

Estimates of Emotional and Psychometric Intelligence: Evidence for Gender-Based Stereotypes

K. V. PETRIDES
ADRIAN FURNHAM
*Department of Psychology
University College, London
England*

G. NEIL MARTIN
*Department of Psychology
Middlesex University
London, England*

ABSTRACT. The authors examined participants' estimates of own and parental psychometric intelligence (IQ) and emotional intelligence (EI). The authors asked 224 participants (82 men, 138 women, 4 people who did not report their gender) to estimate their own and their parents' IQ and EI scores on a normal distribution ranging from 55 to 145 points. The authors hypothesized that men would give higher IQ but lower EI self-estimates than women and that participants, regardless of gender, would rate their fathers as higher on IQ but lower on EI than their mothers. The results confirmed the hypotheses, supporting the view that people perceive psychometric intelligence as a primarily masculine attribute in contrast with emotional intelligence, which they perceive as a primarily feminine attribute. The results also showed that the intensity of the stereotypical perception of EI as a feminine attribute diminished when the authors asked participants to estimate their scores on a range of specific EI facets instead of providing a direct overall self-estimate.

Key words: gender differences, self-estimated intelligence, sex roles

OVER THE PAST DECADE, many studies on self-estimates of intelligence have been sparked, mainly by the research of Hogan (1978) and Beloff (1992). The researchers of these studies have focused primarily on gender differences in self-estimated intelligence and, with few exceptions (e.g., Byrd & Stacey, 1993), have shown that men give higher overall IQ self-estimates than do women (Furnham & Fong, 2000; Furnham & Rawles, 1999). These researchers have also shown that this gender difference can be replicated cross-culturally. Studies carried out in Africa (Uganda), the United States (Hawaii), East Asia (China, Japan,

and Singapore), and Europe (Belgium, Britain, and Slovakia) have nearly all shown male hubris and/or female humility effects (Furnham, Fong, & Martin, 1999; Furnham, Rakow, Sarmany-Schiller, & De Fruyt, 1999; Zhang & Gong, 2001).

Starting with Bennett (1996, 1997, 2000), various researchers have focused on self-estimates of multiple intelligences, as defined by Gardner (1983). The results of the studies have shown that significant gender differences tend to be confined to mathematical and spatial intelligence and do not typically emerge in verbal, musical, bodily kinesthetic, interpersonal, or intrapersonal intelligence (Furnham, 2001; Furnham, Clark, & Bailey, 1999; Rammstedt & Rammsayer, 2000). This finding suggests that, despite men having consistently provided higher self-estimates than women on overall, *g*, or general intelligence, the actual differences are largely restricted to specific primary factors. Perhaps the differences in estimated mathematical and spatial intelligence reflect actual gender differences on these two factors (Lynn, 1999). However, studies have largely failed to register corresponding differences in factors for which there is evidence of actual female superiority (e.g., verbal intelligence; Jensen, 1998; Mackintosh, 1998).

Researchers have also found that gender differences in estimated IQ are often a function of the method of derivation of the overall score. Male-favoring differences tend to occur when researchers ask participants to give a direct self-estimate of overall IQ, but not when researchers derive an overall score through summing up (or averaging) separate estimates on constituent IQ facets (e.g., verbal, mathematical, and similar factors; Furnham, 2000; Furnham, Clark, et al., 1999).

The present research extends the foregoing research into the area of *emotional intelligence* (EI). Salovey and Mayer (1990) defined EI as "the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one's thinking and action" (p. 189). This conceptualization was quickly followed by several salient models of EI (e.g., Bar-On, 1997; Goleman, 1995; Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Petrides & Furnham, 2001) and by an increasing number of empirical studies (e.g., Ciarrochi, Chan, & Bajgar, 2001; Ciarrochi, Deane, & Anderson, 2002; Mehrabian, 2000; Parker, Taylor, & Bagby, 2001; Petrides & Furnham, 2000b, 2003; Schutte et al., 2001; van der Zee, Schakel, & Thijs, 2002). Ciarrochi, Chan, and Caputi (2000) noted that from a conceptual point of view, the majority of EI models are complementary rather than contradictory. Thus, most EI models tend to include various affect-related facets, such as emotion awareness, empathy, and relationship skills (for a review, see Petrides & Furnham, 2001).

The conceptual nature of EI renders it an especially interesting construct for examination of self-estimates of intelligence because many of the specific facets

K. V. Petrides was supported by a PhD studentship and a postdoctoral fellowship from the Economic and Social Research Council.

Address correspondence to K. V. Petrides, Institute of Education, University of London, 25 Woburn Square, London WC1H 0AA, UK; k.petrides@ioe.ac.uk (e-mail).

that EI encompasses involve areas in which investigators think women outperform men (e.g., relationship skills; Argyle, 1990; Goleman, 1995; Hall, 1978; Heatherington, Stets, & Mazzarella, 1986). Researchers might therefore expect that women would make higher EI self-estimates than would men, in contrast to the expectation of the male-favoring difference observed on IQ self-estimates.

In the present research, we intended to complement previous research on self-estimated IQ. The present research shares the conceptual framework with previous research, which is underpinned by the importance of the study of self-estimated traits and abilities for the understanding of self-fulfilling prophecies, aspirations, achievements, and psychological well-being (Beyer, 1990; Beyer & Bowden, 1997; Taylor & Brown, 1988). However, in the present research, we looked at a different construct with different implications for everyday functioning. In this case, we expected the standard male-favoring difference in IQ scores to be reversed because people generally perceive women as more competent in EI than men. So, we hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 1: Men would have higher IQ self-estimates than women.

But we also hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 2: Men would have lower EI self-estimates than women.

Thus, results fulfilling Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 2 would provide evidence for the view that people's perceptions of intelligence (IQ in a limited sense) tend to be male normative, whereas their perceptions of EI tend to be female normative.

In the present study, we looked not only at self-estimates but also at estimates of the IQ and EI of participants' parents. The investigation of estimates of parents' abilities and traits is important, especially in relation to gender differences, for two reasons. First, people's estimates of their parents' intelligence enable researchers to determine whether the gender differences are limited to self-estimates of intelligence or whether one can generalize the differences to include others. Research on IQ estimates suggests that the male-favoring difference extends to estimates of relatives, with fathers and sons being perceived as more intelligent than mothers and daughters, respectively (Furnham, 2001). For EI, the direction of the difference should be opposite, with mothers perceived as more emotionally intelligent than fathers. We hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 3: Irrespective of gender, participants would rate their fathers as more intelligent than their mothers.

Conversely, we also hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 4: Irrespective of gender, participants would rate their mothers as more emotionally intelligent than their fathers.

In the present research, we also examined whether gender differences in EI estimates vary with the method that we used to derive the overall estimated score. As noted earlier in the present article, research on estimated IQ scores has shown that gender differences are more likely to occur when researchers ask participants to give a direct overall estimate of their intelligence than when researchers derive a total score by summing up (or averaging) estimates on multiple constituent aspects of intelligence (e.g., spatial, verbal, numerical, and similar aspects). This finding suggests that if researchers ask lay people to provide a direct estimate of overall intelligence, they are likely to perceive intelligence as a "masculine" domain and neglect specific intelligence facets in which women tend to outperform men (e.g., verbal intelligence). In contrast, the finding also suggests that when the various facets of intelligence are explicitly presented to participants for rating, and those ratings are subsequently summed up, the gender differences are likely to diminish or disappear.

In the present study, we examined whether a similar bias occurs in estimates of EI. In other words, we attempted to establish whether any female-favoring differences in direct EI estimates, suggesting that participants perceive EI skills as more feminine, disappear when participants rate various aspects of EI, some of which represent areas in which men tend to outperform women (e.g., emotion control; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1985). We hypothesized the following:

Hypothesis 5: In contrast to the case of directly self-estimated EI scores, no significant female-favoring difference would occur in summated EI scores.

Method

Participants

The participants were 224 undergraduate or postgraduate students at two British universities (82 men, 138 women, 4 who did not report their gender). Their mean age was 23.24 years ($SD = 5.83$ years).

Materials and Procedure

We asked the participants to complete a 2-page questionnaire that had been based on previous studies of estimated IQ. The questionnaire required a total of 45 ratings. The first part contained a description of the normal distribution of IQ scores. This included a copy of a bell curve spanning six standard deviations (-3 to $+3$) and brief descriptions of the anchor scores (e.g., $55 =$ mild retardation, $100 =$ average, $145 =$ gifted). Below that part of the questionnaire, we asked participants to give direct estimates of their own and their parents' overall IQ and EI scores. Subsequently, we asked them to make 12 additional estimates of various EI components, each presented with a relevant description in list form, which we

had taken from Goleman (1998). We summed up these estimates to derive a second, indirect, overall EI estimate for the participants' self, mother, and father. We allotted participants class time to complete the questionnaire. The response rate approached 100%.

Results

Table 1 shows the male and female means and standard deviations for the direct overall EI estimates for the participants' self, father, and mother. Table 2 shows those for the 12 EI facets. We indirectly derived a total score on self-estimated EI by summing up self-estimates on the 12 facets. No gender differences occurred in that total score ($M_{\text{female}} = 1275$, $SD_{\text{female}} = 102$; $M_{\text{male}} = 1270$, $SD_{\text{male}} = 141$), $t(218) < 1$, p is *ns*, which supports Hypothesis 5. The only significant difference on the 12 facets concerned *emotional awareness*, $t(218) = 2.14$, $p < .05$, for which women ($M = 111.3$, $SD = 13.3$) gave higher estimates than men ($M = 106.6$, $SD = 19.4$).

Analyses of Variance

To test Hypothesis 1 (men would have higher IQ self-estimates than women) and Hypothesis 3 (participants would rate their fathers as more intelligent than their mothers), we performed a two-way split-plot analysis of variance (ANOVA) with gender as the between-subjects variable and IQ rating target (self, father, or mother) as the repeated measures variable. We found a significant main effect of

TABLE 1. Means and Standard Deviations for the Direct Overall IQ and EI Estimates

Gender	IQ			EI		
	Self	Father	Mother	Self	Father	Mother
Male						
<i>M</i>	108.9	109.1	105.8	106.6	101.6	110.1
<i>SD</i>	13.3	13.9	14.6	20.0	18.1	15.4
Female						
<i>M</i>	105.4	110.0	106.5	111.2	98.9	112.7
<i>SD</i>	9.1	14.2	12.5	14.2	16.9	14.3
Total						
<i>M</i>	106.7	109.7	106.3	109.5	99.9	111.7
<i>SD</i>	10.9	14.1	13.3	16.7	17.4	14.7

Note. EI = emotional intelligence. IQ = psychometric intelligence.

TABLE 2. Means (Standard Deviations) for Self-Estimated Scores on the 12 EI Facets

EI facet	Males			Females		
	Self	Father	Mother	Self	Father	Mother
Emotional awareness —Knowing which emotions are being felt and why; realizing links between feelings and what is thought, said, and done; recognizing how feelings affect performance; guiding awareness of personal values and goals	106.6 (19.4)	102.2 (16.6)	113.4 (16.0)	111.3 (13.3)	100.1 (14.4)	111.2 (14.3)
Accurate self-assessment —Awareness of personal strengths and weaknesses; learning from experience and being reflective; openness to candid feedback, new perspectives, and continuous learning	108.7 (17.4)	107.6 (17.8)	109.2 (18.7)	106.9 (14.8)	101.5 (17.2)	107.0 (13.8)
Self-confidence —Having presence and self-assurance; voicing unpopular views and risking sacrifice for what is right; being decisive; making sound decisions despite uncertainty and pressure	102.0 (18.6)	105.9 (17.8)	104.3 (20.4)	102.1 (15.4)	108.5 (16.3)	106.1 (15.8)
Self-control —Managing impulsive feelings and distressing emotions; staying composed, positive, and unflappable in difficult moments; thinking clearly and staying focused	104.2 (20.3)	103.4 (18.4)	104.7 (18.9)	101.8 (16.6)	103.6 (18.5)	103.4 (15.4)
Trustworthiness —Acting ethically; building trust through reliability and authenticity; admitting mistakes and taking principled stands	107.9 (17.7)	105.5 (22.2)	112.5 (16.4)	110.0 (13.3)	105.5 (18.4)	112.6 (15.3)

Conscientiousness—Meeting commitments and keeping promises; accepting accountability for meeting objectives; being organized and careful

107.9 (17.0) 108.9 (20.1) 112.0 (16.7) 109.5 (15.3) 110.3 (16.2) 112.9 (15.2)

Adaptability—Handling multiple demands and shifting priorities; adapting responses and tactics to fit fluid circumstances; being flexible in seeing events

104.9 (17.3) 104.9 (16.3) 107.3 (15.1) 105.0 (13.9) 106.0 (14.6) 109.9 (14.9)

Innovation—Seeking out fresh ideas from a variety of sources; considering original solutions to problems; generating new ideas; taking fresh perspectives and risks in thinking

104.1 (19.5) 103.2 (16.1) 104.0 (15.6) 104.7 (14.4) 103.4 (15.8) 103.8 (14.7)

Achievement drive—Being results oriented; setting goals; taking calculated risks; pursuing information to reduce uncertainty; learning how to improve performance

105.1 (19.5) 107.8 (18.1) 101.9 (18.1) 106.8 (15.0) 106.1 (15.3) 105.6 (15.8)

Commitment—Making sacrifices to meet larger organizational goals; using group's core values

103.8 (16.9) 110.4 (17.9) 108.2 (17.8) 104.2 (15.0) 106.9 (16.5) 108.7 (15.8)

Initiative—Seizing opportunities; pursuing goals beyond what is expected or required; mobilizing others through unusual, enterprising efforts

107.4 (16.3) 104.7 (18.3) 108.7 (18.0) 105.7 (15.9) 105.8 (16.2) 107.0 (14.2)

Optimism—Persisting in seeking goals despite obstacles and setbacks; operating from hope of success vs. fear of failure; viewing setback as result of manageable circumstances vs. personal flaw

107.0 (17.7) 104.9 (17.5) 107.8 (18.6) 106.5 (14.6) 107.2 (15.3) 106.6 (14.6)

IQ rating target, $F(2, 432) = 5.32, p < .01$, but no effect of gender. Sidak post hoc tests indicated that participants had rated their fathers ($M = 109.7, SD = 14.1$) as more intelligent than their mothers ($M = 106.3, SD = 13.3$). The IQ Rating Target \times Gender interaction was not significant, $F(2, 432) = 2.44, p = 0.09$. Nevertheless, a simple main effects analysis, with the degrees of freedom adjusted as per Satterthwaite (1946), indicated a significant gender difference in self-estimated IQ, $F(1, 571) = 3.98, p < .05$, with men giving higher estimates than women ($M_{\text{male}} = 108.9, SD_{\text{male}} = 13.3$, vs. $M_{\text{female}} = 105.4, SD_{\text{female}} = 9.1$). We found no gender differences in IQ estimates for fathers or mothers, indicating that participants—regardless of their own gender—tended to perceive their fathers as more intelligent than their mothers. These results support Hypothesis 1 and Hypothesis 3 and accord well with many previous studies in the area (Furnham, 2000, 2001).

We conducted a similar analysis with gender as the between-subjects variable and with EI rating target (self, father, or mother) as the repeated measures variable to test Hypothesis 2 (men would have lower EI self-estimates than women) and Hypothesis 4 (participants would rate their mothers as more emotionally intelligent than their fathers). The results showed a main effect of EI rating target, $F(2, 432) = 37.63, p < .01$, and a significant interaction between the two factors, $F(2, 432) = 3.94, p < .05$ but no effect of gender. Sidak post hoc tests showed that participants estimated both their own EI ($M = 109.5, SD = 16.7$) and their mothers' EI ($M = 111.7, SD = 14.7$) as significantly higher than their fathers' ($M = 99.9, SD = 17.4$), thereby supporting Hypothesis 4. In line with Hypothesis 2, a simple main effects analysis showed that female self-estimates were significantly higher than male self-estimates ($M_{\text{female}} = 111.2, SD_{\text{female}} = 14.2$, vs. $M_{\text{male}} = 106.6, SD_{\text{male}} = 20.0$). We found no gender differences in estimates of parental EI, indicating that participants—irrespective of their own gender—tended to perceive their mothers as more emotionally intelligent than their fathers.

Factor Analyses

To investigate the structure of the 12 EI facets and to obtain a smaller number of variables to use as predictors in regressions, we performed three factor analyses with Varimax rotation on EI estimates of the participants' self, father, and mother. Table 3 shows the three structure matrices, which are broadly similar.

Two factors consistently emerged in all analyses. *Innovation, initiative, achievement drive*, and *self-confidence* were the main EI facets defining the first factor, Social Drive. *Emotional awareness, trustworthiness, and conscientiousness* were the main definers of the second factor, Emotional Understanding and Dependability). The two factors together accounted for 48.5%, 52.4%, and 51.1% of the total variance in estimates of the participants' self, father, and mother, respectively.

TABLE 3. Factor Structure Matrices (Self, Father, and Mother) for the Factor Analyses of EI Facet Estimates

EI facet	Self		Father		Mother	
	F1	F2	F1	F2	F1	F2
Emotional awareness		.73 ^a		.76 ^a	.31	.66 ^a
Accurate self-assessment		.70 ^a	.31	.62 ^a	.51 ^a	.43 ^a
Self-confidence	.63 ^a		.50 ^a	.34	.80 ^a	
Self-control		.45 ^a		.72 ^a	.64 ^a	
Trustworthiness		.73 ^a		.54 ^a		.64 ^a
Conscientiousness		.59 ^a	.33	.54 ^a		.64 ^a
Adaptability	.57 ^a	.35	.45 ^a	.58 ^a	.47 ^a	.39
Innovation	.78 ^a		.64 ^a		.65 ^a	.32
Achievement drive	.68 ^a	.32	.83 ^a		.55 ^a	.53 ^a
Commitment		.64 ^a	.70 ^a		.45 ^a	.49 ^a
Initiative	.65 ^a	.32	.74 ^a		.70 ^a	
Optimism	.71 ^a		.69 ^a		.45 ^a	.41 ^a
Eigenvalues	4.45	1.37	4.95	1.35	5.06	1.07
Percentage of variance explained	24.4	24.1	27.7	24.7	27.7	23.4

Note. EI = emotional intelligence. F1 = Factor 1 (Social Drive). F2 = Factor 2 (Emotional Understanding and Dependability). Loadings less than .30 are not displayed.

^aLoading greater than .40.

Regression Analyses

We regressed the participants' IQ self-estimates on total self-estimated EI (derived by summing up the scores on the 12 facets) and gender. The regression was significant, $F(2, 219) = 33.34, p < .01$, accounting for 23% of the variance. Both gender, $\beta = .46, t(219) = 7.72, p < .01$, and estimated EI, $\beta = -.17, t(219) = 2.82, p < .01$, were significant predictors in the equation. Controlling for the latter predictor, men's IQ self-estimates were significantly higher than women's, providing further support for Hypothesis 1.

Subsequently, we regressed the participants' direct EI estimates of self, father, and mother on the two factors that had emerged from the factor analyses of the 12 facets with gender and age. We performed these analyses to explore in more detail the extent and nature of gender differences in estimates of EI and to determine whether the two EI factors that we had obtained in the factor analysis described in the previous section were differentially related to the directly estimated overall EI scores. (The dependent variables in these regressions were the

direct EI estimates, not the estimates that we derived by summing up scores on the 12 facets.) The regression for directly self-estimated EI was significant, $F(4, 212) = 28.52, p < .01, R^2_{\text{adj}} = .34$. Both Emotional Understanding and Dependability, $\beta = .57, t(212) = 8.57, p < .01$, and gender, $\beta = .11, t(212) = 2.03, p < .01$, were reliable predictors. When we controlled for the effects of the other predictors in the regression, we found that women's EI self-estimates were higher than men's EI self-estimates, which supports Hypothesis 2. The two equations with direct estimates of fathers' and mothers' EI as the dependent variables were also significant, $F(4, 210) = 19.19, p < .01, R^2_{\text{adj}} = .25$; and $F(4, 212) = 29.63, p < .01, R^2_{\text{adj}} = .35$; respectively. Emotional Understanding and Dependability was the sole reliable predictor of both estimates of fathers' EI, $\beta = .54, t(210) = 7.13, p < .01$, and estimates of mothers' EI, $\beta = .50, t(212) = 6.85, p < .01$.

Discussion

In line with previous studies (Bennet, 1996; Furnham, Fong, et al., 1999; Furnham, Rakow, et al., 1999), results of the present study revealed gender differences in directly self-estimated overall IQ, with men giving significantly higher estimates than women. Both genders rated their fathers as more intelligent than their mothers. We discovered that the male-favoring difference in IQ self-estimates frequently emerges when researchers request a direct overall IQ estimate, but not when they derive an estimate via the summation of multiple IQ facets. One explanation for this finding is that perceptions of intelligence are male normative, and individuals tend to associate overall IQ more strongly with constituent facets in which men are likely to perform better, such as numerical and spatial ability. Consequently, when asked to provide a direct overall estimate, they tend to place disproportionately high weights on these facets, resulting in a significant male-favoring difference in the overall score.

In contrast, researchers do not observe a similar difference in overall estimates obtained through summing up (or, equivalently, averaging) constituent items, because these include IQ facets in which women are of equal or superior ability. Because researchers give neutral, male-favoring, and female-favoring items equal weights in the summated total score, any differences tend either to cancel out or to be obscure among a number of roughly equivalent estimates. In this context, male hubris and/or female humility effects could operate in a dual fashion: (a) at the *overall level* by biasing the estimation process towards placing disproportionately high weights on male-favoring IQ facets, thus leading to a significant gender difference in overall estimated IQ and (b) at the *facet level* by biasing the process so that any actual female-favoring differences do not fully affect estimated scores.

We observed a similar pattern of findings with estimated EI. In this case, however, consistent with the notion that women are more empathic and socially skilled (Argyle, 1990; Heatherington et al., 1986), we observed a female-favoring

difference in directly estimated overall EI. In accord with previous findings (Petrides & Furnham, 2000a), we found no gender differences when we obtained a total estimated EI score through summing up constituent facets. From the three regressions involving estimates of EI of self, father, and mother, it was clear that participants consistently associated the direct overall estimate with the Emotional Understanding and Dependability factor. Therefore, it seems that people think that emotional understanding is at the core of EI. Although this point might seem self-evident, certain EI conceptualizations (e.g., Bar-On, 1997) do not place adequate emphasis on facets such as emotion identification, expression, and regulation. Perhaps more important, the β coefficient for gender in the equation involving self-estimated EI was significant, indicating that gender differences have come from a differential and possibly gender-biased understanding of the variables being estimated.

Just as with IQ, participants gave differential EI estimates for their parents. However, in the case of EI, the difference was opposite, with estimates about mothers being significantly higher than those for fathers. Also, whereas the difference in IQ estimates between fathers and mothers was on the order of 3 points, that in EI estimates exceeded 10. That finding might reflect the perception of mothers as the “emotional managers” in the family and their tendency to spend significantly more time in caring for children (Goleman, 1995; Levant, Slattery, & Loiselle, 1987). The finding might also indicate that perceptions of EI are more female normative than perceptions of IQ are male normative. We found no gender differences in the estimates of parental IQ or EI. Therefore, gender differences in self-estimates do not seem to extend to estimates of parental IQ and EI, where both genders rate their fathers as having higher IQ and their mothers as having higher EI.

We observed a significant difference when we regressed self-estimated IQ on gender, age, and the self-estimated EI derived by summing up scores on the 12 facets. In accordance with previous studies—in our study, men’s IQ self-estimates were significantly higher than women’s, even after we controlled for scores on the other predictors in the equation. Estimated EI was a consistent positive predictor of estimated IQ of participants’ self, father, and mother. That finding suggests that people perceive some degree of overlap between cognitive and emotional abilities as they are manifested in their own and their parents’ behavior.

To summarize, the pattern of results of estimated EI closely resembles that of estimated IQ, with the twist of female- rather than male-favoring gender differences. Women give significantly higher self-estimates of EI than men, and participants of both genders give significantly higher estimates of their mother’s EI than of their father’s EI. These findings are in accord with lay views of “rationality” as a male trait and “emotionality” as a female trait.

Remember that participants in the present study were university students, who might have different conceptions of intelligence and gender roles than older adults with different educational backgrounds and experiences. In addition,

although some empirical evidence supports the cross-cultural robustness of the male-favoring differences in estimates of intelligence, no such evidence supports EI. The gender difference in EI estimates might vary as a function of emotion display rules, which are known to be culture dependent (Brody & Hall, 2000). Moreover, in contrast with research on IQ self-estimates, it is especially difficult to examine the correspondence between estimated and actual EI scores, given the obstacles against devising performance-based tests of EI (Petrides & Furnham, 2001; Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts, 2001).

Future researchers in the area of intelligence might attempt to investigate in more detail the factors influencing the estimation of one's own and other people's scores on significant traits and abilities. More important, future researchers might focus on the consequences of self-estimates of different types of intelligence by investigating both the ways in which they affect behavior and the contexts in which those effects tend to occur (e.g., academic, occupational, interpersonal, and similar contexts). Such research would be worthwhile especially because it could contribute to our understanding of the processes that might lead to inaccurately negative self-evaluations, reduced self-confidence, and stereotypical judgments of other people's attributes and abilities.

REFERENCES

- Argyle, M. (1990). *The psychology of interpersonal behaviour*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.
- Bar-On, R. (1997). *Bar On emotional quotient inventory: Technical manual*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.
- Beloff, H. (1992). Mother, father, and me: Our IQ. *The Psychologist*, 5, 309–311.
- Bennett, M. (1996). Men's and women's self-estimates of intelligence. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 136, 411–412.
- Bennett, M. (1997). Self-estimates of ability in men and women. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 137, 540–541.
- Bennett, M. (2000). Self-estimates and population estimates of ability in men and women. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 52, 23–28.
- Beyer, S. (1990). Gender differences in the accuracy of self-evaluations of performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 960–970.
- Beyer, S., & Bowden, E. M. (1997). Gender differences in self-perceptions: Convergent evidence from three measures of accuracy and bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 157–172.
- Brody, L. R., & Hall, J. A. (2000). Gender, emotion, and expression. In M. Lewis & J. M. Haviland-Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (2nd ed., pp. 338–449). New York: Guilford.
- Byrd, M., & Stacey, B. (1993). Bias in IQ perception. *The Psychologist*, 6, 16.
- Ciarrochi, J. V., Chan, A. Y. C., & Bajgar, J. (2001). Measuring emotional intelligence in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 31, 1105–1119.
- Ciarrochi, J. V., Chan, A. Y. C., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 539–561.
- Ciarrochi, J. V., Deane, F. P., & Anderson, S. (2002). Emotional intelligence moderates the relationship between stress and mental health. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 197–209.

- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, M. W. (1985). *Personality and individual differences: A natural science approach*. New York: Plenum.
- Furnham, A. (2000). Thinking about intelligence. *The Psychologist*, *13*, 510–515.
- Furnham, A. (2001). Self-estimates of intelligence: Culture and gender differences in self and other estimates of both general (g) and multiple intelligences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *31*, 1381–1405.
- Furnham, A., Clark, K., & Bailey, K. (1999). Sex differences in estimates of multiple intelligences. *European Journal of Personality*, *13*, 247–259.
- Furnham, A., & Fong, G. (2000). Self-estimated and psychometrically measured intelligence: A cross-cultural and sex difference study. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *2*, 1–10.
- Furnham, A., Fong, G., & Martin, N. (1999). Sex and cross-cultural differences in the estimated multifaceted intelligence quotient score for self, parents and siblings. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *26*, 1025–1034.
- Furnham, A., Rakow, T., Sarmany-Schiller, I., & De Fruyt, F. (1999). European differences in self-perceived multiple intelligences. *European Psychologist*, *4*, 131–138.
- Furnham, A., & Rawles, R. (1999). Correlations between self-estimated and psychometrically measured IQ. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *139*, 405–410.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Hall, J. A. (1978). Gender effects in decoding nonverbal cues. *Psychological Bulletin*, *85*, 845–857.
- Heatherington, L., Stets, J., & Mazzarella, S. (1986). Whither the bias: The female client's "edge" in psychotherapy? *Psychotherapy*, *23*, 252–256.
- Hogan, W. H. (1978). IQ self-estimates of males and females. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *106*, 137–138.
- Jensen, A. R. (1998). *The g factor*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Levant, R. F., Slattery, S. C., & Loiselle, J. E. (1987). Fathers' involvement in housework and child care with school-aged daughters. *Family Relations: Journal of Applied Family and Child Studies*, *36*, 152–157.
- Lynn, R. (1999). Sex differences in intelligence and brain size: A developmental theory. *Intelligence*, *27*, 1–12.
- Mackintosh, N. (1998). *IQ and human intelligence*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (2nd ed., pp. 3–31). New York: Basic Books.
- Mehrabian, A. (2000). Beyond IQ: Broad-based measurement of individual success potential or "emotional intelligence." *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, *126*, 133–239.
- Parker, J. D. A., Taylor, G. J., & Bagby, R. M. (2001). The relationship between emotional intelligence and alexithymia. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *30*, 107–115.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000a). Gender differences in measured and self-estimated trait emotional intelligence. *Sex Roles*, *42*, 449–461.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2000b). On the dimensional structure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *29*, 313–320.
- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2001). Trait emotional intelligence: Psychometric investigation with reference to established trait taxonomies. *European Journal of Personality*, *15*, 425–448.

- Petrides, K. V., & Furnham, A. (2003). Trait emotional intelligence: Behavioural validation in two studies of emotion recognition and reactivity to mood induction. *European Journal of Personality, 17*, 39–57.
- Rammstedt, B., & Rammesayer, T. H. (2000). Sex differences in self-estimates of different aspects of intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*, 869–880.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 9*, 185–211.
- Satterthwaite, F. E. (1946). An approximate distribution of estimates of variance components. *Biometrics Bulletin, 2*, 110–114.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Bobik, C., Coston, T. D., Greeson, C., Jedlicka, C., et al. (2001). Emotional intelligence and interpersonal relations. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 141*, 523–536.
- Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin, 103*, 193–210.
- van der Zee, K., Schakel, L., & Thijs, M. (2002). The relationship of emotional intelligence with academic intelligence and the big five. *European Journal of Personality, 16*, 103–125.
- Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2001). Slow down, you move too fast: Emotional intelligence remains an 'elusive' intelligence. *Emotion, 1*, 265–275.
- Zhang, Y., & Gong, Y. (2001). Self-estimated intelligence and its related factors. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 9*, 193–195.

Received December 18, 2001

Accepted May 22, 2002