



Emotional Intelligence Appraisal[®]

THERE IS MORE THAN IQ

TECHNICAL MANUAL



©2018 TalentSmart[®], Inc.
www.talentsmart.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Assessment Authors 3

Development of The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal 4

Theoretical foundations 4

Survey model 5

Keeping the end user in mind, from the beginning 6

Rating scale, administration time, and survey formats 7

II. VALIDITY DATA

Comparison to job performance 8

 Representative study 1 8

 Representative study 2 8

Graphical depiction of EQ, job title and job function 9

Comparison to other measures 10

 Study 1: The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal and the MSCEIT 10

 Study 2: The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal and a traditional 360° assessment 11

III. PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

Descriptive Statistics 12

Reliabilities 13

 Me Edition 13

 Team Edition 14

 Multi-Rater Edition 15

Construct Validity 15

 Scree plot 16

 Correlation matrix 17

IV. REFERENCES 18



INTRODUCTION

The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal - Emotional intelligence is the ability to use awareness of emotions to manage behavior and relationships with others. Our aim in developing the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal was to provide a quick, valid, and intuitive assessment of EQ skills that is readily available to the public and based on the prevailing model introduced by Daniel Goleman. We offer the Appraisal in 3 Editions: The Me Edition (self-report), The MR Edition (360° feedback) and The Team Edition (the collective EQ of an intact work group). We appreciate your interest in our assessment and hope you find this Technical Manual useful.

ASSESSMENT AUTHORS:

Dr. Travis Bradberry and Dr. Jean Greaves are the founders of TalentSmart the leading provider of emotional intelligence tests, products, training, coaching and consulting. Their established reputation in the field of leadership development includes the bestselling *Emotional Intelligence 2.0* and the *Emotional Intelligence Quick Book*, the TalentSmart EQ training program, and coauthorship of the Preferred Leader Assessment™ with Ken Blanchard, the best selling business author of all time and coauthor of *The One Minute Manager*®.

Their Emotional Intelligence Appraisal is used by more than half of Fortune 500 companies, all three branches of US government, and organizations of all sizes from virtually every industry.

Their research has been featured by *The Harvard Business Review*, *Newsweek*, *MSNBC*, *Forbes*, *Fortune*, *The Washington Post*, and major television and radio outlets including ABC, CBS, NBC, NPR, and FOX.

Dr. Bradberry holds a dual Ph.D. in clinical and industrial organizational psychology from the California School of Professional Psychology and a B.A. in psychology from the University of California San Diego.

Dr. Greaves holds a Ph.D. in industrial organizational psychology from the California School of Professional Psychology and a B.A. in psychology from Stanford University.

The TalentSmart Research Team is composed of graduate trained scientists who specialize in statistics and industrial organizational psychology. This team is integral to the rigorous and continual research and validation that stands behind the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal test.

INTRODUCTION

DEVELOPMENT OF THE EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE APPRAISAL

Skill assessments tend to be long and cumbersome. They often exceed 100 questions, and this can make the development process a chore for employees (Coates, 1998; Waldman, Atwater & Antonioni, 1998). Assessment typically focuses on specific traits, or highly related clusters of traits, in the hope that participants can increase their understanding in areas of weakness and strength. This knowledge is intended to drive improved job performance through the development of new behaviors.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Although multiple component models of emotional intelligence (EQ) are extremely useful and intuitive, there has been little research confirming emotional intelligence is more than a single skill, divided into Personal and Social Competence. Strong inter-correlations among the sub competencies in the EQ model hinder the construct validity needed to support their identity as independent components (Boyatzis, Goleman, and Rhee, 1999; Bradberry, 2002, Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso, 2002; Sala, 2002).

An overall emotional intelligence score is critical as a valid measure of this construct. Scores in the four-part taxonomy are intuitive for the typical person to retain and follow. Daniel Goleman's benchmark model of EQ (Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness, Relationship Management) is a highly useful and respected method to this end. With little statistical support for a multi-trait model of EQ, the authors sought to design an instrument to measure the core model of emotional intelligence quickly and effectively.


INTRODUCTION

SURVEY MODEL

The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal—Me and Multi-Rater Editions provide an overall EQ score, as well as a score in each of the four EQ competencies. These are:

1. **Self-Awareness:** Your ability to accurately perceive your own emotions and stay aware of them as they happen. This includes keeping on top of how you tend to respond to specific situations and people.
2. **Self-Management:** Your ability to use awareness of your emotions to stay flexible and positively direct your behavior. This means managing your emotional reactions to all situations and people.
3. **Social Awareness:** Your ability to accurately pick up on emotions in other people and get what is really going on. This often means understanding what other people are thinking and feeling even if you don't feel the same way.
4. **Relationship Management:** Your ability to use your awareness of your emotions and the emotions of others to manage interactions successfully. This includes clear communication and effectively handling conflict.

The Multi-Rater Edition also includes open-ended questions, so that users have an opportunity to elaborate on their feedback.



INTRODUCTION

KEEPING THE END USER IN MIND, FROM THE BEGINNING

The assessment was first released to the public in January of 2003. However, research and validation for the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal began early in 2001, with an attempt to capture emotional intelligence without an excessive number of questions needed to achieve statistical and face validity. Research conducted worldwide during the last decade reveals that emotional intelligence is no more than one or two constructs. Therefore, an assessment should not require a large number of questions to measure it.

The authors, with years of subject matter expertise and applied assessment experience, developed a pool of items for each of the 4 subscales. They used an iterative process of writing draft items and reworking them to fit what is “necessary and sufficient” (no more and no less than what covers the elements of that skill).

Once the set of items met the face validity criteria, they were presented to subject matter experts to develop content validity. Subject matter experts directly involved with item writing included Ph.D. and Master’s trained industrial/organizational psychology practitioners and MBA level business people with management experience.

Consistent with TalentSmart’s proprietary model of drafting survey questions, we eliminated unnecessary items by avoiding the use of many, specific behavioral questions to measure a single skill. Instead, the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal questions measure the sufficient **behavioral outcome** needed to adequately assess a particular skill.

The four main skills in Daniel Goleman’s (2002) emotional intelligence model are measured via 28 questions. A brief description of the four survey components follows.

Self-Awareness (6 items)

Social Awareness (5 items)

Self-Management (9 items)

Relationship Management (8 items)



INTRODUCTION

RATING SCALE, ADMINISTRATION TIME AND SURVEY FORMATS

The survey questions describe critical aspects of each skill that indicate the presence of this skill in the behavior of the individual being assessed. The frequency with which an individual demonstrates behaviors related to a skill are the best measure of that skill. Therefore, the questions of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal are structured using a 6-point frequency scale:

- 1- Never
- 2- Rarely
- 3- Sometimes
- 4- Usually
- 5- Almost Always
- 6- Always

The average administration time online is 7 minutes for the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal. The self-scoring version averages 15 minutes for the user to take the assessment and score his or her results. The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal is available in the following editions:

Me Edition (Self Evaluation) is a cost-effective, self-report version that is administered online and includes a complete e-Learning and Goal Tracking System and a free retest. The e-learning includes Hollywood movies, television, and historical events to bring emotional intelligence to life. It can also be administered in a self-scoring booklet. Online administrations of the Me tailor the learning to the user's unique EQ profile. If the user takes the survey again after 6 months, the system compares the scores to measure and reveal change in EQ.

MR Edition (Multi-Rater Edition) uses an on-line multi-rater method to capture a global EQ score through the combination of responses from coworkers. This score is compared to self-scores to yield a gap analysis and an understanding of differences in self-other perception. Includes the 28 core survey items plus two open-ended questions--which give others the opportunity to elaborate on responses. The MR also includes the complete e-Learning and Goal Tracking system based upon the user's unique EQ profile.

Team EQ Edition collects anonymous ratings from multiple individuals on the same intact team. Questions measure behavior of the group as a whole, and responses are combined to yield an EQ score for the entire team. Team members rate what they see happening and a summary report combines and delivers the results. Also includes two open-ended questions. Includes a complete e-Learning and Goal Tracking system, available to the entire team. The learning is geared to team building and is based upon the team's unique EQ profile.



VALIDITY DATA

COMPARISON TO JOB PERFORMANCE

To date, The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal has been studied in comparison to job performance in large-scale studies representing hundreds of thousands of individuals from a cross-section of industries. Across studies, the Me Edition (self-report) explains a significant amount of the variance in job performance and the Multi-Rater Edition (scores from others) explains a highly significant amount of job performance (nearly 60%) for individuals in middle management through senior leadership positions.

Representative Study 1

273 individuals provided multi-rater feedback ratings for 36 senior leaders in three organizations representing telecommunications, construction, and manufacturing industries (Bradberry, 2002). The leaders also provided self-ratings of their EQ. Scores on the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal were compared to job performance ratings for each individual via self-score and score from others.

For self scores, the Me Edition explained 13.2% of the variance in job performance and the Multi-Rater Edition explained 58.5% of the variance in job performance. Job performance was defined through each leader’s performance on the metrics established by their respective organizations.

An analysis of job performance based upon the financial indicators from the leader’s metrics indicates leaders who had high scores on the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal were 20% more productive than their low EQ counterparts, accounting for \$250,000 more productivity per head than low EQ colleagues in the same regions. 82% of top performers at these organizations were high in EQ, while only 26% of low performers were high in EQ.

Rating	R	R Square	Significance
Self	.363	.132	.047
Others	.765	.585	.003

Representative Study 2

512,439 individuals took the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal – Me Edition and their scores were compared to their last performance evaluation (Bradberry, T., and Greaves, J., 2010). Individuals represented nearly every industry, job class, and job level. Scores on the Me Edition had a strong connection to job performance, with self-ratings explaining nearly 20% of the variance in performance across positions.

Rating	R	R Square	Significance
Self	.42	.176	.000


VALIDITY DATA

GRAPHICAL DEPICTION OF EQ, JOB TITLE AND JOB FUNCTION

Emotional Intelligence 2.0 (Bradberry, T., and Greaves, J., 2009) summarizes research conducted on the normative database for the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal revealing EQ scores dropped sharply for individuals holding titles of Director and above.



EQ scores for individuals holding positions traditionally considered to be “low EQ jobs” did not live up to the stereotype. Differences in EQ scores between individuals in sales, finance, and information technology were insignificant. Only engineering positions and the unemployed were significantly lower in emotional intelligence. Customer service, HR, business development, and R&D positions were highest in EQ.



VALIDITY DATA

COMPARISON TO OTHER MEASURES

The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal has been compared to measures of leadership and emotional intelligence.

Study 1: Emotional Intelligence Appraisal and the MSCEIT

273 individuals provided multi-rater feedback ratings on the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal – MR Edition for 36 senior leaders in three organizations representing telecommunications, construction, and manufacturing industries (Bradberry, 2002). The leaders also provided self-ratings of their EQ via the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal – Me Edition and the MSCEIT. As an ability-based measure of EQ, the MSCEIT requires participants to perform various emotion-related tasks such as rating facial expressions from pictures, responding to the emotional tone of stories, and relaying how much emotion is present in patterns objects.

Scores on the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal were compared to job performance ratings for each individual via self-score and score from others. For self-scores, the Me Edition explained 13.2% of the variance in job performance and the Multi-Rater Edition explained 58.5% of the variance in job performance. Scores on the MSCEIT explained 6% of job performance for the leaders in the sample. Job performance was defined through each leader’s performance on the metrics established by their respective organizations.

Individual Variable Contributions of Emotional Intelligence and MSCEIT on Managerial Job Performance			
Variable	Beta	t	p
El Factor	.585	3.359	.003
MSCEIT	.061	.348	.748

The standardized regression weights for the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal and MSCEIT emotional intelligence factors are; $R^2 = 0.585$, $p < .003$ and $R^2 = 0.061$, $p < .748$. The standardized regression weight for the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal is significant while the MSCEIT is not. The difference between the regression weights for the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal and MSCEIT emotional intelligence scores yields a z score of 6.1 indicating a large and statistically significant difference between the values.

VALIDITY DATA

Study 2: Emotional Intelligence Appraisal and a traditional 360° assessment

Bradberry (2002b) collected feedback from 208 individuals on 27 senior leaders through a 360° feedback assessment and the Multi-Rater Edition of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal. Scores on the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal and 6 other leadership competencies from the 360° assessment were compared to job performance for these leaders, to assess the relative connection between each of these skills and job performance in leadership positions.

Scores on the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal had a highly significant connection with leadership job performance. The EQ scores had the strongest significant connection with job performance of any of the leadership competencies, followed by Results Focus, Developing Others, and Strategic Thinking.

(Competency)	Standardized Coefficients		Sig.	Correlations		
	Beta			Zero-order	Partial	Part
Developing Others	.285		.008	.667	.209	.130
Strategic Thinking	.223		.020	.699	.185	.115
Mobilizing Others	.014		.903	.679	.010	.006
Results Focus	.311		.001	.725	.258	.163
Character	-.116		.276	.636	-.087	-.053
Emotional Intelligence Appraisal™	.345		.002	.722	.246	.155



PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

All scores on the three editions of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal are norm converted on a 1 to 100 point scale, with a mean of 75 and standard deviation of 10. Raw scores, presented below, closely mirror the converted output, as the sample population is normally distributed with a negative skew.

Overall Descriptives

Skill Score	Me Edition™ (Self-Rating)		MR Edition™ (Ratings from Others)	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Overall EQ	4.21	.62	4.44	.69
Self-Awareness	4.16	.74	4.35	.75
Self-Management	4.05	.71	4.28	.76
Social Awareness	4.50	.76	4.58	.77
Relationship Management	4.25	.78	4.65	.83

Skill Score	Team EQ Edition™ (Team Rating)	
	Mean	S.D.
Overall EQ	4.15	.22
Emotional Awareness	4.28	.22
Emotion Management	4.07	.24
Internal Relationship Management	4.12	.08
External Relationship Management	4.07	.19



PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

RELIABILITIES

Statistical analyses were conducted to assess the underlying factor structure of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal—Multi-Rater Edition. Cronbach alpha values for the four scales of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal—Multi-Rater Edition ranged from .85-.91 and are presented in the table below along with reliability ratings for the other instruments used in the study.

Key		Me Edition™ (Self-rating)											
\bar{x}	Mean	Self-Awareness			Self-Management			Social Awareness			Relationship Management		
SD	Standard Deviation	\bar{x}	SD	R _{xx}	\bar{x}	SD	R _{xx}	\bar{x}	SD	R _{xx}	\bar{x}	SD	R _{xx}
R _{xx}	Reliability												
Demographic													
LOCATION													
North America	3.90	.236	.895	3.64	.426	.950	4.00	.218	.934	3.67	.255	.967	
Central America	3.76	.224	.912	3.44	.441	.949	3.91	.214	.937	3.60	.300	.970	
South America	3.64	.231	.930	3.22	.321	.960	3.45	.208	.946	3.21	.231	.976	
Western Europe	3.72	.200	.902	3.49	.362	.956	3.77	.183	.944	3.40	.220	.974	
Eastern Europe	3.55	.181	.940	3.05	.293	.970	3.24	.197	.961	2.97	.184	.979	
Middle East	3.46	.221	.931	2.97	.297	.960	3.16	.180	.949	2.88	.162	.981	
Asia	3.70	.195	.923	3.20	.246	.963	3.36	.210	.955	3.02	.179	.980	
Africa	3.63	.238	.916	3.44	.302	.954	3.56	.177	.936	3.35	.163	.975	
Australia	3.84	.254	.907	3.57	.123	.958	3.93	.178	.948	3.60	.238	.974	
GENDER													
Male	3.76	.194	.918	3.43	.302	.962	3.42	.514	.934	3.23	.163	.978	
Female	3.86	.228	.895	3.58	.443	.949	4.03	.211	.935	3.69	.314	.967	
AGE													
18-19 years	3.51	.214	.931	3.08	.354	.959	3.40	.228	.952	3.01	.209	.979	
20-29 years	3.77	.180	.908	3.42	.359	.957	3.73	.198	.946	3.41	.236	.974	
30-39 years	3.98	.236	.871	3.72	.403	.947	4.07	.218	.928	3.75	.247	.964	
40-49 years	4.04	.265	.879	3.89	.418	.942	4.18	.207	.922	3.88	.247	.962	
50-59 years	4.09	.331	.887	4.02	.406	.950	4.27	.165	.935	3.98	.259	.964	
60-69 years	3.80	.257	.926	3.74	.394	.970	3.90	.126	.952	3.71	.266	.972	
70-79 years	4.03	.262	.961	3.74	.472	.965	4.14	.247	.964	3.95	.274	.976	
80+ years	2.62	.307	.927	2.35	.377	.939	2.29	.275	.950	2.03	.129	.991	
JOB FUNCTION													
Sales	3.80	.217	.905	3.50	.389	.951	3.88	.150	.943	3.52	.240	.972	
Marketing	3.81	.226	.902	3.52	.340	.956	3.76	.125	.945	3.45	.186	.973	
Finance	3.75	.244	.924	3.49	.388	.966	3.76	.138	.948	3.38	.230	.977	
Accounting	3.83	.210	.920	3.59	.358	.958	3.88	.203	.950	3.39	.259	.977	
Operations	3.92	.345	.912	3.60	.642	.929	3.86	.726	.918	3.76	.267	.967	
Customer Service	3.91	.216	.881	3.65	.435	.948	4.04	.218	.937	3.72	.286	.968	
Human Resources/OD	3.92	.259	.910	3.70	.372	.959	4.01	.230	.945	3.71	.224	.973	
IT/IS	3.87	.201	.902	3.60	.315	.960	3.76	.235	.941	3.43	.194	.973	
Engineering	3.71	.213	.932	3.37	.264	.964	3.43	.173	.952	3.11	.159	.981	
Business Development	3.97	.286	.911	3.78	.285	.959	3.99	.180	.949	3.67	.155	.976	
Manufacturing/Production	3.93	.211	.865	3.64	.421	.944	3.92	.295	.919	3.68	.252	.959	
Research & Development	3.94	.296	.915	3.76	.300	.961	4.00	.199	.945	3.65	.175	.972	
Unemployed	3.42	.155	.933	2.99	.327	.960	3.28	.226	.947	2.94	.223	.976	
JOB TITLE													
Individual Contributor	3.77	.201	.903	3.45	.388	.953	3.80	.211	.940	3.46	.257	.970	
Supervisor	3.88	.225	.913	3.68	.384	.956	3.98	.204	.943	3.69	.214	.973	
Manager	3.94	.261	.902	3.71	.366	.957	3.99	.172	.942	3.80	.240	.976	
Director	3.83	.231	.920	3.61	.309	.966	3.74	.126	.957	3.48	.184	.978	
Executive/V.P.	3.95	.274	.892	3.44	.317	.959	3.63	.244	.946	3.16	.168	.980	
Senior Executive	3.83	.189	.927	3.30	.287	.969	3.44	.126	.965	3.13	.140	.980	
CEO	3.67	.251	.941	3.20	.308	.954	3.36	.573	.944	3.19	.132	.982	



PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

Key	Team EQ Edition™ (team-rating)												
	Mean	Emotional Awareness			Emotion Management			Internal Relationship Management			External Relationship Management		
	Standard Deviation	Mean	SD	R _{xx}	Mean	SD	R _{xx}	Mean	SD	R _{xx}	Mean	SD	R _{xx}
Demographic													
LOCATION													
North America	3.31	.399	.950	3.00	.153	.969	2.68	.086	.984	2.74	.139	.979	
Central America	3.83	.637	*	3.95	.546	*	3.32	.109	*	3.32	.337	*	
South America	2.80	.692	*	1.95	.517	*	2.08	.109	*	2.15	.905	*	
Western Europe	2.96	.331	.978	2.56	.119	.984	2.48	.046	.992	2.41	.196	.988	
Eastern Europe	3.27	.492	.939	2.33	.285	.976	2.35	.084	.991	2.26	.156	.988	
Middle East	2.15	.253	.977	1.95	.113	.986	1.80	.060	.993	1.84	.176	.989	
Asia	3.13	.334	.942	2.80	.230	.969	2.82	.083	.989	2.68	.220	.970	
Africa	4.21	.727	.777	2.92	.417	.966	3.20	.078	.991	3.30	.300	.978	
Australia	1.95	.141	.985	2.45	.241	.985	2.36	.089	.994	1.95	.141	.985	
GENDER													
Male	3.10	.309	.950	2.72	.150	.972	2.67	.033	.989	2.58	.124	.976	
Female	3.20	.425	.958	2.77	.147	.976	2.50	.103	.989	2.51	.150	.983	
AGE													
18-19 years	3.14	.538	.915	2.52	.234	.955	2.25	.091	.994	2.03	.268	.958	
20-29 years	3.02	.420	.953	2.49	.147	.975	2.38	.044	.987	2.34	.114	.980	
30-39 years	3.02	.313	.966	2.70	.212	.978	2.69	.104	.991	2.61	.122	.984	
40-49 years	3.66	.274	.954	3.44	.223	.968	3.06	.064	.983	3.15	.172	.984	
50-59 years	3.42	.476	.937	2.97	.193	.983	2.81	.137	.988	2.71	.207	.982	
60-69 years	2.62	.564	.958	2.80	.658	.969	2.30	.111	.997	3.09	.855	.960	
70-79 years	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
80+ years	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	
JOB FUNCTION													
Sales	3.11	.390	.933	2.57	.237	.969	2.40	.105	.981	2.32	.294	.965	
Marketing	3.93	.688	.937	2.95	.471	.985	3.07	.142	.996	2.92	.346	.985	
Finance	3.38	.720	.957	1.79	.406	.988	1.90	.091	.998	1.83	.281	.991	
Accounting	3.33	.636	.939	3.39	.552	.937	3.22	.328	.983	3.08	.228	.990	
Operations	1.98	.275	.977	1.87	.231	.988	1.86	.050	.995	2.04	.187	.984	
Customer Service	2.76	.305	.963	2.56	.208	.972	2.30	.092	.989	2.33	.213	.970	
Human Resources/OD	3.64	.297	.955	3.09	.224	.973	2.84	.174	.992	2.82	.141	.990	
IT/IS	3.19	.476	.939	2.69	.278	.970	2.16	.099	.989	2.17	.209	.982	
Engineering	3.06	.331	.947	2.51	.148	.980	2.78	.114	.991	2.50	.446	.971	
Business Development	3.00	.306	.984	2.90	.361	.985	3.00	.136	.991	2.90	.247	.983	
Manufacturing/Production	2.86	.194	.991	2.88	.372	.981	2.83	.288	.989	2.83	.267	.991	
Research & Development	4.29	.292	.853	4.37	.582	.832	4.25	.433	.943	4.25	.401	.909	
Unemployed	3.89	.911	.927	4.00	1.17	.924	4.13	.311	.915	3.33	.642	.982	
JOB TITLE													
Individual Contributor	3.12	.381	.953	2.68	.161	.974	2.49	.065	.989	2.46	.103	.982	
Supervisor	2.77	.462	.966	2.21	.101	.985	2.04	.047	.992	1.99	.202	.987	
Manager	3.43	.322	.950	3.03	.264	.968	2.92	.110	.987	2.83	.218	.979	
Director	3.49	.350	.957	3.39	.140	.962	3.26	.074	.986	3.28	.275	.978	
Executive/V.P.	3.35	.568	.888	2.96	.427	.956	2.71	.202	.989	2.71	.514	.947	
Senior Executive	3.16	.480	.857	3.38	.921	.959	3.16	.167	.976	3.05	.043	.957	
CEO	2.74	.343	.958	2.25	.301	.979	2.17	.064	.999	2.34	.087	.963	

*Information not available due to small sample size



PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

Key		MR Edition™* (Ratings from Others)											
\bar{x}	Mean	Self-Awareness			Self-Management			Social Awareness			Relationship Management		
SD	Standard Deviation	\bar{x}	SD	R _{xx}	\bar{x}	SD	R _{xx}	\bar{x}	SD	R _{xx}	\bar{x}	SD	R _{xx}
R _{xx}	Reliability	Demographic											
LOCATION													
North America		4.33	.484	.840	4.40	.394	.881	4.58	.436	.840	4.48	.212	.943
South Africa		4.27	.542	.803	4.23	.481	.836	4.45	.428	.734	4.59	.224	.922
GENDER													
Male		4.27	.539	.805	4.25	.460	.858	4.44	.392	.744	4.52	.215	.924
Female		4.35	.488	.803	4.41	.387	.834	4.64	.417	.813	4.61	.204	.942

*Due to the nature of a multi-rater survey, no other demographic information was collected

CONSTRUCT VALIDITY

Analysis of the construct validity of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal suggests the best fit for the model presented in the assessment is an overall EQ score with some division along the lines of Personal and Social Competence.

The principal component analysis suggested a two-factor solution, with a loose division between Personal and Social Competence. These two factors accounting for 38.3% of the variance in the correlation matrix. A Catell's scree test of the data also supported the two-factor solution (Catell, 1966). Twenty-five of twenty-eight items loaded with eigenvalues ranging from .408-.751. Items 1, 2, and 3 fell short of this cut-off with eigenvalues of .375, .200 and .344 respectively.


To further assess the proposed dimensionality of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal and support the strong reliabilities of the scales, an exploratory factor analysis was performed on the twenty-eight items. Using a Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation and Kaiser Normalization, the Kaiser-Meyer-Okin value was .944, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Kaiser, 1970).

The Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) reached statistical significance, which supports the factorability of the correlation matrix. The principal component analysis suggested a two-factor solution, with division between Personal and Social Competence, with the two factors accounting for 54.5% of the variance in the correlation matrix. A Catell's scree test of the data also supported the two-factor solution (Catell, 1966).



PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

Scree Plot



The two factors suggested from Varimax Rotation fall along the lines of division of items into Personal and Social Competence. The first factor contains the items from the Self Awareness and Self Management factors of the survey with eigenvalues ranging from .463-.809. The second factor contains the items from the Social Competence factors in the survey with eigenvalue loadings ranging from .428-.940.

PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES

Correlations for the EIA—Me Edition

The correlation matrix for the four sub-scales of the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal—Me Edition supports the 2 factor solution of Personal and Social competence with Self-Awareness and Self-Management as sub-components and Social Awareness and Relationship Management as Social Competence sub-components. Self-Awareness and Self-Management correlate strongly with the Personal Competence Factor, and Social Awareness and Relationship Management correlate strongly with the Social Competence factor.

		PERSONAL	SOCIAL	SELFAWAR	SELFMANA	SOCАWARE	RELAMANA
PERSONAL	Pearson Corr	1.000	.644	.769	.939	.548	.616
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049
SOCIAL	Pearson Corr	.644	1.000	.515	.594	.882	.935
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049
SELFAWAR	Pearson Corr	.769	.515	1.000	.502	.447	.486
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000	.000	.000
	N	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049
SELFMANA	Pearson Corr	.939	.594	.502	1.000	.501	.572
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049
SOCАWARE	Pearson Corr	.548	.882	.447	.501	1.000	.658
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049
RELAMANA	Pearson Corr	.616	.935	.486	.572	.658	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.
	N	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049	2049

All correlations significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).



REFERENCES

- Atwater, L.E. & Yammarino, F.J. (1992). Does self- other agreement on leadership perceptions moderate the validity of leadership and performance predictors? *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 141-155.
- Atwater, L.E., Ostroff, C., Yammarino, F.J., & Fleenor, J.W. (1998). Self-other agreement: Does it really matter? *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 577-598.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. (1999). Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). In R. Bar-On and J. D. A. Parker (Eds.) *Handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bradberry, T. (2002). Emotional intelligence and leader job performance. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bradberry, T. (2002b). Emotional intelligence, traditional leadership skills, and leader job performance. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bradberry, T., and Greaves, J. (2009). *Emotional Intelligence 2.0*. San Diego: TalentSmart.
- Bradberry, T., and Greaves, J. (2010). Self scores of emotional intelligence and job performance: An analysis across industry and position. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bradberry, T., and Greaves, J. (2005). *The Emotional Intelligence Quick Book: Everything You Need to Know to Put Your EQ to Work*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Coates, D. E. (1998). Don't tie 360 feedback to pay. *Training*, 35, 68-78.
- Conway, J. M., & Huffcutt, A. I. (1997). Psychometric properties of multisource performance ratings: A meta-analysis of subordinate, supervisor, peer, and self-ratings. *Human Performance*, 10, 331-360.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston.
- Harris, M.M. & Schaubroeck, J. (1988). A meta-analysis of self-supervisor, self-peer, and peer-supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 43-62.

REFERENCES

- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., and Caruso, D. R. (2002). Mayer-Salovey-Caruso emotional intelligence test: Users manual. Toronto: MHS.
- Sala, F. (2001). It's lonely at the top: Executives' emotional intelligence self [mis] perceptions. www.eiconsortium.org
- Sala, F. (2002). Emotional competence inventory (ECI): Technical manual. Hay Group, McClelland Center for Research and Innovation. www.eiconsortium.org
- Waldman, D. A., Atwater, L. E., & Antonioni, D. (1998). Has 360 feedback gone amok? *The Academy of Management Executive*, 12, 86-94.