

AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL AND CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE

Dimpy Handa*
Dr. Seema Srivastava**

ABSTRACT

Culture and society are often linked together but serves a different purpose for the individuals. As these two terms differ in various aspects, their practical approach in sense of Social and Cultural Intelligence (SCI) also differs although linked together by academicians. This paper thus attempts to examine the relationship between SQ and CQ. The study also helps in determining the level of SQ and CQ among the faculty working in University of Delhi. The study is based on a sample of seventy four faculty members of commerce department from various colleges of University of Delhi. Scales for SQ and CQ were constructed employing exploratory factor analysis. Then a series of statistical techniques were used to test various hypotheses. It was concluded that CQ although small in proportion but definitely contributes to SQ. So, if the organisations are planning to develop a SQ intervention for its employees it is suggested to include at least few dimensions of CQ in intervention objectives and then design the plan around those objectives. By including high CQ individuals in the work teams, the benefits of SQ would be strengthened. Thus, organizations need to assess the CQ of the individuals while hiring them. Moreover, impact of demographic variables such as gender and age was also assessed.

KEYWORDS: *SCI, SQ, CQ, Social Intelligence, Cultural Intelligence, Culture, Society.*

Introduction

“CULTURE is basically the sharing of values and knowledge by a SOCIETY”

Culture is the quality in a person or society that arises from a concern for what is regarded as excellent in arts, letters manners, scholarly pursuits etc. (www.dictionnary.reference.com/browse/culture). There are two types of culture: material and non- material culture. Material culture includes all of the physical objects that people create and give meaning to. For example, car, clothing, schools, computers, books etc. Non material culture consists of thoughts and behaviors that people learn as part of the culture they live in. It includes politics, economics, language, rules, customs, family, religion or beliefs, values and knowledge. Society is a group of humans broadly distinguished from other groups by manual interests, participation in characteristics relationships, share institutions and a common culture (www.thefreedictionary.com/society). Society also is an organization, or association of persons engaged in a common profession, activity or interest. No culture could exist without society and equally no society could exist without culture. The relationship between culture and society is based on its common elements of culture and society. Those common elements are:

- **Language:** Language is a set of symbols used to assign and communicate meaning. It enables to name or label the things in the world so one can think and communicate about them. Members of society generally share a common language which facilitates day to day exchange with others. Language is both an element of culture and society, without language there would no culture and

* Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Commerce, Delhi School of Economics, University of Delhi, Delhi.

** Assistant Professor, Motilal Nehru College (Day), University of Delhi, Delhi.

society. For example when one asks a hardware store clerk for a flash light, you don't need to draw a picture of those instruments.

- **Beliefs and Ideologies:** Beliefs are the things members of a society hold to be true. They are the "factors" accepted by all or most members of society. Ideologies are integrated and connected systems of beliefs. Beliefs and ideologies are common element of culture and society. No culture without beliefs and ideologies and no beliefs and ideologies without culture people share beliefs and ideologies in society.
- **Norms:** They are established standards of behavior uncontained by society. All societies have ways of encouraging and enforcing what they view as appropriate behavior while discouraging and punishing what they consider to be improper behavior. In order for norms to become significant in a given society, it must be widely shared and understood of those norms. For example "wash your hands before dinners" Then salt not kill" "Respect your elders". Norms is a common element of culture and society which are interchangeably. No culture norms and sorely no norms also.

There are two types of norms in a society and culture: formal norms generally have been written down on specify shed punishment of violators and informal norms are generally understood but they are not precisely recorded. Most norms are deemed highly necessary for the welfare of society, often because they symbolize the most cherished principle of people. Values: They are anything members of culture aspire to or hold in high eastern. Values are things to be achieved, things considered of great worth or value. Every individual have their own personal set of standards which may include such things as caring or fitness or success in business but they also share a general set of objectives as members of a society. Values indicate what people in a given culture prefer as well as what they find important normally right (or wrong). Values may be specific, such as having one's parents and owing a home, or they may be more general, such as health, love and democracy.

Value is a common element of culture and society; they enhance people's behavior and serve as criteria for evaluating the actions of others. The values of culture may change, but most remain relatively stable during any one person's life time. Socially shared, intensely felt values are a fundamental part of people's lives in Tanzania.

Culture is a historic perspective and traditional beliefs and practices that are ongoing over the generations, whereas, society has to do everything with laws, government, constitutions, family, and many things. In short, one has to live a social life considering all these aspects in life. Society can also have many different cultures but one culture is always dominant. Society is the total of all different social groups and their interactions. Culture is the total of beliefs, practices and moral values that are handed down through generations. Highly cultured society has a refined level of intellectual and artistic sensitivity. Culture is reflected in the products, art, music and cuisine of a society. Society is a more abstract concept than culture. Although culture and society have so much in common but they cannot be used interchangeably as evident by the following basis of distinction:

Table 1: Comparison between Culture and Society

	Culture	Society
Meaning (TheFreeDictionary.com)	The totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions, and all other products of human work and thought. These patterns, traits, and products are considered as the expression of a particular period, class, community, or population.	The totality of social relationships among humans. A group of humans broadly distinguished from other groups by mutual interests, participation in characteristic relationships, shared institutions, and a common culture.
Derived from	Latin word 'cultura'	Latin word 'societas'
Sum total	Is the sum total of beliefs, practices and moral values that are ongoing over the generations	Is the sum total of all different social groups and their interactions
Reflected	Products, arts, music and cuisine of a society	Intellectual and artistic sensitivity

Concept	Culture is more real concept than society	Society is more abstract concept than culture
Knowledge	It is a collective body of knowledge, including attitudes, norms, etc.	It is the resultant behavior of the people who know the body of knowledge.
Related to	Culture is related to a person	A person is related to his own society
Represents	A culture represents an individual	A small and a large group of the same culture represents a society

The same kind of relationship exists between Social Intelligence (SQ) and Cultural Intelligence (CQ), i.e., apart from having many commonalities a lot of differences does exist between the two. Thereby, the present study explores the complex relation between SQ and CQ.

Objectives of Study

The primary objective of this study is to examine the relationship between SQ and CQ. The study also helps in determining the level of SQ and CQ among the faculty working in University of Delhi. Based on the above objectives following hypothesis are drawn:

Table 2: Hypotheses

Alternate Hypothesis
• There exists positive linear correlation between social intelligence and cultural intelligence of the commerce faculty in University of Delhi.
• There is significant difference in SQ of males and females.
• There is significant difference in CQ of males and females.
• There is significant difference in SQ of individuals from different age categories.
• There is significant difference in CQ of individuals from different age categories.

Limitations of the Study

The study has the following limitations:

- It is based on a small sample size of seventy four commerce faculties working in University of Delhi.
- Since the questionnaire was administered electronically, no personal contact was made with the respondents. Thus, data may suffer from response bias.
- Many dimensions of SQ and CQ were not tested due to paucity of time, only well-accepted dimensions were included in the study.

Review of Existing Literature

It was only during mid 2008 that academicians started exploring SQ (Weis, 2008) whereas the term was introduced by Thorndike in 1920. Since then many academicians have contributed towards defining SQ. There have been two main components in the definitions of SQ, one being the cognitive (intellectual capacity) and other being the behavioural component. For the purpose of the present study, SQ is defined as follows:

- "Social Intelligence means having knowledge of and competencies to appropriately perceive, reason and memorise others behaviour and then behaving accordingly to achieve social goals".
- During the last few years, study on cross-cultural competencies has become more sophisticated as the concept of CQ gained increased interest among management researchers. Although the term was first coined by Earley and Angust, (2003) in their book, but it was popularized by Thomas and Inkson (2004). They and others have tried to explain CQ from different perspective. Few of the selected definitions are listed down. However, for the present study, the operational definition is:
 - "CQ is competency to acquire and apply knowledge of different cultures and sub-cultures in social interactions".
 - CQ was termed as Cross-Cultural Social Intelligence (CCSI) by Ascalon, Schleicher and Born (2006) termed. It is represented as an extension of SQ and is defined as *'the ability to*

understand the feelings, thoughts, and behavior of persons, including oneself, in interpersonal situations and to act appropriately upon that understanding' (Marlowe, 1986). It was discussed that enhanced CCSI must lead to increased:

- * knowledge of different cultures,
- * self-efficacy for dealing with persons from different cultures,
- * awareness of the role of empathy and non-ethnocentrism in multicultural encounters,
- * communication and interpersonal skills,
- * collaboration in intercultural teams,
- * job satisfaction, and
- * Likelihood of completing expatriate assignments.

In the literature based study, Crowne (2009) examined the relation among SQ, CQ and EQ. The major conclusion of this study was that EQ and CQ both are subsets of SQ. For CQ the following reasoning was provided, '*It appears the skills of social awareness in a situation will also allow one to pick up cultural cues in the situation, thus the same perceptual skills aids one in both SQ and CQ*'. It was concluded that people with high CQ also have high SQ because people who are able to interact effectively with other cultures is more likely to be effective at interacting in their own culture. Thus, the benefits of SQ and CQ to an individual's occupational success are commutated. This provides synergy to one's success.

Research Design

• Variable Selection

In order to measure SQ, an adapted version of Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS) was used. To develop and validate a scale to measure SQ, Silvera, Martinussen and Dahl (2001), together conducted three studies. First study was conducted to develop a mutually agreed-upon definition of SQ by professional psychologists'. Second study was conducted to create a pool of SQ items that were to be tested. Lastly, a three-factor, twenty-one item scale was developed. Three-factors included:

- Processing of social information
- Social skills
- Social awareness

This scale was called Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS), comprising of 22-items and its stability was confirmed by various researchers. The study by Livermore (2009) became the basis for constructing the scale for measuring CQ. He gave four CQ capabilities that stem from the intelligence-based approach to intercultural adjustment and performance:

- CQ-Motivation is a person's interest and confidence in performing effectively in culturally diverse settings. It includes intrinsic as well as extrinsic interest;
- CQ-Knowledge is a person's knowledge about cultural similarities and differences. It includes interpersonal knowledge, business knowledge and socio-linguistics knowledge;
- CQ-Strategy is how a person interprets culturally diverse experiences. It includes awareness, planning and checking; and
- CQ-Action is a person's capability to adapt verbal and nonverbal behaviour to make it appropriate to diverse cultures. It involves having a flexible range of behavioural responses that is suitable for a variety of situations.

A 27-items scale was developed to measure CQ keeping in mind their operational definitions. A final draft of 55-items (6-Demographics, 22-SQ and 27-CQ) was emailed to 10 individuals for face validating the questionnaire.

Sample

The study is based on the higher education sector mainly because lecturers in their daily life have to deal with classes of 40 to 50 students which are highly diversified. Commerce faculty of University of Delhi was taken as the population of study. The method adopted for selecting a representative sample is randomizing convenience sampling. In randomizing convenience sampling available database of 311 commerce faculties of University of Delhi was taken and through RANDOM function of MS Excel the final sample of 160 was selected. The e-questionnaire was sent to targeted respondents through E-mail. These individuals were contacted for a month of June 2015. A series of reminder emails were sent to them once a week. Only 77 responses were received out of 160, response rate being 48.125%. Further,

3 responses were not included in study due to huge data loading in those responses. Finally, the study is based on a sample of 74 responses. The characteristics of the sample are extracted from Table 3. It is important to list down the characteristics of the sample as the results of the study are valid for any sample having similar size and characteristics. While results can be improved by increasing the sample size but changes in the characteristics of the sample may only distort the results.

Table 3: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Respondent's Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	17	23.0
Female	57	77.0
Total	74	100.0
Age		
20-24	25	33.8
25-44	45	60.8
45-64	4	5.4
Total	74	100.0
Experience		
0-2 years	42	56.8
2-5 years	14	18.9
5-10 years	10	13.5
10 years and more	8	10.8
Total	74	100.0
Designation		
Associate Professor	4	5.4
Assistant Professor	20	27.0
Assistant Professor (Ad hoc)	41	55.4
Guest Lecturer	7	9.5
Other	2	2.7
Total	74	100.0

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Data collected was analysed through a series of validated tools and procedures. The critical step involved in the development of a measurement scale is the assessment of the reliability of constructs. The factor analysis of the collected data was conducted next. The results of the analysis are described in the following sub-sections.

Reliability Assessment

The reliability of items was assessed by computing the coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951), that measures the internal consistency of the items. For a measure to be acceptable, coefficient alpha should be above 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978). Owing to multidimensionality of SQ and CQ construct, coefficient alpha was computed separately for all the dimensions identified. In the present study, all alpha coefficients ranged from 0.638 (close to the cut-off value of 0.70) to 0.854, indicating good consistency among the items within each dimension. The overall alpha coefficient is 0.894. The results are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Factor Extraction Results of Items

S. No.	Name of Dimension	Factor Loadings	Cronbach's Alpha	KMO	AVE
I	Social Skills		0.812	0.786	0.530
	1. Are you good at entering new situations and meeting people for the first time?	0.871			
	2. Do you fit easily in social situations?	0.861			
	3. Are you a socially active person?	0.709			
	4. Do you frequently face problems finding good conversation topics?	0.640			
	5. Are you good at getting on good terms with new people?	0.560			
II	Social Awareness		0.789	0.777	0.509
	1. Do you often get surprised by others' reaction to what you do?	0.860			
	2. Do others get angry with you for unknown reasons?	0.701			

	3. Do people often get angry or irritated with you when you say what you think?	0.651			
	4. Do you find people unpredictable?	0.642			
III	Processing of Social Information				
	1. Can you understand other's wishes?	0.775	0.638	0.617	0.549
	2. Can you understand other people's feelings?	0.749			
	3. Are you aware of how your actions will make others feel?	0.698			
IV	CQ-Action				
	1. Do you apply cultural knowledge while interacting?	0.792	0.789	0.861	0.447
	2. Do you change your words according to the culture of person you are interacting with?	0.757			
	3. Do you think about the conversation, before initiating the conversation with people from different backgrounds?	0.752			
	4. Are you always conscious about how you interact with people from different cultures?	0.712			
	5. Later, do you think about how you interacted with others from different cultures?	0.680			
	6. Do you change your body language and gestures according to the culture of person you are interacting with?	0.648			
	7. Do you always prepare yourself to interact in cross cultural situations?	0.557			
	8. Is it hard for you to interpret different cultures?	0.448			
V	CQ Motivation				
	1. Do you want to be friends with people from different cultures?	0.916	0.854	0.793	0.531
	2. Do you enjoy talking to people from different cultures?	0.860			
	3. Do you initiate conversation with people from different cultures?	0.723			
	4. Is it fun to interact with people from different cultures?	0.656			
	5. Is it important for you to have healthy relations with people from different cultures?	0.647			
	6. Do you think you get to learn a lot from people with different cultures?	0.570			
VI	CQ-Knowledge				
	1. Are you aware of the rules and regulations of other cultures?	0.816	0.751	0.801	0.425
	2. Are you aware of non-verbal expressions of different cultures?	0.781			
	3. Are you aware of customs of different cultures?	0.655			
	4. Do you have good command over different languages?	0.580			
	5. Have you ever unintentionally hurt anyone from different cultural background?	0.428			

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Appropriateness of factor analysis needs to be assessed. This can be done by examining sampling adequacy through Kaiser- Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistic. KMO value greater than 0.6 is considered adequate (Kaiser and Rice, 1974).

Table 5: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.718
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1368.984
	Df	528
	Sig.	.000

From the table 5, it can be seen that KMO value is acceptable; Bratlett test results also show that the values are significant and thus acceptable. The items in the respective category were individually subjected to PCA with varimax rotation and Kaiser Normalization using SPSS 20.0. The items having factor loadings less than 0.4 were eliminated. Finally, six factors (three for SQ and three for CQ) comprising thirty-one items, all having eigen values of unity and above were extracted and the results are shown in Table 6. Further, in order to assess the appropriateness of the data for factor analysis, the communalities derived from the factor analysis were reviewed. These were all relatively large (greater than 0.5), suggesting that the data set is appropriate (Stewart, 1981). The individual dimensions of the proposed instrument explained total variance exceeding 50.272 per cent, suggesting the appropriateness of the process.

H_a : There exists no linear correlation between social intelligence and cultural intelligence of the commerce faculty in University of Delhi.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between SQ and CQ. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient is a measure of the strength of the linear relationship between two variables. Pearson's *r* can range from -1 to 1. An *r* of -1 indicates a perfect negative linear relationship between variables, an *r* of 0 indicates no linear relationship between variables, and an *r* of 1 indicates a perfect positive linear relationship between variables. From the table 7, there was a positive correlation between the two variables, SQ and CQ with *r* = 0.526, *n* = 74, *p* = 0.000. Overall, there was a moderate, positive correlation between SQ and CQ. Increases in CQ were correlated with increases in SQ.

Table 7: Correlations

		sq1	sq2	sq3	Sq
cq1	Pearson Correlation	.344**	.174	.208	.328**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.139	.076	.004
	N	74	74	74	74
cq2	Pearson Correlation	.540**	.209	.153	.418**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.074	.193	.000
	N	74	74	74	74
cq3	Pearson Correlation	.522**	.417**	.346**	.588**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.003	.000
	N	74	74	74	74
cq	Pearson Correlation	.568**	.308**	.274*	.526**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.008	.018	.000
	N	74	74	74	74

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Before fitting a regression line, it was made sure that the assumptions of regression are satisfied by the data. Linearity, normality of residuals and homogeneity of residuals were established. The next step in regression is to check the model fit. Model fit means testing the null hypothesis that $R^2 = 0$. R^2 is the square of the correlation between the predicted and the observed values of the dependent variable. Hence, it is a measure of the proportion of variance in the dependent variable explained by the predicted values (i.e., the model). With only a single independent variable, R^2 equals the square of the ordinary Pearson product-moment correlation between SQ and CQ. For the available data, the null hypothesis was rejected and therefore the use of model is appropriate, since it accounts for significantly more variance in the criterion variable than would be expected by chance. The model accounts for about 28% of SQ variance. The "adjusted R^2 " is intended to "control for" overestimates of the population R^2 resulting from small samples, high collinearity or small subject/variable ratios. Its perceived utility varies greatly across research areas and time. Regression can capitalize on chance peculiarities in the data, so R^2 is, on average, an upwardly biased estimate of the population parameter. Hence, an adjusted R^2 is also printed. The actual degree to which R^2 is biased is generally unknown, so the adjustment is only approximate. The difference between R^2 and adjusted R^2 is a function of sample size and the number of independent variables in the model. Small samples and large numbers of independent variables will give greater discrepancies between R^2 and adjusted R^2 than large sample with few independent variables. R^2 is reported more often than adjusted R^2 . Also, the "Std. Error of the Estimate" is the standard deviation of the residuals. As R^2 increases the Std. Error of the Estimate will decrease i.e., better fit, less estimation error. On average, our estimates of SQ with this model will be wrong by .43 – not a trivial amount given the scale of SQ.

Table 8: Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.526a	.277	.267	.43457

a. Predictors: (Constant), cq

b. Dependent Variable: sq

Table 9: ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	5.214	1	5.214	27.607	.000b
	Residual	13.597	72	.189		
	Total	18.811	73			

a. Dependent Variable: sq

b. Predictors: (Constant), cq

Table 10: Coefficients^a

Model		Un Standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.816	.313		5.802	.000
	Cq	.499	.095	.526	5.254	.000

a. Dependent Variable: sq

The mathematical model behind simple regression fits a straight line through the data points. For the present case, the SQ equation behind the regression is

$$\hat{S}Q = \alpha + \beta \cdot CQ$$

Here, the hat (^) over SQ denotes that this is the predicted value of SQ. Observed values of SQ, however, will not always be equal to their predicted values. Hence, simple regression adds an error term when it writes the equation for observed values of the dependent variable:

$$\hat{S}Q = \alpha + \beta \cdot CQ + E$$

Regression procedures obtain estimates of the population parameters α and β by minimizing the sum of squared error, the summation being taken over all observations in the data set.

The estimate of the intercept (i.e., the estimate of α) is 1.816. If the relationship between SQ and CQ is linear, then the predicted SQ is very nominal. The slope of the regression line (i.e., the estimate of parameter β) is 0.499. The plus sign implies a positive or direct relationship-increasing CQ in higher SQ. The value of the estimate implies that a one-score increase in CQ is associated with a .499 increment in SQ. Taking the estimates of α and β and placing them into equation gives:

$$\hat{S}Q = 1.816 + 0.499 CQ + E$$

This equation is sometimes referred to as the equation of best fit because the estimates are based on minimizing the sum of squared error. The standard error for this parameter estimate is an estimated standard error, so the appropriate test statistic for the hypothesis that $\beta = 0$ is the t statistic. The value here (5.254) is large and its associated p value (.000) is less than .05. Hence, we would conclude that there is evidence for a change in SQ with CQ.

H_b : There is no significant difference in SQ of males and females.

An independent sample's T-test was conducted to compare mean SQ of males and females. Levene's test for homogeneity of variances shows a significance level of 0.932 (refer to Table 11) which is greater than 0.05 and thus we accept the assumption of equal variances which is a prerequisite for t-test. The significance level of t-statistic is 0.017 which is lower than 0.05 and thus there is significant statistical evidence to reject null hypothesis. From Table 9 it can be observed that there is although a meagre difference in mean SQ of male and female but this difference is significant.

H_c : There is no significant difference in CQ of males and females.

A similar test was conducted to compare mean CQ of males and females. Levene's test for homogeneity of variances shows a significance level of 0.202 (refer to Table 11) which is greater than 0.05 and thus we accept the assumption of equal variances which is a prerequisite for t-test. The significance level of t-statistic is 0.204 which is greater than 0.05 and thus there is no significant statistical evidence to reject null hypothesis. From Table 9 it can be observed that there is a meagre difference in mean SQ of male and female which has been proven to be non-significant.

Table 11: Gender Comparison

Group Statistics					
Gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Sq	Male	17	3.6938	.50938	.12354
	Female	57	3.3623	.48588	.06436
Cq	Male	17	3.3974	.68644	.16649
	Female	57	3.2086	.48054	.06365

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Sq	Equal variances assumed	.007	.932	2.442	72	.017	.33151	.13574	.06092	.60210
Cq	Equal variances assumed	1.657	.202	1.281	72	.204	.18879	.14735	-.10495	.48253

H_d : There is no significant difference in SQ of individuals from different age categories.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of age on SQ. Subjects were divided into three groups according to their age (Group 1: 21-24; Group 2: 24-44; Group 3: 45-60). There was no statistically significant difference at the $p > .05$ level in scores for the four age groups [$F(2, 71) = .558, p = .575$] (refer to Table 12). It is because the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was quite small.

H_e : There is no significant difference in CQ of individuals from different age categories.

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of age on CQ. Subjects were divided into three groups according to their age (Group 1: 21-24; Group 2: 24-44; Group 3: 45-60). There was no statistically significant difference at the $p > .05$ level in scores for the four age groups [$F(2, 71) = .219, p = .804$] (refer to Table 12). It is because the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was quite small.

Table 12: Age Comparison

Descriptives										
		N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min.	Max.	Between-Component Variance
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
sq	21-24	25	3.3867	.60553	.12111	3.1367	3.6366	2.31	4.89	-.00607
	24-44	45	3.4463	.46840	.06982	3.3056	3.5870	2.53	4.54	
	45-60	4	3.6736	.14861	.07431	3.4371	3.9101	3.49	3.85	
	Total Model	74	3.4384	.50763	.05901	3.3208	3.5560	2.31	4.89	
	Fixed Effects			.51073	.05937	3.3201	3.5568			
	Random Effects			.05937 ^a	3.1830 ^a	3.6939 ^a				
cq	21-24	25	3.2879	.57526	.11505	3.0504	3.5253	1.74	4.31	-.01206
	24-44	45	3.2457	.53853	.08028	3.0839	3.4075	1.34	4.20	
	45-60	4	3.0984	.18826	.09413	2.7988	3.3980	2.91	3.35	
	Total Model	74	3.2520	.53555	.06226	3.1279	3.3761	1.34	4.31	
	Fixed Effects			.54137	.06293	3.1265	3.3775			
	Random Effects			.06293 ^a	2.9812 ^a	3.5228 ^a				

a. Warning: Between-component variance is negative. It was replaced by 0.0 in computing this random effects measure

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
sq	2.151	2	71	.124
cq	1.245	2	71	.294

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
sq	Between Groups	.291	2	.146	.558	.575
	Within Groups	18.520	71	.261		
	Total	18.811	73			
cq	Between Groups	.128	2	.064	.219	.804
	Within Groups	20.809	71	.293		
	Total	20.938	73			

Results and Findings

- While developing the scale for measuring SQ, it was found that although all three dimensions of TSIS i.e., Processing of social information, Social skills and Social awareness are valid for the study but not all the items. Out of 21-items only 12-items were taken for analysis categorized under three variables.
- While developing the scale for measuring CQ, it was found that although the literature review presents us with four dimensions of CQ i.e., CQ-Motivation, CQ-Action, CQ-Strategy and CQ-Knowledge, but all these dimensions are not statistically significant. Therefore, CQ-Strategy was dropped from the scale to make it statistically significant.
- The correlation of CQ1 with SQ2 and SQ3 were noted to be insignificant as their p-value is greater than 0.05. Similarly, the correlation of CQ2 with SQ2 and SQ3 were noted to be insignificant as their p-value is greater than 0.05. Insignificance implies that although there is presence of a certain correlation between the variables in the sample but the same amount of correlation may not be present in the population. All other correlation coefficients were proved to be significant at their p-value was greater than 0.05.
- There lies a positive correlation of 52.6% between SQ and CQ. This value indicates that there is moderate association between the two variables. As CQ of an individual increases, SQ also increases.
- The developed regression equation is valid as all its parameters are statistically significant. Thereby, we can assess that about 26.7% of variance in SQ is explained by CQ. Thus, we have sufficient evident to reject the null hypothesis i.e., there exists no linear correlation between SQ and CQ of the commerce faculty in University of Delhi. Hence, it is concluded that there exists positive linear correlation between social intelligence and cultural intelligence of the commerce faculty in University of Delhi.
- On one hand, male faculty possess more SQ than female faculty although the teaching profession is dominated by females. On the other hand, male faculty possess as much CQ as female faculty.
- There is no impact of different age categories on SQ and CQ. Hence, it can be inferred that once an individual gains SQ and CQ, it hardly enhances or denounces over the passage of time.

Conclusion

The main objective of this study is to examine the relationship between SQ and CQ. It is well evident from the study that CQ although small in proportion but definitely contributes to SQ. So, if the organisations are planning to develop a SQ intervention for its employees it is suggested to include at least few dimensions of CQ in intervention objectives and then design the plan around those objectives. By including high CQ individuals in the work teams, the benefits of SQ would be strengthened. Thus, organizations need to assess the CQ of the individuals while hiring them.

References

- ✧ Ascalon, M. E., Schleicher, D. J. & Born, M. P. (2006). *Cross-cultural social intelligence: An assessment for employees working in cross-national contexts* (Working Paper No. 42). Retrieved on January 16, 2015 from Purdue University <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1041&context=ciberwp>
- ✧ Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 22 (3), 297-334.
- ✧ Crowne, K. A. (2009). The Relationships among Social Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence and Cultural Intelligence. *Organization Management Journal*, 6 (3), 148-163.
- ✧ Earley, P.C. & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- ✧ Kaiser, H.F. and Rice, J. (1974), "Little Jiffy, Mark IV," *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 34, 111 -117.
- ✧ Livermore, D. (2009). *Leading with Cultural Intelligence*. New York: AMACOM.
- ✧ Marlowe, H. A. (1986). Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78, 52-58.
- ✧ Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- ✧ Silvera, D., Martinussen, M. & Dahl, T.I. (2001). The Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale: A Self-Report Measure of Social Intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 313-319.
- ✧ Thomas, D. C. & Inkson, K. (2004). *Cultural Intelligence: People Skills for Global Business*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- ✧ Weis, S. (2008). *Theory and measurement of social intelligence as a cognitive performance construct* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Magdeburg). Retrieved on January 15, 2015 from <http://diglib.unimagdeburg.de/Dissertationen/2008/susweis.pdf>