

Cultural Intelligence and Competencies

Soon Ang, Thomas Rockstuhl, and Mei Ling Tan, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Abstract

With the continuing globalization of the workplace, it is critical to understand why some people excel in intercultural contexts whereas others do not. Cultural intelligence is a person's capability to function effectively in intercultural contexts. In this article, we take stock of the growing stream of research on cultural intelligence. In particular, we review the conceptualization, measurement, and empirical evidence for the nomological network of cultural intelligence. We conclude with an eye toward the future and suggest several exciting research directions to further advance our understanding of cultural intelligence.

Theoretical Conceptualization of Cultural Intelligence

Definition

Cultural intelligence (CQ) refers to a person's capability to function effectively in culturally diverse contexts (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008; Earley and Ang, 2003). This definition of cultural intelligence as a capability emphasizes a person's potential to be effective across a wide range of intercultural contexts. Cultural intelligence differs from the capability to function effectively in a specific culture. Instead, cultural intelligence reflects a general set of capabilities that facilitate one's effectiveness across different cultural environments. In this sense, cultural intelligence is culture-free.

Cultural intelligence also differs from cross-cultural views of intelligence that emphasize the relativity of intelligence definitions depending on particular cultural and ecological contexts (Berry, 1976; Sternberg, 2004). For example, hunter-gatherers require different intelligences than agriculturalists to survive in their respective ecological environments. Therefore, the meaning of intelligence varies in each culture depending on its unique ecological context. While cultural intelligence does not refer to these culturally bound notions of intelligence, knowledge of such culturally bound views of intelligence does reflect high-cultural intelligence (specifically, cognitive cultural intelligence, as we will describe below).

Cultural Intelligence as a Multidimensional Intelligence

The conceptualization of cultural intelligence draws upon the rich history of intelligence research. Cultural intelligence builds on insights from intelligence research suggesting that intelligence is multifaceted. Integrating myriad views on intelligence, Sternberg and Detterman (1986) proposed that intelligence resides in different loci within an individual: the biology, the cognition (including metacognition), the motivation, and the behaviors.

The cultural intelligence model (Earley and Ang, 2003) draws on Sternberg and Detterman's (1986) multiple-loci conceptualization of intelligence and comprises four factors: (1) metacognitive cultural intelligence, which reflects an individual's mental capability to acquire and understand cultural knowledge; (2) cognitive cultural intelligence, which reflects an individual's knowledge about cultures and cultural

differences; (3) motivational cultural intelligence, which reflects an individual's capability to direct and sustain effort toward functioning in intercultural situations; and (4) behavioral cultural intelligence, which reflects an individual's capability for behavioral flexibility in cross-cultural interactions. While the initial conceptualization of cultural intelligence did not include biological aspects of intelligence, recent work on cultural intelligence has embraced biological foundations of cultural intelligence (Rockstuhl et al., 2010).

Cultural Intelligence and Other Forms of Intelligences

Cultural intelligence is similar to social and emotional intelligence in that cultural intelligence is a form of interpersonal intelligence. Social intelligence is a broader form of interpersonal or real-world intelligence that refers to the ability to understand and manage others. Emotional intelligence refers more specifically to the ability to deal with emotions of self and others. Cultural intelligence shares similarities with social and emotional intelligence in that cultural intelligence includes the abilities to understand and manage others, as well as to deal with their emotions. However, unlike social and emotional intelligence, cultural intelligence explicitly considers the intercultural context. Understanding culturally different others requires a distinct set of abilities because of cultural variations in how people from different parts of the world express themselves verbally and nonverbally. Hence, a person who is high in emotional intelligence or social intelligence is not necessarily high in cultural intelligence. Empirical studies have shown cultural intelligence to be distinct from emotional and social intelligence. Across multiple studies (for details, see Ang et al., in press), confirmatory factor analyses showed discriminant validity between cultural intelligence and emotional intelligence – correlations between cultural intelligence and emotional intelligence ranged from 0.26 (Ang et al., 2007) to 0.82 (Ward et al., 2009). In addition, one study found cultural intelligence to be discriminant from social intelligence, with the correlation between the two constructs at 0.42 (Crowne, 2009).

Cultural intelligence is also similar to but distinct from general cognitive ability. General cognitive ability is a key predictor of performance across jobs and settings. Similarly, cultural intelligence should predict performance but more specifically in intercultural contexts (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008).

Cultural intelligence is also distinct from general cognitive ability because the latter only includes the cognitive locus of intelligence and excludes the motivational, behavioral, and biological loci. Empirical studies show negative correlations between motivational cultural intelligence and general cognitive ability, and weak correlations ranging from 0.00 to 0.11 for the other three factors of cultural intelligence (Ang et al., 2007; Ward et al., 2009). Empirical evidence also indicates that cultural intelligence has a stronger correlation with task performance in intercultural contexts than does general cognitive ability. Hence, cultural intelligence incrementally predicts performance in intercultural situations beyond cognitive ability (Ang et al., 2007; Rockstuhl et al., 2011).

Cultural Intelligence and Personality Traits

Personality traits refer to stable personal characteristics that lead to consistent patterns of cross-situational behavior (Costa and McCrae, 1992). By contrast, cultural intelligence is a set of capabilities that determine what a person is capable of doing to be effective in culturally diverse settings. Hence, personality traits and cultural intelligence are conceptually distinct. However, given that personality traits affect a person's choice of behaviors and experiences, some personality traits might relate to cultural intelligence. In line with these conceptualizations, Ang et al. (2006) demonstrated discriminant validity between the four factors of cultural intelligence and the Big-Five personality traits. We will elaborate this point below (see Section on *Antecedents of Cultural Intelligence*).

Cultural Intelligence and Other Cultural Competencies

Cultural competencies are an umbrella term for concepts related to intercultural effectiveness. In a recent review of cultural competence models, Leung et al. (2014) identified more than 30 cultural competence models with over 300 concepts related to cultural competence. These 300 concepts cover a broad range of personal characteristics including intercultural personality traits, intercultural attitudes and worldviews, or intercultural capabilities. Intercultural personality traits describe what a person typically does in intercultural contexts. Examples include tolerance for ambiguity or cultural empathy. Intercultural attitudes and worldviews refer to how a person perceives and evaluates experiences with other cultures. Examples include ethnocentrism or ethnorelativism. Intercultural capabilities describe what a person can do to be effective in intercultural contexts. Examples of intercultural capabilities include self-awareness or global business savvy.

Cultural competence models differ in scope. Some models combine personality traits, attitudes and worldviews, and capabilities. Other models focus on unique domains of characteristics. For example, the cultural intelligence model concerns intercultural capabilities only, while the Global Mindset Inventory (Javidan and Teagarden, 2011) embraces personality traits, attitudes and worldviews, as well as capabilities (see Leung et al., 2014).

The range and scope of different content domains covered by cultural competence models raise questions about the structural relationships between these content domains. Theories of job performance suggest that distal constructs such

as personality traits and attitudes exert their effects on job performance via more proximal capabilities (Campbell et al., 1993). Hence, intercultural capabilities are more proximal predictors of performance in intercultural contexts and mediate effects of intercultural personality traits and intercultural attitudes and worldviews.

Therefore, we focus on capability models and the cultural intelligence model in particular, for the remainder of this article. We highlight the cultural intelligence model as a theoretically coherent and parsimonious framework of intercultural capabilities. Based on the multiple-loci conceptualization of intelligence, the concept of cultural intelligence is theoretically precise about what is and is not part of its construct space. The cultural intelligence concept is parsimonious in that it focuses on only four abstract factors (e.g., metacognition) rather than a vast number of narrower dimensions (e.g., self-awareness, cognitive complexity, cognitive flexibility, perspective taking, planning, checking). Capabilities from other cultural competence models can be mapped onto the cultural intelligence model. However, other cultural competence models rarely consider all four factors simultaneously and thus lack the comprehensiveness offered by the cultural intelligence model for describing the capabilities domain.

Measurement of Cultural Intelligence

Individual differences in cultural intelligence are measured using diverse methods. These methods include self-reports, observer-reports, and performance-based measures.

Self-Reports of Cultural Intelligence

Self-reported measures of cultural intelligence present respondents with a list of statements relevant to multiple dimensions of cultural intelligence (e.g., "I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures"). Respondents then rate the extent of their agreement with each statement. As a measure of perceived capability, self-reported measures of cultural intelligence reflect one's self-efficacy in cultural intelligence.

To date, most empirical research uses the 20-item four-factor Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) introduced by Ang et al. (2007). Van de Vijver and Leung (2009) advise that measures for use in intercultural contexts should demonstrate both factor structure validity and cross-cultural measurement equivalence. The Cultural Intelligence Scale meets both criteria. Its four-factor structure generalizes across (1) multiple student and executive samples; (2) repeated measurements using time intervals of up to 4 months; (3) multiple countries, including South Korea, Switzerland, Singapore, Turkey, and the United States; (4) culturally diverse samples; or (5) members in multicultural teams (see Leung et al., 2014).

Observer-Reports of Cultural Intelligence

Observer-reports of cultural intelligence are a fundamental source of information about a person's external manifestation of cultural intelligence and reflect a person's cultural intelligence reputation. In observer-reports, acquaintances (e.g., friends,

peers, supervisors, subordinates) summarize their perceptions of someone's cultural intelligence reputation.

Van Dyne et al. (2008) developed an observer-reported measure of cultural intelligence based on the 20-item Cultural Intelligence Scale. In an initial validation study with 142 executive MBAs, these authors found evidence for the convergent validity between self-reported and observer-reported cultural intelligence. Kim and Van Dyne (2012) further supported the predictive validity of observer-reports of cultural intelligence. In a sample of 181 working adults, observer-reports of cultural intelligence from one group of observers predicted international leadership potential as rated by another group of observers.

Performance-Based Assessment of Cultural Intelligence

Ang et al. (2014a) introduced an intercultural situational judgment test (iSJT) to measure cultural intelligence. This test presents respondents with multimedia vignettes of challenging work-related intercultural situations and asks them how they would respond to that situation. Responses are then scored in terms of how effective they resolve the situation in the vignette. The primary appeal of using multimedia over text-based vignettes lies in their greater fidelity (i.e., correspondence to real situations) due to richer portrayals of detailed cultural information (e.g., nonverbal gestures). Rockstuhl et al. (2013b) showed that the iSJT predicted supervisor-rated task performance for offshoring professionals from the Philippines. In a related study, Rockstuhl et al. (2014) showed that the iSJT predicted peer-rated task performance and interpersonal organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in multicultural teams.

Combining Complementary Measures of Cultural Intelligence

We suggest that different measures of cultural intelligence provide complementary information. In particular, divergence between different measures of the same construct more likely reflects different but theoretically meaningful aspects of a construct (i.e., self-efficacy for self-reports vs reputation for observer-reports) instead of mere bias.

If different measures of the same construct reflect theoretically meaningful aspects instead of bias, then different measures should predict outcomes incrementally over and above each other. Research shows consistently that self-reports predict performance over and above alternative measures of the same construct. For example, in the domain of general cognitive ability, self-reported intelligence predicts academic achievement even after controlling for standardized tests of intelligence (Chamorro-Premuzic et al., 2010). Similarly, meta-analyses show that self-reported emotional intelligence incrementally predicts job performance (Joseph and Newman, 2010) over and above ability-based tests of emotional intelligence. Even in the domain of attitudes, self-reported measures predict actual behavior over and above nonconscious tests of the same attitudes (Greenwald et al., 2009).

Measures of cultural intelligence appear to follow a similar pattern. For example, Rockstuhl et al. (2014) found that self-reported cultural intelligence incrementally predicted task performance in multicultural teams beyond a situational judgment test of cultural intelligence and other intelligence,

personality, and experience predictors. This finding suggests that different measures of cultural intelligence reflect theoretically meaningful aspects of a person's cultural intelligence instead of mere bias. Hence, we propose that different measures of cultural intelligence should be used conjointly to provide a complete assessment of a person.

Nomological Network of Cultural Intelligence

The cultural intelligence construct has received worldwide interest. Empirical studies on cultural intelligence have been conducted in North America, South America, Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Australia, and New Zealand. Samples include expatriates, international business travelers, foreign laborers, global domestics, and international students. Altogether, cultural intelligence studies have sampled people from or working in at least 40 different countries.

Across these samples, scholars have studied (1) antecedents of cultural intelligence; (2) outcomes of cultural intelligence; (3) cultural intelligence as a mediator; (4) cultural intelligence as a moderator; and (5) boundary conditions of effects of cultural intelligence. To date, four major reviews have integrated empirical research on cultural intelligence (see Ang et al., 2011, *in press*; Leung et al., 2014; Ng et al., 2012). Below, we summarize empirical findings.

Antecedents of Cultural Intelligence

Research on antecedents of cultural intelligence has focused on personality traits and international experiences. As noted above, personality traits could relate to cultural intelligence because traits are broad and relatively stable individual differences that affect choices of behaviors and experiences, which in turn can influence the development of cultural intelligence. Among the Big-Five personality traits, openness to experience relates to all four cultural intelligence factors consistently across studies (see Ang et al., *in press*). Openness to experience refers to a person's tendency to be creative, imaginative, and adventurous (Costa and McCrae, 1992), thus pertaining to novel situations. Similarly, cultural intelligence is a set of capabilities targeted at novel and unfamiliar intercultural situations.

In contrast to the consistent findings for openness to experience, the findings for other Big-Five personality traits are more equivocal. For example, Şahin et al. (2013) found that extraversion was the second most important personality predictor of cultural intelligence, whereas Ang et al. (2007) found that conscientiousness was the second most important predictor of cultural intelligence.

Beyond the broad Big-Five personality traits, studies have also examined narrower traits as predictors of cultural intelligence. For example, of the six subfacets of openness to experience (i.e., intellectual efficiency, ingenuity, curiosity, aesthetics, tolerance, and depth), tolerance and curiosity were the strongest predictors of cultural intelligence (Oolders et al., 2008). Other narrow traits that research has linked to cultural intelligence include: (1) need for cognition and need for closure (Imai and Gelfand, 2010); (2) traits from the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (i.e., emotional

stability, social initiative, open-mindedness, cultural empathy, and flexibility) (Ward et al., 2009); or (3) traits from the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (i.e., flexibility/openness, emotional resilience, perceptual acuity, and personal autonomy) (Ang et al., 2007).

Regarding international experiences, scholars have examined both work-related and nonwork-related international experiences. However, findings have not been consistent across the four cultural intelligence factors (for details, see Ng et al., 2012). In one study, the number of countries someone had previously worked in related positively to metacognitive and motivational cultural intelligence. In another study, the same measure of international experience related to metacognitive, cognitive, and behavioral cultural intelligence. Another study found that the length of international work experiences related to cognitive cultural intelligence only.

For nonwork-related international experiences, the number of countries visited related positively to all four cultural intelligence factors in one study, whereas the length of stay predicted metacognitive and cognitive cultural intelligence only. Another study found that the number of educational experiences abroad related positively to both cognitive and behavioral cultural intelligence, but the number of countries visited related only to motivational cultural intelligence.

Other studies have examined the effects of specific programs and interventions on the development of cultural intelligence. For example, participating in a 4-week virtual team project with team members from five countries increased team members' motivational-, metacognitive-, and behavioral-, but not cognitive, cultural intelligence (Shokef and Erez, 2008). Another program designed international experiences based on experiential learning and social contact principles (MacNab et al., 2012). In this program, the time spent interacting with culturally diverse others predicted increases in cultural intelligence for participants. Other studies have replicated the benefits of time spent interacting with culturally diverse others for the development of cultural intelligence (for details, see Ang et al., in press).

Besides personality traits and international experiences, few antecedents of cultural intelligence have been studied. Exceptions include foreign language skills and global identity – both of which relate positively to cultural intelligence.

Outcomes of Cultural Intelligence

Accumulating research shows that cultural intelligence relates to a wide range of cognitive, affective, and behavioral outcomes in intercultural contexts. Research shows that metacognitive and cognitive cultural intelligence predict cognitive outcomes stronger than motivational and behavioral cultural intelligence. An important cognitive outcome is cultural judgment and decision-making, which refers to the quality of decisions regarding intercultural interactions (Ang et al., 2007). Across multiple samples, metacognitive and cognitive cultural intelligence predicted better cultural judgment and decision-making (Ang et al., 2007). In a similar vein, metacognitive and cognitive cultural intelligence related positively with perceived cross-border environment uncertainty, and in turn the accuracy of risk assessments in international business ventures (Prado, 2006).

By contrast, motivational cultural intelligence is the most consistent predictor of affective outcomes in international contexts. To date, the most widely studied affective outcome has been cultural adjustment of sojourners and expatriates, which includes general adjustment (i.e., adjustment to general living conditions in a foreign culture), work adjustment (i.e., adjustment to work in a foreign culture), interactional adjustment (i.e., adjustment to socializing with locals in a foreign culture), psychological adjustment (i.e., feelings of well-being and satisfaction when living in a foreign culture), and sociocultural adjustment (i.e., being able to fit in or negotiate interactive aspects in a foreign culture).

Fourteen studies have examined these cultural adjustment outcomes (see Leung et al., 2014). These studies document consistently the benefits of high-cultural intelligence on all five forms of cultural adjustment. Across these studies, motivational cultural intelligence is the strongest predictor of cultural adjustment.

Beyond cultural adjustment, other studies show that people with higher cultural intelligence (1) experience less culture shock when living abroad (Chen et al., 2011); (2) experience less emotional exhaustion when traveling internationally for business (Tay et al., 2008); (3) report greater intention to complete their expatriate assignments (Wu and Ang, 2011); and (4) report greater satisfaction with their expatriate assignments (Huff, 2013).

Affective trust in culturally diverse others is another outcome that has received growing attention. Rockstuhl and Ng (2008) showed that people are more likely to trust culturally diverse others if (1) they have higher metacognitive cultural intelligence and (2) culturally diverse others have higher behavioral cultural intelligence. Notably, cultural intelligence influences affective trust only in culturally diverse but not in culturally homogeneous dyads. These findings highlight the unique relevance of cultural intelligence in intercultural contexts. At the team level, research also shows that multicultural teams with greater average team member cultural intelligence experience greater cohesion than teams with lower average cultural intelligence (Moynihan et al., 2006). A recent study sheds some light on possible mechanisms behind these effects. In particular, American working adults with greater metacognitive cultural intelligence had greater expectations of cooperative- or relationship-oriented goals – both for themselves and others – when preparing for an interaction with Chinese counterparts (Mor et al., 2013).

Finally, research has studied a wide range of behavioral outcomes of cultural intelligence. Many of these studies use multisource designs and control for a number of alternative predictors, such as general cognitive ability, emotional intelligence, Big-Five personality, and experience-based predictors. Based on levels of specificity, we classify these outcomes broadly into general job performance (including task performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, and adaptive performance), domain-specific performance (including global leadership and negotiation), and specific demonstrated behaviors.

Ten studies show that cultural intelligence predicts task performance in different work contexts, such as global work assignments and work in culturally diverse domestic settings (for details, see Leung et al., 2014). Across these studies,

metacognitive and behavioral cultural intelligence appear to be stronger predictors of task performance than motivational and cognitive cultural intelligence. These studies use self-reported measures of cultural intelligence. Two recent studies show that a situational judgment test of cultural intelligence likewise predicts task performance (Rockstuhl et al., 2013b, 2014). While task performance remains the most widely studied performance outcome to date, studies have also shown that cultural intelligence predicts citizenship behaviors (Rockstuhl et al., 2014; Wu and Ang, 2011) as well as adaptive performance (Oolders et al., 2008). At the team level, empirical evidence suggests that average team members' cultural intelligence predicts performance of multicultural teams (Groves and Feyerherm, 2011) and creative performance both in intercultural dyads (Chua et al., 2012) and multicultural teams (Crotty and Brett, 2012).

A number of studies have related cultural intelligence to global leadership. Several qualitative studies highlight the crucial role that cultural intelligence plays in managing subordinates and offshoring vendors from different cultural backgrounds. Quantitative studies confirm the importance of cultural intelligence for global leaders. Specifically, studies show that cultural intelligence predicts (1) subordinate-rated leader performance in multicultural teams (Groves and Feyerherm, 2011); (2) peer-rated leadership emergence in multicultural teams (Rockstuhl et al., 2013a); (3) peer-rated cross-border leadership effectiveness (Rockstuhl et al., 2011); and (4) peer-rated international leadership potential (Kim and Van Dyne, 2012). At the dyadic level, cultural intelligence of the lower of two intercultural negotiation partners predicts joint profits (Imai and Gelfand, 2010).

Recent studies have also begun to illuminate more specific or proximal behaviors that culturally intelligent people exhibit. For example, nonnative English speakers with higher cultural intelligence tend to interact more frequently with native English speakers, even after controlling for the ability to speak multiple languages (Beyene, 2007). Other studies show that individuals with high rather than low metacognitive cultural intelligence more frequently engage in (1) information sharing with culturally diverse others (Chua et al., 2012), and (2) more cooperative behaviors with culturally diverse others in mixed motive or prisoner's dilemmas (Mor et al., 2013). Similarly, individuals with higher cultural intelligence engage in more information sharing and cooperative-/relationship-management behaviors in intercultural negotiations (Imai and Gelfand, 2010). Perhaps as a result of such communicative and cooperative behaviors, people with higher cultural intelligence also tend to develop larger and more culturally diverse social networks than people with lower cultural intelligence. Mirroring these individual-level results, cultural intelligence at the team-level promotes fusion teamwork behaviors, i.e., teamwork behaviors that encourage meaningful participation and coexistence of different cultures (Crotty and Brett, 2012).

Cultural Intelligence as a Mediator

As noted above, personality and international experience are widely studied antecedents of cultural intelligence. Consequently, research has tested cultural intelligence as a mediator of the effects of these distal predictors on outcomes such as cultural

adjustment, job performance, and global leadership (for details, see Ang et al., *in press*). Empirical studies show that cultural intelligence mediates the effects of personality traits. For example, cultural intelligence mediated the effects of Multicultural Personality traits on general adjustment in a sample of international students in New Zealand. In other studies, cultural intelligence mediated the effect of openness to experience on (1) job performance of expatriates in Malaysia and (2) adaptive performance of undergraduate exchange students in New Zealand.

Cultural intelligence also mediates effects of international experience. In a study of South Korean expatriates, cultural intelligence mediated the effects of previous international experience and predeparture cross-cultural training on cross-cultural adjustment. In a study of culturally diverse MBA students, cultural intelligence also mediated the effects of international experience on international leadership potential.

Finally, one study showed that cultural intelligence mediated the effects of a three-way interaction between home-country identity, host-country identity, and global identity on leadership emergence in multicultural teams.

Cultural Intelligence as a Moderator

Two studies have examined cultural intelligence as a moderator. In a study of senior expatriate leaders in various European countries, higher leader cultural intelligence strengthened the positive relationship between leader's transformational leadership style and organizational innovation (Elenkev and Manev, 2009).

Another study found that cultural intelligence moderated the effects of perceived cultural diversity on voice instrumentality (i.e., perceptions that voicing behaviors will lead to desired organizational changes), which in turn affected actual voice behaviors (Ng et al., 2011). In particular, although cultural diversity lowered voice instrumentality for individuals with low-cultural intelligence, it increased voice instrumentality for individuals with high-cultural intelligence.

Boundary Conditions of the Effects of Cultural Intelligence

More recent studies refine theoretical arguments about effects of cultural intelligence and examine their boundary conditions. Such studies have examined boundary conditions both for effects of international experience on cultural intelligence and for effects of cultural intelligence on outcomes.

In light of the inconsistent effects of international experience on cultural intelligence, scholars have advanced a number of boundary conditions of these effects (for details, see Ang et al., *in press*). One study found that positive effects of work-related international experience on cultural intelligence were stronger for people with a divergent rather than a convergent learning style. Similarly, another study found that positive effects of nonwork international experiences were strongest when people had high mastery-goal orientations and low performance-avoidance orientations in intercultural contexts. Other studies have found that effects of intercultural contact on cultural intelligence were stronger for (1) people with greater self-efficacy; (2) majority rather than minority members; and (3) people who had their first rather than subsequent intercultural service learning experiences.

Recent research also demonstrates the crucial role of cultural capital (i.e., international education and international experiences of one's parents) in fostering positive relationships between international experience and cultural intelligence. Two related studies found that cultural capital strengthened the indirect effects of international experience on global leadership via cultural intelligence. In particular, international experience related positively to cultural intelligence only when cultural capital was high. Cultural intelligence in turn predicted (1) supervisor-rated international military officer potential, and (2) peer-rated leadership emergence in multicultural teams.

Research on boundary conditions of the effects of cultural intelligence on outcomes has hypothesized and tested moderators that both attenuate and strengthen effects of motivational cultural intelligence. For example, G. Chen et al. (2010) found that subsidiary support (i.e., the extent to which the subsidiary helps expatriates adapt to their assignments and provides them with career and financial support) weakened the effect of motivational cultural intelligence on work adjustment and subsequently performance. Likewise, cultural distance (i.e., the extent to which the culture of the host country of the subsidiary is novel or different from expatriates' home countries) attenuated the effects of motivational cultural intelligence on work adjustment and performance.

By contrast, X.P. Chen et al. (2012) focused on contextual variables that strengthen the effects of individual motivational cultural intelligence. These authors showed that the effect of motivational cultural intelligence on cultural sales (number of sales transactions involving clients from cultures different from the employee's own) was stronger (1) when firm diversity climate (i.e., employees' shared perceptions of the extent to which their firm values diversity within the firm) was stronger; and (2) when firm motivational cultural intelligence (i.e., the firm's capacity to direct attention and energy toward learning about and functioning effectively in cross-cultural situations) was higher. Together, these studies begin to illuminate crucial contextual boundary conditions of the effects of cultural intelligence.

Conclusion and Future Research

Cultural intelligence refers to the capability or potential to function effectively across varying cultural contexts. Cultural intelligence research has demonstrated that cultural intelligence is a distinct capability that accounts for significant performance variance in intercultural contexts. Future research needs to validate recent theoretical extensions, in particular, the subdimensions of cultural intelligence (Van Dyne et al., 2012), neurological correlates of cultural intelligence (Rockstuhl et al., 2010), as well as organizational-level conceptualizations of cultural intelligence (Ang and Inkpen, 2008; Moon, 2010). We also expect to see an increasing diversity in the measurement of cultural intelligence. One such direction includes the development of direct behavioral assessments of cultural intelligence, such as assessment centers. Finally, we note that studies of team-level cultural intelligence remain rare and require more conceptual and empirical work. For example, future work could explore team composition

models of cultural intelligence (i.e., how should cultural intelligence within a team be distributed?), as well as processes and norms associated with high team cultural intelligence.

See also: Emotion, Perception and Expression of; Emotional Intelligence and Competencies; Five Factor Model of Personality, Facets of; Implicit Association Test; Intelligence: Assessments of; Intelligence: Central Conceptions and Psychometric Models; Intelligence: Historical and Conceptual Perspectives; Openness to Experience; Personality, Biological Models of; Personality, Trait Models of; Self-Efficacy; Situational Judgment Test; Social Intelligence and Competencies.

Bibliography

- Ang, S., Inkpen, A.C., 2008. Cultural intelligence and offshore outsourcing success: a framework of firm-level intercultural capability. *Decision Sciences* 39, 337–358.
- Ang, S., Rockstuhl, T., Ng, K.Y., 2014a. Performance-Based Cultural Intelligence (CQ): Development and Validation of an Intercultural Situational Judgment Test (iSJT). Nanyang Technological University: Center for Leadership and Cultural Intelligence.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Rockstuhl, T. Cultural intelligence: origins, conceptualization, evolution, and methodological diversity. In: Gelfand, M., Chiu, C.Y., Hong, Y.Y. (Eds.), *Advances in Culture and Psychology*, vol. 5. Oxford University Press, New York, in press.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L. (Eds.), 2008. *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence*. M.E. Sharpe, New York.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., 2006. Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group & Organization Management* 31, 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, 335–371.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Tan, M.L., 2011. Cultural intelligence. In: Sternberg, R.J., Kaufman, S.B. (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Intelligence*. Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. 582–602.
- Berry, J.W., 1976. *Human Ecology and Cognitive Style: Comparative Studies in Cultural and Psychological Adaptation*. Sage-Halsted, New York.
- Beyene, T., 2007. *Fluency as Stigma: Implications of a Language Mandate in Global Work*. Doctoral dissertation. Stanford University, CA.
- Campbell, J.P., McCloy, R.A., Oppler, S.H., Sager, C.E., 1993. A theory of performance. In: Schmitt, N., Borman, W.C. (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA, pp. 35–70.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Harlaar, N., Greven, C.U., Plomin, R., 2010. More than just IQ: a longitudinal examination of self-perceived capabilities as predictors of academic performance in a large sample of UK twins. *Intelligence* 38, 385–392.
- Chen, A.S.Y., Lin, Y.C., Sawangpattanakul, A., 2011. The relationship between cultural intelligence and performance with the mediating effect of culture shock: a case from Philippine laborers in Taiwan. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 35, 246–258.
- Chen, G., Kirkman, B.L., Kim, K., Farh, C.I., Tangirala, S., 2010. When does cross-cultural motivation enhance expatriate effectiveness? A multilevel investigation of the moderating roles of subsidiary support and cultural distance. *Academy of Management Journal* 53, 1110–1130.
- Chen, X.P., Liu, D., Portnoy, R., 2012. A multilevel investigation of motivational cultural intelligence, organizational diversity climate, and cultural sales: evidence from U.S. real estate firms. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 97, 93–106.
- Chua, R.Y.J., Morris, M.W., Mor, S., 2012. Collaborating across cultures: cultural metacognition and affect-based trust in creative collaboration. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 118, 116–131.
- Costa, P.T., McCrae, R.R., 1992. *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and New Five-Factor Inventory (NEO FFI) Professional Manual*. Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL.
- Crotty, S.K., Brett, J.M., 2012. Fusing creativity: cultural metacognition and teamwork in multicultural teams. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research* 5, 210–234.
- Crowne, K., 2009. Social intelligence, emotional intelligence, cultural intelligence and leadership: testing a new model. Paper presented at the 69th Academy of Management Meeting, Chicago, IL.

- Earley, P.C., Ang, S., 2003. *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures*. Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Elenkev, D.S., Manev, I.M., 2009. Senior expatriate leadership's effects on innovation and the role of cultural intelligence. *Journal of World Business* 44, 357–369.
- Greenwald, A.G., Poehlman, T.A., Uhlmann, E., Banaji, M.R., 2009. Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: III. Meta-analysis of predictive validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 97, 17–41.
- Groves, K.S., Feyerherm, A.E., 2011. Leader cultural intelligence in context: testing the moderating effects of team cultural diversity on leader and team performance. *Group & Organization Management* 36, 535–566.
- Huff, K.C., 2013. Language, cultural intelligence and expatriate success. *Management Research Review* 36, 596–612.
- Imai, L., Gelfand, M.J., 2010. The culturally intelligent negotiator: the impact of cultural intelligence (CQ) on negotiation sequences and outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 112, 83–98.
- Javidan, M., Teagarden, M.B., 2011. Conceptualizing and measuring global mindset. *Advances in Global Leadership* 6, 13–39.
- Joseph, D.L., Newman, D.A., 2010. Emotional intelligence: an integrative meta-analysis and cascading model. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 95, 54–78.
- Kim, Y.J., Van Dyne, L., 2012. Cultural intelligence and international leadership potential: the importance of contact for members of the majority. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 61, 272–294.
- Leung, K., Ang, S., Tan, M.L., 2014. Intercultural competence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 1, 489–519.
- MacNab, B., Brislin, R., Worthley, R., 2012. Experiential cultural intelligence development: context and individual attributes. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 23, 1320–1341.
- Moon, T., 2010. Organizational cultural intelligence: dynamic capability perspective. *Group & Organization Management* 35, 456–493.
- Mor, S., Morris, M., Joh, J., 2013. Identifying and training adaptive cross-cultural management skills: the crucial role of cultural metacognition. *Academy of Management Education & Learning* 12, 453–475.
- Moynihan, L.M., Peterson, R.S., Earley, P.C., 2006. Cultural intelligence and the multinational team experience: does the experience of working in a multinational team improve cultural intelligence? *Research on Managing Groups and Teams* 9, 299–323.
- Ng, K.Y., Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., August 2011. Speaking Up in the culturally diverse workplace: the role of cultural intelligence and language self-efficacy. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Ng, K.Y., Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., 2012. Cultural intelligence: a review, reflections, and recommendations for future research. In: Ryan, A.M., Leong, F.T.L., Oswald, F. (Eds.), *Conducting Multinational Research Projects in Organizational Psychology*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, pp. 29–58.
- Oolders, T., Chernyshenko, O.S., Stark, S., 2008. Cultural intelligence as a mediator of relationships between openness to experience and adaptive performance. In: Ang, S., Van Dyne, L. (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence*. M.E. Sharpe, New York, pp. 145–158.
- Prado, W.H., 2006. *The Relationship between Cultural Intelligence and Perceived Environmental Uncertainty*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Phoenix, AZ.
- Rockstuhl, T., Ang, S., Lee, Y.-T., Paunova, M., August 2013a. Beyond international experience: effects of cultural capital on cultural intelligence. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Orlando, FL.
- Rockstuhl, T., Presbitero, A., Ng, K.Y., Ang, S., June 2013b. Metacognitive cultural intelligence and offshoring performance: predictive validity of an intercultural situational judgment test (iSJT). Paper presented at the 3rd International Conference on Outsourcing of Information Services, Mannheim, Germany.
- Rockstuhl, T., Ang, S., Ng, K.Y., Lievens, F., Van Dyne, L., 6 October 2014. Putting judging situations into situational judgment tests: evidence from intercultural multimedia SJTs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Advance online publication.
- Rockstuhl, T., Hong, Y.Y., Ng, K.Y., Ang, S., Chiu, C.Y., 2010. The culturally intelligent brain: from detecting to bridging cultural differences. *Journal of Neuroleadership* 3, 1–15.
- Rockstuhl, T., Ng, K.Y., 2008. The effects of cultural intelligence on interpersonal trust in multicultural teams. In: Ang, S., Van Dyne, L. (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence*. M.E. Sharpe, New York, pp. 206–220.
- Rockstuhl, T., Seiler, S., Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Annen, H., 2011. Beyond general intelligence (IQ) and emotional intelligence (EQ): the role of cultural intelligence (CQ) on cross-border leadership effectiveness in a globalized world. *Journal of Social Issues* 67, 825–840.
- Şahin, F., Gürbüz, S., Köksal, O., Ercan, U., 2013. Measuring cultural intelligence in the Turkish context. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 21, 135–144.
- Shokef, E., Erez, M., 2008. Cultural intelligence and global identity in multicultural teams. In: Ang, S., Van Dyne, L. (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence*. M.E. Sharpe, New York, pp. 177–191.
- Sternberg, R.J., 2004. Culture and intelligence. *American Psychologist* 59, 325–338.
- Sternberg, R.J., Detterman, D.K., 1986. What Is Intelligence? Contemporary Viewpoints on its Nature and Definition. Ablex, Norwood, NJ.
- Tay, C., Westman, M., Chia, A., 2008. Antecedents and consequences of cultural intelligence among short-term business travelers. In: Ang, S., Van Dyne, L. (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence*. M.E. Sharpe, New York, pp. 126–144.
- Van de Vijver, F.J.R., Leung, K., 2009. Methodological issues in researching intercultural competence. In: Deardorff, D.K. (Ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 404–418.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., Koh, C., 2008. Development and validation of the CQS. In: Ang, S., Van Dyne, L. (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence*. M. E. Sharpe, New York, pp. 16–38.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., Ng, K.Y., Rockstuhl, T., Tan, M.L., Koh, C., 2012. Sub-dimensions of the four factor model of cultural intelligence: expanding the conceptualization and measurement of cultural intelligence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 6, 295–313.
- Ward, C., Fischer, R., Lam, F.S.Z., Hall, L., 2009. The convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of scores on a self-report measure of cultural intelligence. *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 69, 85–105.
- Wu, P.C., Ang, S.H., 2011. The impact of expatriate supporting practices and cultural intelligence on intercultural adjustment and performance of expatriates in Singapore. *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 22, 2683–2702.