



Components of Emotional Meaning: A sourcebook

Johnny J. R. Fontaine (ed.) et al.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199592746.001.0001>

Published: 15 August 2013

Online ISBN: 9780191762765

Print ISBN: 9780199592746

Search in this book

CHAPTER

19 Assessing interindividual differences in emotion knowledge: Exploring a GRID-based approach

Steven J. E. Van den Eede, Johnny J. R. Fontaine

<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199592746.003.0020> Pages 299–308

Published: August 2013

Abstract

In this chapter, it is discussed how the results of the GRID instrument can be used to contribute to the construction of valid assessment instruments for emotional intelligence, and particularly the emotion knowledge aspect of it. More specifically, the GRID can be used to identify the nature and the subfacets of the emotional knowledge construct. Emotion knowledge can be defined as knowledge about how Appraisals, Bodily reactions, Expressions, Action tendencies, and Feelings interact during an emotion process. Moreover, the GRID results can be used to score responses in terms of probabilistic relationships between the emotion components. A first version of a new emotion knowledge instrument is presented with knowledge items covering the five components and with a scoring key based on the GRID results. The application of this new instrument in an adult sample revealed a single emotion knowledge factor.

Keywords: [emotion intelligence](#), [emotion knowledge](#), [maximum performance tests](#)

Subject: [Developmental Psychology](#), [Social Psychology](#)

Collection: [Oxford Scholarship Online](#)

Emotion knowledge is considered a core aspect of emotional intelligence and plays a central role in its assessment. It is thought to be an essential element in the recognition and interpretation of emotional situations, expressions, and behaviors (e.g., Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2008). Understanding Emotions forms one of the four constituting branches in the currently golden standard for the measurement of emotional intelligence, namely the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso-Emotional-Intelligence Test (MSCEIT, Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002; Mayer, Salovey, Caruso, & Sitarenios, 2003). The Understanding Emotions branch is represented by two subtests, namely Changes and Blends, which assess knowledge about how one emotion can transform into another and about how different emotions can merge into complex emotions, respectively.

The Understanding Emotions subtests, and the MSCEIT more generally, have been criticized for not having a strong theoretical background (e.g., MacCann & Roberts, 2008). Neither the construction of the items, nor the

scoring of the item responses is embedded in an explicit emotion theory. Two types of scoring keys have been developed for the MSCEIT, namely consensus-based and experts-based scoring keys (MacCann, Roberts, Matthews, & Zeidner, 2004; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). In the consensus-based key a response is scored according to the proportion of respondents in a representative sample that have selected that response as the correct one. In the expert-based key, the consensus between judgments of experts in the field is relied upon (MacCann et al., 2004). Both methods result in highly comparable emotional intelligence scores with the difference that expert judgments have been found to be more consistent and reliable than lay judgments (Mayer, et. al., 2003). From the perspective of maximum performance testing, however, both scoring keys are problematic. The scientific literature on human judgment has extensively demonstrated its fallibility. Sometimes the majority chooses the demonstrably wrong answer, and even experts in statistics can be as susceptible to biases in their daily judgment as lay persons (e.g., Gilovitch, Griffing, & Kahneman, 2001). Thus, neither the consensus in a representative sample, nor expertise in a field guarantees the correctness of a response.

p. 300 One of the most important developments in the assessment of emotion knowledge that deals with the lack of theoretical grounding of both the items and the responses is the development of the Situational Test of Emotional Understanding (STEU) by MacCann and Roberts (2008). Rather than starting from an intuitive understanding of the construct of emotion knowledge, they took Roseman's appraisal theory (Roseman, 2001) as a point of reference. According to this theory, emotions are triggered by a combination of seven appraisal dimensions, such as appraisals about the situational state (motive consistency vs motive inconsistency), the expectedness (expected vs unexpected), and the causal agency (caused by self, by others, or by circumstances) that people make in an emotional situation. According to this theory, 17 discrete emotions can be triggered depending on the profile of appraisals. In the STEU, Roseman's appraisal theory is operationalized by 42 multiple choice knowledge questions or items that assess whether respondents can identify the appraisals that characterize an emotion in general situations, in situations in one's personal life, or and in situations at the workplace. The responses are scored according to Roseman's theoretical framework.

The internal consistency of the STEU has been found to range from low ($\alpha = 0.48$ in the study of Austin, 2010) to moderate ($\alpha = 0.71$ in the study of MacCann & Roberts, 2008). Research on the internal structure revealed one well interpretable factor across the 42 items. This factor, however, accounted for only 5.9% of the total variance (Ferguson & Austin, 2011). While from the perspective of the internal structure, the evidence in favour of the new approach is moderate, the relationship of the STEU with other measurements of emotion knowledge and emotional intelligence, as well as with other constructs, such as verbal intelligence and psychopathology do support the new approach (Austin, 2010; MacCann & Roberts, 2008; Ferguson & Austin, 2010). The STEU is positively correlated with verbal intelligence and the MSCEIT, especially the Understanding Emotions branch, and is negatively correlated with psychopathology.

Because of its theoretical grounding, the development of the STEU means an important improvement in the assessment of emotion knowledge. Its limitation, however, is that it only operationalizes one aspect of the emotion process, namely the appraisals that trigger emotions. In the present chapter, we propose a new approach to the assessment of interindividual differences in emotion knowledge based on the theoretical framework of the GRID study, the GRID instrument, and the data of the GRID study. They can contribute to the further development of assessment procedures for interindividual differences in emotion knowledge in four important ways. The GRID study offers: (1) a comprehensive theoretical framework with respect to the defining characteristics of the emotion knowledge construct; and (2) it throws a new light on the debate about the identification of the correct response. Moreover, it offers a rich source for: (3) the operationalization of emotion knowledge items, as well as for (4) the operationalization of a scoring key for these items.

Defining the emotion knowledge construct. The Component Process Model (CPM), which formed the basis of the GRID instrument, offers a strong basis for defining the emotion knowledge construct. According to the CPM, an emotion is a process that is elicited by a goal-relevant event and that consists of a synchronization

between the five basic human subsystems, also called emotion components (namely Appraisal, Bodily reaction, Expression, Action tendencies, and Feeling) in order to prepare the person for rapid adaptive action (e.g., Scherer, 2005a; see Chapter 1). If the concept of emotion is defined in this way, then **knowing an emotion** means **knowing the Appraisals, Bodily reactions, Expressions, Action tendencies, and Feelings that synchronize in that emotion**. Taking this definition, knowing Changes and Blends, which is assessed in the Understanding Emotions branch of the MSCEIT, is relevant for, but does not belong to the core of construct of emotion knowledge. The STEU does assess one core aspect of emotion knowledge, namely knowing the appraisals that trigger the emotion. However, the STEU underrepresents the emotion knowledge construct by only focusing on Appraisals. For a full representation of the emotion knowledge construct, also knowledge about Bodily reactions, Expressions, Action tendencies, and Feelings needs to be assessed.

p. 301 **Scoring emotion knowledge responses.** From the perspective of the GRID study, which focused on the meaning of emotion terms, the problem of scoring emotion knowledge responses can be approached in a very different way than has been done in the consensus or expert scoring applied in the MSCEIT, or in the a priori theoretical scoring applied in the STEU. In line with the GRID, one can consider the linguistic meaning of a term as the point of reference. Instead of evaluating whether people know the “correct” answer, one can evaluate to what extent people know the meaning of an emotion term as it has been encoded in language. Most people have little or no access to scientific theorizing or empirical studies about emotions. The particularity of emotions, however, is that all persons are confronted with them regularly both within themselves and in others they interact with. People learn to label these recurrent emotional experiences, and learn the meaning of emotion words from the way others communicate about their emotional experiences. The meaning of emotion words captures what a community thinks is pertinent in emotional experiences. For instance, the meaning of the word “anger” represents what a community thinks the experiences of anger are about (see Chapter 4). The GRID study has demonstrated that all theoretically defined emotion components, namely Appraisals, Bodily reactions, Expression, Action tendencies, and Feelings, universally define the meaning of emotion terms. The GRID study has, moreover, demonstrated that the references to these five components do not fluctuate at whim, but show replicable meaning structures across languages and cultural groups. It is thus, in principle, possible to identify the “correct” meaning of emotion terms.

The GRID study moreover qualifies the idea of correctness. The meaning of emotion terms is not defined by a set of necessary and sufficient features (which would mean that a feature either belongs or does not belong to the meaning of an emotion term), but in terms of features that are assumed to be more or less prototypical (cf., the prototype theory on natural language concepts of Rosch, 1978; see also Chapters 1 and 2). In line with this theorizing, it is universally observed that features gradually differ in terms of the likelihood with which they define an emotion term. This implies that a person who has a high level of emotional knowledge should be able to identify the likelihood of features to belong to an emotion concept (rather than differentiate between correct and incorrect features).

Operationalizing the concept of emotion knowledge. From a validity perspective, the first and foremost criterion for the validity of an assessment instrument is the relevance and representativeness of its stimuli with respect to the domain one intends to assess (e.g., Messick, 1989). The GRID instrument and study offer a solid base for operationalizing the construct of emotion knowledge in a relevant and representative way. The GRID instrument consists of a set of 24 emotion terms which represent the variability of types of experiences in the emotion domain and of 142 features which operationalize each of the five basic emotion components based on important theories in the emotion literature. The GRID study has revealed that these 24 emotions are organized into four large emotion clusters (namely a joy, an anger, a sadness, and a fear cluster) and also two small clusters of which one is particularly salient (namely surprise, which is also differentiated from the other emotion terms on the fourth dimension in a four-dimensional representation) (see Chapter 7). Thus, based on the GRID study, the emotion domain can be divided into 25 major facets, with each facet defined by a combination of one of five emotion clusters (joy, anger, sadness, fear, and surprise) and one of five emotion

components (Appraisals, Bodily reactions, Expressions, Action tendencies, and Feelings). Moreover, the GRID study has generated information about how each of the 142 features that represent the five basic subsystems relate to these 24 emotion terms. Thus, each facet can be operationalized by combining GRID emotion terms with GRID emotion features.

p. 302 **Operationalizing the scoring key for emotion knowledge items.** The GRID study has identified an estimation of the likelihood that each of 142 features define the meaning of each of the 24 emotion terms. These estimations can be used to score the “correctness” of responses of emotional knowledge items. The more a participant is capable of identifying the likelihood that an emotion feature defines an emotion term, the higher his/her emotion knowledge.

In the present study, a new instrument for assessing interindividual differences in emotion knowledge on the basis of the GRID study is presented. With the GRID emotion terms and GRID emotion features a new knowledge instrument is constructed that represents the emotion domain in a relevant and representative way. Moreover, a scoring key is developed on the basis of the likelihood with which emotion features define the meaning of emotion terms as observed in the GRID study. Furthermore, a preliminary empirical investigation of the internal consistency (reliability) and internal structure (an important aspect of the construct validity) of the new instrument is presented. More specifically, it is investigated whether emotion knowledge items about Appraisals, Bodily reactions, Expressions, Action tendencies, and Feelings all empirically define the emotion knowledge construct and lead to a reliable scale. Moreover, the GRID-based scoring key is further investigated by comparing it with a consensus scoring key.

19.1 Method

The construction of the emotion knowledge instrument. The new emotion knowledge instrument, further referred to as EKI, consists of 25 different facets of emotion knowledge items with each facet combining one of the five emotion clusters (joy, anger, sadness, fear, and surprise) and one of the five emotion components (Appraisal, Bodily reaction, Action tendency, Expression, and Feeling). For the four large emotion clusters (namely joy, anger, sadness, and fear), three items were constructed for each combination with the five emotion components. For the surprise cluster, which is a small cluster, only one item was constructed per emotion component. Thus, the EKI consists of 65 items, which represent 25 possible combinations between one of the five emotion clusters and one of the five emotion components. Each item consisted of an emotion term and four features stemming from the same emotion component. Participants were asked to rank the four features with respect to their likelihood during an emotion episode that could be labeled with the respective emotion term. A ranking procedure was used instead of a rating procedure in order to avoid the impact of random interindividual differences in scale use. When using a Likert scale, respondents can differ systematically in how they use the response scale irrespective of the content of the items. For instance, some respondents score systematically higher than others across items, and some respondents prefer more extreme response categories than others. In a ranking procedure, these differences in scale use are avoided.

For instance, item 58 was one of the three operationalizations of the anger by bodily reaction facet: Item 58 – If someone experiences **hate** with respect to someone or something, then s/he would: (a) feel hot; (b) feel his/her heartbeat slowing down; (c) feel cold; (d) feel weak limbs.

Participants were instructed to rank the four bodily reactions from the least likely to the most likely Bodily reaction. Two scoring keys were developed, namely a GRID scoring key and a consensus scoring key. For the GRID scoring key, the likelihood scores of the features in the Dutch-speaking Belgian sample in the GRID study were taken as a point of reference. Because also language-specific and cultural-specific meanings have been identified in the GRID study, besides the overall cultural and linguistic stability of the meaning structures, the likelihood scores of the linguistically and culturally matching sample in the GRID study were used. Each item

p. 303 was scored by computing the Pearson-correlation between the rank order proposed by the participant and the likelihood scores of the features in the Belgian sample (for instance, the average likelihood scores for the features in item 58 were 6.35 for “feel hot,” 2.74 for “feel his/her heartbeat slowing down,” 4.68 for “feel cold,” and 4.41 for “feel weak limbs”). The item scores could thus vary between -1 when the participant chose the opposite order and 1 when the participant chose exactly the same order as in the GRID. In the consensus scoring key, the rank order of the respondent was scored according to the proportion of respondents with the same rank order.

Procedure

A web-based study was conducted. Participants were invited to log onto a protected website. First, they completed the general background questions, and subsequently they solved the 65 items. Participation was anonymous and voluntary.

Participants

A heterogeneous convenience sample of adults was selected through snowballing. In total, 233 Belgian Dutch-speaking adults participated in the research: they ranged between 17–64 years, with a mean age of 34.7 years, 59.7% were female. The sample consisted of 17.6% participants who did not finish their secondary education or had a technical and vocational training, 36.5% finished high school or senior technical school, and 45.9% of the participants had at least a bachelor degree. Of the total sample 54.5% was employed, 33.9% was studying, 2.1% was unemployed, and the remaining group consisted of housewives and people on early retirement.

19.2 Results

First, the analyses were executed on the GRID-scored responses and then on the consensus-scored responses.

GRID scoring key

The internal consistency of the total score across the 65 items was computed. With a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.87, the scale was sufficiently reliable (>0.80 , e.g., Lance, Butts, & Michels, 2006). In an ANCOVA with educational level and sex as independent variables and age as covariate, the age and the educational level of the participants was not significantly related to emotion knowledge. There was a small, but significant difference between men and women [$F(1,226) = 10.56$, $p < 0.001$, $\text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.05$], with women slightly outperforming men.

The internal structure of the new instrument was investigated with a factor analysis (principal component analysis). The scree plot clearly revealed a one-factorial solution with the first ten eigenvalues being 9.9, 2.3, 2.2, 2.0, 1.8, 1.8, 1.7, 1.7, 1.5, and 1.5. Moreover, higher-factorial solutions could not be well interpreted. Therefore a one-factorial solution was selected. The one-factorial structure accounted for 15.2% of the total variance across the 65 items with almost all items having a positive loading on this general factor. The factor loadings revealed a large variation ranging from a high 0.70 down to a low and even negative loading of -0.20, with a median loading of 0.35 (see Table 19.1).

Table 19.1 The mean score and the factor loadings of the 65 emotion knowledge items in a one-factorial solution

Item	Emotion cluster	Emotion component	Mean score with GRID scoring key	Factor loadings with GRID scoring key	Factor loadings with consensus scoring key
I31	Joy	Bodily reaction	0.921	0.704	0.507
I62	Joy	Action tendency	0.845	0.679	0.265
I61	Sadness	Feeling	0.871	0.642	0.344
I38	Anger	Expression	0.733	0.631	0.370
I25	Fear	Feeling	0.878	0.612	0.367
I45	Joy	Feeling	0.902	0.589	0.325
I35	Joy	Appraisal	0.733	0.571	0.432
I47	Sadness	Bodily reaction	0.820	0.551	0.440
I16	Fear	Appraisal	0.699	0.533	0.444
I54	Fear	Expression	0.768	0.532	0.250
I39	Sadness	Bodily reaction	0.673	0.525	0.344
I51	Fear	Appraisal	0.696	0.521	0.420
I60	Joy	Appraisal	0.754	0.508	0.506
I44	Fear	Action tendency	0.696	0.504	0.415
I59	Joy	Action tendency	0.761	0.500	0.189
I26	Joy	Appraisal	0.767	0.495	0.325
I56	Sadness	Feeling	0.589	0.485	0.508
I64	Fear	Expression	0.847	0.479	0.273
I13	Joy	Expression	0.842	0.466	0.409
I37	Fear	Feeling	0.697	0.453	0.388
I17	Fear	Bodily reaction	0.706	0.444	0.362
I43	Sadness	Appraisal	0.646	0.434	0.387
I36	Fear	Action tendency	0.515	0.422	0.357
I58	Anger	Bodily reaction	0.614	0.419	0.416

I22	Joy	Bodily reaction	0.751	0.418	0.362
I29	Anger	Action tendency	0.721	0.414	0.347
I32	Sadness	Expression	0.463	0.411	0.325
I20	Anger	Feeling	0.729	0.405	0.294
I55	Joy	Action tendency	0.556	0.385	0.348
I23	Sadness	Expression	0.887	0.382	0.169
I4	Sadness	Action tendency	0.701	0.378	0.323
I1	Anger	Appraisal	0.679	0.375	0.369
I3	Joy	Expression	0.873	0.346	0.308
I65	Sadness	Appraisal	0.548	0.337	0.373
I21	Fear	Appraisal	0.753	0.332	0.365
I28	Sadness	Expression	0.496	0.311	0.201
I50	Fear	Action tendency	0.529	0.301	0.298
I14	Sadness	Action tendency	0.654	0.288	0.395
I27	Joy	Bodily reaction	0.504	0.284	0.148
I10	Sadness	Action tendency	0.701	0.277	0.337
I42	Anger	Expression	0.397	0.275	0.168
I30	Surprise	Appraisal	0.614	0.264	0.284
I53	Anger	Bodily reaction	0.404	0.260	0.241
I34	Fear	Feeling	0.459	0.257	0.238
I41	Sadness	Bodily reaction	0.625	0.253	0.153
I46	Anger	Expression	0.667	0.252	0.301
I12	Surprise	Bodily reaction	0.693	0.244	0.191
I33	Anger	Action tendency	0.361	0.241	0.367
I57	Fear	Expression	0.577	0.234	0.315
I24	Surprise	Action tendency	0.487	0.223	0.257

I49	Joy	Feeling	0.231	0.203	0.282
I19	Anger	Action tendency	0.393	0.194	0.255
I11	Anger	Feeling	0.680	0.185	0.270
I8	Anger	Appraisal	0.204	0.181	0.046
I63	Anger	Bodily reaction	0.598	0.173	0.224
I15	Anger	Feeling	0.537	0.172	0.234
I9	Joy	Expression	0.806	0.151	0.252
I52	Joy	Feeling	0.272	0.127	0.200
I6	Surprise	Expression	0.237	0.124	0.204
I18	Surprise	Feeling	0.057	0.107	0.158
I2	Fear	Bodily reaction	0.375	0.080	0.151
I48	Anger	Appraisal	0.219	0.077	0.233
I5	Sadness	Feeling	0.078	0.022	0.200
I7	Fear	Bodily reaction	0.346	-0.049	0.324
I40	Sadness	Appraisal	-0.15	-0.20	-0.24

As all items were a priori constructed on the basis of the GRID study with the same principles and the same design, the large variability of loadings was unexpected. Therefore, this large variability in loadings was further investigated. In a first step, it was investigated whether emotion clusters, emotion components, or their combination differed in defining the overall general factor. An ANOVA was executed with the factor loadings as a dependent variable and the emotion cluster

p. 304

p. 305

p. 306

and the emotion component as independent variables. Neither the effect of emotion cluster was significant [$F(4,40) = 2.19, p = 0.09$], nor of emotion component [$F(4,40) = 0.11, p = 0.98$], nor of the interaction between emotion cluster and emotion component [$F(16,40) = 0.91, p = 0.57$]. So the variation of the loadings could not be accounted for by the design of the EKI. In a second step, a visual inspection of the properties of the items and the factor loadings revealed a strong relationship between the average item scores and the factor loadings of the items: the higher the average item score, the higher the item loading. This relationship was further explored using a regression analysis with the factor loadings as criterion and the mean item scores as predictors. About two thirds of the variance in the item loadings (64%) could be accounted for by variation in the mean item scores, which was statistically significant [$F(1,63) = 110.71, p < 0.001$]. Thus, the easier an item, the better it defined the overall emotion knowledge factor.

The consensus scoring key

A principal component analysis on the consensus-scored items also revealed only one dominant and interpretable factor. However, this factor accounted for only 10.2% of the total variance. Moreover, with a maximum loading of 0.51 and a median loading of 0.32 the consensus-scored items tended to load lower on the overall factor than the GRID-scored items (see also Table 19.1).

With a Cronbach's alpha of 0.83, the internal consistency of the consensus-scored items is only slightly lower than the internal consistency based on the GRID-scored items. Moreover, the total consensus-based scores and the total GRID-based scores across the 65 items were highly correlated ($r = 0.89$) and thus resulted in highly comparable estimations of the interindividual differences in emotion knowledge.

19.3 Discussion

The goal of the present study was to construct a new assessment instrument for emotion knowledge based on the GRID study. The GRID study, and the theoretical framework on which the GRID study was based, allowed (1) the rigorous definition of the construct of emotion knowledge as the knowledge about how each of the five basic emotion components function in a coordinated way during a particular emotion, (2) the rigorous operationalization of this definition in terms of 25 possible combinations between emotion clusters and emotion components, (3) the definition of the "correctness" of responses in terms of the meaning of emotion words, and (4) the development of a scoring key that quantifies the correspondence between responses of participants and the meaning of emotion words as they emerge in the GRID study.

A first empirical investigation of the internal structure of the newly constructed emotion knowledge instrument by and large confirmed the predictions made on the basis of the GRID study. First, it was predicted that not only questions about Appraisals, but also about Bodily reactions, Action tendencies, Expression, and Feelings would assess emotion knowledge. In line with this prediction, only one dominant factor could be empirically identified across items for Appraisals, Bodily reactions, Action tendencies, Expression, and Feelings. Moreover, there was no significant difference in how well knowledge of each of these five emotion components defined the overall emotion knowledge factor. Furthermore, the total score based on all 65 emotion knowledge items demonstrated good internal consistency.

Second, it is possible to score emotion knowledge items on the basis of the results of the GRID study. A GRID-based scoring key demonstrated better psychometric properties than a consensus-based scoring key. This was especially clear in the factor analysis. The single factor accounted for about one third more variance with the GRID-based than with the consensus-based scoring key (15.2% versus 10.2% of the total variance). Most items loaded (substantially) higher with the GRID-based scoring key. The internal consistency across the 65 items was, however, only slightly better with the GRID-based scoring key. The total score based on the GRID scoring key was also highly correlated with the total score based on the consensus scoring key. Thus, although the psychometric properties of the GRID-based scoring key are better, both scoring keys lead to very comparable estimations of emotion knowledge. This observation mirrors the earlier observation made with the MSCEIT that the consensus and the expert scoring keys eventually lead to the same results, but that the expert scoring key is more reliable. It is also observed that the psychometric properties of the new instrument are better than the psychometric properties of the STEU, to which it most closely resembles. Not only the internal consistency is higher, which can be partially explained by the higher number of items (65 in the EKI versus 42 in the STEU), but more importantly the first dominant factor accounted for about three times more variance in the new instrument than in the STEU (15.2% in the EKI versus 5.9% in the STEU).

One observation was not anticipated, namely a large variation of the items in terms of their loadings on the general factor. As all items were constructed in the same way on the basis of the GRID results, no substantial

differences in factor loadings were anticipated. When this phenomenon was explored post hoc, a very strong positive linear relationship emerged between the average item score and the loading of the item on the general factor. Thus, the easier the item, the better the item functioned as an indicator of the emotion knowledge factor. This means that items that probe insight into subtle differences in emotional reactions that are difficult to differentiate are not very good indicators of the emotional knowledge construct. Thus, from an empirical perspective, the scale does not really measure how good a person can identify subtle differences in emotion processes, but it captures not being able to identify obvious relationships in the emotion domain. A possible explanation for this counterintuitive observation is that difficult items which probe insight into subtle differences in emotional reactions are more ambiguous and are therefore less valid indicators of the emotion knowledge construct. This would be in line with Trentacosta's and Fine's (2010) definition of discrete emotion knowledge, as *the ability to understand relatively unambiguous cues of discrete emotions expressed in traditional channels* (Trentacosta & Fine, 2010, p.2).

There are two important limitations to the current study. The first limitation is the convenience sample that was not representative for the Dutch-speaking population in Belgium. It remains to be demonstrated that the results can be replicated in representative samples. It is especially likely that the psychometric properties of the consensus scoring will improve with representative samples. A second important limitation is that the current study only investigated the internal structure of the new knowledge instrument. It did not investigate its relationships with alternative assessments of emotion knowledge (like the MSCEIT and the STEU) or with other constructs to which it should be related, such as intelligence and psychopathology. Without this additional evidence, no strong conclusions can be drawn about the validity of the new instrument.

19.4 Conclusions

Despite its limitations, the current study offers first empirical evidence that an assessment instrument for emotion knowledge should not be restricted to the Appraisal component, but should include items about the Bodily reaction, the Expression, the Action tendency, and the Feeling components of emotion. Moreover, the present results support the use of the GRID study to construct a scoring key for emotion knowledge items. 4

p. 308

Notes

- 1 Corresponding author: Johnny J. R. Fontaine. Department of Personnel, Work and Organisational Psychology. Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences. Ghent University. Henri-Dunantlaan 2, 9000 Gent, Belgium.
Johnny.Fontaine@UGent.be