

Cultural Intelligence as an Essential Skill in the Twenty-First Century: A Survey Study

Dr. Salma Bennour^{1*}

¹ Martyr Hamma Lakhdar University –El ouad- (Algeria), Social Development and Community Service Laboratory, selma-bennour@univ-eloued.dz

Received: 05 / 04 /2026

Accepted: 11 / 05 /2026

Published: 10 /06 /2026

ملخص: هدفت الدراسة إلى معرفة مستوى الذكاء الثقافي كمهارة في القرن الحادي والعشرين لدى الفاعلين الثقافيين المشاركين في تظاهرات قصر الثقافة. اعتمدت الدراسة المنهج الكمي، مستخدمة الاستبيان كأداة لجمع البيانات من عينة مكونة من 107 مشارك من مختلف المجالات الفنية والخلفيات العمرية. أظهرت النتائج فروقاً ذات دلالة إحصائية مرتبطة بالسن والمجال الفني، مما يعكس تأثير الخبرة العمرية والتكوين الفني في تشكيل المواقف والتمثيلات الثقافية. في المقابل، لم تُسجل فروق ذات دلالة مرتبطة بالجنس، مما يشير إلى تقارب التصورات داخل الفضاء الثقافي وانخراط الفاعلين في تفاعل وإبداع مشترك. تؤكد النتائج أهمية التفاعل بين العوامل الفردية والخبرة الفنية في فهم الظاهرة الثقافية، وتفتح المجال لدراسات مستقبلية تهدف إلى توظيف أدوات بحث متعددة واستكشاف الديناميات الثقافية في فضاءات متنوعة لتعميق فهم الذكاء الثقافي وتأثيره في بناء الوعي الاجتماعي.

الكلمات المفتاح: ذكاء ثقافي؛ ممارسة ثقافية؛ مجال فني؛ انخراط اجتماعي؛ تمثيلات ثقافية.

Abstract:

The study aimed to determine the level of cultural intelligence as a twenty first century skill among cultural actors participating in events organized by the Palace of Culture. The study adopted a quantitative approach, using a questionnaire as a data collection instrument administered to a sample of 107 participants from diverse artistic fields and age backgrounds. The results revealed statistically significant differences associated with age and artistic field, reflecting the influence of life experience and artistic training in shaping cultural attitudes and representations. In contrast, no statistically significant differences were recorded in relation to gender, indicating convergence in perceptions within the cultural space and the engagement of actors in shared interaction and creativity. The findings emphasize the importance of the interaction between individual factors and artistic experience in understanding the cultural phenomenon, and they open avenues for future studies aimed at employing multiple research tools and exploring cultural dynamics across diverse spaces to deepen understanding of cultural intelligence and its impact on the construction of social awareness.

Keywords: Cultural Intelligence; Cultural Practice; Artistic Field; Social Engagement; Cultural Representations.

* Corresponding author.

I- Introduction:

In the context of the profound structural transformations characterizing contemporary societies in the twenty first century, particularly those produced by globalization and the accelerating digital revolution, which have reshaped social relations and patterns of cultural interaction, cultural difference is no longer an exceptional condition but has become a structural feature of modern society. This transformation has been reflected across various social systems, including cultural spaces that have come to constitute vital arenas for interaction among diverse cultural, value based, and symbolic references.

The framework shows cultural intelligence as a vital social ability which helps people recognize cultural differences while using these differences to build connections instead of creating social barriers. The concept goes beyond understanding foreign cultures because it requires people to decode cultural symbols which control human actions across various social settings. It also shows respect for each other.

Cultural palaces serve as dynamic social spaces which host cultural events that display cultural diversity through multiple social groups who come together, while different viewpoints collide with each other. The two-way communication process creates new social relationship types which need people to develop skills for managing cultural exchange, while building better relationships between individuals, thus giving cultural intelligence practical value in this situation.

Accordingly, the study of cultural intelligence in the spaces of cultural events is not limited to its skill-based dimension, but rather constitutes a sociological entry point for understanding the dynamics of cultural interaction in contemporary society, and for revealing how these spaces contribute to the development or limitation of this skill in light of the demands of the twenty first century.

Study Questions:

- What is the significance of cultural intelligence as an essential competency in the twenty-first century ?
- Are there statistically significant disparities in cultural intelligence, a vital talent in the twenty-first century, among the study sample members attributed to gender ?
- Are there statistically significant differences in cultural intelligence, a vital ability in the twenty-first century, among the study sample members related to the specialisation variable ?
- Are there statistically significant differences in cultural intelligence, a vital talent in the twenty-first century, among individuals of the study sample that may be attributed to age?

Study Objectives:

- Among the most important objectives that this research seeks to achieve are the following:
- To assess the degree of cultural intelligence as a fundamental ability of the twenty-first century among the study sample members .
- To discern variations in cultural intelligence as a critical twenty-first century competency among participants within the artistic sphere .
- To discern variations in cultural intelligence as a critical twenty-first century competency among participants in the study based on gender .
- To discern variations in cultural intelligence as a pivotal twenty-first-century competency among participants in the study based on age.

II- Theoretical Framework of the Study:

1. Concept of Cultural Intelligence

The concept of cultural intelligence emerged recently in the third millennium through contributions from specialists in management and psychology, in response to the needs of nations in their interactions with their counterparts. This development generated a need to study and cultivate the capabilities required to acquire sensitivity toward different cultures and to engage constructively with such differences. The concept was first introduced by Earley and Ang in their 2003 book *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions Across Cultures*, through which the notion was articulated. Subsequently, researchers began presenting perspectives, ideas, and studies addressing this concept. (Nashi, 2021, p. 311). Cultural intelligence is defined as the ability to adapt effectively to different cultural situations (Dickson, Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003, pp. 729-768).

Individuals characterized by cultural intelligence possess several distinguishing features (Hayali, 2021, p. 84):

- They have abilities that enable them to place themselves in new cultural situations and experience satisfaction and comfort when interacting with individuals from different cultural backgrounds.
- They postpone their opinions in specific situations until they can evaluate all variables of the situation in order to reach an appropriate judgment.
- They demonstrate a willingness to ask questions, encounter new situations, and attempt practices that are unfamiliar to them.

Operationally, cultural intelligence is defined as the individual's capacity to adapt and interact effectively with situations involving cultural diversity. This is manifested through mental and behavioral readiness to communicate with individuals from different cultural backgrounds, the ability to delay judgment until all dimensions of the cultural situation are comprehensively understood, and the possession of strong intrinsic motivation to explore other cultures, ask questions, and engage in new experiences and practices. Cultural intelligence is measured by the individual's ability to adapt to diverse cultural situations, the degree of comfort and flexibility in interacting with others, and openness to cultural diversity alongside the pursuit of multicultural experiences.

2. Historical Overview of Cultural Intelligence

Christopher Earley and Soon Ang first introduced the concept of cultural intelligence in the social and administrative sciences in 2003. Since that time, the concept has gained global attention, extending beyond a single field to diverse domains. In 2004, Van Dyne and Soon Ang organized the first seminar on cultural intelligence at the Academy of Management in the United States of America. In the same year, this new concept was presented at the International Academy of Intercultural Relations conference in Taiwan. In 2005, the term cultural intelligence was introduced to numerous organizations in order to establish its scientific legitimacy, including the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology. During the same year, it was also presented to the American Psychological Association. Furthermore, in 2005, it was introduced at an international conference on information systems in Athens, where the concept was formally endorsed. In 2006, the concept was defined at the Twenty Sixth International Congress of Applied Psychology in Athens, Greece. Van Dyne and Soon Ang also organized an international conference addressing cultural intelligence, aiming to advance this field through organizational development and empirical research. In the same year, the concept was discussed at the Shanghai Cultural Intelligence Conference in China. In 2007, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency in the United States Department of Defense addressed cultural intelligence in its research and documentation (Hasnawi & Eidi, 2014, p. 15).

3. Cultural Intelligence Skills

Cultural intelligence requires the presence of nine types of skills that are of great importance for diverse forms of intelligence. These skills are as follows (Hilal & Jassim, 2017, p. 282).

- Understanding cultural identity, which involves understanding how we think about ourselves and others, as well as the ways of life we have known and experienced.

- Examining cultural perspective, which entails understanding differences in cultural backgrounds and identifying how these backgrounds influence thinking, behavior, and assumptions.
- Crossing boundaries and viewing the world from multiple perspectives.
- Transferring perspectives to individuals from different cultures, which involves placing ourselves in comparison with the cultures of others.
- Global cultural communication, which refers to exchanging ideas and emotions and creating meaning with individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds.
- Managing cultural conflict, which addresses conflict between individuals from different cultural backgrounds in a constructive and effective manner.
- Working as a team with others who possess diverse cultural backgrounds.
- Dealing with bias, which involves recognizing bias within ourselves and in others and responding to it effectively.
- Understanding power dynamics and comprehending how culture is interconnected with power and how this power influences perceptions of the world and communication with others.

Cultural intelligence represents a system of cognitive and social skills that enables individuals to interact effectively within multicultural environments. This is reflected in understanding cultural identity and perspectives, adopting different viewpoints, and communicating them consciously to others. It also includes the ability to communicate across cultures and manage cultural conflicts constructively. Additionally, it encompasses teamwork within culturally diverse settings, awareness of biases, and understanding power dynamics and their influence on social interaction. These skills constitute a foundation for a deeper understanding of social and cultural contexts in a world characterized by diversity and openness.

4. Dimensions of Cultural Intelligence

There are four dimensions of cultural intelligence:

- **Metacognitive Dimension:** The metacognitive or strategic dimension which represents how people from different cultural backgrounds interact through their cultural awareness. The way people choose strategies to learn cultural information becomes apparent when they evaluate their thinking abilities and those of other people. The dimension requires strategic planning before cultural encounters and assumption verification during experiences. Mental schema adjustment through actual experiences which differ from initial expectations (Ali & Sulaiman, 2022, p. 138). The dimension represents cultural intelligence at its highest regulatory level because it helps people develop critical thinking about their actions and others' behaviors which leads them to modify their responses for different cultural situations, thus producing more deliberate and adaptable decision-making.
- **Cognitive Dimension:** The cognitive dimension represents how people learn about cultural norms and practices and conventions through their educational background and life experiences. The knowledge base requires understanding of economic systems, legal frameworks, social structures, and linguistic elements which exist in different cultures together with their cultural commonalities and distinctions (Stallter, 2009, pp. 543-554). This dimension helps interpret behaviors and customs within their specific cultural frameworks and reduces premature judgments, thereby enhancing effective communication based on a deep understanding of others and an appreciation of each culture's distinctiveness.
- **Motivational Dimension:** The dimension shows how people want to learn about different cultures while building relationships with them. The dimension contains two elements, which include cultural curiosity and self-assurance about handling various cultural environments. People who possess strong motivation tend to seek intercultural experiences while they develop a passion for discovering cultural differences in other societies (Dickson, Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003, pp. 729-768). The dimension serves as the emotional base which develops

cultural intelligence because it makes people more open to new experiences while helping them build positive relationships and accept others despite differences.

- **Behavioral Dimension:** The dimension shows how people demonstrate their ability to use suitable verbal and nonverbal communication when they meet individuals who belong to different cultural backgrounds. The communication process requires people to use appropriate language together with nonverbal signals and behavioral changes which match the particular cultural environment (Stallter, 2009, pp. 543-554). The dimension shows how people use their awareness, knowledge, and motivation to change their actions based on cultural surroundings, which leads to successful communication that society accepts.

III- Method and Instruments:

1. Study Domains:

- **Spatial Domain:** The research took place at the Mohamed El Cheboki Cultural Palace which exists in Tebessa state because this location serves as a cultural hub for various events that enable cultural professionals to connect with local populations through direct contact. This creates suitable conditions to assess cultural intelligence in actual cultural work.
- **Human Domain (Sample):** The sample included 107 participants who represented cultural actors together with people who worked in cultural events, while maintaining their unique cultural and artistic diversity. The selection process focused on individuals who experience cultural activities at their highest level because this group serves as an ideal sample to explore cultural intelligence which emerges from personal encounters, hands-on experience, and social contact.
- **Temporal Domain:** The research study covered its entire scope through a time period which began in June 2025 and ended in February 2026 while researchers studied various cultural events which occurred throughout the entire research season. The system enabled researchers to track cultural intelligence development and participant social behavior patterns through its established monitoring period which provided consistent data collection for precise analysis.

2. Method Used:

The study relied on the quantitative approach, which is based on measuring phenomena and analyzing them statistically in order to reach precise and objective results. This approach was implemented through a questionnaire distributed to 107 participants among cultural actors involved in events at the Mohamed El Cheboki Cultural Palace in the state of Tebessa. This enabled the collection of data on the level of cultural intelligence and its analysis to identify differences associated with age, artistic field, and gender within the sample.

3. Population and Study Sample:

The study population consisted of cultural actors and participants in various cultural events organized at the Mohamed El Cheboki Cultural Palace in the state of Tebessa during several events. They were selected because they represent a diverse group in terms of cultural backgrounds and experiences, and because they have extensive exposure to multiple forms of cultural expression. The nature of their participation in these events provides opportunities for interaction with different cultures, making them more open to issues of cultural diversity and more likely to acquire skills such as cultural intelligence. Ease of access to this group, in addition to their active engagement in cultural activities, constitutes factors that make them an appropriate sample for studying this skill in the context of the requirements of the twenty first century. A questionnaire was distributed to these participants, and the results of the questionnaire distribution were as follows:

Table 01: Study Sample

No. of Distributed Questionnaire	No. of Retrieved Questionnaire	No. of Valid Questionnaire
150	120	107

Source: Prepared by the researcher.

4. Statistical Analysis Methods

Data analysis and the extraction of results were conducted in accordance with the nature of the study objectives and hypotheses. A set of descriptive and inferential statistical methods was employed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences SPSS, in addition to Microsoft Excel for data processing and conversion into graphical representations. In general, these methods included the following:

- Cronbach's Alpha: used to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaire by measuring the consistency of items, their coherence, and their ability to yield consistent responses.
- Kolmogorov Smirnov Test K S: used to verify that the data obtained from the field study follow a normal distribution.
- Arithmetic Mean: the most widely used measure of central tendency, employed to rank the statements according to their importance from the perspective of the study sample.
- Standard Deviation: a measure of dispersion used to assess and indicate the variability of the responses of the study sample around their arithmetic mean.
- One Way ANOVA: used to determine whether there are statistically significant differences in respondents' opinions according to the personal characteristics of the sample such as educational qualification and professional experience.
- Independent Samples T Test: used to determine whether there are statistically significant differences in respondents' opinions according to gender male or female.

5. Study Instrument

The questionnaire was designed after reviewing the literature and previous studies related to the subject of the research. The researcher adopted the scale developed by Saad Abd Al Zahra Al Hasnawi and Jassim Mohammed Aidi, with modifications made and certain items removed that did not align with the nature and objectives of the study.

- The first part relates to the personal data of the respondents.
- The second part contains the items related to the dimensions of cultural intelligence.

To convert responses into quantitative data, a five-point Likert scale was used because of its greater expressive capacity, diversity, and wide range. The scale levels can be illustrated according to the following table:

Table 02: Questionnaire Scale

Responses	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Score	5	4	3	2	1

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on previous accumulated knowledge.

With regard to the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach's alpha coefficient for internal consistency was adopted to determine the extent to which the questionnaire items were consistent. The following table presents the results.

Table 03: Results of the Reliability Coefficient Test Cronbach's Alpha

Questionnaire	Reliability Coefficient
All Sections	0.919

Source: Prepared by the researchers according to the outputs of the SPSS v26 statistical analysis program.

From Table 03, it is evident that the reliability coefficient for the questionnaire dimensions reached 0.919, which is an acceptable value, indicating that the instrument is suitable for measurement and application.

6. Presentation and Analysis of the Study Results

6.1 Characteristics of the Target Group:

The following table presents the characteristics of the study sample:

Table 04: Descriptive Analysis of the Characteristics of the Study Sample

Sample Characteristics	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Artistic Field	Theatre Artist	15	14.02%
	Photographic Artist	60	56.07%
	Visual Artist Painter	25	23.36%
	Musician	7	6.55%
Total		107	100%
Gender	Female	69	64.48%
	Male	38	35.52%
Total		107	100%
Age	Less than 30 years	78	72.98%
	From 30 to 35 years	18	16.82%
	More than 35 years	11	10.28%
Total		107	100%

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the outputs of the statistical analysis program SPSS v26.

2.4. Presentation and Analysis of the Study Variables Results

The following figure illustrates the statistical indicators of the questionnaire dimensions. The number of alternatives equals $5-1=4$, and therefore the class length becomes $5/4=0.80$. Accordingly, the categories corresponding to the direction of responses are as follows:

Table 05: Scale of the Arithmetic Mean Interpretation

Arithmetic Mean	Interpretation
1.00 to 1.79	Strongly Disagree
1.80 to 2.59	Disagree
2.60 to 3.39	Neutral
3.40 to 4.19	Agree
4.20 to 5.00	Strongly Agree

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on prior accumulated knowledge.

Table 06: Statistical Indicators of the Questionnaire Sections

No.	Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Mean	Std. Dev.	Rank
	Cultural Intelligence as a Twenty First Century Skill								
1	I invest my culture when interacting with individuals from other cultures	24	69	3	11	0	3.99	0.63	4
2	I am able to link my culture with other cultures	18	75	2	12	0	3.93	0.847	7
3	I try to understand the philosophy of other cultures	18	70	9	6	4	3.86	0.894	10
4	I am interested in festivals that express other cultures	12	87	2	6	0	3.98	0.743	5
5	I can recall the important features of other cultures	17	91	0	0	0	4.2	0.512	1
6	I am interested in knowing folk arts in other cultures	12	85	2	8	0	3.94	0.67	6
7	I focus on important aspects in other cultures	15	79	0	13	0	3.9	0.475	8
8	I try to learn about clothing styles and their meanings in cultures	20	54	7	17	9	3.55	0.734	18
9	I try to understand other cultures through their historical heritage	19	68	2	15	3	3.79	0.793	13
10	I tend to know standards of beauty in other cultures	21	63	0	23	0	3.77	0.673	14
11	I try to learn about religious occasions in cultures	15	72	1	15	4	3.74	0.788	15
12	I tend to analyze causes of conflict between cultures	27	49	2	27	2	3.67	0.806	16
13	I use my knowledge of the history of other cultures during interaction	30	66	1	10	0	4.08	0.803	3
14	I try to compare values and traditions of different cultures	32	51	2	15	7	3.8	0.781	12
15	I try to learn about political systems in cultures	23	62	2	20	0	3.82	0.847	11
16	I am interested in intellectual forums presenting other cultures	13	80	0	14	0	3.86	0.837	9
17	I read books that require deep reflection on cultures	29	73	0	5	0	4.18	0.568	2
18	I can quickly analyze complex situations in cultures	16	59	15	10	7	3.63	0.707	17
Overall Indicators of Questionnaire Items							3.87	0.728	Agree

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the outputs of the statistical analysis program SPSS v26.

This result indicates that cultural intelligence among cultural actors is primarily centered on the ability to connect personal knowledge with other cultural experiences and to understand the fundamental features of different cultures. This reflects that individuals place greater importance on

direct interaction and the practical application of knowledge in everyday contexts, such as utilizing historical knowledge or recalling essential characteristics of other cultures, as a basis for effective communication and the avoidance of cultural misunderstandings.

The second rank which involves analytical and detailed skills for studying folk arts and festivals, and comparing values and traditions, shows that cultural actors want to understand cultural environments and social diversity better because it enables beneficial social contacts and helps people recognize subtle cultural differences.

The ranking system places abstract and complex skills which include political system analysis, conflict studies, and cultural philosophy understanding at lower positions because these theoretical elements do not appear often in everyday cultural settings. The practice of cultural intelligence depends on people learning through hands-on experience and real-life encounters instead of studying theoretical concepts.

The research findings demonstrate that people develop practical cultural intelligence through their personal experiences and their ability to use what they have learned. Their understanding of theories and analytical skills play a secondary role in their development. The process of effective cultural learning follows sociological principles which state that people learn best through hands-on work experience and by interacting with others in their social environment.

1. Hypothesis Testing

1.5. Testing the First Hypothesis

The first hypothesis states that: "There are statistically significant differences at the significance level ($\alpha \leq 0.05$) in the opinions of the study sample toward the study variables attributable to specialization."

To test this hypothesis, a One Way ANOVA was employed, as shown in the table below.

Table 07: One Way Analysis of Variance ANOVA for the First Hypothesis

Variable	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	F Value Calculated	F Value Tabulated	Significance Level
Cultural Intelligence as a Twenty First Century Skill	Between Groups	1.006	3.701	2.68	0.024
	Within Groups	3.43			
	Total	4.436			

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the outputs of the SPSS v26 statistical analysis program.

Table 07 reveals statistically significant differences in the responses of the study sample based on the creative field. The computed F value is 3.701, exceeding the tabulated F value of 2.68 at a 5 percent significance level with 3 and 103 degrees of freedom. The significant value of 0.024 is below the established significance criterion of $\alpha \leq 0.05$. The results endorse the adoption of the alternative hypothesis H1, which asserts that "There are statistically significant differences at the significance level (0.05) in the opinions of the study sample regarding the study variables due to the artistic field."

The statistical result indicates the presence of statistically significant differences in the opinions of the study sample attributable to the artistic field. This can be interpreted sociologically in that each artistic field constitutes a specific cognitive and aesthetic framework that influences individuals' representations of the studied phenomena. The theatrical artist, by virtue of working with performance and direct interaction with the audience, tends to perceive phenomena from a communicative and experiential perspective based on social interaction. In contrast, the photographic artist adopts a visual documentary or aesthetic perspective focused on capturing the moment and reinterpreting reality through the image. The painter, meanwhile, tends toward symbolic and abstract expression, which leads to engagement with phenomena through a reflective and imaginative depth. The musician relies

on the auditory and rhythmic dimension, which is reflected in a particular sensitivity to rhythm, harmony, and emotional expression.

This differentiation reflects what Pierre Bourdieu refers to as cultural capital, whereby the artistic field contributes to shaping the individual's position within the cultural and artistic field and influences opinions and attitudes. Each category of these artists possesses its own symbolic capital and specific expertise that guide its perception and interpretation of reality.

Accordingly, the recorded differences do not merely reflect diversity in artistic formation, but also reveal the influence of cultural and institutional structures that frame these fields. This confirms that belonging to a particular artistic field is not merely a professional choice, but an active sociological factor in shaping awareness and social vision.

2.5. Testing the Second Hypothesis

The second hypothesis states that there are statistically significant differences at the significance level $\alpha \leq 0.05$ in the opinions of the study sample regarding the study variables attributable to gender.

To test this hypothesis, the independent samples T test was employed as shown in the table below:

Table 08: Results of the Independent Samples T Test for the Second Hypothesis

Variable	Calculated T Value	sig Level
Cultural Intelligence as a Twenty First Century Skill	0.974	0.078

Source: Prepared by the researcher based on the outputs of the statistical analysis program SPSS v26.

The calculated T value is 0.974, which is lower than the tabulated T value at the 5 percent significance level and 106 degrees of freedom, equal to 1.984. In addition, the significance level reached 0.078, which is higher than the adopted significance level $\alpha \leq 0.05$. Accordingly, these results lead to accepting the null hypothesis H0 that there are no statistically significant differences at the significance level $\alpha \leq 0.05$ in the opinions of the study sample regarding the study variables attributable to gender.

The statistical results indicate the absence of statistically significant differences between the opinions of sample members attributable to gender. This may be interpreted sociologically in light of the specificity of the cultural field represented by the cultural palace, considered a symbolic space in which social relations are reformulated, relatively independent of traditional gender determinants. In this context, the position of the cultural actor is not determined by being male or female, but rather by the degree of engagement in cultural action, the extent of accumulated experience and practice, and the capacity to produce meaning and interact within this field.

The participation of cultural actors and attendees of events within the cultural palace in the same spaces and activities such as performances, workshops, exhibitions, and intellectual meetings leads to the formation of what may be termed a shared cultural habitus. Patterns of perception and evaluation converge as a result of continuous exposure to the same artistic and cultural experiences and discourses. This habitus contributes to reducing the influence of gender related differences and reorients actors toward unified reference points based on artistic taste, critical sensibility, and interest in cultural production.

This homogeneity may also be understood in light of the cultural palace functioning as a site of continuous cultural socialization, where values such as openness, free expression, and aesthetic appreciation are produced and reproduced. These values possess a universal character and are not associated with a particular gender. Consequently, gender affiliations become less influential compared to affiliation with the cultural field itself.

Moreover, the absence of differences reflects a transformation in the broader social structure, as gender roles no longer exert the same explanatory power within certain modern spaces, particularly those related to culture and creativity, which operate according to a logic of participation and horizontal interaction rather than traditional hierarchy. Participation in cultural events provides

relatively equal opportunities for expression and interaction, thereby limiting the reproduction of gender differences within this context.

Accordingly, the absence of statistically significant differences should not be understood merely as the absence of variation, but rather as evidence of the formation of a type of symbolic unity within the cultural field. Cultural practice reshapes individual identities in a direction that transcends gender determinants and establishes a shared perspective derived from collective cultural experience and continuous interaction within the cultural palace.

1.5. Testing the Third Hypothesis

The third hypothesis states that there are statistically significant differences at the significance level $\alpha \leq 0.05$ in the opinions of the study sample regarding the study variables attributable to age.

To test this hypothesis, the One Way ANOVA was employed, as shown in the table below.

Table 09: One Way ANOVA for the Third Hypothesis

Variable	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	F Value Calculated	F Value Tabulated	Sig Level
Cultural Intelligence as a Twenty First Century Skill	Between Groups	0.606	3.794	2.68	0.011
	Within Groups	6.122			
	Total	6.726			

Source: Prepared by the researcher according to the outputs of the SPSS v26 statistical analysis program.

The data in Table 09 indicate the existence of statistically significant differences between the responses of the study sample according to age. This is because the calculated F value equals 3.794, which is greater than the tabulated F value at the 5 percent significance level and degrees of freedom 03 and 103, which equals 2.68. In addition, the significance value 0.011 is lower than the adopted significance level $\alpha \leq 0.05$. Accordingly, the results lead to the acceptance of the alternative hypothesis H1, which states that there are statistically significant differences at the significance level $\alpha \leq 0.05$ in the opinions of the study sample regarding the study variables attributable to age.

The statistical result indicates the presence of statistically significant differences in the opinions of the sample members attributable to age. This finding acquires a deeper sociological significance when linked to the nature of the cultural palace as a symbolic field in which different age trajectories intersect, not only in terms of biological time but also in terms of accumulated experiences, patterns of socialization, and levels of cultural engagement.

Age here reflects what may be termed the individual's cultural trajectory within the field. Cultural actors do not enter this space under the same conditions; rather, each carries a distinct stock of experience and varying degrees of accumulation in artistic and cultural practice. This accumulation influences not only the level of knowledge but also modes of perception, evaluation, and positioning within the cultural field. Therefore, differences in opinions reflect differences in perspectives associated with varied age positions.

These differences can also be interpreted through the variation in individuals' relationships with cultural and social transformations. Different age groups have experienced distinct stages in the development of the cultural field and have encountered diverse forms of cultural practice and institutional framing, which leads to diversity in the reference frameworks each actor relies upon in understanding phenomena. This is reflected in varying degrees of openness to new cultural patterns and in the ways changes within the cultural field of the cultural palace are evaluated.

Furthermore, the cultural palace, as a space for intergenerational interaction, does not eliminate differences but reorganizes them, as traditional modes of perception coexist alongside more modern ones within the same domain, producing a state of symbolic plurality rather than homogeneity. Consequently, age related differences reflect an internal dynamic within the cultural field based on

the interaction between continuity, represented by experience and accumulation, and renewal, represented by difference and openness.

Accordingly, the significance of this result extends beyond the simple age dimension to reveal that age represents an indicator of differences in positions, variations in cultural capital, and the multiplicity of habitus patterns within the cultural field, making it a decisive sociological variable in explaining the diversity of attitudes and perceptions among cultural actors and participants in events within the Palace of Culture.

III. Results and Discussion:

Based on the findings obtained from the presentation and analysis of the data, the study results can be interpreted in light of the specific characteristics of the research field represented by the Palace of Culture and the study sample represented by cultural actors and participants in various cultural events, as follows:

- There are statistically significant differences attributable to the variable of artistic specialization. This result can be explained by the fact that each artistic domain produces its own cognitive and aesthetic framework that shapes the perceptions and representations of cultural actors. Artistic training, together with field experience, contributes to the construction of different perspectives on cultural phenomena and influences modes of interaction within the Palace of Culture, leading to variation in attitudes and opinions.
- There are no statistically significant differences attributable to the gender variable. This can be explained by the fact that cultural actors and participants in events within the Palace of Culture engage in a shared space based on interaction, creativity, and expression, which contributes to the convergence of their experiences and perceptions regardless of gender differences. This reflects a decline in the influence of traditional stereotypical roles within the cultural field in favor of a logic based on competence and cultural participation.
- There are statistically significant differences attributable to the age variable. This result can be interpreted sociologically by noting that different age groups within the Palace of Culture carry diverse cultural trajectories and experiences resulting from varying levels of accumulated practice and engagement in cultural activity. The time-based age measure extends beyond its usual meaning because it reveals how cultural development patterns differ between generations and how cognitive approaches vary, and how people connect with their field, which produces distinct ways of viewing the research topic. The findings show how personal elements work with established systems to determine how cultural professionals view their environment. The study shows different cultural development patterns between age groups and artistic disciplines, which create distinct cultural experiences and learning methods that affect how people perceive cultural environments. The research shows that men and women in this field share similar characteristics, which indicates that this area operates with uniformity. While cultural elements work to change social structures which no longer depend on traditional gender roles. The study data shows how the Palace of Culture cultural field structure operates and demonstrates how personal experiences and age factors shape people's views. This creates opportunities for upcoming research to study cultural activities and their effects on social understanding development.

4. Conclusion:

The research study analyzed cultural intelligence through modern sociological perspectives during its theoretical examination which studied how people develop their ability to work with others from different cultural environments. The research investigated the basic theoretical elements which form cultural intelligence. It examined its various aspects and studied the competencies linked to it, and the main traits of people who show strong levels of cultural intelligence. The theoretical framework provides a knowledge base which enables understanding of the studied phenomenon within its socio cultural and institutional context. It demonstrates how cultural intelligence serves as an analytical tool for studying interactions across various social settings.

In the applied dimension, the study results revealed statistically significant differences in the opinions of the sample members attributable to the variables of age and artistic field, indicating the influence of age formation and artistic experience in shaping attitudes and representations within the cultural palace. These differences demonstrate that age trajectories and accumulated cultural experiences, in addition to the nature of artistic training, contribute to the formation of different perspectives toward the cultural and social phenomena under study. In contrast, the study did not record differences attributable to the gender variable, reflecting convergence in perceptions among cultural actors and participants in events. This indicates that engagement in cultural activity within this space contributes to transcending certain traditional gender differences in favor of a shared vision based on interaction, creativity, and cultural practice.

Despite the significance of the results reached by the study, it encountered certain methodological limitations that do not constitute weaknesses, but rather open new research horizons. The restriction of the study to a sample of cultural actors and participants within the cultural palace, and its reliance solely on the questionnaire as a tool, can be considered an initial stage that paves the way for deeper studies employing qualitative tools and multiple approaches to understand the dimensions of the phenomenon more comprehensively. Moreover, the specificity of this cultural space may call for retesting the results in other cultural contexts, thereby allowing expansion of the possibilities for generalization and comparison.

Accordingly, the study recommends expanding the scope of future research through diversification of data collection tools, integration of qualitative and quantitative dimensions, and targeting cultural actors from diverse artistic fields and specializations, as well as from different social and cultural backgrounds. It also proposes conducting comparative studies across multiple cultural spaces and exploring the relationship between cultural intelligence and other variables such as artistic experience, cultural socialization, degree of engagement in events, and openness to others, in order to enrich scientific discussion of this phenomenon and deepen understanding of it within its multiple socio-cultural contexts.

Bibliography

- Ali, N. S., & Sulaiman, A. Y. (2022). Cultural Intelligence among Educational Supervisors in Kirkuk Governorate. *Journal of Educational and Scientific Studies*.
- Dickson, M. W., Hartog, D. N., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2003). Research on Leadership in a Cross Cultural Context Making Progress and Raising New Questions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 729-768.
- Habib, T. A. (2017). Cultural Intelligence and Its Relationship with Quality of Life among University Students. *Al Adab Journal*.
- Hasnawi, S. A., & Eidi, J. M. (2014). A Comparative Study in Social Tolerance According to Levels of Cultural Intelligence among University Students. *Al Mustansiriya Arts Journal*.
- Hayali, B. A. (2021). Cultural Intelligence and Its Relationship with Aesthetic Awareness among Female Students of Kindergarten Department. *Journal of Intelligence Research*.
- Hilal, K. F., & Jassim, Z. A. (2017). Cultural Intelligence and Its Relationship with Mental Openness among Students of University of Babylon. *Journal of the College of Basic Education for Educational and Human Sciences*.
- Nashi, W. A. (2021). Cultural Intelligence among Gifted Students and Their Ordinary Peers. *Journal of Intelligence Research*.
- Stallter, T. (2009). Cultural Intelligence. *Missiology An International Review*, 543-554.