

Open-Source Correlation Matrices of MSCEIT Branches

Fan, H., Jackson, T. Yang, X, Tang, W., & Zhang, J. (2010).

This data was reported in:

Fan, H., Jackson, T. Yang, X, Tang, W., & Zhang, J. (2010). The factor structure of the Mayer - Salovey - Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test V 2.0 (MSCEIT): A meta-analytic structural equation modeling approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 781-785. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-05770-003>

A step-by-step explanation of the data and how it was analyzed also is available in Chapter 6 of:

Jak, S. (2015). Meta-analytic structural equation modelling. Switzerland: Springer. ISBN 978-3-319-27174-3 (eBook) https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-27174-3_6

The author's version is available at http://www.suzannejak.nl/MASEM_SJak.pdf

Table of Contents

Table 1 Raw correlation matrices of consensus scoring method	p3
Table 2 Raw correlation matrices of experts scoring method	p9

Note. These tables were reformatted for convenience in the meta-analysis.

Consensus-Scored Data

GP=1 Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso (2002) (N = 5000)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.37	1						
(3) Facilitation	.32	.43	1					
(4) Sensations	.34	.36	.39	1				
(5) Changes	.14	.28	.41	.21	1			
(6) Blends	.18	.21	.32	.24	.52	1		
(7) Emotion management	.22	.30	.40	.35	.43	.35	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.22	.27	.38	.32	.34	.38	.55	1
Mean	.51	.53	.44	.52	.57	.53	.44	.46
SD	.12	.13	.09	.11	.10	.10	.09	.11
GP=2 Burns, Bastian, & Nettelbeck (2007) (N = 457)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.404	1						
(3) Facilitation	.273	.357	1					
(4) Sensation	.285	.290	.354	1				
(5) Changes	.173	.213	.175	.241	1			
(6) Blends	.103	.188	.166	.249	.407	1		
(7) Emotion management	.136	.240	.316	.304	.340	.311	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.226	.251	.233	.334	.254	.304	.388	1
Mean	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na
SD	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na
GP=3 Rode, Mooney, & Arthaud-day et al. (2008) (sample 1, N = 412)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.29	1						
(3) Facilitation	.34	.28	1					
(4) Sensations	.39	.26	.41	1				
(5) Changes	.29	.19	.35	.31	1			
(6) Blends	.27	.27	.40	.23	.51	1		
(7) Emotion management	.30	.22	.40	.38	.40	.38	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.37	.22	.42	.30	.38	.42	.63	1
Mean	101.50	94.23	93.81	93.07	95.07	93.05	95.16	92.80
SD	21.94	11.62	12.50	16.03	11.44	12.06	11.39	12.69
GP=4 Rode, Mooney, & Arthaud-day et al. (2008) (sample 2, N = 655)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.41	1						
(3) Facilitation	.48	.36	1					
(4) Sensations	.47	.39	.51	1				

(5) Changes	.35	.30	.40	.50	1			
(6) Blends	.35	.35	.41	.54	.65	1		
(7) Emotion management	.42	.34	.38	.58	.56	.54	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.30	.23	.28	.53	.49	.49	.63	1
Mean	100.43	92.69	99.02	88.82	92.43	90.56	88.18	88.37
SD	25.29	12.57	18.18	14.12	14.23	13.57	10.64	13.86

Table 1 (*continued*)

GP=5 Rossen, Kranzler, & Algina (2008) (N = 150)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.32	1						
(3) Facilitation	.21	.36	1					
(4) Sensations	.20	.30	.37	1				
(5) Changes	.20	.13	.22	.26	1			
(6) Blends	.10	.03	.05	.02	.48	1		
(7) Emotion management	.09	.19	.22	.12	.23	.23	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.15	.11	.27	.23	.29	.17	.51	1
Mean	113.0	99.6	104.6	97.6	98.2	97.3	96.7	96.4
SD	24.2	11.1	15.7	11.3	11.4	9.4	9.7	9.4
GP=6 Palmer, Gignac, Manocha, & Stough (2005) (N = 450)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.33	1						
(3) Facilitation	.14	.28	1					
(4) Sensations	.32	.24	.26	1				
(5) Changes	.24	.19	.24	.35	1			
(6) Blends	.22	.15	.17	.20	.50	1		
(7) Emotion management	.22	.20	.34	.28	.26	.21	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.29	.16	.21	.28	.32	.28	.34	1
Mean	.47	.44	.45	.38	.54	.49	.39	.40
SD	.08	.10	.08	.06	.08	.08	.05	.09
GP=7 Roberts, Schulze, O'Brien, MacCann, Reid, & Maul (2006) (N = 138)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.34	1						
(3) Facilitation	.36	.33	1					
(4) Sensations	.24	.22	.17	1				
(5) Changes	.23	.12	.32	.31	1			
(6) Blends	.14	.11	.26	.19	.43	1		
(7) Emotion management	.14	-.06	.22	.18	.23	.34	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.11	-.11	.16	.31	.43	.48	.47	1
Mean	.48	.48	.48	.40	.61	.55	.37	.42
SD	.07	.08	.08	.06	.08	.08	.05	.11

GP=8 Day & Carroll (2004) (N = 246)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.406	1						
(3) Facilitation	.312	.376	1					
(4) Sensations	.373	.450	.375	1				
(5) Changes	.258	.297	.189	.227	1			
(6) Blends	0	0	0	0	0	1		
(7) Emotion management	.309	.372	.270	.324	.361	0	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.322	.388	.282	.337	.377	0	.511	1
Mean	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na
SD	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na

Note. Zero = missing.

Note. Progressions and Transitions of MSCEIT V1.1 were combined as Change of MSCEIT V2.0. Therefore the correlations between Change and other branches of the EI were calculated from the average of the correlations between Progressions (and Transitions) and other branches. And the correlations between blends and other branches were considered as missing value.

Day & Carroll (2004) (N = 246)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Designs	.406	1						
(3) Synesthesia	.373	.450	1					
(4) Facilitation	.312	.376	.375	1				
(5) Progressions	.208	.251	.192	.160	1			
(6) Transitions	.284	.343	.262	.219	.369	1		
(7) Emotion relationships	.322	.388	.337	.282	.319	.435	1	
(8) Emotion management	.309	.372	.324	.270	.306	.417	.511	1

Table 1 (continued)

GP=9 Feng (2006) (N=314)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.646	1						
(3) Facilitation	.189	.185	1					
(4) Sensations	.223	.233	.330	1				
(5) Changes	.061	.060	.079	.093	1			
(6) Blends	.070	.069	.091	.108	.382	1		
(7) Emotion management	.082	.081	.079	.093	.103	.119	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.086	.084	.082	.097	.107	.123	.369	1
Mean	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na
SD	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na
GP=10 Wang, & Liu (2008) (N = 405)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.38	1						
(3) Facilitation	.38	.25	1					
(4) Sensations	.31	.27	.35	1				
(5) Changes	.27	.18	.26	.24	1			
(6) Blends	.25	.26	.25	.34	.33	1		
(7) Emotion management	.07	.04	.02	.16	.16	.19	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.16	.13	.16	.26	.17	.27	.26	1
Mean	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na
SD	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na	Na
GP=11 D'Alessio (2006)(N=375)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.337	1						
(3) Facilitation	.262	.374	1					
(4) Sensations	.300	.284	.254	1				
(5) Changes	.135	.066	.100	.131	1			
(6) Blends	.144	.109	.084	.158	.242	1		
(7) Emotion management	.136	.166	.149	.148	.030	.087	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.281	.187	.245	.248	.109	.168	.294	1
Mean	.515	.514	.458	.483	.510	.470	.385	.432
SD	.107	.085	.070	.088	.070	.077	.058	.074
GP=12 Morrison (2005) (N=239)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.246	1						
(3) Facilitation	.024	.084	1					
(4) Sensations	.129	.215	.184	1				
(5) Changes	.226	.273	.156	.168	1			

(6) Blends	.286	.380	.047	.340	.276	1		
(7) Emotion management	.111	.186	.489	.253	.222	.194	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.095	.197	.312	.460	.255	.300	.346	1
Mean	113.62	102.89	97.53	96.23	97.26	95.84	95.19	95.79
SD	24.25	14.96	10.04	9.23	9.72	10.76	9.52	9.66

GP=13 Kafetsios, Maridaki-Kasotaki, Zammuner, Zampetakis, & Vouzas (in press)(N=260)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	A	E	B	F	C	G	D	H
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.308	1						
(3) Facilitation	.369	.250	1					
(4) Sensations	.342	.176	.312	1				
(5) Changes	.267	.136	.195	.071	1			
(6) Blends	.102	.096	.118	.157	.295	1		
(7) Emotion management	.205	.170	.342	.195	.146	.246	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.163	.017	.183	.115	.146	.177	.355	1
Mean	47.90	42.39	43.78	41.42	44.18	44.68	33.63	30.54
SD	8.49	9.76	7.67	7.37	6.20	7.00	4.29	5.68

GP=14 Kafetsios, Papastephanakis, & Simos (2009, September) (N=266)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	A	E	B	F	C	G	D	H
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.297	1						
(3) Facilitation	.496	.293	1					
(4) Sensations	.441	.396	.519	1				
(5) Changes	.403	.192	.605	.540	1			
(6) Blends	.433	.213	.604	.610	.692	1		
(7) Emotion management	.272	.211	.527	.448	.589	.546	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.253	.185	.478	.444	.585	.547	.570	1
Mean	48.62	52.64	39.53	39.42	40.04	39.24	31.19	28.03
SD	7.57	9.69	10.31	10.50	9.52	10.06	5.74	7.25

GP=15 Kafetsios (2004) (N=182-236)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	A	E	B	F	C	G	D	H
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.402	1						
(3) Facilitation	.300	.265	1					
(4) Sensations	.225	.312	.128	1				
(5) Changes	.162	.203	.104	.455	1			
(6) Blends	.096	.171	.159	.309	.561	1		
(7) Emotion management	.202	.234	.344	.316	.268	.257	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.264	.237	.185	.467	.574	.374	.404	1
Mean	45.60	45.64	40.94	37.32	54.52	46.19	36.25	39.51
SD	8.31	9.58	7.51	6.62	8.52	8.78	4.31	7.60

GP=16 Warwick & Nettelbeck (2004) (N=84)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.406	1						
(3) Facilitation	.466	.389	1					
(4) Sensations	.231	.399	.258	1				
(5) Changes	.309	.344	.375	.329	1			
(6) Blends	.158	.149	.137	.092	.466	1		
(7) Emotion management	.329	.142	.386	.132	.187	.060	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.373	.227	.487	.311	.362	.222	.341	1
Mean	97.92	100.75	95.48	97.81	103.88	105.30	97.45	93.30
SD	16.17	13.27	15.68	12.33	12.04	11.57	9.50	14.31

GP=17 Trimmer & Cuddy (2008) (N=192)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	A	E	B	F	C	G	D	H
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.476	1						
(3) Facilitation	.239	.304	1					
(4) Sensations	.251	.327	.387	1				
(5) Changes	-.048	.047	.119	.116	1			
(6) Blends	.142	.051	.159	.006	.457	1		
(7) Emotion management	.053	.012	.171	.191	.091	.124	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.054	.088	.066	.107	.078	.065	.355	1
Mean	128.53	97.94	104.83	97.61	100.28	99.31	95.50	96.07
SD	18.56	8.76	14.50	9.31	11.00	9.05	8.15	8.03

GP=18 Matthews, Emo, Funke, Zeidner, Roberts, & Jr Costa (2006) (N=198)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.390	1						
(3) Facilitation	.000	.000	1					
(4) Sensations	.000	.000	.000	1				
(5) Changes	.230	.225	.000	.000	1			
(6) Blends	.184	.165	.000	.000	.249	1		
(7) Emotion management	.125	.276	.000	.000	.144	.189	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.154	.246	.000	.000	.255	.336	.627	1

Expert-Scored Data

Table 2

Raw correlation matrices of experts scoring method (k = 3)

GP=19 Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso (2002) (N = 5000)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.37	1						
(3) Facilitation	.30	.42	1					
(4) Sensations	.31	.31	.35	1				
(5) Changes	.12	.28	.40	.25	1			
(6) Blends	.16	.22	.33	.25	.52	1		
(7) Emotion management	.19	.28	.38	.31	.43	.35	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.20	.26	.38	.30	.37	.38	.51	1
Mean	.58	.53	.41	.52	.64	.61	.42	.46
SD	.19	.13	.07	.10	.14	.14	.08	.11
GP=20 Palmer, Gignac, Manocha, & Stough (2005) (N = 450)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.34	1						
(3) Facilitation	.14	.26	1					
(4) Sensations	.29	.24	.26	1				
(5) Changes	.18	.14	.25	.35	1			
(6) Blends	.17	.14	.19	.22	.51	1		
(7) Emotion management	.17	.18	.25	.27	.30	.27	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.24	.17	.21	.31	.31	.28	.32	1
Mean	.52	.46	.42	.39	.63	.60	.39	.42
SD	.15	.11	.06	.07	.12	.14	.06	.11
GP=21 Gardner & Qualter (2009) (N = 523)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	A	E	B	F	C	G	D	H
(1) Faces	1							
(2) Pictures	.260	1						
(3) Facilitation	.295	.277	1					
(4) Sensations	.243	.214	.204	1				
(5) Changes	.145	.135	.178	.181	1			
(6) Blends	.106	.087	.144	.114	.423	1		
(7) Emotion management	.149	.024	.081	.190	.209	.189	1	
(8) Emotion relationships	.165	.088	.197	.201	.212	.196	.508	1
Mean	.578	.552	.421	.540	.690	.639	.417	.450
SD	.212	.110	.061	.086	.110	.126	.074	.109