

Leadership Styles and Cultural Intelligence

Ihsan Eken

University of the Incarnate Word

Osman Özturgut

University of the Incarnate Word

Annette E. Craven

University of the Incarnate Word

Over the last few decades, increasing number of professionals have been challenged to rethink the basic paradigms of leadership styles and how to be successful in this global era. Being a culturally competent leader is not a preferred skill but a required skill within almost any organization. In order to shed light on this complex leadership adaptation in multi-cultural environments, this study explored whether there was a relationship between the leadership styles and four elements of cultural intelligence. Other than the correlation between the democratic style leadership and cultural intelligence motivation, this study has not confirmed a significant correlation between leadership styles and cultural intelligence.

INTRODUCTION

According to Northouse (2012), “leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p. 5). Nahavandi (2009) further elaborates that, “a leader ... helps them establish goals, and guides them toward achievement of those goals, thereby allowing them to be effective” (p.4). Both authors clarify the definition of leadership in the same way that the leaders having certain traits in influencing individuals and groups. Leaders carry out this trait by applying their leadership attributes, such as beliefs, values, ethics, character, knowledge, and skills.

The definition of culture has been identified by countless research studies for decades and an on-going discussion. House et al. (2004) stated the culture in their Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) model, which was investigated in 62 cultural societies involving roughly 17,000 middle managers, as “shared motives, values, beliefs, identities, and interpretations or meanings of significant events that results from common experiences of members of collectives and are transmitted across age generations” (p. 57). Leung et al. (2005) associated conducting international business as being subjective in diverse national cultures as “values, beliefs, norms, and behavioral patterns” of individuals within particular countries (p. 357) are diverse and significant. Morley and Cerdin (2010) drew attention to the international business arena that “intercultural competence, at the individual level, in the form of personal attributes, knowledge and skills, is presumed to be associated with global career success” (p. 805).

Purpose of the Study

Today's business leaders often seek new adventures in different environments. Having this tendency steers leaders to the globalization which refers to engaging in diverse cultural contexts such as beliefs and values. Nahavandi (2012) underlines the significance of effective leaders as the ones that understand the complexities of dynamic global environment with the intelligence to deal with complex problems and the sensitivity. In order to shed light on this complex leadership adaptation in multi-cultural environments, this study explored whether there was a relationship between the leadership styles and four elements of cultural intelligence. The four capabilities of cultural intelligence from Ang and Dyne (2008) and Livermore's (2011) are: CQ Drive (motivation), CQ Knowledge (cognition), CQ Strategy (meta-cognition), and CQ Action (behavior).

Problem Statement

Within the scope of globalization and increasing attention to the interconnectedness of businesses, culturally competency in leading multicultural teams and groups is becoming a challenge. While the world and scope of organizations are shrinking, leaders are required to adapt to the change and evolve when functioning in multi-cultural organizations. Cultural intelligence is an art of an individual's capability of adaptation to complex problems in diverse organizations or cross-cultural environments.

Significance of the Study

Over the last few decades, increasing number of professionals have been challenged to rethink the basic paradigms of leadership styles and how to be successful in this global era to achieve economic development and social transformation. Globalization deeply influences today's leaders in grasping diverse cultures where they intend to invest or foray into. Being a culturally competent leader is not a preferred skill but a required skill within almost any organization in order to maximize organizational performance and profitability.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this research study was to provide an understanding of the relationship between leadership styles and cultural intelligence. This research further provided an in-depth presentation of leadership styles and a discussion of how leaders function in diverse cultural settings.

The definition of leadership has been identified by numerous research studies and it is still being identified and clarified. In this age of technology, leaders are facing many challenges in which leadership styles are supposed to be adapted and implemented in par with the diversity represented in business transactions and communications. According to Muna (2011), "multicultural leaders are cosmopolitan and worldly, they have acquired the cultural sensitivity necessary to bridge cultures (even when working within the same country) and are able to conduct business effectively across national borders" (p. 90). Muna (2011) also stresses that if companies ignore to hire and develop or cultivate multicultural leaders, at that time, those companies will not be able to be competitive in global economy.

Leadership is a blend of special traits such as an act or a behavior that influence its followers in order to achieve a common goal. Yukl (2006) states that "leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives" (p.26). Leaders carry out this process by showing their leadership behaviors that are comprised of three general kinds of behaviors in many organizational contexts: Authoritarian leadership, democratic leadership, and laissez-faire leadership (Northouse, 2012).

Autocratic or Authoritarian Style

Autocratic leadership style is about decision-making power which is centralized. Autocratic leader has absolute power in a group or organization. The autocratic leader makes decisions and takes responsibilities alone for the achievement of companies or organizations. According to Vugt, Jepson, Hart

and Cremer (2004), “They [autocratic leaders] decide which group members should contribute how much without asking anyone for input” (p. 2). They have a tendency to be directive, supervise closely and control followers. The reason of this tendency is that authoritarian leaders inherently feel that their followers, who do not like to work, need to be encouraged as they have a little passion to work, and are not capable of accomplishing a task alone.

According to Northouse (2012), authoritarian leadership has negative outcomes as “it fosters dependence, submissiveness, and a loss of individuality” (p. 54). Being an authoritarian leader can create obstacles for followers’ creativity and personal growth. Followers usually feel under pressure and cannot take initiatives. According to Schoel, Bluemke, Mueller, & Stahlberg (2011) “Autocratic leaders dictate methods and stages of goal attainment and are unconcerned about followers’ autonomy and personal development” (p. 522). Northouse (2012) pointed out that over time, followers gradually become discontent, hostile, and aggressive towards authoritarian leaders. However, although author underlines the negatives of authoritarian leadership, this style is more and popular in business fields.

Democratic Style

Democratic leadership style refers to being a democratic and fair leader in all contexts. Democratic leaders prefer cooperation within the work groups. They motivate the employees effectively and positively by avoiding putting himself or herself above followers. As opposed to authoritarian leaders, the philosophy of the democratic leader is not one-sided because the priority of this leadership is to receive a consensus within the group members while involving them in ongoing projects. According to Schoel, Bluemke, Mueller, & Stahlberg (2011), “Democratic leaders encourage group members to employ their own methods and policies and elicit equal input when decisions are to be made” (p. 521-522). A more democratic leadership style is characterized by a high degree of group members’ involvement and participation, whereas an autocratic leader makes decisions without asking the group members for their input.

The positive aspects of democratic leadership literally outweigh the negative; first, working with a democratic leader makes group members feel more comfortable and encouraged to share their thoughts. Group members are more involved and committed to projects, thus, making them more likely to care about the end results. Second, democratic leadership leads to higher productivity among group members. Northouse (2012) states that “people are motivated to pursue their own talents under the supportive structure of democratic leadership” (p. 57). As to negative aspects of democratic leadership, it may take more time and commitment from the leader to accomplish a project (Northouse, 2012).

Laissez-Faire Style

Laissez-faire leadership is a non-authoritarian leadership style in that they do not try to control followers. Laissez-faire (hands off) is rooted in French. This leadership style is quite different from authoritarian and democratic leadership. Laissez faire leaders do not try to give guidance and motivate as authoritarian leaders do to their followers. According to Northouse (2012), “these leaders recognize subordinates but are very laid back and make no attempt to influence their activities” (p. 57). Free-rein leaders usually do not lead and they give the reins to followers, thereby followers are able to make decisions, determine goals, and solve problems on their own. According to Hinkin and Schriesheim (2008), “Laissez faire leader behavior is not related to follower performance. Rather, it is characterized by avoiding decisions, hesitating to take action, and being absent when needed” (p. 1234).

Tolerating followers in many situations may cause some negative outcomes in organizations. Because group members under laissez faire leaders may exhibit lack the knowledge or experience to complete tasks and make decisions. According to Northouse (2012), downsides of laissez faire leadership are; less accomplished tasks due to being directionless and giving more freedom. Northouse (2012) states that “without a sense of purpose and direction, group members have difficulty finding meaning in their work; they become unmotivated and disheartened” (p. 57).

Cultural Intelligence

Culture

Culture has been being studied for decades by numerous researchers and in many multi-cultural environments. Geert Hofstede (2005) renames culture as “mental software” meaning that “It is the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another.” (p. 5). Culture is collective. It is programming of mind with life experiences, symbols, heroes, rituals and values. Culture is a distinguishing character of nations, ethnicities, genders, generations, occupations, organizations, and departments.

The world we live in needs more interactions (communication and collaboration) with diverse cultures for the dynamic global business practices. House et al., (2004) described it as “commonly experienced language, ideological belief systems (including religion and political belief systems), ethnic heritage, and history” (p. 15). While our world is shrinking, globalization creates challenges for leaders: Understanding of different values, religions, and ethics. According to Jenkins (2012), “Globalization has forced stakeholders to readdress global leadership competencies and reassess decision making”(p. 97). Cohen (2010) states that effective global leadership involves a global mindset. Javidan and Walker (2012) explain global mindset as the collection of skills that help leaders influence individuals, groups, and organizations within different cultures, political and institutional backgrounds. Leaders who want to become successful in global business need to learn, adapt, and live in diverse cultures. As Cohen (2010) stresses, a leader who is effective in a domestic setting also has to be effective in foreign settings. Ehrlich (2002) states that, “Global managers have exceptionally open minds. They respect how different countries do things, and they have the imagination to appreciate why they do them that way “(p.234). Javidan and Walker (2012) further separate the global leadership from regular leadership by explaining that the concept of global leader is about dealing with more challenges and about influencing people from different cultures. Global leadership requires cultural intelligence and embracing and implementing the norms of cultural intelligence can help global leaders to achieve their organizations’ objectives.

Leaders often encounter the challenges of cultural socializing of team members in global organizations (Groves & Feyerherm, 2011). Early, Ang, & Tan state that (2006) “cultural intelligence is a person’s capability for successful adaptation to new cultural settings, that is, unfamiliar settings attributable to cultural context” (p. 5). As population of the world grows, proportionally, leaders become more interactive with multi-cultural organizations. At this point, understanding and accommodation of cultural intelligence has become more significant. Today’s politics, teachers, human resource managers and even students are required to grasp the multi-cultural context where they engage in various interactions with people from diverse cultures.

MacNab, Brislin and Worthley (2012) explain that “Cultural intelligence (CQ) refers to a set of skills and traits that allow one to more effectively interact with novel cultural settings” (p. 1321). Kim and Dyne (2012) state that to be able to deal with more complicated international work and assignments, interpretation of what similarities and differentials are in cultural diversity and being determined and energetic in learning about new cultures are sine qua non in multicultural environments. Thus, we can interpret the cultural intelligence ability, aside from behavioral intelligence, as it is about individuals’ cognitive capability in diverse settings. According to Ang and Dyne (2008), CQ cognition/knowledge, meta-cognition/strategy, and motivation/drive are concerned with mental functioning and CQ behavior displays explicit action in diverse settings. “Behavioral intelligence refers to outward manifestations or overt actions-what the person does rather than what he or she thinks” (Sternberg & Detterman, 1986, p.6).

CQ Drive (Motivation)

Ang and Dyne (2008) provide significant information on one of the four cultural intelligence capabilities, CQ motivation, which reflects the capability to direct attention and energy toward learning about and functioning in situations characterized by cultural differences. Cultural intelligence motivation is the most essential component capability among the other three capabilities. First of all, individuals need to be motivated in order to deal with and to be more effective in cross-cultural environment. Because, if a person’s motivation fails prior to participating in diverse cultural settings, the goals that are intended to be

accomplished may fail. The displaying lack of desire, reluctance to communicate with others from diverse cultural backgrounds, and also lack of learning and adapting the new cultural differences affect in negative way at the beginning of process of dealing with cross-cultural situations.

Dyne, Ang and Koh (2008) conceptualize the CQ motivation as a form of self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation. They claim that motivation plays significant role in CQ because dealing with diverse cultures requires a sense of confidence and interest in diverse cultural settings. Ang and Inkpen (2008) state the CQ motivation as a source of drive in that it creates direct effort and energy in cross-cultural settings.

CQ Knowledge (Cognition)

Ang and Inkpen (2008) state the Cognitive CQ is “a manager’s knowledge of norms, practices, and conventions in different cultures that has been acquired from educational and personal experiences”(p. 344). The point of this capability is to learn more about cultures where they intend to work. According to Dyne et.al. (2012), “cognitive CQ refers to an individual’s knowledge structures about cultural institutions, norms, practices and conventions in different cultural settings” (p. 300). Knowledge resides in the “head” which refers to awareness in the similarities and differences, self-awareness, and knowledge (MacNab, 2012) and getting more information helps to deploy the blur and biases over cultural differences. For instance, observing the way people do things such as what’s going on, do people just kiss or do they just shake hands or just bow, how/ what they eat would definitely help leaders in diverse settings. According to Early and Peterson (2004), “CQ knowledge (cognition) can be viewed as the total knowledge and experience concerning cultural adaptation of an individual stored in memory” (p.106). Consequently, understanding, observing and being acquainted with different cultures enable leaders to better appreciate the organizations that shape and cause specific patterns of social interactions within a culture (Ang and Dyne, 2008). Leaders who have high CQ knowledge/cognition are very successful in interacting with people from different cultural backgrounds.

CQ Strategy (Meta-Cognition)

According to Livermore (2011), “CQ strategy is your level of awareness and your ability to plan in light of your cultural understanding”(p. 110). CQ Strategy underlines an individual’s level of consciousness, cultural awareness of others’ cultural preferences, that is, being harmonized with what’s going on in one’s self and others (Dyne, Ang & Livermore, 2010) and executive processing during cross-cultural interactions (Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2008), which basically refers to the ability to query about assumptions and applying strategically and effectively to cultural knowledge. Planning in CQ strategy normally takes a bit more time in order to prepare for a cross-cultural encounter such as expecting how to approach the people, topic, and situation (Dyne, Ang & Livermore, 2010). After planning the strategy, individuals can check their plans through observing to see if the plans were appropriate before or during interactions (Dyne, Ang & Livermore, 2010). Ang and Inkpen (2008) explain that CQ strategy is the mental ability to acquire, control of cognition, and grasp cultural knowledge.

CQ Action (Behavior)

Ang and Van Dyne (2008) shed light on one of the four capabilities of cultural intelligence, CQ behavior, which refers to an individual’s capability at the action level to exhibit a wide repertoire of appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions when interacting with people from different cultural backgrounds. In the earlier three capabilities, the actions of CQ motivation (drive), cognition (knowledge), metacognition (strategy), are mental capabilities that take place in individuals’ mind (Ang et al., 2007). Dyne, Ang and Koh (2008) clarify that “CQ behavior is a critical component of CQ because behavior is often the most visible characteristic of social interaction”(p. 17).

Prior intercultural contact (Kim & Dyne, 2012) plays a significant role in being successful in international leadership context. Through prior intercultural contact, leaders gain knowledge, increase their cultural sensitivity, skills, and abilities to manage successfully in multi-cultural environment (Caligiuri & DiSanto, 2001). For instance, according to Hansen, Singh, Weilbaker, and Guesalaga (2011), salespeople who work in diverse settings are more effective in cross-cultural trade when they tend to

adapt to costumers' diverse cultures. They confirm that this skill helps to increase the performance of salespeople. The reason is that, they are very good at changing their behaviors in accordance with the cultural context by taking advantage of their cognition or knowledge that they already have in cross-cultural sales environments.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This research study explored leaders' leadership styles through Leadership Style Questionnaire and leader's cultural intelligence styles through Cultural Intelligence Scale. This study employed a quantitative approach to understand the relationship between the leadership style and cultural intelligence. Creswell (2012) explains quantitative research as "analyzing trends, comparing groups, or relating variables using statistical analysis, and interpreting results by comparing them with prior predictions and past research" (p. 13). For this study, quantitative correlation study is used as an appropriate design to collect, analyze, interpret data to acquire empirical evidence about the purpose of the study.

Research Question and Hypothesis

Research Question: Whether or not one of leadership styles does logically correspond to one of cultural intelligences capabilities?

Hypothesis: Using the Chi Square Test of Independence in the Null (H₀) and Alternate (H₁) hypothesis will be:

H₀: There is a significant relationship between leadership style and cultural intelligence

H₁: There is no significant relationship between leadership style and cultural intelligence

Sample

Data was acquired using a web-based tool (Survey Monkey) from 29 participants with the titles of coordinator and above at a private university in South Texas. The sample population consisted of Associate Deans, Chairs, Coordinators, Deans, Directors, and Vice Presidents. Table-1 shows the frequency of female which is 59% (n = 17), and 41% male (n = 12). Table-2 indicates frequency of ethnic background of the leaders who have participated in this study: 28 percent Hispanic or Latino (n =8), 72 percent White/Caucasian (n = 21). The leaders reported their position title as 10 percent coordinator (n = 3), 52 percent director (n = 15), 7 percent chair (n= 2), 7 percent dean (n= 2), 7 percent vice president (n=2), and 7 percent did not prefer answer (n = 2), and as other position title 3 percent administrator (n=1), and 6 percent assistant director (n=2) (Table-3).

**TABLE 1
GENDER**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Female	17	58.6	58.6	58.6
Valid Male	12	41.4	41.4	100.0
Total	29	100.0	100.0	

**TABLE 2
ETHNICITY**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Hispanic or Latino	8	27.6	27.6	27.6
Valid White / Caucasian	21	72.4	72.4	100.0
Total	29	100.0	100.0	

**TABLE 3
POSITION TITLE**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Chair	2	6.9	7.7	7.7
Coordinator	3	10.3	11.5	19.2
Dean	2	6.9	7.7	26.9
Valid Director	15	51.7	57.7	84.6
Vice President	2	6.9	7.7	92.3
Prefer not to answer	2	6.9	7.7	100.0
Total	26	89.7	100.0	
Missing System	3	10.3		
Total	29	100.0		

DATA COLLECTION

Prior to data collection, approval was obtained from Institutional Review Board. The data was gathered via email using a consent letter, a demographic questionnaire, the Leadership Styles Questionnaire (Peter G. Northouse, 2012) the Cultural Intelligence Scale (Linn Van Dyne et al., 2007) to measure a leaders' intelligence quotient. The Leadership Style Questionnaire was designed to measure three common styles of leadership: Authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire consisting of six questions for the each leadership style. The leadership questionnaire consisted of an eighteen item questionnaire that was measured on a five point scale where 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree. The Cultural Intelligence Scale was designed to measure four common four capabilities of cultural intelligence: CQ Drive (motivation), CQ Knowledge (cognition), CQ Strategy (meta-cognition), and CQ Action (behavior). The scale consisted of a twenty-item questionnaire that was measured on a seven point scale where 1=strongly disagree and 7=strongly agree.

Data Analysis

29 participants with the titles of coordinator and above was given the opportunity to participate in this study by filling out an online survey, distributed through Human Resource Department. The Leadership Style Questionnaire and the Cultural Intelligence Survey were sent to over fifty leaders. The data gathered

by the questionnaires and analyzed in the section of descriptive statistics and correlations analyses through SPSS.

Results

In this phase, the data was analyzed descriptively. The purpose of the descriptive analysis was to describe, present, and summarize the means for all of the descriptive data such as the survey participants’ demographic variables.

Descriptive Statistics of Demographics

Demographic questionnaire was provided to understand the profiles of the participants and to be more comprehensive in identifying differences among participants. Gender, age, ethnicity, position title, type of employees supervised, number of employees supervised, and years as supervisor of the participants were collected through the survey. As it indicated in Table-4 and mentioned previously, sample was 59 percent female (n = 17), 41 percent male (n = 12) with std= 0.501 and mean= 1.41.

**TABLE 4
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
What is your gender?	29	1	2	1.41	.501
What is your ethnicity?	29	4	5	4.72	.455
What is your position title	26	3	8	5.69	1.258
Valid N	26				

As to leaders’ work experience years at supervisor level and above, the analysis shows that those leaders who currently work five through ten years is n= 14 which corresponds to 48% of the participants outweigh the other years.

**TABLE 5
YEARS AS A SUPERVISOR**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Years as supervisor	29	1	4	2.10	.976
Valid N	29				

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient for the seven inter items was .863, suggesting that the items have relatively high internal consistency. (Note that a reliability coefficient of .70 or higher is considered “acceptable” in most social science research situations.)

Inferential Statistics and Presentation of Results

Using the results from the collected data, a Chi Square Test of Independence has been used in order to identify and analyze group differences when the dependent variable is measured at a nominal level (McHugh, 2013). To investigate whether or not there is a significant relationship between leadership and cultural intelligence, a chi-square statistic was used. Assumptions were checked and were met. The Pearson chi-square results and indicates that leadership styles and cultural intelligence capabilities are not significant when they are considered in multi-cultural environment. The P-Value is > 0.00001. The result is not significant at p < 0.05.).

P-value that is normally compared to $\alpha = 0.05$ level and $P = 0.836$, which is not smaller than $\alpha = 0.05$. $P = 0.836 > 0.05$ shows that there is no relationship between leadership styles and cultural intelligence. As it can be seen in Table 1 a p-value of 0.836 has been detected and that the results failed to reject the null hypothesis. As a result of this study, $R = 0.044$ and, $p = 0.836 > .005$ values that extracted out of the data demonstrated that negative correlation was found between leadership and cultural intelligence.

TABLE 6

Bivariate Correlations										
		Leadersp	CQ	LSautho	LSdemoc	LSlaisse	CQmetaco	CQcognit	CQmotiva	CQbehavi
Leadersp	Pearson C.	1	.044	.545**	.512**	.748**	.095	-.069	.159	.001
	Sig. (2 tailed)		.836	.003	.006	.000	.638	.736	.428	.994
	N	27	25	27	27	27	27	26	27	26
CQ	Pearson C.	.044	1	-.317	.390*	.068	.763**	.755**	.870**	.861**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.836		.107	.044	.747	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	25	27	27	27	25	27	27	27	27
LSautho	Pearson C.	.545**	-.317	1	-.060	.018	-.164	-.249	-.236	-.256
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.003	.107		.757	.927	.395	.201	.218	.188
	N	27	27	29	29	27	29	28	29	28
LSdemoc	Pearson C.	.512**	.390*	-.060	1	.155	.209	.231	.430*	.333
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.006	.044	.757		.440	.277	.237	.020	.083
	N	27	27	29	29	27	29	28	29	28
LSlaisse	Pearson C.	.748**	.068	.018	.155	1	.144	-.070	.154	-.008
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.000	.747	.927	.440		.475	.732	.445	.970
	N	27	25	27	27	27	27	26	27	26
CQmetaco	Pearson C.	.095	.763**	-.164	.209	.144	1	.402*	.507**	.583**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.638	.000	.395	.277	.475		.034	.005	.001
	N	27	27	29	29	27	29	28	29	28
CQcognit	Pearson C.	-.069	.755**	-.249	.231	-.070	.402*	1	.467*	.502**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.736	.000	.201	.237	.732	.034		.012	.008
	N	26	27	28	28	26	28	28	28	27
CQmotiva	Pearson C.	.159	.870**	-.236	.430*	.154	.507**	.467*	1	.724**
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.428	.000	.218	.020	.445	.005	.012		.000
	N	27	27	29	29	27	29	28	29	28
CQbehavi	Pearson C.	.001	.861**	-.256	.333	-.008	.583**	.502**	.724**	1
	Sig. (2 tailed)	.994	.000	.188	.083	.970	.001	.008	.000	
	N	26	27	28	28	26	28	27	28	28
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).										
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).										

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to understand the relationship between leadership style and cultural intelligence. Using a cross-sectional survey data and inferential statistics, researchers compared three leadership dimensions with four cultural intelligence dimensions. Correlation method was used to determine the relationship between leadership styles and cultural intelligence and also to see whether or not one of leadership styles logically corresponded and positively reflected a relationship with one of cultural intelligences capabilities. Table-6 demonstrates a summary of the findings of this study.

In this research study, the responses of 29 participants with the titles of coordinator and above indicated that democratic leadership style is the most practiced leadership style: authoritarian leadership mean= 2.50 with std= 0.54, democratic leadership mean= 3.99 std= 0.414, laissez fair mean= 2.79 std= 0.69 (see Table-7).

TABLE 7
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
LSautho	29	1.50	4.00	2.5057	.54823
LSdemoc	29	3.33	4.83	3.9943	.42136
LSlaisse	27	1.00	4.00	2.7901	.69275
Valid N (listwise)	27				

The responses of 29 participants with the titles of coordinator and above showed that cultural intelligence motivational style is prevalent : CQ metacognitive mean= 5.15 and std= 0.75, CQ cognition mean= 3.9 std= 0.90, CQ motivation mean= 5.24 std= 0.87 and lastly CQ behavior mean= 4.87 std= 0.84 (see Table-8).

TABLE 8
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
CQmetaco	29	3.75	6.75	5.1466	.75450
CQcognit	28	2.00	5.83	3.8929	.89720
CQmotiva	29	3.60	7.00	5.2414	.87567
CQbehavi	28	3.40	7.00	4.8714	.84716
Valid N (listwise)	27				

According to data collected and analyzed (see Table-6 for the summary analysis), leadership democratic style and cultural intelligence ($P = 0.044 < 0.005$) has significant relationship. As seen in Table-6, $P=0.020 < 0.005$ value shows that leaders with democratic style have high cultural intelligence motivation.

Other than the correlation between the democratic style leadership and cultural intelligence motivation, this study has not confirmed a significant correlation between leadership styles and cultural intelligence as seen in Table 6: $P = 0.836$, Sig. (2-tailed) = 0.044, $N = 25$ out of 29.

Recommendations

For future research, new studies can be conducted to examine the relationship between leadership styles and any of cultural intelligence skills in different settings with a larger sample. Future studies should be conducted where different ethnicities are represented to have a broader understanding of relationships. It is also researchers' recommendation to develop a more comprehensive instrumentation with various elements of culture and cultural competency. Final research recommendation is that a mixed-method study conducted to have a deeper understanding of how leaders define culture, cultural competency, and what it looks like in practice with specific attention to their cultural backgrounds and their meaning systems.

REFERENCES

- Ang, S., & Inkpen, A. C. (2008). Cultural intelligence and offshore outsourcing success: A framework of firm-level intercultural capability. *Journal compilation*, 39(3), 337-358.
- 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. (Eds.) (2008). *Handbook on Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement and Applications*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Ang, S., Dyne, L. V., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3), 335-371. doi: 10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x
- Caligiuri, P.M., & DiSanto, V. (2001). Global competence: What is it and can it be developed through global assignments? *Human Resource Planning Journal*, 34(3), 27–38.
- Cohen, S. (2010). Effective global leadership requires a global mindset. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 42(1), 3–10.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Education research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. (4 ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Earley, P.C. and Peterson, R.S. (2004), “The elusive cultural chameleon: cultural intelligence as a new approach to intercultural training for the global manager”, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3(1), 100-15.
- Early, P. C., Ang, S., & Tan, J. (2006). *Developing cultural intelligence at work*. Stanford, California: Stanford Business Book.
- Ehrlich, H. J. (2002). *The Wiley book of business quotations*, New York: John Wiley.
- Groves, K. S., & Feyerherm, A. E. (2011). Leader cultural intelligence in context: Testing the moderating effects of team cultural diversity on leader and team performance. *Group and Organization Management*, 36(5), 535-566. doi: 10.1177/1059601111415664
- Hansen, J. D., Singh, T., Weilbaker, D. C., & Guesalaga, R. (2011). Cultural Intelligence in Cross-Cultural Selling: Propositions and directions for future research. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, XXXI(3), 243-254. doi: 10.2753/PSS0885-3134310303
- Hinkin, T. R., & Schriesheim, C. A. (2008). An examination of “nonleadership”: From laissez-faire leadership to leader reward omission and punishment omission. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1234–1248. doi: DOI: 10.1037/a0012875
- Hofstede, G.J. (2005). *Cultures and organizations: software of the mind* (Revised and expanded 2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- House, R. J., & Javidan, M. (2004). Overview of GLOBE. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Javidan, M., & Walker, J. L. (2012). A Whole New Global Mindset for Leadership. *People & Strategy*, 35(2), 36-41.

- Jenkins, D. (2012). Global critical leadership: Educating global leaders with critical leadership competencies. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(2), 95-101. doi:10.1002/jls.21241
- Kim, Y., & Van Dyne, L. (2012). Cultural Intelligence and International Leadership Potential: The Importance of Contact for Members of the Majority. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 61(2), 272-294. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2011.00468.x
- Leung, K., Bhagat, R. S., Buchan, N. R., Erez, M., & Gibson, C. B. (2005). Culture and international business: Recent advances and their implications for future research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(4), 357-378.
- Livermore, D. (2011). *The cultural intelligence difference: Master the one skill you can't do without in today's global economy*. Broadway, New York: Amacom.
- MacNab, B. R. (2012). An experiential approach to cultural intelligence education. *Journal of Management Education*, 36(1), 66-94.
- MacNab, B., Brislin, R., & Worthley, R. (2012). Experiential cultural intelligence development: context and individual attributes. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(7), 1320-1341.
- Mchugh, M. L. (2013). The chi-square test of independence. *Lessons in biostatistics*, 23(2), 143-149.
- Morley, M. J., & Cerdin, J. (2010). Intercultural competence in the international business arena. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(8), 805-809.
- Muna, F. A. (2011). Voices: Cultivating Multicultural Leaders. *Business Strategy Review*, 22(2), 90-91. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8616.2011.00761.x
- Nahavandi, A. (2009). *The art and science of leadership* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Northouse, P. G. (2012). *Introduction to leadership: Concepts and practice*. (2nd ed., p. 4). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Northouse, P. G. (2012). *Leadership theory and practice*. (6 ed., Vol. 978-1-4522-0340-9). California: Sage. Ontario, Canada: Thompson.
- Schoel, C., Bluemke, M., Mueller, P., & Stahlberg, D. (2011). When autocratic leaders become an option—uncertainty and self-esteem predict implicit leadership preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101(3), 521-540. doi: 10.1037/a0023393
- Sternberg, R.J., & Detterman, D.K. (1986). *What is intelligence? Contemporary viewpoints on its nature and definition*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Koh, C. (2008). Development and validation of the CQS: The cultural intelligence scale. In S. Ang, & L. Van Dyne, (Eds.) *Handbook on Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement and Applications* (pp. 16-38). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Livermore, D. (2010). Cultural intelligence: A pathway for leading in a rapidly globalizing world. In K.M. Hannum, B. McFeeters, & L. Booyesen (Eds.), *Leadership Across Differences* (pp. 131-138). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Nielsen, T.M. (2007). Cultural intelligence. In S. Clegg & J. Bailey, (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of organization studies*, 1, 345-350. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Retrieved November 2009 from http://www.culturalq.com/papers/IEOS_Van_Dyne_Ang_Nielsen_CQ_2007.pdf
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., Yee Ng, K., Rockstuhl, T., Tan, M. L., & Koh, C. (2012). Sub-dimensions of the four factor model of cultural intelligence: Expanding the conceptualization and measurement of cultural intelligence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 6(4), 295-313.
- Vugt, M. V., Jepson, S. F., Hart, C. M., & Cremer, D. D. (2004). Autocratic leadership in social dilemmas: A threat to group stability. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(1), 1-13. doi: doi:10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00061-1
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-Prentice Hall.