

# Comparing Higher Education Practices and Cultural Competences in Kenya and the United States

Kennedy Musamali<sup>1</sup> & Barbara N. Martin<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Student Support Services, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas, USA

<sup>2</sup> Educational Leadership and Human Development Department, University of Central Missouri, Warrensburg, Missouri, USA

Correspondence: Barbara N. Martin, Educational Leadership and Human Development Department, University of Central Missouri, Warrensburg, Missouri, USA. Tel: 81-683-039-04. E-mail: [bmartin@ucmo.edu](mailto:bmartin@ucmo.edu)

Received: June 28, 2016

Accepted: July 13, 2016

Online Published: August 9, 2016

doi:10.5539/hes.v6n3p127

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/hes.v6n3p127>

## Abstract

Examined within this paper are effective leadership practices across two cultures. Specifically, this study examined the relationship between cultural competency and effective leadership practices in higher education institutions. A quantitative design was used to investigate and compare effective practices of educational leaders in two distinct cultures, Kenya and the United States. Kouzes and Posner's (2002) conceptual framework was used to examine effective leadership practices while the cultural intelligence conceptual framework developed by Earley and Ang (2003) was utilized to assess the influence of culture on effective leadership. A significant correlation was found between effective leadership practices and cultural intelligence. The results have implication for leadership practices in higher education settings across cultures.

**Keywords:** leadership behaviors, cultural competencies, higher education, cultural intelligence

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Statement of the Problem

In today's global economy and interconnected world, cross-cultural competencies are critical to effective leadership (Ang et al., 2011; Dickson et al., 2012). Studies demonstrated that understanding the influence of culture on leadership is essential to developing and facilitating effective global leaders (Kumar & Chhokar, 2013; Marquardt, 2011). However, research also revealed developing culturally competent leaders reveals a pronounced challenge because leadership is practiced differently across cultures (Dickson et al., 2012; Tang, Yin, & Min, 2011). Therefore, the goal of the study was to determine whether effective leadership practices in the two cultures were significantly different. The study also aimed to determine whether a correlation existed between effective leadership practices and cross-cultural competency. Knowledge gained from the study was expected to facilitate a better understanding of effective leadership practices across cultures. Most important, findings from the study were expected to provide additional insight on ways to advance, train, and develop cultural competency and effective leadership practices in higher educational settings (Tang et al., 2011).

### 1.2 Significance of the Problem

Although there are a plethora of studies conducted to examine leadership across cultures, most studies focus on business organization (Deng & Gibson, 2009). Few studies examined effective leadership practices in higher education (Vilkinas & Ladyshevsky, 2011) and far fewer studies examined the influence of culture on educational leadership (Smith & Hughey, 2006; Tang et al., 2011). Consequently, the purpose of this study was to examine leadership practices in higher education across cultures and the relationship between cultural competency and effective leadership.

### 1.3 Conceptual Framework

Cross-cultural leadership theories, coupled with cultural intelligence and leadership behaviors were utilized to develop conceptual constructs for this study. Explicitly, the exemplary leadership conceptual framework espoused by Kouzes and Posner (2002) was utilized to compare effective leadership practices, while the cultural intelligence conceptual framework developed by Earley and Ang (2003) was utilized to assess cultural

competence. Cross-cultural leadership is characterized as a process, in which members of a culturally diverse group are intentionally motivated, influenced and guided toward a goal by appealing to their shared knowledge and meaning making systems (Akiga & Lowe, 2004).

Culture is defined as a set of beliefs, values, and ideologies that form the basis of societal and organizational structures, processes, and practices (Walker & Dimmock, 1999, p. 322). Cross-cultural leadership theories provided a framework in which comparative research could be conducted and cultural competency dimensions assessed (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). Specifically, the theoretical framework provided an appropriate lens through which global mindsets and cultural competence could be examined.

Earley and Ang (2003) conceptualized cultural competency through the lens of cultural intelligence (CQ). The authors defined cultural intelligence as a leader's ability to relate effectively and function successfully in culturally diverse settings (Earley & Ang, 2003; Van Dyne et al., 2010). CQ was designed to measure a set of malleable abilities that could be enhanced through experience, education and training (Ang et al., 2011). The four factors measured by CQ included: Motivational (CQ); Cognitive (CQ); Metacognitive (CQ) and Behavioral (CQ). Motivational CQ referred to the drive and interest to adapt in culturally diverse settings while Cognitive CQ indicated the knowledge or understanding of cultural systems, norms, and values of other societies.

Metacognitive CQ represented the level of awareness when interacting in culturally diverse settings, and Behavioral CQ assessed the ability to engage across cultures (Van Dyne et al., 2010). Studies showed that CQ reliably assessed leaders' abilities to function in a variety of national, ethnic and organizational cultures (Ang et al., 2007; Deng & Gibson, 2009). Subsequently, CQ was selected as one of the conceptual frameworks because of its suitability to address the research questions and its ability to assess competencies across cultures (Ang et al., 2011).

Similarly, while Mumford and Barrett (2013) characterized effective leadership as the ability to influence a group of people toward achieving a desired outcome, Kouzes and Posner (2002) conceptualized effective leadership through five exemplary practices. These practices included: a) Model the Way; b) Inspire a Shared Vision; c) Challenge the Process; d) Enable Others to Act; and e) Encourage the Heart. Model the Way referred to a leader's ability to lead by example while Inspire a Shared Vision demonstrated the ability to create a compelling image and rouse a commitment in followers. Challenging the Process reflected a leader's innovation and ability to take risks while Enabling Other to Act referred to the ability to encourage participation of followers by "fostering collaboration and building trust" (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 18). Encouraging the Heart demonstrated the leader's ability to support and keep followers hopeful. Based on these five exemplary practices, Kouzes and Posner developed a *Leadership Practice Inventory* (LPI) to assess effective leadership. Several studies revealed that the five exemplary practices were universally endorsed leadership concepts that could be readily and consistently appraised across culture (Tang et al., 2011; Zaid, Alzawahreh, & Olimat, 2012). Consequently, Kouzes and Posner's (2002) conceptual framework was utilized in this study because of its extensive use by researchers across cultures.

In summary, cross-cultural leadership, exemplary leadership and cultural intelligence provided the appropriate conceptual frameworks in which to explore the problem and examine the research questions. While cross-cultural leadership provided the appropriate theoretical framework in which leadership in two distinct cultures could be examined and compared (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009), globally endorsed leadership practices espoused by Kouzes and Posner (2002) provided a universal lens through which leadership across cultures could be assessed and compared. Similarly, cultural intelligence provided a lens through which specific cultural factors could be examined to better understand the relationship between cultural competence and leadership (Van Dyne et al., 2010).

#### *1.4 Research Design and Research Questions*

In this study, a quantitative research design was utilized to investigate the research questions. The quantitative research was preferred because it provided the researchers with the ability to assess trends, preferences and practices of a general population using numerical data (Creswell, 2009; Mertens, 2010). Furthermore, the use of a cross-sectional survey and self-administered questionnaires provided a cost effective method of gathering vast amounts of data, across distant geographic location, within short time spans (Creswell, 2009; Fink, 2017). Although the quantitative design was limited in its inability to validate the meaning or accuracy of participants' responses (Creswell, 2009), it allowed the researcher to determine significant differences and examine correlations (Mertens, 2010).

Consequently, the study was guided by the following research questions: first, are there significant differences in effective leadership practices when educational leaders in Kenyan universities are compared to their counterparts

in the United States using the *Leadership Practice Inventory-Self* (LPI-Self) and assessed on the five universally endorsed exemplary practices of: a) Model the Way; b) Inspire a Shared Vision; c) Challenge the Process; d) Enable Others to Act; and e) Encourage the Heart? Second, is there a correlation between effective leadership practice as measured by the LPI-Self and a leader's ability to relate with people from diverse cultural backgrounds as measured by the four cultural intelligence (CQ) factors of a) Motivational CQ; b) Cognitive CQ; c) Metacognitive CQ; and d) Behavioral CQ?

## 2. Method

A non-experimental quantitative approach was used to compare educational leaders from top ranked public universities in the Midwestern state of Missouri in the United States to their counterparts in Kenya. Upper, middle and lower management leaders were surveyed on universally endorsed leadership practices (Kouzes & Posner, 2002) and cultural competencies (Early & Ang, 2003). Data gathered from the surveys were examined for significant differences in leadership practices and assessed for correlations between effective leadership and cultural competency.

The data collection instruments included: 1) A demographic questionnaire (DQ); 2) *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI); 3) Cultural competency measures (CQ). The LPI (Kouzes & Posner, 2002) and CQ (Earley & Ang, 2003) were ready to use questionnaires while the researcher developed the DQ. Both the LPI and CO were chosen for their reliability and validity. The LPI has been extensively used by researchers to examine effective leadership practices across cultures with internal reliabilities on the five exemplary practices ranging from .70 to .85. The LPI also has strong test-retest reliability of .93 or higher. Kouzes and Posner's (1993) findings were supported by other researchers who also found strong internal reliability of the LPI measure in their studies (Kakar, Kakar, Ket de Vries, & Vrienaud, 2002; Zaid et al., 2012).

The CQ instrument was selected because of its strong psychometric properties and application across cultures. Several studies (Ang et al., 2007; Rockstuhl, et al., 2011; Van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2008) revealed the instrument's reliability, stability and validity exceeded .70 as measured by the Cronbach's Alpha (<http://www.cultural.com/research.html>). Similarly, Imai and Gelfand (2010) reported an overall high CQS reliability of alpha .92. The alphas of the four individual CQS factors were reported at metacognitive CQ .76, cognitive CQ .84, motivational CQ .76, and behavioral CQ .83 (Ang et al., 2006). Similarly, Imai and Gelfand (2010) reported reliability of the four factors at metacognitive CQ .90, cognitive CQ .91, motivational CQ .89, and behavioral CQ .90.

### 2.1 Population Selection

The targeted population groups were leaders in higher education institutions and included upper, middle, and frontline managers in selected institutions from Kenya and from the United States. The *4 International Colleges & Universities* (4icu) website was used to identify top ranked universities in Kenya and in one Midwestern state in the United States ([www.4icu.org/about/](http://www.4icu.org/about/)). The sample selection was multi-phased. The researchers used the 4icu website as an initial tool to screen universities selected for the study, because, even with its limitations, the site provided a systematic means of identifying comparable institutions. In addition to the website screening, universities were selected based on their student population and convenience. For example, while the University of Nairobi (UON), Moi University (MU) and Kenyatta University (KU) were listed as public universities with strong website presence and popularity, they also had the highest student enrollment rates in Kenya. Likewise, University of Missouri-Columbia (MIZZOU), University of Missouri Kansas City (UMKC) and University of Missouri St. Louis (UMSL) were listed as institutions with the strongest website presence and popularity among public universities in Missouri. Most important, the three Missouri universities had the highest student populations in the state and were most comparable to the selected Kenyan universities.

### 2.2 Participant Characteristics

Fifty percent of the respondents were female, with twenty-three identifying themselves as Upper Level management, 56% as Middle Level management, and 17% identified with Lower Level management. The majority of the participants had been in their positions less than five years and 10% had more than 15 years of tenure. Forty (44.4%) of the respondents held doctoral degrees, 35 (38.9%) a master's degree, 11(12.2%) a bachelor's degree and 1 (1.1%) an associate's degree. Two (2.2%) had some college and 1 (1.1%) graduated high school. All of the participants supervised six individuals or more, and of those supervised the majority was of a different race than their supervisor. Respondents were also asked about the number of Professional Leadership Development (PLD) training and Cross-Cultural Leadership (CCL) training attended in the last 12 months. Sixteen (17.8%) of the respondents indicated receiving no PLD training, while the remaining participants reported attending three training sessions or less. Similarly, 47 (52.2%) of the participants indicated attending no

CCL training program in the last 12 months. Twenty-nine (32.2%) attended less than 3, while 14 (15.6%) attend more than 3 CCL training programs.

### 2.3 Sampling Procedures

The participants from each institution were selected using convenience sampling. The selection was conducted using multistage sampling. This is a procedure in which "...the researcher first identifies clusters (groups or organizations), obtains names of individuals within those clusters, and then samples within them" (Creswell, 2009, p. 148). Unlike random sampling, convenience sampling recruits those participants who are available and willing to take part in a study (Fink, 2017). A minimum sample size of 15 participants was established for each educational institution. The minimum number of participants per institution was based on the recommended sample size for correlational studies (Tang et al., 2011; Fink, 2017).

Although the research was open to participants at all leadership levels, participation of respondents from middle and lower management levels was encouraged. Middle and lower level leadership positions included Deans, Department Heads, Directors, Managers, and Coordinators. Participation of middle and lower level leaders was encouraged because the literature indicated that studies on educational leadership primarily focused on the top management and neglected middle, and lower (frontline) levels of leadership (Braun et al., 2009).

#### 2.3.1 Sample Size Explanation

A minimum sample size of 15 participants was set for the six educational institutions. The minimum number of participants per institution was based on the recommended sample size for correlational studies (Tang et al., 2011; Fink, 2017). Thus the total number of participants was 45 from the United States and 45 from Kenya. All of the participants were in some level of management within their institutions. Middle and lower level leadership positions included Deans, Department Heads, Directors, Managers, and Coordinators. Participation of middle and lower level leaders was encouraged because the literature indicated that studies on educational leadership primarily focused on the top management and neglected middle, and lower (frontline) levels of leadership (Braun et al., 2009).

#### 2.3.2 Data Analysis

While several steps were used to analyze data gathered from the study, a quantitative statistical model was utilized to examine general data trends (Field, 2009). All data were examined and analyzed in conjunction with the research questions. Specifically, the researcher utilized descriptive, correlational and inferential statistics to analyze data (Mertens, 2010). Inferential statistics are utilized to compare and determine significant difference between groups (Mertens, 2010) and was used to examine the first research question. The question inquired whether significant differences existed in the way effective leadership was practiced by higher educational leaders in Kenya compared to their counterparts in United States. Thus data gathered in the study were analyzed using a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and assessed using a conventional statistically significant value of  $p < .05$  (Mertens, 2010). The researchers chose MANOVA for the study because it allowed for more than one dependent variable to be tested (Mertens, 2010). The researchers examined the independent variable (country) against each of the five dependent variables: 1) Model the Way; 2) Inspiring a Shared Vision; 3) Challenging the Process; 4) Enabling other to Act and; 5) Encouraging the Heart. The data were then examined for statistical significant difference expressed by a  $p$ -value between .0 and 1. The  $p$ -value provides information on the probability that the outcomes in the study occurred by chance or error (Fink, 2017; Mertens, 2010). The conventional value of  $p < .05$  was utilized by the researcher to assess for outcomes that reflected a 5% chance or error.

Similarly, the second research question set out to examine the relationship between effective leadership practices as measured by the LPI-Self and a leader's ability to relate with people from diverse cultural backgrounds as measured by CQ. The researchers utilized correlation coefficients to examine to analyze this research question and describe the relationship between two or more variables (Mertens, 2010). Consequently, the researchers utilized correlational statistical methods to assess the strength and direction of the relationship between effective leadership and cultural intelligence. The direction, strength, and weakness of the relationship were assessed using the Pearson correlation coefficient ( $r$ ) statistic. Numerical statistical values between +1 to -1 showed positive and negative correlations, while a value of zero denoted that no correlation existed between variables (Fink, 2017). Values closer to the +1 and -1 were indicative of strong correlations between variables. All five LPI and CQ variables were assessed in the correlational analysis.

### 3. Results

Below are the findings from the data analysis on the two research questions.

**Q1. Are there significant differences in effective leadership practices when educational leaders in Kenyan universities are compared to their counterparts in the United States using the Leadership Practice Inventory-Self (LPI-Self) and assessed on the five universally endorsed exemplary practices of: a) Model the Way; b) Inspire a Shared Vision; c) Challenge the Process; d) Enable Others to Act; and e) Encourage the Heart?**

To answer the first research question, inferential statistics were used to determine significant differences between groups (Mertens, 2010). An independent sample *t*-test was conducted to compare differences in leadership practices between educational leaders in Kenya and their counterparts in the United States. The independent variable (country) was examined against each of the five dependent variables: 1) Model the Way; 2) Inspiring a Shared Vision; 3) Challenging the Process; 4) Enabling other to Act; 5) Encouraging the Heart. The *t*-test assessed for significant differences between the two independent groups. The conventional value of  $p < .05$  was set as a level of significance. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure alignment with the basic assumptions of normality, linearity, and homogeneity of variance of the data. Levene's test revealed unequal variance ( $F=4.79$   $p=.031$ ) on Enabling others to Act and the degrees of freedom were adjusted from 88 to 66 to correct for this violation. A *t* statistic not assuming homogeneity of variance was computed. A summary of the results is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparisons of leadership practice inventory *t*-test scores

	Country	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SEM</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Model the Way	Kenya	45	48.18	7.65	1.14	-1.322	88	0.189
	USA	45	50.22	7.00	1.04			
Inspire a Shared Vision	Kenya	45	47.22	8.31	1.24	0.229	88	0.819
	USA	45	46.80	9.16	1.37			
Challenge the Process	Kenya	45	47.47	7.95	1.18	-0.785	88	0.434
	USA	45	49.71	17.45	2.60			
Enable Other to Act	Kenya	45	51.49	9.92	1.48	-1.225	88	0.224
	USA	45	53.53	5.19	0.77			
Encourage the Heart	Kenya	45	48.24	7.97	1.19	-1.225	88	0.224
	USA	45	49.11	8.43	1.26			

Note.  $n=90$ .

The results indicated no significant difference between leaders in the two countries as measured by the *LPI-Self*. However, comparing mean scores indicated that educational leaders in the United States showed a higher preference for Model the Way compared to their counterparts in Kenya. Similarly, educational leaders in Kenya preferred Inspire a Shared Vision compared to their counterparts in the United States. More educational leaders in the United States than in Kenya preferred challenging the process. Additionally, enabling others to act was preferred by more educational leaders in the United States compared to their counterparts in Kenya. More educational leaders in the United States than those in Kenya preferred encouraging the heart.

Ranking leadership practices from the highest to the lowest means revealed the most and least preferred leadership competencies in each country. The ranking orders are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Ranking of leadership practice preferences

Leadership Practices	Country	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
Model the Way	Kenya	45	48.18	7.65	3
	USA	45	50.22	7.00	2
Inspire a Shared Vision	Kenya	45	47.22	8.31	5
	USA	45	46.80	9.16	5
Challenge the Process	Kenya	45	47.47	7.95	4
	USA	45	49.71	17.45	3
Enable Others to Act	Kenya	45	51.49	9.92	1
	USA	45	53.53	5.19	1
Encourage the Heart	Kenya	45	48.24	7.97	2
	USA	45	49.11	8.43	4

Note. n=90.

The results showed the ranking order of leadership practices by educational leaders in Kenya as 1) Enabling other to Act; 2) Encouraging others to Act; 3) Modeling the Way; 4) Challenging the Process; 5) Inspiring a Shared Vision. In contrast, the ranking order of leadership practices by educational leaders in the United States was 1) Enabling others to Act; 2) Modeling the Way; 3) Challenging the Process; 4) Encouraging the Heart; 5) Inspiring a Shared Vision. In both countries, the ranking of means showed Enabling Others to Act as the most utilized leadership practice and Inspire a Shared Vision as the least utilized leadership practice.

In summary, while mean scores from the findings suggested different leadership preferences between educational leaders in Kenyan and their counterparts in the United States, no significant differences were found between the groups. The ranking order of means showed Enabling Others to Act and Inspire a Shared Vision as the most and least practiced leadership competencies, respectively, in both groups.

**Q2. Is there a correlation between effective leadership practice as measured by the LPI-Self and a leader's ability to relate with people from diverse cultural backgrounds as measured by the four cultural intelligence (CQ) factors of: a) Motivational CQ; b) Cognitive CQ; c) Metacognitive CQ; and d) Behavioral CQ?**

The second research question focused on the relationship between effective leadership practices as measured by the LPI-Self and a leader's ability to relate with people from diverse cultural backgrounds as measured by CQ. Correlation coefficients were used to examine the relationships between five leadership variables assessed by the LPI-Self and four variables assessed by the Cultural Intelligence (CQ) measure. The five LPI-Self variables assessed include: 1) Model the Way; 2) Inspiring a Shared Vision; 3) Challenging the Process; 4) Enabling Other to Act; 5) Encouraging the Heart. The four variables assessed by CQ include: a) Motivational (Drive) CQ; b) Cognitive (Knowledge) CQ; c) Metacognitive (Strategy) CQ; and d) Behavioral (Action) CQ.

Correlation coefficients assess and describe the relationship between two or more variables (Mertens, 2010). The direction, strength, and weakness of the relationship were assessed using the Pearson correlation coefficient (*r*) statistic. Numerical statistical values between +1 to -1 showed positive and negative correlations, while a value of zero denoted that no correlation existed between variables (Fink, 2017). Values closer to the +1 and -1 were indicative of strong correlations between variables. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure that the basic assumptions of correlational analyses were met. Data were interval, frequency distributions were approximately normal, and scatterplots showed no evidence of non-linear relationships. A summary of results is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Relationship between leadership practices and cultural intelligence

LPI -Self	Cultural Intelligence				
		CQ Strategy	CQ Knowledge	CQ Motivation	CQ Behavior
Model the Way	Pearson ( <i>r</i> )	.273**	.220*	0.15	0.14
	Sig. <i>p</i>	0.009	0.037	0.159	0.189
Inspire a Shared Vision	Pearson ( <i>r</i> )	0.167	0.108	0.058	0.036
	Sig. <i>p</i>	0.116	0.31	0.584	0.736
Challenge the Process	Pearson ( <i>r</i> )	0.133	0.044	0.037	0.022
	Sig. <i>p</i>	0.213	0.682	0.731	0.84
Enable Others to Act	Pearson ( <i>r</i> )	.278**	.233*	.235*	0.181
	Sig. <i>p</i>	0.008	0.027	0.026	0.088
Encourage the Heart	Pearson ( <i>r</i> )	.227*	.217*	.216*	0.149
	Sig. <i>p</i>	0.031	0.04	0.041	0.161

Note. \* Significance  $p < .05$ , 2-tailed, \*\* Significance  $< .01$ , 2-tailed,  $N = 90$ .

The results revealed 8 out of 20 correlations were statistically significant. These correlations included: 1) Model the Way and CQ Strategy variables,  $r(88) = .27$ ,  $p < .01$ , two tailed; 2) Model the Way and CQ Knowledge variables,  $r(88) = .22$ ,  $p < .05$ , two tailed; 3) Enable Other to Act and CQ Strategy variables,  $r(88) = .29$ ,  $p < .01$ , two tailed; 4) Enable Others to Act and CQ Knowledge variables,  $r(88) = .23$ ,  $p < .05$ , two tailed; 5) Enable Others to Act and CQ Motivation variables,  $r(88) = .24$ ,  $p < .05$ , two tailed; 6) Encourage the Heart and CQ Strategy variables,  $r(88) = .23$ ,  $p < .05$ , two tailed; 7) Encourage the Heart and CQ Knowledge variables,  $r(88) = .22$ ,  $p < .05$ , two tailed; 8) Encourage the Heart and CQ Motivation variables,  $r(88) = .22$ ,  $p < .05$ , two tailed.

In summary, the results demonstrated statistically significant relationships between three leadership practices and three cultural intelligence variables. However, no statistically significant relationships were found between the leadership practices variables of Inspire a Shared Vision and cultural intelligence variables, or Challenge the Process and cultural intelligence variables. Similarly, no statistically significant relationships were found between CQ Behavior and leadership practice variables.

#### 4. Discussion

A statistical analysis conducted found no significant differences between effective leadership practices preferred by educational leaders in Kenya and their counterparts in the United States. These findings were inconsistent with those from similar studies in the literature. Specifically, a study conducted by Tang et al. (2011) revealed that leadership practices of educational leaders in the United States differed significantly from their counterparts in Taiwan when assessed by the LPI-Self (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). That study further revealed that while educational leaders in the United States (an individualistic culture) preferred task-oriented behaviors, their counterparts in Taiwan (a collectivist culture) preferred relationship-oriented behaviors (Tang et al., 2011). Although Kenya is considered a collectivist culture, findings similar to the study conducted by Tang et al. (2011) were not demonstrated in the comparative study between Kenya and the USA.

Similarly, the ranking order of leadership preferences by educational leaders in both countries showed Enabling Others to Act and Inspire a Shared Vision as the most and least practiced leadership competencies. Comparably, Tang et al. (2011) found that Taiwanese educational leaders ranked Enabling Others to Act as their most preferred leadership practice and Inspire a Shared Vision among the least preferred practices. These results were consistent with findings from studies conducted in other collective cultures (Kakar et al., 2002; Zaid et al., 2012).

Perhaps the lack of significant difference can be attributed to the similarities in educational structures and systems between the two countries. Currently, the Kenyan education system emulates the American system of

education. The Kenyan government adopted the American 8-4-4 education system in 1985 [UNESCO-IBE], (2010). The system required students to go through 8 years of primary education, 4 years of secondary education and 4 years of university education. Besides, the Kenya system of education has historically been Eurocentric. For over 20 years, the education in Kenya was based on a system inherited from the British in 1963. The Eurocentric approach to education in Kenya may explain the lack of significant difference in leadership preferences between educational leaders in the two countries.

In addition the Kenyan government is pursuing the Vision 2030 under the guidance of a newly set up Commission for University Education (CUE). While the Vision 2030 was set up as a blue print to guide development and transformation of Kenya into a globally competitive nation by the year 2030 (Government of Kenya [GOK], 2007), the regulatory CUE body was established to guide Kenyan universities toward global competitiveness (Universities Bill, 2012). Kenya's focus on developing a globally competitive education system may also explain the lack of significant differences in leadership preferences between educational leaders in the two countries. It can be concluded that the lack of significant differences in effective leadership practices between educational leaders in Kenyan and their counterparts in the United States is because of Kenya's global approach to leadership and its adaption of the American system of education.

The second research question focused on the relationship between effective leadership practices as measured by the LPI-Self and a leader's ability to relate with people from diverse cultural backgrounds as measured by CQ. Data analysis revealed statistically significant correlations between the following LPI-Self and CQ variables: 1) Model the Way and Metacognitive CQ; 2) Model the Way and Cognitive CQ; 3) Enable Other to Act and Metacognitive CQ; 4) Enable Others to Act and Cognitive CQ; 5) Enable Others to Act and Motivational CQ; 6) Encourage the Heart and Metacognitive CQ; 7) Encourage the Heart and Cognitive CQ; and 8) Encourage the Heart and Motivational CQ.

These findings were consistent with the literature that demonstrated a relationship between effective leadership and cultural intelligence (Deng & Gibson, 2009; Keung, 2011). Three leadership practices showed a significant relationship with cultural intelligence. They include: Model the Way, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart. Model the Way was significantly correlated to metacognitive and knowledge CQ. Model the Way reflects the ability to lead by example while metacognitive CQ reflects the level of awareness when interacting in culturally diverse settings. Knowledge CQ demonstrates the understanding of cultural systems, norms, and values of other societies. The significant relationship between Model the Way and the two CQ variables were consistent with findings in a study conducted by Keung (2011). The study found that idealized influence was significantly correlated to metacognitive and knowledge CQ. Idealized influence describes leaders who are strong role models (Northouse, 2016). According to Keung (2011) leaders with high metacognitive and knowledge CQ made for good role models because they were skilled at finding ways to connect with followers in culturally relevant ways.

Equally, data analysis revealed that Enabling Others to Act was significantly related to metacognitive, cognitive and motivational CQ. Enabling Others to Act reflects a leader's ability to encourage participation of followers by "fostering collaboration and building trust" (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 18). These findings were consistent with Keung's (2011) study that showed a significant relationship between individualized consideration and cognitive CQ. Individualized consideration describes leaders who take on the role of a mentor or coach and provide a supportive and enabling environment to help followers actualize their potential (Bass & Riggio, 2006). According to Keung (2011) knowledge CQ facilitates a leader's understanding of similarities and differences across cultures allowing them to make accurate interpretation of events when interacting with individual followers. Besides, knowledge of cultural systems, norms and values facilitate a leader's ability to be considerate to followers.

Encouraging the Heart reflects a leader's ability to be supportive and keep followers hopeful. The data analysis revealed that Encouraging the Heart was significantly related to metacognitive, cognitive and motivational CQ. These findings suggest that a leader's ability to support and keep followers hopeful is related to the leader's sense of awareness and understanding of the cultural systems, norms, and values. The leader also needs to have an interest in the culture of his or her followers. The positive correlation between leadership practices and CQ variables suggest that a higher level of cultural intelligence is related to higher levels of effective leadership. These findings were consistent with studies that showed a significant relationship between inspirational motivation and cultural intelligence. Inspirational motivation describes a leader's ability to encourage and support followers toward an optimistic future (Bass & Riggio, 2006). A later study conducted by Keung (2011) showed that inspirational motivation was also significantly correlated to metacognitive, cognitive and motivational CQ.



The results of the second research question disclosed significant relationship between effective leadership and cultural intelligence. The findings were consistent with the literature review (Deng & Gibson, 2009; Keung, 2011). The three effective leadership practices of Model the Way, Enable Others to Act and Encourage the Heart were significantly correlated with the cultural variables of metacognition, cognition and motivation CQ.

Although this study did not find significant differences between educational leaders in Kenya and their counterparts in the USA, the study showed a significant relationship between effective practices and cultural competence in educational settings. These findings support the conclusion that cultural competence is an important factor in effective leadership practices in higher educational settings. These outcomes are consistent with the literature that shows cultural competency is a critical factor in effective leadership (Ang et al., 2011; Keung, 2011; Marquardt, 2011; Northouse, 2016; Tang et al., 2011; Van Dyne et al., 2010). This study supports the importance of cultural competence in higher education settings by demonstrating the correlation between cultural intelligence and effective leadership.

Furthermore the findings from this inquiry added to the knowledge on effective leadership by examining practices across cultures and investigating the relationship between effective practices and cultural competency in educational settings. While it is known that effective leadership is critical to the success of any organization (Bolman & Deal, 2008), little is known about effective leadership in higher education (Tang et al., 2011). In addition, while multiple studies show that cross-cultural competency facilitates effective leadership (Ang et al., 2011; Deng & Gibson, 2009; Dickson et al., 2012; Marquardt, 2011; Northouse, 2016; Van Dyne et al., 2010), few have examined the relationship between cultural competency and educational leadership (Tang et al., 2011).

Globalization has increased the urgency and need for leaders with cross cultural competencies and skills (Eisenberg, Hyun-Jung, Bruk, Brenner, Claes, Mironski, & Bell, 2013). In response to this growing demand it is important for educational institutions to include cross-cultural competency coursework at the undergraduate and graduate level. While there is a proliferation of institutions offering educational activities to equip students with cultural competencies, these courses are mainly offered in business school programs. Academic training and course work on cross-cultural competency has been found to be effective at increasing students' CQ (Eisenberg, Hyun-Jung, Bruk, Brenner, Claes, Mironski, & Bell, 2013). In today's globalized economy, a cross-cultural competency class needs to be included as part of the general required coursework for all undergraduates. By providing such training this would support the growing demand for leaders with cross-cultural competency and build effective leadership capacities among graduating students in an ever changing global environment.

## References

- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(1), 100-123. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275267>
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review, 3*(3), 335-371.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Tan, M. L. (2011). Cultural intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg, & S. B. Kaufmann (Eds.), *Cambridge Book of Intelligence* (pp. 582-604). New York, NY: Cambridge Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977244.030>
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*(1), 421-449. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621>
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Taylor & Francis.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Braun, S., Nazlic, T., Weisweiler, S., Pawlowska, B., Peus, C., & Frey, D. (2009). Effective leadership development in higher education: Individual and group level approaches. *Journal of Leadership Education, 8*(1), 195-206. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12806/V8/I1/IB6>
- Commission for University Education (2013). *Status of universities*. Retrieved from <http://www.cue.or.ke/services/accrreditation/status-of-universities>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Deng, L., & Gibson, P. (2009). Mapping and modeling the capacities that underlie effective cross-cultural leadership: An interpretive study with practical outcomes. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 16(4), 347-366. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13527600911000339>
- Dickson, M. W., Castano, N., Magomaeva, A., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2012). Conceptualizing leadership across cultures. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 483-492. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2012.01.002>
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Eisenberg, J., Hyun-Jung, L., Bruck, F., Brenner, B., Claes, M., Mironski, J., & Bell, R. (2013). Can Business Schools Make Students Culturally Competent? Effects of Cross-Cultural Management Courses on Cultural Intelligence. *Academy Of Management Learning & Education*, 12(4), 603-621. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amle.2012.0022>
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using spss* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fink, A. (2017). *How to conduct surveys* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Government of Kenya. (2007). *Kenya vision 2030*. Nairobi: Government Printers. Retrieved from [http://www.vision2030.go.ke/cms/vds/Popular\\_Version.pdf](http://www.vision2030.go.ke/cms/vds/Popular_Version.pdf)
- Imai, L., & Gelfand, M. J. (2010). The culturally intelligent negotiator: The impact of cultural intelligence (CQ) on negotiation sequences and outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 112, 83-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.02.001>
- Kakar, S., Kakar, S., Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Vrignaud, P. (2002). Leadership in Indian organizations from a comparative perspective. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 2(2), 239-250. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1470595802002002874>
- Keung, E. K. (2011). *What factors of cultural intelligence predict transformational leadership: A study of international school leaders* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/450/>
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). Psychometric practices of the leadership practice inventory-updated. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 191-199. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164493053001021>
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *Leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kumar, R., & Chhokar, J. S. (2013). Cross cultural leadership. In M. G. Rumsey (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 225-242). New York, NY : Oxford Press.
- Marquardt, M. J. (2011). *Building the learning organization: Achieving strategic advantage through a commitment to learning* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Nicholas Brealey.
- Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and evaluation in educational psychology* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mumford, M. D., & Barrett, J. D. (2013). Leader effectiveness: Who really is the leader? In M. G. Rumsey (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership* (pp. 423-438). New York, NY : Oxford Press.
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Rockstuhl, T., Seiler, S., Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Annen, H. (2011). Beyond general intelligence (IQ) and emotional intelligence (EQ): The role of cultural intelligence (CQ) on cross-border leadership effectiveness in a globalized world. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67, 825-840. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01730.x>
- Sifuna, D. N. (2012). Leadership in Kenyan public universities and the challenges of autonomy and academic freedom: An overview of trends since independence. *JHEA/RESA*, 10(1), 121-137. Retrieved from [http://www.codesria.org/IMG/pdf/6-JHEA\\_Vol\\_10\\_1\\_2012\\_Sifuna.pdf](http://www.codesria.org/IMG/pdf/6-JHEA_Vol_10_1_2012_Sifuna.pdf)
- Smith, B. L., & Hughey, A. W. (2006). Leadership in higher education its evolution and potential: A unique role facing critical challenges. *Industry and Higher Education*, 20(3), 157-163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5367/000000006777690972>
- Tang, H. V., Yin, M. S., & Min, J. C. (2011). A comparative study of educational leadership in Taiwan and the USA. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(1), 30-38. Retrieved from <http://www.academicjournals.org/journal/AJBM>

- U. S. Census Bureau. (2012, December 12). *U.S. census bureau projections show a slower growing, older, more diverse nation a half century from now* [Press release]. Retrieved November 28, 2013 from <http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb12-243.html>
- United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization-International Bureau of Education (UNESCO-IBE), Kenya (2010). *World Data on Education*. Retrieved from [http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Publications/WDE/2010/pdf-versions/Kenya.pdf](http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/WDE/2010/pdf-versions/Kenya.pdf)
- Universities Bill*. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.strathmore.edu/pdf/universities-bill-2012.pdf>
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Koh, C. (2008). Development and validation of the CQS: The cultural intelligence scale. In S. Ang, & L. Van Dyne (Eds.) *Handbook on Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement and Applications* (pp. 16-38). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe. Retrieved from <http://www.culturalq.com/researcharticles.html>
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Livermore, D. (2010). Cultural intelligence: A pathway for leading in a rapidly globalizing world. *Leading across differences: Cases and perspectives*, 131-138. Retrieved from <http://www.culturalq.com/researcharticles.html>
- Vilkinas, T., & Ladyshevsky, R. K. (2011). Leadership behavior and effectiveness of academic program directors in Australian universities. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(1), 109-126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1741143211420613>
- Walker, A., & Dimmock, C. (1999). A cross-cultural approach to the study of educational leadership: An emerging framework. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9, 321-348.
- Zaid, K., Al-Zawahreh, A., & Olimat, A. (2012). Leadership practices among faculty members in Jordanian public universities: A construct validation study. *Jirsea*, 10(1), 53-65.

### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).