

## **A Construct Validity Assessment of Two Emotional Intelligence Measures for College of Business Administration Programs**

**Barbara Burgess-Wilkerson**

Associate Professor of Management  
Winthrop University  
Rock Hill, SC 29733, USA

**Steven A. Frankforter**

Professor of Management  
Winthrop University  
Rock Hill, SC 29733, USA

**Anna C. Lampe**

Executive Professor of Management  
Helzberg School of Management  
Rockhurst University  
Kansas City, MO 64110, USA

### **Abstract**

*Emotional intelligence (EI) is increasingly becoming a concern on college campuses across the country and globally. Employers increasingly express concern about a lack of EI among young business professionals. As such instruments to assess EI are key to developing programs and interventions to meet these needs. The Wilkerson Emotional Intelligence Test for Academics and Careers (WEITAC) is a newly created self-report measure of emotionally and socially competent behavior and attitudes as an estimate of one's social and emotional intelligence. This study was done to see if the WEITAC inventory is as reliable as the existing TTI Emotional Quotient. The study showed that both are proven to have construct validity. The study proved the WEITAC to be a valid and reliable tool to allow college students to participate in a process of understanding and managing emotions in an academic setting and as part of a career readiness strategy.*

**Keywords:** Emotional intelligence; higher education emotional intelligence measurements;; business students and emotional intelligence; professional readiness.

### **Introduction**

Academic and career success is increasingly dependent on a number of variables beyond cognitive-based or “hard skills” development. According to the American College Personnel Association there is compelling evidence regarding the relevance of emotional intelligence as an indicator of academic and career success (Low, Lomax, Jackson & Nelson, 2004). The college experience is characterized as being a time of social, emotional and intellectual adjustment even for the brightest student (Chickering, 1969; Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994; Robbins, Oh, Le, & Button, 2009). Empirical evidence indicates that emotional control influences academic outcomes by diverting attention from worry, anxiety and frustration that can accompany navigating in uncharted waters of higher learning (Kanfer, Ackerman & Heggstad, 1996; Kremenitzer, et. al., 2008). Several studies substantiate the connection between emotional intelligence and academic success. Lam and Kirby (2002) found that EI accounts for increases in cognitive-based performance above the level attributed to general intelligence in three of four EI subscales.

Burgess-Wilkerson, Benson and Frankforter (2002) in conducting an analysis of EI in an academic setting found that EI scores improved because of classroom interventions. Studies of college of business administration students (CBA) at two universities revealed that students in business programs at times struggle with certain aspects of EI despite high academic achievement and accounting students in particular were more vulnerable in areas such as empathy and self-awareness (Bay & McKeage 2006; Esmond-Kiger, et al., 2006; Maas, Burgess-Wilkerson, Lampe, Frankforter, 2013). Salovey and Mayer's (1990) study of non-cognitive intelligence presented a framework for emotional intelligence (EI), which is based on the ability to monitor and understand one's emotional and accurately monitor the emotions of others. Emotional intelligence is defined as a "form of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions, to discriminate them, and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions (1990:185). Goleman (1995) found that IQ alone was not a good predictor of job performance. Cherniss and Adler (2000) found that EI was critical for effective work performance. A national survey conducted by Harris Education Research Council found that only four in ten employees were not able to work cooperatively with fellow employees (1991).

## **2. Emotional Intelligence Measurements**

Salovey and Mayer's (1990) study of social (non-cognitive) intelligence presented an initial framework for EI based on the ability to regulate one's emotions and accurately monitor other's emotions. Efforts by Goleman (1995) and others popularized EI and led to further attempts to define, measure, and apply EI. Theories and instruments to measure EI fall into two major categories: ability or performance measures, and self-report measures. Performance measures are considered the "gold standard" in intelligence research because intelligence corresponds to one's actual capacity to perform the task (Carroll, 1993; Mayer & Salovey, 1993; Scarr, 1989). Self-reports on the other hand ask people to endorse a series of descriptive statements indicating the extent to which they describe the individual (Mayer & Gaschke, 1988; Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey & Palfai, 1995). According to Taylor and Brown (1988) self-reported abilities and traits rely on the individual's self-understanding therefore the *ability* or *trait* is accurate only to the extent that the person's self-concept is accurate.

### **2.1 The WEITAC**

The Wilkerson Emotional Intelligence Test for Academics and Careers (WEITAC) is a self-report measure of emotionally and socially competent behavior and attitudes as an estimate of one's social and emotional intelligence. It is important to note that the WEITAC was not designed to measure traits or cognitive capacity. The WEITAC comprises 129 brief items and employs a five-point Likert Scale ranging from "very seldom or not true of me" to "very often true of me or true of me." It requires 15 minutes or less to complete the online inventory. The assessment tool is divided into five general component scales along with subcomponents (see Figure 1). The first general component scale is *self-awareness*. The second is *self-regulation*. The third scale is *self-motivation*. The fourth scale is *social awareness*. Finally, the fifth scale is *social skills*. When combined, the 25 subcomponents form a total emotional intelligence score (Burgess-Wilkerson, 2015). The emotional intelligence item bank is based upon the generic Emotional Competency Framework from the Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations EI Framework ([www.eiconsortium.org](http://www.eiconsortium.org)). The WEITAC controls for possible sources of bias. First, the positive impression score evaluates the possibility for bias out of attempts to create overly positive impressions. If this score is above 23, disregard the output. Second, the negative impression score evaluates the possibility for bias out of attempts to create overly negative impressions. If this score is less than 10, disregard the output. Third, the inconsistency index tests for randomness in an individual's answers. If this score exceeds 7 or is less than -3, disregard the output. Figure 2 displays the bias measures, components, subcomponents, and definitions for the WEITAC (Burgess-Wilkerson, 2015). After an individual completes the self-assessment, the WEITAC generates a report with component and subcomponent scores. Although specific ranges exist for every component and subcomponent, generally, scores ranging plus one from the medians are either areas of strength and those ranging minus one are areas warranting improvement.

### **2.2 Construct Validation of the WEITAC**

Other methods of validating the WEITAC describe the constructs of emotional and social intelligence. The findings indicate that the WEITAC is measuring emotional and social intelligence based upon the manner in which the total EQ score correlates with various other measures thought to measure the same construct or aspects of it. All Alpha coefficients for the WEITAC'S scores and sub scores exceed .75, indicating good reliability.

### 2.3 The TTI Emotional Quotient

The TTI Emotional Quotient is based upon a multidimensional perspective of emotional intelligence. The emotional intelligence item bank is based upon the Goleman (1995) model of emotional intelligence. The test has been administered to over 500 individuals in several countries globally. Several analyses have been conducted using a sample of working professionals ages 20-75 with a mean age of 48, 44% male and 52% female, in the U.S. England, Greece, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia.

The demographic composition includes 77% Caucasian, 16.9% Black/African American, 1% Hispanic/Latino, and 2.8% from Two or More Races (EQ Mentor, 2008, pg. 4). The TTI assessment provides an overall Emotional Intelligence Quotient (EQ) score, an Intrapersonal Intelligence score, an Interpersonal Intelligence score, scores on five components of EQ and five personality factors as described below in Figure 3. The TTI has 57 questions and requires approximately 10 minutes for completion of the online self-assessment. It has two components and five subcomponents. The questions use a five-point Likert scale. The first component, *interpersonal*, includes self-awareness, self-regulation, and motivation. The second component, *intrapersonal*, includes social skills and empathy. The five subcomponents are combined into a total score. Figure 3 displays the components, subcomponents, and definitions for the TTI. Respondents rate each item using a Likert scale with the options: "Very Inaccurate, Somewhat Accurate, Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate, Somewhat Accurate, and Very Accurate." There are 31 reverse scored items on the instrument. The TTI Emotional Quotient is normed based upon the standard bell curve resulting in 16% low scores, 68% average scores and 16% high scores (EQ Mentor, 2008, 2).

### 2.4 Reliability and Validity

The Alpha coefficient provides information about internal consistency of the scales and test-retest reliability provides information about the stability of the instrument. All reliability estimates exceeded the minimally acceptable level of .700, which is similar to other EI assessments. Two Master's level psychologists developed the bank. Eight subject matter experts reviewed the items for reliability to targeted constructs and pilot tested the instrument on 100 individuals for face validity information resulting in additional items, revisions of some items, and dropping a few items. Further reliability and item analyses resulted in two additional revisions. The TTI Emotional Quotient is currently undergoing a criterion validation study to demonstrate a link between assessment scores and measurable criteria including work performance and emotional well-being (EQ Mentor, 2008, pg. 5). Unlike the WIETAC and other EI self-reporting instruments, the TTI does not have safeguards against possible sources of bias (Burgess-Wilkerson & Frankforter, (2012).

### 3. Purpose of the Study

The WEITAC appears to be a promising instrument for assessing emotional intelligence among college students and was designed specifically for that purpose. It is essential to validate the instrument with divergent population samples and to study the construct validity in higher education using comparable self-report instruments such as the TTI to address construct validity concerns as we move forward in developing self-directed learning programs targeted primarily at millennial in both academic and workplace settings.

### 4. Hypothesis

Business schools are creatively infusing emotional intelligence into the business curriculum as a workforce-readiness strategy. Vandervoort (2006) advocates improving student emotional intelligence because those with higher self-knowledge tend to make better career choices, have fewer behavioral/emotional problems, and have higher scores on standardized achievement tests. The purpose of this study is to investigate the extent to which two emotional intelligence instruments have construct validity and can be used for both a short-term EI self-directed learning and long-term as part of a EI study of students in the College of Business Administration. We predict that both emotional intelligence instruments (the WEITAC and the TTI Emotional Quotient) will have construct validity and can be used in tandem for EI testing and validation purposes to address concerns regarding construct validity. Accordingly, we offer the following hypothesis: H1: The components, subcomponents, and total scores of the WEITAC and TTI Emotional Quotient will be significantly correlated.

#### 4.1 Design of the Study

We concomitantly administered both the WEITAC and the TTI Emotional Quotient to volunteer students at a university in the Midwestern United States during the spring semester of 2017. The study included 101 students. However, two students failed to finish the entire TTI, leaving just 99 who completed both instruments.

#### 5. Statistical Evaluation and Results

In this section of the paper, we compare two instruments that evaluate emotional intelligence, the WEITAC and the TTI. Our first step is to evaluate the possibility of multicollinearity in each instruments' scales with numerous components and subcomponents; it is a material danger that they are too interrelated to provide proper measurement. We conducted our inquiry using two statistical tools, bivariate correlation and variation inflation factors (VIFs). Note that we computed all of the VIF calculations we disclose in this manuscript as an option in SPSS's linear regression calculation. Aside from the VIFs, we did not use any statistics from our linear regression analysis. The generally accepted threshold for evidence of multicollinearity is a VIF in excess of 10 (Netter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1989). Bivariate correlations traditionally show evidence of multicollinearity, with statistics of .60 to .90 traditionally serving as rule-of-thumb cutoffs. While .60 was frequently used in the past, more recent research uses correlation coefficients of .80 or higher for screening (Asher, 1983; Emory & Cooper, 1991). The benefit of using bivariate correlations is that it identifies potential multicollinearity between independent variables, which may be managed by increasing sample size, deleting one of the variables with high correlation coefficients, or combining the independent variables with suspected multicollinearity. However, high correlation among variables can indicate multicollinearity, but is not an entirely reliable indicator. This is because multicollinearity is a multivariate problem, not just a bivariate problem. One advantage that VIFs have over bivariate correlations is that it examines the entirety of independent variables, not just pairs. However, calculating bivariate correlations can be helpful in targeting the specific pairs of independent variables for which multicollinearity may be an issue, with either dropping one of the two variables or combining them into a single variable.

The means, standard deviations, VIFs, and the correlation matrix for the WEITAC's bias measures and subcomponents appear on Table 1. None of the 25 subcomponents reports a bivariate correlation coefficient that exceeds .73. Please note that while high correlation among subcomponents provides evidence of possible multicollinearity, high correlations between subcomponents and the total score does not. None of the variables reported a VIF exceeding 4.51. In sum, we find no evidence to suggest multicollinearity issues among WEITAC's subcomponents. Table 2 displays the means, standard deviations, VIFs, and the correlation matrix for the WEITAC's components. None of the five components reports a bivariate correlation coefficient that exceeds .84, nor a VIF exceeding 5.20. We find no evidence to suggest multicollinearity issues among WEITAC's components. In sum, we find that the WEITAC's components and subcomponents to be sufficiently free of multicollinearity. Next, we examine the TTI. Table 3 shows the means, standard deviations, VIFs, and the correlation matrix for the TTI's subcomponents. Table 6 shows the means, standard deviations, VIFs, and the correlation matrix for the TTI's components. None of the correlation coefficients among either the subcomponents or components exceeded a level of .62. None of the variables on either Table 5 or Table 6 reported a VIF exceeding 2.40. Based on these results, we conclude that the TTI does not have a problem with multicollinearity. Once a lack of significant multicollinearity was established, we then tested the hypothesis that both the WEITAC and TTI each have construct validity, comparing the components, subcomponents, and total scores of the two instruments. Table 5 shows the correlation matrix for the TTI versus the WEITAC's subcomponents. The TTI's subcomponents appear across the top and the WEITAC's on the left. Next, Table 6 shows the correlation matrix for the TTI versus the WEITAC's components and total. The TTI's components and total appear across the top and the WEITAC's on the left. We hoped that correlations between items on the two instruments would be limited, with one item on one instrument having a significant correlation with just one item on the other, indicating one-to-one interchangeability. However, we found extensive statistically significant correlation coefficients with virtually all subcomponents and components. Table 5 shows that all components had statistically significant correlation coefficients. However, significantly correlated total scores indicated that the instruments taken as a whole are interchangeable and appear to measure similar phenomena. Table 6 shows the same pattern of statistically significant correlation coefficients, as did Table 5, except with the TTI's Self-Regulation. Again, it is impossible to conclude that one WEITAC variable is uniquely associated with just one TTI variable.

However, each of the components and subcomponents of each instrument has significant correlation with the components and subcomponents of the other. Similarly, the total scores of the instruments possess statistically significant correlation. Given the strong association between the two total scores, it appears safe to conclude that the instruments as a whole are measuring essentially the same phenomena.

## 6. Conclusion

In conclusion, it appears that the WEITAC's components and subcomponents are sufficiently free of multicollinearity. Secondly, both the WEITAC and the TTI Emotional Quotient have been proven to have construct validity and, therefore, can be used for both short-term EI self-directed learning and long-term as part of a EI study of students in CBA programs. As such, the study has shown the WEITAC to be a valid and reliable tool to allow college students to participate in a process of understanding and managing emotions in an academic setting and as part of a career readiness strategy.

**Figure 1: Components of WEITAC: Bias Measures, Components, Sub-Components & Definitions**

Bias Measures	Components	Subcomponents	Definition
Inconsistency			Randomness in an individual's answers.
Positive Impression			Positive bias in an individual's answers.
Negative Impression			Negative bias in an individual's answers.
	Total Emotional Intelligence		A general indication of a respondent's level of emotional intelligence. Includes all 5 subcomponents.
	Personal Competence		Awareness of inward emotions and the extent to which one can understand, assess, and regulate emotions. Includes an ability to be self-motivating.
	Self Awareness	Emotional awareness Accurate self-assessment Self-confidence	The ability to recognize one's emotions and their effect. Includes knowing strengths and limits/ sense of self-worth.
	Self-Regulation	Self-control Trustworthiness Conscientious Adaptability Innovativeness	The ability to manage disruptive emotions and impulses, stay composed under pressure, act ethically, build trust, meet commitments, is organized, careful with details, flexible, and open to new ideas.
	Self-Motivation	Achievement Drive Commitment Initiative Optimism	The ability to set a standard of excellence by being results-oriented, setting challenging goals, and improving performance; aligning with organizational goals, acting upon opportunities, and maintaining an optimistic attitude.
	Social Competence		Awareness of emotions and how they impact others. Includes the ability to be socially aware in a variety of settings and to use a variety of social skills effectively.
	Social Awareness	Empathy Service Orientation Developing Others Leveraging Diversity Political Awareness	The ability to sense the feelings and perspectives of others, attend to emotional cues, and are good listeners; recognize and meet clients' needs; reward and recognize other's contributions and offer thoughtful feedback; respect and understand diversity; accurately read political environments and power relationships; and cultivate meaningful social networks.
	Social Skills	Influence Communication Leadership Change Catalyst Conflict Management Building Bonds Collaboration Team Capabilities	The ability to use people skills at the appropriate time and place; are persuasive, influential, and able to build consensus; are effective communicators; are knowledgeable of give and take; can read verbal and non-verbal cues and adjust accordingly; can lead and inspire others by example; are change agents and negotiators who can manage conflict; can build bonds through networks; works well in teams, and, as a collaborator, is capable of building and maintaining high morale.

**Figure 2: Components, subcomponents & definitions—TTI emotional quotient**

Components	Subcomponents	Definition
Total Score		A general indication of a respondent’s level of emotional intelligence. Includes all five subcomponents.
Intrapersonal		The ability to understand yourself, form an accurate concept of yourself and apply that concept to operate effectively.
	Self-Awareness	The ability to recognize and understand your moods, emotions and drives, as well as their effect on others.
	Self-Regulation	The ability to control or re-direct disruptive impulses and moods and the propensity to suspend judgment and think before acting.
	Motivation	A passion to work for reasons that go beyond money and status and a propensity to pursue goals with energy and persistence.
Interpersonal		The ability to identify and understand how to effectively relate to, work with and motivate others. This is made up to two key competencies:
	Social Skills	A proficiency in managing relationships and building networks.
	Empathy	The ability to understand the emotional makeup of other people.

**Table 1: The Means, Standard Deviations, VIFs, & Correlation Mix for the EQI-HED’s Bias Measures & Subcomponents**

		Mean	SD	VIF	Ea	Asa	Conf	Cont	Trst	Cons
Inconsistency	Incon	0.24	2.40	N/A						
Positive Impression	Pos	20.35	2.66	N/A						
Negative Impression	Neg	16.44	2.95	N/A						
Emotional Awareness	Ea	9.72	1.35	2.11						
Accurate Self-Assessment	Asa	9.97	1.26	2.77	0.27					
Self-Confidence	Conf	12.24	2.21	3.50	0.46	0.55				
Self-Control	Cont	11.22	2.07	2.89	0.55	0.48	0.48			
Trustworthiness	Trst	11.51	1.46	2.80	0.44	0.43	0.55	0.43		
Conscientiousness	Cons	12.01	1.30	2.51	0.40	0.27	0.30	0.41	0.53	
Adaptability	Adapt	9.85	1.27	3.41	0.32	0.56	0.51	0.54	0.28	0.11
Innovativeness	Inn	10.05	1.52	2.55	0.48	0.47	0.48	0.26	0.37	0.56
Achievement Drive	Drv	10.08	1.28	2.04	0.49	0.44	0.47	0.36	0.48	0.49
Commitment	Cmt	11.52	1.73	2.73	0.48	0.24	0.42	0.27	0.54	0.52
Initiative	Itv	11.43	1.90	4.51	0.54	0.47	0.59	0.45	0.55	0.40
Optimism	Opt	11.92	2.02	2.05	0.28	0.41	0.48	0.52	0.36	0.34
Empathy	Emp	9.78	1.67	2.72	0.35	0.28	0.16	0.25	0.28	0.34
Service Orientation	Ornt	9.67	1.42	2.75	0.44	0.40	0.44	0.23	0.42	0.30
Developing Others	Dev	8.90	1.21	1.83	0.42	0.21	0.34	0.70	0.32	0.25
Leveraging Diversity	Lev	10.71	1.43	2.05	0.30	0.37	0.40	0.12	0.38	0.28
Political Awareness	Pol	11.57	2.01	4.45	0.52	0.49	0.60	0.55	0.31	0.42
Influence	Inf	12.15	2.52	4.05	0.40	0.62	0.73	0.52	0.45	0.24
Communication	Com	9.88	1.40	3.05	0.38	0.53	0.50	0.55	0.37	0.38
Leadership	Ld	10.08	1.68	3.70	0.47	0.48	0.65	0.57	0.52	0.39
Change Catalyst	Chg	10.23	1.87	3.06	0.44	0.49	0.65	0.47	0.44	0.29
Conflict Management	Con	9.74	1.60	2.41	0.40	0.52	0.65	0.58	0.43	0.32
Building Bonds	Bld	10.13	1.55	2.86	0.38	0.48	0.47	0.31	0.41	0.34
Collaboration and Cooperation	Coll	10.10	1.28	3.71	0.50	0.44	0.44	0.39	0.49	0.54
Team Capabilities	Tm	10.55	1.48	4.91	0.49	0.55	0.58	0.38	0.45	0.49
		Adapt	Inn	Drv	Cmt	Itv	Opt	Emp	Ornt	Dev
Innovativeness	Inn	0.47								
Achievement Drive	Drv	0.40	0.44							
Commitment	Cmt	0.29	0.39	0.37						
Initiative	Itv	0.64	0.53	0.52	0.59					
Optimism	Opt	0.43	0.31	0.38	0.40	0.53				

Empathy	Emp	0.33	0.22	0.34	0.45	0.36	0.35			
Service Orientation	Ornt	0.46	0.45	0.36	0.53	0.67	0.38	0.49		
Developing Others	Dev	0.19	0.31	0.31	0.43	0.41	0.20	0.28	0.39	
Leveraging Diversity	Lev	0.38	0.41	0.30	0.34	0.39	0.27	0.43	0.32	0.33
Political Awareness	Pol	0.58	0.40	0.41	0.44	0.61	0.56	0.45	0.49	0.40
Influence	Inf	0.48	0.47	0.40	0.35	0.59	0.49	0.17	0.49	0.25
Communication	Com	0.57	0.30	0.34	0.43	0.47	0.47	0.44	0.37	0.35
Leadership	Ld	0.58	0.46	0.45	0.45	0.61	0.37	0.33	0.43	0.40
Change Catalyst	Chg	0.55	0.47	0.37	0.36	0.66	0.36	0.24	0.44	0.43
Conflict Management	Con	0.55	0.36	0.40	0.31	0.51	0.43	0.37	0.28	0.25
Building Bonds	Bld	0.43	0.16	0.38	0.34	0.39	0.30	0.40	0.27	0.35
Collaboration and Cooperation	Coll	0.45	0.33	0.53	0.45	0.52	0.34	0.51	0.41	0.38
Team Capabilities	Tm	0.50	0.32	0.51	0.49	0.61	0.33	0.47	0.51	0.37
		Lev	Pol	Inf	Com	Ld	Chg	Con	Bld	Coll
Political Awareness	Pol	0.29								
Influence	Inf	0.33	0.64							
Communication	Com	0.31	0.70	0.50						
Leadership	Ld	0.28	0.55	0.63	0.57					
Change Catalyst	Chg	0.32	0.61	0.63	0.57	0.69				
Conflict Management	Con	0.31	0.56	0.52	0.61	0.54	0.54			
Building Bonds	Bld	0.26	0.48	0.38	0.42	0.43	0.36	0.50		
Collaboration and Cooperation	Coll	0.42	0.50	0.38	0.44	0.52	0.45	0.47	0.70	
Team Capabilities	Tm	0.37	0.60	0.61	0.54	0.68	0.60	0.49	0.58	0.70

**Table 2: The Means, Standard Deviations, VIFs, & Correlation Matrix for the WEiTAC’s Components**

		Mean	SD	VIF	Aw	Reg	Mot	Sa
Self-Awareness	Aw	10.46	1.21	4.12				
Self-Regulation	Reg	10.86	1.06	5.20	0.79			
Self-Motivation	Mot	11.17	1.32	2.68	0.72	0.79		
Social Awareness	Sa	10.13	1.12	2.64	0.70	0.67	0.75	
Social Skills	Ss	10.26	1.26	4.88	0.84	0.79	0.74	0.75

**Table 3: The Means, Standard Deviations, VIFs, & Correlation Matrix for the TTI’s Subcomponents**

		Mean	SD	VIF	Aw	Reg	Mot	Emp	Ss
Self-Awareness	Aw	7.79	1.26	1.80					
Self-Regulation	Reg	6.57	1.34	1.66	0.43				
Motivation	Mot	7.71	1.34	2.37	0.62	0.62			
Empathy	Emp	7.57	1.18	1.49	0.43	0.23	0.35		
Social Skills	Ss	7.48	1.25	1.88	0.51	0.41	0.57	0.54	

**Table 4: The Means, Standard Deviations, VIFs, and the Correlation Matrix for the TTI’s Components**

		Mean	SD	VIF	Intra	Inter
Intrapersonal	Aw	7.79	1.26	1.44		
Interpersonal	Reg	6.57	1.34	1.44	0.43	
Total	T	7.41	0.97	N/A	0.77	0.73

**Table 5: The Correlation Matrix for the TTI vs the WEITAC's Sub-components**

<u>TTI:</u>	Intra	Inter	Total
<u>WEITAC:</u>			
Self-Awareness	0.59***	0.58***	0.69***
Self-Regulation	0.65***	0.55***	0.69***
Self-Motivation	0.67***	0.59***	0.68**
Social Awareness	0.43***	0.64***	0.59***
Social Skills	0.63***	0.71***	0.74***
Total	0.67***	0.70***	0.77***
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$			

**Table 6: The Correlation Matrix for TTI vs the WEITAC's Components & Totals**

	<u>TTI:</u>	Aw	Reg	Mot	Emp	Ss
<u>WEITAC:</u>						
Ea		0.54***	0.13	0.45***	0.39***	0.40***
Asa		0.37***	0.11	0.41***	0.34***	0.48***
Conf		0.41***	0.17	0.48***	0.34***	0.43***
Cont		0.28**	0.22*	0.42***	0.29**	0.36***
Trst		0.48*	0.14	0.46***	0.37***	0.46***
Cons		0.56***	0.15	0.52***	0.40***	0.37***
Adapt		0.27**	0.02	0.35***	0.36***	0.32**
Inn		0.23*	0.16	0.30**	0.22*	0.23*
Drv		0.50***	0.02	0.54***	0.42***	0.33**
Cmt		0.48***	0.01	0.34**	0.51***	0.47***
Itv		0.45***	0.01	0.51***	0.46***	0.52***
Opt		0.31**	0.08	0.39***	0.28**	0.36***
Emp		0.36***	0.08	0.16	0.60***	0.45***
Ornt		0.40***	0.03	0.28**	0.36***	0.40***
Dev		0.33**	0.11	0.16	0.22*	0.29**
Lev		0.20*	0.14	0.14	0.36***	0.28**
Pol		0.43***	0.21*	0.44***	0.48***	0.48***
Inf		0.26**	0.10	0.48***	0.33**	0.52***
Com		0.39***	0.15	0.38***	0.40***	0.40***
Ld		0.44***	0.13	0.43***	0.38***	0.48***
Chg		0.43***	0.20*	0.47***	0.39***	0.49***
Con		0.40***	0.15	0.47***	0.46***	0.57***
Bld		0.45***	0.12	0.25*	0.51***	0.57**
Coll		0.58***	0.08	0.44***	0.53***	0.58***
Tm		0.51***	0.08	0.40***	0.58***	0.57***
* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$						



## References

- Bay, D., & McKeage, K. (2006). Emotional intelligence in undergraduate accounting students: Preliminary assessment. *Accounting Education: An International Journal*, 15(4): 439-454.
- Burgess-Wilkerson, B., Benson, K., Frankforter, S. (2010). Does Feedback Increase Students' Emotional Intelligence? *Advances in Business Research*, 1(1), 133-141.
- Burgess-Wilkerson, B., Frankforter, S. (2012). Construct Validity Assessment of Two Emotional Intelligence Measures: Implications for Program Development in the CBA. *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, 6(4), 211-225. [www.SocialSciences-Journal.com](http://www.SocialSciences-Journal.com)
- Burgess-Wilkerson, B., Lampe, A., Frankforter, S. (2013). Emotional Intelligence: A Comparative Analysis of Two College of Business Administration Programs. *Advances in Business Research Journal*, 4(1), pgs. 13-23.
- Carroll, J. B. (1993). *Human cognitive abilities: A survey of factor-analytic studies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cherniss and Adler (2000). *Promoting Emotional Intelligence in Organizations*. VA: American Society for Training and Development.
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations. (1998). *Emotional competence framework*. [www.eiconsortium.org](http://www.eiconsortium.org).
- Emory, C. W., & Cooper, D. R. (1991). *Business research method* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Esmond-Kiger, C., Tucker, M. L., & Yost, C. A. (2006). Emotional intelligence: From the classroom to the workplace. *Management Accounting Quarterly*, 7(2): 35-42.
- Gerdes, H., & Mallinckrodt, B. (1994). Emotional, social, and academic adjustment of college students: A longitudinal study of retention. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, Vol. 72, January/February: 281-288
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence: Why it matters more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Kanfer, R., Ackerman, P. L., & Heggstad, E. D. (1996). Motivational skills and self regulation for learning: A trait perspective. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 8: 185-209
- Kremenitzer, J.P., Mojsa, J.K., Brackett, M. (2008). *Emotional intelligence: Theoretical and cultural perspectives*. Robert Emmerling, Vinod Shanwal and Manas Mandal, Editors). New York: Nova Science Publishers
- Low, G., Lomax, A., Jackson, M., & Nelson, D. (2004). Emotional intelligence: A new student model. A paper presented at the National Conference of the American College Personnel Association. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
- Maas, J., Burgess-Wilkerson, B., Lampe, A., Frankforter, S. (2017). Emotional intelligence: A comparative analysis of accounting and non-accounting business majors at two universities (under review).
- Mayer, J. D., & Gaschke, Y. N. (1988). The experience and meta-experience of mood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55: 102-111.
- Netter, J., Wasserman, W., & Kutner, M. H. (1989). *Applied regression models*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Robbins, S. B., Oh, I, Le, H., & Button, C. (2009). Intervention effects on college performance and retention as mediated by motivational, emotional, and social control factors: Integrated meta-analytic path analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94: 1163-1184.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9: 185-211.
- Salovey, P., Mayer, J., Goldman, S., Turvey, C., & Palfai, T. (1995). Emotional attention, clarity and repair: Exploring emotional intelligence using the Trait Meta-mood Scale. In J.W. Pennebaker (Ed). *Emotion, Disclosure and Health*. (pp. 25-154). Washington DC. American Psychological Association.
- Scarr, S. (1989). Protecting general intelligence: Constructs and consequences for intervention. In R.L. Linn (Ed.), *Intelligence: Measurement, Theory, and Public Policy* (pp. 74-118) Urbana, Ill: University of Illinois Press.
- Taylor, S. F., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103: 193-210
- Vandervoort, D. J. (2006). The importance of emotional intelligence in higher education. *Current Psychology*, 25(1): 4-7.