ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to explore relationship between Cultural intelligence CQ and Employee well-being, using cultural intelligence and employee well-being questionnaire. The research survey sampling to target is Intergovernmental and Nongovernmental organizations’ (NGO & IGO) employees and expatriates that operating in Gaziantep, Turkey. These kind of organizations has providing social, economic, logistics development for both public and private business sector even in developed country, also emergency natural disaster and humanitarian aid around the globe. That is obvious we can not ignore that contributions of their international and national staff experience from different nationalities. Main outcome of our research, there is a significant positive correlation between motivational CQ and employee well-being. You can find details on the results of research.
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INTRODUCTION

Borders are almost obsolete in today’s global world situation. Many people are going to work abroad and they are willing to interact different culture. Basically we can say culture is be formed in many years that in a society lifestyle including beliefs, language, unwritten law etc. Competitive conditions in the world is forcing that people have gone for work in other countries. That’s why we did this study in Cultural intelligence context. The reason of the work done in Gaziantep close to Syria border so many NGO and UN agencies are operating in Gaziantep, Turkey based on current situation in Syria and armed conflict in it.

PREVIEW OF NGO & IGO

Non-governmental organizations are non-profit organizations, which are they organized on a local, national or international level. Some of them are organized for specific context, such as human rights, economic development, environment or health (ngo.org). Following the briefly six of NGO roles can be identified as important (gdrc.org). The number of NGO is expressed in today millions two million in the United States, more than one million registered NGO in India (mfa.gov.tr).

1. Development and Operation of Infrastructure.
2. Supporting Innovation, Demonstration and Pilot Projects.
3. Facilitating Communication.
4. Technical Assistance and Training.
5. Research, Monitoring and Evaluation.
6. Advocacy for and with the Poor.

Intergovernmental organizations are supranational organizations, that have only states as member like European Union (Berg, M:107-130). Turkey is also member of some IGO organization such as; United Nations, International Monetary Fund, World Bank. Briefly and generally NGO’s are normally getting their funds from IGO and, or other states.

CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE ( CQ )

Intelligence as term contains variety of wide-range definitions and type of intelligence such as; cultural intelligence, emotional intelligence, artificial intelligence. Some aspects of intelligence definitions are listed below (Legg & M. Hutter:2007).
Cultural Intelligence and Cultural Quotient refers to us work more efficiently in different cultures. In this century being aware of recent technology, development, globalization and competition is vital for people and organization if they want to survive or succeed their goal. In globalization process, countries, governments, universities, multinational cooperations are co-operating each other, thus one of mid-size or even small size organizations or businesses are inevitably synchronizing with world business and organizations. At this point we are facing cultural boundaries, so contemporary leadership theories or studies is insufficient to guide people in different cultures to succeed. If we expalining with metaphor leadership is lock and CQ is a key for more efficient work or success around the globe.

For the first time as a concept in the literature done by P. Christopher Earley and Soon Ang, Cultural relation with people, groups or situations in unexpected cases and unfamiliar environment. Cultural intelligence captures a person’s adjustments to new cultures. Thus, we define cultural intelligence as a person’s capability for successful adaptation to new cultural settings, that is for unfamiliar settings attributable to cultural context (Earley & Mosakowski,2004). Further definition for CQ, to refer to the ability of newcomers to act like their colleagues or collaborators to understand unfamiliar things and even imitate to adapt to cross-cultural lives (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). Based on Earley and Peterson explanation CQ as an individual’s talent to perform demonstrate acceptable performance ideally in cultural diverse situations (Earley & Peterson, 2004).

Early and Ang (2003) conceptualized as component of CQ metacognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral dimensions with specific relevance of functioning in culturally diversity settings. Metacognitive CQ reflects mental and intellectual as well as spiritual process that peoples’ use to get understand cultural knowledge and control over individual thought processes relating to beliefs or culture. Relevant capabilities including monitoring and revising mental models of cultural norms for countries or group of people. Basically we can describe the metacognitive CQ be prepared or ready to learn plan and organize how to adapt or conduct himself when you involve the new work environment in different culture. However metacognitive CQ focuses on high level expanded cognitive process. Cognitive CQ shows that knowledge of norms, beliefs, practices and conventions in variety cultures gained from educational and personal experiences. This comprises knowledge of economic, legal, sociolinguistic and interpersonal system of different cultures and subcultures also basic frameworks of cultural values. (Ng, Kok-Yee, et al:2012). Cogn tive CQ is directly related experience level of education and capability of linguistics, because without knowing other culture and language or experiencing, how can you feed your cognitive CQ that’s why success of metacognitive CQ depends on level of cognitive CQ. Motivational CQ express the capability to direct attention and energy toward learning about and handling in situations characterized by cultural differences. In addition, Cartell’s (1971) investment theory of intelligence would discuss that motivational CQ is critical in simplifying the expansion of cognitive and metacognitive CQ (Ng, Kok-Yee, et al:2012). If we can not motivate ourself doesn’t make sense how much do we high or more metacognitive, cognitive or behavioral CQ level. This is related every aspect of our life like working, studying. Based on my own personal opinion and experience MCO is the key dimension for success on intercultural work environment.

Behavioral CQ externalizes the ability to demonstrate conveniently verbal and nonverbal actions when interacting with people or group from different cultures. As Hall (1959) emphasized, mental capabilities for cultural understanding and motivation must be supplemented with hte ability to exhibit appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions, based on cultural values of specific settings. (Ng,Kok-Yee, et al:2012). “You will not disarm your hosts, guests or colleagues simply by showing you understand their culture, your actions demeanor must prove that you have already to some extent entered their world” (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). People want to see that you understand them even it is a small thing like hand shaking or moving your head.
Previous studies mostly related for employee satisfaction, work private for only one dimension and one culture. Cultural awareness ed personals.

Employee Well-Being:

In the world, modern technology and intense competition are overwhelming and affecting both employee and employers. I want to focus on more employee aspect, because if employer can motivate and satisfy employee consequently employer might minimize the risk which is based on employee performance and cultural awareness. Based on ranking business magazines (e.g., Fortune, Forbes, Business insider) best companies for work in the world, mostly manufacturing and technology companies. These companies are also multinational companies that competing around the globe.

Employee Well-Beings; Definitions & Conceptions and Measurement;

According to Oxtor English Dictionary the term of well-being come to English from French be ‘be-an etra’ means ‘good-being’. Base on definitions of OED (revised 2nd edition on 2005). “Well-being - The state of being or doing well in life; happy, healthy, or prosperous condition; welfare.” (Young & Chapman: 2010-12). WHO first time mentioned about well-being for defining health. Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity (WHO, 1946). We can define the most narrow sense of well-being that: physically and psychologically to be healthy. In current literature researchers are not common definition of employee well-being but definitions has found its place in organizational behavior literature and related resource areas. Everyone know the meaning but no one can explain exact definition (Lyubomirks, 2001). Previous studies mostly related for employee satisfaction, work attitude, negative affect, employee turnover e.g. but specifically not focused on employee well-being. From this point of EWB we used most recent employee well-being scale which is developed by Zheng & Xiaoming et al. 2015.

The meaning of wellbeing is not fixed - it cannot be. It is a primary cultural judgement; just like what makes a good life? it is the stuff of fundamental philosophical debate (Eraut, Grill, Whiting: 2008). Well-being literatures and studies contains and define two type of well-beings. Psychological well-being (PWB), subjective well-being (SWB). In addition Warwick-Edinburgh metal well-being scale (WEMWBS) has another contribution in employee well-being study. Researches has been done in last decade PWB is related to both work and personal life well-being. Important studies shown that there is relationship between PWB and performance at work and life success. Thus, person's work life and expected success depends on his own potential psychological wellness (Avey & James et al, 2010).

Subjective well-being (SWB) is mostly related, personal’s private consideration of their own life standards, people's emotional and cognitive evaluations of their lives, includes what lay people call happiness, peace, fulfillment, and life satisfaction (Diener, Ed et al: 2003). Cultural variables are also affecting subjective wellbeing (Diener, Ed et al: 2005). So in the EWB scale is life well-being item refers to Subjective life well-being (Zehng & Xiaoming are used three dimension that developed employee well-being scale which contains three part.

- Life well-being (LWB)
- Work well-being (WWB)
- Psychological well-being (PWB)

On the other hand it is obvious cultural differentiates is effecting to employee well-being aspects of working hours and conditions, traditions, habits, norms, values, e.g. so these conditions are may vary across the cultures. Base on Ang and Dyne explanation that CQ is not specific for one culture or personality and as we discussed and reviewed employee well-being that is not specific for only one dimension and one culture. Thus we can make a propositions that does cultural intelligence has directly positive effect on employee well-being.

H1. Behavioral CQ has significantly positive affect on employee well-being.
H2. Motivational CQ has significantly positive affect on employee well-being.
H3. Cognitive CQ has significantly positive affect on employee well-being.
H4. Metacognitive CQ has significantly positive affect on employee well-being.
H5. CQ significant positive effects on employee well-being.

In terms of cultural aspects, CQ affects employability, while well-being also affects employability psychologically. There is no direct study or researche has evaluated this CQ and EWB. Most recent research was done by Shan-Hua Chen (2015) from Taiwan which is related our researche. The researche topic was Cultural intelligence, Psychological well-being, Employability of Taiwan's Indigenous college students and three finding was;
1. CQ’s Positive Impact on Employability
2. CQ’s Positive Impact on Psychological Well-being
3. Psychological Well-being’s Positive Impact on Employability.

There is no direct study has been employed this topic, not to mention the intensity of the interrelated of CQ and employee well-being. To support the related research, this study defines the effects of CQ and psychological well-being on employability, with a focus on local college students. The article intentions to explore whether CQ positively affects college students’ psychological well-being.

METHODOLOGY

Data collection

In this research we used questionnaire survey form based on two scale as mentioned above CQ and EW. Survey form designed in two section: first section is for demographic information and second section for survey questions, according to 7-item likert scale. The study population is employee of the Intergovernmental and Non-Governmental organizations which is operation in Gaziantep province in Turkey. Survey forms hard copies are distributed to offices and collected by on appointment. Some of the survey forms soft copies sent by e-mail for abroad staffs which are working home base or short term travel on duty and responded same way. Total responded was 128 and 11 of the survey forms removed because of missing important data or incompletion. Total analyzed survey forms was 117.

Measurement

In our study, we benefit from these two scales cultural intelligence and employee-wellbeing. All data analyzed by SPSS statistic software package program. CQ (CQS) scale has been developed and validated by Ang et al. The scale has four dimensions; motivational, behavioral, meta-cognitive and cognitive. Employee well-being scale developed and validated by Zehng, Xiaoming et al. The scale contains three dimensions; Life, work, psychological well-being.

Analysis and Results

Research was conducted between 15 March 2016 and 15 May 2016. The result of descriptive analysis for demographic information indicate us analyzed samples (N=117). Respondents were 57 female and 60 male from 25 different nationalities. %56 of respondents are bilingual and %44 of them know 3 and more languages. 60 respondents have 4 years university degree, 49 have masters degree and 8 have Ph.D degree. In terms of age aspects 21% under or 25 years old, %58 between 26-35, %16 35-45, %8 56 and above. Based on organizations departments distributions show us that 9 respondents human resources, 8 finance, 25 operations department, 44 projects management, 5 education, 12 information technology, 4 security, 5 logistic and 5 intern. Normality of the variables test result was assessed by examining the skewness and kurtosis; -1+1 so data is normall distributed.

First and second steps are cultural intelligence scale exploratory factor analysis was conducted in research and result shown on Table 1 and 2.

| Component | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   |
|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| MC_2      | .858|     |     |     |
| MC_3      | .808|     |     |     |
| MC_1      | .797|     |     |     |
| MC_4      | .698|     |     |     |
| MOT_13    |     | .796|     |     |
| MOT_15    |     | .789|     |     |
| MOT_14    |     | .767|     |     |
| MOT_12    |     | .671|     |     |
| COG_8     |     |     | .802|     |
| COG_10    |     |     | .734|     |
| COG_9     |     |     | .731|     |
| COG_7     |     |     | .690|     |
| BEH_17    |     |     |     | .976|
| BEH_19    |     |     |     | .938|
We analysed separately each dimension both for CQ and EW and determined of underlying each dimension (EFA) analyse with varimax rotation. Factor loading determined .40 for controlling each items, the latent root criterion of 1.0 was treated factor inclusion. Some questions are removed from the scale; BEH_18,BEH_20,COG_5,COG_6 and MOT_11 because of low factor loading. CQ scale factor analyse results; (KMO=0.755; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Chi Square=886.656; (df) 91; Sig .000). Data comes from a multivariate normal distribution and is suitable for factor analysis.

EWB scale factor analyse result; (KMO=0.867; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity Chi Square=1164.367; (df) 136 and Sig .000). The sample size is adequate for factor analysis. Data comes from a multivariate normal distribution and is suitable for factor analysis. The question number LWB_26 is removed because of low factor loading. Normality of the variables test result was assessed by examining the skewness and kurtosis -1+1 so all data were normal distributed (Gürbüz Şahin F.,2014).

On step four, reliability of variables analyzed and the analysis results are presented in Table 3.

| Variable       | Item | Alpha  |
|----------------|------|--------|
| Metacognitive  | 4    | .847   |
| Cognitive      | 4    | .765   |
| Motivational   | 4    | .832   |
| Behavioral     | 2    | .876   |
| Life           | 5    | .735   |
| Work           | 6    | .893   |
| Psychological  | 6    | .865   |

Metacognitive dimension contains 4 questions and Cranboachs’ alpha value=.847. Cognitive dimensions contains 4 questions and Cranboachs’ alpha value=.767. Behavioral dimensions contains 2 questions and Cranboachs’ alpha value=.955. Motivational dimensions contains 4 questions and Cranboachs’ alpha value=.833. Life well-being dimension contains 5 questions Cranboachs’ alpha value=.740. Psychological well-being dimension contains 6 questions.
The correlation analysis performed on the third stage variables and analysis results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Correlation

|       | MC   | COG  | MOT  | BEHV | LWB  | WWB  | PWB  |
|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| **MC** |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Pearson Correlation | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| **COG** | .320** | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |
| Pearson Correlation |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| **MOT** | .526** | .436** | 1    |      |      |      |      |
| Pearson Correlation |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| **BEHV** | .043 | .217* | .189* | 1    |      |      |      |
| Pearson Correlation |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| **LWB** | .310** | .488** | .486** | .190* | 1    |      |      |
| Pearson Correlation |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| **WWB** | .418** | .287** | .553** | .073 | .551** | 1    |      |
| Pearson Correlation |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| **PWB** | .392** | .296** | .568** | .072 | .601** | .682** | 1    |
| Pearson Correlation |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Sig. (2-tailed) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

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

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

There are positive and significant relationships between the CQ and EWB dimensions as shown in the table. Except for BEHV and PWB, BEHV and WWB, BEHV and MC. Regression analysis results indicate there are direct relevant implications between dependent and independent variables. CQ motivation dimensions' significant value = Sig.000. Thus regression model was statistically significant. Thus employee well-being can be explained by the CQ dimension of motivation statistically.

In the next step with the aim to test the effect on the dependent variable argument multiple regression analysis was performed and results are given in Table 5.

Table 5. EWB regression analyse.

| Independent variables | Standard Beta (β) | Significance (p) |
|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| **MC**                | .142              | .098            |
| **COG**               | .130              | .113            |
| **BEHAVIORAL**        | -.010             | .892            |
| **MOTIVATION**        | .496              | .000            |
Results shown on Table 5. Motivational cultural intelligence has been shown to significantly affect the well-being positively. Based on Durbin–Watson score it appears that there is no autocorrelation. Model is significant because it is Sig., 0.000. F Value: 20.543 p: 0.000. Adjusted R^2: 0.403 = S Error Estimate: 0.71828 Durbin–Watson: 2.225

**Table 6. Work WB regression analyse.**

| Independent variables | Standard Beta (β) | Significance (p) |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| MC                    | 0.168             | 0.070            |
| COG                   | 0.042             | 0.634            |
| BEHAVIORAL            | -0.028            | 0.724            |
| MOTIVATION            | 0.452             | 0.000            |

Results shown on Table 6. Motivational cultural intelligence has been shown to significantly affect the (WWB) workwell-being positively. Based on Durbin–Watson score it appears that there is no autocorrelation. Model is significant because it is Sig., 0.000. F Value: 13.807 p: 0.000. Adjusted R^2: 0.306 = S Error Estimate: 0.96303 Durbin–Watson: 2.104

**Table 7. Psychological WB regression analyse**

| Independent variables | Standard Beta (β) | Significance (p) |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| MC                    | 0.119             | 0.195            |
| COG                   | 0.052             | 0.554            |
| BEHAVIORAL            | -0.037            | 0.645            |
| MOTIVATION            | 0.490             | 0.000            |

Results shown on Table 7. Motivational cultural intelligence has been shown to significantly affect the (PWB) Psychological well-being positively. Based on Durbin–Watson score it appears that there is no autocorrelation. Model is significant because it is Sig., 0.000. F Value: 14.285 p: 0.000. Adjusted R^2: 0.314 = S Error Estimate: 0.89109 Durbin–Watson: 2.305

**Table 8. Life WB regression analyse.**

| Independent variables | Standard Beta (β) | Significance (p) |
|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| MC                    | 0.039             | 0.672            |
| COG                   | 0.327             | 0.000            |
| BEHAVIORAL            | 0.059             | 0.463            |
| MOTIVATION            | 0.311             | 0.002            |

Results shown on Table 8. Motivational cultural intelligence has been shown to significantly affect the (LWB) Life well-being positively. Based on Durbin–Watson score it appears that there is no autocorrelation. Model is significant because it is Sig., 0.000. F Value: 14.049 p: 0.000. Adjusted R^2: 0.310 = S Error Estimate: 0.83401 Durbin–Watson: 2.208

Final step is determination of CQ interaction on employee well-being and result indicated on Table 9.

**Table 9. Regression analysis result between CQ and EWB**

| Independent variable | Standard Beta (β) | Significance (p) |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| CQ                   | 0.513             | 0.000            |

It has been shown on analysis result CQ to significantly positive affect on employee well-being. Based on Durbin–Watson score it appears that there is no autocorrelation. Model is significant because it is Sig., 0.000. F Value: 41.128 p: 0.000. Adjusted R^2: 0.257 = S Error Estimate: 0.80102 Durbin–Watson: 2.110.

In this study we tried to show that there is a significant affect on employee well-being by cultural intelligence perspective. Based on analysis results that the most important evidence is CQ to significantly positive affect on employee well-being (β, 0.513). So H5 is supported based on analysis result that indicated on Table 9.
DISCUSSION

There are limitations to this study, as in many other studies. In this study, investigating the relationship between cultural intelligence and employee well-being, it was aimed to contribute to human resources and management departments of intergovernmental and nongovernmental (IGO and NGO) organizations/management. We can make suggestion to these kind of organizations. While they are making job interviews they has to be focused on candidate motivational cultural intelligence. For this purpose they must design and prepare the interview question bases on motivation dimension of CQ. Going one step further we recommend for training department managers of supervisors they might check candidate motivational CQ. Motivational CQ refers, individuals to interact with people from different cultures and something about intercultural situations is related to the willingness to learn (I, M, B Çetin, 2014). If they pay attention to this MCQ factor the staff in a multicultural environment would be a better fit to organization goals. For further studies we recommend to researchers to do in same contexts for African base intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations for discovering is that will become same results or not. Detailed in cultural intelligence and well-being content in IGO and NGO field and is almost no comprehensive studies, based on this context, it is thought that an important contribution to the literature.
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