

CREATING A PERFORMANCE-BASED SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE MEASURE USING A  
SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TEST FORMAT

Kate Unterborn

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

Central Michigan University  
Mount Pleasant, Michigan  
May 2011

Accepted by the Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies,  
Central Michigan University, in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the doctoral degree

Dissertation Committee:

Neil Christiansen, Ph.D.

Committee Chair

Kyunghee Han, Ph.D.

Faculty Member

Stuart Quirk, Ph.D.

Faculty Member

May 2, 2011

Date of Defense

Roger Coles, Ed.D.

Dean  
College of Graduate Studies

October 13, 2011

Approved by the  
College of Graduate Studies

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my committee members: Dr. Neil Christiansen, Dr. Kyunghye Han, and Dr. Stuart Quirk. These faculty members provided valuable insight and direction to this project. I would also like to thank the research assistants in Dr. Christiansen's lab for assisting with data collection. They sacrificed many hours for this project.

## ABSTRACT

### CREATING A PERFORMANCE-BASED SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE MEASURE USING SITUATIONAL JUDGMENT TEST

by Kate Unterborn

Social intelligence is a construct which is important for employees due to the increased social interaction component in many jobs. Social intelligence can be defined as an individual's level of intelligence in social situations and interactions. Although previous research has shown that other interpersonal skills are related to successful job performance, there is limited research using social intelligence due to the lack of an agreed upon definition, operationalization, and method of measurement of the social intelligence construct.

This study evaluated the construct and criterion validity of a newly developed performance measure of social intelligence. This measure used a situational judgment test format in order to capture the richness of real-world situational cues. Scores on the performance-based social intelligence were compared to personality traits and general mental ability to give evidence of construct validity. Ratings of socially effective behaviors and performance in novel social situations were used to determine the measure's criterion related validity.

Results indicate that social intelligence is independent from, but related to, general mental ability. Social intelligence showed some promise in its relationships with socially effective behaviors and performance in interpersonal situations. It seems that social intelligence exerts influence on successful performance through socially effective behaviors. Knowledge must be translated into observable behaviors before it can exert influence on performance. .

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW .....	5
Definition of Social Intelligence .....	5
Methods of Measurement .....	9
<i>Performance-based Measures of Social Intelligence</i> .....	10
<i>Self-and Other-reported Methods of Measurement</i> .....	14
Situational Judgment Tests .....	17
Social Intelligence and Related Concepts .....	21
Present Studies .....	25
III. STUDY I .....	29
Method .....	29
<i>Participants</i> .....	29
<i>Materials</i> .....	29
<i>Social Intelligence Measure</i> .....	29
<i>General Mental Ability Measure</i> .....	31
<i>Personality Measure</i> .....	32
<i>Criteria</i> .....	32
<i>Procedure</i> .....	33
<i>Data Analysis</i> .....	34
Results .....	34
<i>Evidence of Construct Validity</i> .....	37
<i>Evidence of Criterion Validity</i> .....	38
Discussion .....	40
IV. STUDY II .....	42
Method .....	42
<i>Participants</i> .....	42
<i>Materials</i> .....	42
<i>Social Intelligence Measure</i> .....	42
<i>Personality Measure</i> .....	43
<i>Criteria</i> .....	43
<i>Social Effectiveness Ratings</i> .....	43
<i>Assessment Center Performance</i> .....	44
<i>Procedure</i> .....	45
<i>Data Analysis</i> .....	47

Results .....	48
<i>Mediation of the Social Intelligence-Performance Relationship</i> .....	52
<i>Post hoc Mediation Analyses</i> .....	53
<i>Moderation of the Social Intelligence-Performance Relationship</i> .....	58
Discussion.....	60
V.    GENERAL DISCUSSION .....	64
Limitations and Future Research .....	69
APPENDICES .....	72
REFERENCES .....	110

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	<i>Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistencies (Cronbach’s alpha) and Intercorrelations of all Variables</i> .....	35
2.	<i>Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistencies (Cronbach’s alpha) and Intercorrelations of Social Intelligence with Social Effectiveness by Rater Type</i> .....	36
3.	<i>Uncorrected and Corrected Correlations for Unreliability of the Social Intelligence Measure and Social Effectiveness Ratings</i> .....	37
4.	<i>Difference Testing Between Social Intelligence Correlations</i> .....	38
5.	<i>Difference Testing Between Social Effectiveness Correlations</i> .....	39
6.	<i>Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistencies (Cronbach’s alpha) and Intercorrelations of all Variables</i> .....	49
7.	<i>Correlations and Internal Consistencies (Cronbach’s alpha) of Social Intelligence and Social Effectiveness with Assessment Center Dimension Performance</i> .....	50
8.	<i>Mediator Effects of Social Effectiveness on the Relationship of Social Intelligence and Assessment Center Performance</i> .....	53
9.	<i>Mediator Effects of Social Effectiveness on the Relationship of Social Intelligence and Assessment Center Dimension Performance</i> .....	57
10.	<i>Moderating Effects of Extraversion Level on the Relationship between Social Intelligence and Social Effectiveness</i> .....	59

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Social interactions make up a large portion of the daily activities of present day jobs (Hogan & Shelton, 1998). These social interactions can take many forms. Informal interactions between coworkers, a manager coaching his or her subordinate or a sales representative working with a client are all forms of social interaction. Whereas each of these situations requires a slightly different interaction style the skills and abilities of reading other people and the situational demands are always needed. An employee who possess the ability to process and use information transmitted from other individuals and the situation is an asset to any organization.

In the most basic sense, social interactions rely on interpersonal knowledge and skills which can positively affect the interaction between people and lead to positive outcomes. Research in this area has identified many different interpersonal skills, all of which lead to superior performance. For instance, social skill (Hochwarter et al., 2006; Witt & Ferris, 2003), political skill (Blickle et al., 2008; Semadar, Robins, & Ferris, 2006), and social effectiveness (Ferris, Perrewe, & Douglas, 2002) have all shown relationships with performance in the work place. While these concepts have their own unique definition they all share a common theme. Namely, each idea centers upon an individual using social intelligence in order to choose behaviors which will facilitate interacting with others in order to produce a favorable outcome.

Whereas interpersonal performance is a basic aspect of most jobs (Jeanneret et al., 1999) it is more important for jobs which rely on high levels of social interaction. For instance managers, sales people, customer service representatives and team members need a high degree of interpersonal savvy in order to negotiate the demands of their jobs. Because these jobs

involve such a high level of interpersonal interaction job performance relies on an individual's ability to understand other people and work effectively with them in order to negotiate these interpersonal situations.

Explicit job performance dimensions like customer service, sales, and coaching are influenced by interpersonal knowledge and skills. Implicit dimensions like contextual performance may also rely on an individual's social intelligence. Contextual performance comprises teamwork and assisting other coworkers (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993). Although these dimensions may not be formally communicated as part of a position they certainly add to organizational performance. An employee with a high degree of social intelligence or skill will be able to understand how to best assist coworkers and how to work well in a team. Research in this area has connected an individual's level of social skill to contextual performance (Morgeson, Reider, & Campion, 2005).

Other individual differences have been shown to be related to job performance. Personality traits like conscientiousness, extraversion, openness, emotional stability, and agreeableness often appear in the job performance literature. Conscientiousness is a valid predictor of job performance across a wide array of occupations and performance criterion (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001). In contrast, the relationship of extraversion, emotional stability, openness and agreeableness varied by the performance criteria and occupation type (Barrick & Mount, 1991). For instance, extraversion and agreeableness have positive, consistent relationships with workplace interpersonal skill (Ferris, Witt & Hochwarter, 2001; Neuman & Wright, 1999).

Facets of personality dimensions have been shown to add incremental validity in the prediction of job performance over and above trait scores (Tett, Steele, & Beauregard, 2003). For instance, the facets of potency and achievement have been linked to supervisor ratings of overall performance and objective sales (Vinchur et al., 1998). The conscientiousness facets of dependability and order are valid predictors of overall, task, and contextual performance (Dudley et al., 2006).

An important characteristic of the personality facet-performance research is that relationships vary based on the operationalization of job performance. When job performance is defined narrowly (i.e., contextual performance) facet scores specific performance domains were of interest to the researcher, not job performance overall. While performance across a wide variety of criteria can be predicted using broad personality trait dimensions, more precise facet measurement can show stronger relationships with the more specific performance dimensions. These results show the importance of taking a slightly more micro view, especially when specific performance dimensions are of interest.

Specific interpersonal skills and personality traits have been linked to job success. Less is known about the specific cognitive mechanisms which underlie job performance. There has been little research about the specific kinds of intelligence which relate to job performance. What is known is that general mental ability is positively related to performance across a wide variety of jobs (Schmidt & Hunter, 2004). However, cognitive ability shows differential predictive relationships depending on the complexity of the job (Schmidt, Ones, & Hunter, 1992) and depending on individual tenure (Schmidt et al., 1988). That is, the more complex the job or the more junior the employee, the more an individual's level of cognitive ability predicts his or

her performance. As the complexity of the job increases an individual is more likely to be required to solve novel problems and remain flexible in his or her cognitive processes in order to successfully traverse the situation. Novel problems which require solutions are also something that new employees come into contact with. The new employee will have to put forth cognitive energy to learn about and to solve these novel problems. The higher an individual's level of general cognitive ability, the easier it will be for that person to solve novel problems, remain cognitively flexible, and learn new job knowledge.

A factor that can add considerable novelty to a situation is interacting with other individuals. Each person adds his or her own point of view and way of thinking to a situation. Learning how to process this information and use it in an effective manner is important to success in interpersonal situations. It is not merely the interpersonal skills one has, but the underlying cognitive mechanisms one uses to process this social information and use it in an effective manner. It is an individual's level of intelligence for social information; his or her social intelligence.

Like facets of personality traits adding predictive validity for specific performance criteria over and above personality domain scores, facets of intelligence may be able to add predictive power when narrower performance criteria, such as interpersonal performance, is of interest. By synthesizing past research concerning social intelligence, a comprehensive construct definition was developed and used as the basis of a performance-based measure. Thus, the purpose of this study is to create a measure of social intelligence, a facet of general mental ability, which shows incremental predictive validity with interpersonal performance in a social environment.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### Definitions of Social Intelligence

Research on the concept of social intelligence began when Thorndike (1920) put forth the idea that intelligence could be separated into three distinct facets. These facets included social, mechanical, and abstract intelligences. The defining factor separating these facets is the types of subjects or stimuli individuals must interact with. Mechanical intelligence refers to an individual's ability to interact competently with machines and other physical things. Abstract intelligence concerns an individual's performance using ideas and other non-tangible objects. Social intelligence pertains to individuals interacting with people in an intelligent manner. Thorndike's theory states that a socially intelligent person will be able to understand others and that he or she will be able to use this information to act wisely in human relations.

Other theorists supported this separation of intelligence into facets. Gardner (1983) believed in multiple intelligences largely as a response to the traditional use of the limited intelligent quotient to measure intelligence. In his view, intelligence is separated into 8 different domains; linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, spatial, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic. These domains account for the wide variety of human intelligence. Interpersonal is most similar to social intelligence in that it concerns understanding the intentions, motivations, and desires of other people.

Guilford (1967) created a model of general intellect. It outlines the basic concepts of cognition which can be generalized to any type of intelligence, even social intelligence. Guilford's model not only maps out the theoretical background of intellect but also the types of

abilities an intelligent person would possess. Intellect includes three dimensions: content (semantic, symbolic, figural, behavioral), operations (cognition, memory, divergent production, convergent production, evaluation), and products (units, classes, relations, systems, transformations, implications). The content dimension refers to properties of the task materials. Operations refer to the cognitive requirements an individual must have in order to complete a task. Finally, the products dimension refers to the outcome of a certain task. Intelligence can then be measured using a combination of these dimensions. For instance, social intelligence is measured using the cognitive operation and the behavioral content. The choice of these two dimensions for measuring social intelligence indicates that a person who has a high level social intelligence should be able to use cognitive processes to understand the behaviors of others.

The ability of the socially intelligent individual to perceive and understand information provided by other individuals within the social environment has influenced other conceptualizations. Decoding nonverbal cues (Barnes & Sternberg, 1989), and realizing the underlying substitute response to an explicit action (Chapin, 1942) are just a few examples of information which is transmitted by others in our social environment.

Not only should socially intelligent individuals be able to use information provided by other people, they should also be able to use information provided by the situation. Not all situations call for the same behaviors. Thus, socially intelligent individuals need to be able to identify the situational cues which provide information as to the correct behavior to engage in. By accurately using the situational cues in the environment a socially intelligent person will be able to identify the correct behaviors in diverse situations.

The effective use of situational cues to get along in diverse social situations is an underlying idea to many definitions of social intelligence. For instance, Brown and Anthony (1990) asked acquaintances to rate individuals on their level of ability in each of several situations. These situations included interviewing for a job, mediating a neighborhood conflict, selling a vacuum cleaner, and engaging in conversation on an airplane.

Ford and Tisak (1983) used a similar design but asked peers to nominate classmates who would behave effectively in each situation. The situations included being a peer counselor, persuading a group of teachers not to give homework over break, being a good date, expressing condolences to a grieving family, directing a class play, and escorting parents on a school tour. These situations all have interpersonal characteristics but the situational cues are all different. Thus, individuals need to be able to perceive and integrate both the situational and interpersonal cues in order to be socially intelligent.

Another avenue for definitions of social intelligence has been to separate it into its fluid and crystallized components (Jones & Day, 1997). Fluid intelligence has been conceptualized as the ability to reason and perceive relationships which is not affected by prior learning (Horn & Cattell, 1966). Thus, it is to some extent innate within an individual as it cannot be changed through learning. Pattern recognition, problem solving, and learning ability are all types of fluid intelligence.

Fluid intelligence is thought to be more important in social intelligence because of the organizing function which it enables (Jones & Day, 1996). This organizing function allows socially intelligent individuals to recall effective social strategies in a shorter time span. The storage and retrieval of social information is more efficient in socially intelligent individuals.

Examples of fluid social intelligence would be interpretations of ambiguous social interactions, deciphering other individual's goals, and judgment in social situations (Lee et al., 2000).

In contrast, crystallized intelligence is characterized by the fact that it is specific and acquired knowledge. This knowledge has been learned through experiences, education, and acculturation (Horn & Cattell, 1966). Because crystallized intelligence can be changed through learning, it has the capability to increase throughout the lifespan. An individual can take an active role in increasing his or her level of crystallized intelligence by learning new skills or facts. He or she could also take a more passive role by being involved in many different situations and learning via observation. An individual's level of fluid intelligence directly affects the acquisition of crystallized intelligence. The more fluid intelligence an individual has, the easier it is for him or her to acquire crystallized knowledge. Examples of crystallized social intelligence would be knowledge about social rules, protocols, and appropriate social behavior (Jones & Day, 1996).

Social intelligence takes into account using three types of information; information provided by other individuals, information provided by the situation, and information provided by social norms. By using this information appropriately, a socially intelligent individual will be able to determine the best behavior to engage in given the environmental cues. That is, a person with a high level of social intelligence will be able to accurately perceive and integrate the information present in the social environment to solve the problem of which behavior to engage in.

Using the ideas from past research, my conceptualization and definition for social intelligence includes: perceptiveness of others' internal states and moods, their thoughts and

intentions, their motivations or values; insight and sensitivity into social situations, understanding social context and the demands of the situation; knowledge about norms and rules of social life and of human relations, understanding consequences of different actions, ability to predict outcomes of social situations. This definition takes into account that a socially intelligent person must use both fluid and crystallized intelligence in order to behave effectively in a given situation.

### Methods of Measurement

The measurement of social intelligence has taken two main forms; the performance-based approach and the self- or informant-report approach. These measurement methods coincide with different conceptualizations of social intelligence. Performance-based measures are generally used when social intelligence is defined as a cognitive ability. These methods are similar to other ability measures which traditionally have one “correct” answer and use a forced-choice format. Self- or informant-report methods are used to measure behaviors associated with social intelligence. These methods are similar to trait inventories which present behavioral statements and require respondents to rate the statement using a Likert-type scale.

The movement from performance-based tests to self-report tests followed from the inability of early researchers to distinguish social intelligence from other forms of intelligence. Thus, later researchers sought to remedy this by using traits which had little overlapping construct space with other intelligences. Each operationalization of social intelligence taps slightly different aspects of the construct. As such, they have different relationships with important social criteria.

### *Performance-based Measures of Social Intelligence*

One of the earliest and most researched performance-based tests designed to measure the ability of social intelligence was the George Washington Social Intelligence Test (GWSIT) (Moss et al., 1927). Six dimensions of social intelligence were assessed in the original version: judgment in social situations (assessing problems in social situations), memory for names and faces (indicating whether a name/face was previously presented), recognition of the mental state of the speaker (matching speeches with appropriate emotional word), observation of human behavior (generalizations about human behavior), social information (assessing knowledge about social interest topics), recognition of mental states (matching pictures with emotional word). Based on follow-up studies two of the original scales, recognition of mental states and social information, were dropped from the original versions due to small correlations with other scales and lack of convergent and divergent validity. Another scale, sense of humor, replaced these scales on subsequent versions of the test.

Judgments individuals make when exposed to social situations and how individuals evaluate human behavior have been assessed using other social intelligence tests. For instance, the Social Situation Judgment Test (Reed & Weiderman, 1933) presents respondents with social ideas and situations and requires the respondents make a judgment as to how “right” each item is using a 5-point Likert-type scale. The items were created to tap an individual’s knowledge of appropriate social behavior and social attitudes. This test clearly taps the crystallized aspects of social intelligence.

Other researchers have tried to pinpoint the knowledge aspect of social intelligence. Chapin (1942) developed a measure, The Social Insight Scale, to assess both the ability to read

people and to determine effective behavioral strategies. Of particular interest to Chapin was the ability to recognize repressed motives which were underlying the behaviors of others and how to behave toward that person in order to diffuse or conclude an interaction in an effective manner. The test used vignettes to convey important cues to the respondents. Each vignettes depicted a social situation. Respondents were required to pick from several options the best description of the situation or the best action to take. Thus, individuals had to take verbally presented social cues and use them correctly in order to pick the best answer. These vignettes capture the novel and complex nature that typify interaction in social situations.

Based on Guilford's Structure of Intellect model (1967), O'Sullivan, Guilford, and deMille (1965) created the 6 Factor Test of Social Intelligence. The creators of this test conceptualized social intelligence as being comprised of the behavioral cognition factors of intellect. As such, this measure asked individuals to use their cognition to understand and manipulate different forms of behavioral content. The factor tests are defined as follows:

*Cognition of behavioral units:* the ability to identify the internal mental states of individuals

*Cognition of behavioral classes:* the ability to group together other people's mental states on the basis of similarity

*Cognition of behavioral relations:* the ability to interpret meaningful connections among behavioral acts

*Cognition of behavioral systems:* the ability to interpret sequences of social behavior

*Cognition of behavioral transformations:* the ability to respond flexibly in interpreting changes in social behavior

*Cognition of behavioral implications:* the ability to predict what will happen in an interpersonal situation.

O'Sullivan and colleagues created a very comprehensive test which coincided with other intelligence research at that time and addressed some of the issues with other performance-based tests. An additional success was the fact that the test used a theory to drive the operationalization

and measurement of the construct. This test measures a person's ability to understand individuals, the situation, and how the two interact to and how this understanding facilitates behavioral choice. It also taps the behavioral flexibility aspect of social intelligence. Because past research had largely failed in distinguishing social intelligence from verbal intelligence, this test was created using only pictures. By using stimuli which were not verbal in nature relationships with other intelligences should decrease.

Additional research has been conducted to ascertain whether or not social intelligence, as measured by these performance-tests, is an independent construct from other forms of intelligence. In addition, a variety of social criteria has been used to examine the predictive properties of the performance-based tests. The following paragraphs outline the validation research of the performance-based social intelligence measures. Overall, the validation research has led to mixed results as to whether social intelligence is a separate construct from other intelligence constructs and whether social intelligence can be used for behavioral prediction.

The GWSIT (Moss et al., 1927) scale scores correlated at least moderately with abstract intelligence. Average correlations of scale scores with intelligence scores range from .32 (Moss & Hunt, 1927) to .70 (Printer & Upshall, 1928). When using factor analysis to determine if social intelligence that could be separated from abstract intelligence, an independent factor for social intelligence was not found (Thorndike, 1936). A one-factor solution combining social and abstract intelligence was the best solution.

The ability of the GWSIT to predict criteria seems to depend on the exact nature of the criteria. When the criterion is performance in interpersonally based jobs (ex., executives, administration, teachers, sales, and foremen) the GWSIT seemed to be a valid measure. Scores

on the GWSIT correlated with successful performance more for jobs which have high interpersonal demands (Hunt, 1928; Moss & Hunt, 1927). However, if the criterion is based on peer ratings, the GWSIT does not seem to predict variability in the criterion. McClatchy (1929) found only a small correlation (.16) between correlation between GWSIT scores and peer rankings of social adaptability. Burkes (1937) found that scores in the GWSIT correlated negatively with the criteria of peer judgments of behavioral appropriateness in social situations, popularity in social situations, interest in gaining and maintaining social prestige, and ability to make friends.

Validity research for the Social Insight Test (Chapin, 1942) shows many of the same patterns as research on the GWSIT. Scores on the Social Intelligence Test correlated higher with scores on measures of academic intelligence than it did with scores on assessments proposed to measure social intelligence (Keating, 1978). The reported correlations between academic intelligence and the Social Insight Test ranged from .18 to .33. However, scores on the Social Insight Test did correlate with supervisory nominations of individuals with superior social intelligence and distinguished employees in social occupations from employees in other occupations (Chapin, 1942; Gough, 1967).

The Six Factor Test of Social Intelligence (O'Sullivan et al., 1965 ) has been found to have moderate correlations between the six factors and general IQ ranging from .17 to .47 (Hoepfner & O'Sullivan, 1968; Shanley, Walker, & Foley, 1971). Further analysis as to the independence of the 6 factors has shown that a one-factor solution may be superior (Romney & Pyryt, 1999). Although social intelligence as measured by the 6 Factors Test may not be a

distinct construct, test scores have been related to choice of an interpersonal field of graduate study (Reardon, Foley, & Walker, 1979).

While, at first glance, these results do not seem to support the discriminant validity of social intelligence from other intelligences there may be a simple explanation. A method factor may be the cause of the relationships between paper-and-pencil performance tests of social intelligence and other intelligences. Method factors have been found to explain the relationship between paper-and-pencil social intelligence tests with other intelligence tests (Weis & Süb, 2007; Wong et al., 1995).

In addition, the other social intelligence assessments used to investigate the convergent validity of the performance-based social intelligence tests may not be valid measures of the social intelligence construct. For instance, Keating (1978) used the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1974), which is a measure of moral reasoning ability, and the Social Maturity Index, which is a peer-rated index of social functioning, to determine the construct validity of the Social Insight Test (Chapin, 1942). The results indicated that social intelligence scores correlated more with academic intelligence scores (Keating, 1978) than with scores on the other measures proposed to operationalize social intelligence. Keating's results may have been a reflection of the inadequacy of the chosen tests in measuring social intelligence. If the Defining Issues Test and the Social Maturity Index are not valid measures of social intelligence there will be lower correlations.

#### *Self- and Other-reported Methods of Measurement*

The correlation between performance-based measures of social intelligence with other forms of intelligence was a concern to early social intelligence researchers. To address this

concern, researchers began using self- or other-reported behavioral assessments. These measures consist of statements of socially intelligent behaviors which respondents must agree or disagree with. Thus, each individual must rate themselves or be rated by others on how much he or she engages in these behaviors.

The Tromoso Scale of Social Intelligence (Silvera, Martinussen, & Dahl, 2001) is an example of such a test. The researchers collected a variety of expert provided behaviors which typify a socially intelligent individual. For instance, a socially intelligent person would be able to predict how others will behave, would easily fit into a variety of social situations, and not anger others with what he or she says. The respondent must decide how much each behavioral statement describes him or herself using a Likert-type scale.

Other measures have used a self-report method. The Battery of Interpersonal Capabilities (Paulus & Martin, 1987) requires each respondent to read several behavioral statements and indicate how likely he or she is to engage in that behavior and if the individual is capable of engaging in the behavior. The Perceived Decoding Abilities Scale (Zuckerman & Larrance, 1979) asks respondents to rate their own ability at deciphering the emotions of others.

While tests using this self-report method may address the problem of correlations with other intelligences, they may be tapping into a separate construct. It has been shown that although individuals can, to some extent, accurately report their own intellectual abilities (Furnham & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2004) the correlation between self-estimates and actual test scores is only moderate in nature at a .29 (Mabe & West, 1982). This calls into question whether self-report estimates of ability can be used as a proxy for test scores (Paulus, Lyse, & Yik, 1998).

The emotional intelligence literature has investigated whether self-report measures of emotional intelligence show the same relationships with criteria as performance measures (O'Connor & Little, 2003) and the correlations between self-report and performance-based measures (Brackett et al, 2006). It has been found that self-report measures of emotional intelligence are different from performance measures based on correlations between the two scores ranging from .12 to .21 (Goldenberg, Matheson, & Mantler, 2006). It seems self-report and performance-based tests of emotional intelligence may not be tapping the same construct as evidenced by the low correlations between scores on the different types of tests. This research in emotional intelligence may be applied to social intelligence. Self-report and performance-based social intelligence measures may be assessing different constructs. As such, these two types of tests should be evaluated separately for their relationships with other constructs and criteria. Self-report measures may not be superior to performance-based measures if they are looking at two separate constructs.

The current research paradigm is interested in measuring social intelligence as an ability, thus a performance-based measure of social intelligence was created. The researchers realize that performance-based measures do show moderate relationships with other measures of intelligence. These moderate correlations may be an indication that social intelligence is, in fact, an intelligence. While the researchers would like to show independence of a social intelligence domain, the primary goal is to create a test which will show incremental predictive validity above general mental ability.

## Situational Judgment Tests

Providing individuals with hypothetical social situations with enough interpersonal and situational cues to measure the underlying level of social intelligence is complicated. On one hand, the situations need to be as rich as possible to mimic the real-world environment and provide sufficient predictive validity. On the other hand, the testing procedure should be cost-effective and easy to administer. Situational judgment tests can provide rich situational descriptions which can measure the ability aspect of social intelligence while minimizing cost and administration hassles.

Low-fidelity simulations used to measure future job performance (Motowidlo, Dunnette, & Carter, 1990) were a precursor to situational judgment tests. Further research has presented the conclusion that situational judgment tests are not measures of a single construct, such as future job performance (Weekley & Jones, 1999). These tests are a measurement method and may be used to measure a variety of constructs depending on the information contained within the items. According to recent meta-analyses, most situational judgment tests measure conscientiousness, emotional stability, agreeableness, and cognitive ability to some extent (McDaniel & Nyugen, 2001; McDaniel et al., 2001).

Situational judgment tests have shown incremental predictive relationships, beyond general mental ability and personality, with overall job performance (Clevenger et al., 2001; Weekley & Ployhart, 2005) and interpersonal performance (Chan & Schmitt, 2002). The predictive capacity of situational judgment tests with interpersonal performance is of interest as interpersonal performance is defined as being able to work with others toward a common goal. This performance dimension lends itself to be an important outcome of social intelligence.

Situational judgments tests are popular selection tools (Ployhart, 2006) which present job applicants with low-fidelity job-related situations. Their design is such that each item is comprised of two parts; the item stem and the item responses (McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001). The item stem presents the applicant with the situation. The item responses follow the item stem and are behavioral in nature. These responses require the applicant to make some sort of evaluation. Instructions for the evaluation can either involve picking the best/worst response or rating each of the responses. Common instructions ask the applicant to pick the response which he or she ‘would’ engage in, which he or she ‘should’ engage in, which is ‘most/least effective’, or to rate responses on effectiveness using a Likert-scale.

The instructions and features of the item determine the relationships with other constructs. For instance, cognitive loading of an item may be a feature of the item stem length and complexity (McDaniel, Wheeler, & Nyugen, 2009). Test instructions also have differential relationships with other constructs. For instance, when applicants are asked to choose the response option that they ‘would’ engage in, their scores correlate with measures of personality traits (McDaniel et al., 2007). On the other hand, when applicants are asked to choose the response option they ‘should’ engage in, their scores correlate more with measures of general mental ability (McDaniel et al., 2007).

Scoring the situational judgment test is usually done a priori (Lievens, Peeters, & Schollaert, 2008). Common practices in scoring situational judgment tests include empirical, theoretical, and expert-based using subject matter experts (Bergman et al., 2006). Empirical keying methods relate criterion scores to the endorsement of each answer. Those answer choices which have higher correlations to criterion scores become the “correct” answer. Theoretical

based scoring schemes use theory to create behavioral responses and/or to choose which responses should be “correct”. Responses are created by the researcher to reflect an underlying construct which should relate to a criterion. Expert-based schemes use subject matter experts to identify correct responses. Because they are knowledgeable on the assessed construct they should be able to form a consensus on which responses reflect the construct. Comparison between these scoring methods indicate that empirical and expert-based methods are superior to theoretical methods and are relatively similar in terms of their validity (Weekley, Ployhart, & Holtz, 2006).

Once the scoring scheme is chosen the next step is to determine how the overall score of the test will be calculated. Calculating a score is also a function of the particular instructions of the situational judgment test. Forced-choice and Likert-type methods are categories of score calculations (Weekley, Ployhart, & Holtz, 2006). Forced-choice methods designate one response as “correct.” A score is calculated by summing the items which were correctly answered. Forced-choice methods are likely to be used when the instructions require the applicant to pick from the behavioral responses listed.

Likert-type methods require the respondent to rate the effectiveness of all behavioral responses. These ratings are then compared to ratings made by expert raters. The amount of correspondence between the respondent ratings and expert ratings are the basis for scores. As the correspondence increases so does the score. Likert-based methods are likely to be used when the instructions require the respondent to rate the effectiveness of the behavioral responses.

Although there is no “correct” answer in the Likert-scale-based method there are responses which are “more correct” than others. Expert raters are used to determine the score

obtained for each respondent rating. Implicitly, this method is saying that if the respondent gave the same rating as the experts then the respondent has picked the “correct” answer.

The relationships of situational judgment tests with other personality constructs and especially their relationship with cognitive ability are recognized by the researcher. No matter what construct is assessed, all situational judgment tests require a respondent to read a situation and make a judgment. It is therefore expected that situational judgment scores will relate to verbal and general mental ability (McDaniel & Nguyen, 2001). This characteristic is exacerbated by the fact that the instructions used in the current research direct the respondent to pick the response option he or she ‘should’ engage in. Although this is a concern, given that past research has not been able to differentiate social intelligence from other forms of intelligence, it does not call for termination of the current research. Instead, based on other situational judgment test research (O’Connell et al., 2007), the relationship between social intelligence and the criteria should be one of incremental prediction over and above the prediction provided by measures of general mental ability and personality.

Using the information from previous situational judgment test studies the current researchers created a face-valid situational judgment test to measure social intelligence which gave respondents instructions to choose the behavioral response the individual ‘should’ engage in given the current situation. These instructions were chosen because of the current conceptualization of social intelligence as a traditional intelligence and, therefore, there should be a correct and an incorrect answer to each item. The scoring scheme used was expert-based as empirical keying of items tends to limit generalizability (Mumford & Owens, 1987). Finally, respondents were asked to pick both the ‘most’ and ‘least’ effective response to the situation.

Although this feature is not in strict accordance to traditional intelligence tests it does increase score variability and could increase the validity of the situational judgment test (Weekley, Ployhart, & Holtz, 2006).

### Social Intelligence and Related Concepts

Support for the concept of social intelligence may have waxed and waned over the decades but research on other concepts which are related to effective interpersonal behaviors has flourished. Most of these concepts are behavioral in nature and include social skills, social competence, social effectiveness, and a variety of trait measures. These concepts are so promising because they relate to important interpersonal outcomes while maintaining their independence from other measures of intellectual ability.

Social skill is multi-dimensional in nature. For instance, Riggio (1986) defines social skills as being comprised of six separate domains; sending and receiving affect, attitude, and status information, sending and receiving verbal communication, emotional control, and social control. Other definitions include interpersonal perceptiveness and the ability to adjust behaviors based on the social situation in order to effectively influence others (Ferris, Witt, & Hochwarter, 2001) and to understand people and our own opinions of our capabilities (Gardner, 1993).

Empirical evidence corroborates the theoretically derived definitions of social skill. For instance, critical incident data were used to create a taxonomy of social skills. Seven social skills were identified which included being sensitive and responsive to others' needs and moods, being flexible and adaptable rather than rigid and rule-bound, being persuasive-able to set agendas and define roles, being able to instill trust in others, being consistent across interactions, being accountable-not trying to have matters both ways, and being able to listen to and communicate

with a wide range of audiences (Hogan & Lock, 1995). It is easy to see the similarities of being able to read other people, being flexible, and being able to communicate with a wide range of audiences.

These conceptualizations seem to define social skill as being a learned skill but the measurement of implies a trait view. Social skill is commonly measured by asking respondents to make judgments of their own skill level. This is done by asking respondents to rate their agreement to behavioral statements using a Likert-based scale. Ferris, Witt, and Hochwarter (2001) used self-ratings of theoretically derived behaviors to measure social skills. These behaviors tapped self-appraisal of adaption to diverse social situations, perception of other's emotional and motivational states, and management of other's impressions. Riggio (1986) also used self-reported behavior ratings to assess and individual's skill or competence level.

Social competence takes a slightly different view of social behavior and includes both learned skills and enduring traits. For instance, the Social Competence Questionnaire (Schneider, Ackerman, & Kanfer, 1996) includes trait concepts of extroversion, warmth, and openness and the learned skills of influence, insight, appropriateness and maladjustment. Overall, these dimensions can be combined into the four overarching factors of social mastery, social responsiveness, social maturity, and social control (Schneider, Roberts, & Heggestad, 2002).

Social effectiveness may be the most diverse concept and includes many interpersonal domains such as emotional intelligence, practical intelligence, self monitoring, social skill, social competence, political skill, ego resiliency, interpersonal intelligence, sociopolitical intelligence, interpersonal acumen, functional flexibility, and social self-efficacy (Ferris, Perrewe, & Douglas,

2002; Semadar, Robins, & Ferris, 2006). The domains included in the social effectiveness concept represent the knowledge base a person has, their skill set, and internal cognitions about his or her abilities and skills.

To some extent the diverse set of skills and abilities that represent social effectiveness can be simplified into four factors. These factors include social potency, social appropriateness, social emotional expression, and social planning and impression management (Heggstad & Morrison, 2008). The constructs included in the social potency factor point to a socially effective individual being comfortable and skilled in diverse social situations and a desire to dominate these situations. Individuals need to behave appropriately in social situations. They need to not only understand what is appropriate but how to engage in those behaviors. The third factor included the constructs of empathy and nonverbal expressiveness. Finally, the social planning factor implies that social effective individuals know how others view them and how to change or modify this view and is defined by the constructs of social planning and impression management.

Some researchers have exclusively focused on personality traits which facilitate smooth social interactions. The underlying idea to this line of research is that if certain traits/behaviors are related to effective interpersonal interactions and effective interpersonal interactions are a sign of social intelligence then individuals who possess these traits should be socially intelligent. Numerous examples can be found in the literature; social adroitness (Stricker & Rock, 1990), empathy (Ford & Tisak, 1983; Brown & Anthony, 1990), dominance and extraversion (Vyrost & Kyselova, 2006; Brown & Anthony, 1990). These traits clearly paint the picture that socially

intelligent individuals get along well in social situations, show empathy toward others, and feel comfortable taking the lead during social interactions.

Although social intelligence and effective social behavior are conceptually independent constructs their definitions overlap because they are part of the same problem-solving process. Two distinct aspects of the problem solving process are solution generation and enacting of that chosen solution (D'Zurilla & Maydeu-Olivares, 1995). Solution generation is when an individual engages in effortful cognitive processing of environmental information to identify appropriate solution options. An individual's level of social intelligence has a large influence on this step. An individual must be able to understand and process social information in the environment in order to identify the most appropriate solution.

Implementing the chosen solution is the next step in the process. Once an appropriate solution has been identified the individual must carry out that solution. Solution implementation can be measured by observing the behaviors an individual engages in. It is the external manifestation of the internal processing of the environmental information. Thus, it stands to reason that by measuring effective behaviors one is also taking into account the internal processes which lead to the behaviors. Usually, this is the case but there are other things, besides internal cognitive processing, which influence behaviors. Some examples are motivation and self-efficacy. Although an individual might be able to identify the correct response he or she might have difficulty carrying it because he or she does not have the desire to engage in that solution or because the individual does not believe that he or she has the skills necessary to engage in that solution. This leads to a somewhat incomplete picture of an individual's social intelligence level.

Social effectiveness is an example of solution implementation. The current research is concerned with measuring the solution generation step, in this case social intelligence. Social effectiveness may be more appropriate as an outcome measure of the internal cognitive processes of social intelligence. Thus, social effectiveness, as measured by observable behaviors, will be the criterion of interest. Scores on a performance test of social intelligence will be used as the predictor.

### Present Studies

The current research program is influenced by early social intelligence researchers and conceptualizes social intelligence as a facet of general intelligence. This conceptualization is in contrast to more contemporary research that suggests social intelligence can be operationalized as socially effective behaviors or as personality traits. In order to capture the ability aspect of social intelligence, a performance-based measure which mirrors other ability measures, was created and validated.

The performance -based format of the current social intelligence test influences the relationship with intelligence scores. Previous research on performance-based measures of social intelligence has reported moderate correlations with other measures of intelligence (Keating, 1978; Moss & Hunt, 1927; Printer & Upshall, 1928). In addition, the situational judgment test format has been related to an individual's level of intelligence (McDaniel et al., 2001). This relationship is increased when directions instruct the respondent to choose the best or most effective behavioral option in response to the situation described in the item stem (McDaniel et al., in press). The conceptualization and method of measurement should result in a positive relationship between the social intelligence measure and another performance-based

measures of intelligence. Conversely, the social intelligence measure should be less related to the personality scores of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability and neuroticism which use a self-report measurement method.

*H1a: Social intelligence scores will be positively related to scores on a general mental ability measure.*

*H1b: Social intelligence scores will be positively related to the personality trait scores of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness.*

*H1c: Social intelligence scores will show a stronger positive relationship with general mental ability scores than with personality trait scores.*

Broad intelligence dimensions, like general mental ability, predict performance across a wide variety of domains (Schmidt & Hunter, 2004). But its validity fluctuates when certain performance domains, instead of overall job performance, are investigated (Colquitt, Lepine & Noe, 2000; Schmidt, Hunter, & Outerbridge, 1986). When a narrow domain of performance is of interest a narrow predictor should add incremental validity. Research in the domain of ability-based emotional intelligence corroborates this claim. When performance dimensions such as team performance, leadership effectiveness and emergence, and net sales are used as the criteria, emotional intelligence adds incremental validity (Offermann et al., 2004; Kostman, 2004). A facet of general mental ability which reflects social problem-solving should be able to predict the narrow performance facet of engaging in socially effective behaviors. Thus, in contrast to general intelligence, social intelligence will show a greater positive relationship with other-rated socially effective behaviors.

*H2a: Social intelligence scores will be positively related to observer ratings of social effectiveness.*

*H2b: General mental ability scores will be positively related to observer ratings of social effectiveness.*

*H2c: Observer ratings of social effectiveness will show a stronger positive relationship with social intelligence scores than with general mental ability scores.*

Interpersonal skills have been shown to predict performance in situations which rely heavily on social interactions (Klein, DeRouin, & Salas, 2006). By assessing the underlying cognitive knowledge which is applied to solving novel social problems we hope to add predictive validity to performance in situations relying on these interpersonal skills. Following this logic, an individual's level of social intelligence should be positively related to his or her performance in assessment center exercises which have an interpersonal component. This relationship will depend on rater evaluations of the individual's socially effective behaviors. That is, an individual's level of social intelligence can only influence exercise performance if social intelligence is manifested in ratings of socially effective behaviors.

*H3: The relationship between social intelligence scores and successful performance in interpersonally demanding situations is mediated by observer ratings of socially effective behavior.*

An individual's level of social intelligence is not the only thing which can influence other's ratings of socially effective behaviors. A rater has to be able to see this internal ability of social intelligence in action. One way to do this is to have a rater observe an individual's socially effective behaviors. But these ratings of behavior are somewhat contaminated as there are other things which can influence the enactment of these behaviors. An individual's level of certain personality traits may be an example of these contaminates.

Extraversion may be a particularly influential personality trait in the ratings of socially effective behaviors. A rater has to actually observe the target individual engaging in behaviors

which illustrate social intelligence. It will be difficult to do such if the target individual is shy or quiet, does not interact with others, or follows someone else's lead. The target individual's low level of extraversion is masking his or her true social intelligence level by not allowing the enactment of socially effective behaviors. The opposite is also true; a person may be extremely extraverted with little social intelligence. The target individual may dominate conversations and often contributes to the conversation. However, these contributions can be completely off topic and domination could be detrimental, especially in a team setting. If a target is very extraverted it will not be difficult to determine their true social intelligence score. Thus, the relationship of social intelligence with other-rated socially effective behaviors is moderated by the individual's extraversion score.

*H4: The relationship between an individual's social intelligence score and observer ratings of social effectiveness will be moderated by the individual's level of extraversion.*

Two studies were conducted to test the hypotheses outlined above. The first study investigated the construct validity of the newly developed social intelligence measure. Of primary interest in this study is the discriminant, convergent, and correlational relationships of the social intelligence measure with intelligence, personality, socially effective behaviors. Study one will test the hypotheses 1 and 2.

The second study is primarily concerned with the predictive validity of the social intelligence measure. The relationship of the social intelligence measure with performance in interpersonally-based assessment center exercises will give evidence of predictive validity. Other variables affecting this relationship will be investigated. Study two will test the hypotheses 3 and 4.

## CHAPTER III

### STUDY I

#### Method

##### *Participants*

Undergraduate psychology students ( $N = 262$ ) were solicited to participate in this study. Participants were given course extra credit for their assistance. Mean age of the sample was 20.16 years. A majority of the sample was white (89%) and female (72%). Participant year in school ranged from 31% freshmen, 21% sophomores, 26% juniors, and 18% seniors.

##### *Materials*

*Social Intelligence Measure.* A situational judgment test designed to measure social intelligence was created for the current study. The 41-item test presents participants with situations which may be common in a work setting (see Appendix A for the complete measure). An example situation is *'Paul just shouted at a very important client over the telephone, and everyone in the office heard it. As his manager, Pam asks what's going on, and Paul says he would rather not talk about it. If you were Pam, what should you do?'* Each situation is followed by four behavioral responses that fit the situation. For instance, the four behavioral response choices for the example situation are; *'Give Paul some space and time to calm down, then address the phone conversation.'*, *'Let Paul know that his behavior is not appropriate, he will most likely not do it again.'*, *'Keep asking Paul about the phone conversation until he tells you what happened.'*, *'Leave Paul alone, he will tell you what happened when he is ready.'* Participants were instructed to make two judgments for each situation; which behavioral

response was most effective in that situation and which behavioral response was least effective in that situation. Thus each item score is comprised of two judgments.

To determine a scoring scheme for participant scores on this measure, experts were used as the comparison group. Each of the 8 experts read the situations and behavioral responses. Their task corresponded to the participants' task; to choose a behavioral response which was most effective and a behavioral response which was least effective. A behavioral response was assigned a score of 2 if it was chosen as 'most effective,' a score of 1 if it was not chosen at all, and a score of 0 if it was chosen as 'least effective.' Means were computed for each response. The scoring scheme used the means and overall standard deviation to assign scores to each behavioral choice.

The 'most effective' scoring scheme began with the identification of the behavioral response with the lowest mean. This response was given the score of 0, indicating that none of the experts chose it as an effective behavior in that situation. The second step was to identify the behavior with the second lowest mean. If this mean was within a fourth of the average standard deviation (.14) away from the behavior with the lowest mean it was also given a 0. However, if the second lowest mean was more than one fourth of the average standard deviation away from the lowest mean then it was assigned a score of 1. The third and fourth steps were similar in procedure. If a behavioral response mean was more than a fourth of the average standard deviation away from the previous behavioral response mean it was given a higher score, if this criteria was not met then the behavioral response was given the same score. Thus scores for the 'most effective' scoring scheme could range from 0 to 3.

The 'least effective' scoring scheme used a similar procedure. The behavioral response with the highest mean was identified and given the score of 0. Following this step, the second highest mean was identified. If this mean was within one fourth of the average standard deviation away from the behavioral response with the lowest mean then it was assigned a score of 0, if it was more than one fourth of the average standard deviation away from the response with the lowest mean then it was assigned a score of 1. The third and fourth steps followed the same procedure, each identifying the response mean that was higher than the mean previous. Scores for the 'least effective' scoring scheme could also range from 0 to 3.

A participant's score is determined by comparing his/her answers to the answers of the experts. If the participant identified the 'most effective' behavior to be the same behavior that the experts chose that individual would receive the number of points which had been allotted to that response. A participant would have two scores per situation. One score would indicate how capable he/she was at identifying the 'most effective' behavior in that situation and the other would indicate how capable he/she was at identifying the 'least effective' behavior. The two scores were summed to create an overall score for each item. Scores for this measure could range from 0 to 172.

*General Mental Ability Measure.* Each participant completed the Wonderlic Personnel Test (2001) to assess his or her level of general mental ability. This 50-item test is timed and each participant has 12 minutes to finish as many questions as possible. The test is comprised of questions that measure general problem solving ability. An example item is '*Paper clips sell for 23 cents per box. How much would 4 boxes cost?*' The questions increase in difficulty as the test progresses. Participants receive 1 point for every correct answer. Items scores were

summed for a test score. Scores from this measure could range from 0 to 50. Reliability estimates of the Wonderlic Personnel Test range from .82 to .94 (Grubb, Whetzel, & McDaniel, 2004).

*Personality Measure.* To assess the participants' personality trait levels a test was created using 142 adjectives from Saucier and Ostendorf (1999). Adjectives were sorted into categories which mapped onto the Big Five personality dimensions of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness. Sample adjectives from this measure are '*sociable*', '*affectionate*', '*organized*', '*undemanding*', and '*intelligent*'. Trait scale reliability estimates (Cronbach's alpha) are as follows; extraversion  $\alpha = .80$ , agreeableness  $\alpha = .76$ , conscientiousness  $\alpha = .80$ , emotional stability  $\alpha = .73$ , openness  $\alpha = .77$  (Saucier & Ostendorf, 1999). See Appendix C for the complete measure. Participants were required to read each adjective and judge how much the word generally described him or her. A 9-point Likert-scale was used to make these judgments where 1 was indicative of a participant strongly disagreeing that the adjective is generally like him or her and 9 was indicative of a participant strongly agreeing that the adjective is generally like him or her. Scores for each Big Five dimension were calculated by adding up the rating for each item which represented that dimension. Scores for the traits of extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness could range from 32 to 288. Scores for the traits of emotional stability and openness could range from 24 to 216.

### *Criteria*

Behavioral ratings of socially effective behaviors were used as the criteria. By surveying past research on social effectiveness several items were developed which could be used to

measure socially effective behaviors that the participants might engage in. Acquaintances of the participants were solicited to make these ratings. Acquaintances were asked to read twelve statements which described socially effective behaviors. These items were rated used a 5-point Likert-scale where 1 was indicative of a behavior which was not characteristic of the participant and 5 being indicative of a behavior which is very characteristic of the participant. An example behavior is '*s/he sometimes seems oblivious to social demands.*' Appendix D includes the entire social effectiveness measure. Following this task, acquaintances rated each behavioral statement on how characteristic it was of the person they were asked to rate. These ratings were made on a 7-point Likert-scale with 1 indicating that the behavior is not characteristic of the person being rated and 7 indicating that the behavior is very characteristic of the person being rated. Scores were summed to obtain an overall social effectiveness score. Scores could range from 12 to 84.

### *Procedure*

Participants were tested in a group setting. Participants completed all materials at the same time during the session. Each participant was given a folder containing a consent form, the Wonderlic Personnel Test (2001), the adjectives measure of personality, and the social intelligence measure. Participants completed the measures in the aforementioned order. Upon completion of the measures participants supplied the researcher with contact information for three acquaintances. Specifically, participants were asked to provide contact information for a friend from college, a friend from his/her hometown, and a parent/guardian. The contact information was either an email or post address. Approximately one week after the participants completed the measures the acquaintances were contacted by the researcher via the contact address and asked to complete the behavioral ratings for social effectiveness. Acquaintances

with email addresses were provided a link to an online survey. Acquaintances with a post address were sent paper-and-pencil forms and supplied with a self-addressed stamped envelope for returning the completed information.

All participants received at least one rating from an acquaintance. Sixty-one percent of the participants received ratings from only one acquaintance. Thirty percent of the participants had ratings from two acquaintances. Nine percent of the participants had ratings from all three acquaintances. Thirty-one percent of the college friends who were contacted provided ratings. Forty-three percent of the home town friends who were contacted submitted ratings. Seventy-three percent of the parents/guardians who were contacted provided ratings.

### *Data Analysis*

In order to test the first set of hypotheses, investigating the construct validity of the social intelligence measure, correlations were calculated between social intelligence and general mental ability, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness. The differences in correlations were tested using a simple t-test.

The process for testing the second set of hypotheses was similar to the previous analyses. First correlations were calculated between the criterion of social effectiveness and the independent variables of social intelligence and general mental ability. These correlations were then tested for significant differences using z-tests.

## Results

Measurement statistics are reported in Table 1. The means and standard deviations of each measure are shown in the first two columns respectively. Correlations between each of the

measures are also reported in Table 1 below the diagonal while Cronbach's alpha for each instrument is reported on the diagonal.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistencies (Cronbach's alpha) and Intercorrelations of all Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Social Intelligence <sup>a</sup>	134.50	9.64	.60							
2 General Mental Ability <sup>b</sup>	25.15	5.46	.34	.79						
3 Extraversion <sup>c</sup>	210.68	30.81	-.03	-.07	.92					
4 Agreeableness <sup>c</sup>	221.62	24.92	.11	-.01	.23	.88				
5 Conscientiousness <sup>c</sup>	218.22	25.67	.05	-.03	.46	.49	.88			
6 Emotional Stability <sup>d</sup>	117.07	23.02	-.02	.05	.17	.30	.23	.85		
7 Openness <sup>d</sup>	144.33	18.16	.16	.20	.32	.34	.37	.14	.85	
8 Social Effectiveness <sup>e</sup>	60.44	7.30	.13	-.02	.25	.19	.19	.07	.19	.67

Note: *N* = 262. <sup>a</sup> scored from 0 to 172; <sup>b</sup> scored from 1 to 50; <sup>c</sup> scored from 32 to 288; <sup>d</sup> scored from 24 to 216. <sup>e</sup> scored from 12 to 84. All coefficients above .12 (two-tail), .10 (one-tail) are significant at *p* < .05; coefficients above .16 (two-tail), .14 (one-tail) are significant at *p* < .01; coefficients above .21 (two-tail), .19 (one-tail) are significant at *p* < .001. Approximately 61% of the participants received social effectiveness ratings from one acquaintance, 30% received ratings from two acquaintances, and 9% of the participants received ratings from three acquaintances.

Of interest are the alpha estimates for the instruments. Acceptable alpha levels of above .70 (Nunnally & Berstein, 1994) were found for the personality trait measures which ranged from .85 (emotional stability and openness) to .92 (extraversion) and for the measure of general mental ability with an alpha of .79. The smallest alpha levels were obtained by the measures created for the current study. For instance, the social intelligence measure had an alpha level of .60 and the measure of social effectiveness had an alpha level of .67.

The criterion of social effectiveness and its relationship with social intelligence was subjected to further analysis because of the heterogeneous nature of the acquaintances used for these ratings. Social effectiveness ratings were separated by acquaintance type and correlated with one another and with social intelligence (Table 2). Correlations are reported below the diagonal with internal consistencies (Cronbah's alpha) reported on the diagonal.

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistencies (Cronbach's alpha) and Intercorrelations of Social Intelligence with Social Effectiveness by Rater Type

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
1 Social Intelligence	134.50	9.64	.60			
2 Social Effectiveness <sup>a</sup>	62.62	10.42	.15 (82)	.86		
3 Social Effectiveness <sup>b</sup>	63.82	11.62	.10 (112)	.39*(36)	.88	
4 Social Effectiveness <sup>c</sup>	64.63	10.49	.09 (196)	.12 (50)	.06 (67)	.85

Note: *N* = 262. Social Intelligence was scored from 0 to 172. Social Effectiveness was scored from 12 to 84. <sup>a</sup> ratings of social effectiveness made by a college friend; <sup>b</sup> ratings of social effectiveness made by a home town friend; <sup>c</sup> ratings of social effectiveness made by a parent/guardian. \* indicates a significant correlation at the *p* < .05 level (two-tailed). Approximately 61% of the participants received social effectiveness ratings from one acquaintance, 30% received ratings from two acquaintances, and 9% of the participants received ratings from three acquaintances

In general, social effectiveness ratings had similar means and standard deviations across acquaintance type. Although parents/guardians tended to give slightly higher ratings (*M* = 64.63, *SD* = 10.49) compared to college friends (*M* = 62.62, *SD* = 10.42),  $t(276) = 1.46, p = .15$  or home town friends (*M* = 63.82, *SD* = 11.62),  $t(306) = .63, p = .53$  these were not significantly different. Ratings given by college friends had a higher correlation with social intelligence score ( $r = .15, p > .05$ ) compared to ratings provided by hometown friends ( $r = .10, p > .05$ ) or parents/guardians ( $r = .09, p > .05$ ). However, this correlation did not meet traditional levels of significance.

Social effectiveness correlations between different acquaintances show that there was little relationship between parents/guardians ratings and ratings provided by college friends ( $r = .12, p > .05$ ) or by home town friends ( $r = .06, p > .05$ ). However, social effectiveness ratings made by hometown friends correlated highly with ratings made by home town friends ( $r = .39, p < .05$ ). Due to these low correlations, and thus the unreliability in the observations, an agreement statistic (Cronbach's alpha) was calculated and used for correction of correlations ( $\alpha = .54$ ).

Due to the lower reliability estimate of the social intelligence and low agreement between raters of social effectiveness, corrected correlations between these two measures and the other variables are reported in Table 3. Overall, correcting for unreliability of these measures did not alter the significance of the correlation. One caveat to this general observation is the relationship between social intelligence and agreeableness. The correlation became significant and increased from .11 to .15.

Table 3. *Uncorrected and Corrected Correlations for Unreliability of the Social Intelligence Measure and Social Effectiveness Ratings*

Variable	Social Intelligence		Social Effectiveness	
	<i>r</i>	$\rho$	<i>r</i>	$\rho$
Social Intelligence	--	--	.13*	.23*
General Mental Ability	.34*	.49*	-.02	-.03
Extraversion	-.03	-.04	.25*	.35*
Agreeableness	.11	.15*	.19*	.28*
Conscientiousness	.05	.07	.19*	.28*
Emotional Stability	-.02	-.03	.07	.10
Openness	.16*	.22*	.19*	.28*

Note:  $N = 262$ .  $\rho$  is the correlation corrected for unreliability. Social intelligence correlations were corrected using  $\alpha = .60$ . Social effectiveness correlations were corrected using the rater agreement value of  $\alpha = .54$ .

\*  $p < .05$ .

### *Evidence of Construct Validity*

The uncorrected correlations reported in Table 3 give support for Hypothesis 1a and partial support for Hypothesis 1b. Scores on the social intelligence measure were positively related to scores on a general mental ability measure ( $r = .34, p < .001$ ). Corrected correlations for the unreliability in the social intelligence measure are also reported in Table 3. The correlation increased to .49 when unreliability in the social intelligence measure was corrected. Correlations between scores on the social intelligence measure and personality trait scores were

more variable and ranged from  $r = -.03, p > .05, ns$  (extraversion) to  $r = .16, p < .05$  (openness). Corrected correlations ranged from  $r = -.04, ns$  (extraversion) to  $r = .22, p < .05$  (openness).

In order to investigate Hypothesis 1c the correlations between the social intelligence test score and the other individual difference measures were compared using  $z$ -tests to test the differences for significance. Table 4 reports the results of these comparisons. In regards to Hypothesis 1c, the correlation between social intelligence test score and general mental ability score ( $r = .34$ ) was more positive and significantly different from the correlation between social intelligence test score and any one of the personality trait scores ( $-.03, .11, .05, -.02, .16$ ),  $ps < .001$ . Thus Hypothesis 1c was supported.

Table 4. *Difference Testing Between Social Intelligence Correlations*

Variable	$r_1$	$r_2$	Difference	$t$	$p$ value
Extraversion	-.03	-.07	.37	4.29	.00
Agreeableness	.11	-.01	.23	2.75	.00
Conscientiousness	.05	-.03	.29	3.42	.00
Emotional Stability	-.02	.05	.36	4.45	.00
Openness	.16	.20	.18	2.42	.01

Note:  $N = 262$ . The correlation between social intelligence and general mental ability was  $r = .34$ . Correlations reported in the  $r_1$  column are between the variable and social intelligence score. Correlations reported in the  $r_2$  column are between the variable and general mental ability score. Values in the difference column represent the difference between the correlation of social intelligence with general mental ability and the correlation of social intelligence with the row variable. Calculations used a two-tailed  $p$  value of .05.

### *Evidence of Criterion Validity*

In order to test the second set of hypotheses, which concern the relationship between ratings of social effectiveness with social intelligence and general mental ability, correlations were examined. These correlational relationships, both uncorrected and corrected for measurement unreliability, are reported in Table 3. Support was found for Hypothesis 2a. Ratings of social effectiveness were positively related to social intelligence ( $r_{uncorrected} = .13$ ;

$r_{corrected} = .23$ ). However, ratings of social intelligence were not positively related to general mental ability ( $r_{uncorrected} = -.02$ ;  $r_{corrected} = -.03$ ). Thus Hypothesis 2b was not supported

Correlations between social effectiveness ratings and social intelligence and general mental ability scores were compared using a z-test to test the difference of these correlations for significance. Table 5 reports the results of this comparison. Hypothesis 2c was supported. The correlation between social effectiveness ratings and social intelligence score ( $r = .13$ ) was greater than the correlation between social effectiveness and general mental ability ( $r = -.02$ ) and these correlations were significantly different from one another ( $p = .02$ ).

Table 5. *Difference Testing Between Social Effectiveness Correlations*

Variable	$r_1$	$r_2$	Difference	$t$	$p$ value
General Mental Ability	-.02	.34	.15	2.12	.02

Note:  $N = 262$ . The correlation between social intelligence and social effectiveness was .13. Correlations reported in the  $r_1$  column are between the variable and social effectiveness. Correlations reported in the  $r_2$  column are between the variable and social intelligence. Values in the difference column represent the difference between the correlation of social effectiveness and social intelligence and the correlation of social effectiveness with the row variable. Calculations used a two-tailed  $p$  value of .05.

## Discussion

In Study I the construct and criterion validity of the newly created measure of social intelligence was investigated. The initial set of hypotheses was primarily concerned with showing the relationships of the social intelligence measure with other individual difference instruments. Specifically hypothesized was that social intelligence would be positively related to both general mental ability and personality traits. In addition, the relationship between social intelligence and general mental ability will be greater than the relationship between social intelligence and the personality traits.

Results indicated that social intelligence significantly correlated with general mental ability. The relationships between social intelligence and the personality traits of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness were variable. Social intelligence was significantly and positively related to openness. Nevertheless, social intelligence was not significantly related to extraversion, conscientiousness, emotional ability, and agreeableness (although this relationship became significant after correction for unreliability in the social intelligence measure). Furthermore, the correlations between social intelligence and extraversion and emotional stability were negative. Finally, it was found that social intelligence scores correlated significantly more with scores on a general mental ability test than with personality trait scores. These results support the current research's construct definition that social intelligence is a facet of intelligence and not a behavioral trait.

The ramifications of these results exert the most influence on the way social intelligence should be measured. Social intelligence should be measured in the same way that other intelligences are measured, by using a performance based test. Early assessments of social

intelligence took this position and used performance based tests to measure the construct. In later years, researchers moved to the more self-report based methods similar to personality assessment. The current results call into question the practice of measuring social intelligence using these self-report measures. Individuals may not be able to accurately assess their own level of social intelligence and report it truthfully. Using a performance-based test will resolve this issue.

In addition to the investigation of the construct validity of the test of social intelligence a preliminary analysis of its criterion validity was also performed. This analysis employed acquaintance rated social effectiveness as the criterion of interest. It was hypothesized that both social intelligence and general mental ability would be positively correlated with social effectiveness ratings but that social intelligence would have a greater relationship.

Results indicated that an individual's social intelligence score was significantly and positively related to ratings of social effectiveness. However, general mental ability was not positively related to social effectiveness. This relationship was negative and nonsignificant. The difference in correlations between social effectiveness and social intelligence and general mental was significant. Social intelligence did, in fact, have a greater relationship with social effectiveness than did general mental ability.

These results are promising in that an individual's social intelligence score, not general mental ability, was related to how well that individual generally behaved in social situations. It seems that an individual who has the knowledge of *how* to act in social situations, as measured by the social intelligence instrument, really does translate that knowledge into behaviors. These behaviors are then recognized as socially effective by others and can be evaluated.

## CHAPTER IV

### STUDY II

#### Method

##### *Participants*

Students ( $N = 57$ ) taking part in an assessment center in a Midwestern university completed assessments as part of their course obligations. Mean age of the sample was 34 years. Over half of the sample was white (59%) and female (59%). Year in school ranged from 59% freshmen, 24% sophomores, and 16% juniors.

##### *Materials*

*Social Intelligence Measure.* Participants completed the social intelligence measure designed by the researchers. This social intelligence measure is in a situational judgment test format. Participants were presented with 41 situations which are common in a work environment (see Appendix A for the complete measure). An example situation is *'Paul just shouted at a very important client over the telephone, and everyone in the office heard it. As his manager, Pam asks what's going on, and Paul says he would rather not talk about it. If you were Pam, what should you do?'* Each situation is followed by four behavioral responses. For instance, the four behavioral response choices for the example situation are; *'Give Paul some space and time to calm down, then address the phone conversation.'*, *'Let Paul know that his behavior is not appropriate, he will most likely not do it again.'*, *'Keep asking Paul about the phone conversation until he tells you what happened.'*, *'Leave Paul alone, he will tell you what happened when he is ready.'* Participants were required to make two judgments for each

situation. They must choose the behavioral response which is most effective in that situation and which behavioral response is the least effective. Scores for these two judgments were summed for each situation and situation scores are summed for an overall score.

*Personality Measure.* Each respondent completed the Mini-IPIP measure of personality (Donnellan et al., 2006). This is a 20-item measure of the Big 5 personality dimensions. There are four items measuring each of the 5 dimensions. A sample item from this measure is '*I feel others' emotions*' (see Appendix E for the complete measure). Participants were asked to read each of the 20 statements and indicate their level of agreement using a 7-point Likert-scale where 1 indicated that the participant disagreed with the item and 7 indicated that the participant agreed with the item. Scale reliabilities range from .65 to .77 (Donnellan et al., 2006). Scores for each of the five factor dimensions were calculated by summing the ratings for each individual item. Scores could range from to 28.

### *Criteria*

*Social Effectiveness Ratings.* As an additional criterion, trained evaluators made social effectiveness ratings. After observing participant performance in the assessment center exercises, three evaluators rated the participants' behavior on twelve social effectiveness items. Examples of these items include '*knows the right social rules to get ahead*' and '*seems to understand what others expect from him/her.*' Appendix D includes the entire social effectiveness measure. Evaluators used a 5-point Likert-scale to make ratings where 1 was indicative of a behavior which was not characteristic of the participant and 5 being indicative of a behavior which is very characteristic of the participant. Ratings made by all 3 raters were summed and averaged to give an overall social effectiveness score.

*Assessment Center Performance.* Participants were required to take part in an assessment center for course credit. The assessment center consisted of several activities which are rated for performance by trained reviewers. Each activity is associated with a unique combination of performance dimensions (see Appendix G for exercise/dimension combinations). The activities of the assessment center include; presentation, leaderless group discussion, client role play, coaching role play, supervisory role play (see Appendix I for exercise descriptions). The performance dimensions for the assessment center include; critical thinking, financial impact analysis, interpersonal communication, presentation skills, teamwork, conflict management, customer relations, leadership, delegation, coaching, ethics, and diversity awareness (see Appendix H for performance dimension descriptions). A score for overall assessment center performance was derived by summing and averaging the performance scores for each of the individual exercises.

An example of the assessment center format can be demonstrated using the presentation exercise. In this exercise the participant it required to use information about a problem to come up with a cost-effective solution and then formally present his/her ideas to a “supervisor”. During this presentation the performance dimensions of *critical thinking, interpersonal communication, presenting skills, leadership* and *coaching* are assessed. In order to measure the critical thinking dimension, raters need to make judgments on how well each participant ‘*identifies key issues*’, ‘*gathers information*’, ‘*identifies/analyzes options*’, and ‘*appropriately handles the situation*’. The interpersonal communication dimensions is evidenced by ‘*effectively expressing ideas*’, ‘*demonstrating an interest in others*’, ‘*focusing on discussing the problem*’, and ‘*displaying effective non-verbal communication*’. The presentation dimension includes

items such as *'presents information in a logical sequence'*, *'demonstrates knowledge of the topic'*, *'demonstrates effective presentation skills'*, and *'effectively uses computer program to design and deliver the presentation'*. The performance dimension of leadership is assessed by the level at which the participant *'provides guidance to the group in completing the task'*, *'appears confident during the interaction'*, *'demonstrates flexibility'*, and *'provides positive feedback to others'*. Finally, the coaching dimension includes the items of *'identifies the need to coach employees through a performance issue'*, *'assist the employee in realizing that a problem exists'*, *'explain that poor performance will not be tolerated'*, and *'assist the employee in exploring options for correcting the problem, but does not force any particular approach'*.

### *Procedure*

Students enrolled in an introductory career exploration course were required to participate in the assessment center as part of their course load. The assessment center is comprised of 5 different exercises; presentation, supervisory role play, coaching role play, client role play, and leaderless group discussion. In the presentation, students must create and give a presentation to a small audience about a work unit's attendance problems and possible solutions to this problem. The supervisory role play asks students to act as a manager and touch base with an employee you have entrusted with the job of designing an elegant fundraiser. During the coaching role play the student is a manager who must confront an employee about her recent performance and attendance issues. The client role play assigns the student to manage conflict with an angry customer. The final exercise is a leaderless group discussion where 5 to 6 students serve on a grievance committee and try to address several different workplace issues.

Each exercise measures a unique combination of five competencies. The presentation exercise measures the competencies of critical thinking, financial impact analysis, interpersonal communication, presentation, and leadership. The competencies assessed in the supervisory exercise include; critical thinking, interpersonal communication, teamwork, delegation, and coaching. During the coaching exercise the competencies of critical thinking, interpersonal communication, leadership, coaching, and cultural diversity are assessed. The client exercise includes the competencies of critical thinking, interpersonal communication, conflict management, customer relations, and ethics. Finally, in the leaderless group the competencies of critical thinking, interpersonal communication, teamwork, conflict management, and leadership are evaluated.

The performance of each student within these exercises was videotaped and later evaluated by trained raters. These rating require each rater to provide behaviorally based judgments which reflect success in the competencies assessed in each exercise. Each competency is rated on a 0 to 12 scale with 0 indicating that the individual did not engage in any of the behaviors which illustrated this competency and 12 indicating that the individual engaged in all of the behaviors which illustrated this competency. Exercise ratings were summed to create an overall assessment center score.

In addition to assessment center performance ratings, judgments of participants' social effectiveness within the assessment center exercises were made. A separate set of raters, independent of the raters used to make performance ratings, were used to make these evaluations. These behavior ratings were completed once the rater had observed the subject's performance in all of the exercises included in the assessment center. Behaviors which measured

social effectiveness were rated on a 1 to 5 Likert-scale with 1 indicating that the behavior was not at all characteristic of the subject and 5 indicating that the behavior was very characteristic of the subject. These ratings were summed to create an overall social effectiveness score.

Students enrolled in the introductory career development class were also required to complete the social intelligence test and a personality measure as part of a class assignment. These measures were made available to the students in an online format. All students indicated their consent to allow their information to be used for research purposes.

### *Data Analysis*

In order to test the hypothesis that socially effective behaviors mediate the relationship between social intelligence and successful performance in interpersonally demanding situations a set of regression equations were computed following recommendations of Baron and Kenny (1986). For these equations assessment center performance is used as the operationalization of performance in interpersonally demanding situations. The first equation regresses assessment center performance on social intelligence scores. The second equation will regress socially effective behaviors on social intelligence. The third equation will regress socially effective behaviors on assessment center performance. These equations were calculated to give evidence of a relationship between all three variables.

The final regression equation is hierarchical in nature. In the first step, assessment center performance is regressed on socially effective behaviors. On the second step, assessment center performance is regressed on social intelligence while controlling for socially effective behaviors. If the  $\beta$  coefficient between social intelligence and assessment center performance is rendered nonsignificant there is evidence of socially effective behaviors fully mediating their relationship.

If the relationship between social intelligence and assessment center performance is merely reduced then there is evidence of partial mediation. The significance of the indirect effect of the mediator was tested using Sobel's test.

To determine if an individual's level of extraversion moderates the relationship between social intelligence and socially effective behaviors a hierarchical regression was conducted. Prior to this test of moderation, simple regressions were conducted between extraversion and socially effective behaviors and between social intelligence and socially effective behaviors. These simple regressions were computed to determine if the independent variables of social intelligence and extraversion were related to socially effective behaviors. Significant relationships were indicated by significant  $\beta$  coefficients.

The hierarchical regression proceeded in two steps. On the first step socially effective behaviors were regressed on social intelligence and extraversion. On the second step the interaction term of social intelligence $\times$ extraversion was entered. A significant  $\beta$  for the interaction term indicates whether the relationship between social intelligence and socially effective behaviors is moderated by extraversion.

## Results

Study II investigated the predictive properties of the newly created social intelligence measure. As a preliminary step to the main analysis basic measurement properties were calculated for the instruments used and are reported in Table 6. The means and standard deviations of each measure are shown in the first two columns respectively. Correlations between each of the instruments are reported below the diagonal while Cronbach's alpha for each instrument is reported on the diagonal.

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistencies (Cronbach's alpha) and Intercorrelations of all Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Social Intelligence <sup>a</sup>	124.00	19.57	.87							
2 Extraversion <sup>b</sup>	20.44	4.90	.01	.79						
3 Agreeableness <sup>b</sup>	22.21	3.68	.38	.27	.57					
4 Conscientiousness <sup>b</sup>	20.21	4.89	.40	.03	.52	.64				
5 Neuroticism <sup>b</sup>	13.58	5.02	-.24	-.20	-.17	-.43	.71			
6 Openness <sup>b</sup>	20.07	4.47	.35	.12	.39	.25	-.16	.60		
7 Social Effectiveness <sup>c</sup>	114.54	23.73	.38	.23	.16	.29	-.03	.20	.93	
8 Performance <sup>d</sup>	151.79	24.65	.36	.12	-.13	.11	.11	.02	.66	.67

Note: *N* = 57. <sup>a</sup> scored from 0 to 172; <sup>b</sup> scored from 4 to 28; <sup>c</sup> scored from 36 to 180; <sup>d</sup> scored from 0 to 300. All coefficients above .26 (two tailed), .22 (one tailed) are significant at *p* < .05; coefficients above .33 (two tailed), .30 (one tailed) are significant at *p* < .01; coefficients above .42 (two tailed), .40 (one tailed) are significant at *p* < .001.

The relationships of social intelligence with the other individual difference variables are, in general, positive and significant. Agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness are all positively and significantly related to social intelligence ( $r = .38, p < .01$ ;  $r = .40, p < .01$ ;  $r = .35, p < .01$ , respectively). Neuroticism and extraversion are exceptions. Neuroticism is negatively related to social intelligence ( $r = -.24, ns$ ). This relationship is barely nonsignificant when using a two-tailed significance test. If a one-tailed test is used the relationship is significant at the  $p = .05$  level. Extraversion shows almost no relationship with social intelligence ( $r = .01$ ).

When considering the dependent variables of assessment center performance and social effectiveness some encouraging results emerge (Table 7). For instance, social intelligence is significantly and positively related to ratings of social effectiveness ( $r = .38, p < .01$ ) and to assessment center performance ( $r = .36, p < .01$ ). Social effectiveness is also significantly related to assessment center performance ( $r = .66, p < .001$ ). Finally, conscientiousness was significantly related to ratings of social effectiveness ( $r = .29, p < .05$ ).

Table 7. *Correlations and Internal Consistencies (Cronbach's alpha) of Social Intelligence and Social Effectiveness with Assessment Center Dimension Performance*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1 Social Intelligence <sup>a</sup>	.87													
2 Social Effectiveness <sup>b</sup>	.38	.93												
2 Critical Thinking <sup>c</sup>	.24	.47	.78											
3 Interpersonal Communication <sup>c</sup>	.37	.61	.53	.40										
4 Teamwork <sup>d</sup>	.14	.16	.40	.16	.76									
5 Financial Impact Analysis <sup>e</sup>	-.13	.11	-.02	.10	-.13	.43								
6 Presentation Skills <sup>e</sup>	-.04	.15	.17	.15	-.04	.31	.40							
7 Conflict Management <sup>d</sup>	.33	.36	.69	.37	.45	-.06	.03	.73						
8 Customer Relations <sup>e</sup>	.13	.43	.67	.56	.34	.09	.07	.67	.76					
9 Leadership Abilities <sup>f</sup>	.13	.61	.52	.39	.18	.10	.03	.39	.37	.68				
10 Ability to Delegate <sup>e</sup>	.24	.17	.12	.09	.10	.04	-.10	.13	.17	.13	.75			
11 Coaching Skills <sup>d</sup>	.40	.46	.56	.54	.18	.06	.00	.37	.48	.46	.46	.80		
12 Ethical Consideration <sup>e</sup>	.17	.38	.54	.51	.21	.11	.22	.34	.59	.31	.13	.53	.78	
13 Diversity Awareness <sup>e</sup>	.10	.16	.14	.11	.02	.03	-.14	.00	-.03	.08	-.04	.02	-.11	.76

Note:  $N = 57$ . <sup>a</sup> scored from 0 to 172; <sup>b</sup> scored from 0 to 36; <sup>c</sup> scored from 0 to 60; <sup>d</sup> scored from 0 to 24; <sup>e</sup> scored from 0 to 12; <sup>f</sup> scored from 0 to 36. All coefficients above .27 (two tailed), .22 (one tailed) are significant at  $p < .05$ ; coefficients above .34 (two tailed), .31 (one tailed) are significant at  $p < .01$ ; coefficients above .43 (two tailed), .41 (one tailed) are significant at  $p < .001$ . Internal consistencies (Cronbach's alpha) for each dimension were averaged to create an overall internal consistency estimate for assessment center performance.

Reliability estimates of the measurement instruments ranged from .57 (agreeableness) to .93 (social effectiveness). The largest alphas were obtained for social effectiveness ratings ( $\alpha = .93$ ), the social intelligence measure ( $\alpha = .87$ ), extraversion ( $\alpha = .79$ ), and neuroticism ( $\alpha = .71$ ). Smaller alpha levels were obtained by assessment center performance ( $\alpha = .67$ ), conscientiousness ( $\alpha = .64$ ), openness ( $\alpha = .60$ ), and agreeableness ( $\alpha = .57$ ).

Assessment center performance was submitted to further analysis. Overall performance was separated into the twelve individual skill dimensions that were assessed. Correlations between social intelligence, social effectiveness and the skill dimensions, as well as internal consistencies of the items used to evaluate the dimensions, are reported in Table 8. Correlations are shown below the diagonal and internal consistencies are shown on the diagonal.

Social effectiveness showed positive relationships with all assessment center performance dimensions. The highest relationships were with interpersonal communication ( $r = .61, p < .001$ ), leadership abilities ( $r = .61, p < .001$ ), critical thinking ( $r = .47, p < .001$ ), coaching skills ( $r = .46, p < .001$ ), customer relations ( $r = .43, p < .01$ ), ethical consideration ( $r = .38, p < .01$ ), and conflict management ( $r = .36, p < .01$ ). Social effectiveness showed the lowest relationships with financial impact analysis ( $r = .11, ns$ ), presentations skills ( $r = .15, ns$ ), and diversity awareness ( $r = .16, ns$ ).

In general, social intelligence showed positive relationships with the performance dimensions. However, negative relationships existed between social intelligence with financial impact analysis ( $r = -.13, ns$ ) and presentation skills ( $r = -.04, ns$ ). Social intelligence showed the highest correlations with the dimensions of coaching skills ( $r = .40, p < .001$ ), interpersonal communication ( $r = .37, p < .01$ ), and conflict management ( $r = .33, p < .05$ ). The lowest

relationships were found with diversity awareness ( $r = .10, ns$ ), customer relations ( $r = .13, ns$ ), leadership abilities ( $r = .13, ns$ ), and teamwork ( $r = .14, ns$ ).

Internal reliability estimates ranged from  $\alpha = .40$  (financial impact analysis) to  $\alpha = .80$  (coaching and teamwork). The highest reliability estimates were found for the dimensions of coaching ( $\alpha = .80$ ), critical thinking ( $\alpha = .78$ ), ethical consideration ( $\alpha = .78$ ), customer relations ( $\alpha = .76$ ), and interpersonal communication ( $\alpha = .76$ ). Financial impact analysis, teamwork, presentation skills, and leadership abilities have the lowest reliabilities ( $\alpha = .40, \alpha = .40, \alpha = .43, \alpha = .68$ , respectively).

#### *Mediation of the Social Intelligence Performance Relationship*

The relationship between social intelligence and assessment center performance may be affected by that individual's level of social effectiveness. That is, an individual's level of social intelligence can only be translated into performance if that person behaves in a socially effective manner. Correlational evidence lends preliminary support to this Hypothesis 3 (Table 6). There are significant relationships between social intelligence and assessment center performance ( $r = .36, p < .01$ ), between social intelligence and social effectiveness ratings ( $r = .38, p < .01$ ), and between social effectiveness ratings and assessment center performance ( $r = .66, p < .001$ ). Significant correlations between these three variables are the initial conditions which need to be met in order to formally investigate Hypothesis 3.

In step 1 of the mediation model, the regression of assessment center performance on social intelligence, ignoring social effectiveness ratings, was significant  $b = .46, t(56) = 2.89, p = .01$ . Step 2 of the analysis revealed that social intelligence was a significant predictor of social effectiveness ratings  $b = .47, t(56) = 3.08, p < .05$ . Step 3 showed that the regression of

assessment center performance on ratings of social effectiveness, controlling for social intelligence, was also significant  $b = .63$ ,  $t(56) = 5.50$ ,  $p < .05$ . Finally, step 4 showed that social intelligence was not a significant predictor of assessment center performance when controlling for the effects of social effectiveness ratings  $b = .17$ ,  $t(56) = 1.20$ ,  $p = .24$ . The standardized regression coefficient and significance level between social intelligence and assessment center performance decreased from  $\beta = .36$ ,  $p = .01$  to  $\beta = .14$ ,  $p = .24$  (Table 8). Thus Hypothesis 3 was supported; ratings of social effectiveness do mediate the relationship between social intelligence and assessment center performance.

Table 8. *Mediator Effects of Social Effectiveness on the Relationship of Social Intelligence and Assessment Center Performance*

	$b$	$\beta$	SE	$t$	$p$ -value
IV $\rightarrow$ DV	.46	.36	.16	2.89	.01
IV $\rightarrow$ MED	.47	.38	.15	3.08	.00
MED $\rightarrow$ DV	.63	.61	.11	5.50	.00
IV $\rightarrow$ DV (MED)	.17	.14	.13	1.20	.24

Note. Sample size  $N = 57$ . In the analysis social intelligence test score was used as the IV, other rated social effectiveness was used as the mediator, and performance in all assessment center dimensions is used as the DV. Sobel statistic = 2.74,  $p < .01$ .

#### *Post hoc Mediation Analyses*

Post hoc analyses were conducted to further elucidate the role of social effectiveness in the social intelligence-assessment center performance relationship. The primary concern was to observe whether or not social effectiveness acted as a full mediator when other dependent variables were used. Each of the dependent variables chosen had differing degrees of

interpersonal interaction. Three additional analysis were conducted each representing high, medium, or low levels of interpersonal interaction.

The first analysis investigated how social effectiveness affects the relationship between social intelligence and performance in the interpersonal communication dimension. This outcome variable represented the ‘high’ level of interpersonal interaction. The second analysis examined the role of social effectiveness ratings in the relationship between social intelligence and performance in all other assessment center dimensions that are not interpersonal communication (i.e., critical thinking, financial impact analysis, presentations skills, teamwork, conflict management, customer relations, leadership, delegation, coaching, ethics, and diversity awareness). This analysis represented the ‘medium’ level if interpersonal interaction. Finally, the third analysis used the critical thinking dimension as the outcome to represent the lowest level of interpersonal interaction.

All variables were chosen because they exhibited significant relationships with social intelligence and social effectiveness (Table 8). Social intelligence correlated with the interpersonal communication dimension  $r = .37, p < .01$ , two-tailed, with the combination of non-interpersonal communication dimensions  $r = .32, p < .05$ , two-tailed, and with the critical thinking dimension  $r = .24, p < .05$ , one-tailed. Social effectiveness correlated with the interpersonal communication dimension  $r = .61, p < .001$ , two-tailed, with the combination of non-interpersonal communication dimensions  $r = .61, p < .001$ , two-tailed, and with the critical thinking dimension  $r = .47, p < .001$ , two-tailed.

In step 1 of the mediation model where performance in the interpersonal communication dimension is the dependent variable, the regression of interpersonal communication on social

intelligence, ignoring social effectiveness ratings, was significant  $b = .11$ ,  $t(56) = 2.99$ ,  $p < .05$ . Step 2 of this analysis revealed that social intelligence was a significant predictor of social effectiveness ratings  $b = .47$ ,  $t(56) = 3.08$ ,  $p < .05$ . Step 3 showed that the regression of interpersonal communication on ratings of social effectiveness, controlling for social intelligence, was also significant  $b = .47$ ,  $t(56) = 4.78$ ,  $p < .05$ . Finally, step 4 showed that social intelligence was not a significant predictor of assessment center performance when controlling for the effects of social effectiveness ratings  $b = .05$ ,  $t(56) = 1.43$ ,  $p = .16$ . The standardized regression coefficient and significance level between social intelligence and performance in the interpersonal communication dimension decreased from  $\beta = .37$ ,  $p < .05$  to  $\beta = .16$ ,  $p = .16$  (Table 9). When performance in the interpersonal communication dimension is used as the outcome, social effectiveness acts as a full mediator.

If the outcome consisting of a combination of non-interpersonal communication assessment center dimensions is used in an mediation analysis results emerge which are similar to the previous mediation analyses. In step 1 of the mediation model, the regression of non-interpersonal communication dimensions on social intelligence, ignoring social effectiveness ratings, was significant  $b = .32$ ,  $t(56) = 2.50$ ,  $p = .02$ . Step 2 of the analysis revealed that social intelligence was a significant predictor of social effectiveness ratings  $b = .47$ ,  $t(56) = 3.08$ ,  $p < .05$ . Step 3 showed that the regression of non-interpersonal communication dimensions on ratings of social effectiveness, controlling for social intelligence, was also significant  $b = .48$ ,  $t(56) = 4.92$ ,  $p < .05$ . Finally, step 4 showed that social intelligence was not a significant predictor of assessment center performance when controlling for the effects of social effectiveness ratings  $b = .10$ ,  $t(56) = .87$ ,  $p = .39$ . The standardized regression coefficient and

significance level between social intelligence and assessment center performance decreased from  $\beta = .32, p=.02$  to  $\beta = .12, p=.39$  (Table 9). As with the previous mediation analysis, social effectiveness acts as a full mediator in this relationship.

Finally, mediation analysis using performance in the critical thinking dimension as the outcome gave further evidence the social effectiveness is a full mediator. In step 1 of the mediation model, the regression of the critical thinking dimensions on social intelligence, ignoring social effectiveness ratings, was significant  $b = .07, t(56) = 1.86, p =.03$ . Step 2 of the analysis revealed that social intelligence was a significant predictor of social effectiveness ratings  $b = .47, t(56) = 3.08, p < .05$ . Step 3 showed that the regression of non-interpersonal communication dimensions on ratings of social effectiveness, controlling for social intelligence, was also significant  $b = .10, t(56) = 3.42, p < .05$ . Finally, step 4 showed that social intelligence was not a significant predictor of assessment center performance when controlling for the effects of social effectiveness ratings  $b = .02, t(56) = .57, p =.34$ . The standardized regression coefficient and significance level between social intelligence and assessment center performance decreased from  $\beta = .24, p=.03$  to  $\beta = .07, p=.34$  (Table 9).

Table 9. Mediator Effects of Social Effectiveness on the Relationship of Social Intelligence and Assessment Center Dimension Performance

	<i>Interpersonal Communication Dimension<sup>a</sup></i>					<i>Non-Interpersonal Communication Dimensions<sup>b</sup></i>					<i>Critical Thinking Dimension<sup>c</sup></i>				
	<i>b</i>	$\beta$	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	$\beta$	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	$\beta$	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
IV → DV	.11	.37	.04	2.99	.00	.32	.32	.13	2.50	.02	.07	.24	.04	1.86	.03
IV → MED	.47	.38	.15	3.08	.00	.47	.38	.15	3.08	.00	.47	.38	.15	3.08	.00
MED → DV	.13	.55	.03	4.78	.00	.48	.57	.10	4.92	.00	.10	.44	.03	3.42	.00
IV → DV (MED)	.05	.16	.03	1.43	.16	.10	.10	.12	.87	.39	.02	.07	.04	.57	.34

Note. Sample size N = 57. In all analyses social intelligence was used as the IV and social effectiveness was used as the mediator. <sup>a</sup> indicates that performance in the interpersonal communication dimension was used as the DV. Sobel statistic = 2.54,  $p < .05$ . <sup>b</sup> indicates that performance in assessment center dimensions *other than* interpersonal communication was used as the DV. Sobel statistic = 2.62,  $p < .01$ . <sup>c</sup> indicates that performance in the critical thinking dimension was used as DV. Sobel statistic = 2.28,  $p < .05$ . Critical thinking dimension mediation analyses used a  $p$ -value of .05 (one-tail).

### *Moderation of the Social Intelligence-Social Effectiveness Relationship*

In order to investigate the possible moderating influence of extraversion on the relationship between social intelligence and social effectiveness a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted. The overall model was nonsignificant,  $R^2 = .04$ ,  $F(2, 54) = 5.50$ ,  $p = .10$  (Table 10). Thus, Hypothesis 4 is not supported.

In the first step, two variables were included in the regression equation: social intelligence and extraversion. These variables accounted for a significant amount of variance in social effectiveness ratings  $R^2 = .20$ ,  $F(2, 54) = 6.67$ ,  $p = .00$ . However, when inspecting each variable individually, social intelligence was the only IV to show significant prediction of social effectiveness ratings  $b = 0.46$ ,  $t(56) = 3.13$ ,  $p = .00$ . Extraversion was not a significant predictor of social effectiveness  $b = 1.10$ ,  $t(56) = 1.86$ ,  $p = .07$ . Although, this result only just missed the traditional significance level of  $p = .05$ .

On the second, and final, step the interaction term combining social intelligence and extraversion was added to the model. This interaction term did not account for a significant proportion of the variance in social effectiveness ratings  $\Delta R^2 = .04$ ,  $\Delta F(1, 53) = 2.73$ ,  $p = .10$ ,  $b = .05$ ,  $t(56) = 1.62$ ,  $p = .10$ . Using the traditional significance value of  $p = .05$  renders the result nonsignificant but using a more lenient, but still accepted, significance statistic of  $p = .10$  then the interaction term would have explained a significant amount of variance and Hypothesis 4 would have been supported.

Table 10. *Moderating Effects of Extraversion Level on the Relationship Between Social Intelligence and Social Effectiveness*

		<i>b</i>	SE	$\beta$	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	$\Delta R^2$	$\Delta F$	<i>p</i>
Step	Variable										
1	Social Intelligence	.46	.15	.38	3.13	.00					
	Extraversion	1.10	.59	.23	1.86	.07	.445	.198	.198	6.67	.00
2	Social Intelligence	.54	.15	.45	3.55	.40					
	Extraversion	1.02	.58	.21	1.75	.18					
	Social Intelligence X Extraversion	.05	.03	.21	1.62	.10	.487	.237	.039	2.73	.10

*Note.* Sample size N =57. The regression coefficients of the final step are reported.  $\beta$  = the standardized regression coefficient. *R*<sup>2</sup> = the proportion of variance in the dependent variable accounted for.  $\Delta R^2$  = change in the proportion of variance due to added predictor variables.

## Discussion

The main purpose of Study II was to investigate the relational properties of the test of social intelligence with performance in interpersonally demanding situations contained in a developmental assessment center. Results indicate that a person's social intelligence level is significantly and positively related ratings of socially effective behavior. That is, as person's level of social intelligence increases it is more likely that he or she will engage in behaviors which are seen as more effective in social situations. In turn, these socially effective behaviors exert influence on performance in interpersonal assessment center exercises.

To further understand how the link between social intelligence and assessment center performance operates both mediation and moderation analyses were conducted. The mediation analysis of the social intelligence-performance relationship was supported. The proposed mediator variable of other-rated social effectiveness fully mediated the aforementioned relationship.

Additional mediation analyses using performance dimensions which had significant relationships with social intelligence but had varying degrees of interpersonal inaction were chosen for these additional calculations. When using the interpersonal communication dimension, a combination of non-interpersonal communication dimensions, and the critical thinking dimension as dependent variables the same pattern of results emerged; ratings of social effectiveness fully mediated the relationship between the outcome variables and social intelligence.

The current research sees the underlying social knowledge that an individual possess as most important. But this knowledge alone is not enough to influence performance in

interpersonal situations. This knowledge may need to work through a behavioral variable in order to lead to effective performance in interpersonal situations. It seems as though a more general evaluation of an individual's adroitness in social situations, social effectiveness, is the vehicle which translates social knowledge into performance in specific social situations.

The additional post hoc mediation analyses were conducted to clarify the role of social effectiveness as a mediating variable. Social effectiveness acted as a full mediator in outcomes regardless of how saturated with interpersonal interaction the outcome was. This is not a surprising finding when looking at the individual items used to evaluate performance in the less saturated dimensions. For instance, some items used for evaluating the critical thinking dimensions include gathering information and identifying issues that need to be addressed. On the surface these items do not look like they would be interpersonal in nature, however, when the participant needs to gather information from another individual knowing how interact successfully to obtain the needed data is important. Thus, social intelligence and social effectiveness would influence performance in this dimension.

Unfortunately the dimensions which were least saturated with interpersonal interaction were not significantly related to social intelligence, hence mediation analysis could not be conducted. Financial impact analysis, which concerns appropriate data collection, calculation and integration, would have been ideal choice. However, the lack of a significant relationship with social intelligence lends support that social intelligence should, and does, only influence performance in those exercises/dimensions which have an interpersonal component.

Another issue which makes the mediation analysis incomplete is the absence of general mental ability information for participants. Due to administration aspects of the assessment

center a measure of this construct was deemed unsuitable to distribute. This lack of information makes understanding the exact relationship between social intelligence and assessment center performance impossible. It is not clear if social intelligence and general mental ability affect assessment center performance in the same fashion. It would be desirable to know if both variables show a similar pattern of relationships with the performance dimensions. The current study shows that social intelligence has to work through a behavioral variable in order to exert influence on assessment center performance. General mental ability may also have to work through a behavioral variable. Additional research with general mental ability data is needed.

The moderation analysis, which used an individual's level of extraversion as the moderator in the social intelligence-social effectiveness relationship, was not supported. Results indicate that although social intelligence and extraversion are individually related to social effectiveness they do not combine to add incremental prediction. Thus, two individuals can be deemed equally socially effective if one has a high level of social intelligence but a low level of extraversion and the other has a low level of social intelligence but a high level of extraversion.

In the current study extraversion and social intelligence were both related to ratings of social effectiveness. While these two variables may indeed reflect social effectiveness there may also be an effect of situational characteristics and strength. It may be that extraversion and social intelligence level will provide similar prediction when the situations used for evaluation put a strong emphasis on leadership, confidence, and communication. Extraverts are naturally strong in these areas, thus will be evaluated favorably when in these types of skills are called for in a situation.

The results found in the current study, that social intelligence and extraversion are related to social effectiveness, may not hold when a more extraverted skill set is not called for.

Different personality traits may emerge as significantly related to social effectiveness depending on the skills needed in a particular situation. Thus, extraversion may not always be significantly related to ratings of social effectiveness. However, because social knowledge will always be relevant, social intelligence should always emerge as related to ratings of social effectiveness.

The interaction term in the moderation analysis being nonsignificant may be a result of the individual items used to measure the construct. The items included in the current extraversion scale seem to inappropriately sample the entire domain universe. The domain of extraversion includes the facets of friendliness, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity-level, excitement-seeking, and cheerfulness (Costa & McCrae, 1992). However, the items included in the current measure seem to measure gregariousness and, to some extent, friendliness.

Specifically, the items are; *'I am the life of the party.'*, *'I don't talk a lot.'*, *'I talk to a lot of people at parties.'*, and *'I keep in the background.'* By neglecting these other facets it leads to a misrepresentation of the dimension as a whole. For instance, it could be that the assertiveness portion of extraversion moderates the relationship between social intelligence and social effectiveness. But, because the current measure is missing items which sample this facet this cannot be tested. Additional research should include a more complete personality measure; one which measures all facets of each domain.

## CHAPTER V

### GENERAL DISCUSSION

The focus of the present research was to create a performance-based measure of social intelligence which could be used to predict performance in interpersonally demanding situations. The ultimate goal is to possess a valid measure which can be used to select job applicants. The current measure was created using a situational judgment test format in order to present participants with rich social situations which would mirror situations applicants may be presented with on the job, while still maintaining ease of administration with a paper-and-pencil based test.

Study I evaluated the construct and criterion-related validity of the social intelligence measure. In order to investigate the construct validity of the measure, correlational relationships were investigated between the social intelligence measure, a measure of general mental ability, and personality trait measures of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness. Relationships of social intelligence and general mental ability with the outcome measure of social effectiveness ratings were examined in order to give evidence of criterion-related validity.

Results from the construct validation indicated that social intelligence is significantly more related to general mental ability than to any of the Big 5 personality traits. The correlational relationship of social intelligence with general mental ability was significantly different than the correlational relationships of social intelligence with the individual personality traits. In addition, social intelligence and general mental ability generally showed similar correlational relationships with the Big 5 personality traits. Both social intelligence and general

mental ability had small correlations with extraversion, conscientiousness, and emotional stability. Openness significantly related to both variables.

The criterion validity portion of Study I showed that general mental ability and social intelligence were differentially related to the social effectiveness outcome. Although social intelligence and general mental ability were significantly related to one another, only social intelligence was significantly related to ratings of social effectiveness. When testing the difference in the correlations between social effectiveness and social intelligence and general mental ability the result was significant; social intelligence had a higher and more positive relationship with social effectiveness than did general mental ability.

Study II further explored the predictive properties of the social intelligence measure. In this study the outcome of interest was performance in assessment center exercises which presented participants with interpersonally demanding work simulations. The role of social effectiveness ratings as a mediator between social intelligence and assessment center performance was investigated. Post hoc analyses varied the dependent variable used to determine the limitations, if any, of the mediated relationship. Furthermore, the possibility that this social intelligence-social effectiveness relationship could be moderated by level of extraversion was also explored.

Results of the second study indicate that ratings of social effectiveness act as a full mediator in the social intelligence-assessment center performance relationship. This full mediation exists in a range of dependent variable which vary in their interpersonal demands. Full mediation was found when the dependent variable was overall assessment center

performance, the interpersonal communication dimension, a combination of non-interpersonal communication dimensions, and the critical thinking dimension.

Social intelligence was not the only variable related to social effectiveness. When using a one-tailed significance value of  $p=.05$  extraversion was related to ratings of social effectiveness. However, combining both social intelligence and extraversion did not result in additional prediction in an individual's level of social effectiveness. These two variables exerted influence additively, not multiplicatively. This interaction may have fallen short of significance because of the items used to measure extraversion.

One of the major questions the current research sought to suss out was how best to define and measure social intelligence. Historically, research on social intelligence has viewed the construct as a facet of general intelligence (Guilford, 1967; Moss et al., 1927; Thorndike, 1920) but failed attempts at differentiation from other facets of intelligence led later researchers to define the construct in more behavioral terms (Brown & Anthony, 1990; Ford & Tisak, 1983). These behavioral terms included both socially effective behaviors and interpersonal-type personality traits. Results from Study I support the notion that social intelligence is a facet of general mental ability and not a behaviorally based personality trait because social intelligence scores were more related to general mental ability and less with personality traits.

The relationship between social intelligence and general mental ability should influence how social intelligence is measured. If social intelligence is indeed a facet of general mental ability both constructs should be measured using similarly formatted instruments. General mental ability is measured using performance-based tests. By using a performance-based test the presumption is that the best way to get at an individual's true intelligence score is to make the

individual use their intelligence to solve problems. By counting how many times an individual used his or her intelligence to correctly solve a problem one can calculate an intelligence score. This score provides an objective metric and is not the same thing as asking someone to subjectively report on his or her level of intelligence. Subjective reporting by the individual will result in erroneous estimates of intelligence.

In direct opposition to the results from Study I, and the conclusion that social intelligence may be more appropriately measured using an objective performance-based test, are the results from Study II. The results from Study II show that social intelligence is significantly related to the personality traits or agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness. These results imply that social intelligence may be able to be measured using personality trait instruments.

The results from Study II may not completely negate the conclusion that social intelligence should be conceptualized as a facet of intelligence and not a personality trait. Although social intelligence was related to most of the personality traits, it was not related to an individual's level of extraversion. This is interesting in that extraversion, or its facets, is commonly used to measure social intelligence. If social intelligence was indeed a more social trait-like construct, extraversion should be the trait that it is most correlated with. It may be that the shortened personality measure used for Study II inadequately sampled from the construct space of the personality traits and led to uncommon relationships with social intelligence.

Another result from Study II which may support the idea that social intelligence is fundamentally different than personality is its relationship with the criteria. Social intelligence was significantly related to both ratings of social effectiveness and performance in

interpersonally demanding assessment center exercises. On the other hand, personality traits were not related to performance in assessment center exercises and only extraversion and conscientiousness were related to ratings of social effectiveness. These differing relationships with the criteria lead to the conclusion that social intelligence and personality represent distinct constructs that cannot be equated.

The results in Study II need to be replicated in order to make a definitive conclusion as to whether or not social intelligence is a personality trait or a facet of intelligence. One missing piece of information in the current study that could shed light on this question is participants' level of general mental ability. By comparing relationships of general mental ability with the other variables one can ascertain whether social intelligence behaves more like an intelligence or a personality trait.

Regardless, there seems to be at least somewhat of a conceptual difference between social intelligence and personality. Social intelligence seems to have a relationship to how well someone performs in socially demanding situations. This relationship needs to work through a behavioral component. Thus, the knowledge of how to be socially intelligent must be translated into behaviors which can be observed and deemed socially effective.

Personality's role in effective behavior in social situations may be influenced by the situational variables. For instance, if a situation calls for empathy or "going with the flow" then an individual with a higher level of agreeableness will be seen as more socially effective. . In the current study social effectiveness may have depended on a person's level of order and gregariousness. Hence, extraversion and conscientiousness showed relationships with ratings of social effectiveness. This may not always be the case other traits may influence social

effectiveness depending on the situation. Traits needed to be deemed socially effective will change with the situation while social intelligence will always influence level of social effectiveness, regardless of the situational characteristics

### Limitations and Future Research

The current study brought to light some interesting results in regards to the construct of social intelligence. However, there were several aspects which could affect the conclusions one can draw from this research and, thus, represent limitations of the current research program. For instance, low/differing reliability estimates across studies, the use of measures which have questionable construct validity, and the use of a sample which is different than the ultimate population. These limitations can be used to guide future research programs.

The primary limitation concerns the internal consistency estimates of the measures used in this study. The measure of social intelligence had a low reliability in Study I ( $\alpha = .59$ ) but a much higher reliability in Study II ( $\alpha = .89$ ). The personality items in Study I had reliabilities around or above .80 while the personality items in Study II had reliabilities ranging from .55 to .78. Low reliabilities can have attenuating effects on measured relationships (Murphy & Davidshofer, 2005). This may be why the independent variables and social effectiveness did not display the hypothesized relationships in Study I and why extraversion did not moderate the social intelligence-assessment center performance relationship in Study II.

Explanations for the differing reliabilities of the social intelligence and personality measures across the two studies may have been influenced by the instrument administration. Participants in Study I were given paper-and-pencil versions of the instruments. Conversely, participants in Study II were administered the instruments online. Past research has found that

paper-and pencil and web-based versions of the same instrument have different measurement properties (Ployhart et al., 2003).

These administration differences are especially important to the personality tests used in the current study. Each of the measures was validated using a paper-and-pencil format. Some research has found that reliability estimates which were in the acceptable range for paper-and-pencil administration conditions may not carry over to computer-based administrations (Ployhart et al., 2003). Research should delve further into the administration issues of the instruments and the complications that may arise from the different administration options available.

A second limitation of the current study is the use of a social effectiveness measure which has unproven construct validity. When creating the measure of social effectiveness used in the current study the researcher surveyed past studies and definitions to drive the item generation for the instrument. However, the current scale was never submitted to stringent construct validation. This lack of validation was clear in Study I as the estimate of internal consistency was .54. Initially, this lack of reliability was attributed to the diversity, both in acquaintance type and breadth of situations observed, raters used to drive social effectiveness ratings.

In order to remedy this lack of reliability in judgments of social effectiveness, raters in Study II were given extensive training. Further, raters in the second study observed participants in the same set of situations. That is, each rater saw each participant in the same assessment center exercises and used the behaviors in these situations to drive the ratings of social effectiveness. The consistency in rater training and observed situations may have increased the reliability beyond what would be expected from a second administration of the same measure in

Study I. Future research should further elucidate the psychometric properties of the current inventory of social effectiveness.

A third limitation of the current study concerns the use of a student sample. Students participating in the study received extra credit for completing each of the individual difference measures. Credit was granted regardless of the purposefulness of the responses provided. Nonpurposeful responding can exert detrimental effects on study results. Future research should strive to increase participants' engagement when filling out the measure by increasing the consequences for nonpurposeful responding.

Using a student sample has other influences on the validity of the measure. Researchers commonly use student samples because of the convenience they provide (Dipboye & Flanagan, 1979) and then generalize the findings to the population at large. Students may have some inherent characteristics which may make them different than the ultimate population which will use the measure. Thus generalizability is impossible because the sample does not reflect the characteristics of the population. In order to ensure accurate results a testing sample must be chosen which mirrors the ultimate population. Future research should attempt to validate the social intelligence instrument on more diverse samples, but, at least, with a sample of adult applicants.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE MEASURE

**Instructions**

On the following pages you will be presented with social situations which are designed to measure social intelligence. Each situation is followed by several behavioral responses. Your job is to read each situation and pick the behavior which you think is the *most effective* response to the situation and which behavior you think is the *least effective* response to the situation. Please indicate your response choices by placing an X in the appropriate box (see example below).

Example situation	Most effective	Least effective
<b>You are at a team meeting working on developing solutions to a problem. One member of the team is constantly offering unreasonable solutions and preventing other members from offering their opinions. Some of the team members are losing focus because of the frequent interruptions.</b>		
Inform the team member that they are not using this time efficiently and that they should offer only practical solutions; clarify what the team is trying to accomplish during the meeting		X
Tell the feuding members how to solve the problem Listen to what the person has to say even though it is affecting the efficiency of the team		
Ask the team member to let other people contribute the discussion and have the group start ranking the solutions that have already been generated	X	
Point out positive aspects of each argument but would not take sides Cut in when the member is making a suggestion and tell them to bring their suggestion up at a more appropriate time, then attempt to bring the team back to the task at hand		

**Situation 1**

Dr. James, the supervisory physician, and Ms. Henderson, the medical director, had a conflict over how to handle an insurance issue. Ms. Henderson thought that Dr. James was not supporting her decision about the issue — which she had made based on previous discussions with him. Dr. James recognized that Ms. Henderson left work that day very upset. The next day, in the hallway, Dr. James sees Ms. Henderson. If you were Dr. James, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Ask Mrs. Henderson if she has resolved the insurance issue		
Ask Mrs. Henderson if she requires any more of your help with the insurance issue		
Assure Mrs. Henderson that you will support her decision with the insurance issue		
Smile and apologize for the conflict yesterday		

**Situation 2**

Alice, who had long been employed for some time by a real estate company, was usually very upbeat, social and assertive. Today, Alice was very non-responsive and sad looking - almost depressed. Ellen, who is Alice's supervisor and who is also a high energy person, walks past Alice's cubicle to drop off some reports. If you were Ellen, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Ask Alice if she is feeling alright or if there is something bothering her		
Stop and chat with Alice, she'll tell you if something is bothering her		
Ask Alice if she has any lunch plans and ask her to accompany you		
Tell Alice you will be in your office later on, in case she needs to talk about anything		

**Situation 3**

Martin and Sam had worked together on the warehouse floor for six years. When the company decided to hire from within for an open shift manager position both Martin and Sam decided to apply. They assured one another that the one selected would have the other's support. When Martin was selected Sam provided initial support; but, it soon became apparent that Sam was not happy. Martin heard second-hand that Sam was spreading some mean-spirited gossip about Martin and about why he got the manager's position. If you were Martin, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Recognize that Sam is upset and he will soon become used to your new position and stop spreading gossip		
Talk to Sam about the rumors that you have heard, he might fess up to spreading them		
Disprove the rumors that are being spread about you, the rumors will stop without proof to back them		
Assure Sam that you obtained your position by merit and ask why he is spreading rumors		

**Situation 4**

Bernie is a project manager. He is having a meeting with Susan, an international employee, about what Bernie feels is a lack of progress on a key project for the third month in a row. Susan is confused by the meeting and thinks the project is moving along nicely. In fact, Susan has put a great deal of time into this project because making an impression on Bernie is a high priority for her. She has attempted to include Bernie in every step of the project in order to make sure that the project progresses in the right direction. Bernie is irritated that Susan continually comes to him with questions. Both Bernie and Susan are becoming frustrated during the meeting. If you were Bernie, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Conclude the meeting and reschedule it for a later date when you are more level headed		
Ask Susan what her expectations are for the project and for you as her manager		
Ask one of your co-managers to sit in on the meeting as a mediator		
Get Susan's perspective but make your expectations clear for the next time she works on a project		

**Situation 5**

Jennifer is one of the team-leaders for quality-control group in the Amroco organization. Their task is to complete inspections of finished products. Recent changes in organization requirements and safety measures have made work for the past year more difficult and stressful than ever before for the team members. Jennifer is informing the employees in her work unit that they have just won an award for achieving the best quality record in the company. If you were Jennifer, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Make sure your employees know what a good job they did and what an honor the award is		
Use the award as a testament to your team's ability and hold them to this level of performance		
Send a company wide email congratulating your team's accomplishment		
Thank the award-team for choosing your team to receive the award		

**Situation 6**

Mitch is probably one of the most productive people in Jon's department. He is nearly always punctual, organized and diligent, and the work he does is first rate. He has a reputation in the department for being sort of a loner and not being too talkative with other employees. The other day in the break room, Jon sees Mitch sitting by himself drinking coffee. If you were Jon, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Smile at Mitch as you walk to your usual table		
Ask Mitch if you can sit with him for lunch		
Invite Mitch over to your table where you sit with the other managers		
Take Mitch with you and sit at a table with some of his co-workers		

**Situation 7**

One of Lisa's employees, Bob, has always performed his work in an excellent manner. Bob always had projects completed on or before the deadline and even helped out his coworkers when he could. Lately, Lisa noticed that Bob's work quality has been declining and he seems less happy to be at work. Today Bob came to Lisa and said he wanted to transfer to a different work team and if possible to a different department. If you were Lisa, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Grant Bob his request and get him re-assigned as quickly as possible		
Inquire about Bob's recent change of behavior and why he wants to change departments		
Tell Bob that you really need him here and see if he will stay in your department		
Say that you will try to talk with the supervisor in charge of re-assignment but you can't make any promises		

**Situation 8**

Emma was one of Mark's best employees. If a project needed to be done, she was the one whom Mark would approach first. Mark had given her the Birdsley report to work on several days before, but deadlines had been pushed up and Mark needed the report by the end of the day. Mark walked by Emma's office and told her about the crunch and that he needed the report before the close of day. Emma let out a big sigh and said, "I'll do the best I can but all these other projects are going to get delayed." If you were Mark, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Tell Emma just to do her best on the Birdsley report at the expense of the other projects		
Ask if she would like the Birdsley report to be assigned to another employee		
Have Emma's other projects re-assigned while she works on the Birdsley report		
Ask Emma if there is any way you can help her finish her work		

**Situation 9**

Patrick is a line worker who is always upset with decisions made by upper management. He frequently expresses his negative remarks and negative attitudes to his fellow workers. Many of them were becoming tired of his negativism. Patrick's co-workers expressed their frustration to their supervisor, Dennis. Dennis was surprised because he had never heard Patrick complain nor had Patrick ever talked with him about his dissatisfaction. If you were Dennis, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Listen to the employees' complaints but do not confront Patrick as you have never witnessed this behavior		
Casually ask Patrick his opinion on some of the newer company policies to see if Patrick expresses his dissatisfaction		
Take the employee complaints seriously and talk to Patrick about his attitude		
Talk to Patrick about being reassigned to a different team, his negative attitude is bringing everyone down		

**Situation 10**

Yolanda was aware that, Eloise, one of her direct reports, was going through a divorce that was becoming more and more messy. Eloise's workload had also increased over the last several months along with everyone else's. Eloise has asked Yolanda for an opportunity to talk about her workload. If you were Yolanda, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Listen to what Eloise has to say but your hands are tied, everyone has more work then they can handle right now		
Try to help Eloise come up with an action plan to get all of her work done so she does not feel overwhelmed		
Let Eloise have a few days off, she must be going through a tough time even though she has said nothing to you		
Tell Eloise that workload is non-negotiable at this time, the company is extra busy but maybe in a few weeks you two can talk		

**Situation 11**

Ben has been noticing that Dawn keeps showing up for work late. The other employees are noticing that she's coming in late, and it's setting a bad example. Since she started coming in late, Ben has been trying to find out why. Dawn hasn't been willing to tell Ben until now: her husband has become a serious problem. Dawn has been referred to counseling and this is why she is often late for her shift. If you were Ben, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Let Dawn keep coming in late even if the other employees get upset, she has a good excuse		
Suggest to Dawn that she may want to schedule her appointments for after work or over lunch		
Stress to Dawn that there is a strict attendance policy and it has consequences, even if she has extenuating circumstances		
Tell Dawn that her past lateness will be excused but she must try to be on time to work from now on		

**Situation 12**

Betsy has three children, and it seems like they are always getting sick. The result is that Betsy has to take a lot of time off on short notice to be with her children. It seems her work is suffering because of it, too. Some of the other employees are getting upset about Betsy's absences. No one has directly complained to the manager, Carla, but she is aware of the problem. If you were Carla, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Refresh your staff on the proper call-in procedure for when they need to take time off during the next employee meeting		
Try to portray a positive attitude to your employees when Betsy calls in due to her children		
Talk with Betsy one-on-one and let her know that her behavior has started to become a problem		
Wait until your employees bring their complaints to you directly before addressing the situation, it may blow over		

**Situation 13**

Paul just shouted at a very important client over the telephone, and everyone in the office heard it. As his manager, Pam asks what's going on, and Paul says, "I'd rather not talk about it." If you were Pam, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Give Paul some space and time to calm down, then address the phone conversation		
Let Paul know that his behavior is not appropriate, he will most likely not do it again		
Keep asking Paul about the phone conversation until he tells you what happened		
Leave Paul alone, he will tell you what happened when he is ready		

**Situation 14**

Rick is the manager of fifteen line supervisors. He is aware that many little problems are surfacing amongst the supervisors. He decided to bring the supervisors together to get things out in the open. Twenty minutes into the meeting it becomes obvious that an argumentative atmosphere was growing within the group. If you were Rick, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Bring the meeting to a close quickly before things can get even more out of hand		
Remind the supervisors of the meeting goals; to work through the conflicts		
Keep the meeting going but be ready to shut it down if things get too hostile		
Let whatever happens happen, conflict is needed for effective resolution		

**Situation 15**

Audrey has been with the company for several years and has been an acceptable employee. Lately it seems she is always upset about something at work and is not always respectful of the other employees. Lynne has witnessed Audrey spreading gossip and being unnecessarily critical of other employees and of management on many occasions. As Lynne walks into the reception area Audrey is talking with another employee about her dissatisfaction with a new company policy. As Lynne looks around she sees several clients sitting in the reception area who are able to hear the entire conversation. If you were Lynn, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Talk to Audrey's manager about the scene you just witnessed		
Confront Audrey about her behavior at that moment		
Talk with Audrey later about her unprofessional behavior		
Apologize to the clients for Audrey's behavior after she leaves the room		

**Situation 16**

Nancy is about to inform the employees in her work unit that they have just lost a very important account. A large majority of the team has been working very diligently over the past few months to land this new client, however a few team members did not work as hard as others and Nancy suspects this cost them the account. If you were Nancy, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Break the news to your employees in a group and say how you all will try harder next time to win the account		
Individually meet with the employees to tell them the news and get feedback about which employees seemed to be less involved		
Gather your employees for a meeting to tell them the news and create a responsibility chart for the next account		
Email the employees to let them know about the bad news and ask them to come up with ideas on how to improve		

**Situation 17**

Terry, the manager of a Michigan state agency, has been told from state headquarters that he must implement some unexpected cutbacks in his agency due to a poor fiscal year and overall poor economy. Terry realizes that to make these cuts he is going to have to downsize and let several personnel go as well as terminate funds and resources for several projects that many of his employees were excited to work on. Terry has called a meeting of local agency supervisors to discuss the cuts and workload increases. Terry and the supervisors must decide which areas to cut and which employees to layoff without causing the employees to lose morale and motivation. Terry realizes that he and his managers have been given a very difficult situation and they are having trouble making the required decisions. If you were Terry, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Take some time to meet with the employees and obtain their input before making final decisions		
Present your ideas for the cutbacks and let each employee vote on which idea they like		
Tell the supervisors your plan for the cutbacks and try to get them on-board		
Conduct the meeting in a round-robin fashion where each supervisor shares their ideas		

**Situation 18**

Joe's direct report, Donna, was tardy for the fifth time in two weeks. Talk around the water cooler is that Donna's husband has been sick and in the hospital for the last month but Donna has not approached Joe to talk about the problem. Joe has just seen Donna come into the work area. If you were Joe, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Call Donna into your office and ask her why she is having a problem getting to work on time		
Ask Donna if she would stop by your office when she gets a chance to touch base		
Go to Donna's desk and ask if she is having troubles at home which are causing her tardiness		
Leave Donna a note on her desk saying that she can talk to you if she has any issues		

**Situation 19**

Max, a mid-level project manager and analyst at Dow Chemical, has been put in charge of leading a management group meeting made up of his peers. During the group meeting several important issues dealing with management strategies are to be discussed. None of the peer managers voiced any strong opinions about which strategies to choose and how to implement them. This is extremely uncharacteristic of the group as they are usually very vocal and creative. Max is concerned about implementing the strategies as he did not get any useful feedback from the group. He is considering bringing the meeting to a close. If you were Max, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Bring the meeting to a close and touch base with each manager separately about their recommendations		
Bring the meeting to a close and use your own ideas about how to implement the strategies		
Try to convince the managers to share their opinions as you need their input to make the implementation successful		
Share your opinions about the strategies with the managers to see if they will support your ideas		

**Situation 20**

Rose was a good employee for the department and for Angelina her manager. Today, Rose had received a rather demanding request over the telephone from an employee in another department. It was a request that Rose knew she couldn't act upon as she did not have the requested materials and she tried to communicate this but the co-worker would not listen. After hanging up, Rose was visibly shaken over this new experience with the co-worker and went into Angelina's office to talk. If you were Angelina, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Let Rose talk about her experience to help her calm down		
Advise Rose to go and talk with the co-worker face-to-face		
Call the co-worker's manager and tell him about the interaction		
Offer to take care of the co-worker's request yourself		

**Situation 21**

Saul was promoted to department manager six months ago. Currently he is trying to reorganize his department so that it runs more efficiently. His efforts were based in his own sense of mission as well as strong suggestions from upper management. Saul realizes that a few of his employees are reluctant to take on any sort of change initiative. However, Saul is eager to get the reorganization off the ground with everyone on-board. If you were Saul, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Make sure all employees know about the re-organization and how it will unfold		
Ask the employees about their ideas on how to make the re-organization go smoothly		
Develop a special task force of these reluctant individuals to lead the re-organization		
Seek help from an experienced manager as to how to make the re-organization work		

**Situation 22**

Ron and Gus had both worked at SNL manufacturing for over 10 years. Recently Gus had been transferred into Ron's department, working directly underneath his supervision. Gus had a history of being a reliable employee, showing up on time, and always completing projects by the deadline. However, recently Ron had begun to pick-up some indications that Gus was perhaps having some problems. He was exhibiting what could be some textbook symptoms of alcoholism. If you were Ron, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Talk to the plant HR department about getting Gus some counseling or into a program		
Place alcoholism pamphlets anonymously in Gus' locker and in the break area		
Casually bring up the subject of alcoholism with Gus to gauge his reaction		
Talk with some of Gus' coworkers to see if they are noticing the same warning signs		

**Situation 23**

Suddenly Sonya had a new problem on her hands as floor supervisor — a problem coming at her from two directions. First, the CEO had really gotten hooked into this national discussion of obesity as an epidemic. The CEO wanted to initiate some to-be-determined company wide program to address this issue after getting employee input. Second, several of her floor employees, who might be considered over-weight, had complained to Sonya about an increase, amongst their co-workers, of the number of jokes, off-hand remarks and judgmental statements about people who were overweight. They want this talked about at the next employees' floor meeting. If you were Sonya, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Follow the CEO's direction and take the idea to your employees for their input		
Address the problem of the off-handed remarks before meeting about the CEO's program		
Ask other managers about their feelings about the CEO's program		
Try to sell the CEO's idea to your employees during the meeting and gain their support		

**Situation 24**

Paula has just asked her manager, Niles, for the next week off due to a death in the family. As one of Niles' top performers he will need her next week to prepare for their yearly audit. Usually no one is given time off during audit preparation as it is one of the most important weeks of the year. If you were Niles, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Give Paula your sympathies but your hands are tied, company policies have to be followed		
Allow Paula to take some time off but you can not allow her to take the full week		
Make a deal with Paula that if she works hard this week you can see if the company can bend the rules this one time		
Let Paula have the requested time off; you will pick up the slack		

**Situation 25**

Stan, a CEO of a mid-size software development company, has 9 managers that work under him to manage the company's employees and oversee project completion. Recently, Bill, one of Stan's managers, has been requesting deadlines to be extended for several of his projects. Bill gave Stan a long list of reasons, many of which were insignificant, as to why the projects could not be completed on time. After stressing that not meeting the deadlines may impact the company's relationship with important clients, Stan asks what Bill can do to keep his employees on task. Bill responds by shrugging and acting as if the inability to meet the deadlines is out of his control. If you were Stan, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Hold Bill to the same standards that you hold your other managers to, no matter the excuse		
Investigate the excuses Bill gave you by asking his employees why they are not meeting goals		
Assure Bill that he is in control of the projects and ask if he would like some help		
Ask another department to assist Bill's department in meeting their deadlines		

**Situation 26**

Kelly is a new manager. Just before she took over, one of the supervisors working under her, Michelle, was promoted into this supervisory position. Michelle is known for being highly intelligent when it comes to the technical aspects of her area, however she has little management experience. Kelly has started to get lots of complaints from Michelle's employees. They are saying that Michelle is inflexible about her management and work philosophy. Kelly has noticed that although employee turnover in Michelle's area has been rising, her unit's performance has not suffered. If you were Kelly, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Talk with Michelle about her new position and the challenges she may be facing		
Wait it out, it could be the unproductive employees are quitting which will not affect performance		
Gather concrete, written feedback from Michelle's employees to share with her		
Track the turnover and performance in Michelle's department, if it gets more severe step in		

**Situation 27**

Max is the supervisor for Char and Bill. They are often at odds with one another; fault-finding and disagreeing over issues that are not always important. Today, they have had an especially loud verbal exchange in front of other co-workers. If you were Max, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Attempt to mediate a meeting between Char and Bill so they can discuss their problems		
Request that Char or Bill be re-assigned to a different department, they obviously can not work together		
Talk with each Char and Bill individually about reasons for the exchange		
Let the incident slide, the co-workers are not complaining and this behavior is normal for Char and Bill		

**Situation 28**

Richard was approached by Clint, one of his fellow managers' subordinates. Clint tells Richard that Clint's coworker is possibly guilty of some major violations of company policy. Clint has followed standard operating procedure and talked to his immediate supervisor. However, Clint's supervisor has not taken this situation seriously since the co-worker is friends with Clint's supervisor. If you were Richard, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Tell Clint to talk with his boss' supervisor about the policy violations, it is not your place to deal with this situation		
Talk with Clint's supervisor yourself; this issue should be addressed no matter the relationship between Clint's supervisor and co-worker		
Reprimand the guilty co-worker, Clint's supervisor is obviously not going to do it		
Tell your supervisor about the violations and get his input on what your role should be in this situation		

**Situation 29**

For several years Anthony's department was short on staff and heavy on workload. Over the last six months, training had been provided for a new computerized system for account management and inventory control. Lots of promises had been made as to how this would make the department's work more efficient, effective, and reliable. Many on Anthony's staff were apprehensive about those promises and wondered if more problems would actually be the result of the new computer system. Today is the go-live day for the new system. If you were Anthony, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Stress to your team that the company is counting on them to support this new system, they need to give it their all and make it work		
Agree with your team that there may be troubles at first but they will work themselves out and things will run smoothly		
Advise your team to stick with it, it is a company directive and you can't do anything about it		
Take your team's concerns to the IT supervisor, maybe he can solve their concerns		

**Situation 30**

Angelina's supervisor, Rita, had just given Angelina the news that she has not been chosen for the new Program Supervisor position for which she had applied. Rita, fairly new to her own position, has made the selection of another employee for the new position. Angelina feels Rita made the wrong decision as she is new to her job and has not had enough time to observe everyone's performance. If you were Angelina, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Talk to Rita and tell her about the other employee's poor performance		
Take your issues to Rita's supervisor, maybe Rita needs more training		
Make a case to Rita telling her about your performance record and why you deserve the job		
Wait, eventually the employee will fail and you can apply for the position again		

**Situation 31**

Clint had been in his management position for about 10 years. He was fairly comfortable there. He did his job well and had no real ambitions for moving up in the organization. However, upper management was applying more and more pressure on Clint to get his department to become more computer literate — which was something that really pushed his comfort level. His supervisor had insisted that a computer techie become a part of Clint’s staff. Since coming on board, the techie, Mark, had been aggressive in making recommendations over the past six months. Yesterday Clint overheard Mark make a demeaning statement to one of his employees about him not learning the program from the past weeks lesson. If you were Clint, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Talk with your supervisor and ask if you can get a different computer expert on your team		
Try to be more proactive in learning the programs that Mark has recommended		
Communicate with Mark as to how you can improve your computer knowledge		
Confront Mark about his comments to the other employee		

**Situation 32**

It was time for the agency’s bi-monthly newsletter. Brad had written the newsletter for three years and always submitted it to his supervisor for review. However, this would be the first time the new supervisor, Renee, would be reviewing the newsletter. As Renee reviews the newsletter copy she becomes concerned about the content, style, and format. She thinks to herself, ‘this is not what I expected to see from a seasoned writer.’ If you were Renee, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Rewrite the newsletter according to your standards		
Publish the newsletter but talk with Brad about your expectations for the next newsletter		
Reassess your expectations, Brad has been doing this job for a long time		
Make Brad re-do the newsletter according to your guidelines		

**Situations 33**

Erin is the manager of a staff of five. As a group they have faced a lot of change over the past months, had carried a huge workload, and accomplished a great deal with minimal resources. The team even identified some work procedures in other departments that were not very efficient and created new methods. This upset the other departments and they have been showing some dissatisfaction towards Erin's team. Although the higher-level executives initially praised Erin's team, lately they have failed to reward the team's accomplishments and Erin feels this could be the result of the other dissatisfied team. If you were Erin, what would you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Confront the dissatisfied team and ask why they are giving your team a hard time		
Talk to the higher-level executives as to why they seem to be ignoring your team		
Praise your team yourself and tell them that their work has not gone unappreciated		
Tell the team to keep up their effort, things will work out eventually		

**Situation 34**

Dan is a very good employee. He is committed to the organization and to customer service. He takes pride in his work and is very knowledgeable. However, Dan is frequently unable to work well with others. He can become bossy and frequently puts others down. When Earl, his supervisor, tries to talk to him about how this gets in the way of his being effective, Dan becomes defensive and denies the problems. It is time for Dan's annual performance review. If you were Earl, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Hold Dan accountable for changing his attitude by including it as one of his performance goals for next year		
Make Dan the teamwork and conflict management liaison and enroll him in training for these areas		
Gather some feedback from other employees so that you can share concrete examples of Dan's behavior with him		
Casually bring up a possible transfer for Dan during the meeting and see what his reaction is		

**Situation 35**

Hector is the supervisor of an ALCOA aluminum manufacturing plant, which has employees who are members of a national labor union. Recently, ALCOA and the labor union have been conducting stressful negotiations regarding a new employee contract. Hector has scheduled a meeting today with his managers to discuss the new contract. Generally, the contract changes involve the way that managers are allowed to interact with union employees and Hector can foresee some push-back from his managers on these new policies. Hector needs to make sure that these changes are implemented as smoothly as possible. If you were Hector, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Come up with an action plan as to how the changes should be implemented and present it to your managers during the meeting		
Assign each manager a unique position in getting the changes up and running and hold them accountable for fulfilling their duty		
Prepare a list of possible objections to the contract and solutions to these objections before the meeting takes place		
Communicate that this is a company directive, all managers need to comply with this contract		

**Situation 36**

Kay had worked for the same company for 20 years, which was recently acquired by a multi-national corporation. Kay is very anxious about her own future in the new company, as there have been rumors flying around for weeks about possible layoffs. She is having a meeting this morning with the new top managers of her company. This is her first meeting with them since the acquisition was announced. If you were Kay, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Be prepared to show the new CEOs why you are a valuable part of the company, they can't fire you if they see your record		
Let the CEOs know how excited you are about the new acquisition, this is a great opportunity for the company		
Listen to what the CEOs have to say but be wary about a possible job loss		
Start looking for another job, you just know you will be terminated during the meeting		

**Situation 37**

Scott had been away from work for the past 10 weeks recovering from knee surgery. Though the doctor had given the OK to go back to work, Scott was still using crutches and is limited to a ¾ time workload. Paul, Scott’s manager, is grateful Scott is getting better and headed back to work. Without Scott, Paul had been very short-handed on staff. Paul doesn’t know how this ¾ time arrangement was going to work-out. He needs Scott to carry his full share of the workload so the team can get caught up. Paul called a meeting one morning with Scott to talk about it. If you were Paul, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Request that Scott do some extra work at home so that the team can get caught up		
Re-organize some of Scott’s tasks, hopefully this will allow him to work at his usual pace		
Assign Scott some of the less important tasks, you will assign him more duties once he is fully healed		
Ask Scott to pick the tasks he is more comfortable with, Scott knows his limits and you do not want to overwhelm him		

**Situation 38**

It is Rod’s first week at a new job. Although he is learning the ropes quickly there are still some tasks that he is unfamiliar with. Today, Rod has been assigned to send over a purchase order to one of the trucking companies for delivery by the end of the day and he is unsure of which company to contact. Rod decides to ask Rachel, a more experienced employee, how to complete the task. Rachel responds curtly, “It’s not my job to train new employees.” The task needs to be completed quickly as it is almost quitting time and there is no one else available to seek direction from. If you were Rod, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Try your best to complete the task, hopefully you will do it right		
Save the task for first thing tomorrow and explain to your supervisor why the task was not completed		
Give Rachel some time and in an hour ask her again for some help		
Call your supervisor on his cell phone and ask him what you should do		

**Situation 39**

One of Doug's newer employees, Sarah, is not pulling her weight in the sales department. For the second month in a row, she has not sold the required amount of goods. Sarah has recently been talking up her sales to the other employees, and Doug has overheard her bragging about her high commissions. Doug starts to see a slide in the other employees' sales, which begins to worry him. If you were Doug, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Pull Sarah aside and ask her why she is lying about her performance and bragging to the employees		
Talk with your other employees about the decline in their sales and see if it has anything to do with Sarah		
Take note of the declining sales but wait to take action, if could just be a bad month		
Have a group meeting where you communicate the important nature of keeping and meeting high sales standards		

**Situation 40**

It is time for the weekly staff meeting where projects for the week and their implementation are discussed. Tom is the team's lead and begins the meeting by introducing a new project for the week. The new project is exactly like other projects the team has worked on and Tom proposes a timetable for completion that the team has successfully used in that past. Before Tom can finish his proposal Andy, one of his employees (who Tom does not always get along with), interrupts to say he does not think Tom's idea will be successful in this case and proposes several ideas he thinks would work better. Andy's aggressive interruption and violation of normal meeting behavior has made a few of the other employees look uncomfortable. If you were Tom, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Ask the rest of the team to vote on which timetable they should use and go with the timetable they decide on		
Thank Andy for his contribution but say that you would rather stick with your idea because it has worked in the past		
Adjourn the meeting and tell the team you will follow-up with them about the timetable for this project		
Use Andy's timetable but talk to him after the meeting about the interruption		

**Situation 41**

Steven is a mid-level manager at a large biotech company that has just been through a large merger with a competing company. As a result of the merger, Steven's department received a new director from the other company. After 3 months, the new director, Karl, recommends one of Steven's employees for a promotion into a key position in the company without asking for Steven's input. Steven does not feel that the employee is ready for a job with so many critical responsibilities and is thinking about sharing his concerns with Karl. If you were Steven, what should you do?

	Most effective	Least effective
Share your concerns with Karl but do not expect a reassignment of the employee		
Make a case as to why the employee is not a good fit for the promotion, hopefully Karl will see your point		
Support Karl's decision, maybe he sees something in the employee that you missed		
Try to convince the employee not to take the promotion		

APPENDIX B

SCORING KEY FOR SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE MEASURE

Item Number	Points Awarded for 'Most Effective' Judgment				Points Awarded for 'Least Effective' Judgment			
	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
Situation 1	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	1
Situation 2	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
Situation 3	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
Situation 4	0	3	1	2	3	0	2	1
Situation 5	3	1	2	0	0	2	1	3
Situation 6	0	2	1	1	2	0	1	1
Situation 7	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Situation 8	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Situation 9	0	2	1	0	2	0	1	2
Situation 10	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	2
Situation 11	0	3	1	2	3	0	2	1
Situation 12	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Situation 13	3	2	0	1	0	1	3	2
Situation 14	1	3	2	0	2	0	1	3
Situation 15	3	0	2	1	0	3	1	2
Situation 16	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Situation 17	2	1	0	2	0	1	2	0
Situation 18	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	2
Situation 19	1	0	2	1	1	2	0	1
Situation 20	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Situation 21	2	3	0	1	1	0	3	2
Situation 22	3	0	1	2	0	3	2	1
Situation 23	1	2	0	1	1	0	2	1
Situation 24	0	3	2	1	3	0	1	2
Situation 25	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Situation 26	2	0	2	1	0	2	0	1
Situation 27	3	1	2	0	0	2	1	3
Situation 28	1	2	0	3	2	1	3	0
Situation 29	2	1	0	1	0	1	2	1
Situation 30	1	0	2	1	1	2	0	1
Situation 31	0	1	2	1	2	1	0	1
Situation 32	0	2	0	1	2	0	2	1
Situation 33	0	2	2	1	2	0	0	1
Situation 34	3	1	2	0	0	2	1	3

Item Number	Points Awarded for 'Most Effective' Judgment				Points Awarded for 'Least Effective' Judgment			
	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D
Situation 35	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	2
Situation 36	3	2	1	0	0	1	2	3
Situation 37	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Situation 38	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	0
Situation 39	1	1	0	2	1	1	2	0
Situation 40	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	2
Situation 41	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	2

## APPENDIX C

### PERSONALITY MEASURE – STUDY I

**Please write the number in the blank that represents how much each word describes how you generally are.**

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neither	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	___	Sociable	35.	___	Philosophical	69.	___	Nervous
2.	___	Affectionate	36.	___	Adventurous	70.	___	Clever
3.	___	Organized	37.	___	Humble	71.	___	Bold
4.	___	Undemanding	38.	___	Industrious	72.	___	Unselfish
5.	___	Intelligent	39.	___	Insecure	73.	___	Prompt
6.	___	Talkative	40.	___	Imaginative	74.	___	Excitable
7.	___	Agreeable	41.	___	Merry	75.	___	Unobservant
8.	___	Decisive	42.	___	Sensitive	76.	___	Competitive
9.	___	Relaxed	43.	___	Neat	77.	___	Boastful
10.	___	Creative	44.	___	High Strung	78.	___	Conscientious
11.	___	Assertive	45.	___	Foresighted	79.	___	Moody
12.	___	Charitable	46.	___	Aggressive	80.	___	Complex
13.	___	Reliable	47.	___	Amiable	81.	___	Unsociable
14.	___	Unemotional	48.	___	Consistent	82.	___	Compassionate
15.	___	Perceptive	49.	___	Irritable	83.	___	Disorganized
16.	___	Daring	50.	___	Analytical	84.	___	Fretful
17.	___	Modest	51.	___	Direct	85.	___	Innovative
18.	___	Ambitious	52.	___	Generous	86.	___	Quiet
19.	___	Uncritical	53.	___	Responsible	87.	___	Antagonistic
20.	___	Intellectual	54.	___	Unstable	88.	___	Indecisive
21.	___	Cheerful	55.	___	Artistic	89.	___	Anxious
22.	___	Sentimental	56.	___	Active(E)	90.	___	Uncreative
23.	___	Orderly	57.	___	Egotistical	91.	___	Weak(E)
24.	___	Unenvious	58.	___	Purposeful	92.	___	Uncharitable
25.	___	Inventive	59.	___	Emotional	93.	___	Punctual
26.	___	Verbal	60.	___	Imperceptive	94.	___	Impatient
27.	___	Cordial	61.	___	Effervescent	95.	___	Unintellectual
28.	___	Firm	62.	___	Warm	96.	___	Rambunctious
29.	___	Unexcitable	63.	___	Meticulous	97.	___	Conceited
30.	___	Insightful	64.	___	Temperamental	98.	___	Aimless
31.	___	Straightforward	65.	___	Knowledgeable	99.	___	Defensive
32.	___	Helpful	66.	___	Domineering	100.	___	Unreflective
33.	___	Dependable	67.	___	Harsh	101.	___	Withdrawn
34.	___	Tranquil	68.	___	Steady	102.	___	Cold

- |                       |                         |                         |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 103. ___Disorderly    | 117. ___Negligent       | 131. ___Seclusive       |
| 104. ___Envious       | 118. ___Suggestible     | 132. ___Insensitive     |
| 105. ___Unimaginative | 119. ___Uncommunicative | 133. ___Unsystematic    |
| 106. ___Untalkative   | 120. ___Unsympathetic   | 134. ___Reserved        |
| 107. ___Hard          | 121. ___Sloppy          | 135. ___Combative       |
| 108. ___Inconsistent  | 122. ___Shy             | 136. ___Illogical       |
| 109. ___Jealous       | 123. ___Rough           | 137. ___Helpless        |
| 110. ___Shortsighted  | 124. ___Scatterbrained  | 138. ___Selfish         |
| 111. ___Cowardly      | 125. ___Submissive      | 139. ___Unreliable      |
| 112. ___Greedy        | 126. ___Stingy          | 140. ___Unenergetic     |
| 113. ___Respectful    | 127. ___Undependable    | 141. ___Egocentric      |
| 114. ___Fidgety       | 128. ___Uncompetitive   | 142. ___Unconscientious |
| 115. ___Unadventurous | 129. ___Vain            |                         |
| 116. ___Snobbish      | 130. ___Lazy            |                         |

APPENDIX D

SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS MEASURE

**Instructions:** This section asks you to provide information on the behaviors of the person you were asked to rate. Below are some behaviors which may or may not be typical of the person you are rating. Your job is to read each behavior and rate how characteristic each behavior is of the person you are rating. Please use the scale provided to make your ratings and circle the appropriate number..

**1=Not characteristic of the person's behavior**

**4= Sometimes characteristic of the person's behavior**

**7=Very characteristic of the person's behavior**

S/he always has a good grasp of social situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S/he sometimes seems oblivious to social demands.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S/he seems to understand what others expect of him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
At times, s/he has trouble understanding other people's motivation and hidden agendas.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S/he always knows the right social rules to get ahead.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S/he can tell when it is most appropriate to listen.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S/he has trouble getting along with very different types of people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S/he always seems to know the right thing to say at the right time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S/he sometimes struggles trying to be effective in difficult situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S/he realizes how to present himself/herself effectively in order to make a good impression.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S/he can tell when he/she is not understood by others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
S/he seems comfortable in many different social situations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## APPENDIX E

### Social Effectiveness Item Correlations for Study I

#### Correlations Between Social Intelligence Score and Social Effectiveness Items

Social Effectiveness Items	<i>r</i>
S/he always has a good grasp of social situations.	.10
S/he sometimes seems oblivious to social demands.	.06
S/he seems to understand what others expect of him/her.	.16
At times, s/he has trouble understanding other people's motivation and hidden agendas.	.05
S/he always knows the right social rules to get ahead.	.05
S/he can tell when it is most appropriate to listen.	.10
S/he has trouble getting along with very different types of people.	.05
S/he always seems to know the right thing to say at the right time.	.07
S/he sometimes struggles trying to be effective in difficult situations.	.02
S/he realizes how to present himself/herself effectively in order to make a good impression.	.11
S/he can tell when he/she is not understood by others.	.06
S/he seems comfortable in many different social situations.	-.06

*Note:*  $N = 262$ . All coefficients above .12 (two-tail), .10 (one-tail) are significant at  $p < .05$ ; coefficients above .15 (two-tail), .14 (one-tail) are significant at  $p < .01$ .

APPENDIX F

PERSONALITY MEASURE – STUDY II

Please read each statement carefully, and decide how much you agree or disagree with that statement for describing how you generally are. Please use the scale provided to make your ratings and mark the appropriate box which corresponds to your agreement/disagreement with each statement. Remember to answer every item on this page.

Disagree      Somewhat      Slightly      Neither      Slightly      Somewhat      Agree  
 Disagree      Disagree      Disagree           Agree      Agree           Agree  
 1              2              3              4              5              6              7

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am the life of the party.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I sympathize with others' feelings.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I get chores done right away.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I have frequent mood swings.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I have a vivid imagination.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I don't talk a lot.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I am not interested in other people's problems.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I often forget to put things back in their proper place.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I am relaxed most of the time.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I am not interested in abstract ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I talk to a lot of people at parties.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I feel others' emotions.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I like other people.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I like order.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I get upset easily.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I keep in the background.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I am not really interested in others.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I make a mess of things.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I seldom feel blue.	<input type="checkbox"/>						
I do not have a good imagination.	<input type="checkbox"/>						

APPENDIX G

LIST OF ASSESSMENT CENTER EXERCISES AND PERFORMANCE DIMENSIONS

Performance Dimensions	<u>Exercises</u>				
	Presentation	Leaderless Group Discussion	Client Role Play	Coaching Role Play	Supervisory Role Play
Critical Thinking	X	X	X	X	X
Financial Impact Analysis	X				
Interpersonal Communication	X	X	X	X	X
Presentation Skills	X				
Teamwork		X			X
Conflict Management		X	X		
Customer Relations			X		
Leadership	X	X		X	
Delegation					X
Coaching				X	X
Ethics			X		
Diversity Awareness				X	

## APPENDIX H

### ASSESSMENT CENTER DIMENSION DESCRIPTIONS AND PERFORMANCE ITEMS

#### ***Critical Thinking***

##### Description

The ability to realistically evaluate an issue without the use of assumptions. The process involves becoming aware that assumptions exist and assessing their accuracy.

##### Performance Items

Effectively identifies key issues  
Gathers needed information  
Identifies and analyzes various options  
Handles the situation appropriately

#### ***Financial Impact Analysis***

##### Description

The need to have an understanding of how decisions and problems affect the organization's financial well being.

##### Performance Items

Identifies all data necessary for an accurate calculation  
Correctly calculates the financial impact of the decision on the organization  
States additional information that may impact the decision  
Properly integrates all appropriate data into a final recommendation

#### ***Interpersonal Communication***

##### Description

Verbal communication with other people and includes verbal communication, nonverbal communication, and listening.

##### Performance Items

Effectively expresses ideas verbally  
Demonstrates an interest in what others have to say  
Focuses the discussion on the problem, not on the other person  
Displays effective non-verbal communication

## ***Presentation***

### Description

The process of formally presenting information verbally to an audience.

### Performance Items

Presents information in a logical sequence

Demonstrates knowledge of the topic

Demonstrates effective presentation skills

Effectively uses PowerPoint to design and deliver the presentation

## ***Teamwork***

### Description

The skills needed to work with a group of people toward a common goal.

Creates a supportive environment for discussion and work

### Performance Items

Actively participates in the discussion

Creates a supportive environment for discussion and work

Encourages others in the group to participate

Analyzes and builds upon ideas that are presented by others

## ***Conflict Management***

### Description

The ability to resolve a contradiction that occurs when two or more people have conflicting opinions.

### Performance Items

Effectively identifies and explores the needs of those involved in the conflict

Appeared calm and cooperative throughout the discussion

Attempts to resolve the conflict

Resolves the conflict in an acceptable manner

## ***Customer Relations***

### Description

The ability to ensure that all people a person interacts with are satisfied with the outcome.

### Performance Items

Restates the customer's complaint to ensure adequate understanding

Demonstrates sympathy for the client's situation

Demonstrates concern for preserving the relationship with the customer

Explains to the client how the problem will be handled

## ***Leadership***

### Description

The ability to inspire employees to perform at their highest level of ability.

### Performance Items

Provides guidance to the group in completing the task

Appears confident throughout the interaction

Demonstrates flexibility

Provides positive feedback to team members

## ***Delegation***

### Description

The ability of the manager to assign minor, non-confidential tasks to subordinates, thus giving the manager more time for other tasks and giving the subordinate an opportunity to develop skills.

### Performance Items

Demonstrates a consideration of delegating tasks to others

Chooses appropriate tasks to be delegated to employees

Chooses appropriate employees to delegate tasks to

Provides adequate information regarding the task to the person completing the task, including task instructions and a deadline

## ***Coaching***

### Description

The method for improving employee performance whereby the coach, in a constructive, non-threatening way, uses active listening and probing questions to help people find their own answers to the issues they are facing.

### Performance Items

Identifies the need to coach employees through a performance issue

Assists the employee in realizing that a problem exists

Explains that poor performance will not be tolerated

Assists the employee in exploring options for correcting the problem, but does not force any particular approach

## ***Ethics***

### Description

The guides by which we apply our values to a given situation.

### Performance Items

Identifies ethical dilemmas

Identifies additional information that is needed to assess the ethical dilemma

Identifies options for resolving the dilemma and analyzes each

Resolves the dilemma without recommending wrongdoing

## ***Diversity Awareness***

### Description

The ability to invite, accept, and integrate points of view different from one's own into a decision.

### Performance Items

Acknowledges the importance of diverse viewpoints

Invites input from people with potentially diverse viewpoints

Avoids the use of inappropriate stereotypes when discussing diverse viewpoints

Integrates diverse viewpoints into the decision making process

## APPENDIX I

### ASSESSMENT CENTER EXERCISE DESCRIPTIONS

#### ***Presentation***

You have been given the following note from the Director of Operations:

*Your department has been experiencing an increase in attendance problems lately. Employees within your department call off or arrive late for work more frequently than any other department at New Foundations. This is causing great concern because the overtime incurred is increasing employee costs and having to force employees to stay over is diminishing morale.*

*The Executive Advisory Committee is interested in hearing your ideas about how you plan to address this problem. They are meeting today and have allotted 10 minutes of their time for you to come in and present your plan.*

You should prepare a presentation that will effectively relay your ideas to them. They will expect you to present the information using PowerPoint.

You are to prepare a 10 minute presentation describing your recommendation. Your audience is the Executive Advisory Committee of New Foundations. They will expect you to use PowerPoint during this presentation.

You will have 30 minutes to prepare the presentation. If you are unfamiliar with Power Point, someone will show you very generally how to create slides. You will take the flash drive with you when you deliver the presentation. Once the presentation is complete, save it to the jump drive provided to you by the proctor. You will be called into the Executive Advisory Committee meeting at a later time today. If you finish ahead of time, please be sure to save your presentation and inform the proctor that you have completed the exercise.

#### ***Leaderless Group Discussion***

Your company, New Horizons, is experiencing some budget cuts. One of the solutions to save the company money is to lay-off some of the work force. New Horizons has four main employee groups and lay off can come from none, some or all of these groups. You are an advocate for one of the employee groups. You have been selected to be part of the committee who is charged with making recommendations as to which employees to lay off.

Your group will have 30 minutes to discuss and decide on recommendations. After your 30 minutes is up, you will be sharing your recommendations with your manager.

### ***Client Role Play***

You will have a meeting with an upset client. The client is complaining about an employee “Lynn Flanders”. You are Lynn’s supervisor and must field the client’s questions and accusations. Your meeting will last approximately 10 minutes. Upon the conclusion of the role play a follow up question will be asked. The follow-up question is as follows:

*Federal law requires you to report injuries to the Health Care Safety Agency. This law imposes fines for injuries that occur in a health care facility and calls for the suspension of federal funding in some cases. Fines can range from \$50,000.00 to \$200,000.00. New Foundations relies heavily upon federal funding. A loss such as this will cause a reduction in the care that New Foundations can provide to the children and programs will have to be cut. In short, children will suffer if the injury is reported. Will you report the injury?*

### ***Coaching Role Play***

You have a meeting scheduled with one of your employees, Mickey Lundster.

Mickey has been employed at New Foundations for six years and is a very good worker. Mickey believes strongly in the New Foundations mission and even does volunteer work for New Foundations. Mickey’s file, which is provided for you on the desk, contains numerous commendations from clients and coworkers. You have always been able to rely on Mickey, who frequently goes above and beyond the call of duty.

However, over the last few weeks Mickey has been very distracted and is performing below what is expected. Mickey has made some record keeping errors, has had attendance problems, and even missed an appointment with a client. None of this behavior is consistent with Mickey’s past performance.

You will be given a few minutes to review the information that is available to you. You will then have 10 minutes to conduct that meeting.

### ***Supervisory Role Play***

You pride yourself on the fact that your department always brings in more donations than any other New Foundations department during the fundraising season. This has not gone unnoticed. New Foundations' CEO has sent you a letter personally requesting that you oversee the planning of this year's main fundraising event. The event is held in May of every year and is New Foundations' most significant fundraising event of the year.

Last year's event brought in \$234,000 and was used to fund research regarding children and terminal illnesses. It was a black tie affair held at the Field Museum. The decorations included ice sculptures and eloquent flower arrangements. An orchestra was hired and played for the entire night. The event is attended by many government officials, corporate executives, and philanthropists. It was a huge success.

This year's fundraiser will raise money to provide new equipment throughout the departments of New Foundations. You know that your department is in extreme need of new equipment. Your employees have been complaining about how outdated and inefficient the equipment is and how it is affecting the quality of their work. You want to make sure that you raise enough money this year so that your department, as well as others, receives this needed equipment.

Your budget for the affair is \$50,000.00. You know that you really need to stretch every dollar if this year's event is going to be half as successful as last year's event. You do not want to let the CEO down, especially since you were hand selected to plan this event. It could lead to bigger things for your future at New Foundations.

Two weeks ago you met with your shift supervisor, Bobby Sanders, to discuss the event and your expectations. You instructed Bobby to gather cost information for various location and entertainment options. You asked Bobby to put together some ideas and informed Bobby that you are the only individual who has the authorization to sign checks for payments and to sign contracts. You have a meeting scheduled with Bobby to discuss how the plans are progressing and what suggestions Bobby has for the event.

## REFERENCES

- Barnes, M. L. & Sternberg, R. J. (1989). Social intelligence and decoding of nonverbal cues. *Intelligence*, 13, 263-287.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 1-26.
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 9-30.
- Bergman, M. E., Drasgow, F., Donovan, M. A., Henning, J. B., & Juraska, S. E. (2006). Scoring situational judgment tests: Once you get the data, your troubles begin. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14, 223-235.
- Blickle, G., Meurs, J. A., Zettler, I., Solga, J., Noethen, D., Kramer, J., et al. (2008). Personality, political skill, and job performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72, 377-387.
- Borman, W. C. & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., Shiffman, S., Lerner, N., & Salovey, P. (2006). Relating emotional abilities to social functioning: A comparison of self-report and performance measures of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 780-795.
- Brebner, J., & Stough, C. (1995). Theoretical and empirical relationships between personality and intelligence. In D. H. Saklofske, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *International handbook of personality and intelligence*. (pp. 321-347). New York, NY, US: Plenum Press.
- Brown, L. T. & Anthony, R. G. (1990). Continuing the search for social intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11, 463-470.
- Burks, F. W. (1937). The relation of social intelligence test scores to ratings of social traits. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 8, 146-153.
- Chan, D. & Schmitt, N. (2002). Situational judgment and job performance. *Human Performance*, 15, 233-254.

- Chapin, F. S. (1942). Preliminary standardization of a social insight scale. *American Sociological Review*, 7, 214-228.
- Clevenger, J., Pereira, G. M., Wiechmann, D., Schmitt, N., & Harvey, V. S. (2001). Incremental validity of situational judgment tests. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 410-417.
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: A meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 678-707.
- 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.
- Donnellan, M. B., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., & Lucas, R. E. (2006). Mini-IPIP scales: Tiny-yet-effective measures of the Big five factors of personality. *Psychological Assessment*, 18, 192-203.
- Dipboye, R. L. & Flanagan, M. F. (1979) . Research settings in industrial and organizational psychology: Are findings in the field more generalizable than in the laboratory? *American Psychologist*, 34, 141-150.
- Dudley, N. M., Orvis, K. A., Lebiecki, J. E., & Cortina, J. M. (2006). A meta-analytic investigation of conscientiousness in the prediction of job performance: Examining the intercorrelations and the incremental validity of narrow traits. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 40-57.
- D'Zurilla, T. J. & Maydeu-Olivares, A. (1995). Conceptual and methodological issues in social problem-solving assessment. *Behavior Therapy*, 26, 409-432.
- Ferris, G. R., Perrewe, P. L., & Douglas, C. (2002). Social effectiveness in organizations: Construct validity and research directions. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9, 49-63.
- Ferris, G. R., Witt, L. A., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2001). Interaction of social skill and general mental ability on job performance and salary. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 1075-1082.
- Ford, M. & Tisak, M. (1983). A further search for social intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 197-206.
- Furnham, A. & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2004). Estimating one's own personality and intelligence scores. *British Journal of Psychology*, 95, 149-160.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.

- Gough, H. G. (1967). A validation study of the Chapin social insight test. *Psychological Reports, 17*, 355-368.
- Grubb, W. L., Whetzel, D. L., & McDaniel, M. A. (2004). *General mental ability tests in industry*. Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Guilford, J. P. (1967). *The nature of human intelligence*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Heggstad, E. D. & Morrison, M. J. (2008). An inductive exploration of the social effectiveness construct space. *Journal of Personality, 76*, 839-874.
- Hochwarter, W. A., Witt, L. A., Treadway, D. C., & Ferris, G. R. (2006). The interaction of social skill and organizational support on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 482-489.
- Hoepfner, R. & O'Sullivan, M. (1968). Social intelligence and IQ. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 28*, 339-344.
- Hogan, J. & Lock, J. (1995, May). A taxonomy of interpersonal skills for business interactions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Orlando, FL.
- Hogan, R. & Shelton, D. (1998). A socioanalytic perspective on job performance. *Human Performance, 11*, 129-144.
- Horn, J. L. & Cattell, R. B. (1966). Refinement and test of the theory of fluid and crystallized general intelligences. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 57*, 253-270.
- Hunt, T. (1928). The measurement of social intelligence. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 12*, 317-334.
- Jackson, D. N. (2004). *Personnel Assessment Form Manual*. Port Huron, MI: Sigma Assessment Systems.
- Jeanneret, P. R., Borman, W. C., Kubisiak, U. C., & Hanson, M. A. (1999). Generalized work activities. In N. G. Peterson, M. D. Mumford, W. C. Borman, P. R. Jeanneret & E. A. Fleishman (Eds.), *An occupational information system for the 21st century: The development of O\*NET*. (pp. 105-125). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Jones, K. & Day, J. D. (1996). Cognitive similarities between academically and socially gifted children. *Roeper Review, 18*, 270-273.
- Jones, K. & Day, J. D. (1997). Discrimination of two aspects of cognitive-social intelligence from academic intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*, 486-497.

- Keating, D. P. (1978). A search for social intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 218-223.
- Klein, C., DeRouin, R. E., & Salas, E. (2006). Uncovering workplace interpersonal skills: A review, framework, and research agenda. In G. P. Hodgkinson, & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology 2006 (vol 21)*. (pp. 79-126). Hoboken, NJ, US: Wiley Publishing.
- Kostman, J. T. (2004). Multi-dimensional performance requires multi-dimensional predictors: Predicting complex job performance using cognitive ability, personality and emotional intelligence assessment instruments as combinatorial predictors (Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67, 6364.
- Lee, J., Wong, C. T., Day, J. D., Maxwell, S. E., & Thorpe, P. (2000). Social and academic intelligences: a multitrait-multimethod study of their crystallized and fluid characteristics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 539-553.
- Lievens, F., Peeters, H., & Schollaert, E. (2008). Situational judgment tests: A review of recent research. *Personnel Review*, 37, 426-441.
- Mabe, P. A. & West, S. G. (1982). Validity of self-evaluation of ability: A review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 280-296.
- Marlowe, H. A. (1986). Social Intelligence: Evidence for the multidimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 78, 52-58.
- McClatchy, V. R. (1929). A theoretical and statistical critique of the concept of social intelligence and attempts to measure such a process. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 24, 217-220.
- McDaniel, M. A., Hartman, N. S., Whetzel, D. L., & Grubb, W. L., III. (2007). Situational judgment tests, response instructions, and validity: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 63-91.
- McDaniel, M. A., Morgeson, F. P., Finnegan, E. B., Campion, M. A., & Braverman, E. 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., Morgeson, F.P., Finnegan, E.B., Campion, M.A. and Braverman, E.P. (in press). Predicting job performance from common sense. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- 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.

Morgeson, F. P., Reider, M. H., & Campion, M. A. (2005). Selecting individuals in team settings: The importance of social skills, personality characteristics, and teamwork knowledge. *Personnel Psychology, 58*, 583-611.

Moss, F. A. & Hunt, T. (1927). Are you socially intelligent? *Scientific American*, 108-110.

Moss, F. A., Hunt, T., Omwake, K. T., & Ronning, M. M. (1927). *Social Intelligence Test*. Washington, DC: Center for Psychological Services.

Motowidlo, S. J., Dunnette, M. D., & Carter, G. W. (1990). An alternative selection procedure: The low-fidelity simulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 640-647.

Murphy, K. R. & Davidshofer, C. O. (2005). *Psychological Testing: Principles and Applications* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Neuman, G. A. & Wright, J. (1999). Team effectiveness: Beyond skills and cognitive ability. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 376-389.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

O'Connell, M. S., Hartman, N. S., McDaniel, M. A., Grubb, W. L., III, & Lawrence, A. (2007). Incremental validity of situational judgment tests for task and contextual job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 15*, 19-29.

O'Connor, R. M. & Little, I. S. (2003). Revisiting the predictive validity of emotional intelligence: self-report versus ability-based measures. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35*, 1893-1902.

Offermann, L. R., Bailey, J. R., Vasilopoulos, N. L., Seal, C., & Sass, M. (2004). The relative contribution of emotional competence and cognitive ability to individual and team performance. *Human Performance, 17*, 219-243.

O'Sullivan, M., Guilford, J. P., & deMille, R. (1965). The measurement of social intelligence. *Psychological Laboratory Report, 34*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Paulhus, D. L., Lysy, D. C., & Yik, M. S. (1998). Self-report measures of intelligence: Are they useful as proxy IQ tests. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 525-554.

Paulhus, D. L., & Martin, C. L. (1987). The structure of personality capabilities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 354-365.

Ployhart, R. E. (2006). Staffing in the 21st century: new challenges and strategic opportunities. *Journal of Management, 32*, 868-897.

Ployhart, R. E., Weekely, J. A., Holtz, B. C., & Kemp, C. (2003). Web-Based and paper-and-pencil testing of applicants in a proctored setting: Are personality, biodata, and situational judgment tests comparable? *Personnel Psychology*, *56*, 733-752.

Pintner, E. & Upshall, C. C. (1928). Some results of social intelligence tests. *School and Society*, *27*, 369-370.

Reardon, R., Foley, J. M., & Walker, R. E. (1979). Social intelligence and vocational choice. *Psychological Reports*, *44*, 853-854.

Reed, A. A. & Weidemann, C. C. (1933). A social situation judgments test--form I. *Educational Research Record (U Nebraska)*, *5*, 10-17.

Rest, J. R. Manual for the Defining Issues Test. Unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota, 1974.

Riggio, R. E. (1986). Assessment of basic social skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 649-660.

Romney, D. M. & Pyryt, M. C. (1999). Guilford's concept of social intelligence revisited. *High Ability Studies*, *10*, 137-142.

Salgado, J. F. (2003). Predicting job performance using FFM and non-FFM personality measures. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *76*, 323-346.

Saucier, G. & Ostendorf, F. (1999). Hierarchical subcomponents of the big five personality factors: A cross-language replication. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*, 613-627.

Schmidt, F. L. & Hunter, J. (2004). General mental ability in the world of work: Occupational attainment and job performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*, 162-173.

Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E., & Outerbridge, A. N. (1986). Impact of job experience and ability on job knowledge, work sample performance, and supervisory ratings of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *71*, 432-439.

Schmidt, F. L., Hunter, J. E., Outerbridge, A. N., & Goff, S. (1988). Joint relation of experience and ability with job performance: Test of three hypotheses. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *73*, 46-57.

Schmidt, F. L., Ones, D., & Hunter, J. E. (1992). Personnel selection. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *43*, 627-670.

Schneider, R. J., Ackerman, P. L., & Kanfer, R. (1996). To “act wisely in human relations:” Exploring the dimensions of social competence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 21*, 469-481.

Schneider, R. J., Roberts, R. D., & Heggestad, E. D. (2002). Exploring the structure and construct validity of a self-report Social Competence Inventory. In L. M. Hough (Chair), *Compound traits: The next frontier of I/O personality research* Symposium conducted at the 17th Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc., Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Semadar, A., Robins, G., & Ferris, G.R. (2006). Comparing the validity of multiple social effectiveness constructs in the prediction of managerial job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 27*, 443-461.

Shanley, L. A., Walker, R. E., & Foley, J. M. (1971). Social intelligence: A concept in search of data. *Psychological Reports, 29*, 1123-1132.

Silvera, D. H., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2001). The Tromso social intelligence scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 42*, 313-319.

Stricker, L. J. & Rock, D. A. (1990). Interpersonal competence, social intelligence, and general ability. *Personality and Individual Differences, 11*, 833-839.

Tett, R. P., Steele, J. R., & Beauregard, R. S. (2003). Broad and narrow measures on both sides of the personality-job performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 335-356.

Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its use. *Harper's Magazine, 140*, 227-235.

Thorndike, R. L. (1936). Factor analysis of social and abstract intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 27*, 231-233.

Vinchur, A. J., Schippmann, J. S., Switzer, F. S., & Roth, P. L. (1998). A meta-analytic review of predictors of job performance for salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 586-597.

Vyrost J. & Kyselova M. (2006). Personality correlates of social intelligence. *Studia Psychologica, 48*, 207-212.

Weekley, J. A. & Jones, C. (1999). Further studies of situational tests. *Personnel Psychology, 52*(3), 679-700.

Weekley, J. A. & Ployhart, R. E. (2005). Situational judgment: Antecedents and relationships with performance. *Human Performance, 18*, 81-104.

Weekley, J. A., Ployhart, R. E., & Holtz, B. C. (2006). On the development of situational judgment tests: Issues in item development, scaling, and scoring. In J. A. Weekley, & R. E. Ployhart (Eds.), *Situational judgment tests: Theory, measurement, and application*. (pp. 157-182). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Weis, S. & Süß, H.M. (2007). Reviving the search for social intelligence – a multitrait-multimethod study of its structure and construct validity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42, 3-14.

Witt, L. A. & Ferris, G. R. (2003). Social skill as moderator of the conscientiousness - performance relationship: Convergent results across four studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 809-821.

Wong, C. T., Day, J. D., Maxwell, S. E., & Meara, N. M. (1995). A multitrait-multimethod study of academic and social intelligence in college students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 117-133.

Wonderlic, 2001. Wonderlic Personnel Test: Form A. Libertyville, IL: Wonderlic, Inc.

Zuckerman, M. & Larrance, D. T. (1979). Individual differences in perceived encoding and decoding abilities. In R. Rosenthal (Ed.), *Skill in nonverbal communication: Individual differences* (pp. 170-195). Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.