

Predicting Relationship Success from Measures of Emotional Intelligence

Monica Beisecker, Justin Lolofie & Kimberly A. Barchard

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Reference: Beisecker, M., Lolofie, J. & Barchard, K.A. (submitted). Predicting Relationship Success from Measures of Emotional Intelligence. Poster submitted for presentation at the 2004 Western Psychological Association Annual Conference, Phoenix Arizona.

Contact Information: Kim Barchard, Department of Psychology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 4505 S. Maryland Parkway, P.O. Box 455030, Las Vegas, NV, 89154-5030, USA, barchard@unlv.nevada.edu

Abstract

Emotional Intelligence includes an individual's ability to perceive, understand, and manage the emotions of themselves and others. In previous research, women scored slightly higher than men on maximum-performance tests of Emotional Intelligence but not on self-report measures (Beisecker & Barchard, 2003). One possible explanation for this finding is that women are more Emotionally Intelligent than men, on average, although perceptions of Emotional Intelligence may be the same for the two sexes. Another possibility is that some measures of Emotional Intelligence are biased against men.

In this study, we examined the relationship between measures of Emotional Intelligence and Relationship Success to determine whether this relationship is the same for men and women and for self-report and maximum-performance measures. If the relationship is not the same for men and women, then measures of Emotional Intelligence are biased predictors of Relationship Success and could also be biased measures of the underlying construct of Emotional Intelligence.

A total of 416 undergraduate students completed 16 measures of Emotional Intelligence (4 maximum-performance tests and 12 self-report subscales), which were used to predict 15 different measures of Relationship Success (5 single-item measures and 10 subscales). We found that the relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Relationship Success does depend on sex: for both self-report and maximum-performance measures of Emotional Intelligence, when men and women were equated for their scores on the Emotional Intelligence measures by using multiple regression, women obtained average higher levels of Relationship Success than men on some measures of Relationship Success. This is referred to as Intercept Bias. The presence of bias in these predictions could indicate that measures of Emotional Intelligence measure slightly different qualities in men and women or that measures of Relationship Success assess something slightly different for men and women. Further research is therefore needed to determine the cause of these differential relationships. Until the source of this Intercept Bias is located, however, this finding raises concerns about the use of Emotional Intelligence tests to make important decisions about individuals or groups.

Introduction

Emotional Intelligence (EI) includes the ability to perceive, understand, and manage your own emotions and those of other people. Both self-report measures (e.g., Bagby, Taylor, & Parker, 1994; Bar-On, 1997; Schutte et al, 1998) and maximum-performance measures (e.g., Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002; O'Sullivan & Guilford, 1976) are used to assess EI.

Previous research has shown that there are sex differences on some measures of Emotional Intelligence. For example, women had significantly higher average scores than men on each of the subscales of the maximum-performance Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT; Mayer et al, 2002), although the difference in men's and women's scores were small. On the other hand, although there were sex differences on the EQi (Bar-On, 1997), a self-report measure of EI, these differences were not consistent: on some scales women scored higher, on some men scored higher, and on some scales there was no significant difference between men and women. One study of sex differences on measures of EI (Beisecker & Barchard, 2003) included a large number of both self-report and maximum-performance measures, and found no consistent sex differences on self-report measures of EI, but did find consistent sex differences on the maximum-performance measures: on average, women had slightly higher scores than men.

Some people may think that sex differences in and of themselves imply that a test is biased. This is not true. If we knew a priori that there were no differences between men and women on the underlying dimension, then a sex difference would indicate that the test is biased. If there are real differences between men and women on the dimension in question, however, then there should also be differences in the scores on a test. However, it is impossible to know the true average scores of men and women on a psychological attribute. Therefore, various statistical strategies are used to try to determine if a test is biased.

One approach to assessing test bias is to compare the regression equations for men and women in predicting some particular criterion. If the regression lines are the same for men and women, this indicates that the relation between the predictor and the criterion is the same for the two groups, and that use of a single regression equation for both sexes will be unbiased. The regression lines could differ in two ways. First, their intercepts could be different: this is called Intercept Bias. Second, their slopes could be different: this is called Slope Bias. Two separate analyses are conducted to determine if Intercept or Slope Bias are present. This approach to examining test bias is called the Cleary (1968) model of test bias.

Test bias, which is a matter of the statistical properties of test scores and their relationship with other variables, can be distinguished from test fairness, which is a value judgment (Darlington, 1971). To assess test fairness in an employment context, Darlington recommends that employers answer the following question (or a similar question, which uses members of the groups of interest): "Suppose we knew the exact criterion scores of a white man and a black man. What would the difference between their criterion scores have to be in order for them to be regarded as equally desirable candidates for selection?" (p. 79). This difference would then be added to the predicted job performance scores of the appropriate group. Thus, if a corporation wanted to hire more people who belong to visible minority groups and people in these groups tended to have lower predicted job performance, then a constant value would be added to the scores of individuals belonging to these minority groups. Using this model, scores on predicted job performance would not be maximal for the group of applicants that was hired. Instead, scores on the *adjusted* predicted job performance scores would be maximal. Darlington refers to such a testing process as *culturally optimal*. In other words, test fairness is assessed by examining the decisions made as a result of using test scores, and unfairness is the difference between the decision made and the decision that one thinks should have been made. Test fairness is a value judgment. Although test bias can be defined empirically, fairness cannot. Fairness is instead defined in political or philosophical terms. In this study, we are interested not in examining whether self-report and maximum-performance measures of EI are fair, but rather in examining whether or not they are biased, which, as stated above, can be defined by the statistical relationship between the test and a criterion variable.

In this study, we examined whether EI measures are biased predictors of Relationship Success. Relationship Success should theoretically be related to Emotional Intelligence (Goleman, 1995, 1998), and one study (Lopes, Salovey, and Straus, 2003) has shown that some aspects of EI predict quality of interpersonal relationships (although this study did not look for possible sex bias). In this study, we operationalized Relationship Success in two ways. First, a relationship is successful if it is described in positive terms (e.g., relaxed, supportive, successful) rather than negative

terms (e.g., strained, superficial). Second, a relationship is successful if the two people in the relationship use pro-social methods of dealing with conflict (e.g., negotiation) rather than anti-social or illegal methods (e.g., psychological aggression, physical assault).

Method

Participants

A total of 416 (283 female) undergraduate students completed this study for course credit. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 65 (mean 20.5, SD 4.9). Participants identified themselves as follows: 61.3% White, 11.8% Asian, 10.6% Hispanic, 9.1% African-American, .7% Native and 6.5% other.

Measures

Sixteen measures of Emotional Intelligence and fifteen measures of Relationship Success were used. These are described below.

Emotional Intelligence Measures

O'Sullivan and Guilford Tests (1975, 1976). The following four tests were originally designed to measure Behavioral Cognition, which we consider to be a part of Emotional Intelligence.

Expression Grouping. This test consists of 30 multiple-choice items. For each question, the item stem consists of a set of three illustrations of facial expressions, gestures, or body postures that convey a similar emotion. Participants then choose from four other illustrations the one that conveys the same emotion as the first three.

Cartoon Predictions. This test consists of 30 multiple-choice items. For each, a cartoon drawing of a scenario is shown. Participants then choose from among three drawings the one that shows the most likely outcome, based upon on the characters' intentions and feelings.

Missing Cartoons. This test consists of 28 multiple-choice items. In each, a series of four illustrations is shown with one of the middle segments missing. Participants select from four separate illustrations the one that best completes the comic strip's storyline.

Social Translation. This test consists of 24 multiple-choice items. For each, two people who have a defined relationship are given, and participants are told what the first person says to the second. Participants then choose from among three sets of people the set in which the statement will have a different meaning.

Tett's Self-Report Questionnaire (Tett, Wang, Gribler, & Martinez, 1997; Tett, Wang & Fox, 2003). This test consists of 146 self-report items, approximately half of which are reverse-scored. Each item is rated on a six-point Likert-type scale, where 1 is "Strongly Disagree" and 6 is "Strongly Agree." These items are grouped into 12 subscales (see Table 1).

Relationship Success Measures

Best Friend Questionnaire (BFQ; Barchard, 2001). The BFQ is a 22-item adjective measure of the quality of one's relationship with one's best friend. Four of the adjectives from the BFQ were selected for this analysis, because they appeared to the authors to be gender neutral and to summarize the quality of the friendship overall, rather than some particular aspect of the relationship. These adjectives were: Successful, Rewarding, Satisfying, and Supportive. In addition, a question at the top of the BFQ asks participants to rate the likelihood that they will still be friends with this person in five years. Responses are given on a 1 to 6 likelihood scale, with 1 indicating "Very UNlikely" and 6 indicating "Very Likely".

Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996). This scale measures the frequency of various tactics for dealing with conflict. There are five subscales: Negotiation, Psychological Aggression, Physical Assault, Sexual Coercion, and Injury. Each of the 34 items are asked twice: once for the self and once for the partner. Thus, there are a total of 10 subscales: 5 for the self and 5 for the partner. In this particular study, we asked people to describe the conflict tactics that were used in a current or recent romantic relationship.

Procedures

The study was completed in two one-and-a-half hour sessions, scheduled one week apart. The BFQ and CTS2 were administered during the first session, along with other measures. The O'Sullivan and Guilford tests and Tett's Self-Report Questionnaire were administered during the second testing session, along with other measures.

Statistical Analysis

To examine test bias using the Cleary (1968) model, a series of three multiple regression equations were used. In the first equation, we used one of the measures of EI as the predictor and attempted to predict one of the criterion measures of Relationship Success. The statistical significance of the beta-weight for the predictor tells us if there is a significant bivariate relationship between the two variables: Can that measure of EI predict that measure of Relationship Success?

In the second regression equation, we used two predictors: (1) the original EI measure and (2) Sex, where Sex had been coded 0 for males and 1 for females. The statistical significance of the beta-weight for Sex tells us if there are differences in the intercepts for men and women. If this beta-weight is statistically significant, its value estimates the difference in the intercepts for men and women. Because we have coded men as 0 and women as 1, the beta-weight is the amount by which the intercept for women is higher than the intercept for men. If the beta-weight is negative, that indicates that the intercept for men is higher.

In the third regression equation, three predictors are used. The first two predictors are the same as in the second regression equation: the original EI measure and Sex. The last predictor is the interaction of the original EI measure and Sex, which is calculated as the product of these two variables. The statistical significance of the interaction term tells us if there are differences in the slopes of the regression lines for men and women. If this beta-weight is significant, then this beta-weight estimates the difference in the slopes. This beta-weight is the amount by which the slope for women is higher than the slope for men. If it is negative, the slope for men is higher. See Anastasi and Urbina (1997) for further discussion of slope and Intercept Bias.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Sample sizes, means, and standard deviations for men and women are given for each of the measures of EI and Relationship Success (see Table 2). Women had significantly higher scores than men on five measures of EI, and men had higher scores on two measures of EI. For two of the five measures of Relationship Success from the BFQ, women had higher scores than men. Women also had significantly higher scores on one subscale from the CTS2.

Predicting Relationship Success

First, we examined the bivariate relationships between EI and Relationship Success (see Table 3). The results varied depending upon the Emotional Intelligence tests used.

The four O'Sullivan and Guilford tests were not able to predict Relationship Success. Of the 60 bivariate regressions used to predict Relationship Success from EI, only 3 were statistically significant at the .05 level. If there were no non-zero relationships in any of the 60 equations, then roughly $.05 * 60 = 3$ of these correlations would be expected to be statistically significant by chance alone (i.e., Type I errors). We therefore conclude that the O'Sullivan and Guilford tests cannot predict Relationship Success.

On the other hand, Tett's subscales were able to predict successfulness of best friend relationships. Of Tett's 12 subscales, four were particularly likely to have significant relationships with the quality of one's relationships: Emotion in the Self: Non-Verbal; Empathy; Regulation of Emotion in Others; and Motivating Emotions. The strongest relationships were for the Regulation of Emotions in Others subscale, although even the highest of these correlations was relatively small ($r = .23$).

Intercept Bias

In the next set of multiple regression equations, we used two predictors: the EI measure and Sex. For any particular measure of Relationship Success and any particular measure of EI, if the beta-weight for Sex is statistically significant, this indicates that the EI measure has Intercept Bias in predicting that measure of Relationship Success. Table 4 contains each of the statistically significant beta-weights for Sex.

When predicting whether the relationship was Rewarding or Satisfying, the intercepts were higher for women than for men for most measures of EI: for men and women with the same levels of EI, women have higher levels of Relationship Success. Thus, if you were to use a single regression line to predict Relationship Success from EI, and no other predictors were used, this prediction would be biased against men.

Interestingly, there was also Intercept Bias when predicting Psychological Aggression for most measures of EI: once again women had higher scores than would be expected based on their EI. This could be because women are more psychologically aggressive than men with equal levels of EI, or because they are more willing to report psychological aggression.

Finally, we examined the possibility of Intercept Bias when using EI measures to predict partner's conflict tactics, using the five partner Conflict Tactic Scales. There was no evidence of Intercept Bias in these predictions.

It is informative to note that the three measures of Relationship Success that showed Intercept Bias are exactly those three measures upon which there were statistically significant sex differences originally. This suggests that sex differences in Relationship Success cannot be accounted for by sex differences in Emotional Intelligence: one or more missing variables are needed to account for these differences.

Slope Bias

In the final set of regression equations, we added the interactions between Sex and the measures of EI; thus there were a total of three predictors for each regression equation. In any particular equation, if the beta-weight for the interaction term is statistically significant, this indicates Slope Bias. Table 5 contains these statistically significant beta-weights. Of the 240 beta-weights calculated, approximately 5% would be expected to be significant by chance, if there was in fact no Slope Bias in any of the measures. In this case, precisely 5% (or 12) of these beta-weights were statistically significant. We therefore conclude that these are likely Type I errors, and that there is no Slope Bias in any of the EI measures.

Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Relationship Success, and to determine if this relationship was the same for men and women. First we examined whether the EI measures could predict Relationship Success. The four O'Sullivan and Guilford tests (1975, 1976) were not able to, but several of the subscales from Tett's Self-Report Questionnaire were. In particular, subscales related to understanding other people, such as Regulation of Emotions in Others, Empathy, and Emotion in Others: Nonverbal, were able to predict Relationship Success.

Second, we examined the data for evidence of Intercept Bias. For both the O'Sullivan and Guilford tests and the subscales of Tett's Self-Report Questionnaire, the regression lines for predicting 3 of the 15 measures of Relationship Success had higher intercepts for women than for men for almost all measures of EI. The measures of Relationship Success for which women had higher intercepts were the three measures of Relationship Success upon which sex differences were also found: (1) considering the relationship with one's best friend to be Rewarding, (2) considering the relationship with one's best friend to be Satisfying, and (3) using Psychological Aggression as a method of dealing with conflict in a romantic relationship. The presence of Intercept Bias for these three variables suggests that sex differences in Relationship Success must be accounted for by one or more other variables, besides Emotional Intelligence.

Finally, we examined the data for evidence of Slope Bias, sex differences in the strength of the relationship between EI and Relationship Success. We found no evidence of Slope Bias.

Thus, the relationship between EI and Relationship Success does depend upon sex, for at least some measures of Relationship Success and most of the EI measures studied here: the intercepts in the regression lines are different for men and women. It may be that EI tests are measuring slightly different qualities in men and women (perhaps because of differences in how men and women complete these measures) or that measures of Relationship Success assess something slightly different for men and women.

A third possible explanation for this Intercept Bias is that there are other important predictors of Relationship Success upon which there are sex differences, and the lack of inclusion of those measures in our regression equations has caused Intercept Bias to appear as a statistical artifact. It has been demonstrated mathematically that Intercept Bias will occur when (a) there are multiple predictors that are related to both the criterion (in this case Relationship Success) and to the grouping variable (in this case Sex), and (b) only one predictor is included in the regression equations at a time (Linn & Werts, 1971; Reilly, 1973). This mathematical proof has been demonstrated empirically in multiple contexts, using many different types of tests and many different types of subjects: as more predictors are added, Intercept Bias is reduced (Hunter & Schmidt; Rauschenberger, 1984). Given that Intercept Bias was demonstrated for exactly those measures of Relationship Success upon which there were sex differences, it seems likely that this bias is a statistical artifact. However, additional research is needed to determine if the Intercept Bias is indeed due to the omission of important predictors (as argued here) or if the bias is due to a confound in terms of what is measured by the tests themselves.

Test bias, whatever its cause, raises concerns about the use of the tests in applied contexts. When EI tests are being used to make decisions about either individuals or groups (such as hiring, promotion, therapeutic choices, etc.), it is important to determine if the relationship between the EI measure and the criterion is the same for men and women or for other subgroups of interest. When this relationship is not the same, steps should be taken to reduce or eliminate this bias. In the case of Relationship Success, additional variables may need to be included in the regression equations.

The relationship between EI and various other criteria (e.g., success at school or work, or physical or psychological health) might also vary according to sex or other group-level variables such as race or ethnicity. Future research should therefore examine EI measures for evidence of sex-bias or ethnic-bias in a wider range of contexts. Such bias may well occur because of the omission of other important predictors; if this is the case in other areas as well, this argues against making decisions about individuals or groups based on EI tests on their own. All available relevant information needs to be taken into account when making such decisions.

References

- Anastasi, A. & Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological Testing, seventh edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bagby, R.M., Taylor, G.J., & Parker, J.D.A. (1994). The Twenty-Item Toronto Alexithymia Scale – II: Convergent, discriminant and concurrent validity. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 38*, 33-40.
- Barchard, K. A. (2001). *Best Friend Questionnaire*. Unpublished questionnaire, available from Kim Barchard, Department of Psychology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 4505 S. Maryland Parkway, P.O. Box 455030, Las Vegas, NV, 89154-5030, USA, barchard@unlv.nevada.edu.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). EQi BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory Technical Manual. North Tonawanda, NY: MHS.
- Beisecker, M. & Barchard, K.A. (2003). Sex Differences in Ability Emotional Intelligence. Poster presented at the Western Psychological Association Annual Conference, Phoenix, Arizona.
- Cleary, T.A. (1968). Test bias: Prediction of grades of negro and white students in integrated colleges. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 5*, 115-124.
- Darlington, R.B. (1971). Another look at “culture fairness.” *Journal of Educational Measurement, 8*, 71-82.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books, Inc.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books, Inc.
- Hunter, J.E., Schmidt, F.L., Rauschenberger, J. (1984). Methodological, statistical, and ethical issues in the study of bias in psychological tests. In C.E. Reynolds & R.T. Brown (Eds.), *Perspectives on bias in mental testing* (pp. 41-99). New York: Plenum Press.
- Linn, R. L., & Werts, C.E. (1971). Considerations for studies of test bias. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 8*, 1-4.
- Lopes, P.N., Salovey, P., & Straus, R. (2003). Emotional intelligence, personality, and the perceived quality of social relationships. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35*, 641-658.
- Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2002). Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) User’s Manual. North Tonawanda, NY: MHS.
- O’Sullivan, M. & Guilford, J. P. (1975). Six factors of behavioral cognition: Understanding other people. *Journal of Educational Measurement, 12*, 255-271
- O’Sullivan, M. & Guilford, J. P. (1976). *A Manual for Four Behavioral-Cognition Tests*. Orange, CA: Sheridan Psychological Services, Inc.
- Reilly, R. R. (1973). A note on minority group test bias studies. *Psychological Bulliten, 80*, 130-132.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25*, 167-177.
- Straus, M.A., Hamby, S.L., Boney-McCoy, S. & Sugarman, D.B. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2). *Journal of Family Issues, 17*, 283-316
- Tett, R., Wang, A. Gribler, J., & Martinez, A. (1997) *Development of self-report measures of emotional intelligence*. Paper presented at the 1997 Annual Convention of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Tett, R., Wang, A., & Fox, K. (2003). *Emotional Intelligence as a Multidimensional Personality Construct: Development and Validation of a Self-Report Measure*. Manuscript in preparation. Available from Robert Tett, Department of Psychology, 308 Lorton Hall, University of Tulsa, 600 S. College, Tulsa, OK 74104.

Table 1

Tett’s Emotional Intelligence Subscales (Tett, Wang, Gribler, & Martinez, 1997; Tett, Wang & Fox, 2003)

Subscale	Description	No. of Items
Emotion in the Self: Verbal	The degree to which one is in touch with his or her feelings and can describe those feelings in words.	12
Emotion in the Self: Nonverbal	The tendency to express one’s feelings openly to others through bodily (i.e., nonverbal) expression; emotional honesty.	12
Emotion in Others: Nonverbal	The degree to which one recognizes others’ emotions based on their non-verbal cues.	12
Emotion in Others: Empathy	The willingness to understand other people’s feelings by relating them to one’s own experiences; the tendency to feel what others are feeling.	12
Regulation of Emotion in the Self	The degree to which one controls strong emotions in the self.	12
Regulation of Emotion in Others	The degree to which one manages how others feel.	12
Flexible Planning	The tendency to make important life decisions based on emotions rather than logic.	12
Creative Thinking	The tendency to think in novel ways, to make connections where others do not.	12
Mood Redirected Attention	The tendency to attend to information about the self when powerful, usually negative emotions occur.	8
Motivating Emotions	Ambition, perseverance, and optimism.	12
Delay of Gratification	The willingness to forgo immediate reward in favor of a greater reward in the future.	12
Emotional Appropriateness	The ability to differentiate between similarly experienced emotions in light of the given situation.	12

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Emotional Intelligence and Relationship Success

	Men			Women			Comparing means for men and women		
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
O'Sullivan and Guilford Tests									
Expression Grouping	132	17.35	3.36	282	17.68	3.42	-0.94	260	.35
Cartoon Predictions	132	19.1	4.67	283	20.89	3.97	-3.81	222.4	.00
Missing Cartoons	131	12.88	5.07	281	13.85	4.13	-1.91	213.3	.06
Social Translations	131	10.98	6.68	281	12.71	6.86	-2.43	259.9	.02
Tett's Self-Report Questionnaire									
Emotion in the Self: Verbal	133	4.09	0.88	282	3.97	0.79	1.37	237	.17
Emotion in the Self: Nonverbal	133	3.87	0.75	282	4.05	0.73	-2.35	254.2	.02
Emotion in Others: Nonverbal	133	4.43	0.71	282	4.33	0.7	1.24	258	.21
Emotion in Others: Empathy	133	3.99	0.83	282	4.46	0.72	-5.58	228.2	.00
Regulation of Emotions in the Self	133	4.02	0.89	282	3.59	0.81	4.72	238.9	.00
Regulation of Emotion in Others	133	4.35	0.65	282	4.39	0.64	-0.57	252.4	.57
Flexible Planning	133	3.53	1	282	3.65	0.69	-1.25	194.6	.21
Creative Thinking	133	3.92	0.62	282	3.79	0.71	1.84	291.2	.07
Mood-Redirected Attention	133	4.42	0.81	282	4.52	0.73	-1.25	237.1	.21
Motivating Emotions	133	4.72	0.63	282	4.63	0.63	1.37	260.1	.17
Delay of Gratification	133	3.68	0.7	282	3.69	0.7	-0.16	258.8	.87
Emotional Appropriateness	133	4.63	0.53	282	4.89	0.44	-4.92	222.1	.00
Best Friend Questionnaire									
Five Years	130	5.58	0.8	278	5.55	0.89	0.39	279.3	.70
Successful	132	4.51	0.88	282	4.54	0.77	-0.39	228.1	.69
Rewarding	133	4.28	0.84	282	4.47	0.79	-2.19	246.1	.03
Satisfying	132	4.23	0.8	282	4.43	0.82	-2.33	261.1	.02
Supportive	133	4.59	0.64	282	4.6	0.72	-0.13	288.2	.90
Conflict Tactics Scale									
Self Negotiation	107	55.81	41.76	240	59.56	38.02	-0.79	187.5	.43
Self Psychological Aggression	107	11.47	17.37	240	18.6	26.22	-2.99	295.5	.00
Self Physical Assault	107	1.81	8.25	240	4.67	18.54	-1.99	345	.05
Self Sexual Coercion	107	5.36	10.01	240	3.27	9.92	1.81	202	.07
Self Injury	107	0.23	1.37	240	0.73	3.68	-1.81	337.3	.07
Partner Negotiation	107	48.52	38.33	240	52.35	35.31	-0.88	189.4	.38
Partner Psychological Aggression	107	13.42	21.33	240	16.63	23.7	-1.25	224.6	.21
Partner Physical Assault	107	3.64	9.36	240	4.31	18.09	-0.46	337.6	.65
Partner Sexual Coercion	107	6.02	11.13	240	5.54	13.6	0.35	245.9	.73
Partner Injury	107	0.29	2.33	240	0.64	3.7	-1.06	306.5	.29

Note: SD = Standard Deviation. Equal variances were not assumed when comparing the means for men and women.

Table 3

Predicting Relationship Success from Emotional Intelligence: Beta-weights for the Emotional Intelligence Measures

Criteria	O’Sullivan and Guilford Tests					Tett’s Self-Report Questionnaire										
	EG	CP	MC	ST	ESV	ESNV	EON	EMP	RegS	RegO	FIPI	CRT	MRA	Motiv	Delay	EmAp
Best Friend Questionnaire																
Five Years						.12*	.12*			.12*						
Successful						.16**		.17**		.23**		.12*	.13*	.15**		
Rewarding								.21**		.21**	.10*			.13*		
Satisfying						.17*		.13**		.20**		.10*	.13**	.10*		
Supportive						.13**	.14**			.22**				.12*		
Conflict Tactics Scale																
Self Negotiation					.15**	.11*	.17**	.16**		.20**		.12*	.21**	.22**		
Self Psychological Aggression					-.21**								.12*			
Self Physical Assault				-.13*												
Self Sexual Coercion																
Self Injury				.12*										.13*		
Partner Negotiation					.14*	.12*	.13*	.16**		.19**			.14*	.21**		
Partner Psychological Aggression									-.12*							
Partner Physical Assault																
Partner Sexual Coercion																
Partner Injury				-.11*					-.11*							

Note. EG = Expression Grouping. CP = Cartoon Predictions. MC = Missing Cartoons. ST = Social Translations. ESV = Emotions in the Self: Verbal. ESNV = Emotions in Self: NonVerbal. EON = Emotions in Others: Non-verbal. EMP = Emotions in Others Empathy. RegS = Regulation of Emotions in the Self. RegO = Regulation of Emotion in Others. FIPI = Flexible Planning. CRT = Creativity. MRA = Mood Redirected Attention. Motiv = Motivating Emotions. Delay = Delay of Gratification. EmAp = Emotional Appropriateness.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 4

Testing for Intercept Bias: Beta-weights for Sex

Criteria	O'Sullivan and Guilford Tests					Tett's Self-Report Questionnaire										
	EG	CP	MC	ST	ESV	ESNV	EON	EMP	RegS	RegO	FIPI	CRT	MRA	Motiv	Delay	EmAp
Best Friend Questionnaire																
Five Years																
Successful																
Rewarding	.11*	.11*	.11*	.12*	.11*	.10*	.11*		.11*	.10*	.10*	.12*	.10*	.12*	.11*	.13*
Satisfying	.12*	.12*	.11*	.12*	.12*		.12*		.12*	.11*	.11*	.12*	.10*	.12*	.11*	.13*
Supportive																
Conflict Tactics Scales																
Self Negotiation																
Self Psychological Aggression	.14**	.14**	.15**	.15**	.14*	.15**	.14*	.15**		.14*	.14*	.13*	.13*	.14**	.13*	.15**
Self Physical Assault																
Self Sexual Coercion																
Self Injury																
Partner Negotiation																
Partner Psychological Aggression																
Partner Physical Assault																
Partner Sexual Coercion																
Partner Injury																

Note. EG = Expression Grouping. CP = Cartoon Predictions. MC = Missing Cartoons. ST = Social Translations. ESV = Emotions in the Self: Verbal. ESNV = Emotions in Self: NonVerbal. EON = Emotions in Others: Non-verbal. EMP = Emotions in Others Empathy. RegS = Regulation of Emotions in the Self. RegO = Regulation of Emotion in Others. FIPI = Flexible Planning. CRT = Creativity. MRA = Mood Redirected Attention. Motiv = Motivating Emotions. Delay = Delay of Gratification. EmAp = Emotional Appropriateness.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 5

Testing for Slope Bias: Beta-weights for the Interaction Terms

Criteria	O'Sullivan and Guilford Tests					Tett's Self-Report Questionnaire										
	EG	CP	MC	ST	ESV	ESNV	EON	EMP	RegS	RegO	FIPI	CRT	MRA	Motiv	Delay	EmAp
Best Friend Questionnaire																
Five Years																
Successful									.47*							
Rewarding			.33*									.62*				-.77**
Satisfying		.55*	.44**						-.63*							
Supportive									.61**							
Conflict Tactics Scales																
Self Negotiation																
Self Psychological Aggression									-.66**							
Self Physical Assault																
Self Sexual Coercion																
Self Injury									-.51*							
Partner Negotiation																-1.26*
Partner Psychological Aggression																
Partner Physical Assault		.53*														
Partner Sexual Coercion																
Partner Injury																

Note. EG = Expression Grouping. CP = Cartoon Predictions. MC = Missing Cartoons. ST = Social Translations. ESV = Emotions in the Self: Verbal. ESNV = Emotions in Self: NonVerbal. EON = Emotions in Others: Non-verbal. EMP = Emotions in Others Empathy. RegS = Regulation of Emotions in the Self. RegO = Regulation of Emotion in Others. FIPI = Flexible Planning. CRT = Creativity. MRA = Mood Redirected Attention. Motiv = Motivating Emotions. Delay = Delay of Gratification. EmAp = Emotional Appropriateness.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.