



Peer reviewed

W. Lee Grubb III (grubbw@mail.ecu.edu) is an Assistant Professor of Management at East Carolina University.

Abstract

As organizations continue to strive to hire the most productive employees, the use of both cognitive and non-cognitive selection and assessment tests has continued to increase. Situational judgment tests continue to grow in popularity as selection and assessment tools because they are valid predictors of one's future performance and because they assess a wide variety performance related constructs. Despite the growth in popularity, very little is known about the ability of situational judgment tests to assess one's emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence research has increased over the last ten years and some researchers have expressed the belief that job applicants' emotional intelligence should be considered as well as their cognitive abilities. This study investigates the relationship between a situational judgment test and an emotional intelligence test and is a first step in understanding how the two measures are related.

Over the last decade, the use of situational judgment tests as selection and assessment measures has increased as research has indicated that situational judgment tests are valid predictors of future job performance (McDaniel, Hartman, & Grubb, 2003; McDaniel, Morgeson, Finnegan, Campion, & Braverman, 2001; McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001; O'Connell, McDaniel, Grubb, Hartman, & Lawrence, 2002; Weekly & Jones, 1999). Situational judgment tests are personnel screening devices designed to measure a respondent's judgment regarding work place dilemmas. Situational judgment tests are typically comprised of several different situations, each followed by a series of choices. After reading the situation, the respondent is asked to choose a specific response that represents a course of action for responding to the aforementioned situation. The following is an example of a situation and response choices from the *Work Problems Survey* (Smith & McDaniel, 1998).

You are in the middle of a difficult job and you ask your boss for help.
Your boss won't help.

- A. Get help from someone else.
- B. Tell the boss you don't like the boss' attitude.
- C. Go to the boss' supervisor and complain.
- D. Refuse to do the work.
- E. Ask for a meeting with your boss' supervisor.

A burgeoning body of literature reveals that situational judgment tests assess a variety of constructs including general mental ability, conscientiousness, emotional stability, agreeableness and job experience (McDaniel et al., 2003; McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001; Nguyen, 2001; O'Connell et al., 2002; Pereira & Schmidt Harvey, 1999; Weekly & Jones, 1999). Hence, situational judgment tests are correlated with different constructs such as cognitive ability and conscientiousness that have repeatedly been shown to be valid predictors of job performance.

McDaniel and Nguyen (2001) and Ployhart and Ryan (2000) remarked on the importance of increasing our understanding of situational judgment tests and what other constructs they measure. In the past, situational judgment tests were often designed specifically to predict supervisory behavior (Smith & McDaniel, 1998) but there is interest in developing situational judgment tests that can be used to provide predictive validity for multiple jobs to decrease the time and cost of developing specific tests for different jobs (Ployhart & Ryan, 2000). As situational judgment tests as selection and assessment tools increase in popularity, additional constructs, relevant to job success, must be investigated to learn more about how they are assessed by the situational judgment tests. The purpose of this study is to assess the degree that different emotional intelligence dimensions are measured by a situational judgment test that was developed to offer predictive validity for most jobs.

While there is still much to be learned about the design of situational judgment tests, there are several characteristics that make them appealing personnel screening tests. Situational judgment tests have been shown to produce smaller race based differences than general mental ability tests (Chan & Schmitt, 1997; Clevenger, Jockin, Morris, & Anselmi, 1999; Motowidlo et al., 1990; Motowidlo & Tippins, 1993; Nguyen, 2001). Further, situational judgment tests are valid predictors of future performance and they may offer incremental validity beyond tests of general mental ability (McDaniel et al., 2001; McDaniel et al., 2002).

Although the literature regarding situational judgment tests continues to grow, McDaniel and Nguyen (2001) reported that there is a paucity of research that has investigated the non-ability correlates of situational judgment tests. As the use of situational judgment tests and other selection and assessment tests grows in popularity in industry, so should our understanding of the different constructs measured by these instruments.

In recent years, the use of emotional intelligence tests as predictors of performance and life success has increased (Bar-On, 2000; Goleman, 1995; Gowing, 2001; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). Bar-On (1997) described his instrument to assess emotional intelligence and the main components of his model of emotional intelligence. Bar-On's (1997) emotional intelligence model includes an overall emotional intelligence score referred to as the Total EQ for emotional quotient and five main dimensions of emotional skills: 1) intrapersonal skills, 2) interpersonal skills, 3) adaptability, 4) stress management and 5) general mood. In addition, an inconsistency scale and a positive impression scale are used as validity indicators to examine the responses for cases of careless or random responses and cases of inflated self-perceptions or attempts to inflate one's score by faking good. Bar-On (2000) offered a brief review of the five main components. First, intrapersonal skills refer to self-understanding and self-awareness and the ability to express one's feelings and ideas. The second component, interpersonal skills, is described as the ability to be aware of, appreciate, and understand others' feelings and the ability to establish and maintain mutually satisfying relationships with other individuals. The third component, adaptability, refers to one's ability to

accurately assess one's feelings with objective external cues and accurately assess the immediate situation. In addition, adaptability refers to one's ability to remain emotionally flexible to change one's thoughts as situations change and to aid in problem solving. The fourth component, stress management, is the ability to cope with stressful situations and to control one's emotions. Finally, general mood is described as the ability to be optimistic, express positive feelings, and enjoy ones' self and others.

Although research regarding emotional intelligence has been popular, several studies have remarked that emotional intelligence is very similar to personality dimensions (Davies, Stankov, & Roberts, 1998; Mayer, Salovey et al., 2000; Newsome, Day, & Catano, 2000). Some studies show moderate correlations between personality dimensions and facets of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 2002; Parker, 2001). These correlations are what one might expect when correlating items that measure similar but different constructs. Because of the relationship between personality measures and emotional intelligence measures and the relationship between personality measures and situational judgment tests, there should be a positive relationship between situational judgment tests and emotional intelligence.

Hypothesis 1:

Total emotional quotient scores will account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores.

Although significant variance is expected based on the relationship between personality measures and emotional intelligence measures, scale comparison between personality measures and emotional intelligence measures can be complex. McCrae (2000) provided a conceptual correspondence between the Costa and McCrae (1992) five-factor personality model and the Bar-On (1997) proposed aspects of emotional intelligence. Emotional stability, the personality dimension most strongly correlated with situational judgment test scores (McDaniel et al., 2003) contains items that closely map to three different scales from Bar-On's mixed model of emotional intelligence, general mood, intrapersonal skills, and stress management. Similarly, conscientiousness, the second most strongly correlated personality dimension with situational judgment test scores (McDaniel et al., 2003), contains items that closely map to two different scales from Bar-On's mixed model of emotional intelligence, adaptability and interpersonal skills.

With a relationship established between some of the Big Five factors used to predict performance and Bar-On's constructs of emotional intelligence, the nature of the emotional intelligence constructs used to predict performance can be better understood. Bar-On (2002) described two studies that have investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance. The first study was an investigation of 100 banking employees in the Philippines that compared cognitive ability and emotional intelligence as predictors of performance (Jae, 1997). Jae (1997) reported positive correlations between all emotional intelligence scales and performance. The order of the individual scale correlations with performance was: stress management ($r = .52$),

adaptability ($r = .49$), intrapersonal ($r = .48$), general mood ($r = .39$) and interpersonal skills ($r = .38$).

The second study involved over two thousand males from the Israeli Defense Forces (Fund & Bar-On, 2002). The results of this study indicated that general mood and stress management were the greatest predictors of performance from Bar-On's (1997 & 2002) emotional intelligence scales. The results of these two studies, as well as the description of what each scale of the Bar-On emotional intelligence instruments measure, helped determine the posited order of the relationships between the emotional intelligence scales and the situational judgment test.

First, the emotional intelligence scale related to interpersonal relationships and social awareness, interpersonal skills, taps into conscientiousness, agreeableness, and openness to experience. Because the interpersonal skills scale taps into three personality correlates of situational judgment test scores and because of its reported predictive ability, I posit:

Hypothesis 2:

The interpersonal scale will account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores.

Emotional stability, the personality dimension most strongly correlated with situational judgment test scores (McDaniel et al., 2003; McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001) contains items that closely map to three different scales from Bar-On's mixed model of emotional intelligence. Stress management is the most represented dimension of emotional intelligence contained within the personality dimension of emotional stability. In addition, Jae (1997) reported that stress management offered the strongest single scale correlation with performance. Therefore, I posit:

Hypothesis 3:

Stress management will account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores.

Next, conscientiousness, the second most strongly correlated personality dimension with situational judgment test scores (McDaniel et al., 2003; McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001), contains items that closely map to two different scales from Bar-On's mixed model of emotional intelligence, adaptability and interpersonal skills (McCrae 2000). The adaptability scale relates to reality testing, flexibility and problem solving. These skills are believed to directly relate to judgment in the workplace and therefore I posit:

Hypothesis 4:

Adaptability will account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores.

Of the remaining personality dimensions, openness to experience and extraversion is not strongly correlated with situational judgment test scores (McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001). The remaining emotional intelligence scales are intrapersonal skills and general mood. Intrapersonal skills may match up with some aspects of emotional stability, extraversion and openness to experience (McCrae 2000), but only emotional stability is strongly correlated with situational judgment test scores. Similarly, general mood may share some characteristics with emotional stability and extraversion (McCrae 2000). Although I do not believe that the intrapersonal scale and general mood will be strongly correlated with situational judgment test scores, Fund and Bar-On (2002) reported that general mood was the strongest predictor of performance, and Jae (1997) reported a strong correlation between the intrapersonal scale and performance. Therefore I posit:

Hypothesis 5:

General mood will account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores.

Hypothesis 6:

Intrapersonal skills will account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores.

Methods

Participants

284 undergraduate business students from a large southeastern public university participated in the study in exchange for partial course credit. The sample size was reduced to 215 after accounting for attrition, missing data, random responding, and excluding subjects that were determined to be faking good by the Bar-On *EQ-i:S*. The average age of the participant was 24 years old ($SD = 7.2$). 49% of the respondents were male and 2% of the respondents did not indicate their gender. Roughly 57% of the respondents were White, 21% of the respondents were Black, 11% of the respondents were Asian, 2% of the respondents were Hispanic, 6% of the respondents indicated they were not characterized by any of the aforementioned races, and 4% of the respondents did not indicate their race.

Procedure

A battery of tests was administered to groups of business students at a large southeastern university. The students were instructed to respond to a situational judgment test, the *Work Problems Survey* and Bar-On's short form emotional intelligence test, the *EQ-i:S*. The respondents were instructed to answer the questions as honestly as possible.

Measures

The Work Problems Survey is a situational judgment test designed by Smith and McDaniel (1998). The test was chosen over other different situational judgment tests because the *Work Problems Survey* was designed by industry experts specifically as a test that would tap into several different relevant, performance predicting constructs (general mental ability, personality and job experience) and could be used to offer validity for a variety of different jobs (Smith & McDaniel, 1998). Often situational judgment tests are developed and designed in industry for one specific type of job. However, the *Work Problems Survey* was designed to be used in different settings and has been successfully used in the past by both practitioners and academics and has been shown to be a versatile, valid and reliable test with alphas consistently in the mid .70s to the low .80s (Grubb, 2003; Nguyen, 2001; Smith & McDaniel, 1998).

The test contains 31 different situations, each followed by five different possible responses to the situation. Respondents are asked to rate the responses by indicating the best and worst action for each different situation. The test taps into several constructs including stable personality traits, cognitive ability, job experience, and age (Smith & McDaniel, 1998).

For use in this study, Bar-On's model and measure of emotional intelligence was chosen from a number of different mixed model, self-report scales for several reasons. Mayer et al., (2000) discussed several emotional intelligence measures including their own emotional intelligence measure, the *Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS)*, the *EQ-i*, a scale from Bar-On (1997), a test developed by Goleman (1995), as well as a measure developed by (Schutte et al., 1998). Additionally, the *Emotional Competence Inventory* (Boyatzis, Goleman, & Hay/McBer, 1999) and the *EQ-Map* (Cooper, 1996), were considered. Of the measures mentioned, the measure developed by Schutte et al., (1997), the *EQ-i* and the *EQ-Map* were the only self-report measures. Further review of the measures indicated that the *EQ-Map* was designed for personal assessment and was not intended for selection. Of the two remaining, the *EQ-i* and the measure developed by Schutte et al., (1997), the *EQ-i* is better known and has received more research attention. In addition, the *EQ-i* was developed to help determine what makes some individuals more successful and productive than others (Bar-On, 1997) which makes it more applicable to a study of selection and assessment measures.

Bar-On (2002) developed a short version of the original 133-item measure. The short version contains 51 questions and measures the same five main components of emotional intelligence and because Bar-On's model of emotional intelligence is a mixed model of emotional intelligence, it should tap into several different constructs that can be measured with situational judgment tests. Mayer et al., (2000) described some of the different constructs related to mixed models of emotional intelligence and mentioned practical intelligence, general intelligence, social desirability, and different aspects of the Big Five model of personality, as well as many others.

The Bar-On *EQ-i:S*, a short version of the *EQ-i* was chosen over the standard version of the *EQ-i* for practical administration purposes. The *EQ-i:S* is a short form emotional intelligence test based on the Bar-On *EQ-i* (1997). The instrument contains 51 items that measure information across 8 different scales. The instrument includes 5 main emotional intelligence scales: intrapersonal skills, interpersonal skills, stress management, adaptability, and general mood. In addition, an overall emotional intelligence score referred to as one's Total EQ is created. One's Total EQ is a score based on one's performance on the five main emotional intelligence scales and is used as an indicator of one's overall emotional intelligence. Two additional scales referred to as an inconsistency index and a positive impression scale are used to screen for random or careless responses and exaggerated positive responses.

The instrument's main emotional intelligence scales and the positive impression scale describe traits or characteristics of a person, and the respondent selects a response based on a five-point Likert scale to report the degree that they believe the statement is representative of his or her self. The responses are anchored at 1 = very seldom or not true of me and 5 = very often true of me or true of me. All of the five main emotional intelligence scales and the global measure of one's emotional intelligence are reported to have alpha reliability coefficients ranging from .71 to .93 (Bar-On, 1997).

Results

To ensure that the results from the *EQ-i:S* were valid, a confirmatory factor analysis using varimax rotation was conducted using SPSS 12.0. Although the solution presented more factors with eigenvalues greater than one, the main emotional intelligence scales were well supported as the first five factors containing stress management, general mood, adaptability, interpersonal skills and intrapersonal skills. Bartlett's test of sphericity for multivariate normality was significant with a value of 4796.18 ($p < .01$) and the KMO test score was .798 indicating that the data set had sufficient structure and was adequate for factor analysis. In order to further investigate the individual factors, the same analysis was conducted suppressing coefficients less than .30.

The factor analysis revealed a fourteen-factor model with eigenvalues greater than 1 but several of the factors appeared to echo the main dimensions of emotional intelligence. The first factor, stress management, revealed an eigenvalue of 8.96 and explained 17.57% of the variance. Next, general mood, with an eigenvalue of 4.33 explained an additional 8.48% of the variance. The third factor, adaptability accounted for 6.07% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 3.09. The fourth factor, interpersonal skills, had an eigenvalue of 3.02 and accounted for 5.92% of the variance. The fifth factor, intrapersonal skills, revealed an eigenvalue of 2.26 and explained 4.37% of the variance. The sixth factor appeared to echo the stress management scale and loaded strongly on three of the stress management items with an eigenvalue of 1.98 that accounted for 3.88% of the variance. In addition, a seventh factor appeared to strongly echo the intrapersonal scale with four items that loaded strongly from the intrapersonal scale with an eigenvalue of 1.68 that accounted for 3.30% of the variance. An eighth factor loaded heavily on the positive impression scale, an instrument validity scale, with

an eigenvalue of 1.50 that accounted for 2.95% of the variance. The eight-factor model accounted for 52.54% of the total variance explained.

Although there were six other factors that posted eigenvalues between 1.01 and 1.42 that explained between 1.99% and 2.79% of the variance (equaling 13.69% of the total variance), they were in large comprised of a smaller number items that belonged to different scales. Although it is possible that the additional factors may represent other facets of emotional intelligence with subtle differences, investigating the potential for different facets of emotional intelligence is beyond the purview of this study. In addition, the subsequent factor loadings are not surprising given that many of the individual scale items address similar but different facets of emotional intelligence. The individual scales of emotional intelligence have moderate to high intercorrelations, and thus they may have a tendency to load with different factors (See Table 1 below.).

Table 1

**Situational Judgment Test Scores and Emotional Intelligence Scales:
Alpha Reliability and Correlation Matrix**

	Alpha	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. SJT Score	.80	1.0						
2. Intrapersonal	.81	.15	1.0					
3. Interpersonal	.81	.19	.27	1.0				
4. Stress Mgmt	.85	.14	.30	.06	1.0			
5. Adaptability	.76	.10	.25	.28	.18	1.0		
6. General Mood	.85	.20	.59	.36	.46	.34	1.0	
7. Total EQI Score	.74	.24	.74	.56	.63	.51	.85	1.0

Correlations at or above .14 are significant at $p < 0.05$
 Correlations at or above .19 are significant at $p < 0.01$
 $N = 215$

Factor analysis was not conducted on the *Work Problems Survey* because it is a generally accepted principle that situational judgment tests do not typically produce interpretable or significant factor structures (McDaniel & Whetzel, 2005). Due to the factorially complex nature at the item level, situational judgment tests are more of a measurement method and do not contain items specifically used to capture unidimensional constructs. The factorially complex items in a situational judgment test therefore do not load cleanly into distinct factors.

Next, the hypotheses were tested using simple and multiple regression to determine the amount of variance the emotional intelligence scales accounted for in the situational judgment test scores. Hypothesis 1 predicted that the total emotional quotient scores would account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores.

Hypothesis 1 was supported using simple linear regression $R = .24$ ($p < .01$). The total emotional intelligence quotient accounted for 5.6% of the variance in the situational judgment test score. Because the total emotional quotient score is based on the scores from the five main facets of emotional intelligence in Bar-On's mixed model, the other main scales were subjected to multiple regression to determine the level of variance that each individual scale contributed to explaining the situational judgment test scores.

Multiple regression, using the enter method, was conducted with the emotional intelligence scales interpersonal skills, stress management, adaptability, general mood and intrapersonal skills to examine the amount of variance explained by each scale. The model summary was significant, $R = .24$ ($p < .05$) and accounted for 6% of the variance however none of the individual scales revealed a significant β .

An additional multiple regression equation using the stepwise method was conducted with the emotional intelligence scales to examine the individual amount of variance explained by each scale. This method allows for variables to be included or excluded from the regression equation depending on the amount of variance the individual variable explains. The amount of variance explained by each individual scale may increase or decrease depending on the presence or absence of the other variables and the weaker variables may be removed from the equation depending on the amount of variance they contribute. The model summary was significant, $R = .20$ ($p < .01$) and accounted for 4% of the variance. Interestingly, only general mood met the entry requirement and was retained for the equation ($\beta = .20$, $p < .01$). Based on this regression output, the majority of the subsequent hypotheses were not supported.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that the interpersonal scale would account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores. Hypothesis 2 was not supported.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that stress management would account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores. This hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that the adaptability scale would account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores. This hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that general mood would account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores. Hypothesis 5 was supported. General mood accounted for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores ($\beta = .20$, $p < .01$).

Finally, Hypothesis 6 predicted that intrapersonal skills would account for significant variance in the situational judgment test scores. Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

Discussion

Although several of the hypotheses were not supported, it is understandable when one considers the high degree of intercorrelation between the emotional intelligence scales. When measures are highly correlated it is possible to have a significant R with the regression equation and not have any of the individual variables reveal a significant β . The total emotional quotient score boasted the highest magnitude relationship with the situational judgment test scores because the total emotional quotient score is comprised of the five main emotional intelligence scales and thus it should explain the most variance because of its broad band width of constructs covered.

General mood, the only single scale to account for variance in the situational judgment test scores is highly correlated with the total emotional quotient scores. When one considers the magnitude of the correlation between the total emotional quotient and the general mood scale (.85) and the magnitude of the correlations between general mood and the other emotional intelligence scales, it seems to indicate that the general mood scale is saturated as a global emotional intelligence measure. The high degree of correlation between the total emotional quotient and general mood helps explain how the inclusion of the general mood scale in a regression equation would draw variance explained in the situational judgment test scores from the other emotional intelligence scales. In addition, this may help explain the earlier research by Fund and Bar-On (2002) that stated general mood was the strongest individual scale predictor of performance.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence and a situational judgment test. As predicted, the relationship between global emotional intelligence, the total emotional quotient score, and the situational judgment test scores was significant. The single scale that accounted for the most variance in the situational judgment test scores was the general mood scale. The general mood scale involves such things as self-motivation, optimism, and happiness. It is, however, important to note that the situational judgment test was not designed to measure emotional intelligence. Further research involving the use of situational judgment tests to measure emotional intelligence is warranted.

This study is the first to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and a situational judgment test. Much more is known and understood about situational judgment tests and their ability to predict performance. Although it seems clear that the relationship between emotional intelligence and situational judgment tests will be positive, additional research is warranted to determine the magnitude of the variance explained and which emotional attributes are most strongly related to situational judgment tests.

The main implications of this research are twofold. First, the current study helps to advance the literature in that it reveals another “noncognitive” construct that can be assessed with situational judgment tests. As noted earlier, (McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001) the literature regarding situational judgment tests and their ability to measure general mental ability is clearer than the literature regarding non-ability constructs such as personality and emotional intelligence. This is the first study to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence and situational judgment tests, and the results

help advance the theory regarding situational judgment tests. Simply knowing that a positive relationship exists between the situational judgment test and emotional intelligence helps us understand more about the versatility of situational judgment tests and their ability to measure different constructs.

Second, from a practitioner standpoint, the current results may lead to the development of situational judgment tests that are able to more accurately assess a wide range of desired employee characteristics and abilities in one test. Although it is widely recognized that general mental ability tests are the strongest predictors of future performance (Grubb, Whetzel & McDaniel, 2004), the literature has also revealed that situational judgment tests can offer predictive validity beyond that of general mental ability tests (O'Connell et al., 2002; McDaniel et al., 2002). The development of situational judgment tests that are able to more accurately assess emotional intelligence dimensions may enable practitioners to hire better employees, more efficiently, through the use of fewer, more comprehensive selection and assessment tools.

Limitations

Although this study offers an interesting look at an additional construct captured by situational judgment tests there are several limitations that need to be addressed. First, the sample used in the current study consisted of junior and senior level students in a school of business. There is some question as to whether or not the results would have been different if the sample had been comprised of older respondents with more work experience. Because situational judgment tests have shown moderate correlations with age and work experience, the results of the current research are likely an underestimate of the population correlation. Interestingly, however, this is not to say that the sample used in the current study is inappropriate. Situational judgment tests were originally designed to measure the judgment and potential of supervisors and managers, but in more recent times situational judgment tests are considered to be measurement methods and can be designed to offer predictive validity for many different types of jobs. Future research may replicate the current study with an older more experienced sample to compare results.

Second, the results of this study are limited in that they compare two specific measurement instruments. The literature regarding emotional intelligence continues to grow and the results presented from this research should not be considered an investigation into the specific emotional intelligence dimensions provided by Bar-On. As the literature continues to grow, additional dimensions of emotional intelligence may be discovered. Also, the Bar-On model differs from other mixed models of emotional intelligence and those models may account for more or less variance in situational judgment test scores. Although Bar-On and his emotional intelligence instruments are well known in both academic and practitioner circles, and although the *Work Problems Survey* has been used both in academic and practitioner settings, the results of the current study are not generalized to apply to other emotional intelligence or situational judgment tests.

Finally, although the *Work Problems Survey* was designed to be a valid predictor of success with several different types of jobs, it was not specifically designed to measure emotional intelligence. Because situational judgment tests are considered to be measurement methods, a test could be designed to specifically measure one's emotional intelligence, but a tradeoff is presumed to exist. Part of the appeal of situational judgment tests is that they tap into several different success-related constructs, and what adds to the capturing of one construct may detract from the capturing of another. Again, the research presented in this paper is simply an extension of research that seeks to further our understanding of what situational judgment tests can be used to measure.

References

- Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Technical Manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory. In J. D. A. Parker (Ed.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 363-390). San Francisco: Josse-Bass.
- Bar-On, R. (2002). *Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory: Short Technical Manual*. Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, *44*, 1-26.
- Boyatzis, R.E., Goleman, D., & Hay/McBer. (1999). *Emotional Competence Inventory*. Boston: HayGroup.
- Chan, D., & Schmitt, N. (1997). Video-based versus paper-and pencil method of assessment in situational judgment tests: Subgroup differences in test performance and face validity perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*, 143-159.
- Clevenger, J., Jockin, T., Morris, S., & Anselmi, T. (1999). *A situational judgment test for engineers: Construct and criterion related validity of a less adverse alternative*. Paper presented at the 14th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.
- Clevenger, J. P., & Haaland, D. E. (2000). *The relationship between job knowledge and situational judgment test performance*. Paper presented at the 15th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA.
- Costa, P. T., & 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.
- Cooper, R.K. (1997). *EQ Map*. San Francisco: AIT and Essi Systems.
- Davies, M., Stankov, L., & Roberts, R. D. (1998). Emotional intelligence: In search of the elusive construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *75*, 989-1015.
- Fund, S., & Bar-On, R. (2002). Examining the contribution of emotional intelligence to occupational performance. Unpublished manuscript.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *What's Your EQ*. Retrieved, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.utnereader.com/>
- Gowing, M. K. (2001). Measurement of individual emotional competence. In D. Goleman (Ed.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace* (pp. 83-131). San Francisco: Josse-Bass.
- Grubb III, W. L. (2003). *Situational judgment and emotional intelligence tests: Constructs and faking*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA.
- Grubb III, W. L., Whetzel, D. L., & McDaniel, M. A. (2004). General mental ability tests in industry. In J. Thomas (Ed.), *Comprehensive handbook of psychological assessment*.
- Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big

- Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 869-879.
- Jae, J. H. (1997). *Emotional intelligence and cognitive ability as predictors of job performance in the banking sector*. Unpublished master's thesis. Ateneo de Manila University, Philippines, Manila.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In D. J. Sluyter (Ed.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (pp. 396-420). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCrae, Robert 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). San Francisco: Josse-Bass Inc.
- McDaniel, Michael A., Hartman, Nathan S., & Grubb III, W. L., (2003). *Situational Judgment Tests, Knowledge, Behavioral Tendency, and Validity: A Meta-Analysis*. Paper presented at the 18th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando.
- McDaniel, M. A., Morgeson, Frederick P., Finnegan, Elizabeth B., Campion, Michael A., and Braverman, Eric P. (2001). Use of situational judgment tests to predict job performance: A clarification of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 730-740.
- McDaniel, M. A., & Nguyen, N. T. (2001). Situational judgment tests: A review of practice and constructs assessed. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 103-113.
- McDaniel, M. A., & Whetzel, D. L. (2005) Situational judgment research: Informing the debate on Practical intelligence theory. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Motowidlo, S., Dunnette, M. D., & Carter, G. W. (1990). An alternative selection procedure: The low-fidelity simulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(6), 640-647.
- Motowidlo, S., & Tippins, N. (1993). Further studies of the low-fidelity simulation in the form of a situational inventory. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66, 337-344.
- Mullins, M. E., & Schmitt, N. (1998). *Situational judgment testing: Will the real constructs please present themselves*. Paper presented at the 13th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX.
- Newsome, S., Day, A. L., & Catano, V. M. (2000). Assessing the predictive validity of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 1005-1016.
- Nguyen, N. (2001). *Faking in situational judgment tests: An empirical investigation of the work problems survey*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA.
- O'Connell, M. S., McDaniel, M. A., Grubb, W. L., III, Hartman, N. S., & Lawrence, A. (2002). *Incremental validity of situational judgment tests for task and contextual performance*. Paper presented at the 17th Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial Organizational Psychology, Toronto, Ontario.

- Parker, J. D. A. (2001). *Conceptual and predictive validity of the emotional intelligence construct: Empirical support using young adults*. Paper presented at the 10th Biennial Meeting of the International Society for the Study of Individual Differences, University of Edinburgh
- Pereira, G. M., & Schmidt Harvey, V. (1999). *Situational judgment tests: Do they measure ability, personality or both*. Paper presented at the 14th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.
- Ployhart, R. E., & Ehrhart, M. G. (2001). *Effects of response instructions on criterion-related validity, construct validity, and reliability of situational judgment tests*. Paper presented at the 16th Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.
- Ployhart, R. E., & Ryan, A. M. (2000). A construct-oriented approach for developing situational judgment tests in a service context. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25*, 167-177.
- Smith, K. C., & McDaniel, M. A. (1998). *Criterion and construct validity evidence for a situational judgment measure*. Paper presented at the 13th Annual Convention of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, TX.
- Weekly, J. A., & Jones, C. (1999). Further studies of situational tests. *Personnel Psychology, 52*, 679-700.



<http://www.westga.edu/~bquest/>