

# Assessing Cultural Intelligence among Tribal and Non-tribal Adolescents



**Rita Rani Talukdar**

Associate Professor and HOD,  
Department of Psychology,  
Gauhati University,  
Guwahati



**Susmita Roy Choudhury Deka**

Research Scholar,  
Department of Psychology,  
Gauhati University  
Guwahati

## Abstract

Cultural Intelligence is a new domain of intelligence which is closely related to diverse work environments. Cultural intelligence is a term used in business, education, government and academic research. Cultural intelligence can be understood as the capacity to relate or work effectively across cultures. It allows people to find out how others think and how they respond to behavioural patterns. It thus reduces intercultural barriers and enables people to manage cultural diversity. The aim of this study is to assess the level of cultural intelligence among tribal and non-tribal adolescence. The total sample consists of 200 adolescence (100 tribals,100 non-tribals) from Guwahati city of Assam. The findings revealed that the level of cultural intelligence of adolescent girls of both tribal and non-tribal groups was found to be higher than adolescent boys of both the groups. While among tribal and non-tribal adolescents of both the genders, non-tribal adolescents were found to possess higher cultural intelligence than tribal adolescents. This indicates that the environment should create positive atmosphere to make the adolescents culturally intelligent.

**Keywords:** Cultural Intelligence, Tribal, Adolescents, Cultural Diversity.

## Introduction

Cultural Intelligence is a new domain of intelligence which is closely related to diverse work environments. Cultural Intelligence is a term used in business, education, government and academic research. Cultural Intelligence can be understood as the capacity to relate or work effectively across cultures. Cultural intelligence allows people to find out how others think and how they respond to behavioral patterns. It thus reduces intercultural barriers and enables people to manage cultural diversity (Abzari and Khari, 2010).

Cultural intelligence is all about understanding people on the inside and outside, both theoretically and practically. It also provides us with a framework and a language to understand the differences and capitalize on them, not just tolerate or ignore them( Plum E, Achen B, Draeby I and Jensen I, 2007). An individual with a high cultural intelligence is able to learn in new cultural environments and enjoys encountering new cultures (Deng and Gibson, 2008)

Cultural Intelligence is the capability to relate and work effectively in culturally diverse situations. Going beyond existing notions of cultural sensitivity and awareness, it is important to identify the recurring capabilities of individuals who can successfully and respectfully accomplish their objectives, whatever the cultural context. Awareness is the first step, but it's not enough. A culturally intelligent individual is not only aware but can also effectively work and relate with people and projects across different cultural contexts

## Rationale of The Study

For adolescents, at higher educational level, cultural intelligence is important to perform better in today's conceptual world. The concept of cultural intelligence is subjective and open to explore new dimensions. Cultural intelligence help them to understand different cultures and adapt with the various cultures.A number of studies have been conducted on cross cultural interactions and behavior, but very few studies are conducted on cultural Intelligence especially in this North Eastern state of India.

Cultural intelligence can be understood as the capacity to relate or work effectively across cultures. It allows people to find out how others think and how they respond to behavioural patterns. Thus this study will help to understand the concept of cultural Intelligence and also help to reduce intercultural barriers and enable people to manage cultural diversity.

**Operational Definition****Cultural Intelligence**

Cultural Intelligence can be defined as an analysis of social, political, economic and other demographic information that provides understanding of people's Psychology, beliefs and behaviours. It is the capacity to relate with people of different cultures and work effectively across cultures.

The cultural intelligence scale consists of four dimensions i.e. Metacognition, Cognitive component, Motivational and Behavioural.

**Review of Literature**

Navarrete et al (2007) carried out a study on cultural and achievement motivation in Latino and Anglo American high school from the high school districts in California. Data were collected by administering culture value annexation and attribution emotion scale to the sample and grade point average was taken as academic achievement measures of the students. Socio-economic status and education of the parents had been found to influence academic achievement of the students of both the cultures.

Earley and Ang (2003) were among the first scholars to propose the term CQ. Earley and Ang developed the term CQ based on the Nature Intelligence theory proposed by Strenberg and Determan (1986). There is some agreement in the meaning of CQ among scholars who conduct research in cross cultural studies. Earley and Ang (2003) described CQ as "a person's capability to adopt effectively to new cultural contexts"

Nelson and Narens (1995, P.16) explained "judgment of learning" or "feeling of knowing" a concept based on metacognition and suggested that a person's metacognitive accuracy varies across time and task, unlike a person's ability in memory that is stable across time and task. This means that individual's metacognitive accuracy for the one task cannot be generalized to metacognitive accuracy for another task.

Ang et al (2007) further clarified that the four dimension of CQ are qualitatively different aspects of the overall capability to function effectively in culturally diverse settings. This suggests that CQ is best described as an aggregate multidimensional construct with two distinguishing features: (a) the four dimensions exist at the same level of conceptualization as the overall construct, and (b) the dimensions make up the overall construct (Law, Wong Mobley 1998). In other words, metacognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioural CQ are different types of capabilities that together form the overall CQ construct.

Elizabeth (2014) demonstrated that an individual becomes more culturally sensitive through increasing mindfulness in pre departure sessions for introducing cultural competence model.

**Methodology:****Nature of the study**

The nature of the study is Quantitative Research. Quantitative research is the systematic empirical investigation of observable phenomena via statistical, mathematical or computational techniques. The objective of this quantitative research is to

develop and employ mathematical models, theories and hypotheses pertaining to phenomena.

**Objectives of The Study**

1. To assess the cultural intelligence among tribal and non-tribal adolescents.
2. To assess the difference in cultural intelligence among boys and girls.

**Hypotheses**

1. There will be no significant difference in cultural intelligence between tribal and non-tribal adolescents.
2. There will be no significant difference in cultural intelligence between boys and girls.

**Variables under Study****Independent Variable**

Cultural Intelligence.

**Dependent Variables**

Tribal and non-tribal adolescents.

**Sample**

A total number of 200 adolescents were taken for this study. Equal number of samples were taken from both the sexes and tribal and non-tribal for the study. Sample were collected from different private Educational institutions situated at Guwahati city by using purposive random sampling. Their age ranges from 12 to 19 years. Their socio-economic status and educational level are more or less similar which eventually helps in maintaining the homogeneity of sample.

**Duration of the Study**

The study was conducted in Guwahati city, the duration of the study was two years.

**Procedure of Test Administration**

Before administering the tests, the Researcher visited Educational Institutions according to the purpose of the study and official permission was taken for collecting data. The Principal was approached. The Researcher demonstrated the purpose of the study, about the tests and their administering procedure.

**Ethical Consideration**

Before administering the tests, the subjects were informed clearly about the purpose of the research. Then they were informed about the aim of the tests. Then they were asked if they were interested. Those who showed interest they were instructed to go ahead.

**Psychological Tools used for the study****Cultural Intelligence Scale**

This scale was developed by Soon Ang, Linn Van Dyne<sup>2</sup>, Christine Koh, K.Yee Ng, Klaus J. Templer<sup>1</sup>, Chery Tay and N.Anand Chandrasekhar. This scale measure cultural intelligence. It consist of 20 items pertaining to four CQ dimension i.e. Metacognitive, Cognitive Component, Motivational and Behavioral. Against each statement five(5) options are there such as Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree.

**Interview Schedule**

A semi structured Interview schedule was prepared by the Researcher to collect demographic information and other related data.

**Research Design**

Sex	Tribal	Non-Tribal	Total
Male	50	50	100
Female	50	50	100
Total	100	100	200

Group = Tribal + Non-Tribal

Sex=Male+Female

2x2 Factorial design will be used.

**Analysis**

A total of 200 samples were collected for this study. Among them 100 participants were tribal adolescents and 100 were non-tribal adolescents. Out of them 50 participants were Boys and 50 were girls. The data was analysed by using SPSS.

**Table 1: Mean and SD Value of Total Sample on Cultural Intelligence Scale**

CI dimensions	Total		Gender				Group			
	Mean	SD	Boys		Girls		Tribal		Non tribal	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
<b>Total CI</b>	<b>64.91</b>	<b>6.26</b>	<b>63.74</b>	<b>5.66</b>	<b>66.08</b>	<b>6.64</b>	<b>64.44</b>	<b>6.59</b>	<b>65.38</b>	<b>5.91</b>
MC	14.13	2.12	13.54	2.05	14.72	2.03	13.94	2.34	14.32	1.86
CC	16.96	2.92	17.07	2.94	16.84	2.91	16.76	3.22	17.15	2.59
MV	17.53	2.96	16.98	2.77	18.08	3.06	17.65	2.81	17.41	3.12
BH	16.30	2.42	16.15	1.78	16.44	2.92	16.09	2.11	16.50	2.69

The mean and SD score of total sample on Cultural Intelligence scale was found to be 64.91 and 6.26 respectively. Among the Boys, the mean score on Cultural Intelligence scale was found to be 63.74 which was found to be lower than the Girls i.e. 66.08. The SD of Boys and Girls is found to be 5.66 and 6.64

respectively. Among Tribal adolescents, the mean score on Cultural Intelligence scale was found to be 64.44 which was found to be lower than the Non-Tribal adolescents i.e. 65.38. The SD of Tribal and Non-tribal was found to be 6.59 and 5.91 respectively.

**Table 2: The difference between Boys and Girls in terms of Cultural Intelligence:(analysis of t value)**

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
MC	Boys	100	13.54	2.057	-4.083	198	.000**
	Girls	100	14.72	2.030			
CC	Boys	100	17.07	2.945	.555	198	.580
	Girls	100	16.84	2.919			
MV	Boys	100	16.98	2.771	-2.661	198	.008
	Girls	100	18.08	3.067			
BH	Boys	100	16.15	1.789	-.845	198	.399
	Girls	100	16.44	2.928			
<b>Tot_CI</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>63.74</b>	<b>5.662</b>	<b>-2.681</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>.008**</b>
	<b>Girls</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>66.08</b>	<b>6.643</b>			

The above table shows the mean, SD and t values of Boys and Girls in terms of scores on Cultural Intelligence scale. The t values have been worked out dimension wise i.e meta cognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioural etc between Boys and Girls. From the table the obtained mean

value of the total sample is 63.74 for boys and 66.08 for girls. The SD is 5.66 for boys and 6.64 for girls. The t value is found to be 2.68 and P value is .008. Hence the difference is found to be significant at 0.01 level.

**Table 3: The difference between Tribal and Non-tribal in terms of Cultural Intelligence :(Analysis of t value)**

	Tribes	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed) (P value)
MC	Tribal	100	13.94	2.348	-1.268	198	.206
	Non-tribal	100	14.32	1.863			
CC	Tribal	100	16.76	3.223	-.942	198	.347
	Non-tribal	100	17.15	2.599			
MV	Tribal	100	17.65	2.815	.571	198	.569
	Non-tribal	100	17.41	3.121			
BH	Tribal	100	16.09	2.118	-1.197	198	.233
	Non-tribal	100	16.50	2.691			
<b>Total CI</b>	<b>Tribal</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>64.44</b>	<b>6.594</b>	<b>-1.061</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>.290</b>
	<b>Non-tribal</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>65.38</b>	<b>5.918</b>			

The above table shows the mean, SD and t values of Tribal and Non tribal adolescents in terms of scores on Cultural Intelligence scale. The t values

have been worked out dimension wise i.e meta cognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioural etc between Tribal and Non tribal adolescents. From the

table the obtained mean value of the total sample is 64.44 for tribal adolescents and 65.38 for non tribal adolescents. The SD is 6.59 for tribal and 5.91 for non tribal adolescents. The t value is found to be 1.06 and P value is .290. Hence the difference is found to be non significant.

#### **Conclusion**

Therefore, in this study, the results show that the mean value of cultural intelligence of adolescent boys was found to be less than the mean value of adolescent girls. Also the mean value of cultural intelligence of non-tribal adolescents was higher than the tribal adolescents. But no significant difference in terms of cultural intelligence has been seen among tribal and non-tribal adolescents. While there is significant difference in terms of cultural intelligence among boys and girls of both the groups (tribals and non-tribals).

#### **Suggetions**

1. Positive environment should be created to make the adolescents culturally intelligent.
2. Awareness needs to be spread about Cultural Intelligence as it allows people to understand how other people think and behave.
3. Developing cultural intelligence reduces intercultural barriers.
4. It also enables people to manage cultural diversity.

#### **References**

1. *Campbell, A., Converse, P.E., & Rodgers, W.L. (1976). The quality of American life. New York: Russell sage Foundation.*
2. *Baron, R.A. Psychology( Fifth Edition, Prentice-Hall, India, 2007)*
3. *Singh, A.K., Tests, Measurements and Research Methods in Behavioural Sciences ( fifth edition, revised print, Bharati Bhawan, New Delhi, 2008).*
4. *Integrating bottom up and top down theories of subjective well-being: The case of health. Journal of personality and Social psychology, 64,646-653.*
5. *Diener, E. (1994). Assessing subjective well-being: Progress and opportunities. Social Indicators Research, 31, 103-157.*
6. *Mangal, S.K., Statistics in Psychology and Education, ( 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Prentice- Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, 2007).*
7. *Psychology, textbook, Class XI(CBSE), published by NCERT.*
8. *Psychology, textbook, Class XII(CBSE), published by NCERT.*
9. *Morgan, C.T., King, R.A., Weisz, J.R. & Schopler, j., Introduction to Psychology (Seventh Edition, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi, 2006).*
10. *Srivastava, D.N., General psychology( Sixth Edition, Vinod Pustak Mandir, Agra, 2008)*