

The Study of Effect of Socio-cultural Factor on Cultural Intelligence(CQ) (Case Study: Sanandaj City)

Yaaghob Ahmadi

Assistant Professor

Economic and Social science Department

Payame Noor University

19395-4697 Tehran, I.R of Iran

Anwar Shahmohamadi

Academic Member

Humanities Department, Payame Noor University

19395-4697 Tehran, I.R. of Iran

Maryam Mahdi Araghi

Humanities Department, Payame Noor University

19395-4697 Tehran, I.R. of Iran

Abstract

P. Christopher Earley and Soon Ang introduced the concept of cultural intelligence (CQ) to the social sciences and management disciplines in 2003. CQ is defined as an individual's capability to function effectively in situations characterized by cultural diversity. Initially conceived as an individual level construct, CQ can also be applied across levels of analysis. CQ has relevance to groups, teams, organizations, and even nations. This study is for measuring CQ. To achieve the purpose mentioned above, questionnaire survey method is used. In this research are examined impacts of some social and cultural factors such as Ethnocentrism and Cultural Empathy Factors on CQ situation. The results also show that Ethnocentrism and social initiative has been meaningful impact on CQ index. Results also show that there is negative significance relationship between Ethnocentrism and CQ. The regression model indicated that the necessary infrastructure to CQ is Cultural Empathy, Ethnocentrism and Openness to experience. In these cases, Cultural Empathy has been more effect on CQ and four dimensions of it.

Keywords: Ethnic, Cultural Intelligence, Social Initiative, Ethnocentrism, Metacognitive

1. Introduction

Diversity in Culture or 'Cultural diversity' is having different cultures respect each others differences. it could also mean the variety of human societies or cultures in a specific region, or in the world as a whole. In other words cultural diversity is an inescapable fact of modern life. Culture refers to a historically inherited system of meaning and significance in terms of which a group of people understand and structure their individual and collective lives. It defines the meaning or point of human activities, social relations and human life in general, and the kind and degree of significance or value to be attached to them. A culture's system of meaning and significance is embodied in its beliefs and practices, which collectively constitute its identity. To say that almost every modern society is culturally diverse or multicultural is to say that its members subscribe to and live by different though overlapping systems of meaning and significance. Cultural diversity in modern society has several sources. Many societies include different ethnic, religious, cultural and other communities, with their more or less distinct ways of life.

The concern for negotiating effectively across cultures is hardly a new phenomenon. Even the world's first historian, Herodotus (ca. 400BC) observed the "strangeness" of how ancient Egyptians traded with the Greeks (Herodotus, Marincola, & de Selincourt, 2003), and as early as the second century BC, trade began to flourish among people of different cultures along the Silk Road that stretched from Rome to China (Elisseeff, 2000). In the 21st century, with the advent of globalization, being able to negotiate effectively across cultures is a crucial aspect of many inter-organizational relationships, including strategic alliances, joint ventures, mergers and acquisitions, licensing and distribution agreements, and sales of products and services (Adler, 2002). The need to negotiate effectively across cultures is also painfully obvious in today's geo-political scene, where the source of conflict among humankind is thought to be increasingly cultural in nature (Huntington, 1996). Indeed, in the recent Iraq Study Group Report, the improvement of cultural training for US personnel fighting the war in Iraq was deemed one of the highest priorities by the US secretary of state, secretary of defense, and the director of national intelligence (Baker & Hamilton, 2006).

Despite the importance of being able to negotiate effectively across cultures, there is a fundamental paradox in the culture and negotiation literature. That is, even though the practical importance of negotiating across cultural boundaries is often touted to justify cross-cultural theory development, the vast majority of research on culture and negotiation remains comparative (e.g. Gelfand & Realo, 1999). With some exceptions (Adair, Okumura, & Brett, 2001), most research compares and contrasts different negotiation behaviors as they occur in mono-cultural contexts across cultures, instead of directly examining intercultural settings where cultural barriers exist right at the negotiation table. Indeed, in reviewing Gelfand and Brett's (2004) *Handbook of Negotiation and Culture*, Kray (2005) aptly lamented that "although researchers have identified a host of cross-cultural differences in styles and preferences, negotiation scholars might consider expanding beyond simple demonstrations of differences and explore whether awareness of these differences makes a difference, knowledge about factors influencing the effectiveness of intercultural negotiations is sparse" (p. 159). Yet to date, the culture and negotiation literature reveals little as to what characteristics negotiators can be selected and/or trained upon in order to maximize the chances of reaching optimal agreements in intercultural negotiations.

Moreover, for more than three decades the advancement of social sciences research on cross-cultural transition and adaptation has been largely guided by theories grounded in social and health psychology (Ward, Bochner, & Furnham, 2001). Two major conceptual frameworks have been used to understand, explain, and predict cross-cultural adaptation. The first, culture learning, has arisen from Argyle's (1969) work on social skills and interpersonal behaviors and focuses on the social psychology of intercultural interactions. This approach is based on the assumption that cross-cultural problems arise because cultural novices have difficulty managing everyday social encounters. Adaptation, therefore, comes in the form of learning the culture-specific skills that are required to negotiate the new cultural milieu (Bochner, 1986; Masgoret & Ward, 2006). From this perspective, empirical research investigating the predictors of adaptive outcomes has highlighted the importance of factors such as length of residence in a new culture, culture-specific knowledge, cultural distance, interactions with host nationals, and acculturation strategies (Furnham & Bochner, 1982; Kurman & Ronen-Eilon, 2004; Searle & Ward, 1990).

The second conceptual framework has been strongly influenced by Lazarus and Folkman's (1984) work on stress, appraisal, and coping. This approach conceptualizes cross-cultural transition as a series of stress-provoking life changes that tax resources used in adjustment and require coping responses. From this perspective, adaptation is reflected in psychological well-being, and its predictors have been linked to life changes, personality, stress appraisal, coping styles, and acculturation strategies (Berry, 2006; Berry & Sam, 1997; Ward & Kennedy, 2001).

More recently, Earley and Ang (2003) introduced a new perspective on cross-cultural transition and adaptation that arose from contemporary work on intelligence (Sternberg, 1988, 2000) and is situated in the literature on expatriate effectiveness (e.g., Aycan, 1997; Black, Gregersen, & Mendenhall, 1992). Their approach emphasizes interindividual differences in the ability to adapt to novel cultural settings and the influences of these differences on the success in global work assignments (GWAs). More specifically, they have highlighted the importance of cultural intelligence (CQ), defined as "a person's capability to adapt effectively to new cultural contexts" (Earley & Ang, 2003, p. 59). Earley and Ang's multilevel model specifies that CQ leads to success in global work assignments, including general adjustment and work performance, but that the relationships between CQ and the adaptive outcomes are affected by individual factors such as personality and technical competence, familial factors, job and organizational factors, and characteristics of the host culture.

2. Literature and review of previous study

2.1: Multidimensional Cultural Intelligence (CQ)

Cultural intelligence (CQ) is a theoretical extension of contemporary approaches to understanding intelligence (Earley & Ang, 2003). Earley and Ang (2003) conceptualized a multifactor concept of CQ that includes mental (meta-cognitive and cognitive), motivational, and behavioral components. Metacognitive CQ therefore reflects mental processes that individuals use to acquire and understand cultural knowledge, including knowledge of and control over individual thought processes (Flavell, 1979) relating to culture. Relevant capabilities include planning, monitoring, and revising mental models of cultural norms for countries or groups of people. Those with high metacognitive CQ are consciously aware of the cultural preferences and norms of different societies prior to and during interactions. These individuals also question cultural assumptions and adjust their mental models during and after relevant experiences (Brislin, Worthley, & MacNab, 2006; Nelson, 1996; Triandis, 2006).

Cognitive CQ. While metacognitive CQ focuses on higher-order cognitive processes, cognitive CQ reflects knowledge of norms, practices, and conventions in different cultures that has been acquired from educational and personal experiences. The cognitive factor of CQ therefore refers to an individual's level of cultural knowledge or knowledge of the cultural environment. Cultural knowledge includes knowledge of oneself as embedded in the cultural context of the environment. Given the wide variety of cultures in the contemporary world, cognitive CQ indicates knowledge of cultural universals as well as knowledge of cultural differences.

Motivational CQ. Motivational CQ reflects the capability to direct attention and energy toward learning about and functioning in situations characterized by cultural differences. Kanfer and Heggestad (1997, p. 39) argue that such motivational capacities "provide agentic control of affect, cognition and behavior that facilitate goal accomplishment." According to the expectancy-value theory of motivation (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002), the direction and magnitude of energy channeled toward a particular task involves two elements: the expectation of successfully accomplishing the task and the value associated with accomplishing the task. Those with high motivational CQ direct attention and energy toward cross-cultural situations based on intrinsic interest (Deci & Ryan, 1985) and confidence in cross-cultural effectiveness (Bandura, 2002).

Behavioral CQ. Finally, behavioral CQ reflects the capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions when interacting with people from different cultures. Behavioral CQ refers to the extent to which an individual acts appropriately (both verbally and nonverbally) in cross-cultural situations. Behavioral CQ is a critical component of CQ, because verbal and nonverbal behaviors are the most salient features of social interactions.

Q1: how is the level of Cultural Intelligence of citizenships (Sanandaj City) in four Dimensions?

2.2: Ethnocentrism and CQ

The term "ethnocentrism" stems from a more general concept developed by Sumner [1906]. In the beginning, ethnocentrism was a purely sociological construct, describing ingroup vs. outgroup conflicts. Sumner defines ethnocentrism as: "[The] view of things in which one's group is the center of everything, and others are scaled and rated with reference to it. Each group nourishes its own pride and vanity, boasts itself superior, exalts its own divinities and looks with contempt on outsiders." (Sumner, 1906). Ethnocentrism is the propensity to view one's own cultural traditions and behaviors as right and those of others as wrong (Black, 1990). The opposite pole of ethnocentrism is cosmopolitanism, which has generally been defined as the tendency to view one's own traditions, culture and patterns of behavior as no better than other distinct traditions, cultures, and behaviors (Shaffer et al., 2006).

From a socioanalytic perspective (Hogan & Shelton, 1998), such attitudes will perpetuate the ambiguities and uncertainties associated with cross cultural social situations and inhibit the expatriate's ability to get along with others and to find meaning in the foreign environment (Church, 1982; Stening, 1979). In addition, ethnocentric attitudes may generate feelings of prejudice, mistrust, and insecurity (Gouttefarde, 1992), leading to less motivation to develop relationships with colleagues, poorer adaptation to the general environment, and stronger desire to return to one's home country (Shaffer et al., 2006). In thinking about relationship between ethnocentrism and CQ, we propose that ethnocentrism will be negatively associated with all four factors of CQ as unified, multidimensional construct. According to Neuliep (2003), ethnocentrism attitude is conditioned by one's cultural background, thus influence people how to think (metacognitive and cognitive CQ), how to feel (motivational CQ), and conditions people how to act (behavioral CQ) (Neuliep, 2003).

H1: Ethnocentrism will be Negative Significance related to Four Factor of CQ.

2.3. Cultural empathy and CQ

Cultural empathy, also referred to as "sensitivity" (e.g., Hawes & Kealy, 1981), is the most frequently mentioned dimension of multicultural effectiveness (Arthur & Bennet, 1995; Leveland, Mangone, & Adams, 1960; Ruben, 1976). Ruben (1976) defined it as "the capacity to clearly project an interest in others, as well as to obtain and to reflect a reasonably complete and accurate sense of another's thoughts, feelings, and/or experiences". In other words, this dimension refers to the ability to empathize with the feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of members of different cultural groups (Mol et al., 2001), in particular the local people.

Cultural empathy was found strongly related to the Big Five factor Agreeableness (Van der Zee & Van Oudenhoven, 2000). Based on evolutionary personality psychology, Caligiuri (2000) asserts that individual form reciprocal social alliances to preserve their social positions, which is achieved through the agreeableness personality trait. Similar to agreeableness, the focus of the cultural empathy trait is primarily focused on interpersonal skills, which suggests a relationship to the some component of CQ, which also reflects interpersonal competencies.

H2. Cultural Empathy will be positively related to Index and Four Dimension of CQ

2.4. Openness to experience and CQ

This Big Five dimension entails broad-mindedness, curiosity, creativity, having wide interests, flexibility of thoughts, inventiveness, cultured, and artistically sensitive (McCrae, 1996). To date, this dimension is the least understood aspect of personality in the literature on the Big Five model (Digman, 1990). Research findings utilizing openness to experience trait some how disappointing in the literature being the only factor in the Big Five that often is not related to work outcomes (LePine & Van Dyne, 2001). Evolutionary personality theory addresses the utility of this trait through its contention that “perceiving, attending to, and acting upon differences in others is crucial for solving problems of survival and reproduction” (Caligiuri, 2000, 74). This is translated to intercultural experiences through the ability to correctly assess the social environments as a matter of self-preservation, which, combined with the tendency toward flexibility in thought and action, suggests potential significant relationships with all components of CQ.

Ang et al. (2006) contended that openness to experience will be related to meta-cognitive CQ because those who are curious and high in openness spend time “thinking about thinking”. In other word, they adopt meta-cognitive strategies when thinking about and interacting with those who have different cultural backgrounds. Openness to experience individuals is also likely to question their own cultural assumptions, analyze the cultural preferences and norms of others, and reexamine their mental models when interacting with others from different culture (Ang et al., 2006). Cognitive CQ is an individual’s knowledge of specific norms, practices, and conventions in different cultural settings (Earley & Ang, 2003). Cognitive CQ plays a significant role in facilitating individuals acquire the knowledge of cultural universals as well as knowledge of cultural differences; thus allows individuals to assess their similarity to others who have different cultural backgrounds. Given the characteristics of curiosity and broad-mindedness, therefore, it is contended that those individuals high on openness to experience should be more knowledgeable about specific aspects of other cultures.

Motivational CQ relates to one’s desire to adapt to unfamiliar cultural environments, whether it originates through self efficacy motivations, from intrinsic interests, or from some other driving force. According to Ones and Viswesvaran (1997) openness to experience individuals willing to experience and enjoy new and unfamiliar environments since they are inherently curious. Behavioral CQ involves one’s ability to actually engage in the desired adaptive behaviors required of a culturally different context. The curious and imaginative tendencies of openness trait suggest that individuals will seek out, act on new experiences, and extend their repertoire of behaviors beyond the daily habits.

H3. Openness to experience will be positively related to Index and Four Dimension of CQ

3. Methods

3.1. Data and Sample

The responders of the study were 348 citizens. But because of some damaged Questionnaires, about 325 Questionnaires was analyzed:

$$n = \frac{N(t^2 pq)}{Nd^2 + (t^2 pq)} \cong 348$$

$$N = 316862$$

$$t = 1.96$$

$$p = 0.5$$

$$q = 0.5$$

$$d = 0.05$$

3.2. Measure and structures (Constructs) of concepts

3.2.1: Cultural Intelligence

The 20-item self-rating CQ measure (Ang et al., 2007) is based on four components: metacognition; cognition, motivation, and behavior. An example of one item from each of the above components is, respectively: “I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions”; “I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures”; “I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me”; and, “I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.” The scale is based on an extension of the CQ conceptualization in Earley and Ang (2003). Respondents were required to indicate a score from 1 (disagree strongly) to 5 (agree strongly) for each item. CQ factor scores were the average of item scores from that factor; the average of all items served as an overall CQ score.

3.2.2: Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism is a socio-psychological concept which could be assessed like attitudes. It is a theoretical construct, unobservable in a direct manner, and thus has to be measured by socio-psychological instruments.

Ethnocentrism (16 items) is measured by items such as “define what goes on in their own cultures as natural and correct: what goes on in other cultures as unnatural and incorrect; feel proud of the in-group or perceive in-group customs as universally valid.

3.2.3 Cultural Empathy

This scale assesses the capacity to identify with the feelings, thoughts and behaviour of individuals from different cultural backgrounds. To function effectively with people of other cultures, it is important to acquire some understanding of those cultures, and cultural empathy seems important to “reading” other cultures. People who score high on cultural empathy are able to identify with the feelings, thoughts, and behaviors of people and groups who are part of different cultures. People with a low score have difficulties in identifying with the feelings, thoughts and behaviours of people and groups with different cultural backgrounds.

Cultural empathy (14 items) is measured by items such as ‘Tries to understand other people's behavior’ (+), ‘is attentive to facial expressions’ (+), and “Finds it hard to guess what others feel” (-).

3.2.4 Openness to experience

Openness to experience is the tendency to be imaginative, creative, and adventurous (Costa & McCrae, 1992). This scale assesses people's capacity to be open and unprejudiced when encountering people outside of their own cultural group and who may have different values and norms. This ability seems vital to understanding the rules and values of other cultures and to coping with them in an effective manner. A 12-item measured used in this study to measure of Openness to experience. Examples of items included: “I feel at ease working on more difficult tasks” to measure intellectual efficiency; “I can be quite inventive at times” to measure ingenuity; “In a quiz I like to know what the answers are if I get the questions wrong” for curiosity; “I learn a great deal from people with differing beliefs” for tolerance; “I see the beauty in art when others do not” for aesthetics; and “It is important for me to be in touch with my inner feelings” for depth. All items were in a four-point Likert format, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

3.3. Reliability of questionnaire

Reliability of questionnaire was tested by Cronbach's alpha reliability test. According to Table 1 reliability of questions related to CQ 0/895, Social initiative 0/879, Cultural Empathy 0/911 and so on.

Table (1): results of Cronbach's alpha for variables in questionnaire

variable	Number of items	Alpha amount
CQ	20	0/895
Behavioral CQ	5	0/871
Motivational CQ	5	0/741
MetaCognitive CQ	4	0/911
Cognitive	6	0/884
Ethnocentrism	16	0/849
Cultural Empathy	14	0/871
Openness to experience	12	0/871

4. Results

In this section, results of research results were indicated based on two dimensions, descriptive and explanation results:

4.1. Descriptive results:

Q1: level of Cultural Intelligence of citizenships of Sanandaj

For determining level of Cultural Intelligence of citizenships of Sanandaj, was used of mean responses of sample. The mean of responses of sample was showed in Table 3:

Table 2: Mean responses of sample statistics based of Likert scale

Variable	Number	Man	S.D	Minimum	Maximum
CQ	325	89/32	25/46	20	140
Behavioral CQ	325	18/67	5/21	5	35
Motivational CQ	325	29/03	3/51	5	35
MetaCognitive CQ	325	22/79	6/48	4	28
Cognitive	325	38/19	2/78	6	42

Based of the table 2, results indicat Mean of level of Cultural Intelligence of citizenships from 20 to 100 is 89/32 that shows Cultural Intelligence of citizenships has in a nearly good situation in Sanandaj city.

Results also show that the highest average in the dimensions of cultural intelligence is related to cognitive cultural intelligence with 38/19 and motivational cultural intelligence 29/03 and so on.

4.2. Explanation results

H1: Cultural empathy and Four Dimensions of CQ

For survey relationship between Cultural Empathy and Four Dimensions of CQ, because all of variables have measured in Distance level, by use of Pearson Test, the meaningfulness of their relationship was computed.

Table 3 indicates situation of relationship between Cultural Empathy and Four Dimensions of CQ.

Table 3: Pearson Correlation Test of Cultural Empathy and Four Dimensions of CQ

		CQ	Behavioral	Motivational	cognitive	
Cultural Empathy	R	0/545	0/228	0/584	0/121	0/085
	Sig	0/000	0/029	0/000	0/054	0/13

Based on table 3, results indicate:

1. There is positive and meaningful relationship between cultural Empathy and Index of CQ (Sig= 0.000<0.05) and Strength of relationship between cultural Empathy and Index of CQ is in high (value=0/545).
2. There is also positive and meaningful relationship between cultural Empathy and three Dimension of CQ (Behavioral, Motivational and cognitive). Strength of relationship between cultural Empathy and Motivational CQ in the highest amount (0/584) after that Strength of relationship between cultural Empathy and behavioral is 0/228.
3. there is no meaningful relationship between cultural Empathy and metacognitive CQ (Sig= 0/13>0/05)

H2: Ethnocentrism and Four Dimensions of CQ

For survey relationship between Ethnocentrism and Four Dimensions of CQ, because all of variables have measured in Distance level, by use of Pearson Test, the meaningfulness of their relationship was computed.

Table 4 indicates situation of relationship between Ethnocentrism and Four Dimensions of CQ.

Table 4: Pearson Correlation Test of Ethnocentrism and Four Dimensions of CQ

		CQ	Behavioral	Motivational	cognitive	metacognitive
Ethnocentrism	R	-0/218	-0/176	-0/154	-0/194	-0/021
	Sig	0/001	0/000	0/028	0/003	0/143

Based on table 4, results indicate:

4. There is negative and meaningful relationship between Ethnocentrism and Index of CQ (Sig= 0.001<0.05) and Strength of relationship between Ethnocentrism and Index of CQ is in nearly high (value= -0/218).
5. There is also negative and meaningful relationship between Ethnocentrism and three Dimension of CQ (Behavioral, Motivational and cognitive). Strength of relationship between Ethnocentrism and cognitive CQ in the highest amount (-0/194) after that Strength of relationship between Ethnocentrism and behavioral is -0/176
6. there is no meaningful relationship between Ethnocentrism and metacognitive CQ (Sig= 0/113>0/05)

H3: Openness to experience and Four Dimensions of CQ

For survey relationship between **Openness to experience** and Four Dimensions of CQ, because all of variables have measured in Distance level, by use of Pearson Test, the meaningfulness of their relationship was computed. Table 5 indicates situation of relationship between **Openness to experience** and Four Dimensions of CQ.

Table 5: Pearson Correlation Test of Openness to experience and Four Dimensions of CQ

		CQ	Behavioral	Motivational	cognitive	metacognitive
Openness to experience	R	0/485	0/228	0/484	0/241	0/285
	Sig	0/000	0/000	0/000	0/000	0/000

Based on table 3, results indicate:

1. There is positive and meaningful relationship between Openness to experience and Index of CQ (Sig= 0.000<0.05) and Strength of relationship between Openness to experience and Index of CQ is in high (value=0/485).

2. There is also positive and meaningful relationship between Openness to experience and all of the Dimensions of CQ (Behavioral, Motivational, cognitive and metacognitive). Strength of relationship between Openness to experience and Motivational CQ in the highest amount (0/484) after that Strength of relationship between Openness to experience and metacognitive is 0/285.

4.2.1. Regression analysis:

In this section, we measure impact of the entire distance variables on CQ by regression analysis. For this, it was measured impact of Cultural empathy, Ethnocentrism and **Openness to experience** on CQ. Table 6 and 7 shows results of regression analysis that do by Enter method.

Table 6, explanation of CQ by Cultural empathy and social initiative

model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square
1	0/467	0/273	0/253

Table7, results of regression analysis

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)		15/645	4/425		7/845	0/000
X1	Cultural Empathy	0/454	0/077	0/296	5/887	0/000
X3	Openness to experience	0/436	0/154	0/285	5/648	0/000
X2	Ethnocentrism	-0/231	0/193	-0/147	3/847	0/000

Table 6 and 7 show that 46/7 percent of variance of CQ can be explains by the entire of variables. Tables also indicate that Cultural Empathy with nearly 29/6 percent has highest impact on CQ. After that, **Openness to experience** with 28/5 percent has second impact on it. Also on those results and based oh B Coefficients, it can be written the below formula of regression:

$$CQ = 15/645 + 0/454(X1) + 0/436(X2) + -0/231(X3)$$

Conclusion

P. Christopher Earley and Soon Ang introduced the concept of cultural intelligence (CQ) to the social sciences and management disciplines in 2003. They define it as an individual's capability to function effectively in situations characterized by cultural diversity. Ang et al. (2007) demonstrate that CQ is a key individual characteristic that predicts success in overseas assignments, positive and constructive working relationships with a wide variety of people. This Article has measured CQ in four factors and explains it by two socio-personal characteristic factor (social initiative and cultural empathy). The findings of the study have determined that CQ of citizenship of Sanandaj city is in a high level and appreciate for cross-cultural negotiations. Results also show that all of four factor of CQ (Motivational, Behavioral, Cognitive and metacognitive) of citizenship is in a high and at least middle rate.

The results also show that Cultural empathy, Openness to experience and Ethnocentrism has been meaningful impact on CQ index, but Etnocentrism has been negative meaningful impact on CQ index. These findings confirm theoretical debate above study associated with CQ. Several researchers have pointed at the relevance of the ability to establish and maintain contacts (Hawes and Kealey, 1981; Kets de Vries and Mead, 1991). Ang et al. (2006) contended that openness to experience will be related to meta-cognitive CQ. According to Neuliep (2003), ethnocentrism attitude is conditioned by one's cultural background, thus influence people how to think (metacognitive and cognitive CQ), how to feel (motivational CQ), and conditions people how to act (behavioral CQ). Caligiuri (2000) asserts that individual form reciprocal social alliances to preserve their social positions, which is achieved through the agreeableness personality trait. Similar to agreeableness, the focus of the cultural empathy trait is primarily focused on interpersonal skills, which suggests a relationship to the some component of CQ, which also reflects interpersonal competencies. The regression model indicated that the necessary infrastructure to CQ is cultural empathy Openness to experience and Ethnocentrism. In these cases, cultural empathy has been more effect on CQ and four dimensions of it.

References

- Adair, W. L., & Brett, J. M. (2004). Culture and negotiation processes. In M. J. Gelfand & J. M. Brett (Eds.), *Handbook of negotiation and culture* (pp. 158–176). Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Adair, W. L., & Brett, J. M. (2005). The negotiation dance: Time, culture, and sequences in negotiation. *Organization Science*, 16, 33–51.
- Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008). Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness, and nomological network. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications* (pp. 3–15). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, S.K. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group and Organization Management*, 31:100-123.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C. K. S., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., et al. (2007). The measurement of cultural intelligence: Effects on cultural judgment and decision-making, cultural adaptation, and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3, 335–371.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., & Ng, K.Y. (2004). *The Measurement of Cultural Intelligence*. Paper presented at the 2004 Academy of Management Meetings Symposium on Cultural Intelligence in the 21st Century, New Orleans, LA.
- Baker, J. A., & Hamilton, L. H. (2006). *The Iraq study group report: The way forward – A new approach*. US Institute of Peace. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 41: 1-26.
- Black, J.S. (1990). The relationship of personal characteristics with the adjustment of Japanese expatriate managers. *Management International Review*, 30: 119-134.
- Caligiuri, P.M. (2000a). The Big Five personality characteristics as predictors of expatriate's desire to terminate the assignment and supervisor-rated performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 53: 67–88.
- Caligiuri, P.M. (2000b). Selecting expatriates for personality characteristics: A moderating effect of personality on the relationship between host national contact and cross-cultural adjustment. *Management International Review*, 40(1): 61–80.
- Cunningham, W. A., Nezelek, J. B., & Banaji, M. R. (2004). Implicit and explicit ethnocentrism: Revisiting the ideologies of prejudice. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1332–1346.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Flaherty, J. E. (2008). The effects of cultural intelligence on team member acceptance and integration in multinational teams. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications* (pp. 192–205). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Goldberg, L. R., Johnson, J. A., Eber, H. W., Hogan, R., Ashton, M. C., Cloninger, C. R., et al. (2006). The International Personality Item Pool and the future of publicdomain personality measures. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 84–96.
- Holopainen, J., & Björkman, I. (2005). The personal characteristics of the successful expatriate: A critical review of the literature and an empirical investigation. *Personnel Review*, 34(1): 37-50.
- Kim, K., Kirkman, B. L., & Chen, G. (2008). Cultural intelligence and international assignment effectiveness: A conceptual model and preliminary findings. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications* (pp. 71–90). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Rockstuhl, T., & Ng, K. (2008). The effects of cultural intelligence on interpersonal trust in multicultural teams. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications* (pp. 206–220). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Tay, C., Westman, M., & Chia, A. (2008). Antecedents and consequences of cultural intelligence among short-term business travelers. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications* (pp. 126–144). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2006). Motivational cultural intelligence, realistic job preview, realistic living conditions preview, and cross-cultural adjustment. *Group & Organization Management*, 31, 154–173.
- Van der Zee, K. I., & Van Oudenhoven, J. P. (2000). The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire: A multidimensional instrument of multicultural effectiveness. *European Journal of Personality*, 14(4): 291–309.