

VALIDATION OF EMOTIONAL EXCELLENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

by Augustine Tan
12 December 2003

1.0 Reliability

Reliability checks, of others' ratings of the participants, are carried out by "check questions" (10 & 16, 15 & 29, 14 & 23, 21 & 26). Questionnaires, which do not have at least 3 out of four pairs of questions, answered the same way or in the same direction are omitted in the analysis.

2.0 Validity

In considering the manner in which we are going to establish the degree of validity of this "instrument" we need to consider its objectives and purpose:

- Needs to be practical for use in Organizational Development Projects
- Managers have to understand it. Cannot be too infused with psychological or sociological jargon
- Be able to identify Real Weaknesses in relation to Emotional Intelligence
- Be actionable so that remedial action by participants can be taken to improve
- Ongoing measures, even beyond pre-post tests, can be carried out, in a Developmental and Growth framework, in the true spirit of Organizational Development

Presently, there are no clearly established instruments for measuring "emotional intelligence" which are extensively validated. Even the ones used by Bar-On (1995) and Goleman (1997) appear to be more used in consultancy work rather than instruments that have been well validated through "pure research".

While "pure research" often attempts to present a "scientific front" through statistical analyses, it's almost impossible to satisfy the assumptions required by "pure statistics" in terms of sampling or mathematical assumptions. Also, correlations may be "statistically significant" but have no practical applications beyond supporting certain hypotheses of interest to the researcher.

For the current instrument, we have taken a simple, but practical, approach to establish construct validity: Does the participants' self-ratings match the ratings by their subordinates?

In this approach, the moment “social desirability” or “acquiescence” affects self-ratings, the measures would be useless – a fact that has long plagued social science research – particularly in the field of organizational behavior. Employees want to look good to their employers! In this research, we overcome the problem by telling the managers that their score on self-awareness will be *low* if they are dishonest.

(Note: The 10 Dimensions of Emotional Excellence are found in the acronym “HIT PROJECT”).

3.0 Results

We have compared the 2 Dimensions that each participant have *self-rated as lowest* with that resulting from average scores based on ratings done by their *subordinates*.

Of the 12 participants, there were 5 who had “perfect matches”, i.e. the 2 Dimensions in which they rated themselves as lowest matched exactly with their subordinates’ ratings. In the other 7 cases, 1 of 2 Dimensions matched.

Hence, the Dimensions in which participants see themselves as “weak” are very strongly related to the *perceptions* of their subordinates. (Table 1)

What about strengths? If we compare the top 5 Dimensions based on “self ratings” vs. that resulting from ratings by subordinates, we find that there were 4 “perfect matches”. In 7 cases, 4 out of 5 Dimensions match. Only in 1 case was there a match of 2 out of 5. This means that the participants’ own ratings of their strengths match extremely well with their subordinates *perceptions*. (Table 2)

Finally, note that where total scores are concerned, in 10 out of the 12 cases, the difference was 10% or less. (Normally, we would expect self-ratings to be much higher due to “social desirability” factor). (Table 1)

4.0 Conclusion

High construct validity has been achieved. The instrument's design also makes it effective for "Action Research" to identify behaviors related to Emotional Intelligence in a form that allows feedback and remedial action by participants.

This instrument can help enhance the work in the field of emotional intelligence by complementing the work already carried out in relation to the "Big 5", using Personality Profiles. Difference: EE focuses on the perceived behavioral components of Emotional Intelligence which participants *can change*.

The Consultant's skill (art?) in getting self-ratings that are honest will make a difference. Protection on the *anonymity* of subordinates identities will also ensure honest ratings. This research also shows that "others' ratings" will be sufficient for Organizational Interventions.

TABLE 1
EXTENT TO WHICH 2 LOWEST SCORES (DIMENSIONS) THROUGH
SELF-RATING MATCHES THAT OF RATINGS BY OTHERS...

	SELF-RATING (1)	OTHERS-RATING (2)	% Difference (2-1)	2 lowest scores match	1 of 2 lowest scores match
1. Ivy Phang	154	138.7	-10	Yes	
2. Tan Gek lang	179	144.2	-19	Yes	
3. Maria Budit	181	149.1	-18	Yes	
4. Jennifer Kho	147	160	9	No	Yes
5. Doris Tan	176	164	-7	Yes	
6. Lily	169	164.6	-3	No	Yes
7. Suffiana	158	165.3	5	No	Yes
8. Remy Miss	181	165.7	-8	No	Yes
9. Josephine	168	167.6	1	No	Yes
10. Salmi	172	169.9	-1	No	Yes
11. Liliana	186	176.3	-5	No	Yes
12. Diana Law	170	180.9	6	Yes	

In 5 cases there were “perfect matches”, and in the other 7 cases one of the two lowest scored Dimensions matched between *self-ratings* and *others' ratings*.

TABLE 2
HOW MANY OF TOP 5 SCORES ON “RATINGS OF DIMENSIONS” BY
“OTHERS” MATCH THE TOP 5 “SELF-RATINGS”?

NAME	NUMBER OF MATCHES
1. Ivy Phang	4
2. Tan Gek lang	4
3. Maria Budit	5
4. Jennifer Kho	4
5. Doris Tan	5
6. Lily	2
7. Suffiana	4
8. Remy Miss	5
9. Josephine	4
10. Salmi	4
11. Liliana	5
12. Diana Law	4

In 4 cases there were “perfect matches”, while 7 cases had 4 out of 5 matches, and 1 case matched 2 out of 5.