INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY, SELF-ESTEEM AND EMOTIONAL QUOTIENT: A STUDY OF UNDERGRADUATE AND POST GRADUATE STUDENTS IN INDIA

Dr. Shuchi Agarwal
Professor,IILM Institute for Higher Education,Delhi

Dr. Gargi Sandilya
Asst.Professor,IILM Institute for Higher Education,Delhi

Abstract: *Globalisation has led to w*orkplaces becoming *more ethnically and culturally diverse, necessitating intercultural understanding and sensitivity. Research indicates that Intercultural sensitivity is shaped by many factors. This research focuses on two such factors ;emotional intelligence and self esteem .A sample of 143 undergraduate and post graduate students in Delhi NCR region was used to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence (EQ),intercultural sensitivity (ICS)and self esteem(SE). Results indicate that EQ and IS are significantly correlated as are Self-esteem and EQ. EQ is also found to significantly predict IS with a large effect size. The results provide an insight for future leaders seeking to manage diversity and inclusion. Inculcating EQ in the academic and professional development initiatives may help the leaders of tomorrow appreciate cultural and individual differences helping them succeed as managers, entrepreneurs, and businessmen in future.*

Keywords: *Emotional Intelligence, Emotional Quotient, Self-Esteem, Intercultural sensitivity*

1. Introduction

The last two decades have seen an increase in the organizational cross cultural contact because of the advances in communication technology, increase in travel, media and world economic trends. Such technological developments have brought people from wide variety of cultures to extreme closeness leading to significant demographic changes (Lockwood, 2005). Today individuals have to be effective intercultural communicators to be successful. For that they have to be interested in other cultures, be sensitive to the differences and show respect for other cultures (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992). Bennett and Bennett (2004) proposed a model in which individuals develop intercultural sensitivity through six steps: denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration. Intercultural sensitivity indicates the "development of a readiness to understand and appreciate cultural differences in intercultural communication" (Chen & Starosta, 2003). It refers to the ability to discriminate and experience relative cultural difference (Hammer, Bennet & Wiseman, 2003). It also refers to an individual's openness to experience (Conard, 2006).

Mayer and Salovey firstly coined the term Emotional Intelligence in 1990 and a decade later Daniel Goleman established its importance and popularized it. Goleman (1995) defines Emotional Intelligence (henceforth referred to as EI) as an individual's ability to accurately recognize, understand and manage their own emotions as well as that of others. EI is made up of four core skills Self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management. Self-awareness is the ability to be aware of one's emotions and manage behaviour and tendencies accordingly. Self-Management is the ability to use self-awareness to stay flexible and positively direct one's behaviour. Instead of reacting to every feeling, one waits for the emotion to pass so that one can respond reasonably instead of taking impulsive decisions. Social Awareness is the ability to accurately pick up and understand emotions in others. Relationship Management is the ability to use self and social awareness to manage interactions successfully. EI affects how people behave, navigate social complexities and make personal decisions to achieve positive results. EI has been found to be associated with experienced leadership and positive interpersonal relations.

Self-esteem is the "evaluative aspect of the self-concept that corresponds to an overall view of the self as worthy or unworthy" (Snyder & Lopez, 2009). It is a judgment of oneself as well as an attitude toward the self (Baumeister, Campbell, Kruger & Vohs, 2003).When individuals view themselves positively they tend to feel confident and worthy. Thus, positive self-evaluation tends to motivate individuals to do well in dealing with others, including those who have different cultural backgrounds. Intercultural gap or insensitivity is often caused by ambiguity and inability to make correct interpersonal predictions. This perceived cultural difference leads to feelings of fear and uncertainty. These emotions are powerful and motivate individual to act in both positive and negative ways. It can lead to denial, forming stereotypes, withdrawing and/or showing hostile behaviour towards other cultures. Or it can even lead to the individual becoming sensitive and reducing the bias towards other cultural groups.

A review of literature shows that there is very limited understanding of the relationship between emotional intelligence, self-esteem, and intercultural sensitivity especially in the Indian context. This study fills the gap to provide a better understanding of the same. Intercultural sensitivity is shaped by many factors. This study focuses on two of these factors Emotional Intelligence and Self-Esteem. It examines the relationship between emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity. Additionally it also studies the relation between self-esteem and intercultural sensitivity.

2. Literature review

Intercultural sensitivity

People have natural tendency to practice in group favouritism and out-group differentiation (Chung & Ting-Toomey, 1999).They are more attracted to people whom they perceive to be similar to them (Barsade, Ward, Turner & Sonnenfeld, 2000). Today's world because of the advancement in technology and globalization

has become a multicultural society which requires a shift from this exclusive attitude and communicating with individuals from 'out-group'. This requires an "acculturation process" which is defined as the process by which group members from one cultural background adapt to the culture of a different group (Berry, 1992). Research suggests that acculturation requires set of interpersonal and intrapersonal skills called intercultural competencies which help individual to work in "foreign environment", to relate to others at professional and emotional levels (Szkudlarek, 2009). Intercultural competencies are grouped in three components: cognitive, behavioural and affective (Bennett, 2004; Chen & Starosta, 1996; Fritz, 2001; Graf, 2004; Müller & Gelbrich, 2001; Spitzberg, 2000; Chung & Ting-Toomey, 1999). Knowledge about other cultures is cognitive dimension while intercultural sensitivity and skills to manage intercultural situations are the affective and behavioural dimensions respectively. According Chen and Starosta (1996) intercultural competence includes; intercultural sensitivity, intercultural awareness and intercultural adroitness. Intercultural sensitivity is the affective component of intercultural competence and is a person's ability to receive and send positive emotional signals before, during and after intercultural interaction. These positive emotional responses lead to acknowledging and respecting cultural differences. Intercultural sensitivity has four elements: self-concept, open-mindedness, non-judgmental attitudes and social relaxation. The cognitive component of Intercultural competence is Intercultural awareness which is the ability of an individual to understand and comprehend other cultures. The behavioural component is Intercultural adroitness which is the capability of an individual to get the job done during intercultural interactions using skills like interaction management, behavioural flexibility, identity management and relationship cultivation. Graf (2004) defines intercultural sensitivity as the emotional capability of an individual to be sensitive towards individuals from different national cultures. He concluded from his review of literature that Intercultural sensitivity is a crucial element in achieving competent intercultural interaction as it is associated with reduced resistance to differences in others. Greater intercultural sensitivity is associated with greater potential for exercising intercultural competence as well (Hammer, Bennet & Wiseman, 2003).

Bennett and Bennet (2004) proposed the developmental model of Intercultural sensitivity (DMIS). It consists of 6 stages namely denial, defence, minimization, acceptance, adaptation and integration. These stages show increasing sensitivity to cultural differences. The first three stages are ethnocentric (denial, defence, and minimisation) where one's culture is 'experienced as being central to reality', and last three stages are ethnorelative (acceptance, adaptation, integration), where one's culture is experienced in the context of other cultures (Hammer, Bennet & Wiseman, 2003). As the sensitivity to cultural differences increases there is reduction in the resistance to cross-cultural difference (Bennett & Bennett, 2004). This is illustrated in the model as a progression from the ethnocentric ways of avoiding cultural differences, either by denying its existence (Denial), by raising one's defense against it (Defense), or by minimizing its importance (Minimisation) to the ethnorelative ways of seeking cultural difference, either by accepting its importance (Acceptance), by adapting a perspective to take it into account (Adaptation), or by integrating the whole concept into a definition of identity (Integration). The competence in intercultural relations increases as one's experience of cultural difference becomes

more sophisticated (Bennett, 2004). Multicultural experience like interacting with diverse groups, living in culturally diverse neighbourhood and travelling abroad has significant role in developing Intercultural sensitivity.

The current research takes adapts the measure of Intercultural sensitivity validated by Fritz, Mollenberg, & Chen (2002) consisting of five dimensions – Interaction Engagement, Respect for Cultural differences, Interaction confidence, Interaction Enjoyment and Interaction Attentiveness.

Emotional Intelligence

Although the roots of Emotional Intelligence (EI) are claimed to go back to Darwin (Bar-On, Handley & Fund, 2006) it was only in 1990 that the term was scientifically explained by Salovey and Mayer. Goleman through his book "Emotional Intelligence" (1995) made the term popular. Goleman in 1998 wrote that the rules of the work were changing. He noted that the new yardstick for judging people was not based how smart they were or by training and expertise but also by how they handle themselves and each other. The prevailing notion today is that traditional intelligence IQ is not enough to be an effective leader (Eicher, 2003, Ryback 1998, Goleman, 1995). EI involves recognizing and managing one's emotions successfully and recognizing and responding to others emotions (Bar-On 1997, Goleman 1995, 1998).

A growing body of empirical research in the last two decades suggests that Emotional Quotient (or measure of emotional intelligence, henceforth referred to as EQ) plays a significant role in enhancing interpersonal competencies. Emotions are inevitably involved during interaction between different groups (Hemphill and Haines 1997). Positive emotion in an individual is associated with agreeableness and sociability (Argyle and Lu, 1990) while persistent negative affect keeps others at bay (Furr and Funder 1998). EI facilitates the management of emotions in self, leading to empathy and therefore, better interpersonal relationships (Boyatzis & Sala, 2004; Kunnanatt, 2004; Lopes, Cote & Salovey, 2006). This suggests that emotionally intelligent people tend to be more prosocial than their counterparts with lesser EQ (Lopes, Cote & Salovey, 2006).

According to Chermiss (2001) EI is the foundation for cultural competence. Intercultural sensitivity is the emotional capability of an individual to be sensitive towards others from a different national culture (Graf 2004). The affective component of intercultural competencies includes three emotion-based skills; dissimilarity openness, tolerance for ambiguity and cultural empathy (Lloyd and Hartel, 2010). Greater awareness of one's own emotions and that of others' may lead to greater openness to individuals who are different or culturally diverse (Eliott 1991). Côté, Lopes, Salovey and Miners (2010) found positive correlation between EI and openness to experience, a trait that partly reflects the willingness to engage in unusual thoughts and activities. Capabilities, such as communication, social-based problem solving and decision making, stress management and quality of social relationships are enhanced by the presence of EI (Caruso & Salovey, 2004; Freedman, 2007; Goleman et al., 2002; Lopes, Cote & Salovey, 2006). EI has an impact on the development of collective goals, generating enthusiasm, confidence, co-operation,

encouraging flexibility in decision making and change (George, 2000). Jada et al (2014) and Gardenswartz, L (2010) stressed the importance of EI in managing diversity, of effectively interacting with people from other cultures. Lack of EI leads to discrimination and harassment practices (Hemphill and Haines 1997).

Self-esteem

Self-esteem reflects a person's subjective evaluation of his own worth. The concept has its origin in the work of William James (1892). Rosenberg (1981) defined Self-esteem as a feeling of self-worth and developed the popular scale to measure it. Bandura known for socio cognitive theory (1986) and self-efficacy theory (1995) argued that self-evaluation plays a key role in motivation. Positive self-evaluation can drive individuals to do well at work and other places. Self-esteem has two dimensions: self-efficacy and self-worth (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1983). The self-efficacy dimension is the perception of one's own social competence. The self-worth dimension refers to the degree to which individuals feel they are a person of value.

According to sociometer theory when people behave in ways that increases the likelihood they will be rejected, they experience a reduction in their self-esteem making self-esteem a possible monitor, or sociometer of social acceptance - rejection (Snyder & Lopez, 2009). People high on Self-esteem are not anxious about how others would perceive them. On the other hand those with low self-esteem want to be socially accepted hence public impression is important for them. Individuals with low self-esteem contribute less to a relationship and tend to be defensive, while individuals with high self-esteem tend to contribute more to the interpersonal relationships (Kernis, Paradise, Whitaker, Wheatman, & Goldman, 2000). When individuals have high self-esteem they feel confident of themselves, feel accepted by others, regardless of success or failure; whereas, when individuals have a low self-esteem, their feeling of belonging is conditional based upon their success or failure (Baldwin, Baccus, & Fitzsimons, 2004). Furthermore, individuals with a low self-esteem appear to be more sensitive to rejection and sometimes perceive rejection where it does not exist (Koch, 2002). High self-esteem persons are able to deal more with feelings of alienation, frustration and stress caused by the ambiguity in intercultural communication. This motivates individual to develop positive emotion to respect differences in intercultural encounters (Chen & Starosta, 2000). Thus, positive self-evaluation tends to motivate individuals to do well in dealing with others, including those who have different cultural backgrounds. Recent studies by Dong, Randall, Christime and Callaco (2008) also support these findings. They found that high Self-esteem can lead to effective and satisfied intercultural relations and that individuals with high Self-esteem participate more in intercultural situations.

The above review of literature clearly indicates the possibility of a strong correlation between intercultural sensitivity, emotional intelligence and self-esteem. Since there are no studies linking these three constructs in the Indian context, the current study explores these inter-relations.

In addition, the author's, who are faculty in a management school, found form personal experience that many their students interact regularly with people from

several diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds, in their businesses/professions. Considering the above situation, the faculty are looking at introducing Emotional Intelligence training as an integral part of the management curriculum. And this paper is an attempt to investigate the need for and possible effectiveness of such a transformation of the curriculum.

This study therefore formulated and researched the following hypotheses:

H1: There is a significant inter-correlation between emotional intelligence, self-esteem and intercultural sensitivity.
H2: Demographic variables of age, gender and number of days of international travel are significantly correlated with EQ, IS and SE.
H3: Emotional Intelligence significantly predicts Intercultural sensitivity.
H4: Self-Esteem significantly predicts Emotional Intelligence.

3. Method

The sample consisted of 143 undergraduate and post graduate college students from Delhi NCR region of India .The age range of the participants was from 18 -27. The sample included male and female participants. A self-administered questionnaire was distributed to participants either in print format or in the form of an online Google form that they could complete at their leisure. The questionnaire had 3 sections with scales to measure EQ, Self-esteem, and Intercultural sensitivity. Participants were given a brief about the purpose of the research, and participation was completely voluntary. They were assured of confidentiality of data for which no names were taken even in the questionnaires. The survey took 30-45 minutes to complete.

Table 3.1

Programme	Male	Female	Age Range in years
UG, N = 63	37	26	18 to 24
PG, N = 80	46	34	21 to 27

Measurement
Standardised measurement scales were used to measure the three variables in the study.

Intercultural sensitivity - Intercultural Sensitivity Scale adapted from Chen and Starosta's (2005) was used. It contains 24 items in the Likert scale format intended to measure individuals' feelings about interacting with people who have different cultural backgrounds. The scale consists of five sub-scales: interaction engagement, respect for cultural differences, interaction confidence, interaction enjoyment, and interaction attentiveness. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale is 0.85 for the current sample.

Self-Esteem -The Rosenberg self-esteem scale (RSES) developed by sociologist Dr. Morris Rosenberg (1981), was used to measure self-esteem of the participants. It is a

brief and uni-dimensional measure consisting of 10 items measured on a Likert scale measuring global self-worth. It uses a scale of 0-30 where a score less than 15 indicates a problematic low self-esteem. The items are answered on a four-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Five of the items have positively worded statements and five have negatively worded ones. The scale asks the respondents to reflect on their current feelings. The scale generally has high reliability: test-retest correlations are typically in the range of 0.82 to 0.88, and Cronbach's alpha for various samples are in the range of 0.77 to 0.88. The Cronbach's alpha for the current sample was 0.74.

Emotional Intelligence – EQ self-score Questionaire by Lloyd (2010) was used to evaluate various aspects of Emotional intelligence. It consists of 40 questions on Likert type 5 point scale measuring Self-awareness, self-management, social skills and social awareness. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale with the current sample was 0.9.

4. Results

The collated data was cleaned for any outliers and checked for normality before conducting the other statistical analyses. Microsoft Excel was used for data entry and SPSS was used for all analyses. This section gives an overview of the results under each category.

Comparing means

The first analysis conducted was to compare the means of the variables by grouping the data set on different parameters. As seen in Table 4.1, there was no significant difference between the means of Post Graduate (PG) and Undergraduate (UG) students' responses on any of the three variables being studied here in this research.

Table 4.1t-test – comparing the UG and PG means of the three variables

Sample / Dimension	UG, N=63		PG, N=80		*t*-value	*p* value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Self-Esteem	30.57	6.00	30.37	4.36	0.229	0.819
Emotional Intelligence Quotient	144.46	23.22	146.59	13.64	-0.658	0.495
Intercultural Sensitivity	19.26	2.73	19.14	2.41	0.277	0.782

Table 4.2 shows the gendered comparison. We can deduce from the results that while there was no significant difference between the means of responses of men and women on Self-Esteem and Emotional Intelligence, women are found to be significantly higher on Intercultural Sensitivity than men in the current data set.

Table 4.2t-test – Comparison of the means of Men and Women on the three variables

Sample / Dimension	Men, N=83		Women, N=60		*t*-value	*p* value
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Self-Esteem	30.33	5.18	30.64	5.10	-0.350	0.727
Emotional Intelligence Quotient	144.34	21.56	147.47	13.81	-1.00	0.319

Intercultural Sensitivity	18.61	2.60	20.00	2.27	-3.323*	0.001

*t value is significant at 0.01 level

Correlation Results

The inter-correlations among the demographic data and the 3 research variables (given in Table 4.3) bring out interesting findings. Corroborating the *t-test* results on gender, Intercultural sensitivity is found to be correlated with Gender. The number of days of international travel is also seen to be significantly correlated with Intercultural Sensitivity. As expected, the more a person is exposed to other cultures the higher their intercultural sensitivity is likely to be.

Therefore Hypothesis H2, "Demographic variables of age, gender and number of days of international travel are significantly correlated with EQ, IS and SE" is partially rejected since age is not significantly correlated with any of the variables, gender is not significantly correlated with emotional intelligence and self-esteem, and number of days of international travel is not significantly correlated with either emotional intelligence or self-esteem.

Self-esteem is found to be significantly correlated with Emotional Intelligence, clearly indicating that when a person is high on emotional quotient their self-esteem will tend to be high. Emotional intelligence is also found to be significantly correlated with Intercultural Sensitivity as per this data, clearly supporting the rationale of this paper and building the case for introducing EI in management curriculum, to help students build their EQ to be well equipped leaders and managers for the *glocal* business world of tomorrow.

These above mentioned correlation coefficient values are also seen to have moderate effect size (Cohen, 1988) if we look at effect size instead of significance through *p* value.

Therefore, hypothesis H1 "There is a significant inter-correlation between emotional intelligence, self-esteem and intercultural sensitivity" is also partially rejected since self-esteem is not significantly correlated with intercultural sensitivity.

Table 4.3 Pearson Correlation between demographic data and all three variables

	N=143	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Age	Correlation	1	0.154	-0.025	0.057	0.037	0.058
2. Gender	Correlation		1	0.102	0.029	0.084	0.270*
3. International Travel days	Correlation			1	0.156	0.149	0.310*
4. Self –Esteem	Correlation				1	0.369*	0.022
5. Emotional Intelligence	Correlation					1	0.326*
6. Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation						1
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed).							
Effect size (Cohen, 1988): r= 0.1(small); 0.3 (moderate); .05 (large)							

Emotional Intelligence as a predictor of Intercultural Sensitivity – Regression results

In order to explore the predictive power of Emotional Intelligence for Intercultural Sensitivity, linear regression was carried out. Kline (2011) recommends hierarchical linear regression method, where the researcher controls the sequence in which predictors are fed in the regression equation based on theoretical or empirical rationale. In this method when demographic variables are first entered, followed by a psychological variable of interest, the order controls for the demographic variables and simultaneously permits evaluation of the predictive power of the psychological variable over and above that of the demographic variables (Kline, 2011). Further, Kline (2011) discourages the use of stepwise, forward and backward methods, since they are all directed by the computer and not by the researcher. Hence, the hierarchical linear regression method was followed in the current study.

Table 4.4 shows the stepwise summary of results of the hierarchical linear regression to predict Intercultural Sensitivity where the demographic variables of age, gender and number of International Travel days were entered into the equation first followed by psychological variables Self-esteem and Emotional Intelligence. Results indicate that age does not predict IS significantly and effect size also as per Cohen's f^2 value of 0.003 is very very small. Cohen's f^2 effect sizes of 0.02, 0.15 and 0.35 are termed small, medium and large respectively (Cohen, 1988). Gender is found to predict IS significantly with a medium effect size ($\Delta R2 = 0.079$; $F_{change} = 12.12$ (p < 0.01); Cohen's $f^2 = 0.091$). 7.9% increase in the variation in IS is explained by the addition of gender in the regression equation. Number of days of international travel also predicts IS significantly with a moderate effect size ($\Delta R^2 = 0.081$; $F_{change} = 13.54$ (p <0 .01); Cohen's $f^2 = 0.196$). 8.1 % increase in the variation in IS is explained by the addition of number of international days in the regression equation. Self-esteem does not predict IS directly ($\Delta R^2 = 0.003$; $F_{change} = 0.488$ (p >0 .10); Cohen's $f^2 = 0.200$). Emotional Intelligence Quotient is found to significantly predict IS with a large effect ($\Delta R^2 = 0.125$; $F_{change} = 24.14$ (p <0 .01); Cohen's $f^2 = 0.412$). A whopping 12.5 % increase in the variation in IS is explained by the addition of Emotional Intelligence quotient in the regression equation.

We can therefore say that Gender, International Exposure and Emotional Quotient are all significant predictors of Intercultural Sensitivity, and hypothesis H3 "Emotional Intelligence significantly predicts Intercultural sensitivity" is not rejected.

Table 4.4 Linear hierarchical regression model of the demographic variables, Self-Esteem and Emotional Intelligence as predictors of Intercultural Sensitivity Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	*p*
	b	SE b	*B*	
Step 1				
(Constant)	17.56	2.41		0.000
Age	0.077	0.112	0.058	0.494

R² = 0.003; (Cohen's f²=0.003)

Step 2				
(Constant)	14.21	2.512		0.000
Age	0.14	0.109	0.102	0.217
Gender	1.47	0.422	0.258	0.001

R² = 0.083; Δ R² = 0.079; F_{change} = 12.12 (p<0 .01); (Cohen's f²=0.091)

Step 3				
(Constant)	14.06	2.406		0.000
Age	0.139	0.105	0.104	0.186
Gender	1.321	0.406	0.256	0.001
Intl Travel Days	0.006	0.002	0.287	0.000

R² = 0.164; Δ R² = 0.081; F_{change} = 13.54 (p <0 .01); (Cohen's f²=0.196)

Step 4				
(Constant)	13.34	2.624		0.000
Age	0.135	0.105	0.101	0.202
Gender	1.305	0.408	0.253	0.002
Intl Travel Days	0.007	0.002	.0.296	0.000
Self-Esteem	0.027	0.039	0.055	0.486

R² = 0.167; Δ R² = 0.003; F_{change} = 0.488 (p >0 .10); (Cohen's f²=0.200)

Step 5				
(Constant)	8.15	2.648		0.000
Age	0.121	0.097	0.090	0.218
Gender	1.13	0.379	0.219	0.003
Intl Travel Days	0.008	0.002	0.335	0.000
Self-Esteem	0.039	0.039	0.079	0.314
EQ	0.053	0.011	0.384	0.000

R² = 0.292; Δ R² = 0.125; F_{change} = 24.14 (p <0 .01); (Cohen's f²=0.412)

Table 4.5 Linear hierarchical regression model of the demographic variables, Self-Esteem as predictors of Emotional Intelligence

Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	p
	b	SE b	B	
Step 1				
(Constant)	137.98	17.46		0.000
Age	0.359	0.813	0.037	0.660

R² = 0.001; (Cohen's f²=0.001)

Step 2				
(Constant)	130.21	18.866		0.000
Age	0.495	0.822	0.051	0.548
Gender	3.419	3.170	0.092	0.283

R² = 0.010; Δ R² = 0.008; F_{change} = 1.164 (p > 0 .01); (Cohen's f²=0.01)

Step 3				
(Constant)	130.79	18.695		0.000
Age	0.480	0.815	0.050	0.557

Gender	4.014	3.156	0.108	0.206
Intl Travel Days	0.026	0.014	0.159	0.060
$R^2 = 0.035$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.025$; $F_{change} = 3.601$ (p > 0 .01); (Cohen's f^2=0.0363)				
Step 4				
(Constant)	97.664	19.131		0.000
Age	0.272	0.767	0.028	0.724
Gender	3.296	2.972	0.088	0.269
Intl Travel Days	0.017	0.013	0.103	0.198
Self-Esteem	1.254	0.286	0.349	0.000
$R^2 = 0.153$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.118$; $F_{change} = 19.239$ (p < 0.001); (Cohen's f^2=0.181)				

Table 4.5 shows the stepwise summary of results of the hierarchical linear regression to predict Emotional Intelligence where the demographic variables of age, gender and number of International Travel days were entered into the equation first followed by the psychological variable Self-esteem. Results indicate that the demographic variables of age and gender do not predict EQ significantly and effect sizes as per Cohen's f^2 value are 0.001 and 0.01 respectively are very small. Cohen's f^2effect sizes of 0.02, 0.15 and 0.35 are termed small, medium and large respectively (Cohen, 1988). Number of days of international travel also does not significantly predict IS, however the effect size as per Cohen's f^2 value of 0.036 is found to be small ($R^2 = 0.035$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.025$; $F_{change} = 3.601$ (p > 0 .01); Cohen's f^2=0.0363). 3.5% increase in the variation in EQ is explained by the addition of international travel in the regression equation. Self-esteem significantly predicts EQ with a moderate effect size ($R^2 = 0.153$; $\Delta R^2 = 0.118$; $F_{change} = 19.239$ (p < 0.001); (Cohen's f^2=0.181). 15.3 % increase in the variation in EQ is explained by the addition of self-esteem in the regression equation.

We can therefore say that Self Esteem is a significant predictor of Intercultural Sensitivity, and hypothesis H4 "Self-Esteem significantly predicts Emotional Intelligence" is not rejected.

5. Discussion

Results shared in the previous sections clearly indicate that higher levels of emotional quotient leads to increased sensitivity to cultural differences, more specifically EQ is responsible for a 29.9% variance in IS. Therefore, we can deduce that integrating practical aspects of emotional intelligence into the management curriculum can help students develop higher levels of intercultural sensitivity. Components of EQ like Social awareness and relationship management can lead to better acceptance and adaptation. This is corroborated by a recent study of 191 British expatriates working in architectural, engineering and construction assignments across 29 different counties which revealed that EI accounted for 60% of the overall variance in cross cultural adjustment (Konanahalli & Oyedele, 2016).

The current data also indicates that women are higher on EQ as well as IS, an interesting finding supported by Beck and Libert (2017) in their article on the likelihood of artificial intelligence replacing many of the workplace roles that men dominate today. In their own words, "The parts of those jobs that will have staying

power are those that rely more heavily on emotional intelligence — skills in which women typically excel" (pp1). This further emphasizes the need for men and women to hone their EQ for future workplaces.

Results of the current study also clearly indicate the strong correlation between number of days of international travel and IS.

The study shows a correlation between self-esteem and emotional intelligence quotient. Participants with high self-esteem also displayed high EQ. Further, self-esteem accounts for 15.3% variance in EQ. Individuals with high self-esteem are more likely to be aware of their own and others emotions, and willing to work on self-management as well as other management, all components of EQ. Each of these further help in increasing IS. Dong, Randall, Christime and Callaco (2008) found a direct link between Self-esteem and intercultural relations though in the current study there was neither a significant correlation nor a regression result that corroborates this. However, the fact that self-esteem is significantly related to EQ, which further predicts IS, clearly build the case for building in all these aspects into education, better preparing the youth for a diverse tomorrow.

6. Conclusion & Implications

The above results have implications both for academia as well as Corporates. Corporates can focus on elements of Emotional intelligence in their diversity training programs and leadership development programmes. They could even begin right at the start and incorporate it in induction programme itself, ensuring an early implementation and practice by everyone in the organization.

The results show a relation between international exposure and IS. Academic institutions could encourage students to participate in study abroad experiences that provide them with cultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity and skills. Further the case for including EI in the management curriculum is also strongly supported by the results of the current study. Academia, however, must ensure that EI integration is done in a manner that creates conditions and opportunities for students to develop their EQ in subtle ways rather than making it a separate subject. Incorporating EI in role plays and discussing EI of leaders / managers on case studies may be effective.
This study is the first to explore the relationship between EI, SE and IS in the Indian context among graduate and undergraduate students.

7. Limitations

No study is free of limitations, despite due diligence and efforts to reduce them. The current study relied on measures that were self-reports only. Incorporating observed behaviour criterion, or peer and other reports, would help validate these findings.
A second limitation was the nature of the sample—college students located in the Delhi NCR. As such, generalization is limited. Future researchers may want to explore IS studies in other parts of Indian as well as other countries and expand their

studies to examine the relationships between the variables and impact that emotional intelligence and other self-constructs may have on IS.

References

Argyle, M. and Lu, L., 1990. The happiness of extraverts. *Personality and individual differences*, *11*(10), pp.1011-1017.

Baldwin, M.W., Baccus, J.R. and Fitzsimons, G.M., 2004. Self-esteem and the dual processing of interpersonal contingencies. *Self and Identity*, *3*(2), pp.81-93.

Bandura, A. ed., 1995. *Self-efficacy in changing societies*. Cambridge university press.

Bandura, A., 1986. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, US: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Bar-On, R., Handley, R. and Fund, S., 2006. The impact of emotional intelligence on performance. *Linking emotional intelligence and performance at work: Current research evidence with individuals and groups*, pp.3-19.

Barsade, S.G., Ward, A.J., Turner, JD and Sonnenfeld, JA. 2000. *To Your Heart's Content: A Model of Affective Diversity in Top Management Teams*, pp.802-836.

Baumeister, R.F., Campbell, J.D., Krueger, J.I. and Vohs, K.D., 2003. Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles?. *Psychological science in the public interest*, *4*(1), pp.1-44.

Beck, M. & Libert, B. 2017. Big Idea: Artificial Intelligence and Business Strategy. *MIT Sloan Management Review*. (accessed on April 7, 2018).

Bennett, J.M. and Bennett, M.J., 2004. An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. *Handbook of intercultural training*, pp.147-165.

Berry, J.W., 1992. Acculturation and adaptation in a new society. *International migration*, *30*(s1), pp.69-85.

Bhawuk, D.P. and Brislin, R., 1992. The measurement of intercultural sensitivity. *Education for the intercultural experience. Intercultural Press, Yarmouth, ME*.

Boyatzis, R.E. and Sala, F., 2004. The Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI) Geher, G. (ed.), *Measuring Emotional Intelligence*, Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

Caruso, D.R. and Salovey, P., 2004. *The emotionally intelligent manager: How to develop and use the four key emotional skills of leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.

Chen, G.M. and Starosta, W.J., 2003. Asian approaches to human communication: A dialogue.

Chen, G.M. and Starosta, W.J., 1996. Intercultural communication competence: A synthesis. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *19*(1), pp.353-383.

Cherniss, C., 2002. 2001 DIVISION 27 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: Emotional Intelligence and the Good Community. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *30*(1), pp.1-11.

Chung, L.C. and Ting-Toomey, S., 1999. Ethnic identity and relational expectations among Asian Americans. *Communication Research Reports*, *16*(2), pp.157-166.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for behavioural sciences,(2nd Ed.)*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Conrad, J.E., 2006. *The relationship between emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Florida).

Côté, S., Lopes, P.N., Salovey, P. and Miners, C.T., 2010. Emotional intelligence and leadership emergence in small groups. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(3), pp.496-508.

Dong, Q, Randall J., Christine , K. and Collaço, M. 2008. Social Intelligence, Self-esteem and Intercultural Communication Sensitivity, *Intercultural Communication Studies, 2,* pp-162-172

Eicher, D., 2003. Essential executive skills for the future: Emotional intelligence.

Freedman, J. (2007), At the Heart of Leadership: How to Get Results with Emotional Intelligence, Sixseconds Emotional Intelligence Press.

Fritz, W., Mollenberg, A., & Chen, G. M. (2002). Measuring Intercultural Sensitivity in Different Cultural Contexts. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 11(2),* 165-176.

Furr, R.M. and Funder, D.C., 1998. A multimodal analysis of personal negativity. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *74*(6), p.1580.

Gardenswartz, L., Cherbosque, J. and Rowe, A., 2010. Emotional intelligence and diversity: A model for differences in the workplace. *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, *1*(1), pp.74-84.

George, J.M., 2000. Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. *Human relations*, *53*(8), pp.1027-1055.

Gecas, V. and Schwalbe, M.L., 1983. Beyond the looking-glass self: Social structure and efficacy-based self-esteem. *Social psychology quarterly*, pp.77-88.

Goleman, D. 1995. *Emotional intelligence*. New York, NY, England: Bantam Books, Inc.

Goleman, D. 1998. *Working with emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R.E. and McKee, A., 2002. *The new leaders: Transforming the art of leadership into the science of results* (p. 14). London: Little, Brown.

Graf, A., 2004. Assessing intercultural training designs. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *28*(2/3/4), pp.199-214.

Hammer, M.R., Bennett, M.J. and Wiseman, R., 2003. Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International journal of intercultural relations*, *27*(4), pp.421-443.

Hemphill, H. and Haines, R., 1997. *Discrimination, harassment, and the failure of diversity training: What to do now*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Jada, U., Jena, L.K. and Pattnaik, R., 2014. Emotional Intelligence, Diversity, and Organizational Performance: Linkages and Theoretical Approaches for an Emerging Field. *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, *3*(1-2), pp.46-57.

James, W., 1892. The stream of consciousness. *Psychology*.

Kernis, M.H., Paradise, A.W., Whitaker, D.J., Wheatman, S.R. and Goldman, B.N., 2000. Master of one's psychological domain? Not likely if one's self-esteem is unstable. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*(10), pp.1297-1305.

Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modelling. 3rd Edition*. Guilford Press: New York.

Koch, E.J., 2002. Relational schemas, self-esteem, and the processing of social stimuli. *Self and Identity*, *1*(3), pp.271-279.

Konanahalli, A. & Oyedele, L.O. 2016. Emotional intelligence and British expatriates' cross-cultural adjustment in international construction projects. *Construction Management and Economics, 34(11)*, 751-768, DOI: 10.1080/01446193.2016.1213399

Kunnanatt, J.T., 2004. Emotional intelligence: The new science of interpersonal effectiveness. *human resource development quarterly*, *15*(4), pp.489-495.

Lloyd, S. and Härtel, C., 2010. Intercultural competencies for culturally diverse work teams. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *25*(8), pp.845-875.

Lockwood, N.R., SPHR, G. and Expert, H.C., 2005. Workplace diversity. *Society of Human Resource Management (http://www. shrm. org/research/quarterly)*.

Lopes, P.N., Cote, S. and Salovey, P., 2006. An ability model of emotional intelligence: Implications for assessment and training. *Linking emotional intelligence and performance at work: Current research evidence with individuals and groups*, pp.53-80.

Müller, S. and Gelbrich, K., 2001. Interkulturelle Kompetenz als neuartige Anforderung an Entsandte: Status quo und Perspektiven der Forschung. *Schmalenbachs Zeitschrift für betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung*, *53*(3), pp.246-272.

Rosenberg, M., 1981. The self-concept: Social product and social force. *Social psychology: Sociological perspectives*, pp.593-624.

Ryback, D. 1998. Putting Emotional Intelligence to Work: Successful Leadership Is More Than IQ, Butterworth-Heinemann, Woburn.

Salovey, P. and Mayer, J.D., 1990. Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, cognition and personality*, *9*(3), pp.185-211.

Snyder, C.R. and Lopez, S.J. eds., 2009. *Oxford handbook of positive psychology*. Oxford University Press, USA.

Spitzberg, B.H., 2000. A model of intercultural communication competence. *Intercultural communication: A reader*, *9*, pp.375-387.

Szkudlarek, B., 2009. Through Western eyes: Insights into the intercultural training field. *Organization Studies*, *30*(9), pp.975-986.