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1. Introduction

During the Cold War, Serbia (as a republic in the former Yugoslavia) was largely independent of the influence of the Soviet Communist bloc, and its citizens were free to travel around the world and encounter other political and economic systems. The long period of socialism in Serbia (more than forty years) saw the introduction of the workers' self-management system and paternalistic style of leadership. In addition, the presence of elements of the market economy also distinguished Serbia from the Soviet bloc. The self-management system relied on the distinction between enterprise policy-making, which was subject to employee influence, and the execution of that policy, which was the domain of management. The successful maintenance of that distinction allowed the workers to be included in the market-oriented decision-making via the Worker's Council, while providing a mechanism for management to ensure adequate discipline (Estrin 1991; Denitch 1990; Drulovic 1978). At that time Serbian workers were able to freely discuss relevant issues at the meetings of the Worker's Councils and communication between employees and their supervisors was relatively free. Directors could not make decisions alone. The worker’s council, at which the common workers were present, decided whether or not a worker had made a serious mistake (Kuljic 2003). The last transition was followed by the sudden breakdown of one cultural identity, and the slow and uneven discovery of another. "Value vacuum" is often used as a term to describe the transition period between an old and new system model (Vukotic et al. 2013). Details about the theory, practice and characteristics of management in Serbia can be found in (Vukotic et al. 2013). The political and economic changes that have occurred in Serbia have resulted in a considerable reduction in the role of Serbian workers in the decision-making process and the communication between workers and management has become largely top-down. This situation may have many negative consequences because of the importance of internal communication for many organizational outcomes. Communication satisfaction is one of the most important constructs in organizational behaviour since it is a predictor of job satisfaction and many aspects of organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB). The relationship between communication satisfaction and OCB is prescribed in the social exchange theory. This theory argues that people reciprocate the advantages they receive from their organization. In other word, if employees are satisfied, then they try to reciprocate by engaging in OCB (Bolino 1999). Ineffective or inadequate communication causes disturbance, employee turnover, disorder, failure to achieve goals, and damages the image of an organization. Lack of effective communication may lead to misunderstandings, lack of information, a drop in employee performance, and a decrease in company turnover, which in turn often result in incompetence, poor teamwork and disrespect. Therefore, it is of interest for scientists from the fields of organizational behaviour theory and communication management theory, as well as management
practitioners and educators, to increase their knowledge of the factors (personal and organizational) that may contribute to increasing the communication satisfaction of employees in a country under transition.

We will discuss emotional intelligence as such a factor which contributes to communication satisfaction. Scholars began to shift their attention from describing and assessing social intelligence to understanding the purpose of interpersonal behaviour and the role it plays in effective adaptability (Zirkel 2000). In general, emotional intelligence (EI) refers to competencies in identifying, understanding, expressing, and managing emotion, in both self and others (Matthews et al. 2005; Mayer et al. 2000).

EI has become a popular topic in the business press in recent years. Some key leadership skills and perspectives are related to aspects of emotional intelligence and the absence of emotional intelligence has been linked to career derailment. EI has recently been shown to be a valid predictor of important outcomes such as leadership, teamwork, and job performance (Van Rooy/Viswesvaran 2004; Wong/Law 2002). More emotionally intelligent individuals succeed in communicating their ideas, goals, and intentions in interesting and assertive ways, thus making others feel better suited to the occupational environment (Goleman 1998). Organizational leaders, who are high in EI, in concert with a supportive organizational climate and human resources team, may affect the relationships in the work setting, which, in turn, impacts upon both group and individual EI and organizational commitment (Cherniss 2001). EI may also be useful for group development since a large part of effective and smooth team work is to know one another’s’ strengths and weaknesses and to leverage strengths whenever possible (Bar-On 1997). EI is claimed to influence one’s ability to cope with environmental demands and pressures, clearly an important set of behaviours to harness under stressful work conditions (Bar-On 1997). Goleman (1998) explained that emotional intelligence creates passion, confidence, friendliness, motivation, pride, and energy in individuals. The ability to transmit these same emotions to others offers emotionally intelligent people advantages over others in interpersonal communication contexts. Zeidner, Matthews and Roberts (2004) suggested that emotional intelligence contributes to the satisfaction of individuals when communicating with others. While research on emotional intelligence has progressed significantly since its inception, more research will be needed to further validate claims of the relative importance of emotional intelligence to the prediction of specific criterion.

In this paper we investigate emotional intelligence as a predictor of communication satisfaction and the roles which GLOBE power distance and collectivism play as moderators of the relationships between emotional intelligence and communication satisfaction in Serbian organizations.
2. Theory and hypotheses

2.1 Emotional intelligence

One of the definitions of emotional intelligence (EI) is that EI is the “ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (Mayer/Salovey 1997:10).

Weisinger (1998) considered the following dimensions of emotional intelligence:

- **Self-awareness**
  Self-awareness reflects an accurate perception of how one projects oneself. This concept is similar to what other researchers have identified as self-monitoring and includes self-understanding, knowledge of true feeling at the moment and knowing one’s internal states.

- **Self-management**
  Self-management is defined as the ability to shake off negative emotions and get back on a constructive track for problem solving.

- **Self-motivation**
  Individuals with a high degree of self-motivation tend to stay intrinsically motivated and do not rely on outside sources for reinforcement.

- **Empathy**
  Empathy is defined as the ability to understand and be sensitive to the feelings of others.

- **Social skills**
  Social skills are defined as the ability to read social situations, interacting with others and forming networks with ease.

Emotional intelligence plays an important role in shaping an individual’s interpersonal behaviours. Zeidner, Matthews and Roberts (2004) claimed that people with higher emotional intelligence succeed in communicating their goals, ideas, and intentions in a more interesting and assertive manner. They also suggest that emotional intelligence is related to the social skills necessary for teamwork. Together, these abilities contribute to a satisfying personal and professional life. Emotional intelligence shapes an individual’s level of satisfaction with social relationships. Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002) claimed that a leader needs to have high emotional intelligence to be trusted and listened to. Indeed, a leader needs to have high emotional intelligence to keep people motivated and to offer a sense of purpose beyond the day-to-day tasks.
2.2 Emotional intelligence and communication

A large body of communication literature considers aspects of self and other roles. The communication development perspective claims that successful communication is contingent upon the ability to (1) differentiate between self and other roles, and (2) take the perspective of the other (Hecht/Sereno 1985). “Several aspects of emotional intelligence – reading others’ emotions, having the capability to assist others regulate their moods in a positive manner – may have great implications for building and maintaining healthier interpersonal communication” (Schutte et al. 2001:530). According to Mayer, Caruso and Salovey (2004:210) “the high EI individual can better perceive emotions, use them in thought, understand their meanings, and manage emotions better than others... tends to be more open and agreeable...”. Theories of EI focus on the significance of understanding and relating with others, which has a close connection with communication where adaptation and proper use of knowledge and skills are essential when interacting with other persons. One of the communication aspects of emotional intelligence holds that emotional intelligence is the outcome of the communicative process and that it is through communication effectiveness that emotional intelligence occurs. The social awareness of emotional intelligence has a direct relationship with people and groups and communication such as “the empathic individual can read emotional currents, picking up on nonverbal cues such as tone or facial expression” (Goleman 2001:35-36).

2.3 Communication satisfaction

According to Downs and Hazen (1977) communication satisfaction can be simply defined as how employees feel about communication efforts and different aspects of their communication. The Communication Satisfaction construct, introduced by Downs and Hazen in 1977, has become a successful research stream in organizational communication. Downs and Hazen (1977) explored the multidimensionality of communication satisfaction using an original questionnaire called the “Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire”. The eight factors that resulted from this analysis were described as follows (Downs/Hazen 1977):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Perspective</th>
<th>It deals with the broadest kinds of information about the organization as a whole.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Feedback</td>
<td>It is concerned with the workers’ need to know how they are being judged and how their performance is being appraised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Integration</td>
<td>It revolves around the degree to which individuals receive information about their immediate environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Supervisory Communication

It includes both the upward and downward aspects of communicating with superiors.

### Communication Climate

It reflects communication on both organizational and personal levels.

### Horizontal Communication

It concerns the extent to which co-workers and informal communication are accurate and free flowing.

### Media Quality

It deals with the extent to which meetings are well-organized, written directives short and clear, and the degree to which the amount of communication is adequate.

### Subordinate Communication

It focuses on upward and downward communication with subordinates. Only workers in supervisory positions respond to items related to this dimension.

## 2.4 GLOBE Cultural dimensions

In this paper we are interested in the moderating influence of GLOBE organizational power distance, and institutional and in-group collectivism on the relationships between the emotional intelligence (EI) and communication satisfaction (CS) of middle managers in Serbian organizations. The GLOBE study was a 10-year research programme (House et al. 2004) undertaken for the major purpose of increasing available knowledge relevant to cross-cultural interactions. The results of the study are reported in the form of quantitative data collected from approximately 17,000 managers holding positions in 951 organizations from 62 different societies around the world. Through their research project, they confirmed many of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions including power distance, uncertainty avoidance and individualism-collectivism. Others were modified: the masculinity-femininity dimension was split into two dimensions - gender egalitarianism and assertiveness, and long-term orientation into future orientation, and others were discovered including performance orientation and humane orientation. There are many papers in which the historical roots of GLOBE dimensions are discussed and details related to that discussion can be found in the book by House et al. (2004).

The GLOBE study included a quantitative assessment of societal and organizational cultural values, seeking information on the current emphasis given to those values (“as it is”) and the emphasis that the respondents felt should be given to each value (“as it should be”). The nine GLOBE dimensions were covered by 78 survey questions, asking the subjects to describe their culture (“as it is”) and the other half to judge it (“as it should be”). GLOBE thus produced $9 \times 2 = 18$ culture scores for each country: nine dimensions as it is (practices) and nine “as it should be” (values) (separately for societal and organizational culture).
Many authors believe (Gudykunst/Mody 2002; Riedel/Karrasch 2002) that individualism-collectivism and power distance are the most important dimensions of cultural variability used to explain the differences and similarities in communication across cultures. On the other side, the so called “pendulum effect“ is strongly manifested by these two cultural dimensions in transition countries, including Serbia (Vukonjanski et al. 2012). The “pendulum effect” is a substantial contrast between “as it is” and “as it should be” indices (Bakacsi 1999). Bakacsi found such an effect in a Hungarian sample and he posed the following hypotheses related to countries in transition:

- The more a country (or an organization) perceives itself as a high power distance culture, the more it wants to change itself into a low power distance one.
- The more individualistic a country's culture (or that of an organization) is, the more its members want to belong to a more collectivistic one.

Power Distance is defined (House et al. 2004) as the degree to which the members of a society or an organization expect and agree that power should be unequally shared. In organizations with low power distance orientation, employees expect all members to have equal rights and they are willing to question and challenge the views of their superiors. In high power distance organizations, employees expect the power holders to be entitled to privileges and they are willing to support and accept the views of their superiors. In low power distance organizations, the relations between managers and employees should be more direct; the power should be based on competencies, and less connected with status symbols than in high power distance organizations (House et al. 2004). Collectivism reflects the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups within a society or organization (House et al. 2004). In-group collectivism is the degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations or families. Institutional collectivism is defined as the degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward the collective distribution of resources and collective action (House et al. 2004).

Hence, we tested the following model:
2.5 Research hypotheses

In this paper we will investigate the following four hypotheses:

H1 – Emotional intelligence has a significantly positive correlation with communication satisfaction.

H2 – The organizational culture dimension of power distance moderates the relationship between emotional intelligence and communication satisfaction.

H3 – The organizational culture dimension of institutional collectivism moderates the relationship between emotional intelligence and communication satisfaction.

H4 – The organizational culture dimension of in-group collectivism moderates the relationship between emotional intelligence and communication satisfaction.

3. Method

3.1 Survey instruments (measures)

The Communication Satisfaction construct introduced by Downs and Hazen (1977), is measured by their questionnaire for the aspects (factors) described above. The 35 items are used with a Likert-type scale ranging from very satisfied (1) to very dissatisfied (10). Each of the eight factors has five items, which are averaged for a factor score. The emotional intelligence of the respondents-
middle managers is measured by the Weisinger (1998) questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of five items for each of the five dimensions of emotional intelligence starting with “you have the ability to” (the range of responses is from 1 “I do not agree at all” to 5 “I completely agree”). Some of the items are: “know what senses you are currently using” (for self-awareness); “relax when under pressure” (for managing emotions); “regroup quickly after a setback” (for self-motivation); “recognize when others are distressed” and “help others manage their emotions” (for empathy); and “develop consensus with others” (for social skills).

We used the GLOBE project instrument for measuring the organizational culture dimensions “as it is”, and the “as it should be” part of the instrument for power distance, and institutional and in-group collectivism. The GLOBE questionnaire has 34 items and the answers are measured on a 7-point Likert scale (House et al. 2004). Some of the items (“as it is”) are: “in this organization, a person’s influence is based primarily on the authority of his/her position” (for power distance); “in this organization, managers encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer“ and “the pay and bonus system in this organization is designed to maximize collective interests“ (for institutional collectivism); and “in this organization, group members take pride in the individual accomplishments of their group manager“ (for in-group collectivism).

3.2 Participants and data collection

The employees (320 middle managers) were approached by the authors during 2011 and asked if they would be willing to complete our questionnaires. If the participants agreed to be part of the study (256 of them agreed), they were provided with a written explanation of their rights as participants in the study and by completing an English version of the questionnaire they gave their consent. All of the middle managers in the sample have Bachelors and Masters Degrees and they learned English for at least 12 years during their studies (in secondary school and advanced courses at university). The sample includes 142 males and 114 females and their tenure is distributed in the following way: 16% have worked for less than 10 years, 61 % have worked between 10 and 20 years and 23% for more than 20 years. The middle managers from the sample were from 131 organizations from the food processing, telecommunications, and financial sectors, hence the same industries as those included in the GLOBE study. Our data were not collected as part of the GLOBE study, but as a separate country study later on.

4. Data analysis

We used descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and hierarchical regression analysis in order to investigate the moderating effects of GLOBE organizational power distance, and institutional and in-group collectivism “as it is“ on the re-
gression between the communication satisfaction dimensions (as dependent variables) and the emotional intelligence abilities (as independent variables). The moderating effect was tested by examining the change in R-squared attributable to the interaction term.

4.1 Descriptive statistics

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for variables E1 – E5, CS1 – CS8, PD, C1 and C2.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Short name</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational perspective</td>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5.4777</td>
<td>2.46159</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with supervisors</td>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.0366</td>
<td>2.42459</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication climate</td>
<td>CS3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.1143</td>
<td>2.55272</td>
<td>.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal feedback</td>
<td>CS4</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.2357</td>
<td>2.38737</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal and informal communication</td>
<td>CS5</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.9598</td>
<td>1.75146</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media quality</td>
<td>CS6</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.4143</td>
<td>1.99690</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational integration</td>
<td>CS7</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.1652</td>
<td>2.20119</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate communication</td>
<td>CS8</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.5733</td>
<td>1.33504</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self awareness</td>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0116</td>
<td>.66754</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing emotions</td>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.7911</td>
<td>.69560</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self motivation</td>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.9929</td>
<td>.67308</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.7393</td>
<td>.68283</td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>EI5</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.0571</td>
<td>.64727</td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational power distance “as it is”</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.7946</td>
<td>1.42911</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational institutional collectivism “as it is”</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.8199</td>
<td>1.35587</td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational in-group collectivism “as it is”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C2</th>
<th>256</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>7.00</th>
<th>4.5634</th>
<th>1.18553</th>
<th>.750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Valid N (list wise) | 256 |

Cronbach’s alpha for all of the questionnaires used in the paper is greater than 0.70. The highest values gained for the communication satisfaction dimensions are satisfaction with subordinate communication and communication with supervisors, and the lowest value is for satisfaction with communication on organizational perspectives. The highest value for the emotional intelligence dimensions is social skills and the lowest value empathy.

4.2 Regression and correlation analysis

The statistical results demonstrate that all EI abilities (EIi, i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) and CS dimensions (CSj, for j = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7) are positive and significantly correlated. The communication satisfaction dimension CS8 is positive but non-significantly correlated with EI abilities and was thus excluded from further consideration.

Table 2: Pearson coefficients of correlation between emotional intelligence abilities and communication satisfaction dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CS1</th>
<th>CS2</th>
<th>CS3</th>
<th>CS4</th>
<th>CS5</th>
<th>CS6</th>
<th>CS7</th>
<th>CS8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>.297**</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.353**</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>.423**</td>
<td>.304**</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>.315**</td>
<td>.338**</td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>.252**</td>
<td>.287**</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>.200**</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>.242**</td>
<td>.285**</td>
<td>.217**</td>
<td>-.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI5</td>
<td>.178**</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td>.271**</td>
<td>.306**</td>
<td>.325**</td>
<td>.238**</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05; **p<0.01

Hence H1 is supported.

Table 3 shows the results of regression analysis – the corrected determination indexes (Dependent Variable: CS dimensions; Predictors: EI1 to EI5).

Table 3: Regression analysis – the corrected determination indexes (Dependent Variable: CS dimensions; Predictors: constant, EI1 to EI5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The corrected determination indexes (R²)</th>
<th>Dependent Variable: CSi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictors: Constant, EI1 to EI5</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The values $R^2$, which signify the percentage of variability of the communication satisfaction dimensions explained by the variables EI1 to EI5, range from 0.106 to 0.192.

We hypothesized that power distance is a moderator of some correlations between CS dimensions and EI abilities. According to hierarchical regression analysis, the moderating effect of power distance on the correlations between emotional intelligence abilities and communication satisfaction dimensions is confirmed for the following correlations:

- **Self-awareness (EI1)** and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) ($R^2 = .239$), communication with supervisors (CS2) ($R^2 = .286$), communication climate (CS3) ($R^2 = .275$), personal feedback (CS4) ($R^2 = .311$), horizontal and informal communication (CS5) ($R^2 = .229$) and organizational integration (CS7) ($R^2 = .203$).

- **Managing emotions (EI2)** and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) ($R^2 = .252$), communication with supervisors (CS2) ($R^2 = .278$), communication climate (CS3) ($R^2 = .274$), personal feedback (CS4) ($R^2 = .325$), horizontal and informal communication (CS5) ($R^2 = .233$), media quality (CS6) ($R^2 = .321$) and organizational integration (CS7) ($R^2 = .242$).

- **Self-motivation (EI3)** and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) ($R^2 = .228$), communication with supervisors (CS2) ($R^2 = .264$), communication climate (CS3) ($R^2 = .261$), personal feedback (CS4) ($R^2 = .271$), horizontal and informal communication (CS5) ($R^2 = .219$), media quality (CS6) ($R^2 = .268$) and organizational integration (CS7) ($R^2 = .213$).

- **Empathy (EI4)** and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) ($R^2 = .202$), communication with supervisors (CS2) ($R^2 = .228$), horizontal and informal communication (CS5) ($R^2 = .159$) and organizational integration (CS7) ($R^2 = .184$).

- **Social skills (EI5)** and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) ($R^2 = .197$), communication with supervisors (CS2) ($R^2 = .256$), communication climate (CS3) ($R^2 = .223$), personal feedback (CS4) ($R^2 = .255$), horizontal and informal communication (CS5) ($R^2 = .188$) and organizational integration (CS7) ($R^2 = .186$).

Hence, H2 is supported for the above mentioned correlations.

We hypothesized that institutional collectivism is a moderator of some correlations between CS dimensions and EI abilities. Hierarchical regression analysis confirmed the moderating effect of institutional collectivism on the correlations.
between emotional intelligence abilities and communication satisfaction dimensions for the following correlations:

- Self-awareness (EI1) and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) (R2 = .190), communication with supervisors (CS2) (R2 = .200) and personal feedback (CS4) (R2 = .232),
- Managing emotions (EI2) and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) (R2 = .171) and personal feedback (CS4) (R2 = .215),
- Self-motivation (EI3) and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) (R2 = .163), communication with supervisors (CS2) (R2 = .184), personal feedback (CS4) (R2 = .195), horizontal and informal communication (CS5) (R2 = .156), media quality (CS6) (R2 = .241), and organizational integration (CS7) (R2 = .166),
- Social skills (EI5) and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) (R2 = .143), communication with supervisors (CS2) (R2 = .178) and personal feedback (CS4) (R2 = .175).

Hence, H3 is supported for the above mentioned correlations.

We hypothesized that in-group collectivism is a moderator of some correlations between CS dimensions and EI abilities. Hierarchical regression analysis confirmed the moderating effect of in-group collectivism on the correlations between emotional intelligence abilities and communication satisfaction dimensions for the correlations between:

- Self-awareness (EI1) and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) (R2 = .404), communication with supervisors (CS2) (R2 = .336), communication climate (CS3) (R2 = .457), personal feedback (CS4) (R2 = .411), horizontal and informal communication (CS5) (R2 = .363), media quality (CS6) (R2 = .465) and organizational integration (CS7) (R2 = .371),
- Managing emotions (EI2) and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) (R2 = .397), communication with supervisors (CS2) (R2 = .328), communication climate (CS3) (R2 = .457), personal feedback (CS4) (R2 = .404), media quality (CS6) (R2 = .464) and organizational integration (CS7) (R2 = .368),
- Self-motivation (EI3) and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) (R² = .409), communication with supervisors (CS2) (R² = .338), communication climate (CS3) (R² = .457), personal feedback (CS4) (R² = .394), horizontal and informal communication (CS5) (R² = .366), media quality (CS6) (R² = .456) and organizational integration (CS7) (R² = .381).

- Empathy (EI4) and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspectives (CS1) (R² = .386), communication with supervisors (CS2) (R² = .317), communication climate (CS3) (R² = .432), personal feedback (CS4) (R² = .372), horizontal and informal communication (CS5) (R² = .331), media quality (CS6) (R² = .412) and organizational integration (CS7) (R² = .347).

- Social skills (EI5) and communication satisfaction dimensions: communication on organizational perspective (CS1) (R² = .391), communication with supervisors (CS2) (R² = .347), communication climate (CS3) (R² = .449), personal feedback (CS4) (R² = .402), horizontal and informal communication (CS5) (R² = .354), media quality (CS6) (R² = .436) and organizational integration (CS7) (R² = .374).

Hence, H4 is supported for the above mentioned correlations.

In the subsample of a high level of power distance (above the median) only the correlation coefficients between satisfaction with media quality and EI1, EI2, EI3, EI4, and EI5, satisfaction with horizontal and informal communication and EI2, satisfaction with personal feedback and EI2, and satisfaction with communication climate and EI2 respectively are significantly positive.

Table 4: Correlation coefficients between EI abilities and dimensions of CS for a high and a low power distance “as it is” (PD) index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD</th>
<th>CS1</th>
<th>CS2</th>
<th>CS3</th>
<th>CS4</th>
<th>CS5</th>
<th>CS6</th>
<th>CS7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.238*</td>
<td>.226*</td>
<td>.190*</td>
<td>.286**</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.236*</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.245**</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI5</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>.491**</td>
<td>.602**</td>
<td>.543**</td>
<td>.595**</td>
<td>.608**</td>
<td>.558**</td>
<td>.531**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>.518**</td>
<td>.473**</td>
<td>.538**</td>
<td>.549**</td>
<td>.524**</td>
<td>.477**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>.469**</td>
<td>.533**</td>
<td>.510**</td>
<td>.494**</td>
<td>.570**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.465**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>.404**</td>
<td>.453**</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.404**</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.369**</td>
<td>.387**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI5</td>
<td>.422**</td>
<td>.544**</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.485**</td>
<td>.528**</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td>.421**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the subsample of a low level of institutional collectivism (below the median), only the correlation coefficients between EI1 and CS3, CS5 and CS6, EI2 and CS1, CS3, CS5, CS6 and CS7, EI3 and CS3 and CS6, EI4 and CS3 and CS6, and EI5 and CS5 and CS6 respectively are significantly positive.

Table 5: Correlation coefficients between EI abilities and CS dimensions for a high and a low institutional collectivism “as it is” (C1) index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1</th>
<th>CS1</th>
<th>CS2</th>
<th>CS3</th>
<th>CS4</th>
<th>CS5</th>
<th>CS6</th>
<th>CS7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>.446**</td>
<td>.576**</td>
<td>.500**</td>
<td>.566**</td>
<td>.478**</td>
<td>.546**</td>
<td>.452**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>.519**</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>.495**</td>
<td>.387**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>.363**</td>
<td>.494**</td>
<td>.378**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.401**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.385**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>.265**</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>.350**</td>
<td>.375**</td>
<td>.342**</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.318**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI5</td>
<td>.314**</td>
<td>.504**</td>
<td>.378**</td>
<td>.457**</td>
<td>.406**</td>
<td>.413**</td>
<td>.358**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.201*</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.224*</td>
<td>.292**</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>.209*</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.335**</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.196*</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.188*</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.219*</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI5</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.189*</td>
<td>.214*</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the subsample of low level in-group collectivism (below the median), only the correlation coefficients between EI1 and CS6 are significantly positive.

Table 6: Correlation coefficients between EI abilities and CS dimensions for a high and a low in-group collectivisms “as it is” (C2) index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C2</th>
<th>CS1</th>
<th>CS2</th>
<th>CS3</th>
<th>CS4</th>
<th>CS5</th>
<th>CS6</th>
<th>CS7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.532**</td>
<td>.565**</td>
<td>.503**</td>
<td>.556**</td>
<td>.579**</td>
<td>.479**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>.476**</td>
<td>.516**</td>
<td>.530**</td>
<td>.526**</td>
<td>.532**</td>
<td>.619**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.506**</td>
<td>.534**</td>
<td>.454**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>.558**</td>
<td>.493**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>.391**</td>
<td>.476**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>.427**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI5</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.527**</td>
<td>.530**</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.512**</td>
<td>.493**</td>
<td>.484**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low C2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI1</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI2</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI3</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI4</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI5</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Discussion

5.1 Correlations between EI abilities and CS dimensions

Middle managers are those who create the overall communication climate within an organization and this will be taken into account during the discussion of the results. For example, by removing hierarchical boundaries a middle manager can improve the communication climate thus allowing workers in different departments to access each other’s performance data. This in turn may serve to enhance discussions about organizational strategy and help employees to see how their actions interact.

5.1.1 Self-awareness

High values for the level of self-awareness of middle managers are accompanied by high values for all aspects of their communication satisfaction. One of the aspects of the communication climate is that a company's communication motivates its employees to achieve the company's objectives. In the sample, high values for the level of self-awareness are followed by high values for satisfaction with the communication climate. Middle managers with a high level of self-awareness have the ability to motivate and encourage employees through the skilful use of the physical manifestations of emotions, which can increase the persuasiveness of their communication and contribute to employees’ trust in their vision of organizational development and ways of achieving organizational goals. Their ability to control the physical manifestations of anger may encourage employees to freely communicate with managers in situations when they have certain problems in the realization of work tasks.

Top managers will have a higher degree of confidence in those middle managers who have effective communication with the employees in their teams, trusting them to be able, through the selection of appropriate communication channels, to be successful mediators between the senior management and the employees in their teams. Hence, it is not necessary for top managers to have a high degree of control of such middle managers (one of the aspects of communication satisfaction with supervisors). Awareness of situations when they are defensive (one of the aspects of self-awareness) helps middle managers to choose a suitable means of communication and appropriate communication channels during conflicts (e.g., face to face communication with employees without the presence of other employees, which may allow them to express their arguments without the interruption of the communication flow from the middle manager’s side in order to defend their own positions). The ability of middle managers with a high degree of self-awareness to control their own level of defensive behaviour also helps them within the organizational climate when, during communication with top managers, they feel like an important part of the organization. Top managers can be stimulated to communicate about important organizational issues and to be
open to new ideas with those middle managers who accept new tasks without providing redundant arguments about the difficulties that may arise in the implementation of these tasks.

As leaders of their teams middle managers have considerable insight into departmental policies, objectives, benefits and salaries. The trust which they build with employees and top managers as persons who successfully resolve conflicts through appropriate communication channels, enables them to obtain information on the progress of their work through both the ascending (from employees) and descending (from top managers) communication channels (feedback and communications integration). All this contributes to the fact that high values for the level of self-awareness are accompanied by high values for satisfaction with communication integration and feedback. Since middle managers are significant creators of communication flows (organizing meetings for team members, giving directives to team members, reporting to top management), a high level of self-awareness contributes to a high quality of communication flow (meetings without unnecessary conflict, good communications cooperation with top managers as a result of the absence of defensive attitudes), which further increases satisfaction with the quality of the media.

5.1.2 Managing emotions

A high level of ability to manage emotions is followed by high levels for all aspects of communication satisfaction. Middle managers with a high level of ability to manage emotions are relaxed in the presence of anger or strong pressure, which may be present when top managers exert pressure for the implementation of certain tasks or demand a higher quality of work performance. This may help middle managers to mobilize their potential by guiding them towards solving tasks and improving the quality of working results. The absence of cognitive inhibition potential due to negative emotions helps them to increase communication skills during conversations with employees in order to clearly point out more productive methods for the realization of work tasks and the improvement of job performance. The ability to manage emotions may also contribute to resolving conflicts through appropriate communication channels with both top managers and employees. During the presentation of new ideas to top managers, middle managers with a high level of ability to manage emotions will be able to relax in situations when their ideas are not immediately accepted and to patiently explain additional arguments, which could positively influence the perception of high communication satisfaction with their supervisors. Their ability to relax when under pressure and to control anger may encourage the employees in their teams to place greater trust in them. This enables middle managers to obtain genuine information from employees about progress in the realization of business tasks (the aspect of communication integration, media quality and feedback).
5.1.3 Self-motivation

High values for the level of self-motivation are accompanied by high values for all aspects of communication satisfaction. Middle managers whose words are backed up by action (the self-motivation aspect of EI) develop a high level of employees’ trust, and their ability to be motivated even in cases when the work is uninteresting (the self-motivation aspect of EI) helps these managers to serve as role models for employees so that they in turn become motivated to complete work tasks. Then even a reduced level of communication can have a high level of efficiency because trust in managerial relationships serves to prevent the emergence of possible conflicts. Highly self-motivated managers will enjoy the confidence of top managers about the possibility of the realization of their ideas, which will result in top managers being more open to any new ideas they may have. Such a situation may contribute to more appropriate control of middle managers’ work by top managers (a higher degree of middle manager autonomy), which in turn also serves to increase communication satisfaction with top managers. The perception of top managers that middle managers can quickly be regrouped after a failure (one of the aspects of self-motivation) may contribute to a freer flow of downward negative information about the growth and demands related to middle managers’ work. For such managers this may act as a stimulus for even greater engagement in order to overcome problems (the aspect of feedback information). The information on salaries and other benefits that is often negative during this period of economic crisis in Serbia will reach a highly self-motivated middle manager without unnecessary filtration (one of the aspects of communication integration) which may also contribute to a higher level of communication satisfaction with the quality of the media.

5.1.4 Empathy

The ability of managers with a high level of empathy to recognize when others are under stress (top managers or other employees), and the awareness of the impact of their behaviour on other employees can help them to choose appropriate communication channels. This will contribute to relieving employee stress and reducing conflict. Such managers will be able to choose the right moment to communicate with top managers when presenting new ideas, which will increase the likelihood of top managers being open to those ideas and carefully listening to their arguments (one of the aspects of communication with top managers). The ability to assist others to manage their emotions can help middle managers with a high level of empathy to provide information on real progress in their work (the aspect of satisfaction with communication integration and feedback). The potential dissatisfaction of top managers with the results of middle managers will be accepted in their mutual communication in a more realistic way, without unnecessary dramatization (communication satisfaction with supervisor).
Employees who are members of a team led by a middle manager with a high level of empathy recognize that their manager is ready to help them in situations when they are under stress (e.g., due to the inability of employees to meet work requirements within the prescribed period) and that communication with their middle manager is a way to overcome stress, which increases the quality of the communication channel between managers and employees.

5.1.5 Social skills

Managers who have the ability to establish a consensus with others and to help others feel good (aspects of social skills) are desirable partners for communication because they do not insist on their arguments being accepted during such communication. Communication with such a manager is much less stressful for employees since the awareness that their manager will give their arguments due consideration helps them to communicate freely and establishes trust in the appropriateness and benefits of presenting arguments thus improving the effectiveness of communication and increasing the quality of the media.

5.2 Power distance and institutional and in-group collectivism as moderators of the correlations between emotional intelligence and communication satisfaction

5.2.1 Power distance

A high level of “as it is” power distance (4.80) and a low level of “as it should be” (3.13) power distance seem to indicate the preference of Serbian middle managers for a more egalitarian approach to the status in organizations and a desire for less privilege for middle manager supervisors. Arandarenko (2000: 347-348) explains social and organizational high power distance in Serbia as the result of a kind of "political capitalism" that followed the fall of the socialist system, where the new/old elites took over the complete administration of the “social” property, and created for themselves opportunities for non-market profit making. War and the economic embargo imposed by the United Nations gave them the perfect cover for various forms of abuse. In addition, hyperinflation further influenced the weakening of the country's economy and the application of market economy rules. The above mentioned socio-economic circumstances gave the managers at all levels in companies in Serbia, in the social and state companies in particular, almost absolute power to dispose of all company resources, including employees. This situation provided Serbian managers with numerous opportunities for corruption, autocratic behaviour and the almost public devastation of “social” capital at the expense of self-interest, with the intention of maintaining the same situation for as long as is possible.

According to Heimrich (2000) in high power distance organizations people tend to use formal, hierarchical communication and rank affects to whom they talk.
Information may not be offered except in formal settings and people may be reluctant to address the commander for additional guidance. They prefer more traditional approaches to dealing with obstacles. The communication in low power distance organizations can be characterized by a mutual exchange of experiences between managers and employees, and upward communication is present in a larger degree than in high power distance organizations. Greater cultural distance between the members of an organization (high power distance) is associated with a greater discrepancy in emotion recognition accuracy. Hence, low power distance organizations offer a good environment for the expression and recognitions of emotions which may help middle managers with a high level of emotional intelligence to enjoy a high level of satisfaction with many aspects of communication. This was confirmed in our investigation since in the high power distance (above the median) subsample, there is a lack of positive correlations between many emotional intelligence abilities and communication satisfaction dimensions: satisfaction with communication about organizational perspectives and all emotional intelligence abilities; satisfaction with communication with supervisors and all emotional intelligence abilities; satisfaction with communication climate and all emotional intelligence abilities except managing emotions; satisfaction with personal feedback and all emotional intelligence abilities except managing emotions, horizontal and informal communication and all emotional intelligence abilities except managing emotions, and satisfaction with communication about organizational integration and all emotional intelligence abilities. Hence, the ability to manage emotions seems to be the most resistant predictor of communication satisfaction with respect to the influence of a high power distance environment. An organizational culture change toward a lower level of power distance may in the future produce a stronger relationship between the emotional intelligence abilities and communication satisfaction dimensions of middle managers in Serbia.

5.2.2 Institutional and in-group collectivism

A high value of “should be” institutional collectivism (4.65) has its roots, at least partly, in the long period of socialism (more than forty years), during which the principle of egalitarianism was highly valued. One of the characteristics of the Yugoslav economy at the time of socialism was the so called self-management system. In its purest conception, the workers’ self-management system was meant to provide the opposite of a Soviet-type dominance over the worker. The main idea was to introduce a kind of democratic control and a democratic voice in the daily activity of work. The self-management system sought innovation in a system that resembled an inverted pyramid in which workers from the lower echelons controlled and took part in the decision making process established by senior management. Yugoslav self-management, which started in the early 1950s, was akin to democracy-tied to the tenet that basic decisions would be made by the workers who would have to carry out such decisions or be
most affected by them. Workers’ councils, composed of as many as 50 individuals in large factories, represented the “will” of the worker (Denitch 1990; Drulovic 1978).

It was a hybrid of various forms of economic organization, not planned socialism like that in the Soviet Union, but also not a pure market economy (Kuljic 2003). It was something in-between. Yugoslavian socialism was an economy with social property, but also many other forms of property. Direct democracy took place only at the lower levels where there was actual democracy, where everyone participated in decision making processes. In the distribution of income in the firms, the workers’ councils – in which all workers were present, not only the skilled ones – were sovereign in their decisions. It was a one-party system, but with some characteristics of direct democracy at the lower levels. At the worker level, for example, workers could not lose their jobs without the workers’ council being activated. The director could not make the decision alone and the workers’ council, in which workers were presented, decided whether or not a worker was good.

A high level of “should be” institutional collectivism (4.65) and in-group collectivism (5.61) mean that middle managers in Serbia consider personal goals to be of less importance than common organizational and team-member goals. In organizations with a high level of both types of collectivism employees prefer an indirect or implicit communication style (Gudykunst et al. 1996). Conyne et al. (1999) found that in-group collectivist team members were less likely to have direct communication with their leaders than with other team members, while the opposite was found for their individualistic colleagues. They also found that in-group collectivist team members were more hesitant to provide information, possibly due to a culture-related hesitancy to speak. When they did speak, it was for longer time periods than in the case of individualist team members, possibly to save face when a risk was taken to speak. In organizations with a high level of both types of collectivism employees have more “other-focused” emotions (Markus/Kitayama 1991), which is also a good environment for positive correlations between emotional intelligence and communication satisfaction especially in the case of in-group collectivism. Collectivists may feel that those they critique will lose face and thus hesitate to offer feedback, or they may hesitate to give feedback because of the conflict that such feedback may create (Gomez et al. 2000). In the subsample of the low level of in-group collectivism, only the correlations between self-awareness and media quality are significantly positive. Hence, satisfaction with media quality seems to be the most resistant dimension of communication satisfaction with respect to the influence of the low level of institutional and in-group collectivism, which can be explained by the fact that media quality is not very relationship based.
6. Conclusion

The theoretical contribution of this paper lies in establishing and testing a model of the relationship between emotional intelligence, communication satisfaction and the GLOBE organizational culture dimensions of power distance and collectivism. We proved that emotional intelligence abilities are predictors of some communication satisfaction dimensions and that a low level of power distance index and high levels of institutional and in-group collectivism indices provide a good environment for the expression and recognition of emotions. In some transition countries like Serbia, there exists the so called pendulum effect of the organizational culture dimensions of power distance (a high value of power distance “as it is” and a low value of power distance “as it should be”) on both types of collectivism (a low value of collectivism “as it is” and a high value of collectivism “as it should be”). In our sample the “as it should be” dimensions of the institutional and in-group collectivism are much greater than the “as it is” values of these dimensions which may, at least partly, be a consequence of the long period of the so called self-management system. Namely, this management system lasted for more than forty years and included many characteristics of the contemporary management style – participative management.

As was pointed by Bakacsi (1999), the gap between “as it is” and “as it should be” organizational culture dimensions may produce a strong negative effect on many organizational outcomes (for example, on motivation) and cause substantial frustration. A high level of frustration can block the use (or manifestation) of emotional intelligence abilities during the communication process which may have a negative impact on a number of organizational outcomes including communication satisfaction. Successful organizational changes toward the “should be” organizational culture dimensions of power distance and institutional and in-group collectivism may serve to improve communication management and teamwork. An organizational culture characterized as low power distance with high institutional and in-group collectivism may help middle managers with a high level of emotional intelligence to enjoy a high level of satisfaction with many aspects of organizational communication. Top management simply cannot effectively develop a strategy and plan for its implementation without assistance from middle managers and their communication satisfaction may lead to operating efficiency and goal achievement. Hence, it has become increasingly vital for modern organizations to learn how to enhance the emotional intelligence of their employees and to permanently monitor “as it should be” organizational culture dimensions and communication satisfaction in order to achieve maximum business results. Namely, a change of organizational culture toward the “as it should be” model could help Serbian organizations to achieve a better ”person-organization” fit and a stronger influence of emotional intelligence on communication satisfaction.
7. **Directions for future research**

One of the possible directions for future investigations related to the correlation between emotional intelligence and communication satisfaction may be research into the moderating impact of different styles of leadership (for example, leader-member exchange style and transformational leadership) on that correlation. It would also be interesting to investigate the same model in other former Yugoslav republics or other South European countries.

One of the limitations of the study may be that our questionnaire was written in English (in spite of the fact that all of the middle managers from our sample have bachelor or master degrees). The second limitation is that the obtained results related to the moderating effect of power distance and collectivism on the relationship between emotional intelligence and communication satisfaction are obtained in organizations under transitions like those in Serbia. These countries are undergoing strong political and economic changes and our results may not be generalized in the same way to those organizations which operate under a high level of political and economic stability.
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