“Methods for assessing emotional intelligence: Prospects for application in public administration in Ukraine”

AUTHORS
Nazar Podolchak
Olena Bilyk
Veronika Karkovska
Natalia Tsygylyk
Mariia Vesolovska

ARTICLE INFO

DOI
http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(2).2023.47

RELEASED ON
Friday, 16 June 2023

RECEIVED ON
Saturday, 01 April 2023

ACCEPTED ON
Tuesday, 06 June 2023

LICENSE
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

JOURNAL
“Problems and Perspectives in Management”

ISSN PRINT
1727-7051

ISSN ONLINE
1810-5467

PUBLISHER
LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”

FOUNDER
LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”

NUMBER OF REFERENCES
47

NUMBER OF FIGURES
3

NUMBER OF TABLES
3

© The author(s) 2023. This publication is an open access article.
METHODS FOR ASSESSING EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE: PROSPECTS FOR APPLICATION IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN UKRAINE

Abstract
This study aims to establish the advantages and disadvantages of various methods for assessing emotional intelligence by comparing the most common methods in leading countries and a developing country (Ukraine) in business, as a field in which the level of emotional intelligence importance is generally recognized, and in the public administration sphere. The MSCEITV2.0 and Hall tests were chosen as the most accurate tests for determining the emotional intelligence of public managers. For a more detailed comparison of these two tests and the selection of a universal one, 100 respondents were surveyed using a questionnaire developed in Google Forms. The sample included officials of local governments in the western, northern, and central regions of Ukraine, as well as representatives of businesses in the same regions, particularly managers of private enterprises. The results indicate that these two tests show similar results when determining the level of emotional intelligence. However, when allowed to choose the testing method, 80% of public managers and business representatives chose the Hall test, which takes less time than the MSCEITV2.0 test. Considering the obtained results and the permissible error, the study identifies the Hall test as a universal method for determining the emotional intelligence of public managers in a developing country – Ukraine.
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INTRODUCTION
In today’s conditions, the emotional intelligence of personnel is becoming increasingly relevant as a key direction of increasing the efficiency of the public and private sectors. Today, a high level of emotional intelligence has a more significant impact on successful task performance and career development than a high level of ordinary intelligence.

The understanding of emotional intelligence was initially studied as a set of cognitive abilities for identifying, understanding, and managing emotions. Further developments of emotional intelligence moved beyond intellectual abilities and began considering it as a component of emotional expression. The main task of emotional intelligence is to promote personal growth and effectiveness in interpersonal interactions and professional activities. Considering the active reforming of the new model of public administration, selecting a methodology for assessing the level of emotional intelligence is particularly relevant. It still requires thorough research with further recommendations for the most effective evaluation methods.
Usually, scientists limit themselves to two or three methods and do not emphasize their application areas. In addition, there is no research on selecting one universal test and model suitable for the adequate assessment of emotional intelligence in any country.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

In recent decades, there has been an active study of emotional intelligence as a condition for a person’s success in social interaction. Emotional intelligence affects various aspects of activity: physical and psychological health, social interaction, and success in an educational institution or workplace. The term “emotional intelligence” was first introduced by Mayer et al. (1990). They defined it as “a subset of social intelligence that includes the ability to monitor one’s own and other’s feelings and emotions, distinguish between them, and use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions.” Its components and emotional intelligence’s role in mental health were clearly defined.

Buck (1991) focused on the ability of an individual to interact with the internal environment of his feelings and desires. Mayer (1993) analyzed the ability to control emotions and use them to improve thinking effectively. Bar-On (1997) targeted knowledge and competence that enable a person to overcome various situations. However, the effects of external factors on a person were not considered.

Since the 2000s, scientists have begun to conduct a comprehensive study of emotional intelligence as a set of components: self-awareness, self-motivation, resilience in the presence of adverse circumstances, impulse control, mood regulation, empathy, and optimism. Goleman’s (2000) emotional intelligence theory describes the understanding, detection, and management of emotions as a significant aspect of human intelligence. According to this theory, emotional intelligence shapes the ability to manage and use emotions in relationships. Hence, the capabilities of emotional intelligence interplay and complement each other, and the development of these capabilities may contribute to improvements in both personal and professional life.

Petrides and Furnham (2003) also worked on emotional intelligence and developed their own concept. Accordingly, the ability of emotional intelligence comprises the following components:

- Understanding emotions (the ability to recognize, interpret, and understand one’s own and other’s emotions), using emotions (the ability to effectively use one’s emotions to support cognitive functions, solve problems, make decisions, and achieve goals), regulating emotions (the ability to effectively manage one’s emotions, mainly to control and express them in appropriate situations), and emotional awareness (the ability to be aware of one’s emotions and emotional state at a particular moment in time). Martins et al. (2010) also made a substantial contribution to the study and development of emotional intelligence abilities, particularly examining emotional intelligence through the ability to contribute to better psychological and physical health. In Lopes et al.’s (2005) approach to perceiving emotional intelligence, the development of abilities plays a significant role. Thus, emotional intelligence can be developed through active learning and training of certain skills. Additionally, emotional intelligence assists in the development of social communications.

- Daus and Ashkanasy (2005), Joseph and Newman (2010), Newman et al. (2010) claim that emotional intelligence specifically assists in improving work outcomes. Palmer et al. (2008) discussed the ability to manage one’s emotions and those of others. Bradberry and Greaves (2009) focused on developing emotional intelligence abilities. They provide practical information and strategies for enhancing emotional intelligence. Specifically, emotional intelligence develops the ability to identify and understand one’s emotions and the emotions of others and, using this competency, to manage behavior and relationships.

- Bar-On (2000) has contributed significantly to understanding and measuring emotional intelligence. He developed a model of emotional intelligence abilities and concluded that emotional intelligence shapes the ability to respond to environmental pressure effectively.

It should be noted that digitization, strengthening of democratic processes, transparency of political
decisions, and reforms in the field of economy and education contributed to increasing scientists’ interest in studying human capital and emotional perception (Podolchak et al., 2021). An individual’s success in work largely depends on the mastery of emotions. At the same time, little attention was paid to the development of emotional intelligence and the consequences of its underdevelopment, the structure of emotional intelligence, the determination of its specificity compared with other forms of intelligence, and the relationship between the level of emotional intelligence and the style of behavior in conflict. Despite a significant number of publications that revealed the essence, components, and approaches to developing emotional intelligence, many tasks need to be solved precisely in a manager’s emotional intelligence. In particular, there is a need to research the role of a manager’s emotional intelligence for enterprise (institution, organization) performance, clearly define its component and methodological approaches, and study the mutual influence of a manager’s emotional intelligence on collective emotional intelligence.

Furthermore, there remain several issues in determining the tools, methods, and techniques for developing managers’ emotional intelligence, with insufficient attention paid to emotional competence, which could lead to an increase in organizational capital. From the 2010s, researchers have been working in the direction of studying this ability. For example, Dincer and Orchan (2012), O’Boyle et al. (2011) focused on the concept of promoting the development, discovery, and implementation of new ideas at work. Zeidner and Hadar (2014) and Dubovyk and Drapchuk (2014) assert that emotional intelligence contributes to the acceptance of one’s feelings and the feelings of another person, lifting bans on expressing feelings and acknowledging the right to feel as a systemic and functional characterization of the personality, ensuring its social success and personal factors. Mayer et al. (2016), Hogan et al. (2010), Lytle (2015), and Steiner (2013) argue that emotional intelligence allows managing the emotional sphere based on intellectual analysis and synthesis of one’s attitude toward the external world, which is based on emotions.

Emotional intelligence is an integral property of an individual. It comprises four components: dispositional, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and information-processing (Chetveryk-Burchak, 2015). Emotional intelligence has a cognitive, emotional, and personal nature, and empathy is one of the main mechanisms of its development. Kozlova (2019) began to consider emotional intelligence (EQ) together with non-verbal intellectual development (IQ) and concluded that IQ and EQ are an integral part of each other.

However, no single approach has been developed that would consider all the features of the emotional intelligence of personnel working in organizations of both public and private ownership. At the current stage of research on emotional intelligence, scientists have developed and improved several models of emotional intelligence, which are included in the appropriate methods. The main ones are:

- model of emotional-intellectual abilities (Mayer et al., 2016);
- model of emotional competence (Goleman, 2000);
- non-cognitive model of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 2000);
- the scale of emotional intelligence, which is divided into sub-models: a model of traits, mixed models, and models of abilities (Krishnan et al., 2020).

According to Jan and Anwar (2019), Malik (2022), and Podolchak et al. (2022), emotional intelligence affects individual and organizational productivity and is a critical and decisive factor in measuring individual and organizational effectiveness. However, the degree of this influence needs to be identified.

Abanina and Antonets (2019) substantiate the concept of emotional intelligence as a factor of effective communication in business organizations and public administration. However, the relationship between the components of emotional intelligence, its assessment methods, and the development of this field has not been established.

Barnard and Nel (2015), Bellamy et al. (2005), and Chapman-Clarke (2017) studied the conditions and
prerequisites affecting the development of emotional intelligence. Esnaola et al. (2016), Gavilanez et al. (2019), and Hayashi and Ewert (2013) considered the components of emotional intelligence. Nisha and Sophia (2017) and Pat McEnrue et al. (2009) studied models of emotional intelligence and approaches to their construction. Ristea et al. (2016) and Shanta and Gargiulo (2014) proposed new methods of emotional intelligence research based on existing ones. However, the versatile direction of emotional intelligence research remains relevant and is not fully studied. There must be thorough research comparing the theoretical, methodological, and applied principles of the most popular methods of assessing emotional intelligence and their application areas. As a result, there are difficulties associated with measuring the level of its development and, accordingly, a large number of approaches and methods.

Currently, research into emotional intelligence and its impact on the level of mental health of people and their career development is ongoing. However, there still needs to be a well-founded single universal method for determining the level of emotional intelligence, which requires minimal adaptation in the conditions of any country and can be applied to the personnel of organizations of various forms of ownership. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to compare the methodological approaches in the most common tests for determining emotional intelligence, establish their advantages and disadvantages, and choose a universal test for determining the emotional intelligence of civil servants in Ukraine.

Considering the active reform of public administration in Ukraine as a developing country, the introduction of emotional intelligence assessment in the HR system of public authorities and the selection of an adequate method for assessing their personnel’s emotional intelligence level is particularly relevant. This will make it possible to reasonably draw up plans for developing personnel in public administration and to use modern methods to increase efficiency.

2. METHOD

This study selects the most common methods for assessing emotional intelligence in business and public administrations for developed and developing countries with deductive and inductive analyses. In addition, main methodological advantages, differences, and spheres of application are also established. Using analysis and synthesis, a model of the relationship between the two most common methods of assessing emotional intelligence – MSCEIT and Hall – is built. This made it possible to establish the relationship between the elements of emotional intelligence, which are determined in the general determination of its level.

The study surveyed officials of local governments from western, northern, and central regions of Ukraine and representatives of businesses in these regions, particularly managers of private enterprises. The total sample is 100 respondents. The sample size is caused by the technical possibilities of testing and processing the results. Since geographically all territories of Ukraine are represented in the sample, the results can be generalized for the entire country, not only for one of its regions. Testing was conducted online using Google Forms. During this testing, the time spent on each test was recorded separately. After the testing, a written anonymous survey was conducted regarding which test for determining emotional intelligence the respondent would choose if given such an opportunity. Statistical analysis methods of Excel are used to process the survey results, and scientific synthesis methods are used to formulate the conclusions.

The Hall method consists of 30 questions, which are divided into five groups of questions that determine the levels of such components of emotional intelligence as emotional awareness, managing one’s emotions, managing the emotions of others, empathy, and self-motivation. The overall level of emotional intelligence is determined by summing up the number of points by answering the questions. The level of emotional intelligence can be low (up to 39 points), average (40-69 points), or high (more than 70 points).

The MSCEIT method evaluates the answers to 141 questions, which concerned the assessment of photographs, images or representations of situations or the assessment of statements and stories, of which 35 are emotion perception (scales A and E); 33 – understanding of thoughts (scales B and F); 34 – understanding of emotions (scales C and G); 39 – emotion management (scales D and H). The level of emotional intelligence is also determined by summing up the answers.
3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Public managers’ successful performance of the assigned tasks determines the country’s development. Since emotional intelligence is much more critical than the coefficient of mental development for the adequate performance of assigned tasks, and there are many methods for its determination, it is advisable to choose the optimal method for determining the level of public managers’ emotional intelligence. It should be adequate, easy to interpret, and be accepted in public administration. It is imperative to use it continuously in public administration to create recommendations for staff’s professional and personal development.

The study conducted a detailed retrospective analysis of publications from 1998 to 2021 inclusive in scientometric databases (Google Scholar, Scopus, and Web of Science). It was established that the primary attention of scientists is the development of the theoretical basis of evaluation methods. In particular, 30% of all articles are devoted to analyzing the results of practical assessment of the level of emotional intelligence using various methods.

In 2021, Google Scholar became the most common for researching EQ-i, ESCI, and MSCEIT methods. In Scopus, in 2021, MSCEIT, TEIQue, and STEM were the most common research methods. In Web of Science, the most common methods used and improved to determine emotional intelligence were SREIT, TEIQue, and EQ-i. The Bradbury method is the least popular method to study.

The analysis of changes in quantitative indicators of publication activity from 2019 to 2021 regarding the use, study, and improvement of these methods showed that:

- The MSCEIT method is becoming increasingly popular due to its high accuracy and adequacy.
- A modulated sinusoidal type of publishing activity characterizes Hall method of research interests. This difference is due to a change in the priorities of scientists regarding the publication in scientometric databases. The general tendency to reduce publication activity is likely due to a glut of publications and research in this area in 2020.
- The EQ-i, ESCI, TEIQue, STEM, and SREIT methods have attracted interest from scientists from 2019 to 2021.

According to the results of this analysis, nine methods of assessing emotional intelligence were selected, which are found most often. Accordingly, Figure 1 shows the prevalence of these methods in developed and developing countries, where methods for measuring emotional intelligence are ac-
tively used in practice (Malik, 2022; Jan & Anwar, 2019; Abanina & Antonets, 2019).

The only method of assessing emotional intelligence – the MSCEIT test – is used in all developed countries and Ukraine. Hall test is used in France, the UK, and Ukraine. The EQ-i test is also used in developed and developing countries (France, the UK, the USA, and Ukraine) to assess the emotional intelligence of business and public administration personnel. STEM testing is standard only in developed countries – Poland, France, the USA, and TEIQue – in Poland, Germany, and the UK. SREIT tests are used only in Poland and France, and Bradbury – in France and the UK. The ESCI method is only used in the UK and USA. Such a distribution is due to the specifics of tests, the level of development of science, in particular the interest of scientists in a particular technique and its adaptation, the peculiarities of the mentality of the inhabitants of countries and managers that directly affect the choice of the direction of personnel development.

Table 1 shows that the MSCEIT test, out of all eight analyzed techniques, is second in its volume only to the TEIQue test. Further in descending order are EQ-i, ESCI, STEM, SREIT, Hall, and Bradberry tests. Each of these tests uses different methods for assessing the perception, regulation, and use of emotions. However, the results still assess the level of emotional intelligence. Therefore, these methods can be compared despite the different approaches to assessing emotional intelligence. In order to single out a universal method, a comparison of nine selected methods was carried out according to several characteristics.

The interest of scientists in the EQ-i method is growing. It is actively used for the same purposes in developing countries (France, the UK, and the USA). Compared in general comparison,
Table 1 (cont.). Comparison of the most common methods of assessing emotional intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Short description</th>
<th>Evaluation method</th>
<th>Using emotions</th>
<th>Scope (business or public administration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>30 questions (5 groups of questions diagnosed by this survey: emotional awareness, managing one's emotions, managing the emotions of others, empathy, self-motivation).</td>
<td>Proposed scales for determining emotional awareness, self-motivation (controlling one's behavior using emotion management).</td>
<td>Performance orientation, adaptability, emotional self-control, optimism. Managing emotions is an emotional openness, emotional flexibility, or arbitrary management of emotions.</td>
<td>Empathy (understanding of other people's emotions) is the ability to empathize with the current emotional state of another person, as well as the willingness to provide support. This is the ability to understand a person's state by facial expressions, gestures, shades of speech, and posture. Recognizing other people's emotions is the ability to influence the emotional state of others. Business, governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREIT</td>
<td>33 statements divided into three scales: 1) evaluation and expression of emotions; 2) regulation of emotions; 3) using emotions when solving problems. The questionnaire shows good psychometric indicators: internal reliability, test-retest reliability, and actual discriminant validity. It is built on the early Mayer and Salovey model.</td>
<td>It is used for self-analysis in terms of optimism/ mood regulation = regulation of emotions in oneself, evaluation of emotions = perception of emotions in oneself.</td>
<td>Social skills = regulation of emotions in others. Using emotions = using emotions strategically.</td>
<td>Business, governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEIQue</td>
<td>153 items and 13 components, combined into 4 factors: well-being, self-control, emotionality, sociability.</td>
<td>It takes into account the &quot;Emotional&quot; factor.</td>
<td>It takes into account the &quot;Self-control&quot; factor.</td>
<td>Emotional management (i.e., a branch of regulating emotion), which is developed based on the situational judgment test paradigm. Business, governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>44 questions.</td>
<td>Measuring people's ability to cope with stressful events.</td>
<td>The ability to regulate negative emotions and enhance positive emotions.</td>
<td>The combination of body language and speech to achieve the necessary goals. Business, governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury (Emotional Intelligence Appraisal)</td>
<td>28 questions: Self-awareness (6 questions) Self-management (9 questions) Social awareness (5 questions) Relationship management (8 questions).</td>
<td>Emotional intelligence means being self-aware, managing yourself well, reading the emotions of others, and communicating with others.</td>
<td>Managing yourself means finding a balance between the logical and emotional sides.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MSCEIT has 7% fewer questions and is long-lasting. The ESCI test is less popular than the EQ-i test and used in the USA and UK solely to assess the emotional intelligence of business representatives. Compared to the test, MSCEIT has 49% fewer questions. Even less popular is the TEIQue test, but the interest of scientists is constantly growing. Compared to the test, MSCEIT has 7% more questions. It is used in Poland, Germany, and the UK to assess the emotional intelligence of civil servants and business professionals. Compared to the TEIQue method, the STEM method is usually omitted by scientists and is actively used for the same purposes in Poland, France, and the USA.

The SREIT method is gaining popularity and is used to assess the emotional intelligence of civil servants and business workers in Poland and
France. The Bradbury method is the least popular method to study among scientists. It assesses the emotional intelligence of civil servants and business workers in France and the UK. It is the least voluminous but the least accurate test of all mentioned above.

Table 2 shows the advantages and disadvantages established as a result of tests comparison for determining emotional intelligence (MSCEIT, EQ-i, ESCI, STEM, SREIT, Hall, and Bradberry).

Although each of these tests to determine emotional intelligence (MSCEIT, EQ-i, ESCI, Hall, STEM, SREIT, and Bradberry) has its own unique advantages and disadvantages, several common disadvantages can affect their result:

1. Subjectivity – tests based on self-assessment risk obtaining incorrect results because this assessment method can lead to overestimation or underestimation of the emotional intelligence level.

2. Socially desirable response – people usually try to present themselves in a better light when taking tests, which can affect the accuracy of the results.

3. Insufficient cultural adaptation (MSCEIT) – some tests are less effective in different cultural contexts and may require adaptation.

4. Time and resources – some tests are time-consuming and require significant resources to administer and interpret.

5. Limited diagnostic utility – some critics argue that emotional intelligence tests are not always helpful in predicting occupational success or personality characteristics, mainly when used alone.

Based on a comparative qualitative analysis of approaches to determining the level of emotional intelligence and the prevalence of methods in developed and developing countries, two tests were chosen for a more detailed investigation of the underlying advantages and disadvantages: MSCEIT and Hall. According to the MSCEIT test, four components of emotional intelligence are identified on eight scales and 141 questions regarding the assessment of a photo, picture, or representation of a situation or assessment of statements and stories. In particular, it has perceiving emotions (scale A, E), facilitating thought (scale B, F), understanding emotions (scale C, G), and manage-

Table 2. Advantages and disadvantages of tests for determining emotional intelligence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MSCEIT | It is based on Mayer and Salovey’s scientifically based emotional intelligence theory.  
An it measures four domains of emotional intelligence: perceiving, using, understanding, and managing emotions. | A rather complex test that takes much time. Results may depend on cultural and educational factors. |
| EQ-i   | It is widely used and well-studied. It assesses five significant areas of emotional intelligence. | A socially desirable response may influence the obtained results. Requires professional intervention to interpret results. |
| ESCI   | It measures emotional and social competencies that are important for leadership and job success. | It is a 360-degree assessment, so it requires feedback from other people. Requires professional intervention to interpret results. |
| Hall   | It is easy to use and interpret. It is fast, it usually takes less than 10 minutes. | A socially desirable response may influence the obtained results. |
| SREIT  | It is short and easy to use.                                               | A socially desirable response may influence the obtained results. |
| STEM   | It is easy to use and interpret. It is fast, it usually takes less than 10 minutes. | A socially desirable response may influence the obtained results. It is short and incomplete to cover all aspects of emotional intelligence. |
| Bradberry | It is easy to use and interpret. It is fast, it usually takes less than 10 minutes. | A socially desirable response may influence the obtained results. It is short and incomplete to cover all aspects of emotional intelligence. |
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ing emotions (scale D, H). According to Hall test, five components of emotional intelligence are determined on five scales of 30 questions (Table 1): emotional awareness, managing your emotions, managing the emotions of others, empathy, and self-motivation. Figure 2 schematically shows their comparison.

Next, it is necessary to compare the two tests to determine the common and different components in the general emotional intelligence level assessment. The paper sought to understand whether these tests can be used interchangeably. Thus, it was established that by semantic content, these scales correlate with each other as follows:

- perceiving emotion completely correlates with emotion awareness;
- facilitating thoughts correlates partly with managing emotions of others (by 30%) and partly with empathy (by 70%);
- understanding emotion correlates partly with managing emotions (by 70%) and partly with empathy (by 30%);
- managing emotion correlates partly with managing emotions (by 60%) and partly with self-motivation (by 40%).

The significant difference between them is the test duration: the Hall test takes up to 10 minutes, and the MSCEIT takes up to 45 minutes. The methods of evaluating the results are also different. In the MSCEIT test, it is difficult to “adjust” the result to the expected one; in the Hall test, it is pretty easy. It should be noted that both tests are used in Ukraine to assess emotional intelligence and business and public administration staff.

Table 3 shows the correlation results of Hall tests and MSCEIT V2.0, calculated as the average value for all indicators. It should be noted that the error was within the permissible limits and was 0.005 for the MSCEIT V2.0 test and 0.004 for the Hall test.

Thus, the tests can be interchangeable (Figure 3, Table 3). According to the results of a survey conducted in Google Forms, it was established that after passing both tests, when giving a choice to 100 people regarding the question of which test to take, a significant advantage (80%) is given to the Hall test. Evaluation of the general level of emotional intelligence is obtained by summing the results of the answers. On average, it takes up to 10 minutes to pass the test. It is a self-assessment tool, the effectiveness of which could be better for civil servants.

Table 3. Averaged correlation of the Hall and MSCEIT V2.0 tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Low level of emotional intelligence</th>
<th>Average level of emotional intelligence</th>
<th>High level of emotional intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSCEIT</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Schematic comparison of MSCEIT and Hall tests the most time-consuming and the least time-consuming among all tests for determining emotional intelligence
According to Figure 3, most people show average indicators of emotional intelligence components. In Hall emotion awareness test, the average level is 62 people, and according to the MSCEIT test, perceiving emotion – 61 people. In Hall test for managing emotions of others, the average level is 58 people, and for empathy – 53 people; in the MSCEIT test for facilitating thought – 63 people. In Hall managing your emotion test, the average level is 63 people, and for empathy – 53 people; in the MSCEIT test for emotion understanding – 54 people. In Hall managing your emotion test, the average level is 63 people and self-motivation – 63 people; in the MSCEIT test, according to the managing emotion component, – 55 people.

Table 3 shows that the results of the average level of correlation between the two tests in assessing the low level of emotional intelligence are entirely the same. When assessing the average level of emotional intelligence, the difference in the results obtained was 3%, and when assessing a high level of emotional intelligence – 5%. Thus, the average error was 2.7%, a permissible value. In addition, the time spent by respondents to pass the Hall test was four times less than when passing the MSCEIT test. Therefore, it can be concluded that a Hall test should be chosen as a universal quick test to determine the level of emotional intelligence.

4. DISCUSSION

The results show that the MSCEIT method is becoming increasingly popular due to its high accuracy and adequacy. In addition, it is the only method in the world used in all countries chosen for comparison to assess the emotional intelligence...
of civil servants and business workers. However, it has a significant drawback – it requires adaptation for each country and takes up too much time to pass. Hall method is somewhat less popular, and scientific interest in using it varies by modulated sinusoidal type. The number of questions in this method is less than four times, and the scales are more than one. It is used in Ukraine, France, and the UK to assess the emotional intelligence of civil servants and business workers.

After conducting a comparative analysis of the methods, it was determined that the Hall method has more advantages when assessing the level of emotional intelligence, as it is short-term (takes up to 10 minutes) and eliminates the possibility of adjusting the obtained results since an expert on the appropriate scales carries out the assessment. Of course, as in any test, it is not excluded that the results obtained are incorrect due to the possibility of giving false answers to the questions. However, for the sake of the civil servants themselves, the study assumes that all answers are given with 100% accuracy. After all, the emotional intelligence level assessment is carried out to draw up a plan for its development and, as a result, increase the efficiency of work and expand the career opportunities of civil servants.

At the same time, less than half of business and public administration managers understand the importance of determining emotional intelligence and the need for targeted activities regarding its development. However, there is a positive trend in this direction. As a result of the civil service reform and the revision of approaches to doing business, more and more managers understand the importance of developing the emotional intelligence of staff (Sumets et al., 2021). Accordingly, training on working on this problem is actively introduced both in business and the civil service. The offer of topics in this direction is significantly expanded.

Future research may assess the possibility of creating an HR system in which, along with traditional components, there will be an assessment and development of the emotional intelligence level as one of the determining factors for the success of the assigned tasks.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to compare the methodological approaches in the most common tests for determining emotional intelligence, establish their advantages and disadvantages, and choose a universal test for assessing the emotional intelligence of civil servants of Ukraine. The most common methods of assessing the emotional intelligence level in business and public administration used in developed countries and Ukraine are MSCEIT, SREIT, EQ-i, ESCI, Hall, TEIQue, STEM, and Bradbury. A common shortcoming of tests based on self-assessment is that they may not reflect the actual state of affairs.

The results show that the best and fastest method of assessing the emotional intelligence of the personnel in the field of business and public administration in Ukraine is the Hall method because it has the most advantages. Compared to the MSCEIT test, the time spent on its passage is four times less, and the error is 0.004. When given a choice between passing the Hall test and the MSCEIT test, 80% of respondents from a sample of 100 civil servants and business representatives have chosen it. The correlation of Hall test results with the MSCEIT test is 97.3%. This proves the possibility of its application to assess the level of emotional intelligence of civil servants and business workers.
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