

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH MARKETING ETHICS: AN EXPLORATORY STUDY ACROSS THREE COUNTRIES

Eric C. Lind, Quinnipiac University
Nathan J. Smith, Quinnipiac University

This study explores whether a relationship exists between Emotional Intelligence and Marketing Ethics, based on data collected from 461 respondents in three countries; the United States (160), France (106), and Germany (195). This study found significant and positive relationships between three of the four components of Emotional Intelligence with respect to Marketing Ethics in the composite data set. Additionally, the study found that socially directed components of Emotional Intelligence accounted for a more substantial relationship with Marketing Ethics than did personally directed components. Further detail on the distinctions between countries is also provided.

Introduction

The discipline of Marketing comes under tremendous scrutiny with respect to ethical business practices (Vitell *et al.*, 1993). Sound judgment is critical to ethical decision making, and with respect to marketing, should ideally be deemed ethical by both the marketer and the affected stakeholders (Bartels, 1967). A complete set of rules governing marketing ethics would be difficult, if not impossible, to create, because an infinite number of scenarios, exceptions, and conflicts, would arise. (Hunt & Vitell, 1986, 2006; Vitell *et al.*, 1993). Hunt & Vitell (1986) point out that much of the difficulty in measuring the effectiveness of ethical alternatives is determining whether desirable outcomes will be created by the decision, and question for whom are these outcomes desirable and by how much.

According to Hunt & Vitell (1986), the process for making an ethical judgment in marketing goes through four steps: first, perception that ethical content exists, second, cognitive evaluation of possible alternatives, third, deontological (rules based) evaluation of the rightness or wrongness of available alternatives, and lastly, teleological (outcome based) evaluation and identification of stakeholders, their perceived weights, and the possible consequences on stakeholders (p. 7 & 9). The importance of stakeholders is made clearer by Bartels (1967) where he states that business is both an economic process and a process of social interactions (p. 21).

The emotional intelligence construct similarly has awareness, management, social, and personal components. Salovey and Mayer (1990) stated emotional intelligence is a set of skills which contribute to the accurate appraisal of emotion in oneself and others, effective regulation and expression of one's own emotions, and constructive use of those feelings (p. 185). It is precisely this similarity between the function of ethical marketing and the emotional intelligence construct which leads us to examine whether significant relationships exist between the two.

Hunt & Vitell (1986) defined a process for making ethical judgments; requiring examination of one's own moral philosophy and examination of ethical alternatives' potential effects. If, as Vitell *et al.* (1993) point out, rules regarding ethical choices in marketing are incomplete, then precisely what mechanisms are used to arrive at ethical judgments? This study attempts to determine whether Emotional Intelligence is one tool utilized in the process of making ethical marketing judgments.

We selected business students as our representative sample to test this relationship for three reasons. First, marketing decisions are commonly made in business settings, and business students are more likely to enter career paths where ethical choices in marketing are necessary. Second, business students are new in their understanding of various ethical standards surrounding marketing ethics, and thus more likely to rely on emotion rather than experience. Thirdly, if relationship exists between emotional intelligence and marketing ethics, an examination of educative elements of emotional intellect with respect to marketing ethics is warranted in future research. We begin with an examination of the literature.

Emotional Intelligence

Emotional Intelligence (EI) has been defined in various ways throughout the literature. Salovey & Mayer (1990) cite Thorndike (1920) who introduced the idea of social intelligence and described it as an ability to “act wisely in human relations” (p. 187). Thorndike revised this definition of social intelligence in 1937 to “the ability to understand and manage people” (p. 187). Salovey & Mayer (1990) point out that much of the early emotional intelligence literature focused on the manipulation of others; often ignoring more benign elements of human relations, thus illustrating lack of consideration for one’s own emotions in development of a viable emotional intelligence construct (p. 187).

Salovey and Mayer (1990) defined emotional intelligence as a, “set of skills hypothesized to contribute to the accurate appraisal and expression of emotion in oneself and in others, the effective regulation of emotion in self and others, and the use of feelings to motivate, plan, and achieve in one’s life” (p. 185). Wong and Law (2002) later defined Emotional Intelligence as, “a set of interrelated abilities possessed by individuals to deal with emotions” (p. 244). Goleman (2001) identified four major EI factors; self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management (p. 2).

There is a common underlying theme among all the definitions since 1990. According to Wong & Law (2002), within the emotional intelligence construct exists an *awareness* dimension with respect to *self* and *others*, a *management* dimension, and a *use* dimension (p. 247). Salovey and Mayer (1990) distinguished emotional intelligence into these four operative areas that Wong and Law (2002) later renamed Self Emotional Awareness [SEA], Other’s Emotional Awareness [OEA], Regulation of Emotion [ROE], and Use of Emotion [UOE]:

- “[SEA] relates to an individual’s ability to understand their deep emotions and to express these emotions naturally.
- [OEA] relates to an individual’s ability to perceive and understand the emotions of people around them.
- [ROE] relates to an individual’s ability to regulate their emotions.
- [UOE] relates to an individual’s ability to make use of their emotions by directing them to constructive activities and personal performance” (Wong & Law, 2002, p. 246).

Marketing Ethics

Hunt and Vitell (1986) defined marketing ethics as, “an inquiry into the nature and grounds of moral judgments, standards, and rules of conduct relating to marketing decisions and marketing situations” (p. 6). They identified two methods of approaching marketing ethics: normative and positive (p. 7). Normative approaches attempt to provide specific rules to govern ethical decisions, while positive approaches deal with the process of examining both the potential value of a specific action (deontological) as well as the potential consequences of a specific alternative (teleological) (p. 6). Hunt and Vitell (1986) also argued that, “positive research should precede normative writings” (p. 15).

According to Hunt & Vitell (1986) positive ethics is, “descriptive rather than prescriptive”; e.g. positive ethics does not prescribe a specific ethical code, but helps describe the process of ethical decision making (p. 7). Since a complete system of ethical rules for marketing would have an infinite number of conflicts and exceptions, understanding how one might arrive at an ethical decision becomes essential (p. 15). They concluded that the process of arriving at an ethical decision is dependent both on deontological and teleological evaluations (p. 15).

To highlight the nature of ethical judgments in marketing ethics, Singhapakdi *et al.* (1999) cited Schlenker and Forsyth (1977), identifying two dimensions in moral philosophy: relativism and idealism. Relativism is the degree to which an individual rejects moral absolutes in ethical decision making. Idealism, by contrast, describes an individual’s concern for the welfare of others. Singhapakdi *et al.* (1999) further caution, “idealism is not based on an embrace of moral absolutes; rather, it involves values related to altruism and a sense of optimism in considering responses to moral issues” (p. 22).

It is the degree of relativism and idealism where ethical dilemmas are perhaps most pronounced. As Hunt and Vitell (1986) pointed out, “if a behavior is ethical it should produce more good than evil beyond any of the other alternatives, but precisely whose good, and how is this measured?” (p. 7). That is to say, if one considers the value of an ethical decision (relativism) and then considers the impact of available alternatives on stakeholders (idealism),

a whole host of ethical dilemmas may arise. Hunt & Vitell (1986) and Singhapakdi *et al.* (1999) both pointed out the conundrum of measuring the goodness of potential outcomes on stakeholders (teleological and idealistic), while simultaneously considering of one's own sense of personal and moral standards (deontological and relativistic) in managing an ethical consideration, and determined that ethical judgments rely on both.

Vitell *et al.* (1993) developed a scale to measure levels of marketing ethics from both a deontological and teleological standpoint. Using exploratory factor analysis, they arrived at five distinct dimensions of marketing ethical norms where ethical considerations are common: Price and Distribution [PD], Information and Contract [IC], Product and Promotion [PP], Obligation and Disclosure [OD], and General Honesty and Integrity [GHI].

- “[PD] items relate to ethical judgments about the methods marketers use to establish prices including product availability and full-price disclosures.
- [IC] items deal with the honest disclosure of marketing information and establishment of contracts.
- [PP] items relate to product safety and the use of misleading or high powered manipulations in sales.
- [OD] items relate to the ethical obligation to disclose pertinent marketing information.
- [GHI] items measure both an individual's general honesty and sense of fairness” (p. 334).

Tying Emotional Intelligence To Marketing Ethics

As early as 1959, the literature considered a potential relationship between marketing, ethics, and emotion. Borton (1959) cited a growing use of behavioral sciences as a tool to examine marketing theory and morality, stating, “These sciences are bringing increased realization that neither consumers nor businessmen are ‘economic men’... instead are seekers of safety, physical well-being, approval and affection, driven by emotions, possessed of mechanisms by which they perceive, learn, and form habits” (p. 49). If we accept this argument, then ethical decisions must be based both on personal value judgments and consideration for others; which is an emotional process by nature, and particularly if one's moral philosophy conflicts with the will or needs of various stakeholders.

With specific respect to ethical decisions, there is a degree of emotional labor involved. As defined by Wong & Law (2002), emotional labor, “refers to the extent to which [one] is required to present an appropriate emotion in order to perform” (p. 249). The extent of emotional labor required in a marketing ethics dilemma varies, but becomes increasingly evident at higher levels of ethical problem solving. For example, Hunt & Vitell (1986) cite the responsibilities marketing researchers have to their respondents and subjects, as well as a need for some standard or code that top management can use to guide their employees to behave more ethically.

Interestingly, Connelly *et al.* (2004) found that emotions accounted for a significant amount of the variance on interpersonal outcomes on ethical choices, while there was no significant variance on organizational outcomes (p. 249). This is further illustrated by Vitell *et al.* (1993) who concluded that the ethical climate has seemingly little impact on one's acceptance of marketing norms, but rather individual considerations are key. (p. 336).

Verbos *et al.* (2007) later examined the nature of positive ethical organizations and actual ethical business practices which exceed business norms. They explained that individuals self-select organizations which reflect their own values; and concluded that external propagation of organizational ethical identity attracts like-minded individuals to that organization (p. 26 & 27). It is perhaps here where the conflict between ethical codes of conduct and personal moral philosophy are at least partially resolved; precisely because if one's own values are reflected in an organization, it appears less likely that ethical conflict would arise between that individual and the organization they participate in.

From the perspective of emotional intelligence, Wong and Law (2002) identified four emotional actions one can pursue to regulate the level of one's emotions: “*Situation Selection*, in which one approaches or avoids certain people or situations on the basis of their likely emotional impact; *Situation Modification*, in which one modifies an environment so as to alter its emotional impact; *Attention Deployment*, in which one turns its attention toward or away from something in order to influence one's emotions; and *Cognitive Change*, in which one evaluates either the situation one is in, or one's capacity to manage the situation so as to alter one's emotions” (p. 248). Whether, and how much, this emotional process may play into managing ethical problems in marketing is precisely what this study attempts to examine.

Hypothesis Development

Vitell *et al.*'s (1993) marketing norms model considers both deontological evaluations, or use of personal philosophy to characterize an ethical dilemma, as well as teleological evaluations, or examination of potential consequences on stakeholders given their respective degrees of importance. How one arrives at an ethical decision in marketing is predicated both on normative prescripts and positive teleological examination of potential weights and consequences on stakeholders. Since ethical decisions in marketing have both cognitive and non-cognitive, perhaps emotional, components associated with any ethical decision, we therefore hypothesize:

H1: There is a positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Marketing Ethics.

Connelly *et al.* (2004) state that while awareness of one's own negative emotions can be useful in reducing their respective impact on ethical judgments; awareness alone is only useful in handling negatively related emotions. Therefore within the ethical decision making process, we expect that awareness alone is not sufficient to ensure sound ethical judgment without some management and use of emotion.

To that end, we expect there is a substantial distinction among the EI components and as such each will have varying degrees of effect on marketing ethics. Therefore we hypothesize:

H2a: There is a positive relationship between Self Emotional Awareness [SEA] and Marketing Ethics.

H2b: There is a positive relationship between Regulation of Emotion [ROE] and Marketing Ethics.

H2c: There is a positive relationship between Others Emotional Awareness [OEA] and Marketing Ethics.

H2d: There is a positive relationship between Use of Emotion [UOE] and Marketing Ethics.

Connelly *et al.* (2004) examined the effects of trait emotions on ethical choice; and more specifically whether, "emotions would account for greater variance in ethical choices with interpersonal outcomes than those with organizational outcomes" (p. 249). They concluded that emotions accounted for a significant portion of the variance in ethical choices on interpersonal outcomes, but were not significant for organizational outcomes. (p. 249) Though organizational outcomes are an important consideration, our study attempts to examine how Emotional Intelligence effects individual Marketing Ethics, and thus organizational outcomes are beyond the scope of this research. However, an analysis of the social outcomes of Emotional Intelligence on ethical decisions in marketing are well within the scope of what we can reasonably examine.

We distinguish Emotional Intelligence into two operative areas with respect to the potential outcome of their emotional activity. Personal components of Emotional Intelligence [SEA & ROE] reflect emotional activity that encompasses individual outcomes. Wong and Law (2002) define Self Emotional Awareness and Regulation of Emotion as understanding and regulating one's own emotions (p. 246). Social components of Emotional Intelligence [OEA & UOE], by contrast, reflect emotional activity that encompasses social outcomes. Wong & Law (2002) define Others' Emotional Awareness as understanding the emotions of others, and Use of Emotion as a use of emotion toward constructive activities and personal performance (p. 246). Although the definition of Use of Emotion shows some overlap with personal outcomes, we would argue that the performance outcome stated in the definition, with respect to marketing ethics, would be personal performance of constructive activities affecting others.

As cited by Bartels (1967), Connelly *et al.* (2004), and Hunt & Vitell (1986 & 2006), social considerations are crucial to sound decision making in marketing ethics. Thus we would expect that socially directed elements of emotional intelligence should show a greater accounting of the variance than personally directed elements on Marketing Ethics. Therefore we hypothesize:

H3: With respect to Marketing Ethics, the social components of Emotional Intelligence [OEA & UOE] will explain a greater portion of the variance than the personal components [SEA & ROE].

Methodology

We developed our 46 item questionnaire based on a combination of Wong & Law's 16 item (2002) emotional intelligence measure, Paul *et al.*'s (2006) 24 item marketing ethics model (slightly modified from Vitell *et al.* 1993), and 6 questions pertaining to demographics. The questionnaire was pilot tested with six university business students, to ensure it was easily understood, and that the directions were clear. Surveys for France and Germany were translated and back translated by native speakers. However, in France, the University curriculum is taught primarily in English, and 51 students elected to take the English version of the survey.

We collected 183 survey responses from undergraduate students at a private university located in the Northeastern United States, of which 160 were useable. 18 were discounted because these students were not U.S. citizens, three because the respondents were not business students, one for failure to answer key questions in the marketing ethics portion of the questionnaire, and one because the respondent appeared to answer questions arbitrarily.

We also collected 147 responses from undergraduate students at a private university in Northwestern France, of which 106 were useable. 14 were discounted because these students were not French citizens, seven for failure to answer key questions in the questionnaire, and 20 because these respondents appeared to answer questions arbitrarily.

Lastly, we collected 220 surveys from undergraduate students at a public university in Germany, of which 195 were useable. Two were discarded because these students were not German citizens, Two because the respondents were not business students, seven for failure to answer key questions in the questionnaire, and 14 because the respondents appeared to answer questions arbitrarily.

Wong & Law's (2002) 16 item emotional intelligence scale was selected because it was shown to be both internally consistent and valid. Furthermore the relative brevity of the 16 items was attractive. We also selected Paul *et al.*'s (2006) 24 item Marketing Ethics model, again for its brevity. We assumed that reliability and validity would remain relatively constant as this model only added one question to Vitell *et al.*'s (1993) H-V model.

While much research has been conducted in the field of emotional intelligence, concerns have been expressed about its construct validity. According to Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso (2004), some believe Emotional Intelligence to be "resistant to adequate measurement" (Becker 2003), while others claim it to be an "elusive concept" according to Davies, Stankov, and Roberts (1998) (as cited in Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004, p. 197).

The majority of arguments against the validity of the EI construct stem from the methods by which they were tested; frequently self-report mechanisms. Brody (2004) states, "the dependant variable studied should be based on objective indexes rather than on self-reports" (p. 236). Although the idea of objective testing is appealing, the practicality of objective indices is not, in terms of comparative length and consumption of resources.

With any discussion of Emotional Intelligence, one must also consider the construct of general intelligence. Brody (1997) concludes, IQ accounts for one quarter of the variance in children's academic achievement (p. 1048). In a later article, Brody (2004) criticizes the Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso model because it does not account for a substantial portion of the variance over and above that of the IQ construct (p. 236). However, if we accept Brody's criticisms outright, the remaining portion of the variance Brody has not accounted for remains largely unexplained by IQ alone.

Wong and Law (2002) performed extensive factor analysis and determined that their EI model had internal consistency reliability on each of their four factors ranging from .83 to .90. Moreover the 16 items measured, each loaded on their respective EI dimensions with an average .80; while cross-loadings were negligible (p. 253). Perhaps most interesting is that Wong and Law (2002) stated that two of the EI factors (OEA and ROE) were significantly and negatively correlated with Eysenck's 1957 IQ measure; and further stated that individuals with higher levels of IQ have difficulty recognizing the emotions of others. Construct validity was also rigorously tested, and the four dimensions' alpha coefficients ranged between .84 and .93: SEA = .92, UOE = .91, ROE = .84, and OEA = .93. (p.257)

Vitell *et al.*'s (1993) marketing norms model has five dimensions: price and distribution [PD], information and contracts [IC], product and promotion [PP], obligation and disclosure [OD], and general honesty and integrity [GHI] (p. 333). Each of these five dimensions were derived using exploratory factor analysis, and drawn from a relatively large number of respondents on the American Marketing Association mailing list [n=508] (p. 333). Internal consistency of the construct for each of the five dimensions ranged from .67 to .87 [PD = .82, IC = .81, PP = .87, OD = .70, GHI = .67]. (p. 334) To test the construct's convergent validity, each of the five dimensions were correlated against the two dimensions of Forsyth's (1980) Ethics Position Questionnaire (EPQ): idealism and relativism. Each of the five marketing norm dimensions were significantly and positively correlated with the idealism scale, while correlating negatively with relativism; and in two cases, were not significant against relativism. As previously mentioned, we used Paul *et al.*'s (2006) modified version of this model.

A variety of statistical tests were performed; including Chronbach Alpha, descriptive statistics, correlations, ANOVA, and single and multiple regression analyses. All statistical tests were performed using SPSS v. 15.

Results

Respondents ranged in age from 18 to 34 years old with an average age of 20.9 years. Males comprised 56.3% of the responses. Respondents had an average of 2.86 years of college education. The Chronbach Alpha was .886; fulfilling the statistical requirements set by Nunnally (1978) for exploratory studies. Descriptive statistics were compiled for each of the five variables studied.

Table 1 - Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Country Means		
						US	FR	DE
Age	460	18	34	20.94	1.78	20.38	21.72	20.98
Gender (0=Male)	460	0	1	0.44	0.50	0.42	0.52	0.41
Education Level	458	1	7	2.86	1.06	2.78	3.36	2.66
Valid N (listwise)	456					N=160	N=106	N=195
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	US	FR	DE
SEA	461	1.75	5	3.79	0.60	3.91	3.58	3.80
ROE	461	1.25	5	3.46	0.69	3.58	3.33	3.44
OEA	461	1	5	3.67	0.62	3.85	3.67	3.53
UOE	461	1	5	3.8	0.62	3.98	3.64	3.74
EI	461	1.56	4.94	3.68	0.44	3.83	3.55	3.63
ME	461	1.31	5	3.92	0.45	3.98	3.79	3.94
Valid N (listwise)	461					N=160	N=106	N=195

Hypotheses 1

Using the composite data to test our primary theory that there is a positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Marketing Ethics, the correlation coefficient for the mean EI score (.35) was positive and significant at .01, thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.

To further examine this relationship, a multiple regression of the four independent EI variables was performed to determine the amount of variance explained. In all four cases each independent variable's beta coefficient was significant, though ROE had a negative beta coefficient. Despite this, the compound effect was an Adjusted R² of .175; significant at .000.

Table 2 – H1 Multiple Regression

Adj. R ²	Sig.	F Stat	Std. Error
† .175	.000	25.5	.410
Variable	¹ Beta	Sig.	T Stat
SEA	† .196	.000	3.89
ROE	-.110 *	.022	-2.30
OEA	† .193	.000	4.18
UOE	† .234	.000	5.15

Hypotheses 2A – 2D

Examining the individual components of Emotional Intelligence, three of the four EI components [UOE, OEA, and SEA] were positively and significantly (.01) correlated with Marketing Ethics, however Regulation of Emotion did not demonstrate significant correlation. Thus, H2A, C, & D were supported, but H2B was not. Correlation coefficients were: UOE: .316, OEA: .305, SEA: .294, and ROE: .071.

Table 3 – Correlation Coefficients

² Correlations	SEA	ROE	OEA	UOE	EI	ME
SEA	1	** .430	** .377	** .305	** .755	** .294
ROE	** .430	1	** .198	** .242	** .701	.071
OEA	** .377	** .198	1	** .252	** .654	** .305
UOE	** .305	** .242	** .252	1	** .647	** .316
EI	** .755	** .701	** .654	** .647	1	** .350
ME	** .294	.071	** .305	** .316	** .350	1

Hypotheses 3

To expand on Connelly *et al.* (2004) we also explored whether the social components of Emotional Intelligence [OEA & UOE] explained more of the variance on Marketing Ethics than the personal components [SEA & ROE]. The individual relationships were significant (.000) in both cases. Social elements [OEA & UOE] accounted for 15% of the variance, while Personal elements [SEA & ROE] accounted for 8.7%, thus H3 was supported. Standardized Beta Coefficients for social elements were OEA .24 and UOE .255, while personal elements were SEA .323 and ROE -.068.

Table 4 - Hypothesis 3

		³ Beta Coefficients		Adj. R2	Sig.	F
OEA & UOE ME		OEA	UOE			
Composite	H3	† .240	† .255	.150	.000	41.61
		Error! Bookmark not defined. Beta Coefficients		Adj. R2	Sig.	F
SEA & ROE ME		SEA	ROE			
Composite	H3	† .323	-.068	.087	.000	22.61

For ease of reference, a brief summary of our test results follows:

¹ † = Sig. <.000, ** = Sig.<.01, * = Sig. <.05

² ** <.01

³ † <.000

Table 5 - Brief Summary Of Results

H1	There is a positive relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Marketing Ethics.	Supported
H2a	There is a positive relationship between Self Emotional Awareness [SEA] and Marketing Ethics.	Supported
H2b	There is a positive relationship between Regulation of Emotion [ROE] and Marketing Ethics.	<i>Not Supported</i>
H2c	There is a positive relationship between Others Emotional Awareness [OEA] and Marketing Ethics.	Supported
H2d	There is a positive relationship between Use of Emotion [UOE] and Marketing Ethics.	Supported
H3	With respect to Marketing Ethics, the social components of Emotional Intelligence [OEA & UOE] will explain a greater portion of the variance than the personal components [SEA & ROE].	Supported

Discussion

Our findings show that SEA, OEA, UOE all had positive and significant correlations with marketing ethics in the composite data set. Regulation Of Emotion however was not significant. Since ROE is a significant component of Emotional Intelligence, it is surprising to see that this variable had no significant correlating effect on Marketing Ethics. Since three EI components act significantly in concert with respect to marketing ethics (Adj. R² of .175) it becomes clear that Brody's concern that the EI construct show more than a trivial portion of the variance is at least somewhat alleviated.

Our results also show that social elements of emotional intelligence explain more of the variance on marketing ethics than the personal elements. This is significant because it not only lends support to the existing marketing ethics literature, but provides evidence that emotional intelligence is one mechanism, or tool, to manage the process of handling ethical dilemmas. This is particularly interesting with respect to teleological stakeholder considerations, and how one may view (or perhaps ignore) others in the ethical decision making process.

The social elements of Emotional Intelligence [OEA and UOE] highlighted Bartels (1967) arguments that business is a social process. What we missed in our hypothesis development was Vitell *et al.*'s (1993) argument that concern for stakeholders is predicated on awareness that ethical content exists. It's here where Self Emotional Awareness appears to play a role. Still, what we define as social emotional intelligence components accounted for the largest proportion of the variance in a stepwise linear regression in the following order; Use of Emotion (.098), Others Emotional Awareness (.052), Self Emotional Awareness (.018), and Regulation of Emotion (.007).

Table 6 – Stepwise Linear Regression

	Adj. R ²	Cumulative Diff.	Sig. F	F	⁴ Beta Coefficients			
UOE	.098	.000	.000	50.848	†	.316		
UOE, OEA	.150	.052	.000	41.612	†	.255	† .240	
UOE, OEA, SEA	.168	.018	.000	31.885	†	.221	†	** .191
UOE, OEA, SEA, ROE	.175	.007	.000	25.457	†	.234	†	.193 † .196 * -.109

Marketing organizations accepting recent graduates might benefit from an analysis of candidates' emotional intelligence. Moreover, as indicated by Verbos *et al.* (2007) organizations which advertise their ethical codes are likely to attract individuals with similar ethical codes; and where the emotional labor of marketing responsibility is high, so too must candidates' level of emotional intelligence. One could infer that business universities not only have an obligation to improve students' emotional intelligence, but might also benefit from advertising their ethical codes so that students can self-select universities which suit their own ethics.

⁴ † = Sig <.000, ** = Sig <.001, * = Sig < .05

Limitations

Similar to other empirical work, our study retains some limitations. Our sample is representative of a relatively small number of business students at three universities. The results therefore show the likely behavior of potential future managers, but may not be generalized to explain the likely behavior of existing managers.

Although our survey was created in English, translated, and back translated by native speakers into both German and French, it is possible that the interpretation held by students in these countries may have differed from U.S. students. As a result some of the survey responses may not be a true representation of some participants' actual beliefs. We also acknowledge that surveys were administered at different times and days which may have affected mood, patience, and attention span.

Directions For Future Research

Because our results illustrate a positive, significant relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Marketing Ethics, we would encourage further research in this arena; particularly since there is very little in the literature which directly examines this relationship. Since evidence of this relationship exists, it would seem appropriate for business schools to examine whether there are ways to teach or improve students' emotional intelligence for the purpose of raising students' skill with marketing ethics.

While the literature continues to grow around the emotional intelligence construct, its applicability to business areas outside of marketing ethics should also be tested. For example, there are any number of recent accounting, and corporate governance scandals, where ethical judgments have been questioned: Enron, Northern Rock, Bear Stearns, etc. Other significant functional areas worthy of examination include purchasing, supply chain management, human resources, logistics, and so on.

We also suggest that further research should be conducted on the distinctions between the social and personal elements of emotional intelligence, with respect to their impact on marketing ethics.

Since our sample is derived from three different western countries. It's perhaps of particular importance to explore these elements in a variety of settings across the globe. Furthermore, if culture has antecedent, or mediating properties, then it would be prudent to explore those components as well.

This study should also be conducted with employees of organizations who manage ethical marketing dilemmas as a function of their work, and perhaps make comparisons between employed workers and students seeking employment in similar fields.

Although this survey was administered to business students who are more likely to face ethical decisions in marketing, other students who never enter business careers, or make ethical marketing decisions, are still affected by the decisions of marketers. Some study with these individuals might provide insights on how they might be affected by an ethical choice in a marketing decision.

References

- Bartels, R. (1967) "A Model for Ethics in Marketing" *Journal of Marketing*, 31, 20 - 26.
- Borton, W. M. (1959) "Respectability for Marketing?" *Journal of Marketing*, 24(2), 47 - 50.
- Brody, N. (1997) "Intelligence, Schooling, and Society" *American Psychologist*, 52(10) 1046-1050.
- Brody, N. (2004) "What Cognitive Intelligence Is and What Emotional Intelligence Is Not" *Psychological Inquiry*, 15, 234 - 238.
- Connelly, S., Helton-Fauth, W., & Mumford, M. D. (2004) "A Managerial In-Basket Study of the Impact of Trait Emotions on Ethical Choice" *Journal of Business Ethics*, 51 (3), 245 - 267.
- Davies, M. Stankov, L and Roberts, R.D. (1998) "Emotional Intelligence: In Search of an Elusive Construct" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75 (4), 989-1015.
- Eysenck, H.J. (1957) *Sense and Nonsense in Psychology*, Penguin Books Ltd: Toronto ON

Goleman, D. (2001) "An EI-Based Theory of Performance" In D. Goleman, *The Emotionally Intelligent Workplace* Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers: San Francisco CA, pp. 1 - 18.

Hunt, S. D., & Vitell, S. (1986) "A General Theory of Marketing Ethics" *Journal of Macromarketing* , 6 (1), 5 - 16.

Hunt, S. D., & Vitell, S. J. (2006) "The General Theory of Marketing Ethics: A Revision and Three Questions" *Journal of Macromarketing*, 26 (143), 143 - 153.

Klemm Verbos, A., Gerard, J. A., Forshey, P. R., Harding, C. S., & Miller, J. S. (2007) "The Positive Ethical Organization: Enacting a Living Code of Ethics and Ethical Organizational Identity" *Journal of Business Ethics*, 76 (1), 17 - 33.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004) "Emotional Intelligence: Theory, Findings and implications" *Psychological Inquiry*, 15 (3), 197-215.

Nunnally, Jum C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory, 2nd ed.* McGraw Hill: New York.

Paul, Pallab, Abhijit Roy, & Kausiki Mukhapaddhaya (2006) "The impact of cultural values on marketing ethical norms: A study in India and the United States" *Journal of International Marketing*, 14 (4), 28-56.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990) "Emotional Intelligence", in *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, Baywood Publishing Co. Inc.: Amityville NY, 9(3), pp. 185 - 211.

Schlenker, B., & Forsyth, D. (1977). "On the ethics of psychological research" *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 13, 369-396.

Singhapakdi, A., Vitell, S. J., & Franke, G. R. (1999) "Antecedents, Consequences, and Mediating Effects of Perceived Moral Intensity and Personal Moral Philosophies" *Academy of Marketing Science*, 27(1), 19 - 35.

Thorndike, R.K. (1920) "Intelligence and Its Uses", *Harper's Magazine* 140, 227-335.

Vitell, S. J., Rallapalli, K. C., & Singhapakdi, A. (1993) "Marketing Norms: The Influence of Personal Moral Philosophies and Organizational Ethical Culture" *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 21(4), 331 - 337.

Wong, C.-S., & Law, K. S. (2002) "The Effects of Leader and Follower Emotional Intelligence on Performance and Attitude: An Exploratory Study" *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 243 - 274.

Appendix - Country Specific Data

Since our samples were individually large enough to make comparisons among the countries, we have included consolidated data below for further study. Brief analysis is included.

Table 7 – Tri-Country Correlation Tables

U.S.A.	SEA	ROE	OEA	UOE	EI	ME
SEA	1	.563	.522	.363	.827	.358
ROE	.563	1	.246	.289	.731	.200
OEA	.522	.246	1	.366	.711	.321
UOE	.363	.289	.366	1	.679	.393
EI	.827	.731	.711	.679	1	.427
ME	.358	.200	.321	.393	.427	1

France	SEA	ROE	OEA	UOE	EI	ME
SEA	1	.191	.212	.264	.622	.270
ROE	.191	1	.245	.253	.675	.045
OEA	.212	.245	1	.276	.657	.259
UOE	.264	.253	.276	1	.666	.386
EI	.622	.675	.657	.666	1	.354
ME	.270	.045	.259	.386	.354	1

Germany	SEA	ROE	OEA	UOE	EI	ME
SEA	1	.396	.325	.194	.736	.160
ROE	.396	1	.093	.135	.674	-.116
OEA	.325	.093	1	.061	.572	.325
UOE	.194	.135	.061	1	.547	.140
EI	.736	.674	.572	.547	1	.188
ME	.160	-.116	.325	.140	.188	1

Table 8 – Tri-Country Marketing Ethics Multiple Regression

Country	⁵ Beta Coefficients				Adj. R ²	Sig.	F
	SEA	ROE	OEA	UOE			
US	** .212	-.029	.114	† .282	.198	.000	10.783
FR	.171	-.109	.160	† .324	.176	.000	6.611
DE	.122	** -.208	† .297	.126	.140	.000	8.893

As you can see from tables 7 & 8 above, the results of the H1 and H2A,C, & D also hold true at the country level. For the purposes of comparison, the country with the strongest explanation of the variance in the EI | ME relationship was the U.S., followed by France and Germany.

Table 9 – Tri-Country Comparison of Social and Personal Variances with Respect to Marketing Ethics

OEA & UOE ME	⁵ Beta Coefficients		Adj. R ²	Sig.	F
	OEA	UOE			
US	** .205	† .318	.180	.000	18.481
FR	.165	† .340	.158	.000	10.832
DE	† .317	.121	.111	.000	13.086

SEA & ROE ME	Beta Coefficients		Adj. R ²	Sig.	F
	SEA	ROE			
US	† .359	-.002	.117	.000	11.542
FR	** .271	-.007	.055	.020	4.047
DE	** .244	** -.212	.054	.002	6.532

Brief analysis of H3 in the context of each country also shows that social components of EI are stronger than personal components across all three countries. It's interesting to see all six regression analyses are statistically significant. Again, the largest proportion of the variance lies with the U.S., followed by France, and then Germany.

⁵ * = Sig <.05, ** = Sig <.01, † = Sig < .000

Biographical Information

Eric C. Lind (U.S.) is a recent graduate from Quinnipiac University, obtaining a B.S. International Business with a minor in European Union Business Studies.

Nathan J. Smith is currently an undergraduate from Quinnipiac University, obtaining a B.S. International Business and a minor in Marketing. Nathan is from the U.K.

Keywords: Marketing Ethics, Emotional Intelligence, U.S., France, Germany