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The research-practice gap continues to be a vexing issue in industrial-organizational psychology generally, and in the area of personnel selection specifically. Selection methods with questionable empirical support often enjoy popularity with hiring managers and lay people, while alternative methods with substantial research support are often underutilized. Emotional intelligence (EI) tests fall into the former category. In an effort to better understand the popularity of EI, this study used an experimental framework to assess the role that three key variables associated with the construct—the construct label, peoples’ views about the malleability of traits, and the emotional labor content of jobs—might play in driving support for the use of EI tests in hiring environments. Evidence was found for the influence of emotional labor demands on reactions toward the use of an EI test in a simulated hiring scenario; the construct label used, and views about trait malleability, were not found to have an effect on these reactions. These findings suggest that the increased popularity EI has enjoyed in recent years may be due to the perceived relevance the construct has for service-sector jobs and other occupations that involve a high degree of social interaction. Future research should examine alternative aspects of emotional labor, such as requirements for positive or negative emotions, or emotional labor demands in simple versus complex jobs, in an effort to better understand when EI is perceived to be most relevant in organizational settings.
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INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the popularity of emotional intelligence (EI) in the business world, in educational settings, and in popular culture as a whole, has increased substantially. Although emotions have long been of interest to psychologists, both scientific and lay interest in EI has grown substantially since the publication of Daniel Goleman’s book *Emotional Intelligence* in 1995. Indeed, a search of the PsycINFO database reveals that, from 1877 (the first year with entries in the database) to 1994, there were only nine peer-reviewed entries that contained the term “emotional intelligence;” since 1995, there are over 2,600 peer-reviewed entries that use this term. Clearly, the popularity of this concept has exploded in the past two decades.

Emotional intelligence has found a receptive audience in both the workplace and the educational system (Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2012). Many business consulting firms market EI-related solutions, such as seminars, lectures, and retreats, as a panacea for a variety of organizational ills, particularly those concerning leaders and teams (Hay Group, n.d.; MLS Consulting, n.d.; See It Thrive, n.d.). Some of these firms make unsubstantiated statements regarding the usefulness of EI, claiming, for example, that “emotional intelligence is the strongest predictor of performance, explaining a full 58% of success in all types of jobs” (Talentsmart, n.d.). This sense of optimism about the power of EI is not surprising, given that Goleman himself claimed that EI is more important for achieving success in life than general mental ability (GMA; Goleman, 1995; Goleman, 1996), a claim that has been successfully challenged by empirical research (Kuncel, Hezlett, & Ones, 2004; Ree & Earles, 1992; Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). Still, Goleman’s position reflects a perspective that is shared by many people in the business world—in a 2011 CareerBuilder survey, 71% of hiring managers indicated that
they valued EI more than GMA in prospective employees, and 59% indicated that they would not hire an employee with high GMA but low EI (Grasz, 2011).

Although the popularity of EI is clear, uncertainty remains over the utility of the construct for applied psychology. This disconnect is an example of the science—practice gap that has vexed industrial-organizational (I-O) psychology for many years (Rousseau, 2006; Rynes, Colbert, & Brown, 2002). Although supporters of EI have used a variety of arguments to endorse the use of this construct in workplace settings, the specific factors that are most responsible for driving peoples’ reactions toward this construct remain unclear. In this study, several key variables associated with EI were manipulated in an experimental setting. Specifically, I examined whether the label “emotional intelligence” itself, the perceived malleability of the construct, or the emotional labor demands of jobs, influenced perceptions of EI. Although research in this area is relevant to a variety of stakeholders (such as those who make hiring decisions, and applicants themselves), my focus was on lay attitudes toward the use of EI in employment settings, with the goal of understanding why such favorable attitudes toward this construct, in the absence of much scientific support, exist.

**Emotional Intelligence**

The search for alternative types of intelligence to supplement GMA has been ongoing in psychology for decades. Although Spearman proposed his “g” theory (1904) over a century ago, several contemporary intelligence theories have found footing by broadening the scope of the construct to include more specific types. In the 1980s, Gardner (1983) developed an elaborate theory of multiple intelligences that included interpersonal intelligence, characterized by “understanding others through social interaction, emotional reactions, [and] conversation” (p. 191; Moran, Kornhaber, & Gardner, 2009) a description that overlaps with some definitions of
EI (described below). Sternberg, with his triarchic theory of intelligence (1985) also made an effort to expand the notion of intelligence beyond GMA. Although his three-part theory includes a component that closely mirrors “g” (what Sternberg called analytical intelligence), it also includes practical intelligence; Sternberg characterized this form of intelligence as the ability to both adapt to and shape environments and situations using prior knowledge (Sternberg, 2008b).

Although these expanded models of intelligence ostensibly emerged to broaden the manner in which psychologists examine intelligence, there is a sense that these efforts were also motivated by a desire to identify alternative types of intelligences that would appear less elitist than traditional GMA. In this way, even though a person might achieve an average (or below average) score on a conventional GMA test, they might still achieve an above-average score on an alternative type of intelligence (see Locke, 2005). As Sternberg (2008a) noted: “Although many of us act as though intelligence is what intelligence tests measure, few of us believe it” (p. 34). This dissatisfaction with GMA and its associated tests has been present for decades, and is likely due to a number of factors, including the heritable and stable nature of intelligence (i.e. it is seen as deterministic), and the fact that conventional intelligence tests are parsimonious in their assessment of test-takers—many people reject the notion that a single number can accurately capture a quality as complex as intelligence (Brody, 2006).

Much of the academic work that has been done on EI to date has focused on clarifying the structure of the construct. A number of different models of EI have been proposed over the past two decades, generally falling into one of two types. Some models are purely ability-based models, and treat EI as an emotion-oriented cognitive process (Mayer, 2001). Other models are termed mixed models, and generally consist of an assortment of characteristics; models that fall into this category often include some characteristics that overlap with established personality
traits, and often include other non-cognitive characteristics as well (Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2002). Given the centrality of EI to the current paper, a brief review of these models is useful.

Although Goleman (1995) is widely credited with bringing EI to the attention of the general public and popularizing the construct, credit for the first academic model of EI typically goes to Salovey and Mayer (1990). Salovey and Mayer initially proposed a three-part ability-based model, consisting of appraisal and expression of emotion, regulation of emotion, and utilization of emotion; several years later, these authors added a fourth component, understanding emotion, to their model (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). To date, this model has received a fair amount of academic support (see Matthews et al., 2002). Mayer, Salovey, and colleagues also developed a measure of their model of EI, known as the Multi-Factor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS; Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999); the MEIS has since been revised and renamed the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT V2.0; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003). In keeping with their conception of EI as an ability-based construct, these are performance-based measures (as opposed to being self-report-based) that assess EI in much the same way that GMA is measured by traditional intelligence tests. For example, one part of the MSCEIT asks people to indicate whether a particular mood would facilitate performance on a specific task (such as experiencing joy while planning a party), while another part asks people to read a story about a person and then choose an action that would be likely to influence that person’s emotional experience. Expert scoring was used to create the answer key for the MSCEIT V2.0 (Mayer et al., 2003).

Though Salovey, Mayer, and colleagues were among the first researchers to subject the concept of EI to scientific inquiry, Goleman remains the figure most closely tied with the
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popularization of EI in wider society (see Goleman, 1995 and Goleman, 1998a). Goleman adapted the Salovey and Mayer definition of EI to craft his own version of the construct; Goleman’s model includes self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and general social skills (Goleman, 1998a). Goleman suggested that EI was necessary to achieve success in many professions (such as medicine and traditional corporate jobs), as well as life domains in general (such as school and family; Goleman, 1995). Following the release of Goleman’s first book, TIME magazine helped to popularize the term “EQ” and claimed on their cover that EI “…may be the best predictor of success in life, redefining what it means to be smart” (Gibbs, 1995).

Although Goleman is often credited with popularizing EI, Reuven Bar-On is another important figure in the dissemination of EI due to his creation of the first measure of EI that found widespread commercial use, the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i; 1997). This self-report scale measures EI by assessing five subdimensions of EI: interpersonal intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence, adaptability, stress management, and general mood. Like Goleman’s (1998a) model, this measure reflects the mixed model approach to EI by measuring a wide variety of personal characteristics, some of which have demonstrated considerable overlap with existing individual difference constructs, such as the Big 5 personality traits (Van Rooy and Viswesvaran, 2004) and positive and negative affectivity (Palmer, Donaldson, & Stough, 2002).

In an effort to clarify the nature of these varied conceptualizations of EI, Cherniss (2010) noted that ability and mixed models each tend to define EI slightly differently. Specifically, he argued that while ability models treat EI as an underlying ability that facilitates performance on tasks involving emotions, mixed models treat EI as a broader set of emotional competencies. This explanation helps clarify the difficulty that researchers have had defining and measuring EI;
this conclusion is also supported by a number of research studies that have found relatively weak correlations between ability-based and mixed model EI measures, with correlations ranging from $r = .14 - .21$ (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Van Rooy, Viswesvaran, & Pluta, 2005).

In an attempt to place EI in a larger context within the intelligence literature, MacCann, Joseph, Newman, and Roberts (2014) examined how EI might fit into established models of the structure of intelligence. These authors found support for the notion that EI is a second-stratum intelligence factor that loads onto a general $g$ factor, just as fluid intelligence and crystalized intelligence (among others) do. It is important to note that MacCann et al.’s (2014) work is based on the ability model of EI, lending further empirical support to Mayer and colleagues’ ability-based definition of EI. These findings do not help to clarify the nature of mixed models of EI, where uncertainty remains about their theoretical value.

**Validity of EI**

Given the commercial popularity of EI, I-O psychologists have begun to examine the operational validity of EI for predicting job performance. Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) conducted the first meta-analysis of EI validity and found that the overall relation between EI and job performance was .23; these authors also found that the relations between EI and other constructs varied considerably depending on the EI scale used, with ability-based scales demonstrating more overlap with GMA than mixed-model scales. Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) also found non-trivial overlap with Big 5 personality scales.

Law, Wong, and Song (2004) examined peer reports of EI and their relation with job performance. These authors found incremental validity of the peer reports over and above self-reports of the Big 5 ($\Delta R^2 = .17$); however, they also found a non-significant correlation of $r = -.1$ between conscientiousness and task performance. As conscientiousness consistently predicts job
performance in a range of settings (Barrick & Mount, 1991), this result suggests that Law et al.’s (2004) sample may have had unique characteristics that limit the generalizability of their findings.

More recent meta-analytic evidence has provided mixed support for the validity of EI. Joseph and Newman (2010) found that performance-based ability measures of EI were only correlated with job performance at $r = .17$, whereas self-report mixed model measures of EI had a substantially higher correlation ($r = .42$) with performance. Examining incremental validity, these authors found that ability-based models of EI contributed almost nothing to the prediction of job performance over and above GMA and personality; mixed models demonstrated some incremental validity ($\Delta R^2 = .14$), but the authors cautioned that these models have poor theoretical support. O’Boyle, Humphrey, Pollack, Hawver, and Story (2011) found that the corrected correlation between EI (all measures combined) and job performance was $r = .28$; they also found that EI predicted job performance over and above GMA and the Big 5 personality traits, with incremental validity of $\Delta R^2 = .07$ when EI measures based on mixed models were used. Based on these results, O’Boyle et al. (2011) concluded that, although EI may not live up to the claims of Goleman and others, there is also evidence that EI is more than just a simple combination of GMA and personality factors. However, a subsequent meta-analysis (Joseph, Jin, Newman, & O’Boyle, 2015) found that, once a variety of common predictors (such as GMA, conscientiousness, extraversion, and ability EI) are controlled for, mixed model measures of EI had negligible predictive validity.

The validity of EI may also be influenced by the characteristics of jobs themselves. Specifically, some research suggests that EI is primarily useful for predicting success on jobs with high emotional labor requirements (Joseph & Newman, 2010; Newman, Joseph, &
MacCann, 2010). Of note, these studies have found that when emotional labor requirements are low, ability-based EI has almost no predictive value.

Although much validation research on EI has focused on predicting overall job performance, attention has also been given to predicting leader effectiveness using EI measures. Since the dawn of the construct’s popularity, high EI has often been mentioned as an important leader characteristic, with Goleman (1998b) even referring to EI as the “sine qua non” of leadership. As with efforts to evaluate EI’s ability to predict overall job performance, research on EI’s ability to predict effective leadership has generated mixed results. Palmer, Walls, Burgess, and Stough (2001) found that some components of transformational leadership were positively correlated with EI; however, support was lacking for the hypothesis that transformational leaders would have higher overall EI than transactional leaders. More recently, Harms and Credé (2010) conducted a meta-analysis on the relation between EI and transformational leadership; they found that, when different sources were used to measure leader EI and transformational leadership behaviors, correlations decreased substantially compared to when the same source was used. Echoing the results discussed above, these authors also found that measures based on mixed models of EI had higher validity coefficients for predicting leader performance than ability-based measures. Reviewing the state of research linking EI and leadership as a whole, Walter, Cole, and Humphrey (2011) noted that EI’s relevance to leadership likely depends on a number of factors, including the outcome of interest (i.e. emergence, effectiveness, etc.) and the type of EI model (and corresponding measure) that is used to assess EI.

Despite over 20 years of research, there remains a good deal of debate and uncertainty over the nature of EI as a construct. Multiple models (and their corresponding measures) have received support from their creators, yet little consensus has emerged about the practical utility
of EI, particularly in terms of its ability to predict job performance over and above existing constructs (such as GMA and personality traits). However, despite these doubts, EI has caught the attention of the business community and popular culture; thus, the popularity of EI appears to be driven by additional factors besides research evidence. As mentioned previously, this situation can be seen as an example of the science-practice gap that has long been cited as a concern by personnel selection researchers (see Rynes et al., 2002); specifically, the selection techniques that are often used by organizations frequently have questionable empirical support (e.g. the continued popularity of unstructured interviews; Buckley, Norris, & Wiese, 2000). In an effort to better understand the popularity of EI and this part of the science-practice gap, I now turn to an examination of factors associated with this construct that may be driving its popularity.

**Explanations for the Popularity of EI**

There has long been recognition by I-O psychologists and other management scholars that organizations, and their stakeholders, are often susceptible to embracing fads and fashions (Abrahamson, 1991; Parker & Ritson, 2005). According to Dunnette (1966) the defining feature of a fad is a life cycle characterized by rapid growth of interest in a particular topic, typically followed by a swift decline in interest after a period of time. Famous examples of management fads include management-by-objectives, T-groups, quality circles, and total quality management (Carson, Lanier, Carson, & Birkenmeier, 1999), each of which has waxed and waned in popularity over the years. Although there is variation in the specifics of each of these fads, several authors have noted that there also appear to be some common themes that characterize the rise and fall of each one. For example, in his work on “management fashions” Abrahamson (1996) suggested that an important component of fashions is that they appear rational and progressive; new techniques that appear well-reasoned are more likely to see widespread
adoption. This tendency can be seen in EI’s history to date. As described above, supporters of the construct have spent considerable effort delineating EI as a legitimate form of intelligence with considerable practical utility; such efforts can be viewed as an attempt to establish the rational merit of EI.

Expanding on Abrahamson’s work, Carson et al. (1999) proposed a model of the lifecycle of a fad, suggesting that a variety of environmental and organizational features are likely to contribute to fad adoption. Several of these features are relevant to the spread and acceptance of EI. For example, Carson et al. (1999) suggested that certain environmental pressures and turbulence can increase fad acceptance. The increase in service-oriented jobs in the United States can be seen as one such pressure, as organizations have been faced with the challenge of developing effective techniques for hiring people who will excel in jobs that require high levels of emotional monitoring and regulation. It is possible that part of EI’s popularity may be its perceived ability to help make hiring decisions in such an environment. Carson et al. (1999) also proposed that fads benefit from having strong supporters who will advocate its utilization and dissemination. As described earlier, emotional intelligence has had a number of vocal supporters since its inception; these supporters have written widely about the construct, and have been especially active promoting the concept to lay audiences (e.g. Gibbs, 1995; Goleman, 1995; Goleman, 1998a). Finally, Carson et al. (1999) suggested that fads are more likely to become popular when they are seen as relatively easy to implement and not radically different from existing practices. The preponderance of EI tests on the market (see above discussion on measures of EI), suggests that an effort has been made to make it easy for organizations to incorporate these tools into their hiring process.
Furnham (2006) examined some of the social dynamics associated with fads, suggesting that fads are often characterized by polarized camps of believers and non-believers, each of which fervently believe, or refuse to believe, respectively, the hype surrounding the new idea. Here again, this tendency can be seen with EI, as supporters of EI have noted that “[In 181 organizational competence models], compared to IQ and expertise, emotional competence mattered twice as much” (Goleman, 1998a, p. 31), while critics have charged that “…any claims for the value of EI in the work setting cannot be made under the scientific mantle” (Landy, 2005, p. 411). Although there are many organizational researchers whose views fall somewhere between these extreme perspectives, support for the use of EI in organizational settings clearly varies widely.

In addition to being faddish or fashionable, the popularity of EI may also be influenced by other beliefs people may hold about testing and human abilities. For example, a common perception of EI is that it provides hiring managers with the ability to “pick up the slack” left behind by other commonly-used predictors. Although no predictor of job performance is perfect, supporters of EI have commented that the construct helps to compensate for the shortcomings of other predictors, especially GMA. For example, Emmerling and Goleman (2003) argued that GMA does a poor job of predicting who is going to be an average employee versus a superior performer, especially at higher organizational levels (see also Goleman, 1998a). This claim conflicts with research in I-O psychology that suggests that the predictive power of GMA increases as job complexity increases (Hunter & Hunter, 1984). In addition, Ones and Dilchert (2009) noted that there is considerable variability in executives’ GMA, suggesting that GMA tests can still be useful selection tools at the highest levels of an organization.
The continued criticism that GMA sometimes faces in mainstream society may also help explain the popularity of EI. Since their use became fairly widespread in the early 1900s, GMA tests have often been criticized as biased, unreliable tools with overstated predictive power (Brim, 1965). Conventional intelligence tests have also suffered from charges that they discriminate against certain racial groups and perpetuate classism (see Brody, 2006, for a review of these arguments). Matthews, Zeidner, and Roberts (2002) suggested that Goleman’s (1995) message may have found a particularly receptive audience because it closely followed Herrnstein and Murray’s (1994) controversial book, The Bell Curve.

Although these large-scale forces have likely played a role in popularizing EI, they do not provide a sufficient psychological explanation that can be used to understand the popularity of EI at the individual level. Whereas these previous explanations for EI’s popularity have focused largely on dissatisfaction with other constructs, in this study, I focused on specific components of EI that may appeal to a lay audience, with the goal of explaining why EI itself is such a compelling idea for many people. First, drawing on research on the impact of labels (e.g. Loftus, 1974) I suggested that the label “emotional intelligence” itself may influence how people react to the construct. Lay peoples’ positive reactions to EI may have less to do with the definition of the construct itself and more to do with its name, which has become well-known in popular culture (Gibbs, 1995).

It may also be the case that EI is perceived to be a malleable quality, and, therefore, something that can be improved with training or experience. Based on research on implicit theories (Dweck, 1986), I predicted that people who see EI in this way (as more, as opposed to less, malleable) would have more positive attitudes toward it.
Finally, I suggested that people who are considering EI’s relevance to jobs with a high degree of social interaction and emotional monitoring (i.e. high emotional labor) would have more positive reactions to it than people who are considering its applicability to low emotional labor jobs. As the U.S. labor force has become increasingly service-based (Hecker, 2005), it stands to reason that people may see EI as increasingly relevant to today’s work world, thus helping to explain EI’s current popularity. Below, these three factors are discussed in more detail.

Label

One reason for the popularity of EI may be the label “emotional intelligence” itself. The influential power of wording has been recognized in psychology for many years, dating back to Loftus’ (1974; 1975) research on eyewitness testimony. In a series of studies, she instructed people to watch a video of a multi-car accident; following the film, people were asked a number of questions about their recollection of the accident. Loftus and her colleagues found that the wording of questions (e.g. “Did you see a broken headlight?” vs. “Did you see the broken headlight?”; emphasis added) influenced what people reported about the accident (Loftus & Palmer, 1974; Loftus & Zanni, 1975). Although Loftus was primarily interested in the effect of question wording on eyewitness testimony, similar results in other settings have demonstrated that labeling can influence lay people in a variety of ways. For example, Schuldt, Konrath, and Schwartz (2011) found that people responding to a survey were more likely to support the idea that climate change is real when it was labeled “climate change” than when it was labeled “global warming.” The authors argued that the associations people make with these terms differ; for instance, compared to “global warming,” “climate change” is a term that is more compatible with extreme cold or snow, thus making it a more flexible label. Similarly, wording used in the
General Social Survey was found to influence how people responded to questions about government spending (Rasinski, 1989). For example, when asked if the government spends too little on “assistance to the poor,” a majority of respondents indicated that they agreed with this statement; however, when this question was relabeled to ask if too little government money is spent on “welfare,” a majority of respondents disagreed. Here again, the associations that people made with each term appeared to differ; specifically, it has been argued that “welfare” may elicit images of loafing and government dependency, while “assistance to the poor” does not (Smith, 1987).

In the case of EI, the word “intelligence” may be a factor driving positive reactions to the construct. Many supporters of EI have made a point to establish it as a true form of intelligence (Goleman, 1995; Mayer & Salovey, 1993), suggesting that they view “intelligence” as a key part of the construct. There has also been an effort by EI supporters to contrast EI with conventional intelligence, and labeling EI as “an intelligence” may be helpful in this regard. That is, by labeling EI as a type of intelligence and therefore placing it on equal footing with conventional intelligence, EI may be more clearly positioned as an alternative that could supplement and/or replace conventional intelligence. Thus, in this study, the label used to define an EI test was manipulated, in order to see if this factor influenced perceptions of the construct. Specifically, based on the legitimacy that the word “intelligence” conveys, I expected that perceptions of EI would be more favorable when it was labeled “emotional intelligence” than when it was labeled with a term that people are less familiar with. Two alternative labels were used in this study. The first, “emotional facility,” is a term that conveys a similar quality as “intelligence,” but is less common in everyday usage. The second, “emotional consortation,” was a term created for this
study; this label was included to explore how perceptions of EI might be different if it were labeled with a name that would be certain to be unfamiliar to people.

_Hypothesis 1:_ Perceptions of EI will be more favorable when it is labeled “emotional intelligence” versus “emotional facility” or “emotional consortation.”

**Malleability**

One purported benefit of using EI to assess people is that EI is believed to be more malleable and easier to develop than GMA (Talentsmart, n.d.; Watkin, 2000). Boyatzis (2000) noted that a series of longitudinal studies involving MBA students at Case Western Reserve University found that a program designed to increase the emotional competency of the students was effective over a period of several years. Similarly, Nelis, Quoidbach, Mikolajczak, and Hansenne (2009) found that an intervention designed to teach basic theoretical information about emotions, along with ways to improve emotional functioning in day-to-day life, was effective at increasing EI in a sample of undergraduate psychology students. Bolstered by such evidence, supporters of EI seem to argue that, if EI is malleable and can improved, then the use of EI assessments in organizational settings is justifiable since such assessments evaluate applicants on a characteristic that can be improved with experience and practice (compared to more stable GMA or personality traits).

This emphasis on malleability is relevant to Dweck’s (1986) work on implicit theories. The core tenant of this idea is that people maintain theories about the nature of human traits, such as intelligence and personality factors. These theories may take one of two forms: one views traits as largely stable, changing little over time (an entity theory), while the other views human traits as fairly flexible, capable of fluctuating on a regular basis (an incremental theory). In some instances, a person’s implicit theory is domain-specific (based on the ability or characteristic
being assessed), but Dweck and her colleagues have also suggested that many people have a tendency to view human behavior in general as being largely influenced by one theory or the other (Dweck, Chiu, & Hong, 1995).

Although Dweck (1986) initially applied her research to children’s theories about intelligence, and the impact this had on their school performance, implicit theories have been found to influence people of all ages (Chiu, Hong, & Dweck, 1997). Application of implicit theories to I-O psychology has been limited, but Heslin, Latham, & VandeWalle (2005) found that managers who were incremental theorists were more likely to acknowledge changes in employee performance when conducting performance appraisals, relative to entity theorists. It is possible that these theories may influence preferences for assessing EI in a selection context; specifically, it stands to reason that the malleability EI supposedly possesses would be valued by incremental theorists, who have a predisposition for viewing traits as fairly flexible. In this study, peoples’ implicit theories were manipulated to examine the impact they have on perceptions of using EI in selection settings. Past studies have found that implicit theories can be manipulated in research settings. For example, Chiu, Hong, and Dweck (1997) and McConnell (2001) used summaries of fictitious journal articles to successfully manipulate participants’ implicit theories; some participants read an article summary describing temperament as stable, while other participants read an article summary describing temperament as flexible. In a variation of this manipulation, Da Fonseca et al. (2008) provided people with a list of four ways that scientists have shown people can change over time. Based on the flexibility that EI is purported to have, I anticipated that people exposed to evidence for the incremental view of human nature would react more positively to EI than people who were exposed to evidence for the entity view.
Hypothesis 2: People who are exposed to information supporting an incremental view of human nature will have more favorable perceptions of the use of EI as a hiring tool, compared to people who are exposed to information supporting an entity view.

Emotional Labor Demands

The type of job that an EI test is applied to may influence perceptions of the construct as well. As noted earlier, EI has been found to have higher validity for predicting success in high emotional labor jobs compared to low emotional labor jobs (Joseph & Newman, 2010; Newman, Joseph, & MacCann, 2010). Jobs that require a high level of emotional labor require employees to use emotions frequently, often using shallow or deep acting strategies to help ensure that they display emotions that are appropriate for a particular job (Diefendorff, Croyle, & Gosserand, 2005). Many service industry jobs involve frequent customer interaction, and can thus be classified as jobs with high emotional labor demands (Grandey, 2000; Morris & Feldman, 1996). As the prevalence of service work is increasing in the United States (Hecker, 2005), people may perceive EI as relevant to many of today’s common service industry jobs. Research suggests that people assess selection methods more favorably when they feel that a selection method is relevant to the content of a particular job (i.e. has high face validity; Hausknecht, Day, & Thomas, 2004; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996). Thus, I suggested that people would react favorably to EI when discussed in the context of jobs with high emotional labor demands.

Hypothesis 3: Perceptions of EI will be more favorable when it is described in relation to jobs with high emotional labor demands, compared to jobs with low emotional labor demands.

Together, these three factors (label, malleability, and emotional labor demands) were manipulated to examine their influence on lay perceptions of EI’s use in selection settings.
Egalitarianism

A final variable that was assessed in this study is the role that fairness concerns have on perceptions of EI, as the use of EI tests in employment settings has been suggested to be more egalitarian than the use of GMA tests (Goleman, 1995). A consistent criticism that has been leveled at GMA tests over time is that they are biased, elitist assessments that can negatively impact minorities, people from disadvantaged backgrounds, and generally poor test-takers (Brody, 2006). Comparing EI to traditional GMA, Matthews et al. (2002) noted that “In contrast, EI offers hope for a more utopian, classless society, unconstrained by biological heritage.” (p. 6). Such beliefs may help to explain the popularity of EI in work settings; if EI is purported to provide greater justice to all job applicants, then EI might be especially appealing to people who value fairness and equality. This argument seems to be driven, at least in part, by the differences in group performance that GMA tests have long been known to suffer from (see Schmidt, 1988, for a review of this issue), and the notion that EI tests may perform better in this regard.

Relatively little research has been conducted in this area, but there is some support for the notion that group performance differences are reduced on EI tests. Van Rooy, Alonso, and Viswesvaran (2005) found only small race and gender differences on the Emotional Intelligence Scale (a self-report EI scale based on Mayer & Salovey’s ability model), and these differences favored minority and female individuals. A more recent study (Whitman, Kraus, & Van Rooy, 2014) using a different self-report EI measure (the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale; WLEIS) found that, on average, White applicants achieved higher scores than Black applicants, but the race differences observed were smaller than the Black-White group differences that have historically been found for GMA tests (see Roth, BeVier, Bobko, Switzer, & Tyler, 2001). Of note, the Black applicants in this study (Whitman, Kraus, & Van Rooy, 2014) had higher face
validity perceptions of the WLEIS than White applicants did, suggesting that they perceived the test’s use in a selection setting to be fair, despite their lower scores.

Social dominance theory provides a lens for understanding the importance that some people place on fairness. This theory suggests that societal conflict that naturally arises among different groups struggling for power is suppressed by establishing the dominance or superiority of one group over the others (Sidnaius & Pratto, 1999). This suppression is achieved through the perpetuation of legitimizing ideologies, which are beliefs that are used to give legitimacy to policies that promote favoritism toward certain groups (such as the belief in manifest destiny that promoted westward expansion in the United States in the 1800s, at the expense of indigenous tribes; Kim & Berry, 2015; Sidnaius & Pratto, 2001). In essence, SDT suggests that societies maintain harmony by collectively endorsing the idea that certain societal groups should be placed in positions of authority or influence based on superior characteristics that they possess, relative to other, less advantaged societal groups. Although SDT was initially focused on the societal level of analysis, subsequent work in this area has revealed that people differ in the extent to which they endorse the ideals of social dominance—what has been termed social dominance orientation (SDO)—and this tendency has been found to influence peoples’ attitudes and behavior at an individual level (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). More recently, researchers have identified two forms of SDO, one focused on overt subjugation of some groups by others (dominance), and the other focused on maintaining policies that favor certain groups over others (antiegalitarianism; Ho et al., 2012).

Although primarily of interest to social psychologists, SDO has been applied to I-O psychology research. Of particular relevance to the current research, Kim and Berry (2015) examined the relationship between SDO and reactions to GMA tests. They found that SDO was a
useful predictor of peoples’ reactions to GMA tests; specifically, people with a higher SDO typically had more positive reactions to the use of GMA tests for making selection decisions. Follow-up mediation analyses suggested that support for GMA tests increased when people felt GMA tests were valid, when they believed such tests helped support a merit-based society, and when they felt that such tests did not perpetuate racial inequality; all three of these beliefs can be seen as legitimizing ideologies that support the use of intelligence to help create social hierarchies.

Given these past findings, as well as the argument that EI is more egalitarian than other constructs, I suggested that EI tests would be more appealing to people with a lower SDO.

*Hypothesis 4:* SDO will be related to perceptions of EI, such that people low in social dominance orientation, relative to those who are high, will view EI more favorably.
METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Participants were adults from the United States recruited from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk) worker pool. MTurk has become a popular data collection tool for researchers, and evaluations of data obtained from MTurk samples have been favorable (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Goodman, Cryder, & Cheema, 2013). MTurk has also been identified as an ideal platform for collecting samples for experimental research (Crump, McDonnell, & Gureckis, 2013; Highhouse & Zhang, 2015). Participants were told that they would complete a short series of questionnaires in order to provide their opinions about a hypothetical organization changing the way it hires employees.

Data were initially collected from 684 participants. Three screening questions were included in the survey to check for inattentive responding. One question instructed participants to leave the answer to the question blank; 13 people failed this question by providing a response to it. Another question assessed comprehension of the implicit theory manipulation contained in the first newspaper article; participants provided an answer (“mostly stable” or “mostly changeable”) to the following statement: “The research you just read about described peoples’ traits as __________.” Eighteen people provided an incorrect response to this question. Finally, in order to check participants’ attention to the label manipulation, participants were asked to respond to the following statement: “According to the newspaper article about Top Value that you read earlier, Top Value had recently decided to start using a test of __________.” Participants were given three response options: “emotional intelligence,” “emotional facility,” and “emotional consortation.” In total, 94 people provided the incorrect label (12 in the emotional intelligence condition, 47 in the emotional facility condition, and 35 in the emotional consortation condition), while one person
did not provide a response. Only participants who passed all three screening questions were retained for further analysis, resulting in a final sample of 558 participants (see Table 1). The final sample was 58% male and 78% Caucasian, with an average age of 35. Forty percent of the participants indicated they had experience making hiring decisions.

This study utilized a 3 (label: emotional intelligence vs. emotional facility vs. emotional consortation) x 2 (implicit theory: entity vs. incremental) x 2 (emotional labor: high vs. low) between-subjects factorial design; participants were randomly assigned to one of the twelve experimental conditions. People were provided, on MTurk, with a link to the study on the survey platform Qualtrics; the first page of the survey was an informed consent page. After being told of their rights and consenting to participate, participants were told that they would be presented with two news articles similar to ones they might encounter in their local paper. The first newspaper article contained the implicit theory manipulation (see Appendix A). Implicit theories were manipulated using a variation of stimuli developed by McConnell (2001); similar stimuli were used by Rydell, Hugenberg, Ray, and Mackie (2007), and were found to be effective at manipulating peoples’ implicit theories. Participants in the incremental theory condition saw the following:

New Research Weighs in on Peoples’ Traits
Beverly Jamison, Research & Science Correspondent

Have you ever wondered whether or not peoples’ traits, like their personality, can change? Thanks to new scientific findings, we may finally have an answer. Recent empirical research by Dr. Kenneth Jones at Hazelbrook University has shown that peoples’ basic underlying attributes can change a great deal over time. At a recent book signing, Dr. Jones stated that ‘peoples’ character is soft like clay. Only for a small number of people is great effort and determination needed to effect changes in their
personal qualities.” Dr. Jones noted that his experiments, and those of numerous other researchers, have consistently found that the characteristics of most people can change a great deal across time and that peoples’ basic personality traits and characteristics are quite flexible and malleable.

People in the entity theory condition saw the following:

New Research Weighs in on Peoples’ Traits
Beverly Jamison, Research & Science Correspondent

Have you ever wondered whether or not peoples’ traits, like their personality, can change? Thanks to new scientific findings, we may finally have an answer. Recent empirical research by Dr. Kenneth Jones at Hazelbrook University has shown that peoples’ basic underlying attributes do not change much over time. At a recent book signing, Dr. Jones stated that “for most people, by the time they are a young adult, personal characteristics have set like plaster and will never soften again.” Dr. Jones noted that his experiments, and those of numerous other researchers, have consistently found that the characteristics of most people cannot change much across time and that peoples’ basic personality traits and characteristics are quite stable.

After responding to the implicit theory comprehension question described earlier, participants were then presented with a second article that contained the emotional labor and EI label manipulations (see Appendix A). People in the high emotional labor, “emotional intelligence” label condition saw the following (terms that were seen in the other emotional labor and label conditions are presented in parentheses):
Top Value to Revise Hiring Practices
Angela Miller, Business Correspondent

The process of getting a job at Top Value, the region’s largest big-box retailer, is about to change. Until recently, Top Value used a reference check and interview to assess applicants for several common positions, including cashiers and customer service representatives (including warehouse workers and merchandise stockers). However, executives at the company announced this week that they have decided to add an emotional intelligence (emotional facility/emotional consortation) test to their hiring process for these positions. Although the content of the test is protected to preserve its integrity, sources in Top Value’s Human Resources Department say that the test is designed to measure a person’s ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to distinguish between them, and to use this information to guide their thinking and actions toward others. In a statement to the media, the Director of Human Resources for Top Value, Wendy Jones, said, “We believe this new test will enable us to make better hiring decisions for these customer-oriented (inventory-oriented) positions, and improve the performance of Top Value.”

Following the presentation of this information, participants completed the dependent measure, a scale assessing their perceptions of the addition of the test described in the scenario (see Appendix B). A scale measuring participants’ SDO, the comprehension check for the label manipulation described earlier, manipulation checks for the implicit theory and emotional labor variables, and demographics questions were also included (these scales are described below, and appear in Appendices C-F). At the conclusion of the survey, participants were provided with a completion code to enter on MTurk, indicating that they had completed the survey. People were paid $0.65 through their Mturk worker account for their participation.
Measures

Perceptions of EI. Perceptions of EI were measured using three items developed for this study (see Appendix B). An example item was “I think the change in tests will help Top Value predict who will do well on these jobs.” All items utilized a 5-point (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree) response scale. The reliability of the scale was high (α = .94).

Social dominance orientation. Social dominance orientation was measured using the 8-item SDO7(S) Scale (Ho et al., in press; see Appendix C). An example item was, “Group equality should not be our primary goal.” Responses were provided using a 7-point (1 = strongly oppose; 7 = strongly favor) response scale. Consistent with initial scale development work, reliability of this scale was high (α = .93).

Test self-efficacy. Participants’ self-rated confidence taking tests was included for exploratory reasons. This variable was measured with three items adapted from Arvey, Strickland, Drauden, and Martin (1990; see Appendix D). An example item was, “I am confident in my test-taking abilities.” Responses were provided on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). Reliability of this scale was high (α = .90).

The comprehension check for the label manipulation (described earlier), and manipulation checks for the implicit theory and emotional labor manipulations were included at the end of the survey (see Appendix E). To assess the emotional labor manipulation, participants were asked, “One of the newspaper articles you read earlier described how the hiring process was being changed for several different positions within Top Value. To what degree did these jobs require social interaction with other people?” Participants responded using a 5-point (1 = to a very small extent and 5 = to a very large extent) scale. Finally, to assess the effect of the implicit theory manipulation, participants responded to the statement, “Peoples’ personal
qualities tend to be quite stable over time.” Responses were be given on a 5-point (1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree) response scale.

Basic demographic variables (e.g. sex, race, age; see Appendix F) and information about prior hiring experience were also collected.
RESULTS

Correlations and scale reliabilities are presented in Table 2. Perceptions of EI were positively correlated with test self-efficacy $r(556) = .15$, $p < .01$, but were unrelated to social dominance orientation, participant age, or extent of prior hiring experience (as measured by number of interviews conducted in the past year).

Results of the manipulation checks for the implicit theory and emotional label variables are presented in Table 3. Consistent with expectations, people in the entity conditions ($M = 3.98$, $SD = .86$) believed that peoples’ personal qualities were more stable than people in the incremental conditions ($M = 2.52$, $SD = 1$), $t(556) = 18.32$, $p < .01$, whereas people in the high emotional labor conditions ($M = 4.28$, $SD = .78$) perceived that the jobs they read about involved a higher degree of social interaction than people in the low emotional labor conditions ($M = 2.63$, $SD = 1.01$), $t(556) = -21.69$, $p < .01$. These results suggest that the manipulations were effective at influencing both participants’ implicit theories and their perceptions of the emotional labor demands of the jobs described in the newspaper article.

Table 4 presents the mean and standard deviation on the dependent measure for each condition. Hypotheses 1-3 were tested using a three-way analysis of variance (see Table 5). People in the emotional intelligence label condition ($M = 3.39$, $SD = .99$) did not have significantly more positive perceptions of EI than people in the emotional facility ($M = 3.53$, $SD = .92$) and emotional consortation ($M = 3.3$, $SD = 1.04$) conditions, $F(2, 545) = 1.92$, $p = .15$; thus, Hypothesis 1 was not supported. People in the incremental theory condition ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 1$) did not have significantly more positive perceptions of EI than people in the entity condition ($M = 3.37$, $SD = .97$), $F(1,545) = .49$, $p = .48$; thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported. Finally, people considering the EI test in the context of high emotional labor jobs ($M = 3.5$, $SD = .95$) had
significantly more positive perceptions of the test than people considering the test in the context of low emotional labor jobs ($M = 3.3, SD = 1.02$), $F(1, 545) = 4.8, p = .03$; thus, support was found for Hypothesis 3. Although no interactions between the independent variables were hypothesized, each of the two-way interactions, as well as the three-way interaction between all three factors, were assessed for exploratory reasons. None of the interactions were statistically significant, though the implicit theory/emotional labor interaction approached significance ($p = .12$; see Figure 1). This interaction suggested that emotional labor demands had an influence on EI perceptions among people exposed to the entity manipulation, but not those exposed to the incremental manipulation.

Hypothesis 4 suggested that people lower in SDO would view EI more favorably than people higher in SDO. A bivariate correlation indicated that these variables were unrelated ($r(556) = -.04, p = .39$; thus, Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

In addition to the hypothesis tests, supplemental exploratory analyses were also conducted. Participant age was unrelated to EI perceptions, and group comparisons found no gender or ethnicity differences on the dependent measure. In addition, SDO and TSE were not found to moderate the impact that any of the independent variables had on perceptions of EI.
ON THE POPULARITY OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

DISCUSSION

Interest in stakeholder reactions to selection methods has generated a robust research literature in I-O psychology in recent years. The targets of this research have included applicants, practitioners, and lay people, (Hausknecht et al., 2004; Klehe, 2004; König, Jöri, & Knüsel, 2011), but a consistent observation in this area is that support for selection methods that research has shown to be effective (such as cognitive ability tests and structured interviews) tends to be low, whereas support for less effective techniques (such as unstructured interviews and letters of recommendation) is often high (Lievens, Highhouse, & De Corte, 2005; Highhouse, 2008; Rynes, Giluk, & Brown, 2007). Although research in this area has examined reactions toward a variety of different selection methods, little research to date has examined reactions toward EI tests. A cursory search of the popular and business press literatures reveals that EI is a popular topic with a broad base of supporters, but relatively little is known about why this construct is so popular. This study aimed to address this gap by examining several key variables associated with EI, in an effort to better understand the popularity of this construct among lay people. Although the majority of this study’s hypotheses were not supported, several conclusions and directions for future research can be gleaned from the results.

Of the three variables that were manipulated in this study, only emotional labor was found to influence EI perceptions. This finding is consistent with previous theoretical suggestions, and empirical findings, that reactions to selection methods tend to be more favorable when they are perceived as being relevant (i.e. face valid) to a target job, or predictive of future job success (Hausknecht et al., 2004; Smither, Reilly, Millsap, Pearlman, & Stoffey, 1993). This finding is also congruent with recent research on EI’s validity, which has found that ability-based EI measures can offer some ability to predict success in jobs with high emotional labor demands (Joseph & Newman, 2010; Newman, Joseph, & MacCann, 2010). This finding,
which is consistent with Carson et al.’s (1999) model of management fads, could help explain why interest in EI has grown so much in recent years, as service-oriented jobs, with high emotional labor demands, have become more common in the U.S. (Hecker, 2005). For many people, it may make intuitive sense that measuring EI during the hiring process would be an effective way to assess peoples’ ability to handle such positions.

The implicit theory manipulation did not have a direct impact on perceptions of EI, but the interaction between the implicit theory and emotional labor manipulations did approach statistical significance. Interpreting this interaction with caution, it suggests that emotional labor demands influenced EI perceptions among people exposed to the entity manipulation, but not among people exposed to the incremental manipulation. It should be noted that the effect size of this interaction was small, and there is not a good theoretical explanation for why emotional labor demands would matter to people endorsing an entity perspective, but not to people endorsing an incremental perspective. However, this interaction lends some modest support to the idea that emotional labor demands may not influence attitudes toward EI testing equally for all people. Future studies could evaluate this dynamic further by examining other potential moderators of the emotional labor—EI perceptions relationship.

The test label manipulation was the most problematic of the three factors manipulated in this study. A sizeable portion of the initial sample provided incorrect responses to the label check question, suggesting that this manipulation may not have been noticeable enough. The nature of the newspaper article that included this manipulation may have been to blame for this difficulty—the name of the test was only given once. By way of comparison, the emotional labor manipulation was mentioned twice, which had a positive impact on comprehension. Mentioning the name of the test multiple times would likely have made the label more salient, which may
have influenced the impact of this factor. The three-way ANOVA results did not reveal a statistically significant effect for this variable, so caution should be used when interpreting this variable. However, follow-up independent samples t-tests did reveal a difference in EI perceptions between the “emotional facility” ($M = 3.53; \ SD = .92$) and “emotional consortation” ($M = 3.3; \ SD = 1.04$) conditions, $t(346) = 2.1, p < .05, d = .23$. The “emotional intelligence” condition did not show statistically significant differences from either of the other two labels. “Emotional facility” is not a term that is commonly used in either the academic literature or the popular press, so its favorability in this study was unexpected. Based on the evidence presented earlier about the power of labeling, as well as other basic psychological principles like the mere exposure effect (Zajonc, 1968), the expectation was that the more common label “emotional intelligence” would lead to the most favorable reactions. Given the challenge encountered with comprehension of this variable, as well as the surprising trend in the findings, this variable may merit additional research.

Finally, SDO was not found to have any relationship with EI perceptions. This is somewhat surprising; given recent research that found that SDO was related to perceptions of traditional GMA tests (Kim & Berry, 2015), it stands to reason that SDO may also be related to perceptions of other selection methods. Research examining the relationship between SDO and selection reactions in general is a relatively new development in I-O psychology, and more research is needed in order to understand when (and why) SDO is related to perceptions of various selection methods.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

One weakness of this study was the exclusive focus on EI testing. Although this study examined perceptions of an ability-based EI test using a variety of labels, the inclusion of other
tests, such as an intelligence or personality test, would have enabled comparisons to be made between the appeal of different test types. Past studies have found that people often have less positive reactions to structured tests than less structured selection methods (Lievens et al., 2005; Steiner & Gilliland, 1996), but it is possible that EI tests are an exception to this general pattern. It would be valuable to compare favorability perceptions of EI tests against other selection tests and methods; to my knowledge, such comparisons have not yet been made.

Given the influence that emotional labor demands were found to have on EI perceptions in this study, it would be valuable for future research to examine this factor in more detail. For example, the type of emotional labor demands an employee experiences may influence how appropriate EI testing is perceived to be for that job. Grandey (2000) noted that multiple types of emotional labor requirements have been identified, including requirements for positive emotions (such as in customer service-oriented jobs) as well as negative emotions (such as for security guards or debt collectors). Examining if people see EI tests as being equally relevant to these different types of demands would provide useful insights into which circumstances are seen as most relevant for EI testing.

Similarly, it would be useful to explore the influence of emotional labor demands across different levels of job complexity. The target high emotional labor jobs used in the hiring scenario in this study were fairly simple (cashiers and customer service representatives), but people with more complex jobs, such as nurses and real estate agents, may also experience high emotional labor demands. It would be valuable to examine if people feel that EI tests are also applicable to these positions. Past research has demonstrated that people can be especially critical of using paper-and-pencil tests and other objective methods for hiring people for complex jobs (Jeanneret & Silzer, 2011; Prien, Schippmann, & Prien, 2003), but if people are found to
endorse the use of EI tests for hiring people in high-complexity jobs, it would lend further support to the notion that people are more accepting of EI tests in general than tests of other constructs.

It would also be valuable to explore this topic with a more experienced audience. Although hiring experience was not a statistically significant covariate when it was included in the three-way ANOVA analysis, a closer look at this variable revealed that the majority of participants had relatively little practice in this area (less than 10% of participants indicated they had conducted more than six interviews in the past year), suggesting that there was relatively little difference between the participants in this sample with hiring and experience and those without. Although the perceptions of lay people are of interest to I-O psychologists, and may shape important outcomes such as applicant reactions, the decision to include or exclude specific assessments in an organization’s hiring process is ultimately driven by human resources professionals and other organizational leaders. Understanding this population’s preferences for hiring tools may help shape the way that researchers present evidence for certain selection methods to organizational decision makers. It might also be the case that different educational backgrounds are related to EI perceptions. Individuals with backgrounds in I-O psychology may be relatively aware of the controversy surrounding EI, given the criticisms that have been leveled at the construct in high-impact publications that are popular with I-O psychologists (see Joseph et al., 2015; Landy, 2005; Locke, 2005; Walter et al., 2011). On the other hand, people with business-focused backgrounds may be less aware of the controversy surrounding EI, thereby contributing to greater acceptance of EI among these individuals. Here again, evaluating these relationships could help academic I-O psychologists to better understand their audiences and improve their ability to have their findings embraced by practitioners.
Conclusion

The science-practice gap has long been identified as a threat to I-O psychology’s effectiveness as a field. In the area of personnel selection specifically, tools and practices that I-O psychologists know to be effective are often met with resistance by both practitioners and lay people, resulting in organizational use of traditional, and often ineffective, selection practices. Identifying the factors that contribute to the popularity of some selection methods, and the criticism of others, remains an important issue for I-O psychologists. The results of this study suggest that the popularity EI has enjoyed in recent years may be related to its perceived relevance to many jobs that are common in today’s service-based economy. Future research should continue to explore the factors that drive the popularity of EI, and other constructs, in order to improve the ability of I-O psychologists to help organizations build effective hiring programs.
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Table 1

Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.85</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American/Alaskan</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other/Multi-racial</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring Decisions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>21.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Interviews = number of interviews conducted in the past year, among participants with hiring experience.*
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations among Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EI Perceptions</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>( .94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SDO</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TSE</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age</td>
<td>34.85</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interviews</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>21.77</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SDO = social dominance orientation; TSE = test-taking self-efficacy; Interviews = number of interviews conducted in the past year among participants with hiring experience. Scale reliabilities are in parentheses along the diagonal.

* = p < .05. ** = p < .01.
### Table 3

Results of Manipulation Checks for the Implicit Theory and Emotional Labor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implicit Theory Condition</th>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Incremental</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Peoples’ personal qualities tend to be quite stable over time.”</td>
<td>3.98 (.86)</td>
<td>2.52 (1)</td>
<td>18.32***</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional Labor Condition</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“One of the newspaper articles you read earlier described how the hiring process was being changed for several different positions within Top Value. To what degree did these jobs require social interaction with other people?”</td>
<td>4.28 (.78)</td>
<td>2.63 (1.01)</td>
<td>-21.69***</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.*** = p < .001. Standard deviations appear in parentheses following means.*
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations by Experimental Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incremental—High EL—EI Label</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental—High EL—EF Label</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental—High EL—EC Label</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental—Low EL—EI Label</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental—Low EL—EF Label</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental—Low EL—EC Label</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity—High EL—EI Label</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity—High EL—EF Label</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity—High EL—EC Label</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity—Low EL—EI Label</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity—Low EL—EF Label</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entity—Low EL—EC Label</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. EL = emotional labor; EI = emotional intelligence; EF = emotional facility; EC = emotional consortation.
Table 5

Summary Table for Three-Way ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Labor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Theory x Emotional Labor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Theory x Label</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Labor x Label</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit Theory x Emotional Labor x Label</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>531.63</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>545.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1

*Implicit Theory x Emotional Labor Interaction*

[Graph showing the interaction between implicit theory and emotional labor perception. The graph has two lines: one for high emotional labor and one for low emotional labor. The y-axis represents EI perceptions ranging from 1 to 5, and the x-axis represents entity theory on the left and incremental theory on the right.]
APPENDIX A: STIMULI MATERIALS

On the following pages, you will be shown two news articles, similar to ones that you might come across in your local newspaper. Please read the articles closely; after you do so, you will be asked to answer some questions based on the information provided in them.

Entity Theory Condition

New Research Weighs in on Peoples' Traits
Beverly Jamison, Research & Science Correspondent

Have you ever wondered whether or not peoples' traits, like their personality, can change? Thanks to new scientific findings, we may finally have an answer. Recent empirical research by Dr. Kenneth Jones at Hazelbrook University has shown that peoples' basic underlying attributes do not change much over time. At a recent book signing, Dr. Jones stated that "for most people, by the time they are a young adult, personal characteristics have set like plaster and will never soften again." Dr. Jones' noted that his experiments, and those of numerous other researchers, have consistently found that the characteristics of most people cannot change much across time and that peoples' basic personality traits and characteristics are very stable.

The research you just read about described peoples’ traits as __________.

a. mostly stable
b. mostly changeable

Incremental Theory Condition

New Research Weighs in on Peoples' Traits
Beverly Jamison, Research & Science Correspondent

Have you ever wondered whether or not peoples' traits, like their personality, can change? Thanks to new scientific findings, we may finally have an answer. Recent empirical research by Dr. Kenneth Jones at Hazelbrook University has shown that peoples' basic underlying attributes can change a great deal over time. At a recent book signing, Dr. Jones stated that "peoples' character is soft like clay. Only for a small number of people is great effort and determination needed to effect changes in their personal qualities." Dr. Jones' noted that his experiments, and those of numerous other researchers, have consistently found that the characteristics of most people can change a great deal across time and that peoples' basic personality traits and characteristics are quite flexible and malleable.

The research you just read about described peoples’ traits as __________.

a. mostly stable
b. mostly changeable
Top Value To Revise Hiring Practices
Angela Miller, Business Correspondent

The process of getting a job at Top Value, the region’s largest big-box retailer, is about to change. Until recently, Top Value used a reference check and interview to assess applicants for several common positions, including cashiers and customer service representatives. However, executives at the company announced this week that they have decided to add an emotional intelligence test to their hiring process for these positions. Although the content of the test is protected to preserve its integrity, sources in Top Value's Human Resources Department say that the test is designed to measure a person’s ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to distinguish between them, and to use this information to guide their thinking and actions toward others. In a statement to the media, the Director of Human Resources for Top Value, Wendy Jones, said, “We believe this new test will enable us to make better hiring decisions for these customer-oriented positions, and improve the performance of Top Value.”
High Emotional Labor/Emotional Facility Condition

Top Value To Revise Hiring Practices
Angela Miller, Business Correspondent

The process of getting a job at Top Value, the region’s largest big-box retailer, is about to change. Until recently, Top Value used a reference check and interview to assess applicants for several common positions, including cashiers and customer service representatives. However, executives at the company announced this week that they have decided to add an emotional facility test to their hiring process for these positions. Although the content of the test is protected to preserve its integrity, sources in Top Value's Human Resources Department say that the test is designed to measure a person’s ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to distinguish between them, and to use this information to guide their thinking and actions toward others. In a statement to the media, the Director of Human Resources for Top Value, Wendy Jones, said, “We believe this new test will enable us to make better hiring decisions for these customer-oriented positions, and improve the performance of Top Value.”
The process of getting a job at Top Value, the region’s largest big-box retailer, is about to change. Until recently, Top Value used a reference check and interview to assess applicants for several common positions, including cashiers and customer service representatives. However, executives at the company announced this week that they have decided to add an emotional consortation test to their hiring process for these positions. Although the content of the test is protected to preserve its integrity, sources in Top Value's Human Resources Department say that the test is designed to measure a person’s ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to distinguish between them, and to use this information to guide their thinking and actions toward others. In a statement to the media, the Director of Human Resources for Top Value, Wendy Jones, said, “We believe this new test will enable us to make better hiring decisions for these customer-oriented positions, and improve the performance of Top Value.”
Low Emotional Labor/Emotional Intelligence Condition

Top Value To Revise Hiring Practices
Angela Miller, Business Correspondent

The process of getting a job at Top Value, the region’s largest big-box retailer, is about to change. Until recently, Top Value used a reference check and interview to assess applicants for several common positions, including warehouse workers and merchandise stockers. However, executives at the company announced this week that they have decided to add an emotional intelligence test to their hiring process for these positions. Although the content of the test is protected to preserve its integrity, sources in Top Value’s Human Resources Department say that the test is designed to measure a person’s ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to distinguish between them, and to use this information to guide their thinking and actions toward others. In a statement to the media, the Director of Human Resources for Top Value, Wendy Jones, said, “We believe this new test will enable us to make better hiring decisions for these inventory-oriented positions, and improve the performance of Top Value.”
The process of getting a job at Top Value, the region’s largest big-box retailer, is about to change. Until recently, Top Value used a reference check and interview to assess applicants for several common positions, including warehouse workers and merchandise stockers. However, executives at the company announced this week that they have decided to add an emotional facility test to their hiring process for these positions. Although the content of the test is protected to preserve its integrity, sources in Top Value's Human Resources Department say that the test is designed to measure a person’s ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to distinguish between them, and to use this information to guide their thinking and actions toward others. In a statement to the media, the Director of Human Resources for Top Value, Wendy Jones, said, “We believe this new test will enable us to make better hiring decisions for these inventory-oriented positions, and improve the performance of Top Value.”
Low Emotional Labor/Emotional Consortation Condition

Top Value To Revise Hiring Practices
Angela Miller, Business Correspondent

The process of getting a job at Top Value, the region’s largest big-box retailer, is about to change. Until recently, Top Value used a reference check and interview to assess applicants for several common positions, including warehouse workers and merchandise stockers. However, executives at the company announced this week that they have decided to add an emotional consortation test to their hiring process for these positions. Although the content of the test is protected to preserve its integrity, sources in Top Value's Human Resources Department say that the test is designed to measure a person’s ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to distinguish between them, and to use this information to guide their thinking and actions toward others. In a statement to the media, the Director of Human Resources for Top Value, Wendy Jones, said, “We believe this new test will enable us to make better hiring decisions for these inventory-oriented positions, and improve the performance of Top Value.”
APPENDIX B: PERCEPTIONS OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

“Based on the newspaper article you just read, please respond to the following questions using the scale provided.”

1. I think the change in tests will help Top Value predict who will do well on these jobs.

2. I believe that Top Value’s decision to switch tests is a mistake.

3. I believe that this change will help Top Value make better hiring decisions.

Note: Item 2 is reverse-coded. Responses were provided on 1-5 scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree.
APPENDIX C: SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION

“Show how much you favor or oppose each idea below by selecting a number from 1 to 7 on the scale below. You can work quickly; your first feeling is generally best.”

1. An ideal society requires some groups to be on top and others to be on the bottom.

2. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.

3. No one group should dominate in society.

4. Groups at the bottom are just as deserving as groups at the top.

5. Group equality should not be our primary goal.

6. It is unjust to try to make groups equal.

7. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.

8. We should work to give all groups an equal chance to succeed.

Note: Items 3, 4, 7, and 8 are reverse-coded. Responses were provided on 1-7 scale, where 1 = Strongly Oppose and 7 = Strongly Favor.
APPENDIX D: TEST SELF-EFFICACY

“Please answer the following questions using the response scale provided.”

1. I am confident of my test-taking abilities.
2. I know, when it comes to taking tests, that I do well.
3. I am afraid of taking standardized tests.

Note: Item 3 is reverse-coded. Responses were provided on 1-5 scale, where 1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree.
APPENDIX E: MANIPULATION AND COMPREHENSION CHECKS

1) The newspaper article you read earlier described how the hiring process was being changed for several different positions within Top Value. To what degree did these jobs require social interaction with other people?
   a) To a very small degree
   b) To a small degree
   c) To a moderate degree
   d) To a large degree
   e) To a very large degree

2) According to the newspaper article, Top Value had recently decided to start using a test of __________.
   a) emotional intelligence
   b) emotional competency
   c) general mental ability
   d) resilience

3) Peoples’ personal qualities tend to be quite stable over time.
   a) Strongly Disagree
   b) Disagree
   c) Unsure
   d) Agree
   e) Strongly Agree
APPENDIX F: DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONS

1) What is your gender?
   a) Male
   b) Female
   c) Prefer not to say

2) What is your age? (participants entered their age in a text box)

3) What is your ethnicity?
   a) African-American
   b) Asian/Pacific Islander
   c) Caucasian
   d) Hispanic
   e) Native American/Alaskan
   f) Other/Multi-racial
   g) Prefer not to say

4) Have you ever been responsible for making hiring decisions?
   a) Yes
   b) No

5) How many interviews have you conducted in the past year? (participants entered their answer in a text box only if they answered “Yes” to the previous question)
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