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INTRODUCTION

Human creatures have tendency to act both logically and emotionally. However, emotions are at the center of their strength, dedication, and enthusiasm. Feelings are prime substances in generating responses to the differences that people see and identify among themselves and others. As one recognizes and controls his/her emotional responses, the more likely one relishes better happiness in relationships, success in communications, and experience internal harmony.

Over a last few decades, curiosity in studying emotional intelligence (EI) has been greatly intensified. While some researchers and practitioners are very confident about the significance of EI in organizations, there are suspects about the concept idea, theory, and assessment of EI (Landy & Conte, 2004) (Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2002). A few studies have been performed on emotional intelligence and it was revealed that EI is an emerging feature in forecasting personal, educational and professional attainment. For a job success, a person needs to perform efficiently and effectively and therefore emotional intelligence abilities necessitate to be developed by him. Employees who have a capacity and skill to cope up with their emotions in an effective manner are more victorious at work.

There are three models of emotional intelligence which have been developed on three aspects namely, Ability, Traits and Mixed model (combination of ability and traits) of emotional intelligence (Kulkarni, Janakiram, & Kumar, 2009).

The current paper evaluates the EI measures, which contrasts in content and their method of valuation. In this article, the four major EI measures i.e. Emotional Competence Inventory, Emotional Quotient Inventory, Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale, Mayer–Salovey– Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test V.2 are measured and compared and a conclusion is made based on the study.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Though there has been substantial research performed into change in organizations over a long period, (Dunphy & Stace, 1990) (Floyd, 2002) (Guest & Hersey, 1977) attention given to the role of emotions in organizations has been afresh (e.g. (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995)(Fineman, 2000)(Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Few researches on emotions in the workplace have centered the topics like emotional labor (Hochschild, 1979) (Morris & Feldman, 1996), emotional expression and organizational culture (Maanen & Kunda,
organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990), emotions in the workplace (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1989), work motivation (George & Brief, 1996) (Ison & Baron, 1991) (Locke & Latham, 1990); general mood and job fulfillment (Forgas, 1995) and the variety of emotions felt at work (Fisher 1997). Emotions have been publicized to determine affect-driven attitudes such as rash behavior, organizational dedication, and short-lived attempts (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). However, some works have focused on the role of emotion as it powers the mind-set and conduct of individuals. To study this, four branches of emotional competence were linked as directed by Mayer and Salovey (1997) and elucidated how they can associate to behaviors that create a learning organization (Senge, 1992) a medium for supporting continuing institutional change.

Saarni (Saarni, 1999) suggested that emotional competence comprised of various skills, or aspects, that appear during the lifetime and are critical elements for effectiveness in interpersonal communications and associations. In playgroup, as children develop in their understanding of emotions, they initiate to interact with friends and companions, and face the classroom atmosphere for the first time, three components of emotional competence are most important: (1) emotion knowledge, i.e. the capability to distinguish others’ emotions by comprehending relative and indicative signs; (2) emotion regulation, the skill to control the power or length of emotional situation; and (3) expressed emotion in societal settings (Denham et al., 2003) When researchers do examine the relationships between emotion knowledge, intensity of negative emotion, and emotion regulation, conclusions obtained are complex. Emotion expressions and emotion regulation tend to be correlated, even though in some research there is slight demarcation between the two paradigm, and in others the two are merged into a single variable (Cole, Martin, & Dennis, 2004) (Denham, Blair, Schmidt, & DeMulder, 2002). When the relationship between negative emotion expressions and emotional control are inspected, they emerge to be modest, such that children who convey more negative emotions tend to demonstrate through emitting approaches, like crying or demonstrating anger to release aggravation (Denham et al., 2003) (Fabes & Eisenberg, 1992)). Researchers have instituted that emotion knowledge is linked (though weakly) to emotion expressions (Denham et al., 2003). The study proposed that low risk middle income young children who have great levels of emotion knowledge were able to convey fairly more optimistic emotions. Others have found, on the other hand,
that emotion knowledge is not correlated to expressing emotion or emotion control (Arsenio et al., (2000).) Denham et al (2002)
Tans (2003) found an affirmative affiliation between emotional competence and other measures like job satisfaction and related performance. Nevertheless, emotional competence can operate with other variables like gender, individual character and personal ethics and morals to forecast job fulfillment and performance. Cote and Miner (2006) claimed that emotional competence and cognitive intelligence intermingle to stimulus performance. It is a truth that it demands more than usual cognitive intelligence to be victorious at job. It also requires emotional intelligence; the talent to curb negative feelings such as anger and self mistrust, and instead concentrate on positive sentiments such as being self-confident and cheerful to be successful at job place. The mixed outcomes of these researches provoked the investigator to empirically analyze the correlation between Emotional intelligence/competence and job excellence.
D. Jamali, et al, (2008) studied emotional competence from the Lebanese perspective, and examined emotional intelligence competency framework that is (Self-awareness, Self-regulation, Self-motivation, Social awareness and Social skills) in a sample of 225 Lebanese workers and executives. A questionnaire-based rate was developed to encapsulate the basic competencies on a self-report basis. The conclusion availed dissimilarity in emotional competence scores across different emotional intelligence competencies for males and females, with males achieving good on self-regulation and self-motivation aspects, and females making high on self-awareness, empathy and social skills, and that emotional intelligence levels raise radically with managerial status.
A study at Johnson & Johnson Consumer and Personal Care Group confirms the perception that emotional competence discriminates successful managers. Better performing executives were perceived to have considerably superior Self-Awareness, Self-Management ability, Social competence, and Organizational familiarity; all constitute a part of the Emotional Intelligence/Competence ambit. Prior studies have publicized that Emotional Competence, like technical talent; can be learned through an organized and constant strategy to create competency in private and public state of affairs. (Cavallo)
David Rosete and Joseph Ciarrochi, (2005) examined to explore the association between emotional competence, individual character, cognitive intelligence and leadership efficiency.
A sample of 41 senior managers underwent an ability measure of emotional intelligence John Mayer and Peter Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), a scale of personality 16 Personality Traits, 5th edition (16PF5) and a computing cognitive ability through Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence (WASI). Leadership efficacy was evaluated by an objective scale of performance and a 360° assessment including each leader’s juniors and direct managers. Correlation and regression analyses showed that higher emotional intelligence competence was related with higher leadership efficiency, and that emotional intelligence described the discrepancy which was not clarified by personality or intelligence.

Empathy is also measured as a crucial socio-emotional ability and a number of writers have emphasized it as one of most essential competences (Benard, 2004); (Grotberg, 1997); (Kumpfer, 1999); (Parker, Cowen, Work, & Wyman, 1990). As Benard (2004) stated “empathy not only helps facilitate relationships development, it also forms the basis of morality, forgiveness, and compassion and caring for others” (p.15). This should be considered a decisive factor for the creation of teambuilding described as pro-social and non-materialized.

A study performed by Barling observed relationship between leadership styles and their ECI of 49 managers. The author calculated EI by the Bar-On EQ-i, but only accounted total EQ and not various subscales it involves. This study found EC and three components elements of transformational leadership were absolutely interconnected, and moreover it discovered that one element of transactional leadership was positively allied with EC. Maximum connection in this study was established between EC and inspiring motivation (Barling et al. (2000)

Orhanl and Dincer in their research studied 150 staff members of Turkish banking sector using Wong and Law’s Emotional Intelligence scale The major motive of using that scale was that some of the scales such as “Baron’s 15”, which comprised of 133 questions, were tough to imply and had validity and reliability issues and were very exhaustive. Nevertheless, the Wong and Law scale contained only sixteen sub-factors concerning four major factors. The survey conducted on 150 employees of state-owned and private banks of Turkey found a noteworthy connection and relations between employees’ emotional competence/intelligence and job satisfaction in an optimistic way but not very intense.
Moreover, the results notified that there was a considerable difference between the employees of state-owned and private banks in regards of emotional intelligence competency. The analysis showed that emotional intelligence level of private bank employees were elevated contrast to the state-owned bank employees. In terms of job fulfillment, it was identified that there was no major disparity between state-owned and private bank employees apart from for the organizational climate element. Private bank employees were greatly contented with their working environment.

The latent relation between EI and interpersonal competence is strengthened by earlier researches covering sensible and important associations between EI and the individual competency spheres of communication, motivation, conflict management, and problem solving. Those who were competent in communication were perceived to be more empathetic (Schmid & Adams, 2008) Empathy is a paradigm conduct in varied models of EI (Goleman D., 1998a) Persons with high EI expressed more empathy. That formed a bond between EI and communication skills. Henderson (2008) extended this correlation by detailing that EI and the encoding and decoding system of communication are truly alike. If the basic Emotions Theory (Mesquita, 2001) is proper, it is reasonable to recommend that some people have skills or propensity that improves their communication flair, based on their intensity of emotional and technical understanding.

The EC of a person has been described to possess some connection with organizational learning (Singh, 2007), managerial perception ((Matzler, Bailom, & Mooradlan, 2007), and performance within stipulated time (Newsome, Day, & Catano, 2000) Emotions induce decision-making practice (Milivojevich, 2006) (Sy & Cote, 2004). These studies grant a bunch of findings signifying that superior EI assessment scores might upshot higher problem-solving aptitude.

Owing to anxiety and doubt, change and emotions are interlaced ((Chrusciel, 2006); (French, 2001) (Lundberg & Young, 2001). Caruso and Wolfe (2002)) originated that persons with high EC are characteristically calmer with uncertainty and change in the place of work. Project management is a category of change management. Emotions may be comprehended in well manner by a few employees, thereby raising the probability of competence. Mayer and Salovey (2004) confirmed this hypothesis in previous studies when
they found that EI affects the individual efficacy while absorbed in change management pattern.

Malek (2000) instituted that populace with superior EC are expected to settle conflict efficiently and successfully using more shared styles for solving disputes. Sy and Cote (2004) indicated that people with high EC outperform in managing the clashing circumstances, coping their own emotions, and lining up with the group targets. Goleman (1998a) cited conflict management as a measure within EI tool, which is the ECI. Whereas these illustrations do not clearly look at project managers or, particularly, EI, a case exists that a relationship of some kind may be present.

OVERVIEW OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE MODELS

As stated in the introduction of this paper, there are three basic models of Emotional Intelligence i.e. the Ability Model, Trait Model and Mixed Model. The detail study of each model is done in The Ability model of emotional intelligence elucidates emotional intelligence as “an ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use the information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (Conte, 2005).

The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) is an Ability-based test intended to evaluate the four spheres of the EI model of Mayer and Salovey. The Second is Traits model of emotional intelligence which integrates non-rational competencies such as self-esteem, self-actualization, general mood, and general well-being with emotional intelligence. It should be noted that measures based on trait aspects do not greatly connect with intelligence traits. Nevertheless, these competencies compellingly associate with individual’s personality traits, inclining investigators to deem this approach as emotional intelligence-as-personality (Conte, 2005). Lastly, the Mixed Model of emotional intelligence which is a combination of ability model and traits model of emotional intelligence. The mixed model signifies the concept that in conjunction with emotional intelligence, personality features and cognitive intelligence should also be integrated. (Schutle 2006).

MEIS AND MSCEIT V.2

Mayer et al. (2000) proposed that emotional intelligence concerns with the ability to understand the cause and effect of emotions. They worked out two different EI tests. Initially they developed a Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) having subscales
but had few difficulties of low reliability and scoring method. Later, they developed the Mayer–Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), which was a modernized form of MEIS. The fresh version of the MSCEIT is Version 2. Both EI tests are described herewith since the MSCEIT V.2 seems to have advanced some of the troubles of the former test, the MSCEIT V.2 is novel and little research have been done using it. The MEIS comprises of 402 items and produces four subscales: Perception, Assimilation, Understanding, and Managing Emotions (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 2000). The MEIS is an ability test that has distinct tactics to detect right answers, including target scoring, consensus scoring, and expert scoring. In Target scoring, a person (i.e., the target) is asked a few questions and based on his/her facial expressions and how he or she actually felt or when engaged in some emotional activity, correct responses are portrayed. On other hand, Consensus scoring includes concluding the answer by assembling the opinion of hundreds of people. This scoring procedure evaluates the degree to which the test take’s choice tallies with the mass opinion. Thus, consensus scoring techniques are ‘in direct contrast to traditional measures of intelligence where an objective measure of truth is considered’ Matthews (2002, p. 186).

The third scale is Expert scoring which considers uncovering the right answers by amalgamating the experts’ opinion in emotions. This type of scoring technique is most parallel to that used in cognitive ability tests. Studies performed over 75 years ago found some association between paradigm such as social intelligence and verbal intelligence (Hunt, 1928).

A research by Landy (2004) researched the primitive history of social intelligence in detail. The Mayer Salovey–Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) V.2 is also intended to assess the four branches of Mayer and Salovey’s (1997) (1993) emotional intelligence ability model. The MSCEIT V.2 provides a total EI score and four Branch scores: (1) perception of emotion, (2) integration and assimilation of emotion, (3) knowledge about emotions, and (4) management of emotions. The MSCEIT V.2 is relatively small and fast to manage compared to the MEIS as it contains 141 items, and offers both consensus and expert scores for all Branch scores. Whereas the MEIS have 12 subtests to evaluate the four Branches, the MSCEIT V.2 includes two subtests for each Branch (Salovey et.al (2003 ). Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, and Sitarenios (2003), researched that total scale reliabilities and Branch levels were all above 0.75. In the MSCEIT V.2, for every scale the standard internal consistency reliability
was 0.68 for consensus scoring and 0.71 for expert scoring. However, for validation, the writers primarily depend on facts from the MEIS to support the MSCEIT V.2.

The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test was executed on 5000 white females aging 30 years. (Mayer et al., 2002) Stability estimates of the MSCEIT (in the form of test-retest reliability after 3 weeks) were accounted 0.86 (Brackett & Mayer, 2003). The internal consistency (in the form of split half reliability) for the four branches scaled between $r = .80$ to $.91$ and $r = .91$ for the entire test (Mayer et al., 2003). The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test slightly correlate with measures of intelligence (IQ), with correlations ranging from $r = .05$ (Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000) to $r = .38$ (Mayer et al., 1999). Similarly, the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test was observed to be reasonably interrelated to elements of psychological welfare ($r = .28$) and to two of the Big Five personality factors as calculated by the NEO Personality Inventory – Revised (NEO-PI-R; $r = .25$ for Openness and $r = .28$ for Agreeableness; (Brackett & Mayer, 2003)

**BAR-ON EMOTIONAL QUOTIENT INVENTORY (EQ-i)**

In 2006, Reuven Bar-On developed a mixed model named Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory Model which was a collection of non-cognitive competencies that induces individual’s skills to turn out well in managing the organizational stress and pressure. (Stys & Brown, 2004) The EQ-i is a 133-item self-report measure that takes about 30 minutes to finish (Bar-On, R, 2000). This model generates an overall EQ score as well as scores for five amalgamated scales: (1) intrapersonal, (2) interpersonal, (3) adaptability, (4) general mood, and (5) stress management. (Stys & Brown, 2004) Bar-On assumed that a persons with higher than average E.Q.’s flourish more in meeting organizational needs and demands. He further clarified that lack of emotional intelligence indicates job failure as well as other emotional problems. Bar-On, is used particularly by researchers who do not have subscales of reality testing, problem solving, handling stress, and exercising control. Bar-On EQ has employed 133 items to get a Total EQ (Total Emotion Quotient) and to generate five combined scales equivalent to the 5 main components of the Bar-On model i.e. Intrapersonal EQ, Interpersonal EQ, Adaptability EQ, Stress Management EQ, and General Mood EQ. These Items are calculated on a 5 point scale varying from 1 (very seldom/not true for me) to 5 (very often/often true of me). Total basic scores are transformed into
standard scores with a mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15, parallel to that of IQ scores (Bar-On, 2002) (Stys & Brown, 2004)

Still, it is not apparent how each of these variables are related theoretically to EI. Matthews et.al (2002) observed that the concept behind this model is unclear. However, Bar-On (2000) stated that the internal consistency reliability of the overall EQ-i was 0.76. The EQ-i demonstrated sufficient test–retest reliability of 0.85 after 1 month and 0.75 after 4 months (Bar-On, R, 1997). In context of combined validity, Gowing (2001) observed that the average correlation among EQ-i subscales was 0.50, and also this average correlation is alike correlations among various components of conventional intelligence tests. Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (2000) found that the correlation between the EQ-i and the MEIS was 0.36. One more significant standard that could be predicted by EI is educational success, which is usually evaluated through student grade point average (GPA) (Conte, 2005). Since, GPA is completely based on rational intelligence (non-emotional) activity and therefore should not be linked to EI. However, Bar-On (2000) in the EQ-i Technical Manual, deduced that EI is a significant forecaster of academic achievements. Additionally, Goleman (1995) projected that EI would be a better predictor of achievements at work as well as job compared to any conventional measures of EI. Conversely, a research on 160 Canadian college students revealed that the EQ-i total score resulted in correlation of 0.01 with grade point average (Newsome, Catano, & Day, 2000). Likewise, none of the five composite EQ-I scores was considerably related with GPA. On the contrary, the noteworthy predictors of GPA were cognitive ability (i.e., the Wonderlic Personnel Test) and a few personality elements (e.g., self-control) (Conte, 2005). Derived from the results, Newsome et al. (2000) claimed that there is insufficient information to validate the use of the EQ-i as a selection tool. Overall, even though the EQ-i proves enough reliability and has a little validity proof, yet it requires distinguished validity confirmation, and a few researches have been done to check whether it provides any incremental validity above the conventional projectors such as cognitive ability and Big Five personality dimensions.

EMOTIONAL COMPETENCE INVENTORY (ECI)

ECI was developed by Boyatzis, Goleman, and colleagues, to assess emotional competencies and optimistic social conduct (Boyatzis, R. E., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. S., 2000) (Goleman, D., 1995) (Sala, F., 2002). ECI focused on the abilities, which include self control, zeal and
persistence and the ability to motivate oneself. This model has included 110 items and measures 20 competencies that are categorized into four clusters: (1) Self-Awareness, (2) Social Awareness, (3) Self-Management, and (4) Social Skills. It has 360-degree assessment techniques that embrace self-ratings, peer ratings, and supervisor ratings. The internal consistency reliability of self-assessment ECI scales extends from 0.61 to 0.85. And the peer and supervisor rating scales, internal consistency reliability scales from 0.80 to 0.95 (Gowing, 2001) (Sala, F., 2002). In a study involving college principals and students retention rate, it was found that the emotional intelligence involving self-awareness and social awareness of college principals was greatly correlated with college student retention rates ($r's = .20$ and $18$; (Sala, F., 2002)) (Stys & Brown, 2004). Other studies have revealed that emotional intelligence calculated based on ECI was considerably correlated with salary ($r = .40$), job success ($r = .33$), and life success ($r = .46$; Sevinc, 2001). ECI model was discovered to correlate meaningfully with the sensing/intuiting and thinking/feeling dimensions of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and with the extroversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness factors of the NEO Personality Inventory. (Stys & Brown, 2004). However, an investigation of deviating validity reported no major relationship between the Emotional Competence Inventory and the level of analytical thinking (Sala, F., 2002). There were no tests for incremental validity performed for the Emotional Competence Inventory. Bradberry (Bradberry, 2002) in his report unearthed that the EIA very well forecasted job performance of middle and senior level managers ($r = .36$ for the Me Edition and $r = .77$ for the MR Edition) (Stys & Brown, 2004). Further validity was again confirmed for the Me Edition of the EIA when Bradberry et al., (2003) conducted a survey among 12,000 individuals representative of all industries, job classes, and job levels ($r = .42$) and the measure was a noteworthy forecaster of job work. But, Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (MR Edition) scale was not notably linked with the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test, and when both were compared to assess managerial work performance, the EIA was a better interpreter of work performance than Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test i.e. the variance in job performance was accounted for 13% and 59% by the Me and MR version, whereas 6% for Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test. Nevertheless, incremental validity was accounted for the Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (Bradberry, et al., 2003) (Stys & Brown, 2004).
However, researchers analyzed that variables in ECI competencies have similarities with four of the Big Five personality dimensions (Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, and Openness) and other psychological concepts in the motivation and leadership theories (Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2002) (Van Rooy; Viswesvaran C., 2004); In general, the analytical validity for ECI has not been justified and the scale does not earn significant concern until peer-reviewed empirical studies using this measure are conducted (Conte, 2005).

**Big Five Personality Factors, Bar-On and Goleman’s Components of Emotional Intelligence**  
*(McCrae, 2000)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Big Five</th>
<th>Bar-On</th>
<th>Goleman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neuroticism:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Happiness (R)</td>
<td>Ability to shake off anxiety (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry Hostility</td>
<td>Self-Regard (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Impulse Control (R)</td>
<td>Stifling Impulsiveness (R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Consciousness</td>
<td>Stress Tolerance (R)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impulsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extraversion:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregariousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement Seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness to Experience:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>Emotional Self-Awareness</td>
<td>Monitoring Feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>Reality Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions</td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreeableness:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>Attunement to Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straightforwardness</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Interacting Smoothly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td></td>
<td>with Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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COMPARING MODELS OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE (EI)

Regardless of the three developed different models of emotional intelligence, there exist some theoretical and statistical connections between various concepts. Globally, all the models intend to identify and assess the elements involved in the detecting and controlling one’s emotions and the emotions of others (Goleman, 2001). In all models there are some key elements to emotional intelligence, and that these components are approved and accepted. For instance, all three models of emotional intelligence encompass the awareness (or perception) factor of emotions and coping up of emotions which turns to be a crucial aspect in being an emotionally intelligent person.

The researchers of EI have used various distinct definitions of the EI concept, which led to a variety of types and numbers of dimensions for different measures (Gowing, 2001). These measures employ different answer formats, which comprise of self-report, ability, and informant approaches. The self-report EI measures (e.g., ECI and EQ-i) test a wide variety of individual disparity, but the majorities of self-report scales having reasonable reliabilities correlate to well-known personality magnitude (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2003) (Davies, Stankov, & Roberts, 1998). Ability- based EI models (i.e., MEIS, MSCEIT V.2), which are quite different from the Big Five personality dimensions, are greatly associated with the general mental ability (GMA) compared to the self-report EI measures (Van Rooy ; Viswesvaran C., 2004), making incapable for ability-based EI measures to predict job performances and leadership aspects. Provided that the ability-based EI measures’ is deficient of offering additional validity in predicting job measures, this model will eventually be considered as a traditional dimension of social intelligence. After performing quite a few investigations using social intelligence measures, R. L. Thorndike claimed that primitive measures of social intelligence.
were just meager tests of GMA, which was described by him as ‘abstract intelligence’ (Thorndike, 1936) (Thorndike & Stein, 1937). To observe the degree of intersection, few researches have used both trait and ability-based EI measures. Mayer et al. (2000) in his study explored that the MSCEIT and Bar-On scales correlated 0.36, which accounted 13 percent share in their variance. Later, Brackett and Mayer (2003) found that the MSCEIT and Bar-On scales correlated 0.21, indicating that they share approximately 4 percent of their variance. A minimal correlation between different EI measures have caused important queries whether they are really considering the same paradigms (Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2002). In contrast to ability-based EI measures, self-report measures would greet less consideration as they do not possess psychometric assistance (like the Big Five personality dimensions). On the other hand, ability-based EI measures are welcomed all around and it should be noted that further evaluation of the combined validity across EI measures are carried out.

A number of examiners bothered about the lack of scientific model for deciding the exactness of consensus and expert scores for the MEIS and the MSCEIT V.2. (Conte, 2005). Also, these ability-based tests may not present significant scores at the high end of the EI gamut because the consensus scoring only uses general responses in identifying the right answers (Matthews et al., 2002). Moreover, in the expert scoring approach, Matthews et al. (2002) questioned about how ‘experts’ were selected while deciding the correct answers for emotional intelligence questions and tasks. (Conte, 2005). There is a wide disparity between the two scales; and the research performed using MEIS cannot be used to sustain the validity of the MSCEIT V.2. Since, the later is too novel to be incorporated in most EI research or in the meta-analysis by Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (Van Rooy ; Viswesvaran C., 2004). It is expected that the MSCEIT V.2 will exhibit distinguishing validity from personality measures, but not increased validity in forecasting performance results. In reality, a research by Barchard (Barchard, 2003).found that out of the many EI measures she studied (including the MSCEIT) none of them demonstrated validity for forecasting educational success in addition to the cognitive ability and personality. Even though, Brackett and Mayer (2003) learnt that the MSCEIT and EQ-i exhibited some indication of incremental validity in foretelling social diverge and alcohol use, but it did not validate the academic performance.
CONCLUSION

While comparing to other (self report) measures of EI, studies show that the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test correlates modestly with the Bar-On Emotion Quotient Inventory (the EQ-I, \( r = .21 \)) or the Self Report Emotional Intelligence Test (the SREIT, \( r = .18 \)), signifying that these three measures of emotional intelligence did not determine a general paradigm (Brackett & Mayer, 2003). The MSCEIT also has incremental validity. As the instigators support the reliability and validity of the MSCEIT, they also claim that EI measured through an ability models fulfills normal standards for an additional intelligence: (Mayer et al., 2003). For instance, in a sample of 207 college students the MSCEIT forecasted social deviance (physical fights and damage) apart from personality and intelligence tests (Brackett & Mayer, 2003) (Stys & Brown, 2004)

The present EI dimensions employ a four- or five-factor model, but no study is done on forecasting work and non-work results (Van Rooy ; Viswesvaran C., 2004). Also, investigation is required on the falsified self-report EI measures. Mayer et al. (2003) established that females achieved greater than men on the MSCEIT V.2, but no major disparity found in ethnicity (Stys & Brown, 2004). Emotional intelligence can be ethically obliged; and therefore cross-cultural similarities and dissimilarities in EI have to be studied. Moreover, additional research on stability, and ‘trainability’ of EI, is desirable (Slaski & Cartwright, 2003). However, the training will really boost EI can only be judged when new suitable measures of EI are established (Goldstein & Ford, 2002). In general, it is a concerning issue for all EI measures, beginning from rating method of ability-based EI measures to the differentiated validity issues of self-report EI measures. There are also unsolved matters with ability-based EI measures even though they seem to be most capable. Gowing (2001) pointed that many EI measures have been used for recruitment purpose. Supervisors should be cautious of using it as a selection tool except it reveals a more précised discriminant incremental validity proof (Conte, 2005). Even though Mayer et al. (2003) have built an indicating EI measures, they assert that ‘the applied use of EI tests must proceed with great caution’ (p. 104). After reviewing various EI measures, it is expected that further scientific research should be executed on incremental validity of EI measures in forecasting job and other work performances apart from cognitive skill and Big Five personality dimensions.
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