Development and Standardisation of Cultural Intelligence Scale

Shireesh Pal Singh* and Sumit Gangwar**

Abstract

The Cultural Intelligence Scale is a tool that explores how to measure an individual's ability to understand, act, and manage efficiently in culturally diverse settings. The authors of this paper conducted a study to develop a framework for culturally responsive pedagogy. Culturally responsible pedagogy is a pedagogy that reorganises the students' knowledge, backgrounds, language, family structure, and social or cultural differences to acknowledge the psychological fact that all learners learn differently. The first objective for developing a framework of culturally responsive pedagogy was to explore the cultural intelligence of teachers and the patterns of culturally responsive pedagogy adopted by them in culturally diverse schools. For exploring the cultural intelligence of teachers, the Cultural Intelligence Scale was developed and standardised, and the procedure for standardisation is presented in this paper. For the development of the Cultural Intelligence Scale, the primary draft of the scale was prepared by the researchers after studying the material available for the scale in which 69 items were placed under four dimensions. All these items were constructed on Likert's five-point rating scale. The primary draft of the scale was administered to 400 teachers to collect data. After qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the collected data, the final draft of the Cultural Intelligence Scale, consisting of 42 items was prepared after determining the reliability and validity of the scale.

**Professor*, School of Education, Mahatma Gandhi Antarrashtriya Hindi Vishwavidyalaya, Wardha.
***Assistant Professor,* Faculty of Education, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad.

Introduction

Cultural intelligence refers to a person's accomplishment to function efficiently in culturally diverse conditions (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008). Cultural intelligence is culture-free as it is considered as a capability that emphasises a person's potential to be effective across a wide range of intercultural contexts. Earley and Ang (2003) developed the construct of Cultural Intelligence CQ based on the contemporary theories of intelligence (Sternberg, 1986). Defined as an individual's capability to function and manage effectively in culturally diverse settings, CQ is a multidimensional construct targeted at situations involving cross-cultural interactions arising from differences in race, ethnicity, and nationality. Cultural intelligence (CQ) is a relatively new concept, one that explains why certain individuals can adapt to different cultural contexts more efficiently than others. Cultural intelligence is closely related to emotional intelligence and social intelligence as these three are forms of interpersonal intelligence. Emotional intelligence refers more precisely to the ability to deal with emotions of self and other; social intelligence is a larger form of real world intelligence that refers to the ability to understand and manage others. Cultural intelligence is more comprehensive as it includes the ability to understand and manage others and also deal with their emotions efficiently.

The idea that intelligence is entirely dependent on cognitive and/or practical skills is not accurate when it comes to cultural intelligence. It goes one step further by fusing the numerous contributions made thus, far and focusing on communicative abilities as the main axis of learning. Academic intelligence (learned in academic environments), practical intelligence (learned in everyday contexts), and communicative intelligence make up cultural intelligence. All people have the ability to speak and act which is the foundation of communicative intelligence (Habermas, 1981). Through such techniques, which are based on the concept of cultural intelligence, people can solve problems that they are unable to answer on their own using only their academic or practical intelligence. The ability to utilise language to request assistance from others to resolve problems we run across is a component of communicative intelligence (Ramis and Krastina, 2010).

Because of the rise in cultural diversity brought on by globalisation, it is essential to have a thorough understanding of what it means to be interculturally competent. Instead of expecting individuals to fully understand all the values, conventions, and practises of only one particular culture, cultural intelligence encourages people to develop a broad perspective and ways of coping with circumstances that are culturally foreign (Ang et al.,

2012). Having a high level of cultural intelligence means being able to take in a perplexing situation, carefully reflect on what is happening (or not happening), and make appropriate adjustments to understand, relate to, and/or react to what is happening in situations where the perspectives and behaviours of others may seem bizarre or random. Anyone can learn this complex set of skills through guided study and experience over time (Livermore, 2011).

To define intercultural ability, cultural intelligence identifies four capabilities: (i) Cultural intelligence drive is the capacity to adapt one's verbal and non-verbal cultural behaviour to fit a specific context. (ii) Cultural intelligence is the knowledge of how cultures are similar and different. (iii) Cultural intelligence is the ability to make sense of culturally diverse experiences and social situations. (iv) Cultural intelligence action is the capacity to do so. As a result, CQ differs from IQ and EQ in that it highlights a set of skills required for success on both a personal, and professional level in multicultural settings (Roux, Suzuki, Matsuba and Goda, 2020).

Cultural Intelligence: A Multifaceted Construct

Earley and Ang (2003) described cultural intelligence as a complex, comprehensive, multidimensional attribute. Cultural Quotient is a multifaceted construct with four dimensions: metacognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioural. The metacognitive cultural quotient is the consciousness and awareness of other people's cultures during interactions with people from different cultural backgrounds. This is considered the process by which one acquires and understands knowledge of different cultural backgrounds. People with a metacognitive cultural quotient have their own assumptions, reflections, and skills for dealing with diverse cultural situations. The cognitive cultural quotient is the understanding of norms and practices adopted in different cultural settings. This actually includes knowledge of different socio-cultural backgrounds and value patterns within those cultures. Self-efficacy reflects motivational cultural quotient, as in how people are interested in cross-cultural situations, and how capable an individual is of directing their energy and attention towards knowing how to function in different cultural situations. A high motivational CQ reflects a high level of self-efficacy. Lastly, the behavioural cultural quotient refers to the competency to perform suitable behaviours (verbal and non-verbal) when interacting with people of different cultural backgrounds. People with high behavioural CQ behave appropriately in cross-cultural situations because of their excellent communication proficiency which includes using appropriate gestures, tones, words and facial expressions.

Cultural Intelligence Scale

The Cultural Intelligence Scale is a tool that explores how to measure an individual's ability to understand, act, and manage efficiently in culturally diverse settings. To assess the cultural intelligence of teachers, a cultural intelligence scale was developed and standardised. First, the investigator explored the research area. The related reviews found that there are four dimensions of cultural intelligence, as generally stated in the available literature. The initial draft of the Cultural Intelligence Scale was developed and applied to 400 teachers for the purposes of establishing the reliability and validity of the scale. The procedure for establishing reliability and validity has been presented in the following table is given to present the primary draught of the cultural intelligence scale.

This Cultural Intelligence Scale was developed and standardised by the researchers to determine a person's capacity to comprehend, act, and manage effectively in culturally varied environments. The following three steps were taken to complete the construction and standardisation of the scale:

Step 1: Planning and item writing for the scale

Step 2: Qualitative and quantitative evaluation of items

Step 3: Establishment of the reliability and validity of the scale

Step 1: Planning and item writing for the scale

The first step in any scaled construction is planning. In this first step of planning the scale, many decisions related to the scale are taken. For proper planning of the scale, the researchers should keep the following aspects in mind: when and how will the quality be measured by the scale to be constructed? For the scale, the content, objective of measurement, types of items, number of items, time period, and scoring process are ensured (Patel and Singh, 2018). Keeping these things in mind, the researchers can develop a good scale. The following sub-steps have been included in the first stage of construction of the Cultural Intelligence Scale:

1.1 Definition of population and aim of scale

Keeping in view the aim of defining the target group, administering the scale, and the characteristics of the members of the target group, the researchers selected teachers as the measurement population.

1.2 Blue print of the cultural intelligence scale

The blueprint of any scale presents a detailed outline of that scale. By looking at the blueprint of any scale, the purpose of that scale, the items included in it, and the distribution of these items according to its dimensions can be easily

understood. For the purpose of evaluating teachers' abilities for comprehending, responding to, and managing effectively in culturally diverse situations, a primary draught of the cultural intelligence scale was developed. With regard to the overall four dimensions (Gozzoli and Gazzaroli, 2018) based on the nature of cultural intelligence, 69 items (53 positive and 16 negative) were included.

Meta-cognitive: Higher-order cognitive processes that are used to acquire and comprehend cultural knowledge are reflected in metacognition (Flavell, 1979). Planning, monitoring, and updating mental models of cultural norms for nations or groups of people are relevant competencies. High metacognitive individuals are cognizant of other people's cultural preferences before and during contacts; they challenge cultural presumptions, and they modify their mental models both during and after encounters (Brislin et al., 2006; Triandis, 2006).

Cognitive: Cognitive refers to an understanding of customs, traditions, economic, legal, and social structures as well as fundamental cultural value systems that is attained via education and life experiences (Triandis, 1994; Hofstede, 2001). People with excellent

Table 1
Position of Items in the Cultural Intelligence Scale With Respect to Dimensions (Primary Draft)

Dimension	Number of Total Items	Nature of Items	Position of Items in Scale
Meta-Cognitive	11	Positive Items	3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11
		Negative Items	1, 2, 4, 5, 9
Cognitive	15	Positive Items	12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25
		Negative Items	15, 26
Motivational	25	Positive Items	27, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51
		Negative Items	29, 31, 33, 42
Behavioral	18	Positive Items	53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69
		Negative Items	52, 56, 60, 64, 66

cognitive abilities are aware of cultural similarities and distinctions (Brislin et al., 2006).

Motivational: Motivational refers to the capacity to focus attention and effort on understanding and navigating situations that are characterised by cultural differences. Due to their inherent curiosity and self-assurance in their cross-cultural efficacy, people with high motivation focus their attention and energy on cross-cultural settings (Deci and Ryan, 1985; Bandura, 2002).

Behavioral: The capacity to engage with people from diverse cultures while using appropriate verbal and nonverbal cues is reflected in one's behaviour. Therefore, based on cultural norms in certain contexts, appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions must be displayed in addition to cerebral ability for cultural comprehension, and motivation (Hall, 1959). Based on their wide range of verbal (words and tone) and non-verbal (gestures and facial expressions) abilities, people with high behavioural scores demonstrate situationally appropriate behaviours.

Step 2: Qualitative and Quantitative Evaluation of Items

In this step, the researchers made a qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the units included in the scale whose description is as follows:

2.1 Qualitative evaluation of items

The Cultural Intelligence Scale's first draft was distributed to subject experts in psychology and education as well as teachers at various levels of education for critical evaluation. They were asked to provide insightful suggestions for the modification of the scale based on their areas of expertise. This process helped the researchers to rectify the language and other difficulties of the scale. In the evaluation of the scale, it was determined by the subject experts that all the items included in the scale fulfil their respective purposes. Necessary improvements were made in the language of ambiguous items on the scale based on the suggestions of the subject experts.

2.2 Quantitative evaluation of items

The first draft of the Cultural Intelligence Scale was administered to teachers as part of the researchers' quantitative evaluation of the scale's items. The teachers were requested to read the scale carefully and provide their response to each item on the basis of the instructions given on the cover page of the scale. A total of 60 minutes were given to the respondents to respond on the Cultural Intelligence Scale. After the teachers gave responses, the scale was taken back from them and scored with the help of the scoring key. Since all these items were rated on Likert's five-point rating scale, the positive items of the scale were divided into strongly agree, agree, unsure, disagree and strongly disagree responses which were given 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 marks, respectively,

and on the negative items, 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 marks were given respectively. Thus, the range of scores on the scale was between 69 and 345. After the collection of data, the following steps were followed for the quantitative evaluation of the items on the scale:

2.2.1 Examining the adequacy of the sample and the suitability of data

Prior to the extraction of the constructs, there are some tests that must be conducted to examine the adequacy of the sample and the suitability of data for further analysis (Burton and Mazerolle, 2011). Sampling adequacy provides the researcher with information regarding the grouping of survey items. Grouping items into a set of interpretable factors can better explain the constructs under investigation. Measures of sampling adequacy evaluate how strongly an item is correlated with other items in the Exploratory Factor Analysis correlation matrix (Burton and Mazerolle, 2011). The sampling adequacy can be assessed by examining the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test (Kaiser, 1970). KMO is suggested when the cases to variable ratio are less than 1:5. It ranges from 0 to 1, while, according to Anderson et al. (1995), and Tabachnick and Fidell (2001), 0.50 is considered suitable for Factor Analysis. On the other hand, Netemeyer et al. (2003) stated that a KMO correlation above 0.60–0.70 is considered adequate for analysing the EFA output. Bartlett's test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1950) provides a chi-square output that must be significant. It indicates that the matrix is not an identity matrix and accordingly it should be significant ($p<.05$) for factor analysis to be suitable (Anderson et al. 1995, Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). Bartlett's test of sphericity indicates that if the item correlation matrix is not an identity matrix, then the researchers can move forward with the FA (Netemeyer et al., 2003).

From Table 2.0, it is evident that the statistic value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test is 0.904. This value is greater than 0.60, so the sample is considered adequate for analysing the factor analysis output. The statistic value of Bartlett's Test is 6.116, whose probability of significance with

Table 2
Examining the Adequacy of the Sample and the Suitability of Data (KMO and Bartlett's Test)

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.904
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6.116
	df	861
	Sig.	0.000

df (861) is 0.000, which is leser than 0.05, i.e., significant at 0.05a level of significance. The statistic value is significant ($p<0.05$), so the sample is considered adequate for analysing the factor analysis output.

2.2.2 Item Analysis

For assessing the items, the bi-serial correlation was used to sharpen the scale. The responses were collected and scored. Individual item score was correlated with the total score of the scale. Item analysis was done for the 400 response sheets by using Item v/s Whole correlation method. This is the correlation of the item designated with the summated score for all the other items. A rule of thumb is that these values should be at least 0.40 (Gliem and Gliem, 2003). If the correlation between the item and the summated score was 0.40 or greater than 0.40, the item was selected for scale, and if the correlation between the item and the summated score was lesser than 0.40, the item was deleted from the scale, Then, 'r' was calculated by correlating the individual item and the corresponding component score. It was found that 46 items out of the total 69 items selected for further analysis had significant correlations with the total score of the scale, except 23 items which had no significant correlation with the total score of the scale. The correlation table is given below:

Table 3
Item Analysis: R-values of Each Item with the Total Score of the Scale and Decision About the Selection of the Item

S. No.	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Item Decision	S. No.	Corrected Item-total Correlation	Item Decision
1.	0.462	Selected	36.	0.641	Selected
2.	0.509	Selected	37.	0.532	Selected
3.	0.530	Selected	38.	0.233	Deleted
4.	0.522	Selected	39.	0.110	Deleted
5.	0.023	Deleted	40.	0.584	Selected
6.	0.522	Selected	41.	0.562	Selected
7.	0.522	Selected	42.	0.613	Selected
8.	0.424	Selected	43.	0.632	Selected
9.	0.122	Deleted	44.	0.253	Deleted
10.	0.518	Selected	45.	0.425	Selected
11.	0.530	Selected	46.	0.668	Selected
12.	0.581	Selected	47.	0.665	Selected
13.	0.595	Selected	48.	0.154	Deleted

14.	0.530	Selected	49.	0.192	Deleted
15.	−0.178	Deleted	50.	0.136	Deleted
16.	0.628	Selected	51.	0.501	Selected
17.	0.621	Selected	52.	0.136	Deleted
18.	0.424	Selected	53.	0.469	Selected
19.	0.430	Selected	54.	0.420	Selected
20.	0.522	Selected	55.	0.462	Selected
21.	0.485	Selected	56.	0.166	Deleted
22.	0.276	Deleted	57.	0.538	Selected
23.	0.634	Selected	58.	0.563	Selected
24.	0.207	Deleted	59.	0.632	Selected
25.	0.415	Selected	60.	0.169	Deleted
26.	0.086	Deleted	61.	0.460	Selected
27.	0.646	Selected	62.	0.411	Selected
28.	0.435	Selected	63.	0.258	Deleted
29.	0.164	Deleted	64.	0.297	Deleted
30.	0.440	Selected	65.	0.480	Selected
31.	0.125	Deleted	66.	−0.086	Deleted
32.	0.471	Selected	67.	0.590	Selected
33.	0.003	Deleted	68.	0.533	Selected
34.	0.211	Deleted	69.	0.599	Selected
35.	0.226	Deleted	Diagonally Darker Items Not Selected		

After the item analysis, 46 items remained. For assessing the correlation of each item with their dimension, the bi-serial correlation was used. Individual item score was correlated with the total score of each dimension. A rule of thumb is that these values should be at least 0.40 (Gliem and Gliem, 2003). If the correlation between the item and the summated score was 0.40 or greater than 0.40, the item was selected for scale, and if the correlation between the item and the summated score was lesser than 0.40, the item was deleted from the scale. Then 'r' was calculated by correlating the individual item and the corresponding dimension score. It was found that out of the total 46 items, there were 42 items that had significant correlations with the total score of the scale, except 4 items that had no significant correlation with their respective dimension. The correlation table is given below:

Table 4
The R-value of Each Item with their Dimension and Decision About the Selection of Item

Dimension	Item No.	Correlation	Decision
Meta-cognitive	1.	0.449	Selected
	2.	0.495	Selected
	3.	0.481	Selected
	4.	0.054	Deleted
	5.	0.416	Selected
	6.	0.541	Selected
	7.	0.460	Selected
	8.	0.479	Selected
	9.	0.577	Selected
Cognitive	10.	0.657	Selected
	11.	0.554	Selected
	12.	0.610	Selected
	13.	0.413	Selected
	14.	0.436	Selected
	15.	0.644	Selected
	16.	0.625	Selected
	17.	0.643	Selected
	18.	0.648	Selected
	19.	0.559	Selected
	20.	0.549	Selected
Motivational	21.	0.640	Selected
	22.	0.537	Selected
	23.	0.554	Selected
	24.	0.592	Selected
	25.	0.712	Selected
	26.	0.659	Selected
	27.	0.639	Selected
	28.	0.640	Selected
	29.	0.280	Deleted
	30.	0.316	Deleted
	31.	0.525	Selected
	32.	0.735	Selected

	33.	0.708	Selected
	34.	0.638	Selected
Behavioural	35.	0.529	Selected
	36.	0.497	Selected
	37.	0.547	Selected
	38.	0.676	Selected
	39.	0.654	Selected
	40.	0.683	Selected
	41.	0.480	Selected
	42.	0.597	Selected
	43.	0.596	Selected
	44.	0.476	Selected
	45.	0.348	Deleted
	46.	0.638	Selected

After assessing items correction with scale and with dimension, it is found that only 42 items have correlation value similar or greater than 0.40. The following Table 5.0 shows dimension-wise distribution of the final draft of cultural intelligence scale.

Table 5
Final Draft of Cultural Intelligence Scale

Dimension	Number of Total Items	Nature of Items	Position of Items in Scale
Meta-cognitive	8	Positive Items	3, 6, 7, 8, 10,11
		Negative Items	1, 2
Cognitive	11	Positive Items	12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25
		Negative Items	……
Motivational	12	Positive Items	27, 28, 30, 32, 36, 37, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47, 51
		Negative Items	……
Behavioural	11	Positive Items	53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 65, 67, 69
		Negative Items	……

Step 3: Establishment of the Validity, Reliability and Discrimination Power of the Scale

The following sub-steps were followed to establish the validity and reliability of Cultural Intelligence Scale:

3.1 Validity of the Cultural Intelligence Scale

Test validity refers to what the test measures and how accurately it measures. The face validity, content validity, and construct validity of the Cultural Intelligence Scale were established by the researchers.

3.1.1 Face validity and content validity

The content validity of the cultural intelligence scale was tested by 21 experts. It is evident from the assessment of experts that the items of the test are directly related to the different dimensions of cultural intelligence.

3.1.2 Construct validity

In order to find out the construct validity of the scale, the researchers calculated the correlation between the score of each dimension of the scale and the summative score of the scale. The details of whose results are presented in the following table:

From the perusal of Table 6, it can be concluded that the correlation coefficient of all dimensions (0.605, 0.846, 0.901, and 0.895 respectively) are significant. This indicates that all the dimensions of the scale have good construct validity.

3.2 Reliability of Cultural Intelligence Scale

Reliability is an essential quality of any test. In a simple sense, reliability refers to the precision of test scores. The degree of consistency among test scores is called reliability. The higher the reliability of a test, the more likely it is to be administered again in the future to obtain relevant scores. The coefficient alpha (Cronbach alpha) was used by the researchers to determine the reliability of the cultural intelligence scale. The values of reliability coefficients (Cronbach alpha) of the whole scale and each dimension are shown below:

From above Table 7, it can be concluded that the correlation coefficient of the whole scale and each dimension (0.919, 0.914, 0.895, 0.890, 0.834 respectively) are significant. This indicates that all the sub-scales and full scale is having a good reliability index.

Table 6

Correlation of each Dimension with the Summative Score of the Whole Scale

S. No.	Dimension	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Meta-cognitive	0.605
2.	Cognitive	0.846
3.	Motivational	0.901
4.	Behavioural	0.895

Table 7
Reliability Coefficient of Cultural Intelligence Scale

S. No.	Description	Cronbach's Alpha
1.	Full Scale	0.919
2.	Meta-cognitive	0.914
3.	Cognitive	0.895
4.	Motivational	0.890
5.	Behavioural	0.834

Table 8
The t-Value for each Dimension of the Cultural Intelligence Scale

Dimension	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	t	Sig.	Remark*
Meta-cognitive	High	108	44.84	2.57	214	33.795	0.000	<0.01
	Lower	108	31.53	3.18				
Cognitive	High	108	64.99	4.86	214	28.813	0.000	<0.01
	Lower	108	41.61	6.88				
Motivational	High	108	74.75	4.55	214	27.635	0.000	<0.01
	Lower	108	49.05	8.52				
Behavioural	High	108	66.36	4.62	214	28.337	0.000	<0.01
		108	43.84	6.84				

**Significant* at 0.01 level

3.3. Discrimination Power Cultural Intelligence Scale

To find out the discrimination power of the items, the researchers used item analysis (difficulty level value and discrimination value). For knowing the level of discrimination power for each dimension of the scale, a t-test for two independent samples was used (high group 27 per cent and low group 27 per cent). Finally, the discrimination validity of the whole test was also determined by using the t-test. Discrimination power for each domain and the whole test is given in Table 3.16. It indicates that all four p-values are greater than 0.01. So, all p values are significant at level 0.01 and the means of the high group are higher than the low group which supports the high validity of cultural intelligence.

Final draft of the cultural intelligence scale

After the qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the Cultural Intelligence Scale, The final draft of the cultural intelligence scale is presented in Table 9.

Table 9
Cultural Intelligence Scale: Detail Item-wise Description

S. No.	Items/Statements
1.	Having biases while interacting with students belonging to diverse cultures is normal. I am biased when I interact with students belonging to diverse cultures.
2.	Providing care and support to culturally diverse students is not always possible.
3.	The formation of identities in the classrooms is beyond the control of the teachers. A teacher should be critically conscious about the formation of identities in the classroom.
4.	Adapting to a culture that is unfamiliar to me is taxing or stressful or difficult.
5.	Cross-cultural interactions need persistent efforts from the teachers.
6.	During my interactions with students from different cultures, I appraise my own cultural knowledge.
7.	Teachers' cultural knowledge is in a state of flux as they have to interact with students from cross-cultural backgrounds.
8.	Teachers need training and support for developing cultural intelligence.
9.	I have the capability to learn the basic or behavioural terms in different languages.
10.	I respect and appreciate cultural differences.
11.	I can contextualise different cultures in the present situation or environment.
12.	I get acquainted with the general rules (vocabulary, grammar, rhythm and delivery) of other languages.
13.	I am able to recognise differences in communication styles that can sometimes lead to misunderstanding.
14.	I know the rituals and superstitions of other cultures.
15.	I know about the constitutional rights and duties of different groups of people belonging to different cultures.
16.	I am able to assimilate the cultural norms, values and beliefs of other cultures.
17.	I am informed about the arts and crafts of other cultures.
18.	I know the social norms and family systems of other cultures.

19.	I can relate to and express different folklore in general discussions or conversations while interacting with the local community.
20.	I prefer to understand the language of the students in order to establish a positive relationship with them.
21.	I use the language of the students to gain their trust.
22.	I usually avoid negative assumptions in me about other cultures.
23.	I like to interact with people of diverse cultural backgrounds.
24.	I derive pleasure in developing knowledge of the socio-cultural aspect of diverse cultures.
25.	I desire to fulfill the cultural expectations of my culturally diverse students.
26.	I prefer to develop my knowledge of the religious beliefs of different cultures.
27.	I get satisfaction in appreciating the differences between various cultures.
28.	Wherever necessary I would like to accept the lifestyle of people of different cultural backgrounds.
29.	I engage myself in different multicultural activities at the school.
30.	I continuously try to develop my competencies in multicultural pedagogy.
31.	I prefer to get trained in dealing with students having multicultural backgrounds.
32.	The cross-cultural interactions have made my behaviour culturally responsive.
33.	I can change my gestures while interacting with culturally diverse people.
34.	I adapt my verbal behaviour (e.g., accent, tone) in varied cultural situations.
35.	I actively participate in cross-cultural ceremonies with students and colleagues within and outside the school.
36.	I appreciate the beliefs, traditions, and values of other cultures.
37.	I incorporate narratives of various cultures while teaching in the class.
38.	I share my meals with my students and my colleagues.
39.	I am comfortable wearing the attire of different cultures.
40.	I am happy to spend my time with people from various religious backgrounds.
41.	My day-to-day actions reflect the cultural ethos of my organisation.
42.	I am open-minded or receptive to the cultural differences present in my institution.

References

Ang, S. and L. Van Dyne. 2008. Conceptualisation of Cultural Intelligence. In S. Ang, and L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications.* M.E. Sharpe, Inc, Armonk.

Ang, S. L. Van Dyne, C. Koh, K. Yee Ng, K. J. Templer, C. Tay and N. A. Chandrasekar. 2007. Cultural Intelligence: Its Measurement and Effects on Cultural Judgment and Decision Making, Cultural Adaptation and Task Performance. *Management and Organisation Review.* 3(3). 335–371. doi: 10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x

Ang, S., L. Van Dyne and T. Rockstuhl. 2012. *Cultural Intelligence: Origins, Conceptualisation, Evolution, and Methodological Diversity.* In M. J. Gelfand, C. Chiu, and Y. Hong (Eds.). Handbook of Advances in Culture and Psychology (pp. 273–322). Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ang, S., L. Van Dyne and M. L. Tan. 2012. *Cultural Intelligence.* In Sternberg, R.J. and Kaufman, S.B. (Eds.). The Cambridge Handbook of Intelligence, Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. 2002. Social Cognitive Theory in Cultural Context. *Applied. Psychology: An International Review.* 51. 269–290. doi: 10.1111/1464-0597.00092

Bartlett, M. S. 1950. Tests of Significance in Factor Analysis. *British Journal of Psychology.* 3(2). 77–85.

Brislin, R., R. Worthley and B. MacNab. 2006. Cultural Intelligence: Understanding Behaviors that Serve People's Goals. *Group and Organisation Management.* 31(1). 40–55. doi: 10.1177/1059601105275262

Deci, E. L. and R. M. Ryan. 1985. *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behavior.* Springer, New York. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7

Flavell, J. H. 1979. Meta-cognition and Cognitive Monitoring: A New Area of Cognitive–developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist.* 34(10). 906–911. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906

Gliem, J. A. and R. R. Gliem. 2003. *Calculating, Interpreting, and Reporting Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for Likert-Type Scales.* Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education. The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Gozzoli C and D. Gazzaroli. 2018. The Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS): A Contribution to the Italian Validation. *Frontiers in Psychology.* 9. 1183. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01183

Gudykunst, W. B., S. Ting-Toomey and E. Chua. 1988. *Culture and Interpersonal Communication.* Sage Newbury Park, CA.

Habermas, J. 1981. *The Theory of Communicative Action: Volume 1. Reasons and the Rationalization of Society and Volume 2. Lifeworld and System:* A Critique of Functionalist Reason. Beacon, Boston.

Hall, E. T. 1959. *The Silent Language.* Doubleday New York, NY.

Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations.* Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.

House, R. J., P. J. Hanges M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman and V. Gupta. 2004. Culture, Leadership, and Organisations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology.* 36(5). 628–630.

Joo-seng, T. 2004. Cultural Intelligence and the Global Economy. *Leadership in Action.* 24(5). 19–21.

Kaiser, H. F. 1970. A Second-Generation Little Jiffy. *Psychometrika.* 35(4). 401–415.

Burton Laura J. and Stephanie M. Mazerolle. 2011. Survey Instrument Validity Part I: Principles of Survey Instrument Development and Validation in Athletic Training Education Research. *Athletic Training Education Journal.* 6(1). 27–35.

Livermore, D. 2011. *The Cultural Intelligence Difference Special E-book Edition: Master the One Skill You Can't Do Without in Today's Global Economy.* AMACOM, New York.

Netemeyer, R. G., Bearden, W. O. et al. 2003. *Scaling Procedures: Issues and Applications.* Sage, London.

Ramis, M. and L. Krastiņa. 2010. Cultural Intelligence in the School. *Revista de Psicodidáctica.* 15(2). 239–252.

Roux, P. W., K. Suzuki, R. Matsuba and Y. Goda. 2020. Developing Cultural Intelligence (CQ) through Experiential Learning: Considering relevance and Rationale in Blended Environments. *International Journal for Educational Media and Technology.* 14(1). 29–37.

Tabachnick, B. G. and L. S. Fidell. 2001. *Using Multivariate Statistics.* MA, Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights.

Triandis, H. C. 1994. *Culture and Social Behavior.* McGraw Hill, New York.

Triandis, H. C. 2006. Cultural Intelligence in Organisations. *Group and Organisation Management.* 31(1). 20–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275253

Van Dyne, L., S. Ang and C. Koh. 2008. *Development and Validation of the CQS: The Cultural Intelligence Scale.* In S. Ang and L. Van Dyne (Eds.). Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Application 16–38. M.E. Sharpe, Inc. Armonk, NY.

Van Dyne, L., S. Ang and C. K. S. Koh. 2009. *Cultural intelligence: Measurement and Scale Development.* In M.A. Moodian (Ed.). Contemporary Leadership and Intercultural Competence: Exploring the Cross-cultural Dynamics within Organisations 233–254. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.