

THE BOND BETWEEN INTELLIGENCES: CULTURAL, EMOTIONAL, AND SOCIAL

Naresh Kumar | Raduan Che Rose | Subramaniam

Increasing interest in multiple forms of nonacademic intelligences in addition to the well-established intelligent quotient (IQ) to explain individual success has triggered a need for clear establishment of the theoretical and empirical connection among these constructs. As such, this article explores the interrelationship that exists among three forms of nonacademic intelligences: cultural, emotional, and social. Theoretical and practical implications are also discussed.

INQUISITIVENESS AMONG PRACTITIONERS IN human performance technology (HPT) on the dynamism of multiple forms of “intelligences” is mounting. This is attributable to the observation that conventional intelligence or intelligent quotient (IQ) does not necessarily mean that one’s life will be successful (Goleman, 1998), and, indeed, it does not account for variance beyond personality factors and traits (Mehrabian, 2000). Measures of IQ were originally designed to predict academic performance. Although application in the academic setting has been widely accepted, such measures account for only 5%–10% of variance in predicting performance in other settings (Wigdor & Garner, 1982). The idea that intelligence encompasses more than IQ tests has been deliberated for some time and includes the argument that IQ tests are too narrowly focused, thus failing to account for “street smarts” and other abilities required for life success (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

Research on other forms of intelligences, such as cultural intelligence (Earley & Ang, 2003), emotional intelligence (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), and social intelligence (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1985), among others, has been recently introduced in an effort to determine how they were related to positive life outcomes. Although past findings show that these domain specific intelligences are positively correlated to various aspects of life outcomes, clear establishment of the theoretical and empirical connection among these constructs by scholars still remains elusive in the literature.

Therefore, this article explores the relationships among cultural intelligence (CQ), emotional intelligence (EQ),

and social intelligence (SQ) and proposes how these constructs, while related, are distinct from each other.

THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENTS AND PROPOSITIONS

The inability of cognitive and motivational theorists to explain a person’s action or behavioral relationship to intelligence has motivated behavioral theorists to examine a person’s actions rather than the mental process (Earley & Ang, 2003). Behavioral theories of intelligence are likely to emphasize the different domains in which intelligent behaviors are observed. As a result, behavioral studies are categorized into either academic or nonacademic domains. Those intelligence behaviors observed in the academic domain are labeled as academic intelligences (i.e., linguistic, mathematics, science).

On the other hand, the intelligence behaviors observed in the nonacademic domain, sometimes called “real world” intelligences (Ang et al., 2007), have been labeled as nonacademic intelligences, such as EQ (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), SQ (Thorndike, 1920), and CQ (Earley & Ang, 2003). Some posit that because the nonacademic intelligences are domain specific or situated, they are therefore grounded in the theory of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983), which is meant to explain the intelligence behaviors observed in various domains that IQ fails to explain and account for. As such, nonacademic or real world intelligences, such as CQ, SQ, and EQ, are said to be the theoretical extension of Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences (Earley & Ang).

While the definition of intelligence itself is somewhat controversial in the literature, scholars claim that CQ, SQ, and EQ are forms of intelligences because they fit into the criteria of what constitutes intelligence: (a) reflecting behavior in the real world, (b) being purposive or directed toward goals, and (c) involving either adaptation to the environment or automation of high-level processes (Jordan, Ashkanasy, & Härtel, 2003). Some researchers state that intelligence comprises structure and function, where structure is the ability to grasp abstractions, and function is the ability to solve problems (Becker, 2003). Mayer and Geher (1996) defined intelligence as an "individual's overall level of intellectual attainment and ability" (p. 89), which involves a hierarchy of mental abilities including verbal, spatial, and specific intelligences (Mayer & Cobb, 2000; Mayer & Geher). For the purpose of this article, intelligence is defined as the capabilities to gather and manipulate information, draw inferences, and enact cognitive, emotive, or behavioral actions in response to stimuli (Earley & Ang, 2003). When critically analyzing the constructs of EQ, SQ, and CQ, they clearly fit into characteristics of intelligence.

Thorndike (1920), who originally coined the term SQ, categorized intelligence into three categories: "abstract intelligence" (i.e., ability to understand and manage ideas), "mechanical intelligence" (i.e., ability to manage and understand concrete objects), and "social intelligence" (i.e., ability to manage and understand people). SQ has been defined as "the ability to understand men and women, boys and girls—to act wisely in human relations" (Thorndike, p. 228) and "the ability to perceive one's own and other's internal states, motives, and behaviors, and to act toward them optimally on the basis of that information" (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 187). Brislin, Worthley, and MacNab (2006) state that SQ requires skills that allow one to "get along" with others. They further contend that SQ involves skills related to all social interactions and acting appropriately in these interactions. Others posit that SQ consists of interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects (Salovey & Mayer).

Interpersonal aspects that can be observed in SQ individuals include understanding others' feelings, thoughts, or behaviors (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Silvera, Martinussen, & Dahl, 2001), the ability to read non-verbal cues and accomplish interpersonal tasks (Kaukiainen et al., 1999), and the ability to act wisely in a situation (Marlowe, 1986).

As for the intrapersonal aspects of SQ, it involves the ability to understand one's own thoughts (Marlowe, 1986) and ability to decode social information (Fredáková & Jelenová, 2004). Because SQ is a broad construct, it is possible that it incorporates other more domain-specific intelligences such as CQ and EQ; however, this has yet to be empirically proven.

On the other hand, CQ and EQ are likely to be distinct forms of SQ because each is focused on specific aspects of social skills. For instance, EQ focuses mainly on the abilities related to one's emotional perception and thought facilitation, understanding and managing oneself and others (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), and the emotional aspects of social interactions. The focus of CQ is on the ability to effectively adapt in culturally diverse settings (Earley & Ang, 2003), thus concentrating on the cultural aspect of social interactions. Given its potential in predicting various life outcomes, the understanding of the connection among these constructs, to date, still remains unclear in the literature. The following discussion focuses on the establishment of the relationships that exist between EQ and CQ and clearly shows how they are distinct yet related constructs as well as subsets of SQ.

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

While scholars acknowledge that both the CQ and the EQ are grounded in the theory of multiple intelligence (Gardner, 1993), there are differences that exist between them. The distinction between the two constructs is made obvious especially when discussing the applicability of the constructs in cross-cultural context. Earley and Peterson (2004) contended that EQ does not include adaptation across cultures and may be culturally specific (Prati, Douglas, Ferris, Ammeter, & Buckley, 2003), and the behaviors resulting from EQ could vary in different cultures (Law, Wong, & Song, 2004).

EQ involves skills such as self-awareness, impulse control, self-efficacy, empathy, and social deftness, which may not carry over to other cultures (Brislin et al., 2006). Earley and Peterson (2004) stated that EQ "presumes a degree of familiarity within a culture and context that may not exist across many cultures" (p. 105). They claim that EQ researchers do not usually mention the cultural context, limit the scope by culture, or discuss any relationship between the two. Earley and Peterson also argue that "a person having a high EQ in their native culture may be entirely incapable at generalizing across cultural settings" (p. 105). Ang et al. (2007) posit that EQ is a distinct construct from CQ because it focuses on the general ability to perceive and manage emotions without consideration of cultural context. Given that emotional cues are symbolically constructed and historically transmitted within culture, the ability to encode and decode emotions in the home culture does not automatically transfer to unfamiliar cultures (Earley & Ang, 2003). Thus, a

person with high EQ in one cultural context may not be emotionally intelligent in another culture.

In contrast, CQ is culture free and refers to a general set of capabilities with relevance to situations characterized by cultural diversity. According to Ang, Van Dyne, and Koh (2006), CQ is one's capability to adjust to diverse cultural situations and effectively adapt to various cultural settings. It has a heavy emphasis on the meta-cognitions component, including "thinking about thinking," which is an individual's cultural consciousness and awareness during interactions with those who have different cultural backgrounds. In addition, those with a high CQ devote time and attention to planning, questioning cultural assumptions, and thinking about cultural preferences; they consider cultural norms before and during interactions and check and adjust mental models based on interactions with those from other cultures (Ang et al.).

Others posit that CQ is related to EQ, but it picks up where EQ leaves off (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). A person with high EQ grasps what makes us human and at the same time what makes each of us different from one another. Earley and Mosakowski further claim that a person with a high CQ can somehow tease out of a person's or group's behavior those features that would be true of all people and all groups, those peculiar to this person or this group, and those that are neither universal nor idiosyncratic.

Drawing on a scenario of an American expatriate manager who managed an international team that was in conflict, Earley and Mosakowski (2004) suggested that an expatriate manager who was merely emotionally intelligent probably would have empathized with the team members whose ideas were being criticized, modulated his or her spontaneous reaction to the critics' conduct, and proposed a new style of discussion that preserved candor but spared feelings, if indeed anyone's feelings had been hurt. But without being able to tell how much of the critics' behavior was idiosyncratic and how much was culturally determined, he or she would not have known how to influence their actions or how easy it would be to do that.

In addition, CQ is focused on aspects of an interaction that is specifically related to culture (Ang, Van Dyne, Koh, & Ng, 2004), which may include elements of an interaction not related to emotions. For instance, knowing when and to whom to shake hands or hug may not require EQ skills. It is a person's cultural sensitivity that one masters through experience and education that is dominant in those with a high CQ. Also, being familiar with the norms, practices, and conventions of a culture, which cognitive CQ encompasses (Ang et al.), does not necessarily involve emotional interactions.

Lastly, the motivation and drive to interact with others from other cultures as a result of one's self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986) and intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985) is not something that will be influenced by one's EQ. In contrast, the motivational dimension in EQ is channeled more toward intrinsic factors such as achievement than the extrinsic motivation provided by money or status (Goleman, 1998). Again, the desire or interest to involve interaction specifically related to a cultural context was not explicitly acknowledged in EQ.

It is also possible that some elements of EQ are not facets of CQ, for example, perceiving and understanding one's emotions is an intrapersonal process that will not likely be influenced by one's CQ, because it involves accurate recognition of aspects of oneself. Also, how an individual generates an emotion is also an intrapersonal component that will not likely be influenced by being culturally intelligent because this is a process that is individual. Rather, researchers argue that emotional expression and the behaviors associated with it are pre-wired and biologically, not culturally, based (Fischer, Rodriguez Mosquera, van Vianen, & Manstead, 2004; Menon, 2000; Ratner, 2000). This does not imply that culture does not influence emotions, but rather having a high CQ will not necessarily impact how one generates or understands one's emotions. With the above-mentioned contention, we therefore propose:

Proposition 1: The construct of CQ is distinct from the construct of EQ.

THE OVERLAPPING CHARACTERISTICS OF CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

Psychologist Daniel Goleman (1998) describes the one critical element that CQ and EQ share: "a propensity to suspend judgment—to think before acting" (p. 95). According to Earley and Mosakowski (2004), for someone with a high CQ, it probably entails hours or days to make a judgment before acting, while for someone with a low CQ, it takes weeks or months to devise judgments. They further claim that, in either case, it involves using our senses to register all the ways that the personalities interacting in front of us are different from those in our home culture and yet similar to one another. Only when we have actually observed conduct, then patterns begin to settle in and we can safely begin to anticipate how these people will react in the next situation. The inferences one draws in this manner will be free of the hazards of stereotyping. Triandis (2006) stated that a CQ individual will

suspend his or her judgment until sufficient information becomes available both on the type of situation (individualistic or collectivist) and on the allocentric-idiocentric continuum.

Triandis (2006) further claims that in addition to suspending judgment and paying attention to situations, the culturally intelligent individual also has the ability to identify the information that is relevant for making a judgment and can integrate this information to make correct judgment. Similarly, in the Goleman's (1998) EQ dimensions, the self-regulation dimension addresses the propensity to suspend judgment and think before acting (Goleman).

Analyzing specifically the aspects of EQ, the ability to accurately perceive and understand emotions in others involves accurately decoding and labeling the emotional expression (Salovey & Pizarro, 2003). Acknowledging that emotional expression varies across cultures (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2003; Tsai & Chentsova-Dutton, 2003), this implies that one needs CQ skills to understand the meaning behind such expressions and behaviors associated with it. For instance, in one study it was discovered that there was a significant difference in smiles displayed during happiness in a study of Americans with Irish and Scandinavian descent; generally, those with Scandinavian descent were less expressive than those with Irish descent (Tsai & Chentsova-Dutton). This suggests that emotional expression is culturally influenced; hence, it implies a possible overlap between EQ and CQ because the understanding of these expressions requires cultural and emotional intelligence skills.

In addition, comparing each of the facets of CQ to EQ suggests an overlapping characteristic between the two. For instance, accurate perception and understanding of emotions in others requires some knowledge of others' backgrounds, specifically their cultural background, which is the meta-cognitive component. This facet of CQ also involves skills to question one's assumptions about others' emotional expression, similar to the notion of "thinking about thinking" that is associated with this facet (Earley & Peterson, 2004). Meta-cognitive CQ is also similar to the mindfulness of CQ (Thomas & Inkson, 2004), which involves one's ability to "gather, interpret, and act upon . . . radically different cues" (Earley & Peterson, p. 105). Thus, being mindful of other's culture is related to the ability to perceive and understand emotions because the recognition of emotion involves accurately reading emotional cues. Cognitive CQ may also be related to EQ in the sense that knowledge gained through cultural experience includes emotional norms displayed in the form of emotional cues and behaviors in other cultures. This cultural knowledge component of CQ enables one to interpret emotions accurately. Triandis (2006) stated

that an individual will suspend his or her judgment until sufficient information is available to accurately decode and label the emotions (Salovey & Pizarro, 2003) of others that could be accumulated through cultural experiences.

In analyzing the motivational facet of CQ, it is possible that there may be some areas of overlap with EQ. For instance, openness to cultural experiences was found to be a common personality trait that can enhance one's CQ and EQ (Ang et al., 2006; Day & Carroll, 2004), and it is likely a key aspect in desiring to learn about and adapt to other cultures. Therefore, if both EQ and CQ are enhanced by being open to cultural experiences, then some similarities likely exist among them.

Lastly, some of the skills in behavioral CQ, such as exhibiting appropriate action and being flexible in behaviors, including verbal and nonverbal behaviors (Ang et al., 2004; Ang et al., 2006), are similar to EQ skills. Specifically, the skill found in those with a high CQ is emotion management, which involves the appropriate regulation of feeling (Salovey & Pizarro, 2003) and the effective management of others' emotions.

Additionally, researchers contended that culture influences one's emotion. Most scholars agree that emotions are cognitive appraisals of situations based on cultural beliefs and norms (Menon, 2000; Ratner, 2000) and that emotions are situation-specific reactions (Ben-Ze'ev, 2002). For instance, Nelson and Baumgarte (2004) found that responses of compassion and sympathy are culturally influenced. In their study, individuals were found to be less likely to be empathetic when they perceive another's personal distress to be a result of a situation that would not typically cause someone from their own culture to be distressed. This implies that aspects of EQ, such as appraisal and management of one's emotion, are likely to be influenced by one's cultural background. Given that there is a relationship between culture and emotion, it would be expected that a relationship exists between CQ and EQ. Thus, we propose:

Proposition 2: The construct of CQ has some components that overlap with the construct of EQ.

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AS A SUBSET OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE

At the very basic, our claim that EQ is a subset of SQ lies in Salovey and Mayer's (1990) definition of EQ itself. They described EQ as "a form of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one's thinking and action" (p. 188). Salovey and Mayer's description of EQ

explicitly acknowledged that EQ is constructed under the umbrella term of SQ, given that the ultimate goal of EQ is the same as SQ, which is to have effective social interactions and act appropriately in these situations (Brislin et al., 2006; Salovey & Mayer).

The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI) describes EQ as an array of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills, and facilitators that impact intelligent behavior (Bar-On, 2005). The intelligent behavior in the Bar-On model refers to the ability that allows one to "get along" with others, which again acknowledges the SQ as the umbrella construct under which EQ lies. In fact, again, the definition of SQ itself clearly specifies that it is "the ability to understand men and women, boys and girls—to act wisely in human relations" (Thorndike, 1920). This early definition of SQ implicitly treats one's ability to monitor his or her emotional state as a crucial skill to have to understand others and to eventually have effective human relations with others, which suggests SQ as the parent construct under which EQ shelters.

Available literature also has suggested that EQ is related to SQ (e.g., Dulewicz & Higgs, 2000; Dulewicz, Higgs, & Slaski, 2003; Law et al., 2004; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Close review of the various definitions of EQ, like SQ, also acknowledges aspects of interpersonal and intrapersonal skills. Salovey and Pizarro (2003), for instance, discuss various emotional skills related to oneself and in relation to others. Bar-On (2005) discusses EQ as personal, emotional, and social competencies that facilitate one in succeeding in social situations, which clearly reflects both interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects of CQ. Based on the argument above, it is possible that EQ is a subset of SQ, with a heavy emphasis on emotional aspects. Hence, it is proposed that SQ is an umbrella term that includes other aspects of more domain specific intelligences. Therefore, we propose:

Proposition 3: The construct of EQ comprises a subset of SQ.

CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE AS A SUBSET OF SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE

Although available research has demonstrated the relationship between SQ and EQ, the relationship is somehow not well established. Some scholars contend that CQ builds on not only SQ (Thomas, 2006) but also IQ and EQ (Thomas & Inkson, 2004). Others argue that CQ is a distinct form of intelligence when compared to other forms of social intelligence because it addresses the cultural component not present in other SQ constructs (Earley & Ang, 2003). Claims that SQ skills may not be transferable across cultures (Brislin et al., 2006) is not

compelling, because those with a high SQ will usually take into consideration the context of situation within which the interaction is taking place, and this context should include culture.

Brislin et al. (2006) state that "cultural intelligence addresses a set of skills, from basic to advanced, that allow an individual to become effective at eventually transferring social skills from one cultural context to another" (p. 53). Because SQ facilitates one to interact effectively with others, it also appears that CQ facilitates one to interact effectively in cross-cultural situations; and in that sense, CQ could be subset of SQ.

In addition, the presence of interpersonal and intrapersonal aspects in CQ suggests its connection to SQ. The interpersonal aspect in CQ is obvious when we carefully analyze the behavioral component of CQ. Behavioral CQ entails an adjustment of actions (Ang et al., 2006), which leads to appropriate interaction with others. This involves exhibiting verbal and nonverbal behaviors to interact effectively and appropriately in various cultural settings, which reflects the interpersonal skills (Ang et al., 2004; Ang et al., 2006). Although the interpersonal aspects of SQ also include the interpersonal aspects of CQ, only CQ focuses on cultural aspects of interaction. Thus, it is possible that CQ could be a subset of SQ.

CQ facets of meta-cognition, cognition, and motivation all contain intrapersonal aspects to a certain degree. Meta-cognition represents the knowledge and control of mental cognitions and adjusting one's mental models (Ang et al., 2006), and it involves understanding one's own cultural knowledge and information processing (Ang et al., 2004; Earley & Ang, 2003). As such, thinking about cultural aspects during a cross-cultural interaction will embrace the knowledge about one's cultural thinking, which is an intrapersonal aspect of SQ. Meta-cognition CQ focuses on higher order cognitive processes; the cognition facet of CQ refers to self knowledge, cultural knowledge, and information handling (Ang et al., 2006), all of which involve intrapersonal processes because they entail knowledge gained from education and experience (Ang et al., 2004) that is unique to each individual.

Lastly, the motivational component of CQ also contains intrapersonal aspects because an individual's intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985) is something internal to an individual. As such, it is obvious that, based on the intrapersonal aspects, CQ is a subset of SQ.

Although some argue that CQ is not a subset of SQ, we counter the argument because there are similarities between the two, and thus we should consider that SQ could be an umbrella term for various intelligences related to SQ, including CQ. Additionally, if we accept that SQ involves skills that allow one to interact with oth-

ers in social settings, then cross-cultural settings should be included. Therefore, we propose:

Proposition 4: The construct of CQ comprises a subset of SQ.

IMPLICATIONS FOR HPT

This article contributes to HPT in several ways. First, in relation to the multiple intelligence theory, by studying SQ, EQ, and CQ simultaneously this article fills a void in the current literature on the understanding about the commonalities and distinctions that exist among various forms of intelligence. Having a holistic view on the inter-relationship among various forms of intelligences guides future HPT researchers in this area. Second, related to practical implications, this article may provide HPT practitioners with valuable direction and tools in terms of employee selection, placement, training, and development. HPT practitioners interested in training SQ, EQ, or CQ should consider a training module that incorporates all these intelligences because there are overlapping characteristics among them. Instead of having training programs in isolation for each of the intelligences, it may be cost effective for organizations to have one integrative training module. This is especially relevant for those organizations considering international assignments as part of their strategy. Providing training in these above areas will enable their employees to become competent during their expatriation period because it provides necessary skills to handle various situations during their stay abroad. On the whole, this article could induce more research attention on how these intelligences will simultaneously explain the various individual outcomes in not only a domestic setting but also an international arena. 🐼

References

- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, S.K. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group and Organization Management*, 31, 100–123.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., & Ng, K.Y. (2004). *The measurement of cultural intelligence*. Paper presented at the 2004 Academy of Management Meetings Symposium on Cultural Intelligence in the 21st Century, New Orleans, LA.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K.Y., Templer, K.J., Tay, C., et al. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation, and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3), 335–371.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bar-On, R. (2005). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Issues in Emotional Intelligence*, 1(4), 1–28.
- Becker, T. (2003). Is emotional intelligence a viable concept? *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2), 192–195.
- Ben-Ze'ev, A. (2002). Emotional intelligence: The conceptual issues. In N.M. Ashkanasy, W.J. Zerbe, & C.E.J. Härtel (Eds.), *Managing emotions at work* (pp. 164–183). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Brislin, R., Worthley, R., & MacNab, B. (2006). Cultural intelligence: Understanding behaviors that serve people's goals. *Group and Organization Management*, 31, 40–55.
- Cantor, N., & Kihlstrom, J.F. (1985). Social intelligence: The cognitive basis of personality. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6, 15–33.
- Day, A.L., & Carroll, S.A. (2004). Using an ability-based measure of emotional intelligence to predict individual performance, group performance, and group citizenship behaviors. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 36(6), 1443–1458.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Dulewicz, V., & Higgs, M. (2000). Emotional intelligence: A review and evaluation study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(4), 341–372.
- Dulewicz, V., Higgs, M., & Slaski, M. (2003). Measuring emotional intelligence: Content, construct and criterion-related validity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(5), 405–420.
- Earley, P.C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Earley, P.C., & Mosakowski, E. (2004). Best practice: Cultural intelligence. *Harvard Business Review*, 82, 139–146.
- Earley, P.C., & Peterson, R.S. (2004). The elusive cultural chameleon: Cultural intelligence as a new approach to intercultural training for the global manager. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3, 100–115.
- Elfenbein, H.A., & Ambady, N. (2003). When familiarity breeds accuracy: Cultural exposure and facial emotion recognition. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 85(2), 276–290.
- Fischer, A.H., Rodriguez Mosquera, P.M., van Vianen, A.E.M., & Manstead, A.S.R. (2004). Gender and culture differences in emotion. *Emotion*, 4(1), 87–94.
- Fredáková, D., & Jelenová, I. (2004). Correlates of social and emotional intelligence. *Studia Psychologica*, 46(4), 291–295.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligence: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.

- Goleman, D. (1998). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 93–102.
- Jordan, P.J., Ashkanasy, N.M., & Härtel, C.E.J. (2003). The case for emotional intelligence in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2), 195–196.
- Kaukiainen, A., Bjoerkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K., Oesterman, K., Salmivalli, C., Rothberg, S., et al. (1999). The relationships between social intelligence, empathy, and three types of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 25, 81–89.
- Law, K.S., Wong, C.-S., & Song, L.J. (2004). The constructs and criterion validity of emotional intelligence and its potential utility for management studies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(3), 483–496.
- Marlowe, H.A. (1986). Social intelligence: Evidence for multi-dimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(1), 52–58.
- Mayer, J.D., & Cobb, C.D. (2000). Educational policy on emotional intelligence: Does it make sense? *Educational Psychology Review*, 12(2), 163–183.
- Mayer, J.D., & Geher, G. (1996). Emotional intelligence and the identification of emotion. *Intelligence*, 22(2), 89–114.
- Mehrabian, A. (2000). Beyond IQ: Broad-based measurement of individual success potential or “emotional intelligence.” *Genetic, Social, & General Psychology Monographs*, 123(2), 133–239.
- Menon, U. (2000). Analyzing emotions as culturally constructed scripts. *Culture & Psychology*, 6(1), 40–50.
- Nelson, D.W., & Baumgarte, R. (2004). Cross-cultural misunderstandings reduce empathic responding. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 34(2), 391–401.
- Prati, L.M., Douglas, C., Ferris, G.R., Ammeter, A.P., & Buckley, M.R. (2003). The role of emotional intelligence in team leadership: Reply to the critique by Antonakis. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 11(4), 363–369.
- Ratner, C. (2000). A cultural-psychological analysis of emotions. *Culture & Psychology*, 6(1), 5–39.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J.D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition & Personality*, 9(3), 185–211.
- Salovey, P., & Pizarro, D. (2003). The value of emotional intelligence. In R.J. Sternberg, J. Lautrey, & T.I. Lubart (Eds.), *Models of intelligence: International perspectives* (pp. 263–278). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Silvera, D.H., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T.I. (2001). The Tromsø social intelligence scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 313–319.
- Thomas, D.C. (2006). Domain and development of cultural intelligence: The importance of mindfulness. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 78–99.
- Thomas, D. C., & Inkson, K. (2004). *Cultural intelligence*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Thorndike, E.L. (1920). Intelligence and its use. *Harper's Magazine*, 140, 227–235.
- Triandis, H.C. (2006). Cultural intelligence in organizations. *Group and Organization Management*, 31, 20–26.
- Tsai, J.L., & Chentsova-Dutton, Y. (2003). Variation among European Americans in emotional facial expression. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 34(6), 650–657.
- Wigdor, A.K., & Garner, W.R. (Eds.). (1982). *Ability testing: Uses, consequences, and controversies* (pp. 119–151). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

NARESH KUMAR is a lecturer at the Graduate School of Management, Universiti Putra Malaysia. He received his PhD degree in extension education from Universiti Putra Malaysia. His primary area of expertise is human resource development, and his research interests include workplace learning, organizational development, and knowledge management. He has published and presented numerous articles internationally on organizational and management-related studies. He may be reached at naresh@putra.upm.edu.my.

RADUAN CHE ROSE is a professor at the Graduate School of Management, Universiti Putra Malaysia. He received an MSc degree in industrial relations from University of Stirling, Scotland, and later a PhD degree in international human resource management from Leeds University Business School, United Kingdom. His primary area of expertise is the strategic management of human resources, and his special interests include Japanese-style management, cross-cultural management, managing team effectiveness, and the design of HRM systems to support business imperatives. He may be reached at rcr@putra.upm.edu.my.

SUBRAMANIAM is a doctoral candidate at the Graduate School of Management, Universiti Putra Malaysia. His areas of research are cross-cultural management, organizational behavior, and cultural intelligence. He may be reached at subra@uupm.edu.my.