

Validation of the Persian Cultural Intelligence Scale and Exploring Its Relationship with Gender, Education, Travelling Abroad and Place of Living

Dr. Ebrahim Khodadady¹ and Shima Ghahari²

¹ Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

Received: 18 September 2011 Accepted: 13 October 2011 Published: 25 October 2011

Abstract

This study explored the validity of Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) and its relationship with gender, education, travelling abroad and place of living in Iran. The Persian version of CQS was administered to 854 undergraduate and graduate students majoring in five broad branches of knowledge in three different state universities in Iran. When the Principal Axis Factoring was employed and the latent variables were rotated via Varimax with Kaiser Normalization, four factors were extracted whose number was the same as other studies but differed in their order, i.e., Cognitive, Motivational, Behavioral, and Meta-cognitive. While the students coming from underprivileged cities had significantly higher total cultural intelligence (CQ) as well as Cognitive, Motivational, Behavioral, and Meta-cognitive CQs, female participants' Meta-cognitive CQ was higher than the male. Whereas graduate participants showed significantly higher Cognitive and Behavioral CQs, the participants who had not traveled abroad surpassed their travelling counterparts not only in total CQ but also in Cognitive, Motivational, Behavioral, and Meta-cognitive CQs. These findings suggest the role of cultural intelligence in learning and developing mega skills such as understanding cultural identity and checking cultural lenses and emphasize its state-like nature.

Index terms— Factor analysis, cultural intelligence, gender, education, place of living.

1 INTRODUCTION

Cultural intelligence (CQ) or CULTINT is defined as an individual's capability to function effectively in culturally diverse settings. It deals with understanding the impact of individuals' cultural background on their behavior essential as it is for effective business and successful engagement in any environment or social settings. It is consistent with Schmidt and Hunter's (2000) definition of general intelligence as the ability to reason correctly with abstractions and solve problems. It, however, recognizes that intelligence is more than general mental ability as measured by IQ. CQ acknowledges the practical realities of globalization (Earley & Ang, 2003) and draws on Gardner's (1993) multiple intelligences to help individuals grasp and behave effectively in situations characterized by cultural diversity. The CQ, therefore, complements IQ by focusing on specific capabilities that are important for high quality personal relationships and effectiveness in culturally diverse settings (Ang, Van Dyne & Koh 2006).

The CQ was first introduced by Earley and Ang (2003) and its necessity was emphasized by Earley and Mosakowski (2004). Since then it has been gaining acceptance throughout the business community because the appreciation of the cultural differences to guide responses results in better business practices (Earley & Ang 2003). According to Van Dyne, Ang and Nielsen (2007), "CQ is a critical individual capability with important personal, interpersonal, and work-related implications given the wide-ranging effects of globalization and diversity

throughout most of the world.” (p. 345) It is, therefore, developed through cognitive means by learning about one’s own and other cultures by using senses and adapting one’s movements and body language to blend in, i.e., physical means and by gaining rewards and strength from acceptance and success, i.e., motivational means. The CQ includes a set of capabilities that lead to specific outcomes such as decision making, performance, and adjustment in culturally diverse settings. It is also malleable in the sense that it changes over time based on people’s interactions, efforts, and experiences. Although the CQ embodies individual capabilities which are culturally relevant, these capabilities are more specific than IQ or EQ. However, it is NOT specific to a particular culture such as American or Iranian. Instead, it focuses on the more general capability to function effectively in culturally diverse situations. Van Dyne, Ang and Nielsen (2007) characterized those with high CQ with having four key capabilities:

”a) they are able to anticipate what will happen in cross-cultural situations, b) they have a wide understanding of multicultural situations, c) they are confident of their capabilities and are intrinsically interested in experiencing culturally diverse settings and CQ is different from personality traits. While it shows what a person may do to be effective in culturally diverse settings, personality traits are stable courses of action which a person typically does across time and across situations. However, in both of them there are temperament influences of choice of behaviors and experiences and, therefore, some personality traits should relate to CQ. Notably, for example, ambiguity tolerance and openness to experience, i.e., the tendency to be creative, imaginative and adventurous, are related to all four dimensions of CQ as described below (Costa & McCrae, 1992). a) Components of Cultural Intelligence Earley and Ang (2003) conceptualized CQ as comprising meta-cognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral components with specific relevance to functioning in culturally diverse settings. As the first component, Meta-cognitive CQ reflects the processes individuals use to acquire and understand cultural knowledge. It occurs when people make judgments about their own thought processes and those of others. This includes thinking of and adopting strategies before a multicultural encounter, as well as checking assumptions and making adjustments during an encounter. Relevant capabilities include planning, monitoring and revising mental models of cultural norms for countries or groups of people. Those with high metacognitive CQ question cultural assumptions and adjust their mental models during and after interactions (Brislin, Worthley, & MacNab 2006; Triandis, 2006).

Cognitive CQ, the second component, refers to a person’s knowledge and understanding of how cultures are similar to and different from each other. It reflects general knowledge structures and mental maps about cultures and includes knowledge about economic and legal systems, social norms, religious beliefs, practices and conventions in different cultures acquired from education and personal experiences. Those with high cognitive CQ understand similarities and differences across cultures (Brislin et al. 2006).

As the third component, Motivational CQ indicates a person’s capability and motivation in learning about and functioning in cross-cultural situations. It includes a person’s inherent interest in experiencing other cultures and interacting with people from different cultures. It also includes the value people place on culturally diverse interactions as well as their sense of confidence that they can function effectively in settings characterized by cultural diversity. Those with high motivational CQ direct attention and energy toward cross-cultural situations based on intrinsic interest and confidence in their cross-cultural effectiveness (Bandura, 2002

2 November

agreeableness and emotional stability with behavioral CQ; (c) extraversion with cognitive, motivational, and behavioral CQs; and (d) openness to experience with all four factors of CQ. The intriguing finding of this study is that openness was the only Big Five that was significantly related to all four factors of CQ. It suggests that openness to experience is a crucial personality characteristic that is significantly related to a person’s capability to function effectively when interacting with different people in different contexts.

Templer, Tay and Chandrasekar (2005) focused specifically on the relationship between motivational CQ and expatriate adjustment and demonstrated that motivational CQ predicts all three types of adjustment, i.e., general, interaction, and work adjustment, over and above time of residence and experience in the host country. Similarly, while Ang, Van Dyne, and Koh (2006) demonstrated that those with more experience interacting with people who have different cultural backgrounds have higher CQ, Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black, and Ferzandi (2006) examined and substantiated cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects of intercultural effectiveness. Using their framework, Ang, Van Dyne, Koh, Ng, Templer, Tay, and Chandrasekar (2007) explored the relationship between CQ and cultural judgment and decision making, a cognitive outcome, cultural adjustment and well-being, an affective outcome, and task performance, a behavioral outcome. Their results demonstrated that CQ has a unique explanatory power in predicting the three aspects of intercultural effectiveness over and above demographic characteristics, general cognitive ability, emotional intelligence, and openness to experience. Those with higher CQ were found to be more effective at making decisions about as well as making adjustments in situations characterized by cultural diversity. More specifically, it was found that the higher the metacognitive and behavioral CQ the higher the task performance. Similarly, they found that the higher the motivational and behavioral CQ, the higher the general, interaction, and work adjustments.

Amiri, Moghimi, Kazemi (2010) examined the relationship between cultural intelligence and employees’ performance in a multicultural environment. They found a significant relationship between metacognitive, cognitive and motivational aspects of cultural intelligence and employees’ performance. Elenkov and Manev (2009) extended CQ to the effect senior expatriates’ visionary, transformational leadership, had on the rate of their

successful innovation. Having tested 153 senior expatriate managers and 695 subordinates from companies in all 27 countries of the European Union, they found a direct influence of senior expatriates' visionary-transformational leadership on the rate of innovation adoption. Further, they figured out that cultural intelligence moderated the effect of senior expatriates' leadership on organizational innovation, but not on product-market innovation. Similarly, Alon and Higgins (2005) showed that EQ, IQ, and leadership behaviors are moderated by CQ in the formation of global leadership success and, therefore, obtaining maximum impact from a global business strategy.

Imai and Gelfand (2010) still extended the research by examining the impact of CQ on intercultural negotiation processes and outcomes. They concluded that CQ affects not only negotiating effectively across cultures but also management behaviors, which in turn predicted joint profit. In the same line, Cheng (2007) used the Virginia Tech tragedy and concluded that in order to decode each message in cultural, linguistic, and social contexts, to avoid communicative disorders, and to provide culturally appropriate intervention when called for, one is required to develop cultural competence. He suggests that cultural competence assists one to decode the messages from the world of English-language learners, the world of Englishes, and the codes shared by the e-generation.

Since all the studies cited above have been conducted in countries other than Iran, the present researchers decided to find out whether the CQ had any factorial validity here. For the sole reason that the students at tertiary level deem it necessary to study English as a foreign language so that they can read the academic texts and possibly pursue their higher education in English speaking countries, they were chosen as the population of the present study. Their cities of birth, educational level, gender and visiting abroad were also taken into account in order to find out whether these variables would bear any significant relationship with their CQ and the factors extracted in the study.

3 II.

4 METHODOLOGY a) Participants

Eight hundred fifty four university students of whom 455 (53.3%) and 399 (46.7) were female and male, respectively, took part voluntarily in the study. Eighty five percent (725) were single and only 129 (15%) were married. Their age ranged between 17 and 47 (Mean = 23.97, SD = 3.82). They were studying 73 different fields which were grouped under the five major categories of agriculture (n = 85, 10%), engineering (n = 176, 21%), humanities (n = 320, 38%), science (n = 239, 28%), and medicine (n = 34, 4%) at Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Shahid Bahonar University, and University of Tehran. Three hundred twenty seven (38.3%) were majoring at undergraduate level whereas 382 (44.7%) and 145 (17%) were continuing their studies at Master and PhD levels, respectively. Seven hundred thirty three (85.8%) spoke Persian as their mother language while 67 (7.8%) conversed in Turkish. While 43 (5%) preferred not to specify their first language, six (.7%) and five (.6%) employed Arabic and English as their language of communication at home.

All the participants knew at least one foreign language (FL), i.e., Arabic, English, French, German, Persian, Russian, and Turkish. While the majority (n = 718, 84.1%) had studied English, 54 participants (6.3%) knew more than one FL. However, in spite of their familiarity with at least one FL, 693 (81%) had not visited any country. The rest (19%) had visited Afghanistan, America, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Canada, China, Curie, Dubai, England, France, Germany, India, Iraq, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malaysia, Norway, Pakistan, Protégée, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, and Turkmenistan from 1-15 days (n = 92, 10.8%), 1-3 months (n = 28, 3.3%), four months up to one year (n = 11, 1.3%) and more than one year (n = 30, 3.5%).

The participants of the present study represented the young and adult undergraduate and graduate students in Iran because they were from 125 cities spread throughout the country. These cities were divided into two educational zones recognized by the Ministry of Science, Research and Technology in Iran. Zone one refers to the capital cities of the provinces and the cities in zone two are literally known as unprivileged areas due to the lack of certain privileges available in capital cities. While 409 participants (47.9%) were born and living in zone one, 445 (52.1%) were from zone two.

5 b) Instrument

The questionnaire employed in the present study consisted of two parts.

6 i. Biodata

The biodata section consisted of twelve short answer and multiple choice items asking for the name of participants' university, their field, year of study, age, gender, marital status, degree of education, place of birth, place of living, language spoken at home, foreign languages known, travelling abroad, the countries visited and duration of visit.

7 ii. Cultural Intelligence Scale

The Persian version of the 20-item Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) developed by Van Dyne, Ang and Koh (2008) was employed in the present study. (This study will be referred to as VAK08 henceforth.) It consists of four meta-cognitive, six cognitive, five motivational and five behavioral items. The items were translated into the Persian language by the researchers on the basis of schema theory (e.g., Khodadady, 2001; Khodadady, 2008; Seif & Khodadady, 2003). Based on this theory, all the words constituting the CQS items were translated by employing

their semantic, syntactic and discoursal relationships with each other and their best Persian equivalents were chosen by employing the same relationships governing the Persian equivalents. The translated items were then submitted to two specialists in the Persian Language and Literature Department of Ferdowsi University of Mashhad to be checked and approved in terms of their academic Persian style. (The Persian version of the CQS is given in Appendix.)

iii. Procedure One of the researchers travelled to Kerman and Tehran to administer the questionnaire consisting of the biodata section and CQS in person while the other administered the rest to the participants in Ferdowsi University of Mashhad. It was distributed in the dormitories, on the campus and in classes after instructors announced their readiness to cooperate. Since filling out the questionnaire did not take more than 15 minutes, many allowed the researchers to distribute it in the class and collect the answers themselves. In some classes, however, the instructors asked the researchers to leave CQS with them so that they could administer it upon finishing their teaching. These teachers were asked to go through the scale with the researchers to ensure that there would be no problems if the students raised any questions in the class. They were also told that the researchers would wait outside the classroom to be called in for any possible questions. Since both parts of the scale were in Persian, no particular questions were raised by the participants.

8 iv. Data Analysis

The descriptive as well as inferential statistical analyses were carried out by utilizing the SPSS version 19.0. The reliability of the CQS was estimated via Cronback Alpha. Following Khodadady (2010) the Principal Axis Factoring (PAF) and Kaiser criterion, i.e., eigenvalues higher than 1, were used to determine the number of factors extracted in this study. Based on Khodadady and Hashemi's (2010) suggestion, the unrotated factor matrix was skipped and all correlation coefficients with their frequency and magnitudes were estimated and reported to test the following six hypotheses: H1. The twenty items comprising the CQS will show high inter correlations with each other.

9 H2. The twenty items comprising the CQS will load on four factors extracted in other studies.

H3. There will be no significant difference in the CQ and its underlying factors of the female and male participants
H4. There will be no significant difference in the CQ and its underlying factors of participants coming from privileged and underprivileged cities
H5. There will be no significant difference in the undergraduate and graduate students' CQ and its underlying factors.

H6. There will be no significant difference in the CQ and its underlying factors of participants who have travelled abroad and those who have not.

10 Global Journal of Human Social Science Volume XI Issue VII Version I

11 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the 20-item CQS and the four factors extracted in this study. As can be seen, the CQS provides a highly reliable measure of cultural intelligence within an academic Iranian context, i.e., $\alpha = .86$. There are, however, some slight differences between the reliability estimates obtained on the factors in the present study and those of VAK08. These differences might be attributed to the number of participants, i.e., 854, 447, their nationality, i.e., Iranian and Singaporean, and level of education, both undergraduate and graduate and undergraduate only, respectively. (Although VAK08 had also administered the CQS to Americans, they were excluded in this study because they spoke English as their first language.) Upon estimating the reliability coefficient and insuring that the responses were reliable enough, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of Sampling Adequacy was employed to find out whether employing factor analysis to extract latent variables was appropriate. The KMO statistic obtained in this study was .88. According to Kaiser and Rice (1974), KMO statistic in the .90s is "meritorious," (cited in DiLalla & Dollinger, 2006, p. 250). In other words, the sample selected in the study and the factor analysis employed would probably provide the best common factors. The significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, i.e., $X^2 = 3.722$, $df = 190$, $p < .001$, indicated that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix.

Table 2 presents the ordered initial and extraction communalities obtained from the 20 items comprising the CQS. As can be seen, the extraction communalities range from .32 to .57 and thus provide support for Costello and Osborne's (2005) observation that uniformly high item communalities, i.e., .80 or above, as suggested by MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang and Hong (1999) are unlikely to occur in real data. The results of this study, however, show that the more common magnitudes suggested by Costello and Osborne need to be lowered from the order of .40 to .70. We therefore suggest .25 to .55 as the most representative order.

Table 3 presents the frequency, percent and cumulative percent of inter correlation coefficients (ICCs) obtained among the 20 items comprising the CQS. As can be seen, the highest and lowest ICCs are .62 and .07, respectively.

Since the mean CC is .24, the majority of CCs fall below the mean, i.e., 62% and thus disconfirm the first hypothesis that the twenty items comprising the CQS will show high inter correlations with each other.

Since VAK08 did not report any ICCs no comparison could be made with the results of the present study. However, they reported the ICCs among the four factors underlying the CQS as shown in Table 4. As can be seen, the highest significant ICC in the present study is between the cognitive and motivational CQs, i.e., .41. The same components, however, show the second lowest significant relationship with each other in VAK08, i.e., .25. In other words, various nationalities, e.g., Singaporeans and Iranians, show different patterns of relationships among the factors underlying their cultural intelligence.

Table 5 presents the twenty items loading on the four factors extracted via Principal Axis Factoring and rotated via Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. As can be seen, all the item load acceptably, i.e., .30 or higher on four distinct factors without cross loading on any other factor and thus confirm the second hypothesis that the twenty items comprising the CQS will load on four factors extracted by VAK08. Furthermore, the Cognitive and Motivations CQs have the highest loadings as the first two factors extracted in this study, implying the priority of knowing and enjoying interactions with the members of other cultures in Iran. In VAK08 study, however, Meta cognitive CQ is extracted as the first whereas it occupies the position of the fourth component in the present study.

Table ?? presents the groups statistics of the female and male participants on the CQS and its factors. The Independent Samples T-Test showed that female participants differed significantly from their male counterparts only on their meta-cognitive CQ, i.e., $t = 2.503$, $df = 852$, $p < .01$. Thus with the exception of the fourth factor, the results obtained in the present study confirm the third hypothesis that there will be no significant difference in the CQ and its three components of Motivational, Cognitive and Behavioral CQs of the female and male participants. Future research must show whether the significant difference in the meta-cognitive CQ of females and males bring about any significant difference on their performances on abilities such as language proficiency and achievement.

Table ?? presents the groups statistics of the participants coming from privileged and underprivileged cities of Iran on the CQS and its factors. As can be seen, contrary to the researchers' expectations, the mean score of participants coming from underprivileged cities is higher than those of the privileged. The Independent Samples T-Test showed that the former differ significantly not only on the CQS ($t = -4.655$, $df = 852$, $p < .001$) but also on Cognitive ($t = -4.281$, $df = 852$, $p < .001$), Motivational ($t = -3.057$, $df = 852$, $p < .001$), Behavioral ($t = -3.172$, $df = 852$, $p < .001$), and Metacognitive ($t = -2.418$, $df = 852$, $p < .01$) CQs. These findings disconfirm the fourth hypothesis that there will be no significant difference in the CQ and its underlying factors of participants coming from privileged and underprivileged cities.

Table ?? presents the groups statistics of the undergraduate and graduate participants on the CQS and its factors. As can be seen, the mean scores of graduate students are higher than those of the undergraduate. However, the Independent Samples T-Test showed that the means are significantly higher only on the Cognitive ($t = -3.331$, $df = 852$, $p < .001$) and behavioral ($t = -1.992$, $df = 852$, $p < .05$) components. These results disconfirm the fifth hypothesis; there will be no significant difference in the CQ and its underlying factors of the undergraduate and graduate students, to some degree.

Table ?? presents the groups statistics of the participants who have travelled abroad on the CQS and its factors. As can be seen, the mean scores of the participants who have not travelled abroad are unexpectedly higher than those who have. The Independent Samples T-Test showed that the means are significantly higher not only on the CQS ($t = -2.535$, $df = 852$, $p < .01$) but also on the cognitive ($t = -2.990$, $df = 852$, $p < .001$) and motivational ($t = -2.512$, $df = 852$, $p < .01$) components. These results disconfirm the sixth hypothesis that there will be no significant difference in the CQ and its underlying factors of participants who have travelled abroad and those who have not.

While the results of this study show that the participants who have not travelled abroad have a significantly higher overall CQ, Cognitive and Motivational CQs, Crowne (2008) showed education and employment in different cultures increases cognitive and behavioral aspects of CQ because motivational CQ was higher for those who had visited more countries for vacation and other purposes. They, therefore, question Cownes' conclusion that the best way to develop CQ is through engaging in activities involving cross-cultural interaction, while passive activities are significantly less effective in nurturing CQ. This difference might be explained by individual differences which are, according to Bandura (1977), either trait-like or state-like.

Trait-like individual differences are not specific to a certain task or situation; in most cases they emerge during early childhood socialization and are relatively stable over time. In contrast, state-like individual differences such as state anxiety or specific self-efficacy are specific to certain situations or tasks and tend to be malleable over time. It seems that visiting other countries for vocation has had a negative effect on the CQ of the participants of the present study because what they had expected in their cultural interactions might not have not materialized, i.e., a state-like experience. Future research must show whether the nature of visit, i.e., vocation and/or education, affects visitors' CQ.

Examining the Big Five personality characteristics, Ang, Van Dyne and Koh (2006), however, demonstrated that trait-like individual differences such as personality characteristics predict CQ. Individuals who are more responsible, planful, and persistent, i.e., conscientiousness characteristic, have higher meta-cognitive CQ whereas individuals more likeable, good-natured, and cooperative, i.e., agreeableness characteristic, turn out to have higher

behavioral CQ. Similarly, while those who are calm, secure, and controlled, i.e., emotional stability characteristic, come to have higher behavioral CQ, sociable, assertive, and active individuals, i.e., extraversion characteristic, have higher meta-cognitive, cognitive, and behavioral CQ; and finally curious, imaginative, and intellectual individuals, i.e., openness to experience characteristic, demonstrate higher levels of all four factors of CQ.

iv.

12 CONCLUSION

Although this study employed Principal Axis Factoring and rotated the latent variables by employing Varimax with Kaiser normalization, it extracted the same four factors underlying the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) in Iran as did Van Dyne, Ang, and Koh (2008) who employed the SEM in America and Singapore. Khodadady's (2010) and Khodadady and Hashemi's (2010) observation with the questionnaires such as the Characteristics of Effective English Teachers and the Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory show that cross loading is a normal feature in these questionnaires. The CQS is, however, unique because none of its twenty items cross loaded on any of the four factors extracted by the present researchers though the order of factors were different, i.e., Cognitive, Motivational, Behavioral, and Meta-cognitive, from those of Van Dyne, Ang, and Koh, i.e., Meta-cognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral. Future research must show whether the replication of the study within a different foreign language context will bring about similar results.

The results of the present study also show that female participants differ significantly from their male counterparts on their Meta-cognitive CQ. Furthermore, participants coming from underprivileged cities have significantly higher total CQ and Cognitive, Motivational, Behavioral and Meta-cognitive CQs. The significant difference extends also to educational level because the graduate participants have higher Cognitive and Behavioral CQs than the undergraduates. And finally, the Iranian participants who have not travelled abroad have higher total CQ as well as cognitive and motivational CQs. These findings support Bucher's (2008) identification of nine mega skills which can be learned and/or developed through cultural intelligence, i.e., understanding cultural identity, checking cultural lenses, global consciousness, shifting perspectives, intercultural communication, managing cross-cultural conflict, multicultural teaming, managing bias, and understanding the dynamics of power.

13 Global Journal of Human



Figure 1: C

1 2 3 4

¹November © 2011 Global Journals Inc. (US) finally, d) they are able to vary their verbal and non-

²© 2011 Global Journals Inc. (US)

³November © 2011 Global Journals Inc. (US) Validation of the Persian Cultural Intelligence Scale and Exploring Its Relationship with Gender, Education, Travelling Abroad and Place of Living

⁴November Validation of the Persian Cultural Intelligence Scale and Exploring Its Relationship with Gender, Education, Travelling Abroad and Place of Living

1

1. Alon, I. & Higgins, J. M. (2005). Global leadership success through national cultural intelligences. *Business Horizons*, 48, 501-512.
2. Amiri, A., Moghimi, M. & Kazemi, M. (2010). Studying the Relationship between Cultural Intelligence and Employee Performance. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 3, 432-427.
- 3.

[Note: (2008). *Handbook on cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement and applications* (pp. 3-15). NY: M E Sharpe, Inc.]

Figure 2: Table 1 :

2

Global Journal of Human Social Science Volume XI Issue VII Version I	Item 12	Initial .51	Extraction .57	Item 1	Initial .36	Extraction .41	Item 6	Initial .30	Extraction .31
	13	.51	.63	9	.36	.41	6	.30	
	8	.46	.60	19	.36	.40	4	.30	
	14	.44	.53	3	.35	.48	11	.29	
	10	.43	.50	7	.35	.42	16	.28	
	15	.39	.45	20	.33	.39	2	.28	
	18	.39	.45	17	.31	.32			

Figure 3: Table 2 :

3

CC	F	P	CP	CC	F	P	CP	CC	F	P	CP
.62	1	0.5	0.5	.38	3	1.4	15.3	.21	11	5.2	53.2
.56	1	0.5	1.1	.36	3	1.4	16.8	.20	9	4.3	57.9
.54	1	0.5	1.6	.35	1	0.5	17.4	.19	13	6.2	64.7
.52	2	0.9	2.6	.34	2	0.9	18.4	.18	9	4.3	69.5
.51	2	0.9	3.7	.33	1	0.5	18.9	.17	6	2.8	72.6
.50	1	0.5	4.2	.32	2	0.9	20.0	.16	8	3.8	76.8
.49	3	1.4	5.8	.31	5	2.4	22.6	.15	5	2.4	79.5
.48	1	0.5	6.3	.30	3	1.4	24.2	.14	7	3.3	83.2
.46	1	0.5	6.8	.29	3	1.4	25.8	.13	7	3.3	86.8
.45	1	0.5	7.4	.27	3	1.4	27.4	.12	7	3.3	90.5
.44	2	0.9	8.4	.26	8	3.8	31.6	.11	3	1.4	92.1
.42	1	0.5	8.9	.25	4	1.9	33.7	.10	3	1.4	93.7
.41	4	1.9	11.1	.24	9	4.3	38.4	.09	4	1.9	95.8
.40	1	0.5	11.6	.23	6	2.8	41.6	.07	8	3.8	100.0
.39	4	1.9	13.7	.22	11	5.2	47.4	Total	190		

Figure 4: Table 3 :

4

Factors	CQS	Present Study (n = 854)			VAK08 (n = 447)		
		1	2	3	1	2	3
1. Cognitive	.75 *						
2. Motivational	.77 *	.41 *			.25*		
3. Behavioral	.65 *	.23 *	.37 *		.34*	.31*	
4. Meta-cognitive	.69 *	.39 *	.40 *	.33 **	.23*	.32*	.37*

[Note: * Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).]

Figure 5: Table 4 :

5

Factors	Item	Loading
Cognitive		

Figure 6: Table 5 :

308 [Quarterly Journal of Humanities] , *Quarterly Journal of Humanities* 18 (70) p. . Al-Zahra University
309 [Francisco and Cq: Pfeiffer] , San Francisco , Cq: Pfeiffer .
310 [Sternberg and Detterman (ed.) ()] , R J Sternberg , Detterman . D. K. (ed.) 1986.
311 [Van Dyne and Ang ()] 'A self-assessment of your CQ'. L Van Dyne , S Ang . *CQ: Developing cultural intelligence*
312 *at work*, P C Earley, S Ang, & J-S Tan (ed.) (Stanford, CA) 2006. Stanford University Press. p. .
313 [Costello and Osborne ()] 'Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the
314 most from your analysis'. A B Costello , J W Osborne . *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation* 2005.
315 10 (7) p. .
316 [Bucher ()] *Building Cultural Intelligence (CQ) Nine Megaskills*, R Bucher . 2008. Upper Saddle River, NJ:
317 Pearson Education Inc.
318 [Dilalla and Dollinger (ed.) ()] *Cleaning up data and running preliminary analyses*, D L Dilalla , S J Dollinger .
319 F. T. L (ed.) 2006.
320 [Khodadady and Hashemi ()] 'Construct validity of beliefs about language learning: Componential or factorial'.
321 E Khodadady , M R Hashemi . *Ferdowsi Review* 2010. 1 (1) p. .
322 [Moodian (ed.)] *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the crosscultural dynamics*
323 *within organizations*, M A Moodian (ed.) (Thousand Oaks, CA) Sage. p. .
324 [Earley and Mosakowski ()] 'Cultural intelligence'. P C Earley , E Mosakowski . *Harvard Business Review* 2005.
325 82 p. .
326 [Van Dyne et al. ()] 'Cultural intelligence'. L Van Dyne , S Ang , T M Nielsen . *International encyclopedia of*
327 *organization studies*, S Clegg, & J Bailey (ed.) (Thousand Oaks, CA) 2007. Sage. p. .
328 [Cheng ()] 'Cultural Intelligence (CQ): A Quest for Cultural Competence'. L L Cheng . *Communication Disorders*
329 *Quarterly* 2007. 29 p. .
330 [Sternberg and Grigorenko ()] *Cultural intelligence and successful intelligence. Group and Organization Manage-*
331 *ment*, R J Sternberg , E L Grigorenko . 2006. 31 p. .
332 [Janssens and Brett ()] *Cultural intelligence in global teams: A fusion model of collaboration. Group and*
333 *Organization Management*, M Janssens , J M Brett . 2006. 31 p. .
334 [Triandis ()] *Cultural intelligence in organizations. Group and Organization Management*, H C Triandis . 2006.
335 31 p. .
336 [Van Dyne et al. (ed.) ()] *Cultural intelligence: A pathway for leading in a rapidly globalizing world*, L Van Dyne
337 , S Ang , D Livermore . K. M. Hannum. B (ed.) 2010.
338 [Earley and Ang ()] *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*, P C Earley , S Ang . 2003.
339 Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
340 [Ang et al. ()] 'Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making,
341 cultural adaptation, and task performance'. S Ang , L Van Dyne , C Koh , K Y Ng , K J Templer , C Tay ,
342 N A Chandrasekar . *Management and Organization Review* 2007. 3 (3) p. .
343 [Brislin et al. ()] *Cultural intelligence: Understanding behaviors that serve people's goals. Group and Organization*
344 *Management*, R Brislin , R Worthley , B Macnab . 2006. 31 p. .
345 [Gudykunst et al. ()] *Culture and interpersonal communication*, W B Gudykunst , S Ting-Toomey , E Chua .
346 1988. Newbury Park, Calif: Sage.
347 [Ng et al. ()] 'Developing global leaders: The role of international experience and cultural intelligence'. K Ng ,
348 L Van Dyne , S Ang . *Advances in Global Leadership* 2009a. 5 p. .
349 [Van Dyne et al. ()] 'Development and validation of the CQS: The cultural intelligence scale'. L Van Dyne , S
350 Ang , C Koh . *Handbook on cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement and applications*, S Ang, & L Van
351 Dyne (ed.) (Armonk, NY) 2008. M.E. Sharpe. p. .
352 [Khodadady ()] 'Factors Underlying Characteristics of Effective English Language Teachers: Validity and Sample
353 Effect'. E Khodadady . *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)* 2010. 13 (2) p. .
354 [Costa and McCrae ()] 'Four ways five factors are basic'. P T Costa , R R McCrae . *Personality and Individual*
355 *Differences* 1992. 13 p. .
356 [Ng et al. ()] *From experience to experiential learning: Cultural intelligence as a learning capability for global*
357 *leader development*, K Ng , L Van Dyne , S Ang . 2009b. Academy of Management Learning & Education. 8
358 p. .
359 [I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to] *I am confident that I can so-*
360 *cialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to*, p. 66.
361 [I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures] *I know the legal and economic systems of other*
362 *cultures*, p. 50.

- [I know the rules (e.g., vocabulary, grammar) of other languages] *I know the rules (e.g., vocabulary, grammar) of other languages*, p. 53.
- [McFeeters, L. Booyesen (ed.)] *Leading across differences: Cases and perspectives*, McFeeters, & L. Booyesen (ed.) p. .
- [Kaiser and Rice ()] 'Little Jiffy, Mark IV'. H F Kaiser , J Rice . *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 1974. 34 p. .
- [Khodadady ()] *Measuring translation ability and achievement: A schema-based approach*, E Khodadady . 2008.
- [Messara et al. ()] L Messara , S Karkoulian , N Al Harake . *Relationship between cultural intelligence and locus*, 2008.
- [Motivational 13. I am sure I can deal with stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me] *Motivational 13. I am sure I can deal with stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me*, p. 76.
- [Templer et al. ()] *Motivational cultural intelligence, realistic job preview, realistic living conditions preview, and cross-cultural adjustment. Group and Organization Management*, K J Templer , C Tay , N A Chandrasekar . 2005. 31 p. .
- [Gardner ()] *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*, H Gardner . 1993. New York: Basic Books.
- [Ang et al. ()] 'Personality correlates of the four-factor model of of control: Application to employees in multicultural corporations'. S Ang , L Van Dyne , C S K Koh . <http://www.freepatentsonline.com/article/European-Journal-Management/182924517.html> *European Journal of Management*. Retrieved 2006. 2010. 22.
- [Creedon and Al-Khaja ()] 'Public relations and globalization: Building a case for cultural competency in public relations education'. P Creedon , M Al-Khaja . *Public Relations Review* 2005. 31 p. .
- [Maccallum et al. ()] 'Sample size in factor analysis'. R C Maccallum , K F Widaman , S Zhang , S Hong . *Psychological Methods* 1999. 4 p. .
- [Seif and Khodadady ()] 'Schema-based cloze multiple choice item tests: measures of translation ability'. S Seif , E Khodadady . *Langue* 2003. 187 (46) p. . Universite de Tabriz, Revue de la Faculte des Letters et Sciences Humaines
- [Schmidt and Hunter ()] 'Select on intelligence'. F L Schmidt , J E Hunter . *The Blackwell handbook of organizational principles*, E A Locke (ed.) (Oxford) 2000. Blackwell. p. .
- [Elenkov and Manev ()] 'Senior expatriate leadership's effects on innovation and the role of cultural intelligence'. D Elenkov , I Manev . *Journal of World Business* 2009. 44 p. .
- [Bandura ()] 'Social cognitive theory in cultural context'. A Bandura . *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 2002. 51 p. .
- [Bandura ()] *Social learning theory*, A Bandura . 1977. New York: General Learning Press.
- [Ward et al. ()] 'The convergent, discriminant and incremental validity of scores on a self-report measure of cultural intelligence'. C A Ward , R Fischer , F S Zaid Lam , L A Hall . *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 2009. 69 (1) p. .
- [Imai and Gelfand ()] 'The culturally intelligent negotiator: The impact of cultural intelligence (CQ) on negotiation sequences and outcomes'. L Imai , M J Gelfand . *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 2010. 112 p. .
- [Ang et al. ()] *The measurement of cultural intelligence. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the*, S Ang , L Van Dyne , C S K Koh , K Y Ng . 2004. New Orleans, LA: Academy of Management.
- [Leong Austin (ed.)] *The psychology research handbook: A guide for graduate students and research assistants*, & J T Leong, Austin (ed.) (California) Sage. p. .
- [Khodadady (2001)] 'Training Translators and Interpreters in the New Millennium'. E Khodadady . *Conference Proceedings*, S Cunico (ed.) (Portsmouth; Portsmouth, England) 2001. 17th March 2001. p. . University of Portsmouth, School of Languages and Areas Studies (Schema: A theory of translation)
- [Van Dyne et al. ()] L Van Dyne , S Ang , C K S Koh . *Cultural intelligence: Measurement and scale development*, 2009.
- [What is intelligence? Contemporary viewpoints on its nature and definition] *What is intelligence? Contemporary viewpoints on its nature and definition*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- [Crowne ()] 'What leads to cultural intelligence?'. K A Crowne . *Business Horizons* 2008. 51 p. .
- [Shaffer et al. ()] 'You can take it with you: Individual differences and expatriate effectiveness'. M A Shaffer , D A Harrison , H Gregersen , J S Black , L A Ferzandi . *Journal of Applied Psychology* 2006. 91 p. .