



# Trait emotional intelligence anchored within the Big Five, Big Two and Big One frameworks



Juan Carlos Pérez-González<sup>a,\*</sup>, Maria-Jose Sanchez-Ruiz<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Faculty of Education, Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (UNED), Madrid, Spain

<sup>b</sup> Social Sciences Department, Lebanese American University, Byblos, Lebanon

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Available online 7 February 2014

### Keywords:

Trait emotional intelligence  
Personality structure  
Personality  
General Factor of Personality  
TEIQue  
Five factor model  
Big Two  
Big One

## ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the relationship between trait emotional intelligence (trait EI) and the Big Five factors, the Big Two and the Big One (i.e., *General Factor of Personality*; GFP). Comprehensive measures of trait EI (TEIQue) and the Big Five (NEO-PI-R) were applied to a sample of 289 university students (170 female). As expected by the trait EI theory, part of the construct's variance was explained by a linear combination of the Big Five, while a distinct oblique trait EI factor was isolated in the Big Five factor space, in line with previous research. Trait EI positively correlated with the Big Two, namely Alpha/Stability and Beta/Plasticity. Finally, correlations between trait EI and the GFP were higher than those between GFP and the Big Five factors from which it was extracted. In addition, when GFP was extracted from the joint data set combining the Big Five factors of the NEO-PI-R and the dimensions (factors or facets) of the TEIQue, the highest loadings came from the latter, not from the former. Findings support the view that trait EI is a broad personality trait integrated into multi-level personality hierarchies and the idea that trait EI can be considered as a proxy of the GFP.

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Even though there is consensus regarding the correlations observed among the Big Five (B5), the key question is what these correlations represent and what is the psychological meaning of the meta-traits found (Ferguson, Chamorro-Premuzic, Pickering, & Weiss, 2011).

Digman (1997) extracted two super-factors from the B5, namely *Alpha* (encompassing agreeableness -A-, conscientiousness -C-, and neuroticism -N-), and *Beta* (encompassing extraversion -E- and openness -O-), which represent desirable and advantageous personality traits and are linked to the processes of socialization and personal growth. These Big Two (B2) have been replicated by DeYoung, Peterson, and Higgins (2002) who re-labeled the super-factors as *Alpha as Stability* and *Beta as Plasticity*, and observed they were correlated ( $r = .24$ ).

In addition, a wealth of research has provided strong evidence for a General Factor of Personality (GFP; see Rushton and Irwing (2011), for an overview), which is thought to have evolved as a

result of natural selection of social effectiveness and has a heritable component (e.g., Rushton, Bons, & Hur, 2008). Nonetheless, some researchers argue that the GFP might be a mere statistical artifact (e.g., Ferguson et al., 2011).

In sum, the literature supports the existence of a hierarchical structure of personality in which the B5 are subsumed under two more general factors, which in turn are subsumed under another super-factor, the GFP, also called the Big One (Musek, 2007), *p*-factor (Hofstee, 2001), or the Primordial One (Hofstee, 2003). This factor is the apex of the hierarchy of personality (e.g., Rushton & Irwing, 2011), the same way that “*g*” is located at the highest level in the hierarchy of cognitive abilities (Carroll, 1993).

Emotional intelligence (EI) was originally presented as a “subset of social intelligence” aiming to “enhance living” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), thus highlighting its adaptive nature, in particular regarding social interaction, similarly to the GFP (McIntyre, 2010).

### 1.1. Trait emotional intelligence

Trait EI has been defined as a constellation of emotional self-perceptions and behavioral dispositions located at the lower levels of personality hierarchies (Petrides, 2011; Petrides, Pita, & Kokkinaki, 2007). It provides a comprehensive operationalization of the affect-related aspects of personality in greater detail than general B5 models (Vernon, Villani, Schermer, & Petrides, 2008),

\* Corresponding author. Address: Department of Research Methods and Assessment in Education (MIDE II), Faculty of Education, UNED, C/ Juan del Rosal, 14, 28040 Madrid, Spain. Tel.: +34 91 398 6955; fax: +34 91 398 8448.

E-mail address: [jcperez@edu.uned.es](mailto:jcperez@edu.uned.es) (J.C. Pérez-González).

URL: <http://eduemmo.com> (J.C. Pérez-González).

and it lies wholly outside the taxonomy of human cognitive abilities (Carroll, 1993).

### 1.2. The location of trait EI in the personality factor space

Trait EI has been found to share approximately 50% of the variance with the B5 (Petrides, Furnham, & Mavroveli, 2007; Petrides et al., 2010). In addition, recent research revealed that correlations between trait EI and the B5 are strong, replicable and genetically influenced (Vernon et al., 2008).

There is some robust, yet scant, empirical evidence that trait EI can be psychometrically isolated in the personality factor space defined by the Giant Three and the B5 as well. Exploratory factor analyses (EFA) showed that trait EI facets tend to cluster together into a distinct oblique factor, rather than being dispersed among the factors emerging from the Giant Three and B5 (Petrides, 2001; Petrides, Pita, et al., 2007). This finding indicates that trait EI captures some unique variance of personality.

### 1.3. Trait EI and the B2

To our knowledge, no research has been conducted exploring the relationship between trait EI and the B2. Extending previous conceptual analysis of their association by McRae (2000), De Raad (2005) found that the overlap between trait EI and the B5 is mainly driven by A and emotional stability (negative pole of N). Additionally, Joseph and Newman (2010) found strong latent correlations between trait EI and A, C, and N, which are the three components of Alpha/Stability as stated earlier. Alpha/Stability might contribute mainly to social and emotional adjustment, while Beta/Plasticity might be a facilitator of social learning; therefore it is reasonable to expect that trait EI would be more strongly associated to the former than the latter.

### 1.4. Trait EI and the GFP

Van der Zee, Thijs, and Schakel (2002) suggested that the GFP (i.e., *p*-factor proposed by Hofstee, 2001) is conceptually rather close to emotional intelligence. Recent studies have supported that idea by showing considerable overlap between GFP and trait EI through two kinds of evidence: (a) A GFP can be extracted from joint data sets combining comprehensive measures of trait EI and personality, where the highest loadings in that GFP come from the trait EI facets or factors (McIntyre, 2010; Rushton et al., 2009; Veselka, Schermer, Petrides, & Vernon, 2009; Veselka, Schermer, Petrides, Cherkas, et al., 2009); (b) The mean correlation between trait EI and the GFP seems to be around  $r = .72$ , which remains substantive even after social desirability bias is controlled (Van der Linden, Tsaousis, & Petrides, 2012).

The present study aims to investigate: (a1) the convergent validity of trait EI with regards to the B5, examining their correlations as well as what percentage of variance in trait EI is explained by a linear combination of the B5; (a2) the discriminant validity of trait EI with regard to the B5, exploring their location in the B5 factor space; (b) the relationship between trait EI and the B2 and (c) the overlap between trait EI and GFP.

## 2. Method

### 2.1. Participants

The sample consisted of 289 Spanish university students (170 female) ranging in age from 18 to 36 years old ( $M = 20.84$ ,  $SD = 2.41$ ).

### 2.2. Measures

#### 2.2.1. B5

The B5 factors were measured using the *NEO Personality Inventory-Revised* (NEO PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992). The internal consistencies are reported in parentheses in Table 3.

#### 2.2.2. Trait emotional intelligence

Trait emotional intelligence was measured through the *Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire* (TEIQue v. 1.0; Petrides, 2001). It consists of 144 items, rated on a 7-point Likert scale, and it covers 15 distinct facets grouped in four factors, namely well-being (W), emotionality (E), sociability (S), and self-control (C). The internal consistencies of the TEIQue scales are reported in parentheses in Table 3, while those of the WESC factors were .84, .73, .70, and .75, respectively.

### 2.3. Procedure

Students signed a consent form indicating their voluntary participation in the study. Data were collected during class time and testing sessions lasted one and a half hours with a 10-min break between the questionnaires.

### 2.4. Statistical analyses

Our extraction and rotation criteria were similar as those used in previous studies (i.e., McIntyre, 2010; Petrides, 2001; Petrides, Pita, et al., 2007; Veselka, Schermer, Petrides, & Vernon, 2009; Veselka, Schermer, Petrides, Cherkas, et al., 2009).

## 3. Results

### 3.1. The location of trait EI in the B5 factor space

Moderate to high correlations were found between trait EI and the B5 (see Table 1); the highest correlation with N ( $r = -.63$ ) and the lowest with A ( $r = .16$ ). The mean inter-correlation between the global trait EI and the B5 was  $r = .38$ .

A multiple regression analysis was carried out with trait EI as the criterion variable and the B5 as predictors. These results are depicted in Table 2. All the B5 were significant predictors of trait EI except A, and they jointly predicted 57.3% of the trait EI variance.

We ran an EFA of the 30 NEO-PI-R facets and the 15 TEIQue facets following a principal axis factor extraction and using Oblimin ( $\delta = 0$ ) and Promax ( $\kappa = 4$ ) rotations. The six-factor solution (see Tables 3 and 4) was very similar using the two rotation methods. Trait EI emerged as a distinct oblique factor under the B5 factor space. The mean inter-correlation between the trait EI factor and the B5 factors was  $r = .25$ .

Among the 15 trait EI facets, six showed moderate-to-high loadings on the trait EI factor ( $>.30$ ), namely Emotion perception (.76), Emotion expression (.71), Social awareness (.57), Interpersonal regulation (.52), Empathy (.56), and Relationships (.46).

### 3.2. Trait EI and the B2

We first investigated the existence of a higher-order factor in the B5 latent space. The five NEO-PI-R scales were subjected to principal component analysis (PCA) using Oblimin ( $\delta = 0$ ) rotation (see Table 5). Two components were clearly evident (eigenvalues  $>1$ ), equivalent to the Alpha/Stability (C, A, and N loadings) and Beta/Plasticity super-factors (O and E loadings). These two super-factors (B2) explained 55.14% of the variance, with Beta/Plasticity explaining a higher percentage than Alpha/Stability, and they were positively correlated ( $r = .16$ ,  $p < .01$ ).

**Table 1**  
Inter-correlations among the B5, the B2, and the GFP.

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
1. GFP- $\alpha\beta$	–									
2. GFP-B5	1.00***	–								
3. Alpha/Stability	.76***	.71***	–							
4. Beta/Plasticity	.76***	.81***	.16**	–						
5. Openness (O)	.59***	.63***	.07	.83***	–					
6. Conscientiousness (C)	.42***	.37***	.76***	–.12*	–.01	–				
7. Extraversion (E)	.68***	.71***	.23***	.81***	.38***	.03	–			
8. Agreeableness (A)	.47***	.45***	.51***	.21***	.15***	.15*	.07	–		
9. Neuroticism (N)	–.60	–.57***	–.70***	–.22***	–.05	–.23***	–.22***	–.12*	–	
10. Trait EI	.69***	.69***	.59***	.47***	.34***	.33***	.44***	.16**	–.63***	–

Note. \* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$ .  $N = 289$ .

**Table 2**  
Multiple Regression of trait EI onto the B5 and trait EI onto the B2.

Trait EI	$F_{(5,265)} = 73.46^{***}$ , $R_{adj}^2 = .57$		Trait EI	$F_{(2,269)} = 129.70^{***}$ , $R_{adj}^2 = .49$	
	Beta	$t$		Beta	$t$
N	–.526	–12.56***	Alpha/Stability	.527	11.92***
E	.230	5.23***	Beta/Plasticity	.379	8.57***
O	.229	5.28***			
A	.024	.59			
C	.189	4.59***			

Note. \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

As observed in Table 1, the correlation between the trait EI and Alpha/Stability ( $r = .59$ ) was higher than that between trait EI and Beta/Plasticity ( $r = .47$ ). The B2 explained a substantial 49% of the variance in Trait EI, with Alpha/Stability as the stronger predictor (Table 2).

### 3.3. Trait EI and the Big One

B2 were also subjected to a PCA. A unique unrotated general component emerged identified as the GFP (GFP- $\alpha\beta$  in Table 1). Moreover, a single-factor PCA was conducted using the five NEO-PI-R scales and, similarly, one factor emerged corresponding to the GFP (GFP-B5 in Table 1). The correlation between both GFPs (the GFP- $\alpha\beta$  and the GFP-B5) was close to 1. GFP showed higher correlations with trait EI than with the B5 from which it was extracted.

The correlation between trait EI and the GFP (GFP-B5) was  $r = .69$ . Following Van der Linden et al. (2012), we also performed a hierarchical regression analysis including trait EI as criterion, the B5-based GFP as predictor entered in step 1, and the individual B5 scales (O, C, E, A, and N) as predictors entered in step 2. The GFP in step 1 explained a substantial 47% of the variance in trait EI ( $R_{adj}^2 = .47$ ,  $F_{(1,270)} = 239.68$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Concerning the total unique variance of the B5 scale scores in step 2, they explained an additional 9.5% of the trait EI variance ( $R_{adj}^2 = .56$ ,  $F_{(1,270)} = 70.92$ ,  $p < .001$ ), though E was excluded from the analysis because of multicollinearity problems (tolerance values  $< .20$ ; VIF  $> 4.00$ ).

We conducted another single-factor PCA using Oblimin (delta = 0) rotation, whereby the five NEO-PI-R scales were combined together with the four TEIQue factors. In line with previous studies (McIntyre, 2010; Rushton et al., 2009; Veselka, Schermer, Petrides, & Vernon, 2009; Veselka, Schermer, Petrides, Cherkas, et al., 2009), the highest factor loadings on GFP corresponded to the four trait EI factors and N.

Lastly, using the same analyses as in Veselka, Schermer, Petrides, and Vernon (2009) and Veselka, Schermer, Petrides, Cherkas, et al. (2009), we ran a PCA using the five NEO-PI-R and the 15 TEIQue facets. Five factors emerged from the analyses

(eigenvalues  $> 1$ ). The first factor (eigenvalue = 6.3) explained the most variance (31.5%), while the second factor (eigenvalue = 2.6) explained 13.16%. The loadings of the B5 on the first factor ranged from .23 to .67, while those of the trait EI ranged from .27 to .72. The loadings of the twenty variables on the first factor ranged from .23 to .72. These results are presented in Table 6 together with those of Veselka, Schermer, Petrides, and Vernon (2009) studies to facilitate the comparison.

## 4. Discussion

Results from this study demonstrate the convergent and discriminant validity of trait EI (a1 and a2) with regard to the B5. In addition, trait EI positively correlated with the B2, more strongly with Alpha/Stability than Beta/Plasticity, as expected (b). Finally, results showed that there was a strong correlation between trait EI and the GFP. Additionally, when GFP was extracted from a data source combining NEO-PI-R and TEIQue scores, the latter had highest loadings in the GFP, indicating a great overlap between trait EI and the GFP (c).

### 4.1. The location of trait EI in the personality factor space

As an evidence of convergent validity, the shared variance between trait EI and the B5 was 57%, which is within the range predicted by the literature (50–80%) (depending on the study and the trait EI measure used; Petrides, Furnham, et al., 2007; Petrides et al., 2010).

Findings from this study replicate for the first time those obtained by Petrides, Pita, et al. (2007) regarding the location of trait EI (measured by the TEIQue) as a distinct and unique factor in the B5 factor space, which is evidence of its discriminant validity.

### 4.2. Trait EI and the B2

Results from this study show that the B2 can be extracted from the B5 pool. The shared characteristics of A, C, and N are reflected in Alpha/Stability, which involves the readiness to successfully

**Table 3**  
Factor Pattern Matrix for the TEIQue and NEO-PI-R.

Test	Trait EI	A	C	N	O	E
<i>TEIQue (.88)</i>						
Emotional perception (.81)	<b>.78</b>		.11			-.13
Emotional expression (.89)	<b>.73</b>	-.12				
Social awareness (.76)	<b>.52</b>	<b>-.39</b>		-.28		.11
Inter-personal regulation (.70)	<b>.45</b>	<b>-.57</b>	-.26	-.10		
Trait empathy (.72)	<b>.62</b>				<b>.30</b>	-.16
Self-esteem (.88)	.28	-.20	.10	<b>-.53</b>	-.23	
Assertiveness (.71)	.22	<b>-.43</b>		<b>-.32</b>		
Relationships (.66)	<b>.45</b>	<b>.39</b>		-.10		
Trait optimism (.84)				<b>-.65</b>	-.12	<b>.39</b>
Trait happiness (.84)	.16	.13		<b>-.49</b>	-.21	<b>.41</b>
Self-motivation (.79)			<b>.61</b>	-.28		.20
Intra-personal regulation (.73)	.16	.13		<b>-.50</b>		<b>-.34</b>
Stress management (.72)			-.22	<b>-.74</b>	.22	-.18
Adaptability (.78)		.13		-.26	<b>.40</b>	.10
Impulsiveness (low) (.72)	.23	.23	.25	<b>-.30</b>		<b>-.53</b>
<i>NEO Agreeableness (A) (.77)</i>						
A4. Compliance (.60)		<b>.72</b>		-.19		
A2. Straightforwardness (.65)	-.25	<b>.74</b>	.12		.14	
A3. Altruism (.66)	.26	<b>.59</b>			.15	.20
A5. Modesty (.73)		<b>.60</b>	-.25	.18		
A6. Tender-mindedness (.56)	.27	<b>.42</b>		.24	<b>.33</b>	
A1. Trust (.71)	.15	<b>.53</b>		-.14		.23
<i>NEO Conscientiousness (C) (.83)</i>						
C4. Achievement striving (.69)		-.13	<b>.87</b>	.24		.18
C5. Self-discipline (.75)	-.18		<b>.86</b>			
C3. Dutifulness (.59)			<b>.73</b>	.13		
C2. Order (.68)			<b>.55</b>	.17	-.20	-.15
C1. Competence (.54)			<b>.72</b>			
C6. Deliberation (.78)	.17	.17	<b>.48</b>			<b>-.44</b>
<i>NEO Neuroticism (N) (.83)</i>						
N1. Anxiety (.69)	.21	.11	.24	<b>.92</b>		
N6. Vulnerability to stress (.69)	.13	.16	-.22	<b>.74</b>	-.10	
N2. Hostility (.67)		<b>-.48</b>	.14	<b>.67</b>		
N3. Depression (.80)	.12			<b>.92</b>		-.17
N5. Impulsiveness (.54)	.19	-.19	-.20	<b>.43</b>		<b>.47</b>
N4. Self-Consciousness (.68)	-.17	.19		<b>.56</b>	-.14	
<i>NEO Openness (O) (.73)</i>						
O5. Ideas (.83)		-.16		-.11	<b>.78</b>	-.21
O2. Aesthetics (.75)		.11	.18	.14	<b>.55</b>	.14
O6. Values (.45)			-.13		<b>.43</b>	
O4. Actions (.51)	-.15			-.26	<b>.61</b>	.13
O1. Fantasy (.71)			-.28		<b>.34</b>	<b>.30</b>
O3. Feelings (.56)	<b>.34</b>	-.12	.10	.28	<b>.43</b>	.19
<i>NEO Extraversion (E) (.69)</i>						
E2. Gregariousness (.60)	.16	.19	-.12			<b>.39</b>
E5. Excitement seeking (.47)	-.20	-.22			.21	<b>.37</b>
E6. Positive emotion (.73)		.20		<b>-.31</b>		<b>.66</b>
E1. Warmth (.61)	<b>.34</b>	<b>.35</b>				<b>.36</b>
E4. Activity (.57)		-.11	.21			<b>.61</b>
E3. Assertively (.63)	.15	<b>-.48</b>		-.28	.15	.13
% Var.	3.34	9.35	11.82	21.00	7.32	5.03
% Var. Ac.	57.86					
KMO	.87					
Bartlett's test	$\chi^2 = 6951.97$	g1 = 990		Sig. = .00		

Note. Factor weights <|.10| were omitted and those  $\geq$ .30 are highlighted in bold. Internal consistencies (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ) reported in parentheses.

**Table 4**  
Inter-correlations among trait EI factor and B5 factors.

Factor	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Trait EI	–	.18	.38	-.46	.42	.39
2. A	.08	–	.23	-.13	-.04	-.19
3. C	.22	.11	–	-.38	.05	-.02
4. N	-.29	-.02	-.21	–	-.07	-.05
5. O	.36	.03	.01	-.08	–	.27
6. E	.29	-.12	-.06	-.01	.20	–

Note. The sign of N was reversed (to positive) in both rotations (i.e., Oblimin and Promax). Values above the diagonal correspond to Promax rotation.

maintain stability and avoid disturbance in emotional, social, and motivational domains. Beta/Plasticity, which reflects the shared characteristics of E and O, represents an individual's tendency to seek novel and rewarding social and intellectual experiences (DeYoung et al., 2002; Wilt, Olson, & McAdams, 2011).

A novel contribution of the present study is the investigation of the associations between trait EI and the B2. Trait EI positively correlated with both super-factors (higher with Alpha/Stability than Beta/Plasticity), as expected. Trait EI, similarly to Alpha/Stability, entails intra-personal adjustment, which is represented in facets

**Table 5**  
EFA results showing factor loadings for the B2 and the GFP.

Trait	Alpha (Stability)	Beta (Plasticity)	GFP	
			NEO-PI-R	NEO-PI-R + TEIQue
% Variance explained	23.58%	31.56%	31.56%	35.13%
O		<b>.84</b> (.69)	<b>.63</b> (.40)	<b>.42</b> (.18)
E		<b>.79</b> (.66)	<b>.71</b> (.51)	<b>.58</b> (.33)
C	<b>.80</b> (.63)	–.24 (.63)	<b>.37</b> (.14)	<b>.37</b> (.13)
N	<b>–.68</b> (.50)		<b>–.57</b> (.33)	<b>–.72</b> (.52)
A	<b>.49</b> (.28)		<b>.45</b> (.21)	.23 (.05)
Well-being (W)				<b>.79</b> (.62)
Emotionality (E)				<b>.74</b> (.55)
Sociability (S)				<b>.63</b> (.40)
Self-control (C)				<b>.61</b> (.38)

Note. Factor weights <.20 were omitted and those  $\geq .30$  are highlighted in bold. Community coefficients are shown between brackets. The sign of Beta was reversed (to positive) to facilitate the interpretation.

**Table 6**  
Loadings in the first unrotated factor extracted from the NEO-PI-R and the TEIQue.

Variable	GFP	GFP Veselka, Schermmer, Petrides, and Vernon (2009); Study 2; Twin-1	GFP Veselka, Schermmer, Petrides, and Vernon (2009); Study 2; Twin-2
N	–.67	–.69	–.65
E	.51	.58	.53
O	.38	.33	.35
A	.23	.42	.35
C	.39	.58	.48
Self-esteem	.67	.74	.73
Emotional expression	.57	.64	.61
Self-motivation	.65	.69	.63
Intra-personal regulation	.51	.58	.54
Trait happiness	.72	.77	.72
Trait empathy	.52	.63	.59
Social awareness	.68	.69	.73
Impulsiveness (low)	.44	.59	.49
Emotional perception	.66	.63	.64
Stress management	.57	.69	.63
Inter-personal regulation	.27	.39	.39
Trait optimism	.76	.77	.74
Relationships	.60	.73	.64
Adaptability	.60	.60	.64
Assertiveness	.46	.48	.55

such as intra-personal emotion regulation, stress management, self-esteem, and self-motivation. However, a potential bias moderating this relationship could be that trait EI, operationalized through the TEIQue, incorporates more intra- than inter-personal dimensions (Brasseur, Grégoire, Bourdu, & Mikolajczak, 2013). In addition, high Alpha/Stability scorers seem to be less likely to hold a negative worldview (Wilt et al., 2011), which can also be said about high trait EI scorers, since trait EI covers facets such as optimism and happiness.

#### 4.3. Trait EI and the Big One

Trait EI was highly correlated to the GFP, and the latter explained more proportion of the trait EI variance than did the B5 scales. These findings replicate for the first time those of Van der Linden et al. (2012) and accord well with the statement “the high end of the GFP is emotional intelligence” (Rushton & Irwing, 2011, p. 146).

Among the trait EI factors, well-being had the highest loading on the GFP (followed by emotionality). This indicates that individuals scoring high on GFP tend to see the glass half full, are self-confident, and generally satisfied with their lives. They are able to perceive their emotions, and those of others, communicate them

effectively, and ultimately, establish and maintain fulfilling personal relationships.

The GFP extracted from the B5 correlated more strongly with trait EI than with the original B5 scales from which it was extracted.

In sum, the present findings suggests that, in line with Van der Linden et al. (2012), trait EI may be considered as a good candidate to describe the psychological meaning of the GFP. We concur with Petrides, Vernon, Schermmer et al. (2010) that the TEIQue could be a good proxy of the GFP. Thus, in order to know an individual's GFP, instead of administering the NEO-PI-R and factor analyze the data, the global TEIQue score can be used as a marker for the GFP.

#### 4.4. Recommendations for future research

It would be interesting to expand this research by exploring the convergent and discriminant validity of trait EI within alternative personality theories such as the Alternative Five Factors (Zuckermann, Kuhlman, Joireman, Teta, & Kraft, 1993), the Six Factors (Hogan, 1986), the Seven Factors (Benet & Waller, 1995), neuropsychological models of personality (Davis & Panksepp, 2011; Gray & McNaughton, 2000), as well as the general factor of psychopathology, recently presented by Caspi et al. (2013). Likewise, future studies could further explore the incremental validity of trait EI over, not only the B5, but also the B2 and the Big One.

### 5. General conclusion

Trait EI demonstrated convergent and discriminant validity regarding the B5, as well as convergent validity regarding the B2 and the Big One. In addition, these data demonstrate the practical equivalence of the Spanish and English forms of the TEIQue, both internally and regarding their associations with personality.

Findings from this study indicate that a comprehensive measure of trait EI can be a good proxy of an affect-laden GFP. Since GFP has been interpreted as the adult development of the so-called good temperament (Rushton & Irwing, 2011), trait EI could be reconsidered as a comprehensive blend of qualities associated to it. This is consistent with Zeidner, Matthews, Roberts, and MacCann (2003) model of investment of EI, according to which there are three levels of EI development, whereby lower-level dimensions may provide a platform for developing more sophisticated emotion-regulation skills, with competencies becoming increasingly differentiated over time. These three levels are temperament (i.e., trait EI), specific aptitudes for learning emotional regulation skills (i.e., fluid ability EI), and acquired self-awareness of emotional regulation (i.e., crystallized ability EI and emotional competence).

## References

- Benet, V., & Waller, N. G. (1995). The big seven factor model of personality description: Evidence for its cross-cultural generality in a Spanish sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 701–718.
- Brasseur, S., Grégoire, J., Bourdu, R., & Mikolajczak, M. (2013). The profile of emotional competence (PEC): Development and validation of a self-reported measure that fits dimensions of emotional competence theory. *PLoS One*, *8*(5), e62635. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0062635>.
- Carroll, J. B. (1993). *Human cognitive abilities: A survey of factor-analytic studies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Caspi, A., Houts, R. M., Belsky, D. W., Goldman-Mellor, S. J., Harrington, H. L., Israel, S., et al. (2013). The *p* factor: One general psychopathology factor in the structure of psychiatric disorders? *Clinical Psychological Science*, *14*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2167702613497473>.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources Inc.
- Davis, K. L., & Panksepp, J. (2011). The brain's emotional foundations of human personality and the affective neuroscience personality scales. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, *35*, 1946–1958.
- De Raad, B. (2005). The trait-coverage of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *38*(3), 673–687.
- DeYoung, C. G., Peterson, J. B., & Higgins, D. M. (2002). Higher-order factors of the B5 predict conformity: Are there neuroses of health? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *33*, 53–552.
- Digman, J. M. (1997). Higher-order factors of the B5. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*, 1246–1256.
- Ferguson, E., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Pickering, A., & Weiss, A. (2011). Five into one doesn't go. A critique of the general factor of personality. In T. Chamorro-Premuzic, A. Furnham, & S. von Stumm (Eds.), *The Blackwell-Wiley Handbook of Individual Differences* (pp. 162–186). New York: Wiley.
- Gray, J. A., & McNaughton, N. (2000). *The neuropsychology of anxiety*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hofstee, W. K. B. (2001). Intelligence and personality: Do they mix? In J. Collis & S. Messick (Eds.), *Intelligence and personality: Bridging the gap in theory and measurement* (pp. 43–60). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hofstee, W. K. B. (2003). Structures of personality traits. In: I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.) & T. Millon, & M. J. Lerner (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 5. Personality and social psychology* (pp. 231–254). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Hogan, J. (1986). *Hogan personality inventory manual*. Minneapolis: National Computer Systems.
- Joseph, D. L., & Newman, D. A. (2010). Discriminant validity of self-reported emotional intelligence: A multitrait-multisource study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *70*(4), 672–694.
- McIntyre, H. H. (2010). Gender differences in the nature and linkage of higher-order personality factors to trait and ability emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *48*, 617–622.
- McRae, R. R. (2000). Emotional intelligence from the perspective of the five-factor model of personality. In R. Bar-On & J. D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 263–276). New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Musek, J. (2007). A general factor of personality: Evidence for the big one in the five-factor model. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *41*, 1213–1233.
- Petrides, K. V. (2001). *A psychometric investigation into the construct of emotional intelligence*. London: University College.
- Petrides, K. V. (2011). Ability and trait emotional intelligence. In T. Chamorro-Premuzic, A. Furnham, & S. von Stumm (Eds.), *The Blackwell-Wiley handbook of individual differences* (pp. 656–678). New York: Wiley.
- Petrides, K. V., Furnham, A., & Mavroveli, S. (2007). Trait emotional intelligence: Moving forward in the field of EI. In G. Matthews, M. Zeidner, & R. Roberts (Eds.), *The science of emotional intelligence: Knowns and unknowns (series in affective science)* (pp. 151–166). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Petrides, K. V., Pita, R., & Kokkinaki, F. (2007). The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality factor space. *British Journal of Psychology*, *98*, 273–289.
- Petrides, K. V., Vernon, P. A., Schermer, J. A., Ligthart, L., Błoomsma, D. I., & Veselka, L. (2010). Relationships between trait emotional intelligence and the B5 in the Netherlands. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *48*, 906–910.
- Rushton, J. P., Bons, T. A., Ando, J., Hur, Y.-M., Irwing, P., Vernon, P. A., et al. (2009). A general factor of personality from multitrait-multimethod data and cross-national twins. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, *12*(4), 356–365.
- Rushton, J. P., Bons, T. A., & Hur, Y.-M. (2008). The genetics and evolution of the general factor of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*, 1173–1185.
- Rushton, J. P., & Irwing, P. (2011). The general factor of personality: Normal and abnormal. In T. Chamorro-Premuzic, A. Furnham, & S. von Stumm (Eds.), *The Blackwell-Wiley handbook of individual differences* (pp. 132–161). New York: Wiley.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, *9*(3), 185–211.
- Van der Linden, D., Tsaousis, I., & Petrides, K. V. (2012). Overlap between general factors of personality in the B5, giant three, and trait emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*(3), 175–179.
- Van der Zee, K., Thijs, M., & Schakel, L. (2002). The relationship of emotional intelligence with academic intelligence and the B5. *European Journal of Personality*, *16*(2), 103–125.
- Vernon, P. A., Villani, V. C., Schermer, J. A., & Petrides, K. V. (2008). Phenotypic and genetic associations between the B5 and trait emotional intelligence. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, *11*(5), 524–530.
- Veselka, L., Schermer, J. A., Petrides, K. V., Cherkas, L. F., Spector, T. D., & Vernon, P. A. (2009). A general factor of personality: evidence from the HEXACO model and a measure of trait emotional intelligence. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, *12*, 420–424.
- Veselka, L., Schermer, J. A., Petrides, K. V., & Vernon, P. A. (2009). Evidence for a heritable general factor of personality in two studies. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, *12*, 254–260.
- Wilt, J., Olson, B. D., & McAdams, D. P. (2011). Higher-order factors of the big-five predict exploration and threat in life stories. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *45*(6), 613–621.
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., Roberts, R., & MacCann, C. (2003). Development of emotional intelligence: Towards a multi-level investment model. *Human Development*, *46*(2), 69–96.
- Zuckermann, M., Kuhlman, D. M., Joireman, J., Teta, P., & Kraft, M. (1993). A comparison of three structural models of personality: The big three, the B5, and the alternative five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 757–768.