
CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE AS AN EFFECTIVE CROSS-CULTURAL COMPETENCY: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Sumeet Kour

Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Cluster University of Jammu

Abstract

Cultural Intelligence helps business-people everywhere to become more effective in making decisions, communicating and negotiating across cultures, leading and motivating others who are culturally different, and managing their careers. Organisation's need to focus on cultural diversity and look for ways to become totally inclusive organisation as managing diversity is the key component of effective people management, which improves workplace productivity. Organisations must develop a new breed of managers, who can see beyond surface level cultural differences. This vision can be attained by being culturally intelligent, which can increase an individual's ability to interact with people outside their cultures.

Introduction

Cultural intelligence is the key competence of the twenty-first century. It is a person's capability to adapt effectively to new cultural context. Cultural Intelligence helps business-people everywhere to become more effective in making decisions, communicating and negotiating across cultures, leading and motivating others who are culturally different, and managing their careers. Organisation's need to focus on cultural diversity and look for ways to become totally inclusive organisation as managing diversity is the key component of effective people management, which improves workplace productivity. Cultural intelligence is a tool, which can increase an individual's ability to interact with people outside their cultures (Jyoti & Kour, 2015; Jyoti, Kour & Bhau, 2015). Since culture is learned from the individual's environment, people living in different places have different cultures. The business houses have to deal with people from different cultural backgrounds. Organisations need to focus on the diversity as it has greater potential to affect productivity and competitive advantage. To deal with the issues of diverse cultures new global skills need to be acquired for an effective leadership. Organisations must develop a new breed of managers, who can see beyond surface level cultural differences (Kanter, 1995; Jyoti & Kour, 2015). This vision can be attained by being culturally intelligent, which can increase an individual's ability to interact with people outside their cultures. People who are culturally intelligent are able to interact effectively with individuals from different culture (Jyoti & Kour, 2017; Jyoti & Kour, 2017).

Cultural Intelligence

Earley and Ang (2003) introduced the concept of cultural intelligence. It refers to an individual's capability to function effectively in situations characterised by cultural diversity (Earley & Ang, 2003). Those with higher CQ have the ability to encounter confusing situations, think deeply about what is happening (or not happening) and make appropriate adjustments to how they understand, relate and lead in the context of these different cultures. It is malleable (adaptable) state that can be developed over time. CQ is a multi-dimensional concept comprising meta-cognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral dimensions (Ang et al., 2007 pp.337).

Meta-cognitive CQ: The meta-cognitive CQ (CQ-Strategy) refers to mental processes that individuals use to acquire and understand cultural knowledge, including knowledge of, and control over individual thought processes relating to culture (Flavell, 1979). It involves planning strategically before cross-cultural interactions, adjusting cultural knowledge when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds and monitoring the accuracy of cultural knowledge during cross-cultural encounters (Ang et al., 2007, pp. 337).

Cognitive CQ: The cognitive component (CQ-Knowledge) relates to how an individual makes sense of similarities and difference between cultures (Ang et al., 2007, pp.337). It includes

knowledge about the legal and economic systems, religious beliefs, the marriage systems, the art and crafts, language of other cultures, an interpersonal system of different cultures and subcultures (Triandis, 1994) and knowledge of the basic framework of cultural values (Hofstede, 2001).

Motivational CQ: The motivational component reflects one's propensity to commit to adaptive behaviors when thrust into a culturally unfamiliar setting (Earley & Peterson, 2004). It involves the inherent preference for interacting with people from different cultures, the confidence on culturally diverse interactions, and the management of stress from adjusting to unfamiliar settings. Those with high motivational CQ direct attention and energy towards cross-cultural situations based on the intrinsic interest and confidence in their cross-cultural effectiveness (Bandura, 2002).

Behavioural CQ: The behavioral component refers to the capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions when interacting with people from different cultures. It includes a sense of flexibility for behavioral responses that fit to a variety of culturally diverse situations, and the ability to adapt both verbal and non-verbal behaviour when a cross cultural interaction requires it (Ang, Van Dyne & Koh, 2006).

Literature Review

Earley and Peterson (2004) examined the concept of cultural intelligence (CQ) along with its implications for global management. After reviewing the previous literature authors had identified the cultural assessment methods. According to them the first important weakness in current intercultural training approach is that it is imbedded assumption that all individuals need a similar exposure and training regime. The second weakness which authors found was that training methods tend to focused heavily on knowledge based information and awareness of the target culture rather than focusing on meta-cognitive skills which are needed to learn in new situations and cultures. Thirdly the current approach to intercultural training programs assumes a strong link between cultural values and norms and individual behaviour within that culture. Finally, according to the authors current methods of intercultural training rely heavily on analogical learning. According to the authors the designing of intercultural training programs is reflected by the three facet of the theoretical orientation in the CQ model which include i) Meta-cognitive-cognitive facet training, ii) Motivation facet training and iii) and Behavioural facet training. They have combined the features of CQ to design the intercultural training with the training needs described by Tan and Chua (2003) of intensity, duration and nature. They concluded, to make the global manager culturally intelligent proper training should be provided to them.

Ang, Van Dyne and Koh (2006) examined a model of personality characteristics as a predictor of CQ. The Big Five factors of personality are a) extraversion, b) agreeableness, c) conscientious, d) emotional stability, e) openness to experience. The study showed that conscientiousness was related to meta-cognitive CQ; contrary to expectation, emotional stability was negatively related to behavioural CQ. Agreeableness was positively related to behavioural CQ. Further, the results showed that extraversion was positively related to motivational CQ and behavioural CQ and openness to experience was related to all four factors of CQ. To conclude, the study demonstrated that the relationship exists between Big Five personality factors and the four factor model of CQ.

Brislin, Worthley and Macnad (2006) examined the connection between CQ and other types of interactive intelligence such as SQ or EQ. They also studied other topics which include adjustment to other culture, cross cultural training, disconfirmed expectation and the ability to deal with confusion when interacting with people cultures other than one's own. Person's CQ can be increased with experience, practice and a positive attitude towards lifelong learning. Another thing which is important to understand CQ is the cross-cultural training. To enrich the overseas adjustment connotations of CQ three type of behaviours that can be covered in a cross-cultural

training program and they vary along a dimension ranging from specific to general are; firstly deals with very specific behaviour a person has to know to adjust successfully to another culture, secondly increase the level of generalisation of behaviours and lastly is highly general with awareness of these people will know that there will be challenges during their overseas assignment that cannot be predicted. The author studied that highly effective people possess a combination of cognitive (SQ) and EQ. Another thing which is important to better understand CQ is expectation for disconfirmed expectancy is a state whereby the expected result or response to an interaction is not what is actually experienced. Culturally intelligent person should always be prepared for unexpected results. Another important and critical skill of people who are culturally intelligent is the expectation for understanding. The culturally intelligent person has the ability to deal with confusion when interacting with people from cultures other than one's own culture. Last thing which help to better understand the CQ is manipulation awareness. Cross-cultural interactions are not always of a cooperative nature but sometimes it is highly competitive. The author concluded that cognitive intelligence should be combined with other type of intelligence like EQ, SQ for more meaningful results.

Ng and Earley (2006) viewed that, despite of extensive research on culture and intelligence in organisational psychology, little attention has been given to the integration of the two constructs. They proposed that one avenue for advancing research on culture and intelligence is to explore the meaning and impact of integrating the two constructs. The study is based on two objectives. First objective described two approaches of integrating culture and intelligence and present a framework to reconcile them. One of the approaches, as broadly termed as cultural variation of intelligence whereas, the other one centers on a concept called CQ. The second objective is to focus on the concept of CQ, which is defined as an individual's ability to adapt effectively across cultures. Cultural variation of intelligence approach recognises that culture and context influences the concept of intelligence, i.e. attributes that make up intelligence, whereas CQ approach is the more recent one, which aims at integrating culture and intelligence. Understanding the nature and impact of CQ can have important implication to individuals, teams, organisations, functioning in a multi-cultural environment. The cultural variation of intelligence approach and the CQ approach represent two different avenues for integrating culture and intelligence. Though these are inter-connected with each other, a central concept (the etic-emic) in integrative framework distinguishes between the two. The cultural variation of intelligence approach reflects the emic (studies behaviour from inside the system) perspective of intelligence which examines what constitutes intelligence in a particular culture and its relationship with other constructs in that culture. Whereas, the CQ approach reflects the etic (studies behaviour from outside that system) perspective of intelligence, which examines the specific conditions in a culture to understand the meaning and impact of intelligence. CQ is a culture free construct that applies across specific cultural circumstances. Thus, a person who has the capacity to be effective in each of the three cultures (emic perspective) displays CQ and hence, is likely to operate effectively regardless of the cultural environment experienced. They concluded that, the results of their study will serve as a spring board for more exciting research on CQ in future.

Triandis (2006) examined some of the attributes which are important to achieve CQ. The first is the suspending judgment. A culturally intelligent person does not give judgment until the information becomes available beyond the ethnicity of the other person because the personality attributes are needed to be taken into account. The second attribute is the importance given to the situation. The person who is culturally intelligent looks for the current behavior in different situations. So, he pays special attention to the situation. The third is the training to overcome ethnocentrism. All humans are ethnocentric i.e. they strongly feels that what is normal in their culture is or should be normal everywhere. He says that the ethnocentrism can be reduced by providing adequate training to the person. CQ requires cognitive, affective and behavioural training. Another attribute to make person culturally intelligent is to tolerate different

organisational attributes. Different organisations have different attributes like voluntary organisation, research institutes and academia are individualistic, while military and mass production facilities are collectivist. Culturally intelligent person choose those organisation to which he is compatible and flexible enough to adjust to different organisational environment. The last attribute for a culturally intelligent person is the organisational practices. The culturally intelligent person employs the employee according to the organisations practices. He concluded that, culturally intelligent person does not take or come to conclusion without having adequate information. CQ can be increased by providing training, which helps them to learn to select organisation so as to avoid counter cultural situations. CQ can be increased by examining both the positive and negative attributes of own and other's culture.

Turner and Trompenaars (2006) formulated three vital hypotheses on which the concept of cultural intelligence can rest. The purpose was to consider the critics and see whether such ability really exists. The most common objection is that cultures are relative in their values and the culture survives in the environment in which it is found. Culture is both relative to environmental circumstances and has contrasting values among the cultures. Every culture can reconcile its own contrasting values i.e. beliefs and facts, which are completely different and can be both true and successful. Culturally intelligent person synergise these contrasting values to become more productive. The researcher has given synergy hypotheses to overcome this objection. Complementarity hypothesis states that cultural study is a backward step, so objective verification of facts must be done. Another hypothesis set to study the CQ is the latency hypothesis, which states that the cultures have both the dominant and latent values which are complementary. Beneath the surface of the culture we find the subculture where latent values can be found. The latent values are buried beneath the surface. CQ can be increased by taking into consideration the latent values and permitting these to surface and qualify the dominant values. To conclude the CQ must rest on these three hypotheses.

Crowne (2008) examined the impact of cultural exposure on CQ as well as developing an understanding of how the depth of exposure influences a person's CQ. The study examined CQ of people with any type of exposure abroad including work, education, vacation or other experience and people not having any of the above. Data were collected from 140 individuals who included employees and students. Results revealed that participants who had experience, education and employment abroad showed higher levels of meta-cognitive CQ. Education abroad also generated higher levels of cognitive, motivational and behavioural CQ. Some non-exposure variables were examined to see if they influence the components of CQ. The only facet affected by any of the non-exposure variables was behavioural CQ. The meta-cognitive CQ tended to be higher in those, who had visited more countries for employment, and was also higher for those who were US citizens. Cognitive CQ and behavioural CQ were both higher in individuals who had made more visits to foreign countries for employment and education. Motivational CQ provided different results. It was higher in individuals, who had visited more countries for vacation and other purposes. Behavioural CQ was also higher for those who were currently employed. Author concluded that, skills of being culturally intelligent are useful not only to those who travel abroad, but also to every individual in the work place. Those who had been abroad for employment and education were found to have higher levels of CQ. Those individuals who had visited more countries for employment and education had higher levels of CQ. On the other hand, the number of countries an individual had visited for vacation or other purpose did not impact total CQ. Author has studied only one antecedent of CQ i.e. exposure in future more antecedents can be taken up.

Crowne (2009) examined the relationship between EQ and CQ and to found that the two are distinct, but related constructs, as well as subsets of SQ. Various models were developed to support the study and to show the evolution of ideas, which help to build the final integrated model. Kerri supported the first proposition by a theoretical model, which said that EQ is a subset of SQ. SQ includes the perception and interpretation of social cues and within the context of cues,

emotional cues are included. Thus, SQ is an umbrella term, which includes other aspects of more specific intelligence, such as EQ, while all aspects of EQ are also aspects of SQ. Therefore based on analysis of the literature, it appears that EQ is a subset of SQ. To support the second proposition researcher developed the second model that related CQ to SQ. SQ skills are super-ordinate to CQ. The skills of perception and interpretation of cues in SQ are super-ordinate to perception of cultural cues. SQ involves the skills of being sensitive to complex situations, which includes skills processing cultural knowledge and effectively processing cultural information. Thus, CQ is a subset of SQ, as CQ skills are variants of SQ. The third preposition was based on the assumption that CQ and EQ are different because EQ does not include adaptation across culture and CQ has a heavy emphasis on meta-cognitions. Culture does not influence emotions, but rather having a high level of CQ will not necessarily impact how one generates or understands one's own emotions. The last preposition was supported by a model narrating that there is a relationship between CQ and EQ. The ability to accurately perceive and understand emotions in others involves accurately decoding and labeling the emotional expression. This requires some CQ skills, because much research indicates that emotional expression can vary by culture. Additionally, in cross cultural situations, individuals would need both, CQ and EQ skills in order to effectively interact with others. As concluded by the researcher, the paper is critical to the field of SQ, EQ and CQ because of its emphasis on studying these constructs together rather than each in isolation.

Karma and Vedina (2009) viewed that, to work in multi-cultural teams or organisations it is important for managers to manage the constantly growing workforce diversity. Researchers stated that diversity needs to be managed to give organisations an advantage in today's interconnected world. The aim was to integrate conceptualisations of workforce diversity and cultural intelligence into one model for future estimations of their effect on organisational performance. They proposed that organisational performance depends on organisational member's ability to acknowledge cultural difference, to able to face them and then act accordingly to this information- in other words, they should be culturally intelligent. Researchers stated that, diversity is a characteristic of social grouping that reflects the degree to which these are objective or subjective difference between people within the group. They further discussed about types of work group diversity: social category, diversity is further divided into three types: 1) diversity of generic demographic attributes, which are easily detectable (age, gender, race); 2) background attributes (education, tenure, experience) and 3) hitherto vaguely defined diversity, which is based on people's self categorisation (e.g. social, cultural and ethical identity). Difference in experience and perspectives lead team members to approach problems, and decision drawing on different information, from different angles and with different attitudes. Therefore, teams composed of people with diverse backgrounds and characteristics are expected to produce a wider variety of ideas, alternatives and solutions and thus perform better. The researchers have integrated the workforce diversity and CQ conceptualisations. Although developing the CQ concept was triggered mainly by the need to cope with difficulties arising in cross-cultural encounters, researchers believed that, it can also be applied to other differences, such as gender culture, generation culture etc., as well as tackling with differences on other demographical attributes. In order to understand this, researchers took the help of meta-cognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioural CQ and linked workforce diversity framework with performance in organisation and using the metaphor of prism for estimating the potential effects of CQ. The model has been derived from the multi-level approaches of these concepts. Value diversity was positioned at the bottom line of other diversity types, as it becomes silent after a certain period of time. As per earlier literature synergy hypotheses, contrasting values are potentially synergistic and cultures can benefit from it plus the power of synergy. It was found that mix of cultural values would be extremely helpful in fostering the success of new product development and that complementary values are best suited for innovation process. The effects of different types of diversity can be both positive and negative. When CQ is present in an organisation and applied to

tackle effects of diversity, it works as a prism and these effects like rays of light deflect and become positive. Motivation dimensions influence cultural adaptation, which further may influence behaviour. Overall, openness to experience facilitates this process. Openness is not only a personality trait, but it is also a cultural value. It consists of stimulation and self-direction types of values. When these values are endorsed in a certain culture, an individual is more open to change and new experience. Researchers concluded that, diversity as an organisational value, if accepted by the members of an organisation may serve as an important means for success and if people are recruited on the basis of traits related to CQ then the whole organisation can benefit from it.

Ng, Van Dyne and Ang (2009) examined conceptually the integrated experiential learning and cultural intelligence to propose a process model that focuses on how leaders translate their international work assignment experience into learning outcomes, which are critical for global leadership development with CQ acting as a moderator that enhances the individuals on international assignments will actively engage in the four stages of experiential learning namely experience, reflect, conceptualise and experiment. They have framed certain propositions based on literature: i) Meta-cognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioural CQ enhances the likelihood that individuals will seek concrete cross-cultural experience during their international job assignment, ii) Meta-cognitive and cognitive CQ enhances the likelihood that individuals will detect patterns and develop conceptual generalisations of cross-cultural experiences during their international assignments, iii) All the dimensions of CQ enhances the likelihood that individuals will implement and test their conceptual generalisations in cross cultural interactions during their international assignments, iv) individuals who seek concrete cross cultural experiences during their international assignments are likely to develop greater global leadership self-efficacy, v) individuals who reflect on their cross cultural experiences during their international assignments are more likely to develop ethno-relative attitude towards other culture, vi) individuals who develop conceptual generalisations based on cross cultural experiences during their international assignments are more likely to develop accurate mental models of effective leadership across cultures, vii) individuals who actively implement and test their ideas in cross cultural situations during their international assignments are more likely to develop flexibility of leadership styles viii) and lastly individuals who gain positive learning outcomes from their international assignments are more likely to experience subsequent enhanced CQ capabilities. They concluded that experiential learning enhances global leader learning outcomes, this leads to future enhancement in CQ capabilities and this is a feedback loop and is of ongoing nature.

Stahl et al. (2010) synthesised the findings from past research, to reconcile perspective and past results, to propose an agenda for the next stage of research in this field. They attempted to understand the mechanisms and contextual conditions under which cultural diversity affects team's processes, both theoretically and also empirically. They tested the hypotheses with a meta-analysis of 108 empirical studies on processes and performance in 10,632 teams. In order to clarify cultural diversity effects on team performance, authors proposed a model that categorised these variables by whether they are associated with divergence or convergence. According to the model, cultural diversity tended to increase divergent process. Divergent processes are those that bring different values and ideas into the team and juxtapose them with each other. Some divergent processes contributed to the group performance positively they created process gains like creativity and brainstorming. Divergent process can also decrease the group's performance and they created processes loss i.e. conflicts. Similarly, cultural diversity tends to decrease convergent processes (processes that align the team around common objective, commitment, or conclusions). Convergent processes contributed positively by creating process gain like communication, cohesion etc. and also contributed negatively through process loss like groupthink. Authors formulated a summary of hypotheses and conceptual model. In summary, they found three complementary explanations for a "zero-direct-effect" relationship between cultural diversity and team performance: positive and negative

effects on intermediate outcomes and effects of study design characteristics. Lastly, they concluded that cultural diversity in teams can be both an asset and a liability. Whether the process losses associated with cultural diversity can be minimised and the process gains realised will ultimately depend on the team's ability to manage the process in an effective manner, as well as on the context within, which the team operates.

Van Dyne et al. (2012) identified sub dimensions of each of the four primary factors of CQ. Knowledge of sub-dimensions for each of the primary factors of CQ should allow trainers and coaches to provide more depth to the feedback they provide to employees and clients. CQ is a multidimensional, it includes meta-cognitive CQ, cognitive CQ, motivational CQ and behavioural CQ. Meta-cognitive CQ has three sub-dimensions i.e., planning, awareness and checking, cognitive CQ has two sub dimensions i.e. cultural general knowledge and context specific knowledge, motivational CQ comprises three sub dimensions i.e. extrinsic interest and intrinsic interest and behavioural CQ has three dimensions i.e. verbal, speech act and non-verbal. The expanded CQS assesses eleven sub dimensions of CQ with 37 items. Data were collected from 286 individuals from more than 30 countries enrolled in an international management course in Singapore. CFA was used to demonstrate discriminant validity of the sub dimensions within each of the four CQ factors. Each of the four models showed good fit to the data and each hypothesised model had better fit than plausible alternative models. CFA of the 11-factor model demonstrated excellent fit. To conclude, researchers have presented a refined theoretical conceptualisation of CQ that delineated sub dimensions for each of the four primary factors of CQ. Expanded CQ scale (E-CQS) was used to assess the eleven sub dimensions. Further, research can be conducted to examine the Nomological network of the sub dimensions, this includes antecedents and consequences of specific sub dimensions as well as determining when focusing on the four factors versus the sub dimensions is more relevant to a particular research questions. Secondly, it will be important to examine profile or configurationally approaches to CQ, ascertain what CQ profile predict and do not predict.

Nafei (2013) explored the impact of CQ on employee job performance. The revealed that there is a significant relationship between the CQ and employees job performance at King Abdul hospital in Al-Taif Governorate. Further, there was difference among the employees regarding their evaluative attitudes towards employee's job performance.

Conclusion

Cultural intelligence is the person's capability to act effectively in a situation characterised by cultural diversity. With globalisation organisations need culturally intelligent managers as they can easily adjust themselves in culturally different situation. Organisations today see culturally intelligent managers as a source of competitive advantage. Individuals, who are culturally intelligent, are better able to adjust themselves in cross-cultural situation which, results in increased performance. Poor cultural intelligence leads to stress and unnecessary conflicts. Therefore, to deal with the issues of diverse cultures organisations need culturally intelligent managers.

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.
- 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.
- Bandura A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied Psychology*, 51(2), 269-290.
- Brislin R., Worthley R., & Macnab (2006). Cultural Intelligence: Understanding Behaviours that serve People's Goals. *Group and Organisation Management*, 31(1), 40-55.
- Crowne, K.A. (2009). The Relationships among social intelligence, emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence. *Organisation and Management Journal*, 6(3), 148-163.
- Crowne, K.A. (2008). What leads to cultural intelligence? *Business Horizon*, 51(5), 391-399.
- Earley, P.C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures* (1st ed.). Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Earley, P.C., & Peterson, R.S. (2004). The elusive cultural chameleon: Cultural intelligence as a new approach to intercultural training for the global manager. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 3(1), 100-115.
- Flavell, J.H. (1979). Meta-cognitive and cognitive monitoring: a new area of cognitive inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906-911.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd Eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jyoti, J., & Kour S., (2015). Assessing the cultural intelligence and task performance equation: Mediating role of cultural adjustment. *Cross Cultural Management*, 22(2), 236-258.
- Jyoti, J., & Kour S., (2017). Cultural intelligence and job performance: An empirical investigation of moderating and mediating variables. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 1-22. DOI: 10.1177/1470595817718001.
- Jyoti, J., & Kour S., (2017). Factors affecting cultural intelligence and its impact on job performance: Role of cross-cultural adjustment, experience and perceived social support. *Personnel Review*, 46(4), 767-791.
- Jyoti, J., Kour, S. & Bhau, S. (2015). Assessing the impact of cultural intelligence on job performance: Role of cross-cultural adaptability. *Journal of IMS Group*, 12(1), 23-33.
- Kanter, R.M. (1995). *World Class: Thriving Locally in the Global Economy*. Simon & Schuster, New York, NY.
- Karma, K., & Vedina, R. (2009). Cultural intelligence as a prism between workforce diversity and performance in a modern organisation. *Review of International Comparative Management*, 10(3), 527-542.
- Nafei, W.A. (2013). The impact of cultural intelligence on employee job performance: An empirical study of King Abdel-Aziz Hospital in Al-Taif Governorate, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 8(1), 26-43.
- Ng, K.Y., & Earley, P.C. (2006). Culture and Intelligence: Old constructs, New Frontiers. *Group and Organisation Management*, 31(1), 4-19.



- Ng, K.Y., Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (2009). From experience to experiential learning: Cultural intelligence as a learning capability for global leader development. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 8(4), 511-526.
- Stahl, G.K., Maznenuski, M.L., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. (2010). Unraveling the effect of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41, 690-709.
- Tan, J.S., & Chua, R.Y.J. (2003). Training and developing cultural intelligence, in P.C. Early and S. Ang (eds.) (pp. 258-303). *Cultural intelligence: Individual Across Cultures*. Stanford Business Book: Stanford CA.
- Thomas, D.C., Elron, E., Stahl, G., Ekelund, B.Z. Ravlin, E.C., Cerdin, J.L., Poelmans, S., Brislin, R., Pekerti, A., Aycan, Z., Maznevski, M., Kevin, A., & Lazarova, M.B. (2008). Cultural intelligence: domain and assessment. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 8(2), 123-143.
- Triandis, H.C. (1994). *Cultures and Social Behaviour* (2nd Eds.). New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Triandis, H.C. (2006). Cultural intelligence in organizations. *Group Organization Management*, 31(1), 20-26.
- Turner, C.H., & Trompenaars (2006). Cultural Intelligence: Is Such a Capacity Credible? *Group Organization Management*, 31(1), 56-63.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., Kok, Y., Ng, Rockstuhl, Tan, M.L., & Koh, C. (2012). Sub-Dimensions of the four factor model of cultural intelligence: Expanding the conceptualisation and measurement of cultural intelligence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 6(4), 295-313.