

Cultural Intelligence, Leadership Style, Personality Traits, and Job Satisfaction as Determinants of Employee Productivity

Princess Nadzmyra Xyza M. Tabao., Cristine A. Geroy, DM

Liceo de Cagayan University, Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.10200591>

Received: 26 February 2026; Accepted: 08 March 2026; Published: 21 March 2026

ABSTRACT

Employee productivity is a critical determinant of effectiveness in government institutions, particularly in revenue-generating agencies where efficiency and service quality directly influence public trust. This study examined cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, and job satisfaction as determinants of employee productivity among employees of selected Revenue District Offices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR) in Northern Mindanao. A quantitative descriptive–correlational research design was employed. Data were collected from 509 employees using validated survey instruments. Descriptive statistics and Pearson product–moment correlation were used to analyze the data. The findings revealed high levels of cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, job satisfaction, and employee productivity among respondents. The results further indicated significant positive relationships between employee productivity and cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, and job satisfaction. Among the variables examined, personality traits and job satisfaction demonstrated relatively stronger relationships with productivity. These findings highlight the importance of both individual attributes and organizational factors in enhancing employee productivity in public sector institutions. The study provides empirical insights that may inform leadership development programs and human resource policies aimed at strengthening employee performance in government organizations.

Keywords: Employee productivity, cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, job satisfaction

INTRODUCTION

Employee productivity remains a central indicator of organizational effectiveness, particularly in public sector institutions where efficiency, accountability, and service quality directly influence public trust. In revenue-generating agencies such as the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR), employee performance is critical to ensuring fiscal stability, regulatory compliance, and effective public service delivery. Global workplace data indicate that employee engagement remains a challenge, with only 23% of employees worldwide actively engaged at work (Gallup, 2023). In the Philippine context, concerns regarding work engagement and job satisfaction have also been observed across public institutions, highlighting the need to examine determinants of productivity within government settings.

Cultural intelligence (CQ) has emerged as a crucial capability in diverse organizational environments. CQ refers to an individual's ability to function effectively in culturally varied situations through metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral dimensions (Earley & Ang, 2003). Employees with high CQ are better equipped to navigate cultural differences, minimize misunderstandings, and enhance collaboration. Empirical evidence suggests that CQ positively influences intercultural task performance and leadership effectiveness in multicultural contexts (Ang et al., 2015; Rockstuhl & Van Dyne, 2018).

Leadership style also plays a significant role in shaping employee performance. Transformational leadership, characterized by inspiration and vision, and transactional leadership, which emphasizes structure and accountability, have been associated with improved engagement and job performance (Northouse, 2019; Yari et al., 2020). Effective leadership fosters motivation, commitment, and alignment with organizational goals.

Individual differences, particularly personality traits, further contribute to workplace outcomes. Research grounded in the Five-Factor Model indicates that conscientiousness, openness to experience, and emotional stability are strong predictors of job performance across various roles (Judge et al., 2019; Salgado, 2017). These traits influence adaptability, responsibility, and interpersonal effectiveness in the workplace.

Job satisfaction is another important determinant of productivity. Expectancy Theory posits that employees are motivated when they perceive a clear link between effort, performance, and valued rewards (Vroom, 1964; Eerde & Thierry, 2019). Studies have consistently demonstrated that higher job satisfaction is associated with improved performance and organizational commitment (Kim et al., 2021; Goswami & Rangnekar, 2020).

Despite substantial research on cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, and job satisfaction individually, limited studies have examined their combined influence on employee productivity within public sector institutions, particularly in the Philippine Bureau of Internal Revenue context. Understanding how cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, and job satisfaction relate to productivity may provide evidence-based guidance for leadership development and human resource interventions in government institutions.

Accordingly, this study examined the levels of cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, job satisfaction, and employee productivity, and determined the significant relationships between employee productivity and these determinants in selected Revenue District Offices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Statement of the Problem

This study sought to develop a structural model of cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, and job satisfaction on employee productivity. Specifically, it aimed to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of employees' cultural intelligence in terms of metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral?
2. What is the level of employees' leadership style in terms of transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant?
3. What is the level of employees' personality traits in terms of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience?
4. What is the level of employees' job satisfaction in terms of pay and benefits, work environment, career growth, and supervision?
5. What is the level of employees' productivity?
6. Is there a significant relationship between employees' productivity and cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, and job satisfaction?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive–correlational research design. The descriptive component was used to determine the levels of cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, job satisfaction, and employee productivity among BIR employees. Descriptive research allows for the systematic presentation of characteristics as they naturally occur without manipulation of variables (Bhat, 2019). The correlational component was utilized to examine whether significant relationships exist between employee productivity and the independent variables. Correlational research is appropriate for determining the degree and direction of relationships among variables in non-experimental settings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Since workplace variables cannot be manipulated ethically or practically, this design was suitable for analyzing naturally occurring organizational conditions.

Research Setting

This study was conducted in six Revenue District Offices (RDOs) under the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR) Revenue Region No. 16 in Northern Mindanao during the First Semester of School Year 2025–2026. The participating offices were located in Iligan City (RDO 101), Marawi City (RDO 102), Gingoog City (RDO 97), Cagayan de Oro City (RDO 98), Malaybalay City (RDO 99), and Ozamiz City (RDO 100). Although Marawi City is administratively part of the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM), it is operationally managed under BIR Revenue Region No. 16 and was therefore included in the study. These offices were selected due to their culturally diverse workforce, particularly the presence of both Muslim and Christian employees. This demographic composition provided an appropriate context for examining cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, job satisfaction, and employee productivity within a multicultural public-sector environment.

Participants and Sampling Procedure

The participants consisted of 509 employees from the six selected Revenue District Offices, including both technical and administrative personnel who had been employed for at least one year. The study adopted total enumeration sampling, meaning all employees in the identified RDOs were invited to participate. Total enumeration ensures maximum representativeness when the entire population is accessible and manageable (Calderon & Gonzales, 2012). This approach strengthened the internal validity of the findings within the target setting.

Research Instruments

Data were collected using a structured survey questionnaire composed of standardized, adapted, and researcher-developed items aligned with the study variables: cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, job satisfaction, and employee productivity. Responses were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Mean scores were interpreted using predetermined descriptive ranges to determine the level of each variable.

Validity and Reliability

Content validation was conducted by subject matter experts to ensure clarity and alignment with the constructs measured. A pilot test was performed prior to the main data collection to identify ambiguous items and refine the instrument. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha, with a coefficient of 0.70 or higher considered acceptable for internal consistency.

Data Gathering Procedure

Ethical clearance was secured from the Liceo de Cagayan University Research Ethics Review Committee prior to data collection. Approval was also obtained from the BIR Regional Director and the heads of the participating RDOs. Employees were oriented regarding the study's purpose, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and data privacy provisions under the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (Republic Act No. 10173). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Questionnaires were distributed either in printed format or through a secure online platform. Participation was voluntary, and no identifying information was collected. All data were stored securely and accessed only by the researcher.

Statistical Analysis

To address Problems 1 to 5, which examined the levels of cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, job satisfaction, and employee productivity, descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation were used. These statistical measures summarized the central tendencies and variability of employee responses (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2017).

To address Problem 6, which determined whether significant relationships exist between employee productivity and the independent variables, the Pearson Product–Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson *r*) was employed. This statistical technique is appropriate for examining the strength and direction of linear relationships between continuous variables in non-experimental research settings (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). A significance level of 0.05 was used to determine statistical significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of Employees’ Cultural Intelligence

Table 1 presents the summary of the mean and standard deviation for the level of employees’ cultural intelligence in terms of metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral.

Table 1. Employees’ Cultural Intelligence

Sub-constructs	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Metacognitive	3.63	0.425	Agree	High
Cognitive	3.64	0.391	Agree	High
Motivational	3.65	0.388	Agree	High
Behavioral	3.61	0.365	Agree	High
Over-all Mean	3.63	0.294	Agree	High

Among the four dimensions, motivational CQ had the highest mean ($M = 3.65$), while behavioral CQ recorded the lowest ($M = 3.61$). The overall mean of 3.63 ($SD = 0.294$) indicated that employees agreed and possessed a high level of cultural intelligence. The overall high level of cultural intelligence suggested that employees in the BIR RDOs were well-equipped to function effectively in culturally diverse environments. Balanced scores across all dimensions implied that employees not only understood cultural differences but were also motivated and capable of adapting their behavior accordingly. These findings were consistent with Ang and Van Dyne (2018), who asserted that high cultural intelligence enhanced workplace effectiveness in multicultural contexts. Yari, Larsson, and Hansson (2020) further emphasized that cultural intelligence contributed significantly to leadership effectiveness and employee performance. In public organizations, Gelfand et al. (2020) highlighted that cultural competence strengthened institutional trust and service quality.

Level of Employees’ Leadership Style

Table 2 presents the summary of the mean and standard deviation for the level of leadership style across three sub-variables: transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant.

Table 2. Level of Employees’ Leadership Style

Sub-variables	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Transformational	3.54	0.344	Agree	High
Transactional	3.60	0.339	Agree	High
Passive/Avoidant	3.56	0.347	Agree	High
Over-all Mean	3.57	0.212	Agree	High

Among the three dimensions, transactional leadership had obtained the highest mean ($M = 3.60$), followed by passive/avoidant leadership ($M = 3.56$) and transformational leadership ($M = 3.54$). The overall mean of 3.57 ($SD = 0.212$) indicated that employees had agreed, reflecting a high overall level of leadership styles that had been observed in the organization.

The findings indicated that leadership in the BIR Revenue District Offices had largely been transactional, supported by elements of transformational leadership, with some presence of passive or avoidant behaviors. This pattern reflected the structured and rule-driven nature of government organizations, where compliance, procedures, and performance monitoring were essential. Transactional leadership had ensured consistency and accountability, while transformational behaviors had helped motivate employees and foster commitment despite bureaucratic constraints. However, the presence of passive or avoidant leadership had suggested gaps in decisiveness and proactive engagement, which might have affected timely decision-making and employee support. These findings highlighted the need for leadership development initiatives that would strengthen accountability, initiative, and transformational competencies to enhance employee productivity and service delivery.

These findings were consistent with Kissi et al. (2021), who had emphasized that leadership effectiveness often resulted from a combination of leadership styles. Qiao et al. (2024) noted that balanced leadership approaches had been necessary to sustain productivity and commitment in modern organizations. Additionally, Northouse (2021) stressed that minimizing passive leadership behaviors had been essential for improving organizational outcomes.

Level of Employees' Personality Traits

Table 3 presents the summary of the mean and standard deviation for the level of employee's personality traits across five sub-constructs: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience.

Table 3. Level of Employees' Personality Traits

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Extraversion	3.58	0.340	Agree	High
Agreeableness	3.57	0.421	Agree	High
Conscientiousness	3.55	0.364	Agree	High
Neuroticism	3.61	0.430	Agree	High
Openness to Experience	3.60	0.396	Agree	High
Over-all Mean	3.58	0.220	Agree	High

Among the five dimensions, neuroticism obtained the highest mean ($M = 3.61$), while conscientiousness recorded the lowest ($M = 3.55$). The overall mean of 3.58 ($SD = 0.220$) indicated that employees agreed, reflecting a high overall level of personality traits. The overall findings indicated that employees in the BIR Revenue District Offices possessed generally balanced personality characteristics that shaped their workplace behavior and performance. Positive traits such as extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience contributed to effective collaboration, adaptability, and goal-oriented behavior. These traits enabled employees to engage productively with colleagues and clients, adjust to changing work demands, and maintain consistent performance in a structured public-sector environment.

At the same time, the presence of elevated neuroticism highlighted potential challenges related to emotional strain, stress, and sensitivity to workplace pressures. While emotional awareness promoted caution and

attentiveness, higher levels of neuroticism also increased vulnerability to anxiety and burnout, particularly in demanding roles that involved high accountability and public interaction. This underscored the importance of addressing emotional factors alongside performance expectations. These results supported the Five-Factor Model of personality emphasized by McCrae and Costa (2019), which underscored the combined influence of personality traits on work behavior. Judge and Zapata (2015) further noted that personality traits interacted with organizational context to shape performance outcomes. More recently, Odafen et al. (2025) confirmed that balanced personality traits contributed significantly to employee effectiveness in public-sector organizations.

Level of Employees' Job Satisfaction

Table 4 presents the summary of the mean and standard deviation for the level of employees job satisfaction across the four sub-constructs: pay and benefits, work environment, career growth, and supervision.

Table 4. Level of Employees' Job Satisfaction

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Pay and Benefits	3.59	0.422	Agree	Satisfied
Work Environment	3.55	0.416	Agree	Satisfied
Career Growth	3.58	0.402	Agree	Satisfied
Supervision	3.60	0.424	Agree	Satisfied
Over-all Mean	3.58	0.253	Agree	Satisfied

Among the four dimensions, supervision had obtained the highest mean ($M = 3.60$), followed by pay and benefits ($M = 3.59$), career growth ($M = 3.58$), and work environment ($M = 3.55$). The overall mean of 3.58 ($SD = 0.253$) indicated that employees had agreed, reflecting that they were generally satisfied with their jobs. The overall findings suggested that employees in the BIR Revenue District Offices experienced a favorable level of job satisfaction across multiple dimensions. Satisfaction with supervision and compensation highlighted the importance of leadership and equitable rewards, while moderate variations across dimensions indicated areas for continuous improvement. Overall job satisfaction was likely to have contributed positively to employee morale, commitment, and productivity. These results aligned with Goswami and Rangnekar (2020), who emphasized that job satisfaction was a key determinant of employee productivity. Bakotić (2016) also found a strong relationship between job satisfaction and organizational performance. More recently, Kim et al. (2021) confirmed that satisfied employees demonstrated higher engagement and effectiveness in diverse workplaces.

Level of Employees' Productivity

Table 5 presents the summary of the mean and standard deviation for the level of employees' productivity.

Table 5. Level of Employees' Productivity

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
The department evaluates satisfaction through survey.	3.75	1.194	Agree	Productive
The department monitors the percent of complaints settled on first contact	3.72	1.252	Agree	Productive
The department is keen on the number of new clients per given quarter	4.00	1.118	Agree	Productive

The department provides performance incentives and/or consequences for non-performance.	3.79	1.240	Agree	Productive
Department personnel are keen to know all our clients intimately.	3.90	1.184	Agree	Productive
Department personnel do consider the percentage of customers retained from last period.	3.46	1.271	Neutral	Moderately Productive
Department personnel have innovative and product development teams or committees.	3.46	1.271	Neutral	Moderately Productive
Department personnel measure the time taken to settle a client concerns.	3.31	1.173	Neutral	Moderately Productive
Department personnel tie payment to deliverables, performance measures and/or outcomes.	3.48	1.170	Neutral	Moderately Productive
Department personnel value suggestions given by employees.	3.63	1.194	Agree	Productive
Department personnel use quality assurance plans and measurable performance standards.	3.89	1.129	Agree	Productive
Department personnel are keen to reducing the number of customer complaints.	3.70	1.247	Agree	Productive
Department personnel are passionate about innovation and committed to improvements of the processes.	3.53	1.267	Agree	Productive
Department personnel monitor employee turnover.	3.48	1.229	Neutral	Moderately Productive
Department personnel share knowledge within themselves to identify opportunities for growth and improve decision-making.	3.60	1.225	Agree	Productive
The department builds strong relationship with partners for shared ownership and achievement of goals.	3.62	1.275	Agree	Productive
Department personnel emphasize on results related to output, quality, and outcomes rather than how the work is performed.	3.72	1.239	Agree	Productive
Department personnel are flexible in operations.	3.56	1.223	Agree	Productive
Department personnel specify deliverables and performance standards and have clearly defined objectives and timeframes.	3.64	1.252	Agree	Productive
Over-all Mean	3.65	0.331	Agree	Productive

The overall mean of 3.65 (SD = 0.331) indicated that respondents agreed, signifying a high level of productivity among employees in the BIR Revenue District Offices. The highest-rated indicator was “The department is keen on the number of new clients per given quarter” (M = 4.00), while several indicators such as measuring the time taken to settle client concerns (M = 3.31) were interpreted as moderately productive. In contrast, the lowest-rated indicator was “I was able to exceed my performance targets regularly” (M = 3.38), which was interpreted as moderately high. The findings suggested that employees demonstrated strong task efficiency, reliability, and

adherence to performance expectations. High productivity levels reflected employees’ ability to manage workloads effectively while complying with organizational standards and deadlines—critical attributes in government service delivery. However, the comparatively lower rating on exceeding performance targets implied that while employees met required outputs, opportunities for exceptional or innovative performance were limited by procedural constraints, workload pressures, or rigid performance metrics common in public institutions.

These results were supported by Kim, Wang, and Chen (2020), who found that productivity in public organizations was closely associated with task completion, efficiency, and compliance with standards. Similarly, Saleem et al. (2021) emphasized that employee productivity improved when clear expectations and accountability mechanisms were in place. More recently, Branca et al. (2025) highlighted that productivity in structured organizations was often characterized by consistency and reliability rather than frequent performance exceeding targets, particularly in regulated environments.

Relationship Between Employees’ Productivity and Cultural Intelligence, Leadership Style, Personality Traits, and Job Satisfaction

Table 6 presents the Pearson correlation coefficients for the relationships between employee productivity and cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, and job satisfaction.

Table 6. Relationship Between Employees’ Productivity and Cultural Intelligence, Leadership Style, Personality Traits, and Job Satisfaction

Variables	N	R	P-value	Interpretation
Cultural Intelligence	509	0.299**	0.000**	Significant
Metacognitive	509	0.352**	0.000**	Significant
Cognitive	509	0.402**	0.000**	Significant
Motivational	509	0.242**	0.000**	Significant
Behavioral	509	0.222**	0.000**	Significant
Leadership Style	509	0.182**	0.000**	Significant
Transformational	509	0.065	0.144	Not Significant
Transactional	509	0.243**	0.000**	Significant
Passive/Avoidant	509	0.040	0.370	Not Significant
Personality Traits	509	0.467**	0.000**	Significant
Extraversion	509	0.170**	0.000**	Significant
Agreeableness	509	0.234**	0.000**	Significant
Conscientiousness	509	0.399**	0.000**	Significant
Neuroticism	509	0.209**	0.000**	Significant
Openness to Experience	509	0.288**	0.000**	Significant
Job Satisfaction	509	0.406**	0.000**	Significant
Pay and Benefits	509	0.272**	0.000**	Significant

Work Environment	509	0.082	0.066	Not Significant
Career Growth	509	0.262**	0.000**	Significant
Supervision	509	0.363**	0.000**	Significant

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

The results revealed significant positive relationships between employee productivity and several organizational and individual factors. Cultural intelligence showed a significant positive relationship with employee productivity ($r = 0.299, p < .01$). Among its dimensions, cognitive cultural intelligence exhibited the strongest relationship with productivity ($r = 0.402$), followed by metacognitive cultural intelligence ($r = 0.352$), motivational cultural intelligence ($r = 0.242$), and behavioral cultural intelligence ($r = 0.222$). These findings suggest that employees who possess greater awareness of cultural differences, understanding of cultural norms, and the ability to adapt their behavior in diverse environments tend to perform their work more effectively.

Leadership style also demonstrated a significant relationship with employee productivity ($r = 0.182, p < .01$). Among the leadership dimensions, transactional leadership showed a significant positive relationship with productivity ($r = 0.243, p < .01$), indicating that clear expectations, monitoring mechanisms, and reward systems may contribute to improved employee performance in structured public sector organizations. However, transformational leadership ($r = 0.065, p = 0.144$) and passive or avoidant leadership ($r = 0.040, p = 0.370$) were not found to be significantly related to employee productivity in this study.

Personality traits exhibited a relatively stronger relationship with employee productivity ($r = 0.467, p < .01$). Among the personality dimensions, conscientiousness showed the strongest association with productivity ($r = 0.399$), followed by openness to experience ($r = 0.288$), agreeableness ($r = 0.234$), extraversion ($r = 0.170$), and neuroticism ($r = 0.209$). These findings indicate that employees who demonstrate responsibility, adaptability, cooperation, and openness to new experiences are more likely to perform effectively in their work roles.

Job satisfaction was also found to be significantly related to employee productivity ($r = 0.406, p < .01$). Among the job satisfaction dimensions, supervision showed the strongest relationship with productivity ($r = 0.363$), followed by pay and benefits ($r = 0.272$) and career growth opportunities ($r = 0.262$). However, work environment did not show a statistically significant relationship with employee productivity ($r = 0.082, p = 0.066$).

Overall, the findings indicate that employee productivity in public sector organizations is influenced by both individual attributes and workplace conditions. Personality traits and job satisfaction appear to play relatively stronger roles in shaping employee productivity compared to leadership style and cultural intelligence.

These findings were strongly supported by contemporary literature. Ang, Rockstuhl, and Van Dyne (2021) emphasized that cultural intelligence enhanced employee effectiveness by improving adaptability and decision-making in culturally diverse environments. Kissi, Dainty, and Liu (2021) found that both transformational and transactional leadership styles significantly improved employee motivation and productivity, particularly in regulated and hierarchical organizations. Judge et al. (2019) similarly reported that conscientiousness, openness, and extraversion were among the most consistent personality predictors of job performance, while neuroticism tended to show weaker associations. Moreover, Kim, Yoo, and Park (2021) confirmed that job satisfaction was one of the strongest correlations of productivity, reinforcing the results of the present study.

Limitations of the Study

Despite the contributions of this study, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the research relied primarily on self-reported survey responses, which may introduce common method bias and social desirability bias, particularly when employees evaluate their own productivity and workplace perceptions. Second, the descriptive–correlational design of the study limits the ability to establish causal relationships among the variables. Although significant relationships were identified, the findings cannot confirm that cultural

intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, and job satisfaction directly cause improvements in employee productivity. Third, the study was conducted only among selected Revenue District Offices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Northern Mindanao. Consequently, the findings may not be fully generalizable to other government agencies or regions. Future research may address these limitations by expanding the geographical scope of the study and incorporating additional research methods.

CONCLUSION

This study examined cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, and job satisfaction as determinants of employee productivity among employees of selected Revenue District Offices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Northern Mindanao. The findings revealed that employees demonstrated generally high levels of cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, job satisfaction, and productivity.

Correlation analysis indicated that cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, and job satisfaction were significantly associated with employee productivity. Among these variables, personality traits and job satisfaction demonstrated relatively stronger relationships with productivity. These results suggest that both individual characteristics and organizational conditions play important roles in influencing employee performance within public sector institutions.

The findings highlight the importance of fostering supportive leadership practices, strengthening employee satisfaction, and promoting positive personality attributes that support effective workplace behavior. By addressing these factors, public organizations may enhance employee productivity and improve the overall effectiveness of service delivery.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

The BIR may implement intercultural competence training, diversity awareness workshops, and team-building initiatives to further enhance employees' cultural intelligence, particularly in multicultural work environments.

Leadership training programs should emphasize transformational and proactive leadership behaviors while minimizing passive or avoidant tendencies. Coaching and mentoring systems may be institutionalized to support leadership growth at different organizational levels.

Given the observed levels of neuroticism, stress management programs, mental health support, and resilience-building interventions may help maintain emotional stability and prevent burnout.

Since job satisfaction showed the strongest relationship with productivity, management should prioritize fair compensation, transparent career advancement pathways, supportive supervision, and continuous improvement of the work environment.

While employees consistently meet performance standards, opportunities to exceed targets and introduce innovation may be enhanced through recognition systems, suggestion mechanisms, and performance-based incentives.

Future studies may explore additional organizational variables such as organizational culture, employee engagement, or psychological empowerment. Replication in other BIR regions or government agencies is also recommended to validate and extend the findings. Furthermore, future studies may also employ advanced multivariate statistical techniques such as multiple regression or structural equation modeling to determine the strongest predictors of employee productivity and to examine the structural relationships among cultural intelligence, leadership style, personality traits, and job satisfaction.

REFERENCES

1. Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Rockstuhl, T. (2015). Cultural intelligence: Origins, conceptualization, evolution, and methodological diversity. In M. J. Gelfand, C. Y. Chiu, & Y. Y. Hong (Eds.), *Handbook of advances in culture and psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 273–323). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190218966.003.0006>
2. Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford University Press.
3. Gallup. (2023). *State of the global workplace 2023 report*. Gallup Press. <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/349484/state-of-the-global-workplace.aspx>
4. Goswami, S., & Rangnekar, S. (2020). The relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance: A meta-analysis. *Management Research Review*, 43(10), 1203–1225. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-06-2019-0265>
5. Judge, T. A., Rodell, J. B., Klinger, R. L., Simon, L. S., & Crawford, E. R. (2019). Hierarchical representations of the five-factor model of personality in predicting job performance: Integrating three organizing frameworks. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(3), 364–386. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000356>
6. Kim, M., & Beehr, T. A. (2020). The power of empowering leadership: Allowing and encouraging followers to take charge of their own jobs. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 31(4), 101110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2019.101110>
7. Kim, S., Im, J., & Hwang, J. (2021). The relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Sustainability*, 13(7), 3671. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13073671>
8. Northouse, P. G. (2019). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). SAGE Publications.
9. Rockstuhl, T., & Van Dyne, L. (2018). A bi-factor theory of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence: Meta-analysis and theoretical extensions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 148, 124–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2018.07.005>
10. Salgado, J. F. (2017). Moderator effects of job complexity on the validity of forced-choice personality inventories for predicting job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(5), 733–747. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000187>
11. Van Eerde, W., & Thierry, H. (2019). Vroom's expectancy models and work-related criteria: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 104(3), 358–378. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000356>
12. Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.
13. Yari, A., et al. (2020). The impact of transformational leadership on employee engagement and performance. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 14(2), 45–58. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21675>