〈**Research Notes**〉

Cultural Intelligence and Intercultural Cooperation：The Moderating Effect of Cultural Perspective Taking and Metacognitive Cultural Intelligence

Robert B. Gommerman

Abstract

Cultural Intelligence（CQ）is a relatively new concept that purports to measure an individual's capacity to operate in intercultural situations. For organizations that wish to prepare their employees for expatriate assignments, or to train personnel for cross-cultural interactions in a domestic environment, CQ offers a quick solution to evaluate an employee's readiness to work in these settings. An important aspect of cross-cultural management is cooperation among culturally diverse counterparts, and an important basis for establishing a healthy cooperative environment is trust. Studies have shown that trust can be enhanced by engaging in an explicit perspective-taking exercise（Williams, 2012）. However, these studies are rare in the cross-cultural management literature. This study explores the relationship between CQ and trust, and whether it is mediated by a cultural perspective taking intervention. The study was done by administering a survey to Japanese undergraduate university students（n=73）in a global business management program. The method used to assess（non-）cooperation was the likelihood to cooperate（defect）in a prisoner's dilemma. The instrument used to measure CQ was the CQ scale developed by Early and Ang（2003）. To evaluate the effectiveness of a perspective taking intervention, respondents were randomly separated into a control and treatment group. Results showed no statistically significant effect of a perspective taking intervention, and no correlation between cooperation and CQ. The results of this study suggest that CQ on its own may not be enough to predict cooperative behavior in a cross-cultural setting, and that a basic cultural perspective taking intervention will not have a significant influence on an individual's cooperative behavior.

Contents

Conclusion

There is much debate in the field of cross-cultural training (CCT) as to which methods produce the best results (for a thorough summary, see Nam et al. 2014). Traditionally, CCT involves instructing managers about business practices and customs that are specific to different markets. This is known as the culture values awareness approach and is undergirded by systems that measure differences between countries and cultures according to specific cultural dimensions. Arguably, the most well-known and used is the system developed by Hofstede (1980), which measures cultural differences according to four main dimensions : power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity v. femininity, and collectivism v. individualism. Although the cultural values approach is still a common method used today in corporate cultural awareness programs (Nam et al. 2014), it has been suggested that a new approach that reflects the reality of current cross-cultural management issues be developed (Early and Peterson, 2004). Given the recent trend toward shorter expatriate assignments and the growing number of countries that a manager is expected to operate in, a cultural values approach that focuses on specific countries one at a time is both impractical and expensive. Additionally, Earley and Peterson (2004) suggest that the traditional culture-specific approach fails to address personal deficiencies in handling cross-cultural situations. Training that simply educates managers about the particular characteristics of specific cultures and the values that predominate in those cultures will not ensure that appropriate cross-cultural behavior will follow. Moreover, knowledge of one country's cultural practices is not generalizable beyond the country targeted in the training intervention. It is in this context that Early and Ang (2003) introduced the concept of cultural intelligence. In contrast to CCT approaches that focus on country specific information, Cultural Intelligence (hereafter referred to as CQ) is designed as a culture general construct to develop and assess the specific characteristics that enable individuals to work successfully in different cross-cultural situations. According to Ang, et al. (2007), CQ constitutes "an individual's capability to function and manage effectively in culturally diverse settings" (p. 3). Earley and Peterson (2004) argue it is a better approach to CCT because it involves developing a set of skills that are portable and applicable in any cross-cultural context.

CQ has been research with respect to various business processes and from the perspective of different nationalities. In the context of leadership, a study done by Xiaoyun and Peerayuth (2022) revealed a mediating effect of supervisor support on CQ among Chinese expatriate managers working with Thai subordinates in manufacturing plants in Thailand. Research by Setti et al. (2022) on expatriate adjustment revealed a positive correlation between CQ and an expatriate's ability to adapt and perform well within companies in the energy sector in the Middle East. In a study done on business students, Kurpis and Hunter (2017) demonstrate the positive impact "experiential learning" can have on students' CQ when domestic and international students are engaged together in their studies.

Although CQ has been explored from the perspective of several different cultures and in various contexts, up to now there have been very few published studies in the literature dealing with CQ from the perspective of Japan, either on an exclusive level, or in relation to other cultures and/or nationalities.

This paper will examine if CQ has any influence on a Japanese individual's inclination to cooperate

with a counterpart from a different cultural background after a perspective taking intervention. The paper will first discuss CQ in more detail, with an emphasis on metacognitive CQ, followed by an examination of the literature on perspective taking, and a presentation of hypotheses. The paper then presents the methodology, results, and discussion.

Cultural Intelligence

CQ is generally based on the multi-factor construct of intelligence developed by Sternberg and Detterman (1986), who argue that intelligence is multifaceted and can be understood according to four dimensions：metacognitive, cognitive, behavioral and motivational. Broadly speaking, metacognition is control over cognition. It is the process of acquiring, organizing and understanding information. Cognition refers to the content of knowledge. It is the sum total of all information and knowledge that has been accumulated over a lifetime. Motivational intelligence focuses on the desire and energy directed toward applying cognitive intelligence. Finally, behavioral intelligence deals with the application of the three other dimensions at the action level. According to Ang and Van Dyne (2008), CQ mirrors the understanding of intelligence developed by Sternberg and Detterman as a complex multifaceted construct involving metacognition, cognition, motivation, and behavior. In this way, metacognitive CQ can be understood as the capacity for control over cultural knowledge and information. It is the ability to consciously think about and critically take stock of our cultural assumptions during intercultural interactions. Cognitive CQ is the general knowledge an individual possesses about the content and norms of foreign cultures. Motivational CQ reflects the desire to learn about and function well in culturally unfamiliar environments. Behavioral CQ deals with competencies in the verbal and non-verbal actions in cross-cultural situations.

In order to understand the nature of CQ in more concrete and measurable terms, Ang et al., (2007) developed a 20-item cultural intelligence scale (CQS). The scale is designed as a self-administered instrument, which tests and measures all four dimensions of CQ. CQS has become the foundation for multiple studies on CQ.

Metacognitive Cultural Intelligence

As described above, metacognition can be understood as a process wherein an individual actively and consciously checks and adapts his or her thoughts in reaction to a given situation. Metacognitive CQ focuses on the cultural aspect of this in cross-cultural situations. Cultural perspective taking fits into the dimension of metacognitive CQ because it involves taking the point of view of a foreign counterpart, which by its nature involves adjusting pre-existing constructs and thinking in a flexible way. According to the measurement of metacognitive CQ developed by Ang et al. (2007), people who possess a high degree of metacognitive CQ are consciously aware of and can adjust their cultural knowledge when interacting with people from different cultural backgrounds. They are also able to check the accuracy of, and flexibly adjust, their own cultural knowledge of specific cultures when confronted with a situation that doesn't fit pre-existing assumptions about these cultures.

Thomas et al. (2008), define cultural intelligence as a system of interacting abilities based on culture specific knowledge and governed by metacognitive processes. For these theorists, metacognitive CQ is

the most important dimension of cultural intelligence, because it links and manages all the other components. The role of cultural metacognition is to transfer culture specific knowledge into more generalized principles in order to formulate creative responses to novel situations (Earley, 2003). Thus, metacognitive CQ operates as a tool that enables the culturally intelligent individual to apply specific cultural knowledge, gained either from experience or training, to a variety of different cross-cultural problems in different contexts. A problem that Thomas et al. (2008) acknowledge is the difficulty of measuring metacognition. Given the claims of metacognitive CQ as a highly sought-after portable skill for handling cross-cultural situations, it is critical to accurately measure and assess it. Therefore, understanding the effectiveness of specific metacognitive strategies is an important step in clarifying the relative utility of cultural intelligence. Klafehn et al. (2008) take a step towards this in discussing the psychological antecedents to the development of metacognitive cultural intelligence. Specifically, the particular experiential factors that contribute to contextualized thinking and cognitive flexibility. Contextualized thinking refers to the ability to take a more nuanced approach to handling sensitive cross-cultural situations. The focus on experience suggests that metacognitive CQ is a skill that can be developed over time with exposure to the right situations and effective training (MacNab & Worthley, 2012). However, the authors note that the greater the dissonance between cultures, the more cognitively flexible an individual must be to navigate cross-cultural differences.

Metacognitive Cultural Intelligence and Trust

An important element in any cooperative situation is trust. This can be a particularly serious challenge in a cross-cultural context, where limited knowledge of a counterpart's culture can make it difficult to predict responses (Luo, 2002). Therefore, understanding the extent of any connection between cultural intelligence and trust could help predict the likelihood of cooperation between culturally different partners. In a study of multicultural teams, Rockstuhl and Ng (2008) found a relationship between cultural intelligence and trust at the dyadic level. Their research showed that trust was lower in pairs that do not share the same cultural background, but the level of trust increased with higher levels of cultural intelligence. According to the authors, cultural intelligence reduces the inclination of partners to view each other as members of an out-group, and helps them to overcome misunderstandings based on previously held assumptions, personally held cultural categories, and stereotypes. In particular, metacognitive CQ is instrumental in attenuating the negative impact of cultural diversity on trust because it enables people to be more conscious of their own cultural differences with their counterparts. This in turn reduces the likelihood of making inaccurate and inappropriate judgments based on superficial differences. Additionally, people with higher metacognitive CQ are more capable of thinking flexibly and spontaneously about the accuracy of their own cultural assumptions and can adjust their actions accordingly before saying or doing the wrong thing. These culturally intelligent behaviors help to increase trust between culturally different team members.

Crotty and Brett (2012) discovered that the effects of metacognitive CQ also increase cooperation and creativity in multicultural teams. The authors argue that a concept which Janssens and Brett (2006) refer to as "fusion teamwork," is enhanced when team members possess higher levels of metacognitive CQ. Fusion teamwork is defined as a form of teamwork that "recognizes and respects cultural

differences among team members in their approaches to working on teams" (Crotty & Brett, 2012, p. 211). In a similar study of multicultural teams, Chua et al. (2012) researched the connection between metacognitive CQ and creative collaboration. The authors found a strong correlation between higher levels of metacognitive CQ and collaborative outcomes. Furthermore, it was shown that successful collaboration was mediated by affect-based trust. Respondents with higher levels of metacognitive CQ were more able to trust their counterparts, and thus achieve greater team outcomes. However, the results also showed less of an impact when cultural difference was low. Although creative collaboration was higher between culturally similar counterparts with lower metacognitive CQ than culturally different counterparts with lower metacognitive CQ, as the level of metacognitive CQ increased, so did the level of collaboration. Indeed, at greater levels of metacognitive CQ, a higher amount of creative collaboration took place between culturally dissimilar counterparts than among those that had little cultural difference. Although the research of Chua et al. (2012) and Rockstuhl and Ng (2008) indicate a promising link between metacognitive CQ and cooperation, the studies were done only at the team level. Nevertheless, based on the results of Chua et al. (2012) it can be surmised that a higher level of CQ will lead to a greater likelihood of cooperation in cross-cultural situations. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed :

H1 : The decision for a Japanese individual to cooperate with a culturally different counterpart will be influenced by cultural intelligence.

Perspective Taking

Although the concept of perspective taking has been explored in the social sciences and more recently in the management literature, a concrete and broadly supported theoretical understanding of what it means has not been established. Ku et al. (2015) define perspective taking as "the active cognitive process of imagining the world from another's vantage point … to understand their visual viewpoint, thoughts, motivations, intentions, and/or emotions" (p. 17). It is the process of "imagining oneself in another's shoes" (Galinsky et al., 2005, p. 110). Although Ku et al. (2015) understand perspective taking as a cognitive process, their definition of the concept as the ability to think flexibly in a manner that enables the conscious adjustment of mental schemas aligns more closely with the conception of metacognition advanced by Ang et al. (2007). Perspective taking is inherently a process that requires mental flexibility on the part of the perspective taker. However, a cognitive element will also inevitably be involved as the perspective taker mobilizes his/her knowledge of the target either through prior knowledge and experience, or information provided in a perspective-taking intervention. Together, the metacognitive and cognitive mechanisms undergirding perspective taking are what enable individuals to place themselves in the position of another and imagine the world from their point of view. Galinsky et al. (2008) suggest that a consequence of this involves taking on the other's self-concept, which leads to behaviors that mimic the characteristics of the perspective-taking target. Some of the noted outcomes of this are that perspective taking can improve interpersonal relations by reducing the inclination to ascribe prejudicial views onto others et al. It has also been noted to increase cooperation as well as enhance communication effectiveness and build trust in intergroup situations (Falk and Johnson, 1977). The implica-

tions of this could be useful in situations that require individuals to behave cooperatively with culturally different counterparts. However, Ku et al. (2015) note that perspective taking can have deleterious effects in a variety of situations. For example, taking the perspective of counterparts with aggressive personalities can lead to aggressive outcomes as perspective takers mimic these behaviors (Galinsky et al. 2008), or selfish behavior when the target is selfish (Gino & Galinsky, 2012). Additionally, in competitive situations, taking the perspective of one's competitor could lead to the anticipation that he/she may behave unethically in order to gain competitive advantage, resulting in the perspective taker adopting these behaviors as a cautionary pre-emptive measure. Galinsky et al. (2008) observed that perspective taking resulted in a higher defection rate in a prisoner's dilemma experiment when the perspective-taking target was from a stereotypically aggressive culture. In spite of the research by Galinsky et al. (2008), the dynamics of perspective taking in a cross-cultural context have remained underexplored in the literature.

Cultural Perspective Taking

Cultural perspective taking (CPT) involves thinking about a counterpart's point of view while taking into consideration the fact that the counterpart is from a different culture. Research into CPT is still in the early stages. Lee et al. (2011) examined CPT in the context of cross-cultural negotiations in a study that included participants from North America and East Asia. The study involved a laboratory experiment in which participants, consisting of undergraduate students from Korea and China representing East Asia, and Caucasian students from the U.S. and Canada representing North America, took part in a negotiation role play activity. The study examined the effect of CPT on negotiation outcomes in comparison to culture neutral perspective taking. Interestingly, the study showed that CPT helped East Asian participants claim more value in negotiation simulations than the North American participants. This discrepancy raises an interesting question about the nature of CPT, as it suggests there are differences in its relative efficacy, which may be caused by cultural factors, and the context in which it is being applied. Lee et al. (2011) suggest that CPT helped East Asian participants more than North Americans because taking the perspective of a culture that is more individualistic and competitive was helpful in preparing for a process (in this case, negotiation) that is competitive by nature. Conversely, North American participants could not capture as much value because taking the perspective of a culture that emphasizes cooperation and relational harmony reduced their inclination to behave competitively.

In other research, Mor et al. (2013) attempt to measure the impact of cultural perspective taking (CPT) on cooperation in five separate studies. In one of the studies, fifty-seven respondents completed a survey where they were presented with a prisoner's dilemma scenario involving a choice of whether to launch a derogatory advertising campaign against a foreign competitor. Half of the respondents were given a CPT intervention, and the other half were not. Participants' level of cultural intelligence was also assessed with a survey instrument developed by Van Dyne et al. (2012) after completing the experiment to control for metacognitive CQ. Results indicated that CPT increased participants' willingness to cooperate with a foreign counterpart. This study is particularly relevant to the proposed research question because it directly measures the effect of CPT on cooperative outcomes with a foreign

counterpart.

As was discussed above, in a cross-cultural cooperative situation, heightened levels of metacognitive CQ can help to build the foundation of trust that is necessary for cooperation to take place (Imai & Gelfland, 2010). If having the ability to take the perspective of a culturally different partner is indicative of an individual's metacognitive CQ, then cultural perspective taking should also increase an individual's ability to trust a foreign counterpart, which will make him or her more likely to cooperate. Based on the concepts presented above, the following hypotheses are proposed :

H2 : A cultural perspective taking intervention will increase the likelihood that a Japanese individual will cooperate with a culturally different counterpart.

H3 : The outcome of cultural perspective taking is mediated by cultural intelligence such that a higher level of metacognitive CQ is associated with a greater inclination to cooperate with a culturally different counterpart.

Methodology

In this study, a mixed-motive conflict scenario in the form of a prisoner's dilemma was administered, which followed a research approach similar to other studies in CPT (Mor et al. 2013). The prisoner's dilemma has been used extensively in business, economics, and social psychology research to evaluate cooperative tendencies in a variety of different scenarios (Pruitt & Kimell, 1977). Use of the technique has also appeared in studies of cross-cultural contexts. In particular, Cox et al. (1991) investigated differences in cooperative behavior between collectivists and individualists using a prisoner's dilemma scenario. In another example, Mor et al. (2013) analyzed the relationship between cultural metacognition and cross-cultural cooperation in a study of cultural perspective taking. Specifically, the aim of the study was to determine the efficacy of cultural perspective taking on White/Caucasian participants toward a Chinese counterpart. Participants were selected from a random sample of college students and working adults and were randomly assigned to a treatment or control group. Participants were asked to read a prisoner's dilemma scenario, following which they were asked to decide whether or not to cooperate with their Chinese counterpart. Prior to making the decision, those in the treatment group were given a perspective taking intervention, while those in the control group were not. Results of the study indicated a statistically significant difference between the treatment and control group, hence lending empirical support for the concept of cultural perspective taking.

In its most basic form, the prisoner's dilemma is represented by the following payoff matrix :

	C	D
C	R, R	S, T
D	T, S	P, P

wherein the following chain of inequalities is satisfied :

T > R > P > S

In a standard 2 person prisoner's dilemma, each player can choose whether to cooperate ("C"), or defect ("D"), i.e. not cooperate. The consequences of each move will vary based on the selections of both players. If both players choose to cooperate, both will receive a reward ("R"). If neither player cooperates, both will receive a punishment ("P"). However, under a condition where one player cooperates and the other defects, the cooperator will receive the lowest payoff (S = sucker), and the defector will receive the highest payoff (T = temptation) (Kuhn, 2014). In a prisoner's dilemma, both players have a rational incentive to cooperate, but hesitate to do so either out of concern their counterpart may not reciprocate, or temptation for a higher reward. Therefore, the game is a suitable experiment to ascertain the degree to which a player will trust his/her opponent.

For the purpose of this research paper, the prisoner's dilemma is deemed a suitable instrument for theoretical and practical reasons. From a theoretical standpoint, a prisoner's dilemma game can gauge whether a player is willing to trust a counterpart when there is a rational reason not to do so. If a player chooses to defect, it is an indication of a lack of trust in his/her counterpart's inclination to cooperate. If it can be shown that a perspective taking intervention increases the extent to which players choose a cooperative option over defection, then an argument in favor of the effectiveness of perspective taking can be made. From a practical standpoint, the prisoner's dilemma is an efficient tool for conducting research on a large group.

In order to test the effectiveness of CPT as a strategy for cross-cultural cooperation, the following prison's dilemma scenario was administered :

> Imagine you are the owner of a flower shop. Across the street from you, there is another flower shop, owned and operated by a non-Japanese person. The shop sells the exact same type and quality of goods. When you decide your prices, you are constantly faced with the same dilemma. As a business owner, you want to keep your prices high, and maximize your profit. However, if your competitor lowers their price by 10% and you do not, your competitor will attract more customers and increase profit by 10,000 yen per day. As a result, you will have fewer customers and your profit will go down by 10,000 yen. If you lower your prices by 10% and your competitor does not, you will get more customers and your profit will go up by 10,000 yen per day. This will also cause your competitor to lose customers and his/her profit will go down by the same amount. If both you and your competitor lower your prices, both businesses will make 5,000 yen less per day. If both you and your competitor keep your prices as is, both businesses will maintain the same level of profitability.

The scenario above satisfies the chain of inequalities specified for a prisoner's dilemma, such that T = increased profit of 10,000 yen per day, R = maintenance of profit levels, P = decrease in profit of 5,000 yen per day, and S = decrease in profit of 10,000 yen per day. Therefore, the optimum outcome for both players is cooperation, which would result in profitability being maintained at current levels. In this context, the maintenance of normal profitable business conditions is understood as a reward.

Control, Treatment Group, and Procedure

A survey was administered to 200 undergraduate university students by email, from which a total of 74 (n=74) valid responses were obtained. Participants were randomly assigned to a control (n=37) and treatment group (n=38). There were 31 male and 44 female respondents, and the average age was 20 years old. Respondents were asked to complete a consent form, and no personal information was obtained. Those who consented to participate in the experiment were then presented with the prisoner's dilemma scenario.

After reading the scenario, participants in the treatment group were administered a perspective-taking intervention. The perspective taking intervention followed a similar model as that presented in Mor et al. (2013) and reads as follows :

> Think about your competitor as an individual from a foreign culture. Try to put yourself in the position of a person from a foreign culture, and think about his/her point of view. Think about the fact that your competitor will also want to maintain normal business operations and avoid losing money.

The control group was not administered a perspective taking intervention. Participants were then asked how likely they are to lower their prices (i.e., not cooperate) on a 7 point Likert scale. After completing the prisoners' dilemma exercise, participants completed the 20 item CQ scale.

Results

To test the first hypothesis, Spearman's rank correlation was computed to assess the relationship between CQ and the response to the prisoner's dilemma scenario in both the control and treatment groups. Results showed a non-correlation in both groups (control group : $r(35) = 0.26$, $p > 0.05$, treatment group : $r(38) = -0.1$, $p > 0.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that "The decision to cooperate with a non-Japanese counterpart will be influenced by cultural intelligence" could not be supported.

To test the second hypothesis, results of the Likert scale responses to the prisoner's dilemma scenario were first checked for normality. Given the sample sizes were small, a Shapiro-Wilk test was performed and showed the distributions for both the control group and treatment group departed significantly from normality (control : $W = 0.91$, $p < 0.01$, treatment : $W = 0.88$, $p < 0.005$). Based on this outcome, a Mann-Whitney U test was used and showed no statistically significant difference between the control and treatment group ($U = 441$, $p > 0.05$). Therefore, the hypothesis that "A cultural perspective taking intervention will increase the likelihood that a Japanese individual will cooperate with a culturally different counterpart" could also not be supported.

To test the third hypothesis, Spearman's rank correlation was used to compute the relationship between metacognitive CQ and the response to the prisoner's dilemma in the treatment group. Results showed a non correlation ($r(38) = 0.13$, $p > 0.05$) and as such, the hypothesis that "The outcome of cultural perspective taking is mediated by cultural intelligence such that a higher level of metacognitive CQ is associated with a greater inclination to cooperate with a non-Japanese counterpart" could not be

supported.

Discussion

Based on the results of this study, it is possible that CQ, and in particular the CQS, has some limitations in terms of its ability to predict cooperative behavior in cross-cultural situations. Additionally, a cultural perspective taking intervention, at least in the form it was conducted in this study, did not induce the level of intercultural cooperation that was shown in other studies, and that metacognitive CQ did not appear to influence the effect of a perspective taking intervention as it was expected.

One limitation of this study is that respondents were limited to first- and second-year university students. While it is not unusual in the literature for studies of CQ to involve undergraduate students, given that the CQ scale is self-administered, it is possible that respondents in this study lacked a fundamental understanding of their own cultural awareness to properly and reliably complete the CQ scale. Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, it would not be unreasonable to assume some first- and second-year university students to have had some international experience, either through tourism, or studies abroad. This kind of international exposure, even for a short period of time, can have a positive impact on cultural intelligence (Iskhakova et al., 2021). There is no doubt that the level of intercultural exposure has suffered since early 2020, especially in Japan where the border has been tightly controlled. This may have played a role in respondents' ability to accurately assess their own cultural intelligence.

Future studies of this kind should control for time respondents have spent in intercultural situations. A good opportunity to revisit this experiment could be once international travel and exchanges normalize.

Conclusion

In a data-centric age, any quantifiable measure that purports to track, monitor, and evaluate employees will certainly be an attractive tool. Therefore, it is important to understand to what extent these tools can be trusted for management purposes, and the scope with which they can be applied. This study has shown, albeit in a narrow context, that contrary to similar applications of the CQ scale in previous studies, cooperative outcomes could not be predicted by the CQ scale alone ; that cultural perspective taking may not lead to a higher likelihood of cooperative outcomes ; and that meta-cognitive CQ did not have a mediating effect on cooperation.

References

Ang, S. & Van Dyne, L. (2008). Conceptualization of cultural intelligence : Definition distinctiveness and nomological network. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence : Theory, measurement, and applications* (pp. 3–15). M. E. Sharpe.

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.

Batson, C. D., Early, S., & Salvarani, G. (1997). Perspective taking : Imagining how another feels versus imagining how you would feel. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23* (7), 751–758.

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.

Cox, T. H., Lobel, S. A. & McLeod, P. L. (1991). Effects of ethnic group cultural differences on cooperative and competitive behavior on a group task. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34*, 827-847.

Crotty, S. K. & Brett, J. M. (2012). Fusing creativity : Cultural metacognition and teamwork in multicultural teams. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, *5* (2), 210-234.

Earley, P. C. (2003). Redefining interactions across cultures and organizations : moving forward with cultural intelligence. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *24*, 271-299.

Earley, P. C. & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence : Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford, CA : Stanford University Press.

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.

Falk, D. R., & Johnson, D. W. (1977). The effects of perspective-taking and egocentrism on problem solving in heterogeneous and homogeneous groups. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *102* (1), 63-72.

Galinsky, A. D., Ku, G., & Wang, C. S. (2005). Perspective-taking and self-other overlap : Fostering social bonds and facilitating social coordination. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *8* (2), 109-124.

Galinsky, A. D., Maddux, W. W., Gilin, D., & White, J. B. (2008). Why it pays to get inside the head of your opponent : The differential effects of perspective-taking and empathy in negotiations. *Psychological Science*, *19* (4), 378-384.

Gino, F., & Galinsky, A. D. (2012). Vicarious dishonesty : When psychological closeness creates distance from one's moral compass. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *119* (1), 15-26.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, *10* (4), 15-41.

Imai, L. & Gelfand, M. J. (2010). The culturally intelligent negotiator : The impact of cultural intelligence on negotiation sequences and outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *112* (2), 83-98.

Iskhakova, M., Bradley, A., Whiting, B. & Lu, V. N. (2021). Cultural intelligence development during short-term study abroad programmes : The role of cultural distance and prior international experience. *Studies in Higher Education*, Published Online : 28 Jul 2021. https : //doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1957811

Janssens, M., & Brett, J. M. (2006). Cultural intelligence in global teams : A fusion model of collaboration. *Group and Organization Management*, *31* (1), 124-153.

Kuhn, S. (2014). Prisoner's Dilemma. In E.N. Zalta (ed.), *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Spring 2014 Edition). https : //stanford.library.sydney.edu.au/archives/spr2014 /entries/prisoner-dilemma/

Klafehn, J., Banerjee, P., & Chiu, C. Y. (2008). Navigating cultures : The role of metacognitive cultural intelligence. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence : Theory, measurement, and applications* (pp. 318-331). M.E. Sharpe.

Ku, G., Wang, C.S. & Galinsky, A. D. (2015). The promise and perversity of perspective-taking in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *35*, 79-102. http : //dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2015.07.003

Kurpis, L. H., & Hunter, J. (2017). Developing students' cultural intelligence through an experiential learning activity : A cross-cultural consumer behavior interview. *Journal of Marketing Education*, *39* (1), 30-46. https : //doi.org/10.1177/0273475316653337

Lee, S., Adair, W. L., & Seo, S. J. (2011). Cultural perspective taking in cross-cultural negotiation. Group Decision Negotiation, 22 (3), 1-17.

Luo, Y. (2002). Building trust in cross-cultural collaborations : Toward a contingency perspective. *Journal of Management*, *28* (5), 669-694.

MacNab, B. R. & Worthley, R. (2012). Individual characteristics as predictors of cultural intelligence development : The relevance of self-efficacy. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *36* (1), 62-71.

Mor, S., Morris, M. & Joh, J. (2013). Identifying and training adaptive cross-cultural management skills : The crucial role of cultural metacognition. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *12* (3), 453-475.

Nam, K. A., Cho, Y., & Lee, M. (2014). West meets East? Identifying the gap in current cross-cultural training research. *Human Resource Development Review*, *13* (1), 36-57.

Pruitt, D. G. & Kimmel, M. J. (1977). Twenty years of experimental gaming : Critique, synthesis, and suggestions for the future. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *28*, 363-392.

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 : theory, measurement, and applications* (pp. 206-220). M. E. Sharpe.

Setti, I., Sommovigo, V., & Argentero, P. (2022). Enhancing expatriates' assignments success : The relationships between cultural intelligence, cross-cultural adaptation and performance. *Current Psychology*, *41* (7), 4291-4311. https : //doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00931-w

Sternberg, R. J., & Detterman, D. K. (1986). *What is intelligence? Contemporary viewpoints on its nature and definition.* Ablex.

Thomas, D., Elron, E., Stahl, G., Ekelund, B., Ravlin, E., Cerdin, J., Poelmans, S., Brislin, R., Pekerti, A., Aycan, Z., Maznevski, M., Au, K. & Lazarova, M. (2008). Cultural intelligence : Domain and assessment. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *8* (2), 123-143.

Williams, M. (2012). Building and rebuilding trust : Why perspective taking matters. In R. M. Kramer & T. L. Pittinsky (Eds.), *Restoring trust in organizations and leaders : Enduring challenges and emerging answers* (pp. 171-184). Oxford University Press. https : //doi.org/10.1093/acprof : oso/9780199756087.003.0009

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* (4), 295-313.

Xiaoyun, G., & Peerayuth, C. (2022). The effects of cultural intelligence on leadership performance among chinese expatriates working in thailand. *Asian Business & Management*, *21* (1), 106-128. https : //doi.org/10.1057/s41291-020-00112-4