect with or load on deeply grounded character aspects (Daus and Ashkanasy, 2003; Davies, Stankov, and Roberts, 1998). Ability-based EI measures (i.e., MEIS, MSCEIT V.2), which are more particular from the Huge Five character aspects, have higher connections with general mental capacity (GMA) than do self-report EI measures (Van Rooy and Viswesvaran, 2004), leaving less space for capacity based EI measures to give incremental expectation of work standards like work execution and pioneer rise. Given capacity

based EI estimates' cross-over with GMA and their absence of gradual legitimacy proof in anticipating work rules, it is conceivable that capacity based EI estimates will at last be viewed similarly as early measures of social knowledge. In particular, in the wake of directing a few examinations utilizing social knowledge measures, R. L. Thorndike inferred that early proportions of social knowledge were just unfortunate trial of GMA, which he called 'conceptual insight' (Thorndike, 1936; Thorndike and Stein, 1937).

Not many examinations have analyzed both characteristic and capacity based EI measures to inspect the degree of the cross-over. Mayer et al. (2000) found that the MSCEIT and Bar-On scales related 0.36, showing that they share roughly 13% of their difference. In a later report, Brackett and Mayer (2003) found that the MSCEIT and Bar-On scales corresponded 0.21, demonstrating that they share approximately 4% of their fluctuation. The low connection between various EI estimates brings up difficult issues about whether they are all really estimating a similar build (Matthews et al., 2002). Contrasted with capacity based EI measures, self-report measures are probably going to get less consideration before long given that they need psychometric help (especially discriminant legitimacy from the Large Five character aspects). On the other hand, capacity based EI measures are probably going to get continued consideration, and it is fundamental that extra evaluations of the focalized legitimacy across EI measures are directed.

7. EI Measures: Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Research

As a rule, EI measures have shown satisfactory interior consistency dependability. Self-report EI measures have satisfactory inside consistency as do the general scales for capacity based measures, yet these information without anyone else give no sign about whether EI measures are just evaluating constructs currently estimated by other, more settled builds (e.g., the Huge Five character dimensions). Further, a portion of the subscales for the capacity based EI measures have hardly OK inward consistency and test-retest unwavering quality. Legitimacy proof for EI measures has fallen behind dependability proof. Content legitimacy proof for EI measures is missing a result of dubious hypothetical improvement for the overwhelming majority of the actions and on the grounds that the substance across EI estimates shifts generally. Since few EI scientists will be explicit about what they need to gauge, analyzing content validity is troublesome. Likewise, develop legitimacy proof as united and discriminant legitimacy is inadequate. In the first place, EI measures have neglected to join on a typical build. Second, self-report EI measures seem to evaluate existing character qualities or maybe close to home skills, yet they don't seem to survey insight (Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey, 1999).

In their meta-examination, Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) found that EI and Enormous Five character aspects had connections (rectified for lack of quality) that went from 0.23 to 0.34 (these investigations included both capacity and self-report EI measures). Consequently, EI and the Enormous Five character aspects are more profoundly related than numerous EI specialists have proposed, recommending that these EI measures are deficient in discriminant legitimacy. The capacity to appreciate anyone on a deeper level measures can likewise be analyzed as far as standard related and gradual legitimacy. Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) found that the level of difference in execution made sense of by EI was 5%, which is a lot of lower than the cases of some EI defenders (e.g., Goleman, 1995), who have contended that it is a higher priority than general mental capacity (GMA). To give viewpoint, appraisals of the level of difference in work performance that GMA represents range from 10% to 26 percent (Tracker and Tracker, 1984; Schmidt and Tracker, 1998).

Further, GMA regularly gives steady legitimacy in anticipating work results above different measures, while EI has shown practically zero gradual legitimacy above GMA in foreseeing performance results. In their meta-examination, Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) found that profound intelligence gave steady legitimacy (going from 0.06 for Scruples to 0.29 for Receptiveness to Experience) over the Large Five character aspects in anticipating execution. Notwithstanding, EI measures gave negligible (0.02) gradual legitimacy above broad mental capacity (GMA) in predicting execution. On the other hand, GMA gave significant steady legitimacy (0.31) above EI (Van Rooy and Viswesvaran, 2004). It ought to be noticed that capacity based and self-report EI measures were not isolated in the steady legitimacy examinations in this meta-investigation; hence, it is hazy how the various sorts of EI measures would charge in discrete examinations. By the by, in light of observational exploration to date, wide cases that EI is a more significant indicator than GMA (e.g., Goleman, 1995, 1998) are unwarranted and unconfirmed.

Ebb and flow EI gauges regularly utilize a four-or five-factor model, yet research is required on which aspects are generally prescient of work and non-work results (Van Rooy and Viswesvaran, 2004). Also, research is required on the potential for faking on self-report EI measures. Mayer et al. (2003) found that ladies frequently scored higher than men on the MSCEIT V.2, however that there were no massive contrasts connected with identity. In like manner, for the capacity based EI measures, further assessment of possible antagonistic effect against safeguarded bunches is required. The capacity to appreciate people on a deeper level is probably going to be socially bound; hence, an examination of diverse likenesses and contrasts in EI is likewise required. At last, in light of the fact that numerous utilizations of the EI idea include endeavors to foster EI or profound skills (i.e., making individuals all the more socially smart), further examination of the solidness, and on the other hand, the 'teachability' of EI, is required (Slaski and Cartwright, 2003). Obviously, inquiries regarding whether preparing can expand EI can be addressed exclusively with the utilization of substantial EI measures and thorough exploration plans (Goldstein and Portage, 2002).

In aggregate, serious worries stay for all of the EI measures, going from scoring worries for capacity based EI measures to discriminant legitimacy worries for self-report EI measures. Despite the fact that capacity based EI measures have all the earmarks of being most encouraging, numerous annoying issues stay even with them. Gowing (2001) noticed that numerous EI measures have been utilized for improvement, yet that the pattern is toward involving them for determination also. Supervisors and other hierarchical leaders ought to be careful about taking this jump except if more thorough discriminant, prescient, and gradual legitimacy proof for EI measures is shown. In spite of the fact that Mayer et al. (2003) have fostered the most encouraging of the EI measures, even they express that 'the applied utilization of EI tests should continue with extraordinary wariness' (p. 104). Subsequent to directing this audit of EI measures, I would need to concur. By the by, I anticipate extra logical examinations of the gradual legitimacy of EI estimates in foreseeing position execution and other work results over the commitment of laid out indicators, for example, mental capacity and Huge Five character aspects.

8. Conclusion

In this we discussed with the capacity to understand anyone on a deeper level measure fluctuate generally in both their substance and in their technique for evaluation. Specifically, the capacity to understand individuals on a deeper level measure will generally utilize either a self-report character-based approach,

a witness approach, or a capacity-based evaluation technique. In this paper, the estimation and psychometric properties of four of the major capacity to understand people on a deeper level measure.

9. References

1. Barchard, K. A. (2003). Does emotional intelligence assist in the prediction of academic success? *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 63, 840–858.
2. R. (1997). *Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory: Technical manual (EQ-i)*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
3. R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). In R. Bar-On, & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 363–388). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
4. Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. S. (2000). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence.
5. R. Bar-On, & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, and assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace* (pp. 343–362). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
6. Brackett, M. A., & Mayer, J. D. (2003). Convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of competing measures of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 1147–1158.
7. Caruso, D. R., Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (2002). Relation of an ability measure of emotional intelligence to personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 79, 306–320.
8. Daus, C. S., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2003). Will the real emotional intelligence please stand up? On deconstructing the emotional intelligence ‘debate’. *Industrial-Organizational Psychologist*, 41(2), 69–72.
9. Davies, M., Stankov, L., & Roberts, R. D. (1998). Emotional intelligence: in search of an elusive construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 989–1015.
10. Dawda, D., & Hart, S. D. (2000). Assessing emotional intelligence: reliability and validity of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) in university students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 797–812.
11. Goldstein, I. L., & Ford, J. K. (2002). *Training in organizations: Needs assessment, development, and evaluation* (4th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
12. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam.
13. Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
13. Gowing, M. K. (2001). Measurement of individual emotional competence. In C. Cherniss, & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations* (pp. 83–131). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
14. Hunt, T. (1928). The measurement of social intelligence. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 12, 317–334.
15. Hunter, J. E., & Hunter, R. F. (1984). Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96, 72–98.
16. Kaplan, R. M., & Saccuzzo, D. P. (2001). *Psychological testing: Principles, applications, and issues* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

17. Landy, F. J., & Conte, J. M. (2004). *Work in the 21st century: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
18. Matthews, G., Zeidner, M., & Roberts, R. D. (2002). *Emotional intelligence: Science and myth*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
19. Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27, 267–298.
20. Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D., & Salovey, P. (2000). Selecting a measure of emotional intelligence: the case for ability scales. In R. Bar-On, & J. D. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 320–342). New York: Jossey-Bass.
21. Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence*, 17, 433–442.
22. Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey, & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators* (pp. 3–31). New York: Basic Books.
23. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. *Emotion*, 3, 97–105.
24. Murphy, K. R., & Davidshofer, C. O. (2001). *Psychological testing: Principles and application* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
25. Newsome, S., Day, A. L., & Catano, V. M. (2000). Assessing the predictive validity of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29(6), 1005–1016.
26. Roberts, R. D., Zeidner, M., & Matthews, G. (2001). Does emotional intelligence meet traditional standards for an intelligence? Some new data and conclusions. *Emotion*, 1, 196–231.
27. Sala, F. (2002). *Emotional Competence Inventory: Technical manual*. Philadelphia, PA: McClelland Center For Research, HayGroup.
28. Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D., & Lopes, P. N. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence as a set of abilities with the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test. In S. J. Lopez, & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive psychological assessment: A handbook of models and measures* (pp. 251–265). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
29. Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 262–274.
30. Slaski, M., & Cartwright, S. (2003). Emotional intelligence training and its implications for stress, health, and performance. *Stress and Health*, 19, 233–239.
31. Slaski, M., & Cartwright, S. (2002). Health, performance, and emotional intelligence: an exploratory study of retail managers. *Stress and Health*, 18, 63–68.
32. Thorndike, R. L. (1936). Factor analysis of social and abstract intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 27, 231–233.
33. Thorndike, R. L., & Stein, S. (1937). An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 34, 275–285.
34. Van Rooy, D. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (2004). Emotional intelligence: a meta-analytic investigation of predictive validity and nomological net. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 65, 71–95.