

Spring 2012

Relationship Between Cultural Intelligence And Leadership

Lu Yang
Fort Hays State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/theses>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Yang, Lu, "Relationship Between Cultural Intelligence And Leadership" (2012). *Master's Theses*. 134.
DOI: 10.58809/KYEU4618
Available at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/theses/134>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE AND LEADERSHIP

being

A Thesis Presented to the Graduate Faculty
of the Fort Hays State University in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Liberal Studies

by

Lu Yang

B.G.S., Fort Hays State University

Date _____

Approved _____
Major Professor

Approved _____
Chair, Graduate Council

ABSTRACT

The study investigates the prediction that the higher cultural intelligence competencies, the more effective leadership. Multiple regression analysis of data from 14 managers in the United States and 71 managers in China report several relationships between the cultural intelligence competencies and effective leadership. The study focused on the relationships of each dimension of the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS), Metacognitive (ME), Cognitive (C), Motivational (MO) and Behavioral (B), to each dimension of the Leadership Behavior Inventory: Visualizing Greatness (VG), Empowering the “We” (WE), Communicating for Meaning (CM), Managing Oneself (MOS), and Care and Recognition (CR). Analysis indicated that there are significant relationships between the cultural intelligence of leaders and effective leadership in China. However, analysis indicated that there are not significant relationships between the cultural intelligence of leaders and effective leadership in the United States.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis was made possible through the help, advice and support of many individuals. Very special thanks to Dr. Brent J. Goertzen, my advisor, who had the expertise to guide me through many difficult situations and provided extensive assistance. Thanks to my graduate committee members, Dr. Josephine E. Squires, and Dr. Curt Brungardt, for reviewing my thesis and making recommendations. In addition, thanks to the executive director of the Hays Area Chamber of Commerce, Tammy Wellbrock, and the executive director of Zhengzhou Small Business Administration, Huchen Yang, for helping with my survey. All of you have made studying here an enjoyable experience. Thank you for all of your kindness.

Also, thanks to my parents for always being there for me. You will never know how much I appreciate your love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	viii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
<i>Purpose</i>	1
<i>Hypothesis</i>	1
<i>The probable benefits from the research</i>	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
Global Competencies.....	3
<i>Multicultural Training</i>	3
<i>Global Mindset</i>	5
<i>Cross-cultural Competence</i>	6
<i>Intercultural Sensitivity</i>	6
<i>Cultural Intelligence</i>	7
<i>Cultural Intelligence Dimensions in Questionnaire of the Study</i>	8
<i>Metacognitive (ME)</i>	9
<i>Cognitive (C)</i>	9
<i>Motivational (MO)</i>	10

<i>Behavioral (B)</i>	10
Leadership.....	11
Leadership Definition.....	11
Components of Effective Leadership.....	12
Effective Leadership Behaviors.....	14
Sources of Leader Behaviors.....	15
<i>Visualizing Greatness</i>	16
<i>Empowering the “WE”</i>	16
<i>Communicating for Meaning</i>	16
<i>Managing Oneself</i>	16
<i>Care and Recognition</i>	17
Dimensions of the Leadership Behavior Inventory.....	17
<i>Visualising Greatness (VG)</i>	17
<i>Empowering the “WE” (WE)</i>	18
<i>Communicating for Meaning (CM)</i>	18
<i>Managing Oneself (MOS)</i>	19
<i>Care and Recognition (CR)</i>	19
Hypothesis.....	20
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	21
Participants.....	21
Questionnaire.....	22
<i>Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS)</i>	22

<i>Leadership Behavioral Inventory</i>	23
<i>Demographic Information</i>	24
<i>Procedure Used to Administer the Survey</i>	24
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS.....	27
Samples.....	27
Measurement of Variables.....	28
<i>Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS)</i>	28
<i>Behavioral Leadership Inventory</i>	29
<i>The United States Sample</i>	29
<i>The Chinese Sample</i>	30
Regression Results of the U.S. Sample.....	33
<i>Metacognitive (ME) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory</i>	33
<i>Cognitive (C) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory</i>	35
<i>Motivational (MO) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory</i>	37
<i>Behavioral (B) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory</i>	39
Regression Results of the Chinese Sample.....	41
<i>Metacognitive (ME) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory</i>	41
<i>Cognitive (C) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory</i>	43
<i>Motivational (MO) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory</i>	45
<i>Behavioral (B) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory</i>	47
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	49
Limitations.....	51

Implications for Research.....	52
REFERENCES.....	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistencies, and Correlations for the U.S. sample.....	31
2. Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistencies, and Correlations for the Chinese sample.....	32
3. The U.S. Sample: Regression Results on Metacognitive (ME) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory.....	34
4. The U.S. Sample: Regression Results on Cognitive (C) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory.....	36
5. The U.S. Sample: Regression Results on Motivational (MO) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory.....	38
6. The U.S. Sample: Regression Results on Behavioral (B) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory.....	40
7. The Chinese Sample: Regression Results on Metacognitive (ME) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory.....	42
8. The Chinese Sample: Regression Results on Cognitive (C) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory.....	44
9. The Chinese Sample: Regression Results on Motivational (MO) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory.....	46
10. The Chinese Sample: Regression Results on Behavioral (B) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory.....	48

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. English Version of the Questionnaire.....	60
B. Chinese Version of Questionnaire.....	64
C. Permission for the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS).....	68
D. Permission for the Leadership Behavior Inventory Questionnaire.....	70
E. The First E-mail.....	72
F. The Second E-mail.....	73
G. The Third E-mail.....	74
H. The Fourth E-mail.....	75

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Since the world moved into the 21st century, exchanges and cooperation among different countries or cultures has become more frequent. More and more managers in organizations and companies do business with foreign clients who have different cultural backgrounds and habits; address problems with customers of different backgrounds; or should know how to manage diversity of employees in organizations and companies. Therefore, cultural intelligence competencies have become more important qualities for leaders and managers than ever before.

Purpose:

The purpose of this research is to investigate the relationship between cultural intelligence competencies and effective leadership. Therefore, the sample of this study is focused on two groups of managers with different cultural backgrounds—the United States and China.

Hypothesis:

H1: There will be a positive relationship between cultural intelligence competencies and effective leadership.

The probable benefits from the research:

- 1) The results of this research show the relationship between cultural intelligence competencies and effective leadership. This can guide the leaders and managers on how to improve their effective leadership skills in the future.
- 2) The results of this research can also help leaders and managers in organizations to design and plan more effective cultural training for employees and employers.

- 3) The results of this research are useful for other researchers to investigate some relative projects in the future.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Global Competencies

Globalization has already become an important trend in the world. Every country's economy, religion, culture and some other factors have mixed together more so than in the past. The United Nations (2002) has written that globalization is a widely-used term that can be defined in a number of different ways. When used in an economic context, it refers to the reduction and removal of barriers between national borders in order to facilitate the flow of goods, capital, labor, and services (United Nations, 2002). Globalization now brings more international business to organizations in the current global business market. This means current organizations and workers in these organizations will likely face increased cross-cultural contact when they conduct international business. Currently, the World Trade Organization (WTO) has 150 members, including China, the United States, Ireland, France, and New Zealand. In addition, the World Trade Organization (WTO) collectively accounts for more than 97 percent of world trade (Daniels, Radebaugh & Sullivan, 2008). Therefore, the trend of globalization brings a new requirement to managers in organizations in order to adopt a global economic market. The new requirement is that managers in current organizations should have global competencies.

Multicultural Training

Multicultural training is also referred to as cross-cultural training. The idea of multicultural and cross-cultural training first appeared 30 years ago, but has attracted the increased attention of managers of organizations in recent years (Lang, 2004). According

to the 2001 Global Relocation Trends Survey, there are 69 percent of the 150 companies that responded offered cultural training for their outbound employees, up 10 percent in one year and almost 50 percent in 20 years” (Lang, 2004, p.1). In the past decade, there are so many researchers have given cross-cultural training a comprehensive definition. In Littrell, Salas, Hess, Paley and Riedel’s article (2006), multi-/cross-cultural training is defined as “the educative processes used to improve intercultural learning via the development of the cognitive, affective, and behavioral competencies needed for successful interactions in diverse cultures (p.358).” Multi-/Cross-cultural training is important to organizations, especially in today’s globalized world.

Multi-/cross-cultural training focuses on improving leaders’ and employees’ cultural awareness through educative methods. Organizations want their employees to have a stronger ability to deal with many cultural problems, such as cultural cooperation, diverse workforce, or overseas business, in order to gain more success in the international business markets (Littrell, Salas, Hess, Paley & Riedel, 2006). There are two main approaches used in designing multi-/cross-cultural training—didactic (information-giving) and experiential learning activities (Littrell & Salas, 2005). Didactic or information-giving training focuses on informing employees about different countries’ travel arrangements, job characteristics, shopping behaviors, and political, economic, and cultural conditions. The purpose of the didactic or information-giving training is to help employees in foreign countries live as they do in the host countries (Littrell & Salas, 2005). Secondly, the experiential training focuses on developing employees’ skills in making decisions in alternative situations and dealing with some unexpected problems in

different cultural countries or working environments in order to give benefits to the host organizations (Littrell & Salas, 2005).

Bucker and Poutsma (2009) divided global competencies of today's managers into four parts—“global mindset”, “cross-cultural competencies”, “intercultural sensitivity” and “cultural intelligence”. These are generally related concepts of cultural competence and there are many ways by which the notion of cultural competence has been defined.

Global Mindset

Dr. Carol Dweck (2006), the author of *Mindset: the New Psychology of Success*, summarized two kinds of mindsets to explain the reason for the difference. The two kinds of mindsets are “growth mindset” and “fixed mindset”. If people have the growth mindset, they believe that their basic abilities or talents can be developed by learning and hard work. On the other hand, the fixed mindset people believe that everyone's intelligence and talent is fixed and is the only factor in determining if a person can be a leader or not. In addition, Dweck (2006) indicated that high performance people have had the growth mindset in different fields, such as business, education, and sports. Growth mindset is one of the essential qualities of a good leader. However, the era of globalization requires a new mindset of leaders—the global mindset.

It is not easy to summarize the definition of the global mindset. Bowen and Inkpen (2009) reviewed many articles on the concept of “global mindset.” They interviewed 30 professors of the Thunderbird School of Business, 206 alumni around the world, and 17 senior global managers in Europe, Asia, and the United States with the open-ended question “What is a global mindset?”. Bowen and Inkpen (2009) concluded that global

mindset is —the capability to influence individuals, groups, and organizations from different sociocultural systems and are comprised of intellectual, social, and psychological capital” (Beechler & Javidan, 2007, p.131-150).

Cross-cultural competence

Lynch & Hanson (1993) defined cross-cultural competence as —the ability to think, feel, and act in ways that acknowledge, respect, and build upon ethnic, socio-cultural, and linguistic diversity” (p. 50). In the current business world, the higher level of cross-cultural competence managers have, the better performances business managers can achieve when they are doing business with customers of different cultures.

Hajro and Pudelko (2010) summarized several important competencies of culturally competent leaders after interviewing 70 leaders of multinational organizations. They found that cross-cultural competence can be the second most important factor for leaders (the most important factor is the knowledge of management). Leaders and members of multinational organizations believe that cross-cultural competence can help multinational team (MNT) leaders to build better social relationships with their employees in order to improve the multinational organizations’ performances (Hajro & Pudelko, 2010).

Intercultural Sensitivity

Bucker and Poutsma (2008) describe intercultural sensitivity as focusing on the ability to understand cultural differences and the ability to react in different cultural environments. Based on the work of Milton Bennett (1993), intercultural sensitivity can be defined as six stages. The first stage is called denial. In the denial stage, people do not think cultures are different. People believe there is only one culture around the world that

is their own culture. The second stage is defense. In the defense stage of intercultural sensitivity, people find there are differences among cultures, but still do not think other cultures are right. The third stage is called minimization. In the minimization stage, people basically accept the differences of some parts of other cultures. Meanwhile, people still consider that everyone is the same. The fourth stage is called acceptance. In the acceptance stage, people completely accept that cultures are different. The fifth stage is adaptation. In the adaptation stage of intercultural sensitivity, people not only accept the differences of cultures, but also try to adapt to these differences. The last stage is integration. In the integration stage, people adapt to the cultural integration trend around the world. Today's globalized business market requires managers of organizations to have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity to adapt to more and more international business.

Cultural Intelligence

A growing number of organizations of the 21st century have become multinational. Multinational organizations in the current global market will likely face differences in language, religion, politics, or business habits. Therefore, the importance of cultural intelligence has called a lot of attention to managers in organizations and researchers in today's globalized business world. Cultural intelligence is defined as a "multifaceted competency consisting of cultural knowledge, the practice of mindfulness, and the repertoire of behavioral skills" (Thomas & Inkson, 2004, p. 182-183). Based on the *Census 2000 Brief* (2000) records, 12.3 percent of the total United States population are Black or African American; 3.6 percent are Asian; 5.5 percent are other ethnic groups; and 2.4 percent of total population have two or more ethnic groups. In addition, the U.S.

Census Bureau believes that other ethnic population percentages will keep increasing year by year.

The current study includes the two most important parts—cultural intelligence and leadership. Understanding the importance of cultural intelligence is important to this study. After receiving 420 responses from 99 leaders and 321 followers, Groves and Feyerherm (2011) found several important factors of cultural intelligence for leaders and organizations. First, leaders who have greater cultural intelligence can gain higher leader performance in multinational organizations. Second, leaders who have greater cultural intelligence can help organizations and teams improve the team's performance (Groves & Feyerherm, 2011). Therefore, cultural intelligence is not only important to leader performance, but also important to the organization's performance.

Cultural Intelligence Dimensions in Questionnaire of the Study

The questionnaire of the current study includes two parts —the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) and the Leadership Behavior Inventory. (The Leadership Behavior Inventory will be introduced at the end of effective leadership section in literature review).

The Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) was designed by Ang, Dyne, Koh, Yee Ng, Templer, Tay and Chandrasekar in 2007. They used the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) in an article entitled *“Cultural Intelligence: Its Measurement and Effects on Cultural Judgment and Decision Making, Cultural Adaptation and Task Performance”*. The Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) includes four dimensions with a total of 20 items. The four dimensions are Metacognitive (ME), Cognitive (C), Motivational (MO), and Behavioral (B).

Metacognitive (ME)

Four items in the Metacognitive (ME) dimension focus on investigating the cultural awareness of individuals in mental intelligence. For example, *“I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds”* (Ang, et al., 2007). Ang, and colleagues (2007) believed that *“metacognitive (ME) is the higher-order mental capability to think about personal thought processes, anticipate cultural preferences of others and adjust mental models during and after intercultural experiences (p.341)”*. In addition, Moon (2010) defined that *“metacognitive (ME) reflects higher level cognitive processes (think over think) that enable individuals to promote new heuristics and rules for cross-cultural interactions and to adjust their mental maps (p.463)”*. Therefore, it is meaningful to use *“metacognitive (ME)”* as one of the factors for learning an individual’s mental capability of cultural intelligence.

Cognitive (C)

Six items in the Cognitive (C) dimension are focused on investigating an individual’s awareness for other cultures in social life. For example, *“I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures”*. Ang and colleagues (2007) believed that *“ognitive CQ reflects knowledge of the norms, practices and conventions in different cultures acquired from education and personal experiences (p.338)”*. The cognitive facet of cultural intelligence has a strong relationship with individual learning processes of intelligence in a diverse cultural environment (Moon, 2010). The Cognitive CQ dimension of cultural intelligence can help researchers to understand an individual’s personal leaning capabilities, especially cross-cultural learning capabilities. Therefore, the cognitive

dimension also is one of the important factors for understanding cultural intelligence.

Motivational (MO)

Five items of the Motivational (MO) dimension are focused on investigating an individual's personal motivation learning about for other cultures. For example, *“I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures”*. Ang and colleagues (2007) believed that *“motivational reflects the capability to direct attention and energy toward learning about and functioning in situations characterized by cultural differences (p.338)”*. Templer, Tay, and Chandrasekar (2006) defined the motivational as *“individual's intrinsic motivation and specific self-efficacy to engage in cross-cultural experiences and master its nuances (p.4)”*. Therefore, the motivational can help researchers to understand an individual's personal desire for cultural intelligence in culturally diverse situations.

Behavioral (B)

Five items of the Behavioral (B) dimension are focused on investigating an individual's behaviors when facing other cultures. For example, *“I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations”* (Ang et al., 2007). Ang and colleagues (2007) summarized *“behavioral reflects the capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and non-verbal actions when interacting with people from different cultures (p.338)”*. It is important to understand an individual's behavioral habits for individual in culturally diverse environments.

There are three substantive findings from the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) (Ang et al., 2007). First, there are positive relationships between Metacognitive (ME) and Cultural Judgment and Decision Making (CJDM) effectiveness, Cognitive (C) and CJDM

effectiveness. Second, Motivational (MO) and Behavioral (B) also have positive relationships with cultural adjustment and well-being. Third, only Metacognitive (ME) and Behavioral (B) can predict task performance, not all four dimensions.

Leadership

Leadership Definition

Leadership is a popular and important social phenomenon that has called the attention of all businessmen and researchers worldwide. Numerous researches have summarized different definitions of leadership. Early on, Mumford (1909) defined that “leadership is the preeminence of one or a few individuals in a group in the process of control of societal phenomena (p.12)”. Knickerbocker (1948) said, “Leadership is a function of needs existing within a given situation, and consists of a relationship between an individual and a group (p.23)”. Janda (1960) summarized that “leadership as a particular type of power relationship characterized by a group member’s perception that another group member has the right to prescribe behavior patterns for the former regarding his activity as a member of a particular group (p.355)”. Along with the development of times and the progress of the society, the definition of leadership in recent time has changed a bit. Howell and Costley (2001) defined leadership as “a process used by an individual to influence group members toward the achievement of group goals, where the group members view the influence as legitimate (p.33)”. Based on many concepts of leadership, we can summarize four central phenomenon of leadership. First, leadership cannot be achieved or gained at once; it is a process. Second, influence is an important factor in the leadership process. Third, in the leadership process, no matter

leaders or followers should have common goals throughout the process. Fourth, leadership cannot occur in one or two persons, it should occur in groups or organizations (Northouse, 2010).

As mentioned earlier, the most important purpose of this research was finding the relationship between cultural intelligence and effective leadership through surveying our participating managers. Therefore, understanding the knowledge of effective leadership is important to us.

Components of Effective Leadership

Anderson, Krajewski, Goffin and Jackson (2008) summarized nine major components of effective leadership in a study.

The first component of effective leadership is relational leadership. Anderson et al., (2008) considered that leaders displaying relational leadership effectiveness were mainly focused on how to build a good interpersonal relationship with co-workers or subordinates.

The second component of effective leadership is impartial leadership. Leaders who have high levels of impartial leadership effectiveness made decisions without personal bias, and were willing to listen to others' opinions. Anderson et al., (2008) summarized the impartial leadership effectiveness regarded as "being even-tempered and even-handed (p.602)".

The third component is technical leadership. Anderson et al., (2008) summarized the leaders who have technical leadership effectiveness were displayed as "well informed, business savvy, and skilled in their professions or areas of expertise (p.602)".

The fourth component of effective leadership is creative leadership. Leaders who display creativity are willing to find new ways when doing business or managing organizations.

The fifth component of effective leadership is directive leadership. Anderson et al., (2008) summarized the leaders who display high level of directive leadership effectiveness were “characterized by an emphasis on planning, execution, and evaluation of work behavior in their relationship with subordinates (p.602)”.

The sixth component of effective leadership is tenacious leadership. Anderson et al., (2008) mentioned that “a tenacious leader displayed physical and mental fortitude on the job; put the larger interests of the organization ahead of personal needs; showed effort in the face of adversity (p.602)”.

The seventh component of effective leadership is empowering leadership. Leaders who display the empowering leadership effectiveness let people work in their well suited positions.

The eighth component of effective leadership is influential leadership. Anderson et al., (2008) mentioned that leaders who displayed a high level of influential leadership effectiveness were “persuasive, self-assured, and polished; spoke fluently and articulately; created a positive first impression through demeanor and appearance; and demonstrated a personal confidence in business matters (p.602).”

The ninth component of effective leadership is strategic leadership. Anderson et al., (2008) summarized the strategic leadership effectiveness as “thought about, forecast, and prepared for future business developments; understood the evolving nature of business

markets; and acted to change cultural norms and values for the purpose of organizational realignment (p.602)".

Effective Leadership Behaviors

Howell and Costley (2001) believed that ~~almost~~ all current leadership experts agree that effective leadership behavior depends on situational and follower characteristics (p.86)". That is to say the behavior of effective leadership does not have a universal standard. The behavior of effective leadership may be different in different situations. Therefore, an effective leader should know when to use which appropriate leadership behavior model in which situation. Howell and Costley (2001) summarized five core patterns of effective leadership behaviors.

The first pattern of effective leadership behaviors is ~~supportive leadership behaviors~~" (Howell & Costley, 2001). Leaders play supportive roles in making followers feel strongly satisfied with jobs, organizational goals, and leadership styles of leaders. Howell and Costley (2001) pointed out that supportive leaders should pay more attention to how to improve their communication skills.

The second pattern of effective leadership behaviors is ~~directive leadership behavior~~" (Howell & Costley, 2001). Leaders who have directive leadership behavior patterns love doing everything for followers. This style leaders willing to help followers to set goals, help and coordinate followers to make good plans for work, let followers know the expectations of performance, and specify teams' rules and procedures (Howell & Costley, 2001).

The third pattern of effective leadership behaviors is ~~participative leadership~~

behavior". Leaders who use participative leadership behavior allow followers participate into the decision-making process. The final decisions of organizations will contain followers' opinions (Howell & Costley, 2001).

The fourth pattern of effective leadership behaviors is "leader reward and punishment behavior". Leaders reward followers when followers provide benefits to organizations. On the other hand, when followers make some mistakes, leaders will give them corresponding punishment. Moreover, Howell and Costley (2001) believed that "rewards and punishments based on performance are usually the most effective (p. 89)".

The fifth pattern is "charismatic leadership behavior". Leaders who use charismatic leadership behavior patterns usually play roles such as ideals, idols, or heroes in front of followers. These kinds of leaders often draw a vision of the future for followers based on their strong self-confidence (Howell & Costley, 2001).

Sources of Leaders Behaviors

In this study, visualising greatness, empowering the "WE", communicating for meaning, managing oneself, and care and recognition were used as five important categories of leader behaviors. Quesdada, Gonzalez, and Kent (2008) developed a scale intended to measure the five categories of leaders' behaviors.

Visualising Greatness

A leader who has *Visualizing Greatness* performs with a clear vision to formulate future goals of teams or organizations, and make plans for achieving these goals (Quesdad et al., 2008). The category of *Visualizing Greatness* is similar to Ilies, Judge, and Wagner's (2006) vision and goals. Ilies, Judge, and Wagner (2006) believed that

visions provide followers with a cognitive road map that structures their activities; this cognitive road map leads to the setting of challenging goals (p.11)".

Empowering the "WE"

Empowering the "WE" refers to "strengthening, and identifying with, a unit (such as a team or an organization)" (Quesdad et al., 2008, p. 679). Raub and Robert (2010) conducted research on the effects of empowering leadership behaviors (ELBs) on in-role and extra-role employee behaviors. They found that there are "direct and mediated effects of empowering leadership behaviors (ELBs) on employee behaviors, and moderated mediation involving psychological empowerment and power values such that psychological empowerment was more strongly related to challenging behaviors for individuals low in power values" (Raub & Robert, 2010, p. 1744).

Communicating for Meaning

Communicating for Meaning refers to deep level transactions between employees or followers and leaders (Quesdad et al., 2008). For example, leaders give written materials and documents to followers when they need to do work, or leaders motivate and inspire followers' work by "using influence techniques" (Quesdad et al., 2008, p. 680). The *Communicating for Meaning* is similar to Ziegler and DeGrosky's (2008) Communicate Intent.

Managing Oneself

Managing Oneself refers to "the leader's skill at self-direction and self-control" (Quesada et al., 2008, p.680). Leaders are the center of followers and organizations. Leaders should be models for followers. *Managing Oneself* is similar to the

self-managing and self-management of Kendall et al. (2010).

Care and Recognition

Leaders who have the *Care and Recognition* of leadership behaviors pay more attention to followers' needs and wants, encourage followers' work, and give more support to followers ((Quesada, Gonzalez & Kent, 2008). For example, followers' work is achieved through setting goals of organizations'. The *Care and Recognition* leaders will give rewards to followers and hold parties to celebrate the achievements.

Therefore, it is very necessary to select these five categories of leader behaviors used in this study.

Dimensions of the Leadership Behavior Inventory

Besides the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS), the study includes the Leadership Behavior Inventory which was designed by Quesada, Gonzalez, and Kent (2008). This Leadership Behavior Inventory was used in the literature *—A Road for Achieving an International Measure and Understanding on Leaders' Behaviors*" (Quesada, Gonzalez & Kent, 2008).

The Leadership Behavior Inventory includes five dimensions—Visualising Greatness (VG), Empowering the "We" (WE), Communicating for Meaning (CM), Managing Oneself (MOS), and Care and Recognition (CR).

Visualising Greatness (VG)

Six items of Visualising Greatness (VG) are focusing on investigating individual's inspiring vision. For example, *—has visions and dreams of what can be*". In general, *—visualizing greatness* involves behaviors related to creating and communicating an

inspiring vision” (Rudd, Kent & Blair, 2009, p.119). According to the Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy, visualizing greatness is defined as an important process of leading (Rabin, 2003). Leaders must have clear images about the future of organizations in order to lead organizations and subordinates to develop better.

Empowering the “WE” (WE)

Eight items of Empowering the “WE” (WE) dimension focus on investigating individual’s beliefs of empowerment. For example, *“gets people involved in decisions that affect”*. Konczak, Stelly and Trusty (2000) summarized three main dimensions of empowering leadership behavior which are important to organizations. The first dimension of empowering leadership behavior is *“delegation of authority”* (Konczak et al., 2000, p.303). The second dimension of empowering leadership behavior is the *“accountability for outcomes of leaders’ emphasis”* (Konczak et al., 2000, p.303). The third dimension of the empowering dimension of empowering leadership behavior is the *“coaching for innovative performance”*. Konczak et al. (2000) considered that empowering leaders should *“encourage calculated risk taking and new ideas, provide performance feedback, and treat mistakes and setbacks as opportunities to learn (p.303)”*.

Communicating for Meaning (CM)

Six items of the Communicating for Meaning (CM) dimension are focused on investigating individual’s abilities about communication. For example, *“communicates in ways that inspire and motivate others”*. Communicating for meaning is related to leaders’ communicating styles. In general, it involves *“items that reflect on the leader's ability to relate their ideas to others, to take the time necessary to communicate the underlying*

meaning and importance of the message and to discuss the ideas at a deeper level such as at the level of values, beliefs, and principles” (Kent, 2007, p.334).

Managing Oneself (MOS)

Four items of the Managing Oneself (MOS) dimension are focused on investigating an individual’s personal management skills. For example, *“has a sense of self-determination and self-confidence”*. In general, managing oneself means self-leadership. It *“describes the behaviors that result from the leader’s conscious management of their state of being”* (Rabin, 2003, p.121). It is an important process of leading.

Care and Recognition (CR)

Four items of the Care and Recognition (CR) dimension are focused on investigating individual’s attitudes about others’ efforts. For example, *“celebrates victories”* (Quesada et al., 2008). Care and recognition *“is related to the sense of concern and caring that comes from the leader through the attention she or he places on the team and individuals’ successes and victories”* (Kent, 2007, p.334). Kent (2007) points out *“letting individuals and the world know that we have succeeded (p.335)”* is very important to leadership, and therefore he indicates care and recognition is an important component of leading.

Authors, Quesada, Gonzalez, and Kent, took research in three countries—Costa Rica, USA, and Spain regarding the Leadership Behavior Inventory. Based on their research, they found that the dimension of *“Managing Oneself (MOS)”* is not necessary in Spanish leadership, and US leaders prefer individual leadership more than Costa Rican and Spanish leaders. (Quesada et al., 2008)

Hypothesis

In this study, we predicted that there is a positive relationship between cultural intelligence competencies and effective leadership behaviors. As mentioned at the beginning of the literature review section, globalization is an unstopped trend to the world. Cultural intelligence competencies had already become very important abilities of leaders. Though, there are many factors that can determine the leadership behavior effectiveness. Cultural intelligence may likely be one of the determining factors of leadership behavior effectiveness. Therefore, we expect to see a positive relationship between cultural intelligence and leadership behaviors.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Participants:

The sample of this research program consisted of two sample groups. The one group comes from the People's Republic of China, the other from the United States. Participants of the survey samples are managers or leaders from all trades and professions.

In the United States, all 65 managers were chosen from organizations or companies in Hays, Kansas, which was based on the database of Hays Area Chamber of Commerce. The executive director of Hays Area Chamber of Commerce, Tammy Wellbrock, helped us contact participating managers because their contact information is private. Hays Area Chamber of Commerce has no right to reveal managers' personal contact information to others. In the survey process, Tammy Wellbrock received every contact e-mail first. Then, she forwarded every e-mail to participating managers.

In the People's Republic of China, all 100 managers sampled were chosen from Zhengzhou, in Henan Province. The sample was based on the database of the Zhengzhou Small Business Administration. The procedures to recruit managers in the Chinese sample were the same as for the United States sample. As in the American sample, the contact information of sampled managers in China also is private to other people. Therefore, the executive director of Zhengzhou Small Business Administration, Huchen Yang, helped us contact every sample manager. He received the contact e-mails first, and forwarded the e-mails to every manager. As the official language in China is Mandarin Chinese, translation of the questionnaire was carried out by the author. In order to reduce bias or misunderstanding, the questionnaire, which was used in the Chinese sample, was

translated into Mandarin form. The meaning and number of each question in the Mandarin form questionnaire was absolutely the same with the English form questionnaire. A native professor from China reviewed the translation of the questionnaire.

Questionnaires:

The survey questionnaire consisted of three major sections—the cultural intelligence section, the leadership behavioral section, and the demographic information section. The Cultural intelligence Scale (CQS) questionnaire by Ang, Dyne, Koh, Templer, Tay, and Chandrasekar (2007), and Leadership Behavioral Inventory questionnaire by Kent, Quesada, and Gonzalez (2008) were used in this survey. All questions were designed using a Likert-type scale. Appendix A is the English version questionnaire. Appendix B is the Chinese version questionnaire. One of the authors, Linn Van Dyne, gave permission to use the survey questionnaire of CQS in this study (see Appendix C). The author, Thomas W. Kent granted permission to use the survey in this study (see Appendix D).

Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS)

There are twenty items in the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) questionnaire. The sample participants in this research were asked to describe their cultural intelligence knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors by using a 1 to 7 point Likert-type scale with: “1” representing “strongly disagree” and “7” representing “strongly agree”. These twenty items in the CQS were divided into four major parts—“Metacognitive CQ,” “Cognitive CQ,” “Motivational CQ” and “Behavioral CQ.” Questions 1 to 4 measured “Metacognitive CQ.” For example, “I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when

interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds” is one question of ~~–~~Metacognitive CQ”. Questions 5 to 10 measured ~~–~~Cognitive CQ”. For example, ~~–~~I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures” is one sample question of ~~–~~Cognitive CQ”. Questions 11 to 15 measured the ~~–~~Motivational CQ”. For example, ~~–~~I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures” is one sample question of ~~–~~Motivational CQ”. Questions 16 to 20 measured the ~~–~~Behavioral CQ”. For example, ~~–~~I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it” is one sample question of ~~–~~Behavioral CQ”.

Leadership Behavioral Inventory

The original Leadership Behavioral Inventory questionnaire was designed by Thomas et al. (2008), stands on followers’ positions to describe their leaders’ behaviors. In this research, the original Leadership Behavioral Inventory questionnaire was changed to stand on leaders’ positions to describe their own behaviors.

There were twenty-nine items in the Leadership Behavioral Inventory questionnaire. Participants were asked to describe their behaviors in ~~–~~Visualising Greatness (VG)”, ~~–~~Empowering the we’ (WE)”, ~~–~~Communicating for Meaning (CM)”, ~~–~~Managing Oneself (MOS)”, and ~~–~~Care and Recognition (CR)”. All twenty-nine items were using 1 to 8 point Likert-type scale form. ~~–~~1” representing ~~–~~Rarely”, and ~~–~~8” representing ~~–~~Very Often”. All questions start with ~~–~~I would describe myself as a Leader as one who:”

Questions 21 to 26 measured the ~~–~~Visualising Greatness (VG)”. The sample question of VG dimension is ~~–~~Has visions and dreams of what can be”. Questions 27 to 34 measured the ~~–~~Empowering the we’ (WE)”. The sample question of WE dimension is

–Gets people involved in decisions that affect”. Questions 35 to 40 measured the –Communicating for Meaning (CM)”. The sample question of CM dimension is –Talks about the principles or values behind decisions that are made”. Questions 41 to 45 measure the –Managing Oneself (MOS)”. The sample question of MOS dimension is –Has a sense of self-determination and self-confidence”. Questions 46 to 49 measure the –Care and Recognition (CR)”. The sample question of CR dimension is –Celebrates team accomplishments regularly”.

Demographic information

In this section, there were five questions. Survey participants were asked to provide general information such as gender, age, education level, tenure at current organization, and tenure at current position/job. These questions are voluntary to answer, except gender.

Procedure Used to Administer the Survey:

Both questionnaires, the English form and Chinese form, were posted on the online survey system of Fort Hays State University. Every participant finished the questionnaire and submitted it online. All responses were saved by the online survey system of Fort Hays State University. All data was collected during the Fall of 2011. All participating managers, no matter in China or the United States, were voluntary and respondents took the survey anonymously. IRB of Fort Hays State University approved the questionnaires before the process of data collecting.

For receiving more effective response rates of the survey, I decided to use the –Multiple Contacts” method, which is based on Dillman’s (2007) methodology. Every participating manager received four e-mails during the whole research process.

Step 1:

The first contact e-mail was a notification or introductory letter. It described the purpose of the survey and participants knew the request of the survey project. It also explained to survey participants why this research is important (see Appendix E).

Step 2:

The second contact e-mail was sent out about seven days after the first contact e-mail. In the second e-mail, it repeated the survey request and explained in more detail about the usefulness of the survey. In addition, participants knew why they were selected to do the survey and were thanked in the second contact e-mail (see Appendix F).

Step 3:

The third contact e-mail was sent out about 7-10 days after the second contact. The third contact e-mail was a thank you or reminder letter. This was for recalling participating managers' memory about the survey. The third contact letter expressed thanks to participants if they had completed the questionnaire. Otherwise, if participants did not finish the questionnaire or forgot it, the third contact e-mail helped participants find the link and complete the questionnaire (see Appendix G).

Step 4:

The fourth contact e-mail was the final one. It was sent out between 1-2 weeks after the third contact. The fourth contact e-mail summarized the three e-mail letters that were sent before. It was work for helping managers to recall their memories about the survey requests. Participants were also asked to complete the questionnaire in the final contact letter. In addition, confidentiality of the survey and participants' responses were also

pointed out clearly in the final contact e-mail. At the end of the fourth letter, the participants were thanked for their help (see Appendix H).

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Samples:

In the American sample, 25% participants (n=14) completed the questionnaire. One participant indicated choosing not to participate in the survey. There were 57.1% (n= 8) of the participants were women and 35.7% (n=5) were men, while 7.1% (n=1) of the participants did not report their gender. On average, the participating managers' were 46.92 years old (range=27-66, SD=11.61). The American sample included two education levels' of participants: 64.3% (n=9) participants had a bachelor's degree (e.g., BA, BS); 21.4% (n=3) participants had a master's degree (e.g., MA, MS, MBA), and 14.3% (n=2) participants did not report their education level. The questionnaire also collected data regarding tenure at current organization and tenure at the current position/job of all participants. In the American sample, the minimum tenure at current organization was one year, and the maximum was 26 years. On average, the tenure at the current organization was 9.53 years (SD=7.07). The minimum tenure at the current position/job was one year, and the maximum was 16 years, one participant did not answer this question. On average, the tenure at current their position/job was 6.83 years (SD=5.27).

In the Chinese sample, 71% participants (n=71) completed the questionnaire. Three participants mentioned that they did not want to participate in the survey. There were 51.4% (n=36) of the participants were women; 45.7% (n=32) of participants were men; and 2.9% (n=3) of the participants did not report their gender. On average, participants were 32.05 years old (range=25-49, SD=6.43). The Chinese sample included 5 education levels. There were 37.1% (n=26) of the participants who had an associate's degree (e.g., AA, AS),

while 41.4% (n=29) of the participants had a bachelor's degree (e.g., BA, BS), 14.3% (n=10) of the participants had a master's degree (e.g., MA, MS, MBA), 1.4% (n=1) of the participants had a professional degree (e.g., MD, DDS, LLB), and 2.9% (n=2) of the participants had a doctorate degree (e.g., PhD, EdD). Similar to the American sample, the Chinese sample also collected the data of tenure at current organization and tenure at current position/job of participants. The average tenure at the current organization of participants was 5.11 years (SD=5.09). The minimum tenure at the current organization was 2 months, and the maximum one was 26 years. The average tenure at the current position/job was 4.01 years (SD=4.61); the minimum tenure at the current position/job was 2 months, and the maximum one was 26 years.

Measurement of Variables

In this study, all items were aggregated for each of the nine dimensions (*Metacognitive, Cognitive, Motivational, Behavioral, Visualizing Greatness, Empowering We, Communicating for Meaning, Managing oneself, and Care and Recognition*).

Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS)

The four items of the *Metacognitive (ME)* dimension (e.g. "I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds") earned Cronbach alpha $\alpha=.788$ in the U.S. sample and $\alpha=.924$ in the Chinese sample. The six items of the *Cognitive (C)* dimension (e.g. "I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures") earned Cronbach alpha $\alpha=.941$ in the U.S. sample and $\alpha=.933$ in the Chinese sample. The five items of the *Motivational (MO)* dimension (e.g. "I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures") earned Cronbach alpha

$\alpha=.878$ in the U.S. sample and $\alpha=.904$ in the Chinese sample. The five items of the *Behavioral (B)* dimension (e.g. “change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it”) earned Cronbach alpha $\alpha=.897$ in the U.S. sample and $\alpha=.946$ in the Chinese sample.

Behavioral Leadership Inventory

The six items of the *Visualizing Greatness (VG)* dimension (e.g. “Has visions and dreams of what can be”) earned Cronbach alpha $\alpha=.942$ in the U.S. sample and $\alpha=.899$ in the Chinese sample. The eight items of the *Empowering We (WE)* dimension (e.g. “Gets people involved in decisions that affect”) earned Cronbach alphas $\alpha=.930$ in the U.S. sample and $\alpha=.930$ in the Chinese sample. The six items of the *Communicating for Meaning (CM)* dimension (e.g. “Explains why you is doing what you are doing”) earned Cronbach alphas $\alpha=.906$ in the U.S. sample and $\alpha=.936$ in the Chinese sample. The five items of the *Managing Oneself (MOS)* dimension (e.g. “Is a model of persistence and perseverance”) earned Cronbach alphas $\alpha=.882$ in the U.S. sample and $\alpha=.906$ in the Chinese sample. The four items of the *Care and Recognition (CR)* dimension (e.g. “Celebrates victories”) earned Cronbach alphas $\alpha=.949$ in the U.S. sample and $\alpha=.949$ in the Chinese sample.

The United States Sample

In the dimensions of the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS), there were two significant relationships between *Metacognitive (ME)* and *Cognitive (C)* ($r=.71$); *Metacognitive (ME)* and *Behavioral (B)* ($r=.57$). Unexpectedly, the data revealed that all dimensions of the Behavioral Leadership Inventory in the United States sample have significant

relationships with each other at a $p < .05$ significance level. In addition, the internal correlation values of all dimensions in the Behavioral Leadership Inventory were very high, the r values ranging from .70 to .95. The lowest internal correlation value was the Motivational (MO) of the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) ($r = .11$) (see Table 1).

The Chinese Sample

Surprisingly, the data revealed that all dimensions of the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) and Behavioral Leadership Inventory in the Chinese sample were interrelated to one another. In addition, the internal correlation value of every dimension in the Chinese sample was different from the United States sample. There have not extremely high or low values of internal correlation in the Chinese sample. The r values ranging from .33 to .85 (see Table 1 and Table 2).

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistencies, and Correlations for the U.S. sample

Measure	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.ME	4.52	.97	(.788)								
2. C	2.21	.98	.71*	(.941)							
3.MO	4.43	1.08	.11	.25	(.878)						
4. B	4.68	1.08	.57*	.40	.41	(.897)					
5.VG	5.62	1.47	.40	.30	.39	.22	(.942)				
6.WE	5.88	1.22	.26	.25	.32	.08	.83*	(.930)			
7.CM	5.75	1.42	.24	.17	.31	.18	.94*	.88*	(.906)		
8.MOS	6.00	1.54	.39	.33	.32	.21	.94*	.83*	.95*	(.882)	
9.CR	6.10	1.70	.29	.41	.59*	.33	.84*	.70*	.85*	.83*	(.949)

Note. N=13. $p < .05$. Values in () represent Cronbach's Alphas. ME= CQS Metacognitive; C= CQS Cognitive; MO= CQS Motivational; B= CQS Behavioral; VG= Visualizing Greatness; WE= Empowering We; CM= Communicating for Meaning; MOS= Managing Oneself; CR= Care and Recognition.

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, Internal Consistencies, and Correlations for Chinese sample

Measure	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. ME	5.04	1.65	(.924)								
2. C	4.19	1.48	.54*	(.933)							
3. MO	4.61	1.52	.62*	.58*	(.904)						
4. B	4.47	1.63	.55*	.66*	.69*	(.946)					
5. VG	5.50	1.46	.70*	.50*	.66*	.60*	(.899)				
6. WE	5.78	1.50	.73*	.39*	.53*	.42*	.76*	(.930)			
7. CM	5.71	1.58	.61*	.43*	.43*	.33*	.62*	.79*	(.936)		
8. MOS	5.90	1.60	.69*	.39*	.46*	.38*	.67*	.84*	.81*	(.906)	
9. CR	6.11	1.66	.66*	.41*	.41*	.34*	.64*	.79*	.65*	.85*	(.949)

Note. N=68. $p < .05$. Values in () represent Cronbach's Alphas. ME= CQS Metacognitive; C= CQS Cognitive; MO= CQS Motivational; B= CQS Behavioral; VG= Visualizing Greatness; WE= Empowering We; CM= Communicating for Meaning; MOS= Managing Oneself; CR= Care and Recognition.

Regression Results of the U.S. Sample

The statistical analysis process (SPSS) was used in this study to get the results. Hypotheses were tested using a multiple regression analysis. Tables 3 to 10 reported descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliabilities for the US sample and the Chinese sample.

Metacognitive (ME) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory

According to Table 3, multiple regression analysis was not significant for the model Metacognitive (ME) to Visualizing Greatness (VG) ($\Delta R^2=.242$, $F(1, 4) = 2.850$, n.s.); was not significant for the model Metacognitive (ME) to Empowering (WE) ($\Delta R^2=.288$, $F(1, 4) = 2.995$, n.s.); was not significant for the model Metacognitive (ME) to Communicating for Meaning (CM) ($\Delta R^2=.377$, $F(1, 4) = 3.982$, n.s.); was not significant for the model Metacognitive (ME) to Managing Oneself (MOS) ($\Delta R^2=.409$, $F(1, 4) = 4.678$, n.s.); and was not significant for the model Metacognitive (ME) to Care and Recognition (CR) ($\Delta R^2=.104$, $F(1, 4) = 1.130$, n.s.).

Table 3:

The U.S. Sample: Regression Results on Metacognitive (ME) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory

Variable	VG			WE			CM			MOS			CR		
	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2
Step 1 (Control)		.419	.419		.327	.327		.244	.244		.241	.241		.529	.529
Gender	.033			-.131			-.002			-.079			.218		
Age	-.195			.294			-.329			-.242			-.442		
Edu	.125			-.375			-.300			-.218			.111		
Tenure org.	.025			.482			-.254			.041			.491		
Tenure pos.	.319			-.433			.564			.470			-.448		
Step 2 (Independent)		.660	.242		.615	.288		.621	.377		.650	.409		.633	.104
Metacognitive	.886			.967			1.107			1.152			.580		

Note: * $p < .05$ † $p < .01$ Ns=11 because of listwise deletion of missing data. ME= CQS Metacognitive; VG= Visualizing Greatness; WE= Empowering We; CM= Communicating for Meaning; MOS= Managing Oneself; CR= Care and Recognition.

Cognitive (C) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory

According to Table 4, multiple regression analysis showed that there were not significant relationships between Cognitive (C) and each dimension of Leadership Behavioral Inventory:

Cognitive (C) – Visualizing Greatness (VG) ($\Delta R^2=.015$, $F(1, 4) = .104$, n.s.); Cognitive

(C) – Empowering WE (WE) ($\Delta R^2=.100$, $F(1, 4) = .702$, n.s.);

Cognitive (C) – Communicating for Meaning (CM) ($\Delta R^2=.029$, $F(1, 4) = .161$, n.s.);

Cognitive (C) – Managing Oneself (MOS) ($\Delta R^2=.062$, $F(1, 4) = .357$, n.s.); Cognitive

(C) – Care and Recognition (CR) ($\Delta R^2=.013$, $F(1, 4) = .118$, n.s.).

Table 4:

The U.S. Sample: Regression Results on Cognitive (C) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory

Variable	VG			WE			CM			MOS			CR		
	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2
Step 1 (Control)		.419	.419		.327	.327		.244	.244		.241	.241		.529	.529
Gender	.187			-.263			.159			-.027			.259		
Age	-.073			.531			-.165			-.031			-.341		
Edu	.327			-.561			-.090			-.156			.163		
Tenure org.	-.189			-.766			-.626			-.739			.150		
Tenure pos.	.228			.398			.547			.812			-.323		
Step 2 (Independent)		.433	.015		.428	.100		.273	.029		.303	.062		.543	.013
Cognitive	.380			.990			.534			.779			.363		

Note: * $p < .05$ † $p < .01$ Ns=11 because of listwise deletion of missing data. C= CQS Cognitive; VG= Visualizing Greatness; WE= Empowering We; CM= Communicating for Meaning; MOS= Managing Oneself; CR= Care and Recognition.

Motivational (MO) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory

According to Table 5, multiple regression analysis showed that there was not significant relationship between the model Motivational (MO) and Visualizing Greatness (VG) ($\Delta R^2=.024$, $F(1, 4) = .173$, n.s.); was not significant for the model Motivational (MO) to Empowering (WE) ($\Delta R^2=.009$, $F(1, 4) = .056$, n.s.); was not significant for the model Motivational (MO) to Communicating for Meaning (CM) ($\Delta R^2=.003$, $F(1, 4) = .015$, n.s.); was not significant for the model Motivational (MO) to Managing Oneself (MOS) ($\Delta R^2=.041$, $F(1, 4) = 226$, n.s.); and was not significant for the model Motivational (MO) to Care and Recognition (CR) ($\Delta R^2=.098$, $F(1, 4) = 1.049$, n.s.).

Table 5:

The U.S. Sample: Regression Results on Motivational (MO) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory

Variable	VG			WE			CM			MOS			CR		
	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2
Step 1 (Control)		.419	.419		.327	.327		.244	.244		.241	.241		.529	.529
Gender	.421			.233			.450			.426			.520		
Age	-.013			.329			-.249			-.122			-.330		
Edu	.484			.208			.249			.249			.195		
Tenure org.	.332			1.073			.266			.441			.490		
Tenure pos.	-.179			-1.332			-.247			-.178			-.491		
Step 2 (Independent)		.443	.024		.336	.009		.247	.003		.282	.041		.627	.098
Motivational	.223			-.138			.076			.290			.449		

Note: * $p < .05$ † $p < .01$ Ns=11 because of listwise deletion of missing data. MO= CQS Motivational; VG= Visualizing Greatness; WE= Empowering We; CM= Communicating for Meaning; MOS= Managing Oneself; CR= Care and Recognition.

Behavioral (B) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory

According to Table 6, multiple regression analysis was not significant for the model Behavioral (B) to Visualizing Greatness (VG) ($\Delta R^2=.020$, $F(1, 4) = .142$, n.s.); was not significant for the model Behavioral (B) to Empowering (WE) ($\Delta R^2=.000$, $F(1, 4) = .003$, n.s.); was not significant for the model Behavioral (B) to Communicating for Meaning (CM) ($\Delta R^2=.019$, $F(1, 4) = .105$, n.s.); was not significant for the model Behavioral (B) to Managing Oneself (MOS) ($\Delta R^2=.057$, $F(1, 4) = .322$, n.s.); and was not significant for the model Behavioral (B) to Care and Recognition (CR) ($\Delta R^2=.001$, $F(1, 4) = .010$, n.s.).

Unexpectedly, as a whole, the data failed to support the hypothesis of cultural intelligence related to leadership behaviors among the U.S. sample.

Table 6:

The U.S. Sample: Regression Results on Behavioral (B) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory

Variable	VG			WE			CM			MOS			CR		
	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2
Step 1 (Control)		.419	.419		.327	.327		.244	.244		.241	.241		.529	.529
Gender	.363			.251			.416			.342			.443		
Age	-.121			.356			-.242			-.138			-.401		
Edu	.574			.135			.266			.357			.414		
Tenure org.	.448			.976			.284			.579			.782		
Tenure pos.	-.252			-1.183			-.185			-.220			-.877		
Step 2 (Independent)		.438	.020		.328	.000		.263	.019		.298	.057		.531	.001
Behavioral	.186			.028			.183			.314			.045		

Note: * $p < .05$ † $p < .01$ Ns=11 because of listwise deletion of missing data. B=CQS Behavioral; VG= Visualizing Greatness; WE= Empowering We; CM= Communicating for Meaning; MOS= Managing Oneself; CR= Care and Recognition.

Regression Results of the Chinese Sample

Metacognitive (ME) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory

According to Table 7, multiple regression analysis was significant for the model Metacognitive (ME) to Visualizing Greatness (VG) ($\Delta R^2=.490$, $F(1, 56) = 61.170$, $p < .01$); was significant for the model Metacognitive (ME) to Empowering (WE) ($\Delta R^2=.415$, $F(1, 56) = 50.930$, $p < .01$); was significant for the model Metacognitive (ME) to Communicating for Meaning (CM) ($\Delta R^2=.269$, $F(1, 56) = 25.030$, $p < .01$); was significant for the model Metacognitive (ME) to Managing Oneself (MOS) ($\Delta R^2=.368$, $F(1, 56) = 40.017$, $p < .01$); and was significant for the model Metacognitive (ME) to Care and Recognition (CR) ($\Delta R^2=.353$, $F(1, 56) = 37.408$, $p < .01$). Therefore, the data did support the hypothesis of Metacognitive (ME) related to leadership behaviors among the Chinese sample for each of the cultural intelligence dimensions.

Table 7:

The Chinese Sample: Regression Results on Metacognitive (ME) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory

Variable	VG			WE			CM			MOS			CR		
	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2
Step 1 (Control)		.062	.062		.128	.128		.130	.130		.117	.117		.120	.120
Gender	.104			.018			-.079			-.130			-.141		
Age	-.217			.027			.039			-.056			-.146		
Edu	.094			.100			-.001			.082			.112		
Tenure org.	.031			.067			.170			-.005			.133		
Tenure pos.	.130			-.040			-.045			.103			.073		
Step 2 (Independent)		.552	.490†		.543	.415†		.399	.269†		.485	.368†		.472	.353†
Metacognitive	.762			.702			.564			.660			.646		

Note: * $p < .05$ † $p < .01$ Ns=63 because of listwise deletion of missing data. ME= CQS Metacognitive; VG= Visualizing Greatness; WE= Empowering We; CM= Communicating for Meaning; MOS= Managing Oneself; CR= Care and Recognition.

Cognitive (C) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory

According to Table 8, multiple regression analysis was significant for the model Cognitive (C) to Visualizing Greatness (VG) ($\Delta R^2=.201$, $F(1, 56) = 15.237$, $p < .01$); was not significant for the model Cognitive (C) to Empowering (WE) ($\Delta R^2=.091$, $F(1, 56) = 6.530$, n.s.); was significant for the model Cognitive (C) to Communicating for Meaning (CM) ($\Delta R^2=.136$, $F(1, 56) = 10.381$, $p < .01$); was not significant for the model Cognitive (C) to Managing Oneself (MOS) ($\Delta R^2=.096$, $F(1, 56) = 6.865$, n.s.); and was not significant for the model Cognitive (C) to Care and Recognition (CR) ($\Delta R^2=.097$, $F(1, 56) = 6.934$, n.s.). Therefore, the data only partially supported the hypothesis of Cognitive (C) related to leadership behaviors among the Chinese sample for each of the cultural intelligence dimensions.

Table 8:

The Chinese Sample: Regression Results on Cognitive (C) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory

Variable	VG			WE			CM			MOS			CR		
	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2
Step 1 (Control)		.062	.062		.128	.128		.130	.130		.117	.117		.120	.120
Gender	.110			.012			-.071			-.133			-.143		
Age	.156			.366			.317			.264			.167		
Edu	-.037			.020			-.112			-.003			.026		
Tenure org.	-.132			-.080			.048			-.144			-.004		
Tenure pos.	.115			-.044			-.060			.096			.066		
Step 2 (Independent)		.263	.201†		.219	.091		.266	.136†		.214	.096		.217	.097
Cognitive	.482			.325			.397			.334			.335		

Note: * $p < .05$ † $p < .01$ Ns=63 because of listwise deletion of missing data. ME= CQS Cognitive; VG= Visualizing Greatness; WE= Empowering We; CM= Communicating for Meaning; MOS= Managing Oneself; CR= Care and Recognition.

Motivational (MO) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory

According to Table 9, multiple regression analysis was significant for the model Motivational (MO) to Visualizing Greatness (VG) ($\Delta R^2=.477$, $F(1, 56) = 57.840$, $p < .01$); was significant for the model Motivational (MO) to Empowering (WE) ($\Delta R^2=.269$, $F(1, 56) = 24.983$, $p < .01$); was significant for the model Motivational (MO) to Communicating for Meaning (CM) ($\Delta R^2=.191$, $F(1, 56) = 15.781$, $p < .01$); was significant for the model Motivational (MO) to Managing Oneself (MOS) ($\Delta R^2=.192$, $F(1, 56) = 15.613$, $p < .01$); and was significant for the model Motivational (MO) to Care and Recognition (CR) ($\Delta R^2=.144$, $F(1, 56) = 10.970$, $p < .01$). The data succeeded to support the hypothesis of Motivational (MO) related to leadership behaviors among the Chinese sample for each of the cultural intelligence dimensions.

Table 9:

The Chinese Sample: Regression Results on Motivational (MO) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory

Variable	VG			WE			CM			MOS			CR		
	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2
Step 1 (Control)		.062	.062		.128	.128		.130	.130		.117	.117		.120	.120
Gender	.048			-.031			-.119			-.175			-.183		
Age	.152			.364			.310			.260			.161		
Edu	.138			.139			.030			.118			.146		
Tenure org.	-.227			-.153			-.009			-.203			-.053		
Tenure pos.	.297			.090			.063			.215			.173		
Step 2 (Independent)		.539	.477†		.397	.269†		.321	.191†		.310	.192†		.264	.144†
Motivational	.695			.523			.441			.442			.382		

Note: * $p < .05$ † $p < .01$ Ns=63 because of listwise deletion of missing data. MO= CQS Motivational; VG= Visualizing Greatness; WE= Empowering We; CM= Communicating for Meaning; MOS= Managing Oneself; CR= Care and Recognition.

Behavioral (B) to Dimensions of Leadership Behavioral Inventory

According to Table 10, multiple regression analysis was significant for the model Behavioral (B) to Visualizing Greatness (VG) ($\Delta R^2=.337$, $F(1, 56) = 31.469$, $p < .01$); was significant for the model Behavioral (B) to Empowering (WE) ($\Delta R^2=.129$, $F(1, 56) = 9.745$, $p < .01$); was not significant for the model Behavioral (B) to Communicating for Meaning (CM) ($\Delta R^2=.092$, $F(1, 56) = 6.593$, n.s.); was not significant for the model Behavioral (B) to Managing Oneself (MOS) ($\Delta R^2=.098$, $F(1, 56) = 7.014$, n.s.); and was not significant for the model Behavioral (B) to Care and Recognition (CR) ($\Delta R^2=.078$, $F(1, 56) = 5.461$, n.s.). Therefore, the data only partially supported the hypothesis of Behavioral (B) related to leadership behaviors among the Chinese sample for each of the cultural intelligence dimensions.

Table 10:

The Chinese Sample: Regression Results on Behavioral (B) to the Leadership Behavioral Inventory

Variable	VG			WE			CM			MOS			CR		
	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2	β	R ²	ΔR^2
Step 1 (Control)		.062	.062		.128	.128		.130	.130		.117	.117		.120	.120
Gender	.041			-.033			-.120			-.177			-.186		
Age	.068			.310			.265			.213			.120		
Edu	.070			.095			-.007			.080			.113		
Tenure org.	-.035			-.018			.104			-.089			.047		
Tenure pos.	.134			-.029			-.038			.113			.084		
Step 2 (Independent)		.399	.337†		.257	.129†		.221	.092		.215	.098		.198	.078
Behavioral	.586			.363			.305			.316			.282		

Note: * $p < .05$ † $p < .01$ Ns=63 because of listwise deletion of missing data. B= CQS Behavioral; VG= Visualizing Greatness; WE= Empowering We; CM= Communicating for Meaning; MOS= Managing Oneself; CR= Care and Recognition.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This research reported one of the first empirical studies examining the relationship between cultural intelligence competencies and effective leadership. In general, the hypothesis of this research was expected to predict there would be a positive relationship between cultural intelligence and effective leadership. Unfortunately, the analysis based on the data of the United States sample revealed that there is not any significant or positive relationship between each dimension of the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) and each dimension of the Leadership Behavior Inventory. That is to say, the cultural intelligence competencies of the leaders in Hays do not relate to effective leadership.

However, the analysis revealed many different relationships based on the data of the Chinese sample. *Metacognitive (ME)* of the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) has strong relationships with each dimension of the Leadership Behavior Inventory. *Cognitive (C)* has significant relationship with *Visualizing Greatness (VG)* and *Communicating for Meaning (CM)*. Yet surprisingly no significant relationship was detected between *Cognitive (C)* and *Empowering We (WE)*; *Cognitive (C)* and *Managing Oneself (MOS)*; *Cognitive (C)* and *Care and Recognition (CR)*. In addition, *Motivational (MO)* of the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) has significant relationships with each dimension of the Leadership Behavior Inventory. *Behavioral (B)* of the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) has a significant relationship with *Visualizing Greatness (VG)* and *Empowering We (WE)*. On the other hand, no significant relationships were revealed between *Behavioral (B)* and *Communicating for Meaning (CM)*; *Behavioral (B)* and *Managing Oneself (MOS)*; *Behavioral (B)* and *Care and Recognition (CR)*. Perhaps, we can say that the cultural

intelligence competencies of leaders in Zhengzhou have very strong relationships with the effective leadership. In other words, the Chinese leaders in Zhengzhou who have higher cultural intelligence competencies can gain more effective leadership.

Perhaps, there are two reasons to support this positive relationship in Zhengzhou, China. First, the foreign cooperation of the Chinese organizations increased substantially in recent years. From managers to subordinates of organizations, people in China face more international business and international cooperation than before. If the leaders have higher cultural intelligence competencies, they can handle different cultural organizations or customers. They would be receiving more success when they are engaged in foreign business than others. Therefore, current Chinese organizations pay more attention to improving managers' and employees' cultural intelligence to enrich their comprehensive abilities to develop the international talents in order to make them create more benefits for organizations.

Second, there are more and more foreign employees in the Chinese organizations. The increasing cultural diverse workforce requires leaders to pay more attention to different cultural problems of employees. In current Chinese organizations, employees may come from many countries with different cultures. These diverse employees may have different habits, beliefs, and needs than local Chinese employees. As leaders, they should understand employees' thinking and needs. Leaders who have higher cultural intelligence competencies can understand their diverse employees' needs or thoughts. Only employees' needs were satisfied, they can work hard for organizations and create more benefits for organizations. Therefore, there is the positive relationship between the

cultural intelligence and the effective leadership in Zhengzhou, China.

Unexpectedly, the final analyses revealed differences between the United States sample and the Chinese sample. The small response numbers of the survey in Hays may be one reason leading to this huge difference. On the other hand, the very different cultural background of participants of the United States sample and the Chinese sample may be the other reason leading to this difference. Further examinations need to expand the range and number of survey samples; and choose similar background participants to reduce the different cultural bias.

Limitations

There are four major limitations of this research. First, this research received a low response rate. In Hays, there were 56 managers who got the questionnaire of the study. At the end of the research, we got 14 responses from these 56 managers. The response rate in the United States sample was 25%. In Zhengzhou, there were 100 managers who got the questionnaire. At the end of the research, we had received 74 responses from these 100 managers. The response rate in the Chinese sample was 74%. However, the sample sizes of the research were too small, especially the U.S. sample in Hays. The response rate of questionnaire was much less than desirable. Therefore, the findings based on the current research should not be generalized to managers in the United States and China.

Second, the high internal correlation among each dimension is another limitation of the research (the r -value of each dimension is larger than .70, see Table 1 and Table 2). Every item in the research appears the same latent variable.

Third, the results of this study were based on self reported data from participants.

That is to say, every participant responded to survey items based on both their own leadership ability and their own cultural intelligence. This potentially leads to a self-report bias, because people always want others to think they are better. Therefore, participants potentially chose higher scales to make the questionnaire look more perfect. For instance, participants in the Chinese sample may want to present themselves in a favorable light and therefore responded to the items very highly on one scale as well as highly on the other scale. Perhaps this is analogous to the notion of “saving face”, which is commonly associated with the Chinese culture. Therefore, the “self-report bias” is the third limitation of the study. The fourth limitation is the sample ranges were too narrow. In this research, there are only two sample areas—Hays and Zhengzhou. There may be a lack of possible international business or international cooperation in these two small cities. Therefore, the research results, which were based on these two small cities, cannot represent the whole managers’ or leaders’ opinions in the United States and China. Future research need to expand the sample ranges of survey, or choose some big, international cities as the sample areas of survey.

Implications for Research

This study is one of the initial attempts to empirically examine the relationship between the cultural intelligence competencies and effective leadership. Further testing is required to determine if the different cultural background of participants influences the effective leadership. This study examining the role of the higher cultural intelligence competencies is one of possible factors that may be related to effective leadership. Our understanding of the relationship between the cultural intelligence competencies and the

effective leadership can help leaders or organizations to design and determine their cultural training plans of employees and employers for gaining more effective leadership. Additionally, our understanding of the relationship between the cultural intelligence competencies and the effective leadership also can help organizations improve their training efficiency. Future research should also directly test the effectiveness of cultural training.

Again, this research is limited by high values of the inter-correlations for each of the nine dimensions of the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) and the Behavioral Leadership Inventory, no matter in the United States sample or the Chinese sample. Further research is required to ensure the validity and reliability of the measure across samples to avoid this limitation.

There is tremendous potential toward further research that will have totally different results with this research. Nevertheless, this research is quite likely a foundation to help further researchers design more studies to examine the relationship between the cultural intelligence competencies and the effective leadership.

References

- Anderson, W. D., Krajewski, T. H., Goffin, D. R. & Jackson, N. D. (2008). A leadership self-efficacy taxonomy and its relation to effective leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 19. 595-608.
- Ang, S., Dyne, V.L., Koh, C.K.S., 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: 335-371. Retrieved June 21, 2011, http://culturalq.com/docs/MOR%20Ang_Van%20Dyne%20etc.%202007.pdf
- Beechler, S., & Javidan, M. (2007). Leading with a global mindset. In M. Javidan, R. M. Steers, & M. A. *The global Mindset (Advances in International Management)*. Oxford, UK: JAI Press, p.131-150).
- Bennett, Milton J (1993). *A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity*. Retrieved June 10, 2011, from <http://www.library.wisc.edu/edvrc/docs/public/pdfs/SEEDReadings/intCulSens.pdf>
- Bowen, D. E. & Inkpen, A. E. (2009). Exploring the role of “global mindset” in leading change in International Contexts. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. Retrieved June 5, 2011, from <http://jab.sagepub.com.ezproxy.fhsu.edu:2048/content/45/2/239.full.pdf+html>
- Bucker, J. & Poutsma, E. (2009). Global management competencies: a theoretical foundation. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. Vol. 25 No. 8, 2010. p. 829-844.

Chambers, R., Mohanna, K., Spurgeon, P., & Wall, D. (Eds.). (2007). *How to succeed as a leader* (p. 7-8). Oxford, NY: Radcliffe Publishing.

Crowne, Kerri A. (2008). What leads to cultural intelligence? *Indiana University*.

Retrieved June 15, 2011, from

<http://jab.sagepub.com.ezproxy.fhsu.edu:2048/content/45/2/239.full.pdf+html>

Daniels, J.D. Radebaugh, L.H. and Sullivan, D.P. (2008). *International Business: environments and operations* (12th ed, p.6-7). Pearson Prentice Hall.

Dillman, A. D. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc, Hoboken, New Jersey.

Dweck, Carol S. (2006). *Mindset: the new psychology of success*. New York: Ballantine Books.

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 Organization Management. Vol. 36 No. 5, p.535-556.

<http://gom.sagepub.com/content/36/5/535.full.pdf+html>

Hajro, A. & Pudelko, M. (2010, August). An analysis of core-competencies of successful multinational team leaders. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*. Vol.10 No. 2, p. 175-194.

<http://ccm.sagepub.com/content/10/2/175.full.pdf+html>

Hitt (Eds.). *The global mindset—Advances in international management Volume 19* (pp. 131-169).Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Howell, P. J. & Costley, L. D. (2001). *Understanding behaviors for effective leadership*.

New Jersey: upper Saddle River.

Ilies, R., Judge, T. & Wagner, D. (2006). Making sense of motivational leadership: the trail from transformational leaders to motivated followers. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*. Vol. 13 no. 1, p. 1-22.

<http://jlo.sagepub.com.ezproxy.fhsu.edu:2048/content/13/1/1.full.pdf+html>

Janda, K. F. (1960). Towards the explication of the concept of leadership in terms of the concept of power. *Human Relations*, 13, 345-363.

Kaipa, P. & Kriger, M. (2010, March 22). Empowerment, vision, and positive leadership: an interview with Alan Mulally, Former CEO, Boeing Commercial—current CEO, Ford Motor Company. *Journal of Management Inquiry*. Retrieved July 20, 2011, from

<http://jmi.sagepub.com/content/19/2/110.full.pdf+html>

Kendall, E., Ehrlich, C., Sunderland, N., Muenchberger, H. & Rushton, C. (2010).

Self-managing versus self-management: reinvigorating the socio-political dimensions of self-management. *Chronic Illness*. Vol. 7 no. 1, p. 87-98.

<http://chi.sagepub.com.ezproxy.fhsu.edu:2048/content/7/1/87.full.pdf+html>

Kent, T. (2007). *Definitions of the five behaviors*. Retrieved March 23, 2012, from

<http://kentt.people.cofc.edu/definitions.html>

Knickerbocker, I. (1948). Leadership: a conception and some implications. *Journal of Social Issues*, 4, 23-40.

Konczak, J. L., Stelly, J. D. & Trusty, L. M. (2000). Defining and measuring empowering leader behaviors: development of an upward feedback instrument. *Educational*

and Psychological Measurement. Vol.60 no. 2, p.301-313.

Lang, G. (2004, January 24). Cross-cultural training: how much difference does it really

make? *The New York Times*. Retrieved June 18, 2011, from

http://www.nytimes.com/2004/01/24/news/24iht-rcross_ed3_.html

Littrell, N. L., Salas, E., Hess, P. K., Paley, M. & Riedel, S. (2006, September).

Expatriate preparation: a critical analysis of 25 years of cross-cultural training

research. *Human Resource Development Review*. Vol. 5, No. 3 September 2006

355-388. Retrieved March 1, 2012, from

<http://hrd.sagepub.com.ezproxy.fhsu.edu:2048/content/5/3/355.full.pdf+html>

Littrell, N. L. & Salas, E. (2005, September). A review of cross-cultural training: best

practices, guidelines, and research needs. *Human Resource Development Review*

2005 vol. 4 no. 3 p.305-334. Retrieved March 1, 2012, from

<http://hrd.sagepub.com.ezproxy.fhsu.edu:2048/content/4/3/305.full.pdf+html>

Lynch, E.W., & Hanson, M.J. (1993). Changing demographics: Implications for training

in early Intervention. *Infants and Young Children*, 6, 50-55

Moon, T. (2010). Organizational cultural intelligence: dynamic capability perspective.

Group Organization Management. Vol 35 no.4 p.456-493.

<http://gom.sagepub.com/content/35/4/456.full.pdf+html>

Mumford, E. (1909, March). Origins of leadership. *American Journal of Sociology*, p.12.

http://books.google.com/books?id=cEfuHrsND_kC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false

Quesada, G., Gonzalez, E. M. & Kent, T. (2008). A road for achieving an international

measure and understanding on leaders' behaviors. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. Vol. 29 No. 8, 2008, p. 678-692,
www.emeraldinsight.com/0143-7739.htm

Northouse, G. P. (2010). *Leadership: theory and practice*. Sage Publications Inc. California. p.3

Rabin, J. (2003). *Encyclopedia of public administration and public policy*. (Vol. 2, p. 708). New York, NY: Marcel Dekker. Retrieved March 23, 2012, from
[http://books.google.com/books?ei=GEFtT4-BMoKusQLcvLWOBg&id=55ghk_xYpToC&dq=Encyclopedia of Public Administration and Public Policy k-z&q=greatness](http://books.google.com/books?ei=GEFtT4-BMoKusQLcvLWOBg&id=55ghk_xYpToC&dq=Encyclopedia+of+Public+Administration+and+Public+Policy+k-z&q=greatness)

Raub, S. & Robert, C. (2010). Differential effects of empowering leadership on in-role and extra-role employee behaviors: exploring the role of psychological empowerment and power values. *Human Relations*. Vol. 63 no. 11, p. 1743-1770.
<http://hum.sagepub.com.ezproxy.fhsu.edu:2048/content/63/11/1743.full.pdf+html>

Rudd, H., Kent, T., & Blair, C. (2009). Leader behavior inventory: A test of measure equivalence in germany and the united states. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(1), 22. Retrieved March 23, 2012, from
[http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/ijls/new/vol5iss1/IJLS_Vol5Is1_Rudd_et_al\(2\)R.pdf](http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/ijls/new/vol5iss1/IJLS_Vol5Is1_Rudd_et_al(2)R.pdf)

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*. vol.31 no.1 pp.154-173.

<http://gom.sagepub.com/content/31/1/154.full.pdf+html>

The United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (2002). *Summary of the annual review of developments in globalization and regional integration in the countries of the ESCWA region* (pp1-2). New York: United Nations. Retrieved June 10, 2011, from

<http://www.escwa.un.org/information/publications/edit/upload/grid-02-2.pdf>

Thomas, D. C. & Inkson, K. (2004). *Cultural intelligence: People skills for global business*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000 Brief Summary File. Retrieved October 9, 2011, from

<http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/c2kbr01-1.pdf>

Ziegler, A.J. & DeGrosky, T. M. (2008). Managing the meaning of leadership: leadership as “communicating intent” in wildland firefighting. *Leadership*. Vol. 4 no. 3, p.271-297.

<http://lea.sagepub.com.ezproxy.fhsu.edu:2048/content/4/3/271.full.pdf+html>

APPENDIX A:
ENGLISH VERSION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Informed Consent Form

Nowadays, cross-cultural/multi-cultural training has already become a popular trend in current organizations. More and more managers are willing to take the cross-cultural/multi-cultural training, or require their employees to take the training, or willing to hire new employee who have the cross-cultural/multi-cultural training experiences. This project is an important one that will help managers or organizations to find the relationship between multi-cultural training and effective leadership, in order to help managers or organizations determine the value of taking multi-cultural training. Your permission is needed in order for the project coordinator to collect the necessary information.

If you agree to participate, we would like to conduct a brief survey with you for regarding your opinions and experiences.

It's important for you to know that:

1. Your participation in the survey is voluntary. If at any time you would like to stop the survey you are welcome to do so.
2. All information you share regarding your experiences will be kept confidential and used for research purposes.
3. Information provided in survey will remain anonymous. Only the project coordinator will know the identity of the responses of the managers.

The needs assessment is being conducted by the following persons:

Dr. Brent J. Goertzen, Associate Professor of Leadership Studies, FHSU
Lu Yang IDS899 Student

If you have any questions concerning this study, you may contact:

Dr. Brent J. Goertzen
Fort Hays State University, Hays, KS 67601
785-628-4303 or bgortze@fhsu.edu

Lu Yang
Fort Hays State University, Hays, KS 67601
785-787-5537 or l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu

I have read the above statements and understand that participation in this survey is voluntary. Please answer question below. If you choose "Yes", then click the "continue", you will forward to the questionnaire. if you choose "No", then click the "continue", you will stop the survey.

Yes, I want to participate. No, I don't want to participate.

41. Has a sense of self-determination and self-confidence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
42. Keeps your own level of energy up high.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
43. Believes anything can be done; has a "can do" attitude.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
44. Is a model of persistence and perseverance.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
45. Maintains focus and constancy of purpose.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
46. Publicizes peoples' successes to all employees.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
47. Celebrates team accomplishments regularly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
48. Genuinely cares about others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
49. Celebrates victories.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Demographic Questions

50. Gender: Female Male

51. Age: _____

52. Educational Level:

Associate Degree (for example: AA, AS) Bachelor Degree (for example: BA, BS)

Master Degree (for example: MA, MS, MBA) Professional Degree (for example: MD, DDS, LLB)

Doctorate Degree (for example: PhD, EdD) other_____

53. Tenure at Current Organization: _____

54. Tenure at Current Position/Job: _____

APPENDIX B:
CHINESE VERSION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

知情同意书

现如今，企业对员工或领导进行跨国培训或跨文化培训已经成为一种新的流行趋势。越来越多的企业领导者愿意参加跨国培训或跨文化培训；或者愿意让员工参与此类培训；或者更愿意招聘拥有跨文化或跨国经验的应聘者。此次调查研究就是帮助企业以及企业领导找到跨国培训与有效领导力之间的关系。从而帮助企业决定跨国培训的价值。我们需要您的同意才能为这个调查收集回复资料。

以下内容对您非常重要：

1. 您参加此次问卷调查是完全自愿的。您可以在任何时间停止回复调查。
2. 您所回复的所有内容均是保密的，也只会被用作调查目的。
3. 您所回复的所有内容均是匿名形式的。

问卷调查设计者：

Brent J. Goertzen 博士，领导力学院教授，FHSU

杨璐 学生

如果您对本次调查有任何的疑问，均可联系：

Brent J. Goertzen 博士

福特海斯州立大学

785-625-4303 或者 bgoertze@fhsu.edu

杨璐

福特海斯州立大学

787-787-5537 或者 l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu

我已经读过以上条款，并且明白参加此次问卷调查是完全处于自愿。请在下面两个答案之间进行选择，并按继续

是，我同意参加调查 不，我不同意参加调查

参与者个人情况的调查问题

50. 性别: 女 男

51. 年龄: _____

52. 学历: 大专学位 (例如: 会计专业专科) 本科学位 (例如: 文学学士, 理学学士) 硕士研究生学位 (例如: 工商管理学硕士, 文学硕士) 职业性学位 (例如: 医学士, 法律学士) 博士学位 (例如: 哲学博士学位, 教育学博士学位) 其他

53. 在本公司任职多久 (年): _____

54. 在本职位任职多久 (年): _____

APPENDIX C:
PERMISSION FOR THE CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE SCALE (CQS)

Subject: RE: Fort Hays State University
From: "Van Dyne, Linn" <vandyne@bus.msu.edu>
Date: Mon, August 1, 2011 4:35 pm
To: "Yang, Lu" <l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu>
Priority: Normal
Status: answered
Options: [View Full Header](#) | [Print](#) | [Download this as a file](#)

Hello Lu,

Thank you for the information.

The scale in the book has an applied focus, is copyrighted, and not available for research.

But I will gladly give you permission to use the 20 item CQS in your research. This 20 item scale has been validated and used successfully in prior research.

You can obtain the scale and the validation evidence in the Management and Organizational Review paper that can be downloaded from our web site.

<http://culturalq.com/researcharticles.html>

Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C.K.S., 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: 335-371. Click here to download the paper (PDF 175KB)

Best wishes. We will be interested in learning about your results.

Linn

-----Original Message-----

From: Yang, Lu [mailto:l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu]
Sent: Monday, August 01, 2011 9:07 AM
To: Van Dyne, Linn
Subject: Fort Hays State University

Dear Dr. Dyne:

My name is Lu Yang. I am a graduate student in the Department of Leadership at Fort Hays State University in Hays, Kansas. I am currently working on my thesis required to complete a master's degree. My thesis topic is about relationship between multicultural training and effective leadership. My thesis advisor is Dr. Brent Goertzen.

My investigation will survey some managers of companies' attitudes toward leaders taking multicultural training and effective leadership.

I read the "self-assessment of your CQ" questionnaire on the book "Developing Cultural intelligence at work". The CQ questionnaire is very useful to my thesis. Can I use this instrument in my research survey of thesis?

Thank you for your time and consideration. When I finish my thesis, I would be happy to share it with you. If you have any further questions or requirements, please address or email them to me.

Sincerely,

Lu Yang
Graduate Candidate, Department of Leadership Fort Hays State University
Phone: (001) 785-787-5537
E-mail: l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu

Advisor:
Dr. Brent J. Goertzen
Chair and Associate Professor
Department of Leadership Studies
Fort Hays State University
235C Rarick Hall
Phone: (001) 785-628-4303
E-mail: bgoertze@fhsu.edu

APPENDIX D:
PERMISSION FOR THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR INVENTORY
QUESTIONNAIRE

Subject: RE: Fort Hays State University
From: "Kent, Thomas W" <KentT@cofc.edu>
Date: Mon, August 1, 2011 1:07 pm
To: "Yang, Lu" <l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu>
Priority: Normal
Status: answered
Options: [View Full Header](#) | [Print](#) | [Download this as a file](#)

Here is the questionnaire. Let me know if you have any questions about it.

Tom Kent, Ph. D.
Chair,
Department of Management & Entrepreneurship
School of Business
College of Charleston
843-953-7658

-----Original Message-----

From: Yang, Lu [mailto:l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu]
Sent: Thursday, July 28, 2011 2:48 PM
To: Kent, Thomas W
Subject: Fort Hays State University

Dear Dr. Kent:

My name is Lu Yang. I am a graduate student in the Department of Leadership at Fort Hays State University in Hays, Kansas. I am currently working on my thesis required to complete a master's degree. My thesis topic is about relationship between multicultural training and effective leadership. My thesis advisor is Dr. Brent Goertzen.

My investigation will survey some managers of companies' attitudes toward leaders taking multicultural training and effective leadership.

I read your article online, "A road for achieving an international measure and understanding on leaders' behaviors". The questionnaire in this article is very useful to my thesis. Can I get the full questionnaire and

use it in my thesis?

Thank you for your time and consideration. When I finish my thesis, I would be happy to share it with you. If you have any further questions or requirements, please address or email them to me.

Sincerely,

Lu Yang
Graduate Candidate, Department of Leadership
Fort Hays State University
Phone: (001) 785-787-5537
E-mail: l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu

Advisor:
Dr. Brent J. Goertzen
Chair and Associate Professor
Department of Leadership Studies
Fort Hays State University
235C Rarick Hall
Phone: (001) 785-628-4303
E-mail: bgoertze@fhsu.edu

APPENDIX E

//2011

A few days from now you will receive an email request to complete a questionnaire. The questionnaire is work for an important research project.

We are examining the relationship between multicultural awareness and effective leadership. Your opinions and experiences are critical to help us understand this possible relationship.

In today's global business environment it is critical that managers and employees have an effective understanding of, and ability to work with diverse workforces. As such, we seek to understand the relationship between cultural understanding and engagement relate to how people lead and influence others. Your participation in this study is invaluable in that it will help design more effective training programs regarding culture and leadership.

Thank you very much for helping with this important and meaningful study. If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you. Please feel free to contact with us.

Sincerely,

Lu Yang
Graduate Candidate, Department of Leadership
Fort Hays State University
Phone: (001) 785-787-5537
E-mail: l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu

Advisor:
Dr. Brent J. Goertzen
Associate Professor
Department of Leadership Studies
Fort Hays State University
235B Rarick Hall
Phone: (001) 785-628-4303
E-mail: bgoertze@fhsu.edu

APPENDIX F

Date: **/**/2011

I am writing to ask your help in a survey of relationship between the cultural intelligence and leadership behavior. This survey is part of a graduate thesis which focusing on relationship between multi-cultural competence and effective leadership.

This study examines with managers' opinions regarding multi-cultural competence and effective leadership. You have valuable opinions or experiences about this important topic.

Results from the survey will be used to help us gain better understanding of the connection between cultural understanding and engagement and effective leadership. Furthermore knowledge gained here will help other scholars and practitioners develop more meaningful and effective training programs regarding the topics of cultural understanding and leadership development.

Your answers are completely confidential and will be reported only as summaries in which no individual's answers can be identified. This survey is hosted on the Fort Hays State University's survey system and therefore the link is protected. This survey is voluntary. However, you can help us very much by taking a few minutes to share your experiences and opinions about current workplace new trend—cultural competence and leadership.

Please complete this on-line survey by clicking on the following link:

<http://survey.fhsu.edu/takeSurvey.asp?surveyID=1112>

If you have any questions or comments about this study, we would be happy to talk with you.

Thank you very much for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

Lu Yang

Graduate Candidate, Department of Leadership

Fort Hays State University

Phone: (001) 785-787-5537

E-mail: l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu

Advisor:

Dr. Brent J. Goertzen

Associate Professor

Department of Leadership Studies

Fort Hays State University

235C Rarick Hall

Phone: (001) 785-628-4303

E-mail: bgoertze@fhsu.edu

APPENDIX G

//2011

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinions about the relationship between cultural competence and effective leadership was sent to you.

If you have already completed the online questionnaire for us, please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. You can access the survey by clicking on the link here:

<http://survey.fhsu.edu/takeSurvey.asp?surveyID=1112>

We are especially grateful for your help because it is only by asking managers like you to share your experiences and opinions that we can understand whether the cultural competence have benefits to effective leadership.

Thank you very much for your help.
Sincerely,

Lu Yang
Graduate Candidate, Department of Leadership
Fort Hays State University
Phone: (001) 785-787-5537
E-mail: l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu

Advisor:
Dr. Brent J. Goertzen
Associate Professor
Department of Leadership Studies
Fort Hays State University
235C Rarick Hall
Phone: (001) 785-628-4303
E-mail: bgoertze@fhsu.edu

APPENDIX H

//2011

During the past three weeks you have received several E-mail letters about an important research study about the relationship cultural competence and effective leadership.

Its purpose is to help current managers and organizations understand the relationship between cultural competence and effective leadership. Based on the knowledge gained in this important study, practitioners will be able to design more effective training programs regarding these critical topics.

We are sending this final contact by e-mail because of our concern that people who have not responded may have had different experiences than those who have. Hearing from every manager in the Hays area helps assure that the survey results are as accurate as possible.

We also want to assure you that your response to this study is voluntary, and if you prefer not to respond that is fine. Still, your response to this brief survey is very valuable. Click on the following link to access the survey:

<http://survey.fhsu.edu/takeSurvey.asp?surveyID=1112>

Finally, we appreciate your willingness to consider our request as we conclude this effort to better understand cultural competence and effective leadership. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Lu Yang
Graduate Candidate, Department of Leadership
Fort Hays State University
Phone: (001) 785-787-5537
E-mail: l_yang15_sia@scatcat.fhsu.edu

Advisor:
Dr. Brent J. Goertzen
Associate Professor
Department of Leadership Studies
Fort Hays State University
235C Rarick Hall
Phone: (001) 785-628-4303
E-mail: bgoertze@fhsu.edu