



## Study of The Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Tendency to Democratic Values (Case Study of Orumieh)

Fatemeh Golabi<sup>1</sup>, Mohammad Bagher Alizadeh Aghdam<sup>2</sup>, Rahim Badri Gargari<sup>2</sup>, Mehdi Rafiee<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Associate professor of Sociology, University of Tabriz, Iran.

<sup>3</sup> Associate professor of Psychology, University of Tabriz, Iran.

<sup>4</sup> Ph.D Student of Sociology, University of Tabriz and faculty member of Sociology, Payame Noor University of Zahedan, Iran.

### ABSTRACT

Supportive culture of democracy has been emphasized by many social theorists. They have examined the role of a broad array of attitudes, values and behavior patterns on democratization and democratic processes in societies. These studies have demonstrated the importance of knowledge, belief, morals, custom and so on for democracy and the tendency of individuals to democratic values. Longitudinal studies also support the theory that intelligence has an impact on political orientations and behavior. The study of the relationship between emotional intelligence- as a mental and behavioral ability- and the tendency of individuals to democratic values can be seen in this line of studies. The study was administered in Orumieh (capital city of West Azarbaijan province) which is one of the most culturally and ethnically diverse cities of Iran. A survey was created and administered to 600 citizens of this city. Using multistage cluster sampling of 5 districts in Orumieh, 600 citizens were selected and the study was performed among them. Obtained data were analyzed using Pearson correlation and linear regression, and the result shows the existence of a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and the tendency to democratic values among Orumieh citizens. Statistical findings also show religion and ethnicity affect the tendency of individuals to democratic values. Thus, both our first hypothesis about the relationship between emotional intelligence and the tendency of individuals to democratic values and the second hypothesis about the effects of religion and ethnicity on the tendency of individuals to democratic values are confirmed according to acquired data.

**Key Words:** Democracy, Democratic Values, Emotional Intelligence (EQ), Cultural Diversity, Cultural Adaptation, Orumieh.

**Corresponding author:** Fatemeh Golabi

### INTRODUCTION

Theorizing and empirical study on the underlying determinant factors of the tendency of individuals and groups to democracy and democratic values have always been one of the important attempts in social and political sciences. As Gorodnichenko & Roland (2015) pointed out very large literature has developed analyzing empirically the determinants of democratization (p. 2). They point to poor share of culture in this literature and state "To our knowledge, the role of culture has generally been absent in this literature" (ibid). In fact, culture plays a much more crucial role in democracy than the literature of the past two decades would indicate (Vanhanen, 2003: 13). Since culture as Tylor (1871) defined it, is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society (p. 1), intelligence, including emotional intelligence or (EQ) as part of "that complex whole" has also been neglected in the study of democracy and the tendency of individuals to democratic values. It is worth noting that emotions like anger, happiness,

and fear, as well as mood states, preferences, and bodily states, influence how people think, make decisions, and perform different tasks (Mayer & Bremer, 1985; Forgas & Moylan, 1987; Salovey & Birnbaum, 1989). Hence, emotions serve important social functions, conveying information about other people's thoughts, intentions, and behavior (Ekman, 1973; Keltner & Haidt, 2001). As Mayer and Caruso (2002) pointed out emotions such as happiness, sadness, anger, and fear refer to feelings that signal information about relationships. For example, happiness signals harmonious relationships, whereas fear signals being threatened. So, there is a mutual relation between emotions and actions (p. 1).

In this paper, we present a very simple model of the tendency of individuals to democratic values that includes the effect of having different rates of emotional intelligence on having different rates in the tendency to democratic values. Hence, our aim here is not to develop a full description of emotional intelligence and its aspects or democracy and its principles and values, but only to study the relationship between emotional intelligence or EQ as the independent variable and democratic values as dependent ones. We consider whether and how EQ enhance the likelihood that

individuals from different religious and ethnic backgrounds in Orumieh - which is according to Iranian population and housing census results of 2011 one of the most culturally and ethnically diverse cities of Iran - have tendency to democratic values.

### Definitions of Democracy and Democratic Values

The concept of democracy is one of the most used concepts of the socio-political vocabulary, but there is not now, nor will there likely be, a final consensus on the definition or full content of it. As Bühlmann and associates (2008) have stated there is an abundant literature relating to democracy theory, with countless definitions of what democracy should be and what democracy is (p. 5). These definitions range from Schumpeter's (1962) minimalist "competitive struggle for votes" to more extensive definitions that include reference to equality, political freedoms, tolerance, economic rights, and so on. The main definition of democracy in the present study is an extensive one that focuses on the role of knowledge and culture. This concept accords with the one adopted by Lipset (1994) who believes democracy requires a supportive culture, the acceptance by the citizenry and political elites of principles underlying freedom of speech, media, assembly, religion, the rights of opposition parties, of the rule of law, of human rights, and the like (p. 3). As the case of the concept of democracy, there is no consensus on measures, principles, criterion and values of democracy also. As Kekic stated there is no consensus on how to measure democracy, definitions of democracy are contested and there is an ongoing lively debate on the subject (Kekic, 2007: 1).

Nevertheless, there are certain principles and values of democracy about which there is a significant consensus. In their inspiring book *Introducing Democracy: 80 Questions and Answers*, Beetham & Boyle (1995), suggest that democracy entails the twin principles of "popular control" over collective decision-making, and "equality of rights" in the exercise of that control. Sodaro believes Tolerance, fairness, and compromise are among the most important of these values (Sodaro, 2004: 164). And Bühlmann and associates (2008) identify the key concepts of equality, freedom, and control as three fundamental principles of democracy. It can be said by referring to many of conceptualizations of democracy that freedom (with all its different aspects and dimensions), tolerance, and socio-political participation of people in public affairs, are among the most important values and principles of democracy.

Hannah Arendt (1993), sees freedom as one of the most important features of democratic societies and Amartya Sen (2000) defines it the absence of disabling conditions for an individual and the fulfillment of enabling conditions. The (United States-based) Freedom House organization underscores in its mission statement: "Freedom is possible only in democratic political systems in which the governments are accountable to their own people; the rule of law prevails; and freedoms of expression, association, and belief, as well as respect for the rights of minorities and woman, are guaranteed<sup>1</sup>. Acton (1907) in his book *The History of Freedom and Other Essays* writes:

The most certain test by which we judge whether a country is really free is the amount of security enjoyed by minorities (p. 4).

Thus, one of the important measures of a country's freedom (especially in a multicultural- multiethnic society as Iran) is type of dealing with cultural, religious and ethnic minorities, but it should be noted that this treatment is strongly under the influence of emotional intelligence because emotional intelligence as Goleman (1998) described it, is someone's ability: (a) to understand his feelings, (b) to listen to others and to feel them, and (c) to express his emotions in a productive manner. And it is actually the ability to handle our emotions and our relations in a way that leads to harmonious coexistence (Ioannidou & Konstantikaki, 2008: 122).

Tolerance and political tolerance, in particular, can be defined as a willingness to put up with disagreeable ideas and groups (Gibson 2007: 410). Society, especially multicultural and multiethnic one such as Iran, is comprised of people with different cultural and ethnic backgrounds, who practice different religions and represent different groups. Democratic societies strive to be politically tolerant, and the rights of minorities and other groups are protected. But it is worth noting that the tolerance or intolerance depends largely on culture and cultural values, and also on abilities and mental capabilities of individuals such as intelligence, and especially emotional intelligence. Because emotions determine whether people accept, reject, approach, avoid, or engage with others. The more one understands and manages emotional responses, the more one enjoys greater comfort in relationships, effectiveness in interactions, and inner peace (Gardenswartz et al, 2010: 76).

Political participation is described as one of the basic conditions of functioning democracy (Verba et al. 1995, Norris 2002). And defined as an activity that has the intent or effect of influencing government action - either directly by affecting the making or implementation of public policy or indirectly by influencing the selection of people who make those policies (Verba et al, 1995: 38). Hence, citizen participation in public sphere builds a stronger democracy, but it is worth noting also that political culture (which is under the influence of intelligence including emotional intelligence), has an important role in the tendency of individuals to political participation. As Rindermann (2007) has stated intelligence is a relevant phenomenon for politics and itself a relevant political phenomenon (p. 319).

### Supportive culture of democracy

Supportive culture of democracy has been emphasized by many social theorists (Almond 1956, Almond & Verba 1963, Pye 1965, Dahl 1971, Bobbio 1987, Eckstein 1988, Diamond et al 1990, Lipset 1994, Weingast 1997, Inglehart 2000, Young 2000). Inglehart and Welzel (2005) believe from the outset, scholars of political culture have claimed that the functioning and persistence of democratic institutions at the system-level is closely linked with prevailing mass tendencies in individual-level attitudes and value orientations (p. 2). They concluded, after pointing out to some cases, almost all studies in the political culture tradition claim in one or the other way that mass tendencies in individual-level attitudes and value orientations are important for the functioning of democracy at the system-level. One can reasonably conclude that this is the basic creed of the political culture school by which most of its advocates justify their research (ibid). As Almond and Verba (1963) believe, political culture is a subjective mass phenomenon that consists of orientations toward key objects

<sup>1</sup>- See: <http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=2>

of the political system and toward the individual's role in it. They state that the political culture of a nation is the particular distribution toward political objects among members of the nation (Almond & Verba, 1963: 13).

Wucherpfennig and Deutsch (2009) believe at a time when democratic forms of government were the exception rather than the rule, it was Lipset, who in his seminal 1959 piece *Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Development*, first established the theoretical link between the level of development of a given country and its probability of being democratic (p. 1). They concluded, economic development- like urbanization, wealth, and education - in Lipset's account works as a mediating variable that is part of a larger syndrome of conditions favorable to democratization (p. 2). One may find content of this "larger syndrome of conditions favorable to democratization" in Almond and Verba's (1963) conclusion that a healthy mixture of "subject orientations" and "participant orientations" was conducive to a "civic culture" that helps democracies to flourish (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005: 2) and mean according to Coppedge (2012) from subject orientations, citizen's respect to the law and the authority of the state and the government and from participant orientations, citizen's interest in politics and participate in elections and other activities that make democracy work (p. 221), or in Inglehart & Welzel's (2005) statement where they see a logical connection between having a large proportion of citizens who "value self-expression" - who feel economically secure, independent from elite domination, and claim "the ability to make decisions and actions based on autonomous choices." (p. 47).

According to Tessler and Gao (2009) while Almond and Verba focused on political cognition, feelings toward government and politics, levels of partisanship, sense of civic obligation and political efficacy (p.198), Inglehart, investigated the relationship between democratic achievement and adherence to self-expression values, including trust, tolerance, and political activism, and Rose and associates (1998) examined support for freedom of expression, political tolerance, respect for competing ideas and preferences, political interest and a willingness to participate in the political process (ibid). They mention dimensions of political culture that have received attention in other studies and say these dimensions include political interest by Booth and Richard 1998, political tolerance by Dalton 2000, valuation of liberty by Garcia-Rivero et al 2002, rights consciousness by Gibson et al 1992, support for civil disobedience by Inglehart and Welzel 2003, support for media independence by Nathan and Shi 1993, and political participation by Rice and Feldman 1997 (ibid).

These studies have examined the role of a broad array of attitudes, values and behavior patterns on democratization and democratic processes in societies, and the study of the relationship between emotional intelligence as a mental and behavioral ability and tendency to democratic values can be seen in this line of studies. In fact, many analyses have focused on the influence of these and other cultural and political cultural variables on democratic orientations, and focus on the influence of emotional intelligence on the tendency of individuals to democratic values can be done under these and other relevant studies inspirations.

### Emotional Intelligence (EQ)

the concept of emotional intelligence according to Brackett and associates (2011) was described formally by Salovey and Mayer in 1990. They defined it as the ability to monitor one's own and others' feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions (Salovey & Mayer, 1990: 189). Reuven Bar-On (2000) also defines emotional intelligence as being concerned with effectively understanding oneself and others, relating well to people and adapting to and coping with the immediate surroundings to be more successful in dealing with environmental demands. It was brought to light and popularized in 1995 by Daniel Goleman's best-selling trade book, *Emotional Intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ* (Brackett et al, 2011: 89). In this book, he claims emotional intelligence can be "as powerful, and at times more powerful, than IQ" in predicting how successful one is in life (Goleman, 1995: 34). Use of the concept reinforced by his several other popular publications (Goleman, 1998, 2006, 2011a, 2011b; Lantieri & Goleman, 2008). According to Zeidner and associates (2009), Goleman's model suggests two key divisions separating different aspects of emotional intelligence. First are distinguished those elements of emotional intelligence that refer to personal competencies (e.g., self-awareness) from those that relate to social competencies (e.g., empathy). This distinction corresponds to Gardner's (1983) intrapersonal and interpersonal competencies. Second are distinguished facets of emotional intelligence that relate to awareness from those that concern the management and regulation of emotion. For example, recognizing that someone is unhappy is different from being able to cheer the person up. And yet both "reading" emotions and changing emotions constructively relate to the overall facility of emotional intelligence (p. 10).

As Emmerling and Goleman (2003) illustrated within the emotional intelligence paradigm there exists not one, but several theories (e.g. Mayer & Salovey, 1997; Goleman, 1995,1998; Bar-On, 2000) and each theory has been put forward in an attempt to better understand and explain the skills, traits, and abilities associated with social and emotional intelligence (p. 9). of course, they remember that the existence of several theoretical viewpoints within the emotional intelligence paradigm does not indicate a weakness, but rather the robustness of the field (ibid: 11). And believe while each theory represents a unique set of constructs that represents the theoretical orientation and context in which each of these authors has decided to frame their theory, all share a common desire to understand and measure the abilities and traits related to recognizing and regulating emotions in ourselves and others (ibid: 12).

Goleman (2004) distinguished five components for emotional intelligence, including Self-Awareness, Self-Regulation, Motivation, Empathy, and Social Skill. Self-Awareness according to him is the ability to recognize and understand your moods, emotions, and drives, as well as their effect on others, self-regulation is the ability to control or redirect disruptive impulses and moods and is the propensity to suspend judgment - to think before acting, motivation is a passion to work for reasons that go beyond money or status and is a propensity to pursue goals with energy and persistence, empathy is the ability to understand the emotional makeup of other people and is a skill in treating people according to their emotional reactions, and social skill is proficiency in managing relationships and building networks and is an ability to find common ground and build rapport (p. 88). Regarding the characteristics of emotional intelligence mentioned by Goleman, it can be said that emotional intelligence is actually the ability to handle our emotions and our relations in a way that leads to harmonious coexistence. People who have emotional intelligence create within their

family, friends and work safe, functional, and relieving relations (Ioannidou & Konstantikaki, 2008: 122).

These "safe, functional, and relieving relations within family, friends, and work" can move beyond these borders and spread to local communities, intragroup and intergroup relations, and society. Thus, emotional intelligence encompasses interdependent competencies in both self-awareness and responsiveness to others. The emotionally intelligent individual remains aware of his or her emotions and manages those emotions in the moment to respond appropriately and productively to events and situations (Gardenswartz et al, 2010: 75). As Mayer (2008) has stated high emotionally intelligent individuals are perceived more positively by others - Other individuals perceive those with high emotional intelligence to be more pleasant, socially skilled and empathic to be around. So, emotional intelligence can affect orientations and tendencies of individuals to socio-cultural adaptation, citizenship rules, and democracy.

### Theoretical Framework

According to Wucherpfennig and Deutsch (2009), it was Lipset, who drew the connections between micro-level modernization and macro-level democracy and conducted the empirical testing. Thus, the Lipset's theory is, in essence, a cultural one (p. 2). Lipset (1959) writes "the more well-to-do a nation, the greater the chances that it will sustain democracy." (p. 75). And believes (1994) the acceptance of principles underlying freedom of speech, media, assembly, religion, the rights of opposition parties, of the rule of law, of human rights, and the like by the citizenry and political elites creates a supportive culture (p. 3), or in Wucherpfennig and Deutsch's term, micro-level modernization that prepares the ground for establishment of democracy in macro-level.

Almond and Verba's work, *The civic culture*, according to Tessler and Gao (2009), was the first major attempt at understanding the relationship between citizen orientations and democracy and established the importance of studying the attitudes, values and behavior patterns of ordinary men and women, obligation to participate, sense of efficacy and level of inter-personal trust are among the particular orientations they explore (p. 197). Inglehart and Welzel (2005) also believe Almond and Verba (1963) launched the first comparative empirical survey of the mass attitudes that are presumably linked to the stability and functioning of democracies. (p. 2). It was a landmark study, according to Silver and Dowley (2000) because it showed how survey data could be used to characterize the subjective "political culture" of a nation and address questions about the congruence between patterns of subjective political orientations and political structures (p. 519). Inglehart and Welzel themselves, According to Wucherpfennig and Deutsch (2009), revitalizing Almond and Verba's (1963) long-standing argument of cultural prerequisites for democracy and provide what is perhaps the most comprehensive framework, by linking socio-economic development and cultural prerequisites for democracy (p. 5).

Inglehart and Welzel (2005) hypothesizing that the emancipative nature of self-expression values reflects a strong commitment to democratic norms, such as liberty and tolerance (p. 3). Self-expression values according to them, include a postmaterialist emphasis on personal and political liberty, civilian protest activities, tolerance of the liberty of others, and a sense of subjective well-being reflected in life satisfaction. Interpersonal trust, too, belongs to this syndrome of self-expression values. For this reason, interpersonal trust tends to be linked with democracy as well (p. 7). Tessler and Gao (2009), believe during the last decade and a half, there

have been many empirical investigations of citizen orientations and their relationship to democratization (p. 198). The general conclusion, according to them, as summarized by Inglehart, is that "culture plays a crucial role in democracy. . . Its survival depends on the values and beliefs of ordinary citizens" (Inglehart, 2000: 96). But it should not be neglected that more than values and beliefs, culture, also includes "any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society" (Tylor, 1871: 1), and under this extensive framework, intelligence, including emotional intelligence as one of these "capabilities", "plays a crucial role in democracy" and has important effects on tendency of ordinary citizens to democratic values.

According to Brackett and Geher (2006) Goleman described the emotional intelligence as an array of positive attributes including political awareness, self-confidence, conscientiousness, and achievement motives rather than focusing only on an intelligence that could help individuals solve problems effectively. Goleman has speculated that certain aspects of emotional intelligence may tend to promote prosocial behavior: Self-awareness must be deployed to act in accord with one's own sense of purpose, meaning, and ethics; empathy appears an essential step in fostering altruism and compassion (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003: 26). Ioannidou & Konstantikaki (2008) also point out to Interpersonal perception of moods, feelings, and motivation of others, cooperation and communication in a group with others as some Consequences of empathy as an important aspect of emotional intelligence (p. 121). And believe People who have largely those skills usually stand out in terms of smooth interaction with others and always distinguish in social scene (ibid).

In fact, emotional intelligence is postulated to promote positive social functioning by helping individuals to detect others' emotion states, adopt others' perspectives, enhance communication, and regulate behavior (Brackett et al, 2011: 96). Mayer (2008) also believes that emotional intelligence reflects abilities to join intelligence, empathy, and emotions to enhance thought and understanding of interpersonal dynamics. And says high emotional intelligence among adults is correlated with better self-perception of social ability and more successful interpersonal relationships while less interpersonal aggression and problems.

According to Sluyter & Salovey (1997) research on emotional intelligence has moved beyond personality and IQ borders and pays to developments in life, family relations, and citizenship relations. So, it is predictable that research on the relationship between emotional intelligence and citizenship relationships, social and cultural adaptations, intergroup relations, multiethnic and multicultural relations, democracy and democratic values, will grow in the near future and existing theoretical and empirical works on emotional intelligence have established a firm foundation for research on emotional intelligence's relation with cultural adaptation, social and political tolerance, tendency of individuals to socio-political participation freedoms and rights, democratic values and democracy.

We integrate these two streams of research to inform our research. Going beyond existing research on supportive culture of democracy that has demonstrated the importance of knowledge, belief, morals, custom, and so on for democracy and the tendency of individuals to democratic values and going beyond existing research on emotional intelligence that has theorized and demonstrated the importance of emotional intelligence for smooth interaction and promoting prosocial behavior with others, we focus here on emotional intelligence as a mental capability that affects the tendency of individuals

to freedom, tolerance, and participation, and consider how having higher rates of emotional intelligence among the citizens of Orumieh enhance the likelihood that they have higher rates in tendency to these democratic values. So, our major claim is that emotional intelligence has a role in the tendency of individuals to democratic values. Accordingly, our hypotheses in this study are as follows:

A: There is a relationship between the tendency to democratic values and emotional intelligence or EQ.

B: Religion and ethnicity affect the tendency of individuals to democratic values.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Procedure & Measures**

A survey was created and administered to 600 citizens of Orumieh (capital city of West Azarbaijan province) which is according to population and housing census results of Iranian Statistical Center in 2011, one of the most culturally and ethnically diverse cities of Iran. The data were collected as part of a larger study on the relationship between cultural, social, emotional, and moral intelligence and tendency to democratic values, conducted in Jun 2016. Studied population, hence includes 18 years old and older citizens of Orumieh city. Using multistage cluster sampling of 5 districts in Orumieh, 600 citizens were selected and the study was performed among them. Obtained data were analyzed using Pearson correlation and linear regression for hypothesis 1, and one-way ANOVA for hypothesis 2.

The survey instrument for measurement of emotional intelligence of individuals in this study was Hendrie Weisinger's (1998) 25- item emotional intelligence scale which is presented in his book *Emotional intelligence at work: The untapped edge for success* in 1998. The validity of the scale has been confirmed by Sosik and Megerian (1999), and Charbonneau and Nicol (2002). This questionnaire is localized and validated in Iran by Mortazavi and associates (1384/2005). To ensure the validity of the questionnaire they have subjected it to management and psychology experts and reliability of the scale has obtained - 0.83 using Cronbach's alpha coefficient (p. 175). In our study, this questionnaire is scored based on a five - point Likert scale, and using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, obtained reliability for the entire questionnaire is .872 (see table 1).

**Table 1: Reliability statistics of emotional intelligence.**

| Reliability Statistics |  |            |
|------------------------|--|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha       | Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
| .872                   | .872   | 25         |

Instrument for measurement of tendency of individuals to democratic values was a 80-item questionnaire which was a combinatorial scale obtained from Almond and Verba's (1963) work on *The civic culture: political attitudes and democracy in five nations* which is according to Inglehart and Welzel (2005) the first comparative empirical survey of the mass attitudes that are presumably linked with the stability and functioning of democracies (p. 2), Inglehart and Welzel's (2005) work on *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy*, and Tessler

and Gao's (2009) work on *Democracy and the political culture orientations of ordinary citizens*. In the following table different aspects of the questionnaire and their theoretical resources are mentioned:

**Table 2: Main democratic values, their aspects, the number of questions, and theoretical resources of the democratic values questionnaire.**

| Main democratic values | Aspects of values, the number of questions on each aspect and their theoretical resources.   |
|------------------------|--|
| Freedom                | Individual Freedoms with 5 questions obtained from Almond and Verba (1963) & Inglehart and Welzel (2005).                                |
|                        | Group Freedoms with 5 questions obtained from Inglehart and Welzel (2005) & Tessler and Gao (2009).                                      |
|                        | Press Freedoms with 7 questions obtained from Almond and Verba (1963), Inglehart and Welzel (2005), & Tessler and Gao (2009).            |
| Tolerance              | Individual Tolerance with 4 questions obtained from Almond and Verba (1963).   |
|                        | Social Tolerance with 4 questions obtained from Almond and Verba (1963).   |
|                        | Political Tolerance with 6 questions obtained from Almond and Verba (1963), Inglehart and Welzel (2005), & Tessler and Gao (2009).       |
|                        | Gender Tolerance with 12 questions obtained from Almond and Verba (1963), Inglehart and Welzel (2005), & Tessler and Gao (2009).         |
|                        | Religious Tolerance with 11 questions obtained from Almond and Verba (1963) & Inglehart and Welzel (2005).                               |
| Participation          | Ethnic Tolerance with 8 questions constructed by researchers inspired by Religious Tolerance of Inglehart and Welzel (2005).             |
|                        | Individual Participation with 11 questions obtained from Almond and Verba (1963), Inglehart and Welzel (2005), & Tessler and Gao (2009). |
|                        | Collective Participation with 7 questions obtained from Almond and Verba (1963).   |

The decision for making a scale for measurement of the tendency of individuals to democratic values has taken when we noticed during a work by one of the Ph.D. students on his doctorate thesis<sup>2</sup> that there is not a standard questionnaire for the measurement of democratic orientations and tendencies of individuals in Iran. Our more emphasis on tolerance and its aspects in the scale was due to the cultural, social, religious, and ethnic diversity of Iranian society and our aim was to examine effects of these differences on the tendency of individuals to democratic values. This questionnaire is also scored based on a five - point Likert scale. To ensure the validity, the tool has been subjected to experts (sociology professors of Tabriz University) and necessary modifications were made. To ensure reliability, the tool was implemented as a pilot in the sample and the obtained Cronbach's alpha for the entire questionnaire was .744 that shows the acceptable reliability of the tool. Obtained Cronbach's alpha coefficient for different dimensions of this questionnaire (including freedom,

<sup>2</sup> - Ph.D thesis of Mr Mehdi Rafiee titled "The Study of the relationship between cultural, social, emotional, and moral intelligence and tendency to democratic values: case study of Orumieh".

tolerance, and participation) in the main study are respectively .742, .831, and .771 and .886 for the entire questionnaire. Reliability statistics of democratic values are displayed in table 3.

**Table 3: Reliability statistics of democratic values.**

| Reliability Statistics |                             |            |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha       | Based on Standardized Items | N of Items |
| .886                   | .890                        | 80         |

**Statistics & Discussion Hypothesis 1**

In order to determine is there a meaningful relationship between the tendency To democratic values and emotional intelligence of Orumieh citizens, we performed Pearson correlation and a simple linear regression among the two variables. Correlations have shown in Tables 4 to 11 respectively for three dimensions of democratic values and the variable in its entirety. Results show, in agreement with our prediction in Hypothesis 1, at a significance level of .01, the tendency to democratic values is associated with emotional intelligence or EQ.

**Table 4: Emotional intelligence (EQ) and freedom correlations.**

|                                   |                                   | EQ                  | Freedom            |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| EQ                                | Pearson Correlation               | 1                   | .414 <sup>**</sup> |
|                                   | Sig. (2-tailed)                   |                     | .000               |
|                                   | Sum of Squares and Cross-products | 5.887E4             | 1.676E4            |
|                                   | Covariance                        | 98.284              | 27.975             |
|                                   | N                                 | 600                 | 600                |
|                                   | Freedom                           | Pearson Correlation | .414 <sup>**</sup> |
| Sig. (2-tailed)                   |                                   | .000                |                    |
| Sum of Squares and Cross-products |                                   | 1.676E4             | 2.779E4            |
| Covariance                        |                                   | 27.975              | 46.395             |
| N                                 |                                   | 600                 | 600                |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Table 5: Emotional intelligence (EQ) and freedom regression.**

| Model | Coefficients <sup>a</sup>   |            |                           |      |        |      |
|-------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------|--------|------|
|       | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t    | Sig.   |      |
|       | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant)                  | 37.150     | 2.332                     |      | 15.931 | .000 |
|       | EQ                          | .285       | .026                      | .414 | 11.131 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Freedom

**Table 6: Emotional intelligence (EQ) and tolerance correlations.**

|                                   |                                   | EQ                  | Tolerance          |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| EQ                                | Pearson Correlation               | 1                   | .356 <sup>**</sup> |
|                                   | Sig. (2-tailed)                   |                     | .000               |
|                                   | Sum of Squares and Cross-products | 5.887E4             | 2.504E4            |
|                                   | Covariance                        | 98.284              | 41.802             |
|                                   | N                                 | 600                 | 600                |
|                                   | Tolerance                         | Pearson Correlation | .356 <sup>**</sup> |
| Sig. (2-tailed)                   |                                   | .000                |                    |
| Sum of Squares and Cross-products |                                   | 2.504E4             | 8.407E4            |
| Covariance                        |                                   | 41.802              | 140.357            |
| N                                 |                                   | 600                 | 600                |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Table 7: Emotional intelligence (EQ) and tolerance regression.**

| Model | Coefficients <sup>a</sup>   |            |                           |      |        |      |
|-------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|------|--------|------|
|       | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t    | Sig.   |      |
|       | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      |      |        |      |
| 1     | (Constant)                  | 121.044    | 4.165                     |      | 29.065 | .000 |
|       | EQ                          | .425       | .046                      | .356 | 9.313  | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Tolerance

**Table 8: Emotional intelligence (EQ) and participation correlations.**

Correlations

|                                   | EQ      | Participation |
|-----------------------------------|---------|---------------|
| Pearson Correlation               | 1       | .424**        |
| Sig. (2-tailed)                   |         | .000          |
| Sum of Squares and Cross-products | 5.887E4 | 16478.093     |
| Covariance                        | 98.284  | 27.509        |
| N                                 | 600     | 600           |
| Pearson Correlation               | .424**  | 1             |
| Sig. (2-tailed)                   | .000    |               |
| Sum of Squares and Cross-products | 1.648E4 | 25693.573     |
| Covariance                        | 27.509  | 42.894        |
| N                                 | 600     | 600           |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 9: Emotional intelligence (EQ) and participation regression.

Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

| Model        | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|              | B                           | Std. Error |                           |        |      |
| 1 (Constant) | 36.934                      | 2.232      |                           | 16.551 | .000 |
| EQ           | .280                        | .024       | .424                      | 11.438 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Participation

Table 10: Emotional intelligence (EQ) and democratic values correlations.

Correlations

|                                   | EQ                 | DemocraticValues   |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Pearson Correlation               | 1                  | .480 <sup>**</sup> |
| Sig. (2-tailed)                   |                    | .000               |
| Sum of Squares and Cross-products | 5.887E4            | 58274.740          |
| Covariance                        | 98.284             | 97.287             |
| N                                 | 600                | 600                |
| Pearson Correlation               | .480 <sup>**</sup> | 1                  |
| Sig. (2-tailed)                   | .000               |                    |
| Sum of Squares and Cross-products | 5.827E4            | 250760.240         |
| Covariance                        | 97.287             | 418.631            |
| N                                 | 600                | 600                |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 11: Emotional intelligence (EQ) and democratic values regression.

Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

| Model        | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|              | B                           | Std. Error |                           |        |      |
| 1 (Constant) | 195.128                     | 6.753      |                           | 28.894 | .000 |
| EQ           | .990                        | .074       | .480                      | 13.366 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable:

DemocraticValues

**Hypothesis 2**

In order to determine is there a meaningful relationship between the tendency to democratic values and religion and ethnicity and to determine if religion and ethnicity affect the tendency of Orumieh citizens to democratic values, we performed one-way ANOVA among these variables. Relationships have displayed in Tables 12 to 15 respectively for religion and ethnicity. Results show, in agreement with our prediction in Hypothesis 2, these variables affect the tendency of individuals to democratic values.

Table 12: Impact of religion on the tendency of individuals to democratic values (ANOVA).

ANOVA

DemocraticValues

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | 5389.826       | 2   | 2694.913    | 6.758 | .001 |
| Within Groups  | 238065.348     | 597 | 398.769     |       |      |
| Total          | 243455.173     | 599 |             |       |      |

**Table 13: Impact of religion on the tendency of individuals to democratic values (Multiple Comparisons).**

Multiple Comparisons

DemocraticValues

Tamhane

| (I) Religion | (J) Religion | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |             |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
|              |              |                       |            |      | Lower Bound             | Upper Bound |
| Shia         | Sunni        | -2.492                | 1.751      | .398 | -6.69                   | 1.70        |
|              | Christian    | -9.425*               | 2.555      | .001 | -15.61                  | -3.25       |
| Sunni        | Shia         | 2.492                 | 1.751      | .398 | -1.70                   | 6.69        |
|              | Christian    | -6.933*               | 2.553      | .022 | -13.11                  | -.76        |
| Christian    | Shia         | 9.425*                | 2.555      | .001 | 3.25                    | 15.61       |
|              | Sunni        | 6.933*                | 2.553      | .022 | .76                     | 13.11       |

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

As results of comparisons table show shia and sunni citizens of Orumieh have not significant differences in the tendency to democratic values, but christians of the city differ significantly from shia and sunni citizens in the tendency to democratic values. Christians have a significantly higher tendency to democratic values.

**Table 14: Impact of ethnicity on the tendency of individuals to democratic values (ANOVA).**

ANOVA

DemocraticValues

|                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | 6364.863       | 3   | 2121.621    | 5.333 | .001 |
| Within Groups  | 237090.311     | 596 | 397.803     |       |      |
| Total          | 243455.173     | 599 |             |       |      |

**Table 15: Impact of ethnicity on the tendency of individuals to democratic values (Multiple Comparisons).**

Multiple Comparisons

DemocraticValues

Tukey HSD

| (I) Ethnicity | (J) Ethnicity | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |             |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
|               |               |                       |            |      | Lower Bound             | Upper Bound |
| Kurd          | Armenian      | -2.438                | 1.748      | .503 | -6.94                   | 2.06        |
|               | Turk          | -6.661                | 3.078      | .135 | -14.59                  | 1.27        |
|               | Assyrian      | -14.078*              | 3.903      | .002 | -24.13                  | -4.02       |
| Turk          | Armenian      | 2.438                 | 1.748      | .503 | -2.06                   | 6.94        |
|               | Kurd          | -4.224                | 3.081      | .518 | -12.16                  | 3.71        |
|               | Assyrian      | -11.641*              | 3.906      | .016 | -21.70                  | -1.58       |
| Armenian      | Turk          | 6.661                 | 3.078      | .135 | -1.27                   | 14.59       |
|               | Kurd          | 4.224                 | 3.081      | .518 | -3.71                   | 12.16       |
|               | Assyrian      | -7.417                | 4.655      | .383 | -19.41                  | 4.58        |
| Assyrian      | Turk          | 14.078*               | 3.903      | .002 | 4.02                    | 24.13       |
|               | Kurd          | 11.641*               | 3.906      | .016 | 1.58                    | 21.70       |
|               | Armenian      | 7.417                 | 4.655      | .383 | -4.58                   | 19.41       |

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

As results of comparisons table show turk and kurd citizens of Orumieh have not significant differences in the tendency to democratic values, but armenians of the city differ from turks to some extent in this regards. Assyrians of the city have main differences in the tendency to democratic values with other ethnic citizens of the city. Assyrians have a significantly higher tendency to democratic values comparing other ethnic groups, especially with turks.

**CONCLUSION**

As mentioned earlier existing research on supportive culture of democracy has demonstrated the importance of knowledge, belief, morals, custom and so on for democracy and the tendency of individuals to democratic values. As Inglehart and Welzel (2005) pointed out:

Democracy is not simply the result of clever elite bargaining and constitutional engineering. It depends on deep-rooted orientations among the people themselves. These orientations motivate them to press for freedom, effective civil and political rights, and genuinely responsive government - and to exert continual vigilance to ensure that the governing elites remain responsive to them (p. 300).

Intelligence is also a relevant phenomenon for politics and itself a relevant political phenomenon (Rindermann, 2007: 319). Longitudinal studies support the theory that intelligence has an impact on political orientations and behavior (Deary et al, 2008a, & 2008b). According to Meisenberg (2004), The causal arrow (from intelligence to political orientations) is likely to point from the latent trait 'intelligence' to a rational, non-traditional system of beliefs and values. As people get brighter they develop a habit of critical thinking, questioning religious dogmas and other sources of traditional authority (p. 139).

Emotional intelligence or EQ also as has shown in this study has a positive effect on the tendency of individuals to democratic values. Thus, our main hypothesis about the existence of a relationship between emotional intelligence of

individuals and their tendency to democratic values is confirmed and this indicates the positive role of a mental and behavioral ability of individuals on their attitudes and opinions towards politics and political preferences. As Coppedge (2012) pointed out Those who study political culture believe that we cannot discover useful theories without getting inside the heads of political actors (p. 213).

Our finding is also consistent with those researches on emotional intelligence that have theorized and demonstrated the importance of emotional intelligence for citizenship relations (Sluyter & Salovey, 1997), relating well to people (Bar-On, 2000), Empathy, prosocial behavior, and Social Skills (Goleman, 1995, 1998, 2004), relieving relations, smooth interaction (Ioannidou & Konstantikaki, 2008), successful interpersonal relationships (Mayer, 2008), and positive social functioning (Brackett *et al*, 2011) and demonstrates that emotional intelligence is an ability and mental capability that affects the tendency of individuals to freedom, tolerance, and participation, and shows having higher rates of emotional intelligence among the citizens of Orumieh city enhance their tendency to these democratic values. As Van Dyne and associates (2012) have stated "initial research on new constructs typically focuses on more global conceptualizations. Then, over time, more narrow conceptualizations are advanced which elucidate sub-dimensions that allow more refined theorizing and testing" (p. 296). Our study on the relationship between emotional intelligence and the tendency of individuals to democratic values regarding this viewpoint can be seen as an initial attempt in "advancing more narrow conceptualizations" on emotional intelligence that allows "more refined theorizing and testing" of its relationship with concepts such as democracy and democratic values.

Moreover, as statistical findings in statistics section show religion and ethnicity affect the tendency of individuals to democratic values. Hence, our second hypothesis is also confirmed according to acquired data and this matter indicates the role of religion and ethnicity of orumieh citizen's on their tendency to democratic values. There are many different studies about the role of each of these variables on democracy, democratization, and democratic values, for example, religion, according to Norris and Inglehart (2004), remains an important driver of political behavior, and particularly so in the developing world. Michael Hoffman (2012) states about the nature of the relationship between religion and democratic orientations "I wish to suggest that the incentives faced by religious groups in the political settings under which they operate, influences their approaches to democracy in significant ways." (p. 21).

About the role of ethnicity in political culture, Silver & Dowley (2000) believe "in the world at large, people and ethnic groups differ markedly in their levels of political interest, interpersonal trust, subjective political competence, pride in the country, and confidence in political institutions, even when adjusting for compositional differences. They thus differ markedly in their adoption of a political culture of democracy" (p. 532). Our findings also consistently with these findings show the different effects of religion and ethnicity on the tendency of individuals to democratic values.

## REFERENCES

1. Acton, John D. (1907). *The History of Freedom and Other Essays*. London: Macmillan.
2. Almond, G. & Verba, S. (1963). *The civic culture: political attitudes and democracy in five nations*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Co.
3. Almond, Gabriel. (1956). *Comparative Political Systems*. pp. 34-42 in *Political Behavior: A Reader in Theory and Research*, edited by H. Eulau, S. J. Eldersveld, and M. Janowitz. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
4. Arendt, Hannah (1993). *What is Freedom, Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought*, New York: Penguin.
5. Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). In R. Bar-On & J.D.A. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 363-388). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
6. Beetham, David., & Boyle, Kevin. (1995). *Introducing Democracy: 80 Questions and Answers*. USA, Polity Press.
7. Bobbio, Norberto. (1987). *The Future of Democracy: A Defense of the Rules of the Game*. Minneapolis,
8. Booth, J. A. & Richard, P. B. (1998). Civil society, political capital, and democratization in Central America, *The Journal of Politics*, 60 (3), pp.780-800.
9. Brackett, M. A., & Geher, G. (2006). Measuring emotional intelligence: Paradigmatic shifts and common ground. In J. Ciarrochi, J. P. Forgas & J. D. Mayer (Eds.), *Emotional Intelligence and Everyday Life* (2nd ed., pp. 27-50). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
10. Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional Intelligence: Implications for Personal, Social, Academic, and Workplace Success, *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 5/1 (2011): pp. 88-103.
11. Bühlmann, Marc., Wolfgang, Merkel, & Bernhard, Wessels (2008). *The Quality of Democracy, Democracy Barometer for Established Democracies*. (Revised Version 20.03.2008). National Center of Competence in Research: Challenges to Democracy in the 21st Century: Working Paper No. 10a. [<http://www.nccr-democracy.uzh.ch/nccr/publications/workingpaper/10>]
12. Charbonneau, D., & Nicol, A. A.M. (2002). Emotional intelligence and leadership in adolescents, *Personality and Individual Differences*, No. 33, pp. 1101-1113.
13. *Comparing Experiences with Democracy*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
14. Coppedge, Michael (2012). *Democratization and Research Methods (Strategies for Social Inquiry)*, Cambridge University Press.
15. Dahl, R. A. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
16. Dalton, R. (2000). Citizen attitudes and political behaviour, *Comparative Political Studies*, 33 (6-7), pp. 912-940.
17. Deary, I. J., Batty, G. D., & Gale, C. R. (2008a). Bright children become enlightened adults, *Psychological Science*, No. 19, pp. 1- 6.
18. Deary, I. J., Batty, G. D., & Gale, C. R. (2008b). Childhood intelligence predicts voter turnout, voting preferences, and political involvement in adulthood: The 1970 British Cohort Study, *Intelligence*, No. 36,

- pp. 548–555 (Corrigendum 2009, *Intelligence*, 37, p. 325).
19. Diamond, Larry., Juan, Linz., & Seymour. Martin, Lipset, eds. (1990). *Politics in Developing Countries*.
  20. Eckstein, Harry. (1988). A Culturalist Theory of Political Change. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 82, No. 3, pp. 789-804.
  21. Ekman, P. (1973). *Darwin and Facial Expression: A Century of Research in Review*, Oxford, England: Academic Press.
  22. Emmerling, R. J., & Goleman, Daniel (2003). Emotional intelligence: issues and common misunderstandings, The Consortium for Research on Emotional Intelligence in Organizations, available at ([www.eiconsortium.org](http://www.eiconsortium.org))
  23. Forgas, J. P., & Moylan, S. (1987). After the movies: Transient mood and social judgments. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 13, pp. 467–477.
  24. Garcia-Rivero, C., Kotze, H. & Du Toit, P. (2002). Political culture and democracy: the South African case, *Politikon*, 29 (2), pp. 163–181.
  25. Gardenswartz, Lee., Cherbosque, Jorge., & Rowe, Anita. (2010). Emotional Intelligence and Diversity: A Model for Differences in the Workplace, *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, Volume 1, pp. 74-84.
  26. Gibson, J. L. (2007). Political Intolerance in the Context of Democratic Theory. In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science*. ed. Goodin, Robert E. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 323-341.
  27. Gibson, J. L., Duch, R. M. & Tedin, K. L. (1992). Democratic values and the transformation of the Soviet Union, *The Journal of Politics*, 54 (2), pp. 329–371.
  28. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
  29. Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
  30. Goleman, D. (2004 [1998]). *What Makes a Leader?* Harvard Business Review, Inside the Mind of the Leader, (reprinted in January of 2004).
  31. Goleman, D. (2006). *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Human Relationships*. Random House Publishing Group.
  32. Goleman, D. (2011a). *The Brain and Emotional Intelligence: New Insights*. Northampton, MA: More Than Sound.
  33. Goleman, D. (2011b). *Leadership: The Power of Emotional Intelligence; Selected Writings*. Northampton, MA: More Than Sound.
  34. Gorodnichenko, Yuriy & Roland, Gerard. (2015). *Culture, Institutions and Democratization*, National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series, Paper No. 21117. April 2015. Cambridge, MA.
  35. Gudykunst, W. B., Ting-Toomey, S., & Chua, E. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
  36. Hoffman, Michael (2012). *Religion and Democratic Attitudes*, Prepared for Princeton University Comparative Politics Graduate Research Seminar (November 13, 2012).
  37. Inglehart, R. & Welzel, C. (2003). Political culture and democracy: analyzing cross-level linkages, *Comparative Politics*, 36 (1), pp. 61–79.
  38. Inglehart, R. & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
  39. Inglehart, Ronald. (2000). Culture and democracy. In: Harrison, L. E. And Huntington, S., eds *Culture matters: how values shape human progress*. New York: Basic Books.
  40. Ioannidou, F. & Konstantikaki, V (2008). Empathy and emotional intelligence: What is it really about? *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 1(3): pp. 118–123.
  41. *Iranian Population and Housing Census (2011)*, Statistical Centre of Iran.
  42. Kekic, Laza (2007). *The Economist Intelligence Unit's Index of Democracy. The World in 2007*. London: The Economist. [[http://www.economist.com/media/pdf/DEMOCRACY\\_INDEX\\_2007\\_v3.pdf](http://www.economist.com/media/pdf/DEMOCRACY_INDEX_2007_v3.pdf)]
  43. Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (2001). Social functions of emotions. In T. J. Mayne & G. A. Bonanno (Eds.), *Emotions: Current Issues and Future Directions* (pp. 192–213). New York: Guilford Press.
  44. Lantieri, L. & Goleman, D. (2008). *Building Emotional Intelligence: Techniques to Cultivate Inner Strength in Children*. Colorado. Sounds True.
  45. Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy. *American Political Science Review*. 53 (March): pp. 69-105, doi:10.2307/1951731.
  46. Lipset, S. M. (1994). the social requisites of democracy revisited, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 59, No. 1, pp. 1-22.
  47. Mayer, J. D., & Bremer, D. (1985). Assessing mood and affect-sensitive tasks. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, pp. 95–99.
  48. Mayer, J. D., & Caruso, D. (2002). The effective leader: Understanding and applying emotional intelligence. *Ivey Business Journal*, Ivey Management Services, November/ December 2002.
  49. Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In Salovey, P. & Sluyter, D. (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.
  50. Mayer, J.D., & Salovey, p. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence, *Intelligence*, vol. 17, pp. 433-442.
  51. Mayer, John. D. (2008). Human Abilities: Emotional Intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, No. 59: pp. 507–536.
  52. Meisenberg, G. (2004). Talent, character, and the dimensions of national culture, *Mankind Quarterly*, No. 45, pp. 123–168.
  53. MN: University of Minnesota.
  54. Mortazavi, S., Nazemi, Sh., & Mahmodi Fakhrrabad, S (1384/ 2005). *Barrasi Rabete Hoshe Atefi va Sabke Rahbari: Tahavvol bakhsh- Mobadeleey (Study of the Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Style: Transformational- Trading*, *Journal of Human Sciences MODARES*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (42 continuously), Autumn 2005, pp. 167-190.
  55. Nathan, A. & Shi, T. (1993). Cultural requisites for democracy in China: findings from a survey, *Daedalus*, 122 (2), pp. 95–123.
  56. Norris, P. (2002). *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
  57. Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2004). *Sacred and Secular: Religion and Politics Worldwide*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

58. Pye, Lucian W. (1965). Introduction: Political Culture and Political Development. pp. 3-26 in *Political Culture and Political Development*, edited by L. Pye and S. Verba. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
59. Rice, T. & Feldman, J. L. (1997). Civic culture and democracy from Europe to America, *Journal of Politics*, 39 (4), pp. 1143-1172.
60. Rindermann, Heiner. (2007). Relevance of education and intelligence for the political development of nations: Democracy, rule of law and political liberty, *Intelligence*, vol. 36, pp. 306 – 322.
61. Salovey, P., & Birnbaum, D. (1989). Influence of mood on health-relevant cognitions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, pp. 539-551.
62. Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, No. 9, pp. 185-211.
63. Schumpeter, Joseph (1962 [1942]). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, New York: Harper and Row, (reprinted in 1962).
64. Sen, Amartya. (2000). *Development as Freedom*. Anchor Books.
65. Silver, Brian D., & Dowley, Kathleen M. (2000). Measuring Political Culture in Multi-Ethnic Societies: Reaggregating the World Values Survey, *Comparative Political Studies*, NO. 31 (May), pp. 517-550.
66. Sluyter, D. & Salovey, P. (1997). *Emotional Development and Emotional intelligence: Implications for Educators*, New York, NY: Basic Books.
67. Sodaro, Michael J. (2004). *Comparative Politics. A Global Introduction*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
68. Sosik, J. J., & Megerian, L. E. (1999). Understanding leader emotional intelligence and performance, *Group and Organization Management*, No. 24, pp. 367-390.
69. Tessler, Mark & Gao, Eleanor (2009). *Democracy and the political culture orientations of ordinary citizens: a typology for the Arab world and beyond*, UNESCO 2009. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, UK and Malden, USA.
70. Tylor, Edward Burnett. (1871). *Primitive Culture: Researches Into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom*, Volume 1. London: John Murray Publication.
71. Van Dyne, Linn., Ang, Soon., Yee Ng, Kok., Rockstuhl, Thomas., Tan, Mei Ling., & Koh, Christine (2012). Sub-Dimensions of the Four Factor Model of Cultural Intelligence: Expanding the Conceptualization and Measurement of Cultural Intelligence, *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 6/4: pp. 295-313.
72. Vanhanen, Tatu. (2003). *Democratization: A Comparative Analysis of 170 Countries*, London: Routledge.
73. Verba, S., Scholzman, K. L., and H. Brady. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
74. Weingast, Barry R. (1997). *The Political Foundations of Democracy and the Rule of Law*, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 2, pp. 245-263.
75. Weisinger, H. (1998), *Emotional intelligence at work: The untapped edge for success*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
76. Wucherpfennig, Julian & Deutsch, Franziska (2009). *Modernization and Democracy: Theories and Evidence Revisited*, *Living Reviews in Democracy*, pp: 1-9. First published: September 2009, Most recent version available at <http://www.livingreviews.org/lrd-2009-4>
77. Young, Iris Marion (2000). *Inclusion and Democracy*, Oxford University Press, UK.
78. Zeidner, Moshe., Matthews, Gerald., & Roberts, Richard D. (2009). *What we know about emotional intelligence: how it affects learning, work, relationships, and our mental health*, US, the MIT Press.