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the need for future research on EL

the implications of the present study, the implications of the use of this new instrument, and

scores on MSCERT and age were found. Finally, the results are discussed in light of the

obtained by men and accordingly to the age criterion, a positive correlation between the

higher scores obtained by women on overall scale and branches scores than scores of

Spanish version of the MSCERT, a high level of convergence between scoring methods;

MSCERT scores. Results demonstrated a good reliability and internal consistency for the

differences on MSCERT scores, and (4) to examine the relationship between age and

MSCERT V.2.0 at the total scale, area, branch and subscale levels; (2) to analyze the

correlations between the methods of scoring in the Spanish version of the MSCERT

MSCERT V.2.0 at the total scale, area, branch and subscale levels; (2) to analyze the

objectives of this study were: (1) to examine the reliability of the Spanish version of the

distributed in 16 to 55 years old. After the translation and back-translation process, the

sample of 946 undergraduate and high school students (426 males, 520 females)

This study examined the reliability of the Spanish version of the MSCERT.
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Introduction

Spanish version of the MSCEIT
have been adapted by their original distributors. Competence Inventory (ICE: Baposis and Bouchek 1999: a Haygroup property) have

(EG I. Bap On, 1997: a MHS property, Toronto, Canada) and the Emotional Intelligence Inventory by AFGa (Tappa, 2007). Also, the Emotional Quotient Inventory of Pepeano, 2007; Pepeano and Pepe in this issue) have adapted the Emotional Remoros, 2004, Pepeano, 2003) adapted the extended version of the TIEG(ue v.1.0 (Penides, 2004) Pepeano, 2003) adapted the abbreviated (Fernandez-Bertocci, Experiments a

Spanish version of the TMM) has been adapted (Fernandez-Bertocci, Experiments a

three basic dimensions of EL from the 48-items original scale, an adapted abbreviated version of the TMM-Mood Scale (TMM-MS), a meat-knowledge scale that evaluates the original (Cull, 2004). For example, Fernandez-Bertocci et al. (1998) adapted the original self-report measure (for a Spanish review, see Experiments, Fernandez-Bertocci, Mesera, using them for basic and applied research. However, all these validations correspond to

there is a vibrant interest in validating the Spanish versions of the EL instruments and in

in particular, literature regarding the measurement of EL is still sparse. In spite of this,

during the past ten years from English-speaking cultures (Lopes, Brecken, Nezki,
cultures and languages to verify the generalization of the research findings reported.

next essential stage must assess the adaption and validation of the instruments to other

speaking countries (United States, Great Britain, Australia, Canada). To our opinion, the

exponential development of experimental studies, most of them conducted in English-

instruments for the assessment and measurement of EL. The third period brought an

during second period most efforts were dedicated to the creation and improvement of
dedicated to the development of the theory and to the conceptualization of models of EL;

has gone through three well-differentiated periods within the last ten years: First period
The four branches of EI proposed in Mayer and Salovey's model (Mayer & Salovey, 1995) are Emotional Intelligence, Social Skills, and Social and Personal Competence. These branches are based on the ability to recognize and express emotions, manage emotions, understand emotions, and use emotions to guide thinking and behavior. Mayer and Salovey (1997) developed the MSCEIT, a test that measures EI, and improved and shortened version, MSCEIT v.2.0 (Mayer, 2000), and its improved and shortened version: Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, Emotional Intelligence Test: Research Version. Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2002). The MSCEIT, as well as its predecessors, covers two abilities: the Emotional Intelligence Scale (Mayer et al., 1999) and the MSCEIT (Mayer, 1999). From this point of view, two ability-based scales to assess EI have been developed: the MSCEIT (Mayer, 1999) and the WMS (Wechsler, 1997).

Since 1990 (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), there have been different attempts to create a more objective evaluation of emotional abilities (Mayer, 1990). However, these attempts have not been successful in reducing the subjective nature of EI measures. Mayer and Salovey (2000) developed the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) to assess emotional intelligence. This test measures the ability to identify and understand emotions, express emotions, and use emotions to guide thinking and behavior.

From the Mayer and Salovey's (1997) model, the use of ability-based scales is encouraged. Following the traditional method used to assess cognitive intelligence, descriptive problems arise when the ability concept is applied to EI. Mayer et al. (2000) provide a solution to this problem by developing the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT). This test assesses the ability to identify and understand emotions, express emotions, and use emotions to guide thinking and behavior.

Mayer et al. (2000) also develop the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) to assess emotional intelligence. This test measures the ability to identify and understand emotions, express emotions, and use emotions to guide thinking and behavior. The MSCEIT is a self-report measure and is based on the person's ability to recognize and express emotions, manage emotions, understand emotions, and use emotions to guide thinking and behavior. These branches are based on the ability to recognize and express emotions, manage emotions, understand emotions, and use emotions to guide thinking and behavior. Mayer and Salovey (1997) developed the MSCEIT, a test that measures EI, and improved and shortened version, MSCEIT v.2.0 (Mayer, 2000), and its improved and shortened version: Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, Emotional Intelligence Test: Research Version. Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2002). The MSCEIT, as well as its predecessors, covers two abilities: the Emotional Intelligence Scale (Mayer et al., 1999) and the MSCEIT (Mayer, 1999). From this point of view, two ability-based scales to assess EI have been developed: the MSCEIT (Mayer, 1999) and the WMS (Wechsler, 1997).

Since 1990 (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), there have been different attempts to create a more objective evaluation of emotional abilities (Mayer, 1990). However, these attempts have not been successful in reducing the subjective nature of EI measures. Mayer and Salovey (2000) developed the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) to assess emotional intelligence. This test measures the ability to identify and understand emotions, express emotions, and use emotions to guide thinking and behavior.

From the Mayer and Salovey's (1997) model, the use of ability-based scales is encouraged. Following the traditional method used to assess cognitive intelligence, descriptive problems arise when the ability concept is applied to EI. Mayer et al. (2000) provide a solution to this problem by developing the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT). This test assesses the ability to identify and understand emotions, express emotions, and use emotions to guide thinking and behavior. The MSCEIT is a self-report measure and is based on the person's ability to recognize and express emotions, manage emotions, understand emotions, and use emotions to guide thinking and behavior. Mayer and Salovey (1997) developed the MSCEIT, a test that measures EI, and improved and shortened version, MSCEIT v.2.0 (Mayer, 2000), and its improved and shortened version: Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, Emotional Intelligence Test: Research Version. Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2002). The MSCEIT, as well as its predecessors, covers two abilities: the Emotional Intelligence Scale (Mayer et al., 1999) and the MSCEIT (Mayer, 1999). From this point of view, two ability-based scales to assess EI have been developed: the MSCEIT (Mayer, 1999) and the WMS (Wechsler, 1997).

Since 1990 (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), there have been different attempts to create a more objective evaluation of emotional abilities (Mayer, 1990). However, these attempts have not been successful in reducing the subjective nature of EI measures. Mayer and Salovey (2000) developed the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) to assess emotional intelligence. This test measures the ability to identify and understand emotions, express emotions, and use emotions to guide thinking and behavior. The MSCEIT is a self-report measure and is based on the person's ability to recognize and express emotions, manage emotions, understand emotions, and use emotions to guide thinking and behavior. Mayer and Salovey (1997) developed the MSCEIT, a test that measures EI, and improved and shortened version, MSCEIT v.2.0 (Mayer, 2000), and its improved and shortened version: Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, Emotional Intelligence Test: Research Version. Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2002). The MSCEIT, as well as its predecessors, covers two abilities: the Emotional Intelligence Scale (Mayer et al., 1999) and the MSCEIT (Mayer, 1999). From this point of view, two ability-based scales to assess EI have been developed: the MSCEIT (Mayer, 1999) and the WMS (Wechsler, 1997).
Research in emotion. The consensus scoring criterion implies the need for a score based on the
dimensional levels of consensus scoring and consensus scoring criterion. The expert scoring criterion implies
the model. Each one of these scores is obtained through two scoring criteria: expert
branches scores (each measured by two subscales) that assess the four primary abilities of
general level of EL; (2) two area scores, Experiencing EL and Share of EL; and (3) four
scores on the MSCET represent three categories: (1) an overall EL score reflecting a
their convexity; and (4) the ability to effectively regulate and manage emotion. In general,
reasoning; (3) the capacity to understand the meaning of emotions and the information
(1) the ability to perceive emotion; (2) the ability to utilize emotion to regulate
Mayer and Salovey's model of EL, which comprises four conceptually related abilities:
The recent MSCET v.2.0 consists of 141 items; it has been designed to assess

applied purposes, to the development of the previous scales (Mayer et al., 2003). Mayer,
improved scale compared to its predecessors; the concepts recognized in basic and
v.1.1 and later the MSCET V.2.0 emerged. The MSCET V.2.0 has been designed as an
development of a new scale (Mayer et al., 2003). From this background, the MSCET
structure of the WET (Roberts et al., 2001; Caradonna, Cham & Caputo, 2003), led to the
low levels of internal consistency for some of the subscales as well as the P engage
problems concerning the validity of the scoring methods (expert and consensus), the
length of the scale (402 items), and some psychometric problems, more specifically,
a reliable measure of the four factors comprising EL as ability. Problems regarding the
1997). The WET was created as a previous attempt to show the capacity of developing
reasoning (c) understanding emotions (d) managing emotions (Mayer & Salovey,
1997) of EL. (a) perceiving emotions effectively, (b) using emotions to facilitate
Spanish version of the MSCET.
Several studies using different versions of the MSCET have found that its areas
and the Emotional Relationships subscale:
manages emotions (Managing Emotions) is assessed through the Emotional Management
emotions that result from the manifestation of certain feelings. Finally, the ability to
form more complex feelings, while the Changes scale assesses participants' ability
Changes subscale, the Blends and Pictures subscales: the ability to understand emotions (Understanding Emotions) is measured by the Blends and
(Perceiving) is evaluated by the Pictures and Pictures subscales: the ability to perceive emotions (Perceiving) is evaluated by the
different subscales. The ability to perceive emotions (Perceiving) is evaluated by the

The MSCET v.2.0 comprises 8 subscales: each branch is evaluated through two
refers to the ability to integrate logic and emotions to make effective decisions.
how emotions change people and people's behavior across time. The regulation branch
meaning of emotions and how our own emotions and other's emotions change, and also
emotions. Thus, the understanding branch refers to the ability to understand the
ability to evaluate and arrange actions based on the information given by feelings and
managing emotions branches encompass the strategic area, because they refer to the
ability to use emotions to improve reasoning. On the other hand, the understanding and
refers to the ability to perceive other's emotions, and the regulation branch refers to the
two branches of the model (perception and regulation). Thus, the perception branch
ability to identify emotions and to assimilate emotions in thought, comprising the first
regarding the experiencing and the strategic areas, the former refers to

over 2,000 individuals.
Spanish version of the MSCET

Branches and subscales are computed, although they are functionally different and do
ability-based measures from English-speakers populations (Mayer et al., 1999; Mayer et al., 1999; Mayer et
on the WSCEIT and age. On the basis of previous studies using this scale and other
differences in WSCEIT scores according to gender and the relationship between scores
factor structure, correlations between subscales, branches, and areas, as well as
college students. For this purpose, we investigated the Spanish WSCEIT’s reliability,
Spanish version of the WSCEIT with a reliability wide sample of high school and
approach, the general aim of this study is to examine the psychometric properties of the
need for Spanish-speakers investigations to have an instrument to measure EL from this
given the absence of ability-based scales adapted to Spanish-speakers, and the

in ability-based scales (Kafetsios, 2004; Mayer et al., 1999; Mayer et al., 2002).
experience. Thus, following the evolution criterion, older persons usually score higher
findings concerning age show that abilities develop sequentially in relation to
Ciarrochi et al., 2000; Palmer et al., 2002; Kafetsios, 2004; Day & Carroll, 2003);
Newer, 2004; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002; Mayer et al., 1999;
where ability-based scales show that women usually score higher than men (Bracken,
regarding gender, indices.week test-retest reliability was .66 (Bracken & Mayer, 2002). Regarding gender, indices
are a higher reliability at the full-scale (overall EI), area, and
emotion) (Kafetsios, 2004). Likewise, there is a higher reliability at the full-scale (overall EI), area, and
possibly established clear criteria for answers, i.e., retrieving and understanding
determining more and less correct test answers (at least in the areas where research has
indicated that the expert criterion is superior to the consensus criterion in terms of
expert group showed higher inter-rater reliability in identifying correct answers,
though, 2002). Moreover, studies conducted with the MSCEIT v.2.0 have found that the
Salovey, Caruso, & Sternberg, 2001; Mayer et al., 2003; Palmer, Gignac, &
not overlap conceptually or empirically (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002; Mayer,
Spanish version of the MSCEIT.
authors of MSCET v.2.0 and Spanish authors was conducted by modifying the
version was made and, where necessary, a review of any discrepancies among original
comparison of the original version and the back translation of the provisional forward
bilingual PhD students from Yale University back-translated the instrument. Next, the
traffic Spanish and later, one of the authors of the original MSCET v.2.0 and two
this study and an English language philosopher translated the instrument from English
instrument was translated into Spanish through a back-translation process. Authors of
Test v.2.0 (Mayer et al., 2002: Exercitum et Penandentes-Berrocal, 2002) was used. The
MSCET v.2.0: The Spanish version of Mayer-Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence
Measures

50 students. Finally, the participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.
administered to the participants in class, with a range number of students between 30 to
anonymity. Participation was voluntary and anonymous. Next, the MSCET v.2.0 was
first given a set of written and short verbal instructions which were informed on the
females), ranging in age from 16 to 58 years (M=19.78; S.D.=7.6). Participants were
The sample consisted of 94 undergraduate and high school students (426 males, 270
Participants and Procedure

Method

experience differences in EL.

scores on the Spanish version of the MSCET v.2.0 and age, demonstrating age and
Overall EL and Branch scores than men; (4) there will be a positive relationship between
of the Spanish version of the MSCET v.2.0. (3) Females will obtain significantly higher
and age level; (2) there will be a high correlation between the different scoring methods
MSCET v.2.0 will exhibit higher internal consistency reliability at the subscale, branch
at, 2003: Palmer et al., 2003) it is hypothesized that (1) The Spanish version of the
Spanish version of the MSCET.
were found; supporting the fact that expert criterion may be the criterion of choice for answers. In our sample, slightly higher scores at perceiving and understanding branches previously found to demonstrate higher inter-rater reliability in identical contexts in comparison to consensus-based test scores in areas where the expert group have been lower. In the same way, Mayer et al. (2003) reported higher expert-based test scores in

sub-scales as index of EL.

a, 2003: Palmer et al., 2005) suggesting the use of overall scores instead of using reliability than branch or overall MSCEIT, as earlier studies have reported (Mayer et

Similarly, individual sub-scales such as changes or blends tasks showed lower

Palmer et al., 2003), and
gate similar and even slightly support to those reported by Mayer et al., (2003) and as can be seen, the overall MSCEIT full-scale and areas split-half reliabilities were

the Spanish MSCEIT v.2.0 both General and Expert Scoring are presented in Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics and Reliabilities

Results

 SALOVERY, in this issue.

More details can be found in the Technical Manual (Mayer et al., 2002 or Brczek &

the scores, the structure and reliability was previously explained in the introduction.

MSCEIT v.2.0 is scored using both expert and consensus norms. Further information on

the four branches (c) understanding emotions; (d) managing emotions. The

Mayer and Salovery’s theory of El. (e) perceiving emotions, (f) using emotions to

MSCEIT v.2.0 is a 141-item ability scale designed to measure the four branches of

provisional forward version to ensure accuracy and understanding of all items. The
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A previous descriptive analysis of MSCEIT branches and overall EL scores by gender (Carmona et al., 2000; and the MSCEIT [Mayer et al., 2002; Palmer et al., 2005]. Table 1). It was reported in previous studies using the English version of the MSSES [Mayer et al., 1999], significantly higher than male for both criteria. These results are similar to those on local EL areas and MSCEIT branches, where females systematically scored higher than males in each area and MSCEIT branches. Consistent with previous research, ANOVAs revealed no significant differences in the existence of significant differences on MSCEIT scores between male and females. Research on EL has previously found (Karasek, 2004: Mayer et al., 1999), we examined in order to examine hypotheses related to potential gender differences as in Table 2.

Insert Table 2

Table 2: A high degree of correspondence between scoring criteria was found in the intercorrelation among scoring methods, with high correlation between the scores according to different scoring methods. The high diagonal values can be seen in the polychoric diagonal, where positively and significantly correlated, while both experts (above the diagonal) and overall MSCEIT. As shown in Table 2, all branches, areas, and overall MSCEIT were compared for both expert and consensus scoring for MSCEIT branches, areas, and overall MSCEIT. We examined in order to examine hypotheses related to potential gender differences as in Table 2.

Insert Table 1

Table 1: For answers:

ability less, at least in the areas where research has possibly established clear criteria.
socio-economic characteristics.

At least is use to be compared to other Western countries or countries with similar properties, allows the use of the Spanish version of the MSCETL in transcultural studies.

exhibit high consistency with Spanish samples. This, together with good psychometric samples. Moreover, the expert scoring criterion and the consensus scoring criterion that the Spanish version of the MSCETL v2.0 is suitable to use in Spanish-speaking English version of the MSCETL (Mayer et al., 2003; Palmer et al., 2005) suggest that gender. In general, results are consistent with and support recent findings from the MSCETL v2.0 with a large sample that covers a wide range of age and similar by

This study presents the main psychometric properties of the Spanish version of

**Conclusion**

$F = 20.4, p < 0.01 \text{ for Overall scores}$

Relationship with age ($r = 0.13; p < 0.01$ for Experiential; $r = 0.2; p < 0.01$ for Strategic; and branch 2 to $r = 0.25; p < 0.01$ for branch 4). Areas and overall scores also showed a positive between branches and age were significant and positive (ranging from $r = 0.8; p < 0.05 \text{ for Experiential} : r = 0.7; p < 0.05 \text{ for Strategic} and $r = 0.2; p < 0.01 \text{ for Overall score})$. Similar $r = 0.2; p < 0.05 \text{ for Experiential} : r = 0.13; p < 0.01 \text{ for each area and overall scores also showed a positive relationship with age}$ for all branches (ranging from $r = 0.7; p < 0.05 \text{ for branch 2 to } r = 0.25; p < 0.01 \text{ for branch 4})$. For consensus criterion, there were significant and positive relationships with relationships between total MSCETL scores, ages, MSCETL branches, and age were performed Pearson product-moment correlations. Across both criteria, significant

To examine hypotheses 4, the relationships between MSCETL scores and age, we

**Table 3**

Spanish version of the MSCETL
branches of the model as basic emotional abilities, which comprises the third criterion increase with age. Previous studies also demonstrated the suitability of the four intercorrelations. (2) There should be age-related differences. These abilities should they fulfill these requirements: (1) The abilities of a construct must exhibit significant the results from the present study have been examined for two of these criteria, and “intelligence” measures of the construct should meet these standard intelligence criteria.

On the other hand, Mayer et al. (1999) propose that for EI to be considered

by the inclusion of new items that increase their individual reliability. Those items comprise the understanding and reasoning branch and could be benefitted by scores obtained in the subscales. In this sense, in terms of studies, some subscales such as the area and the branch level, being especially cautious with interpretations of the scale, the area and the branch level, being especially cautious with interpretations of the full scale. Mayer et al. (2003) suggest it is recommended to interpret the scores from the full scale. (Mayer et al., 2003) Thus, internal consistency coefficients (α = 0.69 to 0.73) of the four subscales assessed the lowest coefficients (ranging from 0.60 to 0.69). The FACET-II subscales presented the lower reliability slightly higher than those of the subscales scores. Subscales exhibit variable reliability and the sample reliability coefficients of the overall, area, and branch scores were in 2.0 in the Spanish version. In this sense, as previously found by Mayer et al. (2003) and present study were slightly higher than those reported by Mayer et al. (2003) and based scores exhibited a good reliability. The reliabilities coefficients reported in the Spanish version of the MSCEIT exhibited good reliability at the full-scale.
with age and other criteria. A Palmer sample, Australia General Population sample, and their respective relationship scores determined with Spanish General Population sample, with a wide range of age. Also, it is necessary to examine the relationship between the consensus relationship scores determined with Spanish General Population sample with a wide range of age. Therefore, studies need to be conducted using consensus scores, and this might bias the results towards positive correlations with consensus sample. However, it is important to note that our Spanish participants' scores were based on American normative sample which is older than our sample which is homogeneous variable. Therefore, if we compare the results of different age and avoid using exclusively college samples, where including groups of different age and avoid using exclusively college samples, where could be the reason why some studies found age related differences on EL scores and heterogeneous scores of age (Kaiser, 2004). Allowing a higher degree of variability and in our sample, and in the sample studied by Mayer et al., (1999), or the inclusion of other absence of child and adolescence in their sample. Thus, the inclusion of adolescents (2005) point out the non-effect of age observed in other investigations may be due to the Mayer et al., 1999; Mayer et al., 2004; Palmer et al., 2005, (Palmer et al., 2005). Palmer et al., 2004; Mayer et al., 2004; Kaiser, 2004) and previous studies and branches scores and for the two scoring criteria, accordingly to previous studies significant positive relationships between age and WMCFT scores for full-scale, means relationship between scores on the WMCFT and age, with the present sample we found no excessive conceptual overlap. Finally, although Palmer et al., (2005) did not find each ability exhibits discriminant validity with respect to others, showing that there is a scoring criteria used. Moreover, these correlations were moderate, which evidence that positive relationships between branches, areas and overall score according to the two Mayer et al., 1999; Roberts et al., 2001). The current study found highly significant Spanish version of the WMCFT. 14
abilities used. Conversely, women under value their perceived emotional abilities, related to better scores on psychological well-being indices, regardless of the emotional performance in ability-based scales. This high reliance on their own abilities might be held as a self-efficiency or perceived general competence, then what they really feel.MENU PERCEIVE THEMSELVES more emotionally intelligent as it happens in other Kincade, & Thomas, 2000; Putman & Putman, 2000). A possible explanation within score slightly higher on interpersonal dimensions than women (Barnett, Brown, differences in EI assessed through self-report measures did not report significant gender difference on EI assessed through self-report measures, did not report significant gender (Barnett & Mayer, 2003; O'Connor & Tuite, 2003). Literature regarding gender from different approaches, since correlations between both measures are usually low measures and ability-based scales evaluate a different construct or different evaluations. EI differences on all MSEFT scores, consistently across the two scoring methods, as regardine gender difference, results of the present study show significant

correla yet.

18-year-olds) although unfortunately it has not been adapted and validated into Spanish assess emotional intelligence among pre-adolescents and adolescents (suitable for 12 to 16 years old) and 1700 7: Youth Version (MSEFT: YV; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2004), designed to

test emotional intelligence behavior across age groups, in this sense we keep in mind the existence of a recent measure called Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence emotional intelligence behavior across age groups, in this sense we keep in mind the

method. Also apply to the expert scoring criterion when constructing different norms for
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have explained unique variance in depression (measured by the Beck Depression Inventory; Gill-Okano, Palermo & Broderick, in this issue). Moreover, this instrument and predicted students' final grades beyond and above personality and academic and predicted students' final grades beyond and above personality and academic intelligence (Gill-Okano, Palermo & Broderick, in this issue). Besides, this new version is moderately related to social competence and predicted positively with teacher ratings of academic achievement and depression for both genders even after controlling for IQ and the Five-Factor Personality Traits (Weiner et al., 1999) correlated positively with teacher ratings of academic achievement and depression for both genders even after controlling for IQ and the Five-Factor Personality Traits (Weiner et al., 1999).

Although preliminary, some empirical studies have found that Spanish MSEL

MSEL/2.0 to predict the outcomes variables.

should demonstrate the predictive and incremental validity of the Spanish version of the MSEL/2.0 in predicting the outcome variables. These factor intercorrelate moderately and develop with age. Further studies potential this instrument can evaluate for factors that may be considered basic emotional competency, suitable to be used in Spanish-speaking samples, as Mayer et al. (1999) showed good reliability and factorial and educational programs adapted to each gender.

In conclusion, the Spanish version of the MSEL/2.0 showed good reliability and factorial and educational programs adapted to each gender. MSEL/2.0 performed better in emotional aspects where men and women differ, and, if needed, to the development of emotional differences from both approaches. This would help to a better understanding of the results of the Spanish MSEL/2.0.

Researchers should evaluate perceived and performed EI, and examine gender thought themselves less emotionally intelligent than those who obtained high scores on the MSEL/2.0 large percentage of participants who thought themselves emotionally intelligent (measured by the TWMS).

Participants who thought themselves emotionally intelligent scored lower on the self-report measures. The results described by Gohm and Claro (2002), who found a greater variance in negative influence on their psychological well-being levels. This hypothesis might explain the results described by Gohm and Claro (2002). This low reliability on their own abilities may have a negative influence on their psychological well-being levels. This hypothesis might explain the results described by Gohm and Claro (2002).

Spanish Version of the MSEL/2.0
cultural differences of this new construct allows exploring basic heuristics issues related with the cross-cultural consistency and concreteness of interpersonal relationships. There is no doubt that this Spanish version spares, and must be extended to different cultures related to mental health work in preparation. However, research conducted with Spanish-speaking samples is still in preparation. Therefore, research conducted with Spanish speakers showed incremental validity to predict neuroticism and extraversion in preparation. Finally, in a high-school teachers sample, this Spanish inventory, even after controlling for rumination and perceived EI (Fernandez-Berrocal et al., 2017).
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The table below presents the reliability and mean scores for the emotional, management, and understanding subscales of the Spanish version of the MSCET.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>96.95</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>96.72</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>96.90</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Skill-level relationships are reported at the cell level. Area and bench scores due to item heterogeneity.

**Table 1:** Unrelated Score Means and Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Inter-correlations for the Spanish Version of the MSCET
and expert-based scores for each branch is presented in boldface in both columns in the main diagonal of the table respectively.

*Note: All correlations in the table are statistically significant at the 0.01 level. The correlation between concepts and branches is based on the Pearson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Branches</th>
<th>Branches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.98**</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Branches (rows and cols) scores. Table 2: Inter-correlations for amongst Expert (above the diagonal) and consensus (below the diagonal) MSCET Spanish version of the MSCET 26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>p&gt;0.01</strong></th>
<th><strong>N=945</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall MScET</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential Area</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>branches</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>branches</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scores</td>
<td>scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for MScET branches and overall EL scores by gender.