

Emotional Intelligence across Cultures: The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Cultural Distance

Moon, Tae-Won*

〈Abstract〉

This study focuses on the workplaces of two distinct nations, the United States and Korea, to ascertain the impact of culture on emotional intelligence (EI). This paper examines if EI is dependant on culture by finding significant variances of emotional responses under a given situation. The results suggest that EI is significantly impacted by national culture. In addition, this study investigates the relationship between cultural distance and EI by using the secondary data of 19,402 participants across 13 nations. The results demonstrate that only power distance among Hofstede's dimensions has significant effect on EI.

Key Words : emotional intelligence; culture; cultural distance

I . Introduction

As businesses and industries progress toward rapid globalization through foreign direct investment, international joint ventures, strategic alliances and other forms of collaboration, cross-cultural studies are becoming more demanding in order to solve several problems caused by cultural differences in complex international working environments. Understanding and

논문접수일: 2010년 5월 12일 수정일: 2010년 6월 15일 게재확정일: 2010년 6월 21일

* Assistant Professor, Dept. of Business Administration, Hongik University, twmoon@hongik.ac.kr

coordinating a culturally diverse workforce is an essential factor necessary in dealing with the challenges of managing a diverse workforce (Earley & Ang, 2003; Earley, Ang & Tan, 2006). Hence, the degree of attention given by the managers of an organization towards the culturally patterned emotional expressions and behaviors of each member within their workforce, has a direct correlation with the effective administration of people from varying cross cultural backgrounds (Earley & Ang, 2003; Earley, Ang & Tan, 2006; Gabel, Dolan & Cerdin, 2005).

Despite the fact that emotion is an inevitable and inseparable factor of the workplace, emotion in organizational life has been a long neglected topic in organizational behavior and cross-cultural management studies (Muchinsky, 2000). Furthermore, many scholars in organizational behavior often regarded emotions in workplace as the antithesis of rationality and maintain a negative view of emotion in the workplace (Muchinsky, 2000). Whyte (1956) views effective business people as being logical, reasoned, rational decision makers and holds emotion as an undesired impact which disoriented people from the way of objectivity. However, with the introduction in the early 1990's of Emotional Intelligence (EI) and the development of EI assessment, the view on neglecting emotional factors in relation to the workplace has diminished among increasing views that emotions connect logical mental activities rather than interrupting them (Mayer & Salovey, 1993). Furthermore, with the publication of Emotional Intelligence by Daniel Goleman (1995), the topic of emotional intelligence has gained greater attention and public interest.

Recent studies in cultural psychology have found that cultural orientation has a great impact on emotional expression as well as on the content and perceptions of the self (Markus & Kitayama 1991; Matsumoto 1989; Aaker & Williams 1998). People of different cultures not only have different contexts of the self, of others, and of the interdependency of the two, but also hold different patterns of emotional response under a given situation.

Numerous studies have demonstrated the effect of emotional intelligence on individual and organizational performance (Bar-On, 2000; Cherniss & Goleman, 2001; Goleman, 1988; Higgs & Dulewicz, 2001). However, few

studies have investigated the differential comprehension and response in the workplace with respect to emotions, as exhibited by individuals of varying cultures. The majority of studies conducted thus far have overwhelmingly dealt with cross-cultural or cross-national research in the field of Human Resource Development (Brewer, Tregaskis, Hegewicsh & Mayne, 1996). Moreover, the empirical studies of the relationship between emotional intelligence and cultural differences are potentially flawed despite the rises of interest in cultural dimensions of behavior in organizations (Kim, 2000).

In order to measure the effect of cultural difference, this study uses the constructs of cultural distance (CD) that is widely employed in international business. Cultural distance involves the dissimilarities between cultures regarding a variety of their aspects, such as language, religion, values, the status of women, individualism-collectivism, attitudes to authority, forms of government, the legal system, etc (Chirkov, Lynch, & Niwa, 2005). Cultural distance has obtained a great and broad deal of acceptance in the international business literatures, and several frameworks of CD have been developed and used in the measurement of cultural differences among countries (Hofstede, 1980; Kogut & Singh, 1988; Shenkar, 2001; Triandis, 1989). This study uses Hofstede's (1980) cultural dimensions to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and cultural distance.

This study connects research on cultural orientation and emotional intelligence to find how responses may vary when cross-cultural/cross-national emotions are taken into consideration on an international level. The premise of this study is that interpretation of emotional arousal or change can be subject to cultural or national differences. Since an individual's emotion is greatly influenced by culture, how one manages and copes with emotions differ largely based on one's ethnic and national background (Markus & Kitayma, 1991).

The objective of this study is two-fold. First, Study 1 examines that emotional intelligence is influenced by culture, based on the responses of 160 participants (80 from the United States and 80 from South Korea). More specifically, the most frequent response for a given question on an EI assessment, or test, varies by culture, and the distribution of answers differs

by culture because the fundamental comprehension and responses of emotions under a given situation vary by national or cultural origin. In addition, the moderating factors that influence the relationship between emotional intelligence and cultural distance, such as age, gender, and educational level are analyzed empirically. Second, Study 2 examines the relationships between emotional intelligence and cultural distance by using the secondary data of 19,402 participants across 13 nations drawn from the Bar-On Emotional Quotient-Inventory (EQ-i) of the MHS Technical Manual (2006).

II. Theoretical Background

1. The Effects of Culture on Self

“Self” affects the nature of interpersonal phenomena, such as conformity, obedience, and social comparison, as well as intrapersonal phenomena, such as self-affirmation, self-verification, and self-esteem (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Previous studies have proven that people develop and exert a sense of self within certain cultural contexts (Markus & Wurf 1987; Markus & Oyserman 1993; Bailey & Chen 1997). The self is a combination of beliefs, feelings and knowledge of the individual that consist of one’s intellectual, emotional and behavioral responses to the external environment (Bailey & Chen, 1997). The self is molded via one’s experience by which humans interpret and react to socio-cultural contexts. Since individual experience is largely influenced by national origin or culture, it can be inferred that the self is culturally shaped.

One of the dimensions that form the concept of self is individualism and collectivism (Hofstede 1980; Markus & Kitayama 1991; Triandis 1989; Bailey & Chen 1997; Asai & Lucca, 1988). Individualists are more likely to emphasize their own idiosyncratic values, attitudes and preferences while collectivists tend to emphasize shared group norms and social welfare rather than their own interests. Markus and Kitayma (1991) use the term

'independent' and 'interdependent' to parallel the individualism and collectivism dimension respectively. In the independent construction of the self, individuals are not connected but separate. This vision is predominant in Western cultures, especially in the United States. Since the independent vision emphasizes the uniqueness of internal qualities, like preferences and abilities, the expression and display of skills and abilities are encouraged (Bailey & Chen, 1997). In contrast, the interdependent vision implies that individuals are not separate but closely connected. Collectivistic cultures, like Japan and Korea, place high value on the connectedness of people and harmony between one another. An individual's fundamental goal is to adjust oneself to fit into social norms and create harmony with others (Bailey & Chen, 1997). Therefore, people in this vision tend to organize and form their emotions, thoughts and behaviors in reference to their social relationships.

2. The Effects of Culture on Emotions

Culture has a great influence on patterns of emotion, and provides guidance for emotional expression (Hochschild, 1983). Since emotion is a set of complicated internal processes and reactions that occur between the self and the social stimuli, emotion or emotional intelligence should be explained within the domain of culture (Marcus & Kitayama, 1991). The recognition and experience of many emotions are not independent characteristics, but interdependent characteristics within socio-cultural contexts. Culture establishes the rules that guide emotional expression and social behavior for effective and harmonious social interactions (Marcus & Kitayama, 1991). Emotional expression and experience rely on the current socio-cultural context, and experienced emotions play an important role in altering and transforming the nature of the social situation (Matsumoto, 1989). They achieve this change by allowing the emergence of a new construct of the social context, and by enabling people to act according to a certain situation (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Culture governs emotional expression by providing rules for feelings (Hochschild, 1983). For instance, some foods which are categorized as

nutritious and delicious in one country can equally evoke a feeling of disgust and fear in another country. These feeling rules give a baseline in deciding which emotions should be expressed under a given situation and what level of intensity and length of time individuals use in expressing their emotions (Hochschild, 1996). For example, in Japanese society, the internal emotional experience of sadness is often masked by an external expression of cheerfulness and a disguised smile is often made as an indication of the person's intention to engage in a relationship with others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Culture also shapes emotional experience in relation to a variety of social interactions and stimuli (Hochschild, 1996).

3. Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Cultural Distance (CD)

The study of emotion has been legitimized by the appearance of EI as a concept and the corresponding development of EI measurement techniques. The current conceptualization of emotional intelligence originated with Thorndike's (1920) social intelligence. Thorndike (1920) introduced the concept of social, concrete and abstract intelligence, as the ability to understand and manage others in social context. Thorndike's (1920) theory is represented in detail in Sternberg's (1986) formulation of practical intelligence, and Gardner's (1993) multiple intelligence. Both Sternberg (1986) and Gardner (1993) broadened traditional cognitive perceptions of analytical intelligence. Reuven Bar-On (1988) was the first to use the term "emotional quotient" in his dissertation to approach EI in relation to the measurement of well-being. Bar-On (2000) defined EI as an array of emotional and social knowledge and abilities that impacted one's overall ability to effectively handle the demands of the environment. The concept of EI appeared again when Salovey and Mayer (1990) defined the term in their paper, "Emotional Intelligence." Salovey and Mayer's (1990) definition of EI was, "Emotional intelligence involves the ability to perceive accurately, appraise and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth"

(p.10). The notion of EI has gained more attention since Daniel Goleman published his article, "Emotional Intelligence," in 1995. Goleman (1995) defined EI as a different way of being smart. According to Goleman (1998), EI is the competency of managing yourself and your relationships with others, making effective teamwork, leading others, and forecasting the future.

In order to examine the variances of emotional intelligence by culture, the objective construct for measuring cultural differences was used in this study. From a practical point of view, culture is extremely difficult to be accurately measured due to its complex, broad and subjective characteristics (Shenkar, 2001; Soutar, Lee & Ng, 2006). However, researchers have suggested using cultural indices for measuring cultural differences in order to simplify its operationalization, and measure at least some elements of culture (Hofstede, 1980). Among many culture-related constructs, cultural distance is the most broadly used construct in international business (Shenkar, 2001; Sousa & Bradley, 2004).

Cultural distance is defined as the degree to which one nation's culture is similar to or different from the other nation's culture (Shenkar, 2001; Soutar, Lee & Ng, 2006). Cultural distance score reflects the extent of cultural differences on various cultural dimensions between the different cultural groups. By transforming complex, intangible and subtle concepts of culture into an aggregate quantitative construct, cultural distance has been used in most business administration disciplines, such as management, marketing, finance, accounting and human resource management (Shenkar, 2001). Even if the construct of cultural distance has been criticized due to problems in conceptualization and measurement (Shenkar, 2001), it has offered a simple and standardized measure for cultural differences by overcoming the complexities and intricacies of culture (Kogut & Singh, 1988).

Among several measurements of cultural distance, Hofstede's (1980) cultural index is clearly the most frequently used approach to measure cultural distance (Agarwal, 1994; Brouthers & Brouthers, 2001; Grosse & Trevino, 1996; Manev & Stevenson 2001; Soutar, Lee & Ng, 2006). Cultural distance index based on Hofstede's (1980) four cultural dimensions, such as power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, masculinity was used in this study.

III. Conceptual Framework and Hypotheses

1. Study1 : Cultural Impact on Emotional Intelligence

The first hypotheses examined the variances of emotional reactions, between two countries, for certain situations. McConatha, Lightner and Deaner (1994) discuss that primary emotions, such as fear, anger and sadness are universally common to the human experience while secondary emotions, such as pride, guilt and shame, evolve in relation to the socio-cultural context and differ across cultures. McConatha, Leone and Armstrong (1997) suggest that rules governing cultural feeling influence an individual's internal interpretation of the self, others and the environment whereas rules of cultural display provide a guideline of which emotion is expressed under a certain situation. Both rules of feeling and display are significantly impacted by one's cultural or national norms (Marcus & Kitayama, 1991).

Previous studies found that there were three major factors influencing emotional intelligence: age, gender, and educational level (Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 1999; McConatha, Lighter, & Deaner, 1994; Sjöberg, 2001). The literature on gender and EI has not offered any conclusive results. Some studies have found gender-based EI disparities (Hart, 2002; Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 1999; Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Schutte, Malouff, Hall, Haggerty, Cooper, Golden, & Dornheim, 1998) while others have noted no significant differences (Cavallo & Brienza, 2002; Eagly, Karau & Makhijani, 1992). Unlike gender however, research on age have found that a positive relation with emotional intelligence exists (McConatha, Lightner & Deaner, 1997; Mayer, Caruso & Salovey, 1999). Their findings have shown that emotional intelligence increases with age (McConatha, Lightner & Deaner, 1997). Similarly, research on EI and education level has shown that there is a link between EI and the level of schooling an individual has attained (Sjöberg, 2001; Chipain, 2003). Sjöberg (2001) found that emotional intelligence was positively related to higher levels of educational achievement.

Study 1 includes the four hypotheses. First, in order to test whether the most populated answer for each question of the EI test varies by culture, descriptive statistics was used to compare the frequency of answers for each question from respondents of both cultural groups. The study demonstrated which emotional response was predominantly perceived as the best choice for employees in Korea and the United States in certain scenarios. Second, Chi-Square test was conducted to examine whether distribution of answers differs by culture. Third, the multiple regression was used to find the effects of independent variable (culture) on dependent one (EI) while controlling for the other independent variables. Finally, this study examined the moderating effect of the three demographic factors, such as age, gender and educational level on the relationship between emotional intelligence and culture.

H1a. The most populated answer on EI differs by culture.

H1b. The distribution of answers on EI differs by culture.

H1c. Emotional intelligence and its attributes, such as self regulation and other regulation are influenced by culture.

H1d: Demographic variables, such as age, gender, and educational level will moderate the relationship between emotional intelligence and culture.

2. Study2 : Relationship between Cultural Distance and Emotional Intelligence

Study 2 examined the effect of cultural differences on emotional intelligence. Cultural distance involves the dissimilarities between cultures regarding a variety of their aspects, such as language, religion, values, the status of women, individualism-collectivism, attitudes toward authority, forms of government, the legal system, etc (Chirkov, Lynch, & Niwa, 2005). Differences in race, social norms, and language affect the self-concept and emotion of individual (Bailey & Chen, 1997). Correspondingly, cultural

distance would affect emotional intelligence.

Hofstede's (1980) cultural indices were used to tap in the objective dimensions. Hofstede's (1980) cultural indices include the four cultural dimensions such as power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity. Power distance refers to "the extent to which members of a society perceive that an institution has unequal distribution in power" (Hofstede, 1980, p. 45). In cultures with high power distance, people are more likely to perceive that their superiors wield more power than they do, and individuals are also remarkably affected by inherited wealth and social status (Steenkamp, 2001). In cultures with low power distance, people tend to accept the power of expertise rather than coercive power; they also consider respect and equality as the most important elements of social interaction (Hofstede, 1980). Thus, subordinates are easy to socialize with their superiors, perceive them as colleagues, question their directives, and make decision making with their bosses in low-power distance culture (Early, Ang & Ten, 2006). In such cultural environments people are more likely to have both greater emotional intensity and greater emotional expressiveness, the level of emotional intelligence is expected to be higher.

H2a. Power distance has a negative effect on EI.

The individualism/collectivism dimension is the most frequently used in cross-cultural research (Triandis, 1989; Triandis, Bontempo & Villareal, Asai & Lucca, 1988). Both self-concept and emotion are formed by dimensions of individualism and collectivism (Hofstede 1980; Marcus & Kitayama 1991; Triandis 1989; Bailey and Chen 1997; Asai and Lucca, 1988). Collectivists are more likely to value the overall welfare of the group over the needs of the individual, whereas individualists stress the exceptional significance of their own idiosyncratic values, attitudes and preferences.

The terms "interdependent" and "independent" are utilized by Marcus and Kitayama (1991) to describe the social dynamics of collectivism versus individualism. For an independent construal of the self, individuals are separate, disconnected identities. Thus, the expression and display of one's

own skills are encouraged because this valuation of independence emphasizes the uniqueness of exceptional qualities, preferences and abilities (Bailey & Chen, 1997). In contrast, the concept of interdependence is underscored by a network of connectedness between individuals. Collectivistic cultures highly value this ability to connect with others and strive for mutually harmonious relationships (Marcus & Kitayama, 1991). In these cases, the individual should not strive to assert their own identities, but rather, negotiate norms and work together with others for the greater good (Bailey & Chen, 1997). People in collectivistic cultures tend to formulate their personal emotions, thoughts and behaviors according to broader social relationships. Therefore, individualism is expected to have a positive effect on emotional intelligence.

H2b. Individualism has a positive effect on EI.

Uncertainty avoidance refers to ambiguity and the extent to which countries perceive the tolerance of deviation from the norm (Hofstede, 1980). In a culture with low uncertainty avoidance, individuals exhibit higher levels of tolerance to behavior that stands outside generally accepted social practices and behaviors (Hofstede, 1980). Compared to cultures with high uncertainty avoidance, these individuals view diversity and change as a given aspect of life and tend to take more risks. However, members of cultures with high uncertainty avoidance adhere more rigidly to written rules, clear statements, and a formality to the structure of life (Yeniyurt & Townsend, 2003). As a result, in cultures with high uncertainty avoidance less attention would be paid to the emotional world of the individual.

H2c. Uncertainty avoidance has a negative effect on EI.

The masculinity dimension expresses the extent to which society values power, money and assertiveness, as opposed to people, quality of life and caring for others (Hofstede, 1980). Material wealth, power, and assertiveness are emphasized in a masculine culture. People in these cultures emphasize competition, performance, personal ambition, independence and work. On the other hand, a feminine culture is highly focused on people. In particular, service and responsibility to others, interdependence between people, and the

quality of social life are valued (Hofstede, 1980). Consequently, individuals in the feminine cultures are more likely to have both greater emotional intensity and greater emotional expressiveness than those in the masculine cultures (Paez & Vergara, 1995; Berrocal, Salovey, Vera, Extremera & Ramos, 2005). Hence, it is expected that masculinity dimension has a negative effect on emotional intelligence.

H2d. Masculinity has a negative effect on EI.

IV. Methods

1. Study1 : Participants and Data Collection

The author selected a Korean/American comparison due to the remarkably increased business opportunities between the two nations. The experimental design implemented for the study focused on minimizing the impact of factors such as differences between organizations, industries, etc. by finding a single corporate entity (one organization) with similar facilities (electronics manufacturing plants) in each country. The EQ Episode Test was administered to a random sample of participants at two sites, one located in Seoul, South Korea and one located in Dallas, Texas, United States of America. Demographics show that the participants represent all ages, all educational levels, all salary ranges, both genders, and all job positions typical of this corporation's manufacturing facilities. A total of 160 individuals (80 from the United States and 80 from South Korea) participated in this study. The EQ Episode Test was used to measure the level of the individual's ability in each of the two attributes; self regulation and other regulation.

This study used a survey based on experimental design with cross-sectional convenience sampling to examine the relationship between culture and EI. The EQ Episode Test, developed by Dr. Moon (1999) was used as the data collection instrument for this study. The EQ Episode Test was originally designed for measuring various behavioral tendencies in terms of

how people express and regulate their emotion in given situations (Moon, Kang & Choi, 2004). More specifically, the EQ Episode Test was designed to measure the extent and degree of the individual's ability for regulating and managing emotions in others and ourselves (Moon, Kang & Choi, 2004). This instrument attempts to portray more detailed and complicated situations in each question by using multiple-task ability scales rather than simply presenting the statement by using a numeric point Likert scale.

The EQ Episode Test consists of 25 questions organized into two attributes: 1) self regulation and 2) other regulation, which are adapted from Salovey and Mayer's (1990) Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS) (Moon, Kang & Choi 2004). Table 1 presents a definition of each attribute, and examples of questions. Each question reflects one out of the two attributes, e.g. Question 11 reflects other regulation while Question 15 reflects self regulation. The EQ Episode Test was translated into an English version for the American participants by the author. In addition and consistent with protocol of the Institutional Review Board at George Washington University, the instrument was reverse translated to ensure the accuracy of the translation. However, controlling potential translation nuance and vagaries are limited when the original EI test written in Korean was translated by the author into English.

Table 1. EI Attributes and Examples of Questions

Attributes	Self Regulation
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The ability to perceive and identify one's emotional content from a current situation ▪ Calm oneself and control one's negative feeling
Example of Question	15. Today is not your day. Your family was in a bad mood this morning, and most daily tasks have not progressed well as normal. However, you have a lot of tasks still ahead of you. What would you do?
Attributes	Other Regulation
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Calm other's negative feeling ▪ Transform other's feeling into a positive
Example of Question	11. Your daughter or son often shows a temper over little things. Today, he/she also shows nervousness and makes a sharp retort after returning from school. What would you do?

Cronbach's alpha estimate for reliability of the EQ Episode Test is 0.81 based on a total 160 individuals (80 from the U.S. and 80 from Korea) participated in this study. More specifically, the reliabilities of the two attributes are 0.80 for self-management, and 0.82 for other management. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) demonstrated good fit of the data to a two-factor correlated model: $\chi^2 (23 \text{ df}) = 856.68$, Goodness-of-Fit (GFI) = 0.90 Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) = 0.95, Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.93, and root mean square of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.047.

2. Study 2 : Participants and Data Collection

While Study 1 used primary data by utilizing random samples from two countries, Study 2 employed secondary data, consisting of 19,402 participants (9,892 from South Africa, 534 from Singapore, 1,759 from Sweden, 516 from the United States, 1,036 from Canada, 1,342 from Finland, 1,009 from Norway, 1,623 from United Kingdom, 310 from Australia, 446 from Argentina, 168 from German, 418 from Israel, and 235 from India) drawn from the Bar-On Emotional Quotient-Inventory (EQ-i) of the MHS Technical Report (2006). In addition, we collected the secondary data from helps of the MHS Company which has promoted and sold both Reuven Bar-On's product, the BarOn EQi, and the Mayer Salovey Caruso product, the MSCEIT.

The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i, 133 item version) was designed to measure social and emotional competencies related to the construct of emotional (EQ-i Technical Report, 2006). The Bar-On EQ-i has been translated into more than 30 languages, and data have been collected in over 48,000 individuals worldwide. As self-assessment, the EQ-i includes the five components: 1) Intrapersonal EQ (Emotional Self-Awareness, Assertiveness, Self-Regard, Self-Actualization, and Independence); 2) Interpersonal EQ (Empathy, Interpersonal Relationship, Social Responsibility, Problem Solving, Reality Testing, and Flexibility); 3) Adaptability EQ (empathy, organizational awareness and service orientation); 4) Stress Management EQ (Stress Tolerance, and Impulse Control); and 5) General Mood (Happiness, and Optimism) (EQ-i Technical Report, 2006). The first two components

(intrapersonal and interpersonal EQ) are similar in comprehension and knowledge, although one concerns the ability to express oneself and the other involves the ability to relate to other, or empathy. The third component, adaptability EQ deals with adaptability to change and the ability to solve problems of a personal or social nature. The fourth component, stress management deals with control: how adeptly one handles strong emotions and regulates impulses. Finally, the last component, general mood refers to the ability to look at the brighter side of life, to continue a positive attitude, and to feel satisfied with one's life. Table 2 describes the mean EI scores of the 13 countries, and their index scores of the 4 cultural dimensions.

Table 2. EI Mean Scores and Index Scores of Cultural Dimensions in 13 Countries

Country	Mean EI	SD	PDI	IDV	MAS	UAI
Argentina	415.53	50.11	49	46	56	86
Australia	441.23	53.15	36	90	61	51
Canada	438.32	19.3	39	80	52	48
Finland	482.5	37.13	33	63	26	59
German	438.46	23.21	35	67	66	65
India	400.44	19.45	77	48	56	40
Israel	543.24	33.55	13	54	47	81
Norway	477.02	34.76	31	69	8	50
Singapore	454.78	44.82	74	20	48	8
South Africa	480.73	41.84	49	65	63	49
Sweden	477	11.3	31	71	5	29
UK	453.37	47.81	35	89	66	35
USA	470.94	15.5	40	91	62	46

V. Results from This Study

1. Study1 : Cultural Impacts on Emotional Intelligence

The first hypothesis for Study 1 states that the most frequent answer to questions on an EI test varies between cultures. Table 3 shows outcomes from the H1a testing and attributes of each question. The results presented

in Table 3 were obtained by asserting a null hypothesis that is consistent with current common usage of EI tests, i.e. 'The most populated answer for each question on the EI test is equal between two cultures', and proceeding with typical hypothesis testing. These results indicate that the most frequent answer to questions on the EI test were identical in 14 questions (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21 and 22) and different in 11 questions (1, 2, 8, 10, 13, 15, 19, 20, 23, 24 and 25) between the two cultural groups. In other words, hypothesis testing revealed that the overall results are mixed and the most frequent answer on the EI test is identical in some questions and different in the other questions between two cultural groups.

Table 3. Outcomes of H1a

H1a: The most frequent answer for each question on the EI test varies between two cultures.

Question Number	Question Content	Attribute	Result of H1a
1	Episode of life situation	Other Regulation	H=Supported
2	Episode of interpersonal relationship	Self Regulation	H=Supported
3	Episode at work	Other Regulation	H=Rejected
4	Episode at home	Other Regulation	H=Rejected
5	Episode of interpersonal relationship	Other Regulation	H=Rejected
6	Episode of interpersonal relationship	Self Regulation	H=Rejected
7	Episode of car accidents	Other Regulation	H=Rejected
8	Episode of man and wife	Self Regulation	H=Supported
9	Episode of traffic problem	Other Regulation	H=Rejected
10	Episode of friend relationship	Self Regulation	H=Supported
11	Episode of family relationship	Other Regulation	H=Rejected
12	Episode of friend relationship	Self Regulation	H=Rejected
13	Episode of colleague relationship	Self Regulation	H=Supported
14	Episode of colleague relationship	Other Regulation	H=Rejected
15	Episode of life situation	Self Regulation	H=Supported
16	Episode of interpersonal relationship	Self Regulation	H=Rejected
17	Episode of family relationship	Other Regulation	H=Rejected
18	Episode at work	Other Regulation	H=Rejected
19	Episode at work	Self Regulation	H=Supported
20	Episode of interpersonal relationship	Self Regulation	H=Supported
21	Episode of interpersonal relationship	Self Regulation	H=Rejected
22	Episode of friend relationship	Self Regulation	H=Rejected
23	Episode of interpersonal relationship	Other Regulation	H=Supported
24	Episode of neighbor relationship	Other Regulation	H=Supported
25	Episode of family relationship	Self Regulation	H=Supported

In order to test whether or not the study can generalize its findings for significant variances in the answers (A, B, C, or D) selected by the two cultural groups for each question, a Chi-Square Test was conducted to verify the statistical significance of each question. Table 4 summarizes the statistical significance of each question with 95% confidence. Complete details of the statistical analysis are shown in Appendix I.

Table 4. Outcomes of H1b

H1b: The distributions of answers (A, B, C, or D) for each question differ by culture.

Question Number	Attribute	X ² (Chi-square)	Is it statistically significant at 95%? (P-Value)
1	Other Regulation	7.94	Yes (0.047)
2	Self Regulation	40.11	Yes (0.000)
3	Other Regulation	17.56	Yes (0.001)
4	Other Regulation	54.42	Yes (0.000)
5	Other Regulation	4.81	No (0.186)
6	Self Regulation	23.26	Yes (0.000)
7	Other Regulation	20.82	Yes (0.000)
8	Self Regulation	12.45	Yes (0.006)
9	Other Regulation	11.74	Yes (0.008)
10	Self Regulation	15.74	Yes (0.001)
11	Other Regulation	5.79	No (0.055)
12	Self Regulation	6.78	No (0.079)
13	Self Regulation	32.87	Yes (0.000)
14	Other Regulation	1.46	No (0.483)
15	Self Regulation	11.88	Yes (0.008)
16	Self Regulation	10.79	Yes (0.013)
17	Other Regulation	2.29	No (0.515)
18	Other Regulation	2.18	No (0.536)
19	Self Regulation	23.14	Yes (0.000)
20	Self Regulation	19.74	Yes (0.000)
21	Self Regulation	2.79	No (0.425)
22	Self Regulation	11.34	Yes (0.010)
23	Other Regulation	37.85	Yes (0.000)
24	Other Regulation	18.86	Yes (0.000)
25	Self Regulation	91.75	Yes (0.000)

As shown in, only 7 questions out of 25 (5, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18 and 21) show no statistically significant differences in the distribution of answers

between the two cultural groups. Although the most frequent answer to each question on the EI test were identical in 14 questions (3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 21 and 22) between the two cultural groups, 7 of these questions (3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 16 and 21) showed significant variances in the distribution of answers, i.e. the distribution of the frequency of respondents selecting answer A, B, C or D for a given question. The findings support that feeling and rules for emotional display are significantly influenced by cultural norms. The reason for statistically significant variances in the distributions of answers between the two cultural groups is due to these different standards of acceptability, which have evolved in relation to socio-cultural contexts and differ across cultures.

This study represented that EI was largely dependent on culture by analyzing the answer sheets between the two cultural groups. In order to see whether culture was a truly unique factor that influences EI regardless of other variables, such as gender, age and educational level, the multiple regressions were conducted. The nominal variables, such as culture and gender were converted into the dummy variables for multiple regression analyses.

First of all, a multiple regression analysis among educational level (1=high school, 2=college, 3=graduate), gender (1=male, 2=female), age, and EI was conducted except 'culture' variable. By including or excluding 'culture' variable in multiple regression models, the influencing power of culture on EI can be examined through the comparisons of R² and F-change between the two multiple regression models. The multiple regression test without 'culture' variable leads to 95% confidence that there is a linear relationship between EI and independent demographic variables like gender, age, and education (Adjusted R²=0.322, F=26.211, P<0.05). It was concluded that 32.2% of the variance in EI level is shared with gender, age and education. The results of the multiple regression also lead to 95% confidence that all of the independent variables, such as gender ($\beta=0.161$, $t=2.423$), age ($\beta=0.359$, $t=5.448$) and education ($\beta=0.372$, $t=5.564$) significantly impact EI ($p<0.05$).

The results of multiple regression test including 'culture' variable lead to 95% confidence that there is a linear relationship between EI and

independent demographic variables like gender, age, education and culture. Adjusted R² increased by 2.4% from 0.322 to 0.346, and F-value also increased significantly ($p < 0.05$). Thus, involvement of 'culture' variable in a model increases the explanatory power of an overall multiple regression model. The independent variables such as gender, age, educational level and national culture have a unique, determining relationship with EI. The results of multiple regression show that culture is a truly unique factor that influences EI. The multiple regression results with emotional intelligence and its attributes as the dependent variables and the culture, age, gender, and educational level as the independent variables are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Multiple Regression Results (N = 160)

H1c. Emotional intelligence and its attributes, such as self regulation and other regulation are influenced by culture.

Independent Variables	Total EI		Self Regulation		Other Regulation	
	Std beta	p-value	Std beta	p-value	Std beta	p-value
Culture	0.203	0.000	-0.232	0.010	0.383	0.000
Age	0.446	0.000	0.254	0.002	0.415	0.000
Gender	0.148	0.025	0.113	0.130	0.122	0.060
Educational Level	0.290	0.000	0.200	0.016	0.250	0.001

Based on Table 5, it was concluded that 34.6% of the variance in total EI, 16.8% of the variance in self regulation, and 36.9% of the variances in other regulation are shared with gender, age, educational level and culture. Based on an observation of beta weights, age appears to be the best predictor in all three regressions, with a beta weight of 0.446 (total EI), 0.254 (self regulation), and 0.415 (other regulation). In the regressions of self regulation and other regulation, the next best predictor is culture, with a beta weight of - 0.232 and 0.383 while the next best predictor is educational level, with a beta weight of 0.290 in the regression of total EI. Based on the multiple regression of total EI, the independent variables such as gender, age, educational level, and culture have a unique, determining relationship with EI. However, in the regressions of self regulation, and other regulation,

gender have no significant relationships between EI attributes ($p>0.05$).

To test the moderating effects of demographic variables, such as age, gender, and educational level on the relationship between EI and culture, a series of hierarchical moderated regression analyses were conducted for each of the three dependent variables. In the first step of each regression analysis, the independent variable (culture) was entered. The second step added the moderator variables (culture, gender, and educational level). The third step included interaction effects of Culture X Age, Culture X Gender, and Culture X Education with all variables.

Table 6. Hierarchy Regression Analysis Predicting EI and Attributes (N = 160)
H1d: Demographic variables, such as age, gender and educational level will moderate the relationship between emotional intelligence and culture.

Predictor Variable	Total EI		Self Regulation		Other Regulation	
	Beta	T	Beta	T	Beta	T
Step 1						
Culture	0.16	2.032*	-0.238	-3.085**	0.333	4.434***
Adjusted R ²	0.019		0.051		0.105	
Change in F	4.128		9.519		19.657	
Significance (F Change)	0.044		0.002		0.000	
Step 2						
Culture	0.203	2.591**	-0.232	-2.623**	0.383	4.977***
Age	0.446	6.117***	0.254	3.087**	0.415	5.794***
Gender	0.148	2.261*	0.113	1.523	0.122	1.897
Education	0.290	3.983***	0.200	2.439*	0.250	3.498***
Adjusted R ²	0.346		0.168		0.369	
Change in F	27.343		8.432		22.980	
Significance (F Change)	0.000		0.000		0.000	
Step 3						
Culture	-0.068	-0.193	-1.104	-2.756**	0.532	1.510
Age	0.367	4.409**	0.110	1.163	0.397	4.776***
Gender	0.263	2.850**	0.145	1.386	0.248	2.685**
Education	0.306	3.529**	0.201	2.048*	0.269	3.113**
Culture x Age	1.011	2.946**	1.309	3.362***	0.531	1.549
Culture x Gender	-0.325	-2.585*	-0.170	-1.190	-0.311	-2.477*
Culture x Education	-0.561	-1.799	-0.355	-1.003	-0.502	-1.613
Adjusted R ²	0.390		0.215		0.392	
Change in F	4.748		4.065		3.003	
Significance (F Change)	0.003**		0.008**		0.032*	

The results partially supported the hypothesis that the demographic variables, such as age, gender and educational level moderate the relationship between emotional intelligence and culture. As Table 6 suggests, a significant interaction effect of Culture x Age and Culture x Gender were found for the total EI. In other words, the results supported that age and gender have moderating effects on the relationship between culture and the total EI. Table 6 indicates that the interaction of Culture x Age was significant for self regulation while the interaction of Culture x Gender was significant for other regulation. The results supported that age functioned as a moderator on the relationship between culture and self regulation whereas gender moderated the relationship between culture and other regulation.

2. Study2 : Relationship between Cultural Distance and Emotional Intelligence

Study 2 examined the relationship between cultural distance and emotional intelligence by utilizing Hofstede's cultural dimension scores across nations and the Bar-On EQ-i data. Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics, and correlations used in this study. The hierarchical regression results with emotional intelligence (total EQ-i) and its five components as the dependent variables and the cultural dimensions as the independent variables can be seen in Table 8.

In the first step of each regression analysis, the two control variables (age, and gender) were entered and the four cultural dimensions (power distance, individualism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity) were included at the second step of each regression analysis. As shown in Table 8, the coefficient for power distance is negative and significant, supporting H2a that power distance has a negative effect on total EQ-i ($\beta = -.13, p < .05$). However, the coefficients for the other three dimensions, such as individualism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity are insignificant, failing to provide support for H2b, H2c, and H2d. Therefore, only one of the

second four hypotheses is supported.

Although we did not make hypotheses between EQ-I's five components and cultural dimensions, this study examined their relationships as well. In Intrapersonal EQ as Table 8 shown, power distance negatively related to Intrapersonal EQ ($\beta=-.12$, $p < .05$). Regression results demonstrated that Interpersonal EQ was related to none of cultural dimensions. Regarding Adaptability EQ, power distance also negatively related to Adaptability EQ ($\beta=-1.08$, $p < .05$). In Stress Management, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance negatively related to Stress Management ($\beta=-.13$, $p < .01$, $\beta=-.69$, $p < .05$). Finally, General Mood was only related to power distance ($\beta=-1.27$, $p < .05$). In sum, power distance negatively related to all of the five EQ-I components.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics Correlations

		M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Total EQ	47.81	35.06	-											
2	Interpersonal EQ	136.25	10.51	.96**	-										
3	Interpersonal EQ	108.97	29.63	.33	.31	-									
4	Adaptability EQ	97.93	8.69	.87**	.87**	.43	-								
5	Stress Management	67.38	5.26	.96**	.96**	.37	.92**	-							
6	General Mood	60.02	4.99	.97**	.98**	.32	.91**	.98**	-						
7	Power Distance	41.69	17.45	-.70**	-.63*	-.31	-.51	-.60*	-.67*	-					
8	Individualism	65.61	20.31	-.03	-.01	.14	.11	.01	.10	-.55*	-				
9	Uncertainty Avoidance	49.76	20.64	.18	.19	-.26	-.16	.01	.10	-.50	.09	-			
10	Masculinity	47.38	21.03	-.41	-.42	-.64*	-.46	-.41	-.40	.27	.11	.15	-		
11	Age	31.52	7.60	.17	.10	.11	.28	.15	.22	-.41	.51	-.18	-.25	-	
12	Gender (1=male 2=female)	1.25	0.81	-.35	-.35	-.23	-.44	-.31	-.29	-.01	.34	.04	.32	.01	-

Table 8. Hierarchical Multiple Regression Results Including the 13 Countries (N = 19,402)

Variable	Total EQ		Intrapersonal EQ		Interpersonal EQ		Adaptability EQ		Stress Management		General Mood	
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2	Step 1	Step 2
Age	.18	-.17	.10	-.23	.11	-.49	.29	-.17	.15	-.26	.22	-.16
Gender	-.32	-.15	-.36	-.19	-.24	-.12	-.44	-.35	-.31	-.14	-.29	-.16
Power Distance		-.13		-.12		-.49		-1.08		-.13		-1.27
Individualism		-.54		-.47		.27		-.21		-.51		-.43
UA		-.50		-.41		-.54		-.71		-.69		-.53
Masculinity		.10		.02		-.55		.03		.10		.08
F	.78	4.64	.81	4.78	.38	2.1		4.83	.68	5.59	.79	4.71
ΔF		5.82		4.38		2.82		4.63		5.96		4.30
R^2	.13	.82	.13	.73	.07	.67		.73	.12	.78	.13	.73
ΔR^2		.68		.59		.60		.45		.66		.59
Adjusted R^2	-.03	.64	-.03	.47	-.11	.35		.47	-.05	.56	-.03	.46

Notes: Gender (1=male, 2=female), UA (Uncertainty Avoidance) * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

VI. Discussion and Managerial Implications

The fundamental question of Study 1 asked is, "Do the perceptions and reactions of emotion under a certain situation differ between employees in Korea and in the United States?" That is, the question of whether emotional intelligence is culturally-dependent has been answered by this research. This study finds that emotional intelligence does not depend completely on national culture, but is significantly influenced by it. The findings support that feeling and rules for emotional display are significantly influenced by cultural norms. The reason for statistically significant variances in the distributions of answers between the two cultural groups is due to these different standards of acceptability, which have evolved in relation to socio-cultural contexts and differ across cultures. There are two possible reasons for similar distributions of answers between the two cultural groups. The first reason is due to the existence of basic emotion, which is

universally common to the human experience. The second reason is explained by the complexity of culture. Although this study attempted to explore two national cultures (American and Korean) in terms of individualism versus collectivism, the boundaries defining individualism and collectivism were not always apparent, but sometimes blurred.

The most populated answers chosen by the Korean group do not consistently reflect the traits of collectivistic society, but sometimes reflect the traits of individualistic society. Similarly, the most populated answers selected by the American group also reflect the characteristics of both individualism and collectivism. Collectivism and individualism can coexist in a single culture and emphasis on either in each culture depends on the situation (Triandis, 1993). In other words, there are individualists in collectivistic cultures and collectivists in individualistic cultures (Bandura, 2002). The distinction between vertical and horizontal individualism/collectivism is relevant here. There are individuals with strong characteristics of individualism/collectivism as well as individuals with weak traits of individualism/collectivism within an individualistic/collectivistic society. This cultural complexity contributes to the similar distribution of answers between the two cultural groups.

The purpose of Study 2 examined the relationship between cultural distance and emotional intelligence. The results of multiple regression analyses did not prove that causal relationships existed between emotional intelligence and cultural dimensions, such as individualism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity, but the results of this study indicated a strong association between emotional intelligence and power distance. Although the results were not consistent with all of the expected hypotheses, Study 2 contributes to the body of empirical evidence regarding the relationship between emotional intelligence and cultural distance. Since most studies have examined EI's relationship with individual performance or organizational effectiveness, Study 2 is actually the first attempt to define the relationship between emotional intelligence and cultural distance in the EI literatures.

New management and social theories are formulated and tested all the time. Nevertheless, our ethnic cultures change only slowly and will remain,

by and large, the same. Today, managers who are responsible for activities such as directing, communicating and coordinating the work lives of very diverse groups of people must exercise emotional intelligence continuously. In addition to exercising emotional intelligence, studies such as the one presented in this paper illustrate that to be effective managers must also be cognizant of the differences between cultures in the work place. That is, this study concludes that there is a definite and appreciable effect of culture on emotional intelligence. And, that this cultural effect is rooted in our ethnic background. Results of analysis completed show that now only is there a discernible effect of culture overall but that each attribute of emotional intelligence is affected differently by culture.

As with any study, there are limitations in this study. This study assumes that by studying two different sites for the same company, one in South Korea and one in the United States, the data collected is representative of the differences in culture of each country and the differences found between different companies has been mitigated. This has not been proven. Nor have the differences in organizational culture from group to group inherent in any company been considered in any detail. In addition, since the data samples collected in this study are limited to the workers of a single company with one site each in South Korea and in America, generalizations of the study is limited and the chance of sampling errors cannot be excluded. Therefore, the results of the study may not be universally applicable to all Korean and American firms. Another limitation is a small number of countries involved in Study 2. This study attempted to collect a large number of the secondary data from helps of the MHS Company. The initial aim of collecting average EI data for the countries was much more than those of the 13 countries, but it was limited due to its copy right issue. If EI data for more numbers of countries were collected, this study would demonstrate stronger relationships between emotional intelligence and cultural distance. Since Study 2 includes only 13 countries, we need to add more numbers of countries from all over the world in the future study.

References

1. Aaker, J. and Williams, P. (1998). Empathy versus pride: The influence of emotional appeals across cultures. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 25(3), 241-261.
2. Agarwal, S. (1994). Sociocultural distance and the choice of joint ventures: A contingency perspective. *Journal of International Marketing*, 2(2), 63-80.
3. Assai, M. and Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives in self-ingroup relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(2), 323-338.
4. American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: 4th Edition. 2003.
5. Bailey, J. and Chen, C. (1997). Conceptions of self and performance-related feedback in the U.S., Japan and China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 28(3), 605-625.
6. Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 51(2), 269-290.
7. Bar-On, R. (1988). The development of a concept of psychological well-being. Doctoral dissertation, Rhodes University, South Africa.
8. Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the emotional quotient inventory, In R. Bar-On and J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), *The Handbook of emotional intelligence: theory, development, assessment, and application at home, school, and in the workplace*, 363-388. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
9. Bar-On, R. (2006). Emotional quotient inventory (EQI) Technical Manual, MHS.
10. Benson, E. (2003). Intelligence across cultures: Research in Africa, Asia and Latin America is showing how culture and intelligence interact. *Monitor on Psychology*, 34(2), 56-58.
11. Berrocal, P.F., Salovey, P., Vera, A., Extremera N. and Ramos, N. (2005). Cultural influence on the relationship between perceived emotional intelligence and depression. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale*,

- 18(1), 91-107.
12. Brewer, C., Tregaskis, O., Hegewicsh, A., and Mayne, L. 1996. Comparative research in human resource management: A review and example. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 7(3), 585-604.
 13. Brouthers, K. D. and Brouthers, L. E. (2001). Explaining the national culture distance paradox. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(1), 177-189.
 14. Cavallo, K. and Brienza, D. (2002) "Emotional competence and leadership excellence at Johnson & Johnson: The emotional intelligence and leadership study." http://www.eiconsortium.org/research/jj_ei_study.htm, accessed 14 March 2004
 15. Cherniss, C. and Goleman, D. (2001). The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
 16. Chipain, G. C. (2003). Emotional intelligence and its relationship with sales success. A thesis in educational leadership. School of Education in DePaul University, July 2003.
 17. Chirkov, V. I., Lynch, M. and Niwa, S.(2005). Application of the scenario questionnaire of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism to the assessment of cultural distance and cultural fit. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 469-490.
 18. Cohen, Jacob. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (Rev. Ed.). New York: Academic Press.
 19. DeMente, B. L. (1988). *Korean etiquette and ethics in business*. Lincolnwood: NTC Business Books.
 20. Doi, T. (1973). *The anatomy of dependence*. Tokyo, New York: Kodansha International.
 21. Eagly, A., Karau, S. and Makhijani, M. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111(1), 3-22.
 22. Earley, P. C. and Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: An analysis of individual interactions across cultures*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford

University Press.

23. Earley, P. C., Ang, S., and Tan, J. (2006). *CQ: Developing cultural intelligence at work*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
24. Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQI) Technical Report (2006), MHS.
25. Gabel, R. S., Dolan, S. L. and Cerdin, J. L. (2005). Emotional intelligence as predictor of cultural adjustment for success in global assignments. *Career Development International*, 10(5), 375-395.
26. Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*. New York: Basic.
27. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
28. Goleman, D. (1998). *Working With Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
29. Greenfield, P. M. (1997). You can't take it with you: Why ability assessments don't cross culture? *American Psychologist*, 52(10), 1115-1124.
30. Grosse, R. & Trevino, L. J. (1996). Foreign direct investment in the United States: An analysis of country of origin. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(1), 139-155.
31. Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E. , Tatham, R. L. and Black, W. C. (1995). *Multivariate data analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
32. Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
33. Hall, E. T. & Hall M. R. (1990). *Understanding cultural differences*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
34. Hart, B. (2002). *Men and women should celebrate differences*. Salt Lake City, UT: The Desert News Publishing Co.
35. Hay/McBer (1996). *Generic Competency Dictionary*. Boston, Hay/McBer.
36. Hemphill, C. (1998). Class, gender, and the regulation of emotional expression. In P. Stearns and J. Lewis (Eds) *An emotional history of the United States*: 33-51. New York: New York University Press.
37. Higgs, M. and Dulewicz, S.V. (1999). *Making sense of emotional intelligence*. Windsor, Berkshire, UK: NFER Nelson.
38. Higgs, M. and McGuire, M. (2001). *Emotional intelligence and culture: an exploration of relationship between individual emotional intelligence and*

- organizational culture. Henley Working Papers and Research Notes: HWP0118, 1-35.
39. Hochschild, A. R. (1996). The sociology of emotion as a way of seeing. In G. Bendelow and S. Williams (Eds) emotions in social life: critical themes amid contemporary issues. London: Routledge.
 40. Hochschild, A. R. (1983). The managed heart: The commercialization of human feeling. Berkeley: University of California Press.
 41. Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(1), 42-63.
 42. Kim, E. S. (2000). Emotional intelligence assessment: Working with culture, Multicultural Matters. [http://www.indiana.edu/~div16/ MultiCultural.html](http://www.indiana.edu/~div16/MultiCultural.html) accessed 5 May 2003.
 43. Kim, U. (1994). Individualism and collectivism: theory, method, and applications. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
 44. Kogut, B., and Singh, H. (1988). The effect of national culture on the choice of entry mode. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 19(3), 411-432.
 45. Ledger, L. D. (1997). "Cultural bias in IQ testing," Liberal Arts and Crafts. <http://www.liberalartsandcrafts.net/contentcatalog/social/bias.shtml> assessed 06 March, 2004.
 46. MacConatha, J. T., Leone, F. M. and Armstrong, J. M. (1997). Emotional control in adulthood. *Psychological Reports*, 80(2), 499-507.
 47. Marcus, H. and Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychology Review*, 98(2), 224-253.
 48. MacConatha, J. T., Lightner, E., and Deaner, S. L. (1994). Culture, age, and gender as variables in the expression of emotion. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 9(3), 481-488.
 49. Manev, I. M. and William B. S. (2001). Nationality cultural distance and expatriate status: Effects on the managerial in a multinational enterprise. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(2), 285-303.
 50. Matsumoto, D. (1989). Cultural influences in the perception of emotion. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20(1), 92-105.

51. Marcus, H. R. and Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 299-337.
52. Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., and Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27(4), 267-298.
53. Mayer, J. and Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence*, 17(4), 433-442.
54. Moon, Y (1999). The EQ Episode Test, Seoul National University.
55. Moon, Y., Kang, M. and Choi, K. (2004). Exploring the validity of EQ Episode Test. *The Korean Journal of Human Development*, 11(3), 1-16.
56. Mesquita, B., Frijda, N., and Scherer, K. (1997). Culture and emotion. In J.W. Berry, P.R. Dasen, and T.S. Saraswathi (Eds) *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Basic processes and human development (Vol 2)*: 255-297. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
57. Muchinsky, P. (2000). Emotions in the workplace: the neglect of organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(7), 801-805.
58. Oyserman, D. and Marcus, H. R. (1993). The Sociocultural self. In J. Suls (Ed) *Psychological Perspectives on the Self: Vol 4 (The Self in Social Perspective)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.
59. Paez, D. and Vergara A. (1995). Cultural difference in emotional knowledge. In J.A. Russell, J.M. Fernandez-Dols, A.S.R. Manstead & J.C. Wellenkamp (eds.) *Everyday conceptions of emotion*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.
60. Petrides, K. and Furham, A. (2000). Gender differences in measured and self-estimated trait emotional intelligence. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 42(5), 449-461.
61. Poortinga, Y. H. (1989). Equivalence of cross-cultural data: An overview of basic issues. *International Journal of Psychology*, 24(6), 737-756.
62. Salovey, P. and Sluyter, D. (1997). *Emotional development and emotional intelligence*. New York: Basic Books, HarperCollins.
63. Salovey, P. and Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition & Personality*, 9, 185-211.

64. Sandhu, D. S. (1997). Psychocultural profiles of Asian and Pacific Islanders Americans: Implications for counseling and psychotherapy. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 25(1), 7-22.
65. Shenkar, O. (2001). Cultural distance revisited: Towards a more rigorous conceptualization and measurement of cultural differences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(3), 519-535.
66. Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J. and Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25, 523-536.
67. Sjöberg, L. (2001). Emotional Intelligence and Life Adjustment: A Validation Study. SSE/EFI Working Paper Series. Center for Economic Psychology, Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden, 1-14.
68. Sousa, C. M. and Bradley, F. (2006). Cultural distance and psychic distance: two peas in a pod? *Journal of International Marketing*, 14(1), 49-70.
69. Soutar, N. G., Lee, J. A. and Ng, S. I. (2007). Are Hofstde's and Schwartz's value frameworks congruent? *International Marketing Review*, 24(2), 164-180.
70. Steenkamp, J.-B.E.M. (2001). The role of national culture in international marketing research. *International Marketing Review*, 18(1), 30-44.
71. Sternberg, R. J (1986). *Handbook of human intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
72. Steinberg, D. I. (2000). Euphoria after the summit. KOIS Special. <http://www.korea.net/issue/sn/news/xnews.asp> accessed 01 June, 2004.
73. Thorndike, R. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper Magazine*, 140, 227-235.
74. Triandis, H. C. (1989). The Self and social behavior in differing cultural Contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96(3), 506-520.
75. Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M., Asai, M. and Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(2), 323-338.

76. Trompennars, F. (1994). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin Professional Publications.
77. Whyte, W. H. (1956). *The organization man*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
78. Yoo, S. (2001). The cultural impact on depression expression and attitudes toward seeking professional help: A comparative study of Americans and South Koreans. *Asian Pacific Education Review*, 2(1), 94-100.

문화와 정서지능 : 정서지능과 문화적 거리의 관계를 중심으로

문태원*

요 약

본 연구는 문화와 정서지능과의 의존관계를 정립하여 정서지능 연구에 새로운 시각을 부여하려고 했다. 본 연구의 전제는 개인정서의 지각, 평가, 표현, 이해, 조절 등이 문화에 크게 영향을 받기 때문에 인간의 다양한 정서 프로세스를 기초로 개발된 정서지능 역시 문화에 많은 영향을 받는다는 것이다. 본 논문은 문화가 정서지능에 미치는 영향을 규명하기 위해서 미국과 한국의 직장인을 대상으로 정서지능을 측정 한 후, 정서지능과 문화의 의존관계를 실험하였다. 주어진 상황 아래서 정서적 반응이 문화 간 다양한 변화를 보인다는 것을 입증함으로써 정서지능이 문화에 의존한다는 것을 보였다. 또한, 본 연구는 Bar-On Emotional Quotient-Inventory (EQ-i)의 2차 데이터를 사용하여 13개국의 19,402명의 정서지능과 문화적 거리의 관계를 조사하였다. 연구결과로서 Hofstede의 문화차원 중 권력의 거리 (power distance)만이 정서지능에 유의미한 결과를 보였다.

핵심주제어 : 문화, 정서지능, 문화적 거리

* 홍익대학교 경영학과 조교수, twmoon@hongik.ac.kr