CONSTRUCT VALIDITY ANALYSIS

Company: Assessments 24x7

Product: Emotional Intelligence Assessment

Certified: May 9, 2026
Expires: June1, 2031

REPORT NUMBER: A247-CV-EI-260506
ORIGINAL ISSUE DATE: May 6, 2026

EVALUATION CENTER
Assessment Standards Institute
5865 Ridgeway Center Parkway, S-300
Memphis, TN 38120

RENDERED TO

Assessments 24x7
San Diego, CA

PRODUCT: Emotional Intelligence Assessment
EVALUATION PROPERTY: CONSTRUCT VALIDITY

1. Table of Contents

2. Introduction

This document is provided as a tool for end-users of the Emotional Intelligence Assessment (EI) to allow comparisons between the Emotional Intelligence Assessment and other multi-dimensional models in the marketplace.

The EI is a normative self-report assessment in which respondents rate themselves on 61 statements using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). The instrument measures four broad dimensions of emotional intelligence: Self-Awareness (12 items), Self-Management (18 items), Relationship Awareness (14 items), and Relationship Management (17 items). These four scales sum to a Total EI composite score. The success of all self-report instruments depends on the insight, candor, and honesty of the respondent.

APA Guidelines

An evaluation was conducted in accordance with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, developed jointly by the American Educational Research Assn. (AERA), American Psychological Association (APA), and the National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME).

Evaluation Date

The data evaluation began on April 1, 2026, and was completed on May 6, 2026.

3. Test Data Preparation

3.1 SAMPLE SELECTION

Sample data was submitted to ASI directly from the client and were not independently selected for testing. Samples are requested to:

- Be a sufficient number to represent the general population.
- Be randomly selected.

The sample panels were received at the ASI Evaluation Center by email on March 28, 2026.

SAMPLE SIZE: N = 5,000

3.2 DATA CLEANING

Upon receipt of the samples at ASI, the data was downloaded and cleaned as follows:

1. **Missing Values – Only 1 missing value was identified across 305,000 data points (61 items x 5,000 respondents), representing less than 0.001% of the data.**
2. **Duplicates – No duplicate entries were identified.**
3. **Categorization** – Data was categorized and labeled by attribute type for the appropriate comparison.

4. Testing and Evaluation Methods

4.1 TEST STANDARDS

Construct validity is one of the most central concepts in psychology. It is the degree to which a test measures what it claims, or purports to be measuring. Researchers generally establish the construct validity of a measure by correlating it with a number of other measures and arguing from the pattern of correlations that the measure is associated with these variables in theoretically predictable ways. Overall, it is the appropriateness of inferences made on the basis of observations or measurements (often test scores), specifically whether a test measures the intended construct. Construct validity examines the question: does the measure behave like the theory says a measure of that construct should behave?

The purpose of a correlation is to display the level of correspondence or co-relationship between two variables. An item or trait correlated against itself yields a perfect correlation of 1.0, which is as high as the scale goes. A completely opposite correlation yields a coefficient of –1.0, which is a perfect inverse or negative correlation. Scores with no co-relationship show a correlation coefficient at or near zero. All correlations follow a spectrum of scores beginning at +1.0, passing through zero, and ending at –1.0. The closer a correlation is to zero, the lower the correlation. The more a correlation coefficient moves away from zero, in either direction, the stronger the correlation becomes.

The reader should note that there is no agreed-upon table in the world of statistics that grades a correlation as weak or strong in absolute, definitive terms. As a result, specific commentary by a field of researchers may vary with regard to what they consider to be strong or weak correlations. The team of scientists at ASI have selected to establish the criteria (plus or minus) as posted below.

- 0.00 to 0.19 Very Weak
- 0.20 to 0.39 Weak
- 0.40 to 0.59 Moderate
- 0.60 to 0.79 Strong
- 0.80 to 1.00 Very Strong

Other statisticians may present divergent opinions based on their own scientific observations and training.

5. Testing and Evaluation Results

The EI measurement model proposes four related but distinct scales of emotional intelligence. The construct validity expectation is that the four scales should show moderate to strong positive correlations with one another, supporting a single higher-order EI construct while remaining empirically distinguishable. All correlations fall in the Strong band (0.64 to 0.76). These values are below the conventional threshold for construct redundancy (≈0.85, Tabachnick & Fidell 2013) and are consistent with inter-scale correlations reported for comparable four-domain emotional intelligence instruments, where related dimensions typically correlate in the .50 to .80 range.

Pearson's Correlation Coefficients: Table 1

	SA	SM	RA	RM
SA	**1.00**	0.73	0.68	0.70
SM	0.73	**1.00**	0.64	0.75
RA	0.68	0.64	**1.00**	0.76
RM	0.70	0.75	0.76	**1.00**

SA = Self-Awareness; SM = Self-Management; RA = Rel. Awareness; RM = Rel. Management

Inter-scale correlations of this magnitude are typical for self-report emotional intelligence instruments. The Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS) reports correlations of approximately .42 to .73 among its four dimensions in the original validation (Wong & Law, 2002).

The EI assessment reports composite-score intercorrelations in the .60 to .80 range (Bar-On, 2006; Multi-Health Systems, 2011). The MSCEIT V2.0, which is ability-based rather than self-report, reports lower interfactor correlations of approximately .17 to .59 across its four branches (Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003). The EIQ-2 pattern (.64 to .76) sits within the range observed for self-report instruments and is consistent with a hierarchical model of emotional intelligence in which related domains share a common general factor while remaining empirically distinct.

Discriminant Validity Summary: Table 2

Metric	Value
Total unique scale pairs	6
Mean inter-scale |r|	0.71
Max inter-scale |r|	0.76
Pairs exceeding redundancy threshold (0.85)	0
Pairs in Very Weak band	0
Pairs in Weak band	0
Pairs in Moderate band	0
Pairs in Strong band	6
Pairs in Very Strong band	0

All 6 inter-scale correlations are positive, with a mean |r| of 0.71. 6 of 6 pairs fall in the Moderate to Strong range, consistent with the theoretical expectation that the scales of Emotional Intelligence Assessment measure related facets of a broader construct while remaining empirically distinguishable. No pair approaches the conventional redundancy threshold of 0.85 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

6. Conclusions

The data submitted for evaluation passed all acceptable standards and was therefore awarded ASI Certification.

Certified
May 6, 2026

7. References

Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). Psicothema, 18 (Suppl.), 13–25.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., Caruso, D. R., & Sitarenios, G. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence with the MSCEIT V2.0. Emotion, 3(1), 97–105.

Multi-Health Systems Inc. (2011). EQ-i 2.0: Emotional Quotient Inventory 2.0 User's Handbook. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using Multivariate Statistics (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Wong, C. S., & Law, K. S. (2002). The effects of leader and follower emotional intelligence on performance and attitude: An exploratory study. The Leadership Quarterly, 13(3), 243–274.

8. Document Review

ASI TESTING SERVICES

Reported by: Russel J. Watson

Russel J. Watson, Ed.D.
Chief Technical Officer

Examined by: Dennis W. Koerner

Dennis W. Koerner, Ph.D.
Chief Compliance Officer