Kelli Lynn FELLOWS*
Sascha Dennis GOEDDE**
Elisabeth Jasmin SCHWICHTENBERG***

What's your CQ? A thought leadership exploration of cultural intelligence in contemporary institutions of higher learning

Abstract

Globalizations' impacts continue to permeate the present rhetorical moment in time. Impacts are evidenced in contemporary organizations across workforce internationalization, expanding market reach, and globalized competition. Subsequently, parallel increases in demand for individuals with intercultural competence manifest. Concurrently, universities face equitable attention provision to a tripartite mission of (a) knowledge creation, (b) student learning, and (c) the social charter. Cultural competencies' critical role in contemporary organizations is clearly evidenced. The current thought leadership article explores organizational dynamics and influence variables including identity, transformational leadership, and organizational communication within institutions of higher education. The authors propose Cultural Intelligence (CQ) as an ideological platform to engage universities, business organizations, and students in meeting cultural competence development while remaining consistent with organizational business, academic, and social charter missions.

Keywords: Organizational Communication, Cultural Intelligence, Transformational Leadership, Identity, Globalization.

Identify your limitations. Turn them into advantages. Adapt.
(Veach & Kirsch, 2012)

1. Introduction

From inception, organizations form to achieve a specific goal (e.g., provide a commodity or service). These organizations are comprised of individuals who facilitate the necessary production in order to achieve the organization's goal. Throughout this process, the organization and associated stakeholders (e.g., employees; stockholders; customers) are metaphorically consolidated into a mass audience – a machine operating as one unit rather than a grouping of individual living organisms. Movement through the business life cycle stages fuel continuous examination of performance indicators and heighten focus on the organizations' goals while rhetorically consolidating the resources necessary for continued operation.

* Pfeiffer University, USA, Kelli.Fellows@Pfeiffer.edu.

** Pfeiffer University, USA and the University of Applied Sciences Muenster, Germany, SaschaGoedde@gmx.de.

*** Pfeiffer University, USA and the University of Applied Sciences Muenster, Germany, Elisabeth.Schwichtenberg@gmx.de.

In this mechanical view of organizations, dysfunctional behavior is deemed a symptom when it detracts from or inhibits progress toward organizational goal attainment (Kahn, 2012). Comparable with atypical functioning of a machine, these dysfunctions are symptomatic of a mechanical problem. In organizations, as with a machine, an expert (e.g., leaders; consultants) confirms the existence of the symptom, gauges the relevance of the symptom to overall performance, and recommends resolutions (e.g., repairs) to ensure continued functionality.

Inherent to this perspective is the oppressive state of being that manifests from a context devoid of a core factor – human beings are not machines and mechanically based (process driven solutions) examination fails to integrate individuality and associated variance. Rather, acknowledgement of each individual's identity provides a framework of exploration to guide the co-construction of solutions within the current reality.

The contemporary marketplace concurrently impacts and is impacted by a spectrum of influence variables that create an interdependent web across organizational contexts. Factors such as globalization, multiculturalism, and technological advancement coalesce to shape the context the organizational machine exists within. As the context metamorphoses organizations and individuals engage in a delicate interplay of commitment to authenticity and fluidity to sustain and thrive.

The perpetual flexibility required is paradoxical when a mechanistic view (of both organizations and individuals) is entrenched. The perception of a machine as a fixed entity may fail to reflect the need for and capacity of organizations to evolve. In this regard, evolving is a choice. Survival is not mandatory. Recognizing a distinction between instinctive response (e.g., biological survival instinct) and thriving (e.g., growing, developing) harmoniously in a context highlights the transposition of organizations as a machine (e.g., inorganic) to an organic entity. The role duality becomes pronounced when organizations or individuals identify a skill (tool) necessary to fuel sustainability. For example, as internationalization permeates organizational contexts increased focus on cultural competence, cross cultural communicative prowess, and intercultural experiences/immersion surface as key components in the metaphorical organizational toolbox.

The fundamental deficiency of this viewpoint/approach, however, is the mechanistic view. If individuals are trained to identify cultural indicators (e.g., behavior; appropriate verbal or nonverbal communicative style) then successful interaction will manifest. Learning, or perhaps memorization of scripts, occurs. Yet, is growth and development occurring as well? Why do some organizations and individuals thrive while others dissipate?

Higher education institutions are in the nexus of the paradox. By extension, Universities reflect an optimal specimen to scrutinize/diagnose/diagnostics and serve the role of influencer and influenced. The current paper argues the inorganic machine – organic entity paradox is influenced by three key variables including identity, leadership, and globalization.

The current thought leadership manuscript explores institutions of higher education through the theoretical lens of Systems Thinking (Conrad & Poole, 2012). Three key influence variables – globalization, identity, and transformational leadership – are examined as they relate to Universities' tripartite mission fulfillment. The authors propose Cultural Intelligence (CQ) as an ideological platform to engage universities, business organizations, and students in meeting cultural competence development while remaining consistent with organizational business, academic, and social charter missions.

2. Systems Thinking as a Theoretical Interpretive Framework

Organizations are groupings of human beings bonded together in coordinated goal attainment via communication (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Through strategic approaches of coordination and control, organizations unify diverse groups of individuals toward specified accomplishment of goals and objectives (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Downs and Adrian (2004) note, “organizations are systems of human interaction,” (p. 31). When organizations are considered holistically (as an entity) and individuated, the orchestrated interdependence of each individual organizational member illuminates the magnanimous nature of daily operation.

Human beings are social creatures innately driven toward group membership (Fellows, 2013; Hogg, 2001; Hogg & Terry, 2001). This drive manifests as relational engagement – with individuals or organizations. The identity construct is woven throughout this desire, reflecting individuals’ fundamental drive for acceptance and belonging. Thus, identity is a relational process that informs organizational membership, commitment, and sensemaking (Foreman-Wernet & Dervin, 2011). Given the multiplicity of identities each individual represents, relational development, maintenance, or dissolution contributes to identity relevance and salience.

By extension, individuals may metaphorically expand or contract as variables of influence change unfolding dynamics across the organizational context. Observed identity status, then, may reflect a transient rather than entrenched identity state. Grounded in this observation, MacGregor’s Theory Y (as cited in Conrad & Poole, 2012, p. 127) highlights the role of relational organizing in balancing human needs with organizational approaches. Specifically, Conrad and Poole (2012) note, “people have important needs for autonomy, creativity, and sociability needs that are frustrated by organizations’ (and societies’) needs for control and coordination,” (p. 127).

The aforementioned discussion illuminates identity constructs and relational strategies of organizing. These processes co-exist and co-create the present moment in time. In order to holistically examine the implications of these complex nuances’ interdependence and influence on organizational communication, Conrad and Poole’s (2012) notion of systems thinking provides a comprehensive theoretical interpretive framework.

3. Organizational Systems Thinking

Conrad and Poole (2012) note systems’ fundamental construction are comprised of “its components and the relationships among them,” (p. 34). Further, they suggest seven principles that inform conceptualization of organizations as systems and strategic organizational communication therein:

- The whole is more than the sum of its parts
- Cause-and-effect relationships in systems are complex
- It takes time to find the right levers
- To understand a system, don’t just focus on the system itself
- Systems must adapt or they perish
- History is important in organizations systems
- Systems must constantly learn and renew themselves

(Conrad & Poole, 2012, pp. 35-39)

Organizational structure is designed to optimize organizational operations. Within higher education institutions, structure centers around overarching categories of academics, student support, and administration concurrent with foundational business goals (i.e., market reach; market share).

The complexity of the unfolding structures is correlated with numerous variables (e.g., size and age of the organization; public or private ownership). This hierarchical structuring provides definition and function, poising the academic institution as comparable with traditional business organizations' hierarchies. Thus, critical examination of universities historical, present, and future strategic position are evidenced within the tenets of the structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 2008) and the notion of systems thinking (Conrad & Poole, 2012). Two key systems thinking principles frame the current study (1) systems must adapt or they perish; and (2) systems must constantly learn and grow. The current marketplace illustrates the desire and need for cultural competence. However, careful consideration of key influence variables may provide a deeper understanding of the complexity of achieving this goal. The following sections explore globalization, identity, and leadership individually and collectively to discern the complexity of Universities' position in the contemporary marketplace.

4. Institutions of Higher Education as a System

As an organizational entity, institutions of higher education (e.g., universities; colleges) maintain specific organizational goals consistent with the organizational mission. Nickolai and colleagues (Nickolai, Hoffman, & Trautner, 2012) suggest 21st century universities are guided by three missions including (a) knowledge production, (b) student learning, and (c) the social charter (pp. 205-206). Knowledge production reflects the hallmark of higher education as an institution for the creation and dissemination of knowledge. Student learning reflects idealistic goals of whole person development to contribute to the betterment of society. Social charter is the expectations of the university to its "surrounding community, nation, and increasingly, world," (Nickolai, et al., 2012, p. 212).

Nickolai and colleagues (Nickolai, et al., 2012) note emergent tensions associated with multiple goal attainment in evolving contextual shifts,

Within this knowledge production sphere, the key dilemma is the extent to which the pursuit of knowledge should transcend short-term problem solving or serve as a vehicle for immediate social needs and revenue generation. (p. 206).

Consideration of contemporary higher education commands conceptualization of the present moment in time resultant from globalization and technological advancement. Kidd and Keengwe (2010) characterize this moment as a "learning revolution" both fueled and facilitated by technological advancement (p. xvi).

Within this context, exacerbated pressure exists for business organizations, colleges and universities, and individuals who comprise the polis. This pressure, though, may thwart specific goal attainment as increasing market expansion, competition, and delivery channels continue to shift interactions, across business and social contexts. For example, Fellows (2013) notes universities' concurrent business (e.g., market share; profitability) and academic (e.g., knowledge generation; pedagogical standards; student learning outcome attainment) goals

may conflict. External and internal dynamics exert pressure and poise the institution in a perilous position of goal duality. While the institution's responsiveness addresses one goal, it may yield inequitable attention to other co-existing goals.

Concurrently, organizational stakeholders (e.g., students; employees; community members) co-exist within the organizations goal attainment strategies. This existence is informed by macro level influence of cultural and contextual variables (e.g., globalization; internationalization; technological advancement; Fellows, 2013). Technological advancements, for example, reflect tangible changes to education infrastructure. Subsequently, students' adaptability influences their navigation through the process (Angelaina & Jmoyiannis, 2012) and influences their organizational identity constructions (Fellows, 2013).

Higher education rhetoric permeates today's contemporary business environment. Employees consider educational and professional development opportunities to optimize their competitive advantage. Increasing numbers of international students come to the U.S. to attend college to obtain similar benefits upon return to their native country. Concurrent with organizations' workforce and markets experience internationalization, universities are uniquely positioned to capitalize on associated opportunities emergent within this context while fulfilling their tripartite organizational mission (Nickolai, et al., 2012).

Mohrman and colleagues (Mohrman, Ma, & Baker, 2008) suggest universities are both *agents* and *recipients* of globalization's influence. As organizations, institutions of higher education maintain a dual role because of their fundamental role in producing "the intellectual capital required by the worldwide knowledge society," (p. 17). Universities, thus, are poised to contribute to preparation of the global workforce (Mohrman, et al., 2008).

In order to compete in a globalized environment, contemporary organizations seek employees with experience in foreign countries (Ascalon, Schleicher, & Born, 2008). These prospective employees possess desirable competencies organizations' perceive will optimize their performance across global markets. Competencies (e.g., language skills, flexibility, self-dependence, ability to work in a team, organizational skills, and intercultural competencies) reflect anticipated benefits of international work or educational experiences. As a result, the number of international students studying in foreign countries continues to rise (Awang & Roach-Duncan, 2010).

For example, during 2001 to 2013, the total number of international students in the United States rose from 582,996 students in 2001 to a record level of 819,644 students in 2013, a 40.59 % increase across the 12 year time frame (Institute of International Education, 2013). The highest rate of increase occurred across Chinese international student populations. In 2005, approximately 62,582 students studied at U.S. institutions. By 2013, approximately 235,597 Chinese students attended U.S. institutions, reflecting a 276.46 % increase over an eight year span (Institute of International Education, 2013). Collectively, international students' spending contributes approximately \$24 billion to the U.S. economy (Institute of International Education, 2013).

While the United States is one of the largest host countries of international students, the total number of international students accounts for a minimal 4 % of total U.S. student population (approximately 21,253,000) in 2013. Thus, increased focus on intercultural knowledge dissemination and international educational experiences (for U.S. native students) is critical. To facilitate this process, University faculty cultural awareness, knowledge expansion, and international experience is imperative to complement native U.S. students' global awareness.

Potential influence extends beyond workforce development. Consistent with universities' tripartite missions (Nickolai, et al., 2008), engaged relationships with business organizations and local, regional, national, and international communities reflect interdependent opportunities to expand and share influence, innovation, and financial gain.

As higher education institutions interpret their tripartite mission within the context of globalization and internationalization, inconsistent expectations of the organizations' role may emerge. Specifically, as Nickolai and colleagues (Nickolai, et al., 2012) note, the paradoxical nature of the present moment in time may posit leaders and stakeholders with the dilemma of equitable balance or definition of "the proper scope of university activities where market logics and business-oriented practices contradict academic values," (Nickolai, 2012, p. 210).

5. Globalization

Ferguson (2002) observes "globalization has existed for many centuries as a probes by which cultures influence one another and become more alike through trade, immigration and the exchange of information and ideas," (p. 774). The pervasiveness of globalization within recent decades is the product of technological advancement and increasing "financial interdependence" (Ferguson, 2002, p. 774). Globalization, today, illustrates amplified influence on economic and cultural dimensions. This expanded exposure may exacerbate the differences between the emergent global culture and existing cultural traditions and expectations within a given region or context (e.g., personal or professional contexts; business delivery or engagement). Subsequently, supportive and resistant responses may emerge (Arnett, 2002).

Globalization encompasses a spectrum of phenomena across social and business contexts. Mohrman and colleagues (Mohrman, et al., 2008) note,

Globalization tends to be something beyond any institution's control – the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas across borders. Knight (2003) makes the distinction this way, 'internationalization is changing the world of education and globalization is changing the world of internationalization. (p. 17)

Artifacts of globalization's intensifying influence exist across organizational contexts. Increasingly diversified workforces (e.g., employees from foreign countries), international market expansion (e.g., market reach; market share), and international supplier networks reflect the globalized contemporary marketplace. Regardless of organizations' interpretation of globalization (as a threat or opportunity), their capacity to thrive and remain competitive is impacted by their responsive and pro-active adaptability to globalization's impacts.

One factor supporting and driving globalization is technological advancement (Arnett, 2002). Technological developments (e.g., video conferencing, instant messaging, email, and cloud data sharing) facilitate working in a global environment without travelling. In this regard, communicative channel expansion and availability is morphing organizational business engagement, providing geographic boundary transcendence. Therefore, new working environments (e.g., virtual teams) emerge (Lipnack & Stamps, 1999).

However, mindful awareness of existing variance across and within countries (and associated cultures) – in terms of technological availability, integration within social and professional contexts, and degree of impact – remains. As globalization's influence resonates, a

retorically constructed macro-narrative may manifest, potentially fueling a perception of cultural homogeneity (Arnett, 2002). Connectedness via asynchronous channels may foster cultural homogeneous presumptions across interactants. Subsequently, the presumptions may render organizations and individuals, alike, cognitively numb to critical consideration of fundamental cultural differences existence and their reflective enactments (e.g., traditions; beliefs; cultural norms). In this way, individuals may grossly categorize groups of individuals based on cultural ascriptions rather than engaged co-constructions of the individual through engaged interaction.

When such approaches occur within organizations (at the individual or organizational levels), response to globalization and internationalization may defer authentic communicative engagement to existing cognitive schemas. Human beings are cognitive misers. Interpretation of contextual cues illuminates associated identity schema while preserving cognitive resources. Globalizations' impact is evidenced within and across organizations the workforce, customer base, and business exchanges expand beyond traditional geographic boundaries. Organizations recognize concurrent challenges and opportunities associated therein, and strive to identify strategic options to facilitate smooth transitions and optimal performance (across individual and organizational performance measures). They strive to facilitate survivability via cultural awareness.

Organizational responses historically utilized cultural and diversity training. These approaches provide cultural overviews highlighting differences of the foreign culture to the source culture. The product often yields a cultural recipe to guide interactions and minimize potential unknowingly offensive interactions. This surface level approach, though, may reduce individuals' critical thinking skills engagement with the non-native individual beyond the stated cultural expectations and anticipated behavior. In this way, mechanistic rather than organic communicative encounters may occur, and limit surface relational development to presumptions. By extension, limited scrutiny of factors contributing to the failure to thrive may remain.

Consistent with Nickolai and colleagues' (Nickolai, Hoffman, & Trautner, 2008) tripartite 21st century mission, universities may play a pivotal role in shaping and informing organizations' responses. Carnoy, (2000 as cited in Mohrman, et al., 2008) suggests globalization's focus center around "financially driven, free-market ideology" rather than a "clear conception for improving education," (p. 774). Recognition of and strategic planning grounded in the tripartite mission may facilitate organizations' equitable attention to each mission, and in turn, provide and receive benefits (see Figure One).

One proposed framework is the Emerging Global Model (EGM; Mohrman, et al., 2008). Development and implementation of the EGM, as a macro-level paradigm, may provide necessary infrastructure for collaborative approaches universities may embrace (according to their size, resources, mission) that integrates internationalization and globalization. The EGM focus centers around the premise "investment in human capital is good for society and that new knowledge leads to a better world," (p. 6). The authors note the elite nature and limited (yet growing) number of true EGMs. Mohrman and colleagues (Mohrman, et al., 2008) observe,

For the foreseeable future, most college students will attend non-EGM institutions, the college and universities focused on regional needs and the development of well-trained citizens who can contribute to economic and social advancement. At the same time, however, the pressures of globalization and the attractiveness of internationalization will both push and pull on these locally focused institutions to adapt elements of the EGM to their own circumstances. Thus the EGM is relevant to higher education in many countries and many locations, even those that will never fully develop the EGM of the research university. (p. 21)

Figure 1. Desire for Cultural Competence in the contemporary marketplace.

The contemporary marketplace is reminiscent of a machine. As the forces of globalization and technological advancement permeate the fabric of professional and personal contexts, metaphorical and geographic boundaries diminish. Eisenberg and colleagues' (Eisenberg, Lee, Brück, Brenner, Claes, Mironski, & Bell, 2013) note the "rapid increase of globalization processes" (p. 604) and associated impacts. These impacts are evidenced in individuals' increased interactions within individuals from different cultures via asynchronous channels, increasing internationalization of organizational workforce, and expanded market reach potential. As globalization's impacts perpetuate, organizations and individuals engage in a spectrum of reactive and pro-active strategies to poise themselves for optimal performance. For example, organizations actively hire employees with cross-cultural competencies, while college students select educational programs offering international education experiences as part of curricular offerings (Eisenberg, et al., 2013).

6. Identity

The second key influence variable is the notion of identity applied to organizations and individuals. Identity is a socially constructed phenomenon (Lloyd, Lucas, & Holland, 1998) that conceptually emerged in the psychological literature in the 1940s. The primary distinction centers on the individual versus collective influence and enactment of identity (Hogg, 2001). Identity is the product of an array of complex intrapersonal processes of engagement and relationship with oneself (Breakwell, 1983; Ting-Toomey, 1993). This continuously evolving construct reflects a co-constructive process influenced by individuals' intrapersonal sense-making of contextual aspects (e.g., historical; cultural; geographic; Mokros, 2003) and past experiences (Brewer, 1991, 1999; MacDonald, et al., 2008; Breakwell, 1983; Fellows & Rubin, 2006).

Identity is a "malleable construct" (Mokros, 2003, p. 9) that encompasses individuals' self-construals grounded in three fundamental tenets of cognition, affect, and behavior (Fel-

lows, 2013; Fellows & Rubin, 2006). These tenets illuminate the biopsychosocial nuances of human existence (MacDonald, Sulsky, & Brown, 2008). For example, cognition reflects individuals' categorization schema, cognitions, sense making processes, belief systems, and assimilation of those within their overall self-conception. Affect entails the emotional associations or experiential interpretation of individual or group interaction. Finally, behavior affirms the identity and serves as an outward demonstration.

As individuals move through the process of constructing, maintaining, and abandoning identities, their path is influenced by varying combinations of internal and external variables. Palmer (2004) states, "We are cursed with the blessing of consciousness and choice, a two-edged sword that both divide us and can help us become whole," (p. 9). Palmer's (2004) notion of consciousness highlights the innate aspect individuals' existence, generally, and the soul (specifically). Thus, consciousness is a representative term for one's essence – one's soul.

Juxtaposed with consciousness, is the notion of choice. Palmer (2004) notes, "All of the great spiritual traditions want to awaken us to the fact that we co-create the reality in which we live... We are continually engaged in the evolution of self and world, and we have the power to choose" (p. 48). This observation highlights the interdependent nature of human existence. Our choices impact both ourselves and the community of others within the world.

Consideration of individuals' identity multiplicity over their lifespan reflects the capacity for change and the persuasive impact relationships (either actual or desired) with other individuals possess. The notion further aligns with Burn's (1978) assertion that "leadership, as we have defined it, is a function of complex biological, social, cognitive, and affective processes," (p. 427). The contributing forces to this identity misalignment and realignment may be the result of leadership.

7. Leadership

The third key influence variable is leadership. The quest for defining and replicating various forms of leadership is continuous across organizational contexts. Burns (1978) notes, "We search eagerly for leadership yet seek to cage and tame it. We recoil from power yet we are bewitched or titillated by it," (p. 9). Leadership, thus, is an elusive construct that is evident in its impact more so that its viability as an entity in and of itself. Burns (1978) defines leadership as "leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values, and the motivations – the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations – of both leaders and followers," (p. 19). Leadership entails an engaged relationship.

Relational engagement evokes Palmer's (2004) notions of consciousness and choice. Either as a leader or a follower, the core desire for acceptance and belonging frames the process. By extension, identity construction, maintenance, or dissolution is a relational process. Within this context, change (in attitude or behavior) may occur. However, this change may result from coercion rather than intentional self-generated desire for alignment or growth. In this regard, the change (and associated identities) may be transient rather than longstanding.

Eisenbeiß and Boerner (2013) note, transformational leadership focuses on change and envisioning (i.e., possibility) as opposed to control or supervisory maintenance of the status quo. Gong, Huang, and Farh (2009) suggest transformational leaders' tactics align with these criteria yielding a "process of addressing the values and ideals of employees to motivate action," (p. 765). Further, authentic relational engagement consistently emerges as a key di-

mension associated with transformational leadership's effectiveness (Bass & Steidlmeier, 2004; Gong, et al., 2009; Hirst, van Dick, Knippenberg, 2009; Jacob, McMaster, Nestel, Metzger, & Olesky, 2013; MacDonald, et al., 2008).

Predictive and applied value of Bass' (1985) transformational leadership is illustrated throughout the literature (Phipps, Prieto, & Verma, 2012). For example, Hirst and colleagues (2009) note the impact of leader's inspirational motivation and employees' self-efficacy and connection with the organizational group's collective pursuit in creativity oriented projects and contexts. Through inspirational motivation, employees' reframe "challenges as opportunities," (p. 967). Leaders establish creativity expectations for employees through intellectual stimulation (Gong, et al., 2009). They serve as a role model for the employee to aspire to achieve and nurture the need for cognition associated with creative activity. This cognitive engagement through relationship reflects a developmental, rather than static, approach to employee learning and performance growth across cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions (Ekmekeci & Casey, 2009; Gong, et al., 2009; Walumba & Hartnell, 2010).

Metaphorical consideration of institutions of higher education as a machine embodies the spectrum of variables whose influence is intertwined within the circuitry of the contemporary marketplace. Key influence variables of globalization, identity, and leadership play dual roles as the diagnostic tool and cog to propel adaptation. In order to simultaneously embrace the mechanistic and organic paradox, an ideological platform shift is warranted. Moving from a performance driven cultural competence model to one that encompasses developmental consideration acknowledges the key element to the system's sustainability – human beings. Cultural intelligence provides a theoretical foundation that balances this role duality while supporting Universities' tripartite mission.

8. The Quest for Cultural Competence

Individuals increasingly interact with individuals from different cultures across personal and professional contexts (Eisenberg, et al., 2013, p. 604). Organizations continuous market reach expansion through multinational operations, multicultural diverse workforce, and international employee assignments (Ng, Dyne, & Ang, 2009; Ang, et al., 2007; Thomas, et al., 2008) illuminates the organizational mechanistic-organic paradox.

Emergent within this increase is the need for holistic understanding of cultural differences, generally, and cross-cultural competence, specifically, to optimize interactions and overarching organizational goal attainment (Eisenberg, et al., 2013) and individual effectiveness (Ng, et al., 2009). Organizational response to globalized influences (e.g., workforce; organizational processes; workforce composition; market reach) include educational strategies (e.g., intercultural and diversity training; Ng, et al., 2009), intercultural communication (Gudykunst, 2001; Triandis, 2004) and cultural competence models (Hofstede, 1980; Trompenaars, 1997; Hall, 1987). Organizational leaders who demonstrate cultural competence are both desirable and beneficial to organizations operating in the global marketplace (Ng, et al., 2009). Within higher education, these approaches appear across disciplines in specialized topic areas (e.g., international marketing; intercultural communication; international human resources) and study abroad offerings (Institute of International Education, 2013).

Linguistically, numerous terms or phrases are utilized to describe intercultural interactions (e.g., intercultural skills; cultural competencies; cross-cultural; cultural knowledge; cul-

tural awareness). However, closer scrutiny suggests these approaches reflect a preparatory category (i.e., performance oriented; Ng, et al., 2009) to assist individuals in sensemaking of or preparation for intercultural interactions. This cultural knowledge provides locutants with information regarding potential cultural divergence that may manifest in interactions. Yet challenges associated with multiculturalism remain across organizational contexts (Ang, Dyne, Koh, Ng, Templar, Tay, & Chandrasekar, 2007). Scholars argue this recurrence reflects a gap in the literature examining developmental and learning perspectives associated with multicultural organizations (Ng, et al., 2009). Specifically, Earley and Ang (2003) argue this recurrence reflects a deficiency in measuring individuals' cultural adaptability.

Cultural models' (and associated training programs) exploration of various cultures provides a cognitive framework of understanding, comparative data highlighting where source and host cultures may diverge, and skill set development to perform effectively therein (Ng, et al., 2009; Thomas, et al., 2008). The notion of cultural intelligence (Earley & Ang, 2003) provides an ideological theoretical paradigm to guide and inform cultural competence development and performance.

9. Cultural Intelligence

Earley and Ang (2003) introduced the concept of cultural intelligence to provide a holistic conceptualization of individual's abilities and skills to function (e.g., interact; work; perform) effectively in environments that are culturally diverse (Ang, et al., 2007; Eisenberg, et al., 2013; Rosenblatt, Worthley, & MacNab, 2013). Cultural Intelligence (CQ) extends beyond individuals' merely possessing culturally appropriate knowledge (e.g., what behavior is or is not culturally acceptable; traditions) to include consideration of individuals' learning approach. It is comparable with other types of intelligence (conceptualizations and measures) such as cognitive ability (IQ), emotional intelligence (EQ), and social intelligence (SQ). Consistent with these measures, as a type of intelligence, CQ provides a "quantitative continuum of individual difference along which people may be arrayed," (Thomas, et al., 2008, p. 124). Applied to an organization as a system, CQ provides a nuanced paradigm to inform organizational response and development across multicultural opportunities (e.g., internal and external).

Cultural Intelligence is comprised of four interdependent components: (a) meta-cognitive facet (CQ-Strategy); (b) cognitive facet (CQ-Knowledge); (c) motivational facet (CQ-Drive); and (d) behavioral facet (CQ-Action; Eisenberg, et al., 2013; Johnson & Buko, 2013; Moon, 2010). These four dimensions reflect attitudinal and knowledge aspects. Specifically, CQ-Strategy and CQ-Knowledge encompass the knowledge aspect while CQ-Drive and CQ-Action reflect individual's attitudinal aspects.

CQ-strategy. The CQ-Strategy describes an individual's learning process when experiencing situations in a different culture. It is characterized according to three factors including awareness, planning, and checking (Lee, Veasna, & Wu, 2013). Awareness refers to one's knowledge of cultural differences. Planning refers to action oriented approaches to or anticipated handling of cultural differences. The final factor, checking, entails continuous comparison and adjustments to one's knowledge base regarding cultural differences according to one's experiences.

CQ-knowledge. One's CQ-Knowledge refers to the actual knowledge an individual has about different cultures. Knowledge acquisition may have occurred through education or ex-

periential strategies. Further, knowledge may be categorized according to business (e.g., legal and economic systems), interpersonal (e.g., social interaction norms; religious beliefs), and socio-linguistic (e.g.; language; verbal and non-verbal communication) dimensions (Erez, et al., 2013).

CQ-drive. The CQ-Drive refers to an individual's interest and motivation to encounter and learn from culturally diverse experiences. Gregory, Prifling, and Beck (2009) suggest three sub-categories exist, including intrinsic interest (e.g., enjoying experiences in a culturally different environment), extrinsic interest (e.g., gaining advantages from experiences in different cultures), and self-efficacy (e.g., having self-confidence when dealing with situations in different cultures)

CQ-action. CQ-Action is the individual's capacity to use culturally-appropriate communicative behavior (e.g., verbal and non-verbal) and adapt flexibly to a variety of culturally diverse situations (e.g., using and modifying language, accent, tone; using and modifying gestures; Magnusson, Westjohn, Semenov, Randrianasolo, & Zdravkovic, 2013).

Cultural Intelligence represents a holistic construct encompassing intercultural knowledge and experience. Notably, CQ accounts for individuals' learning capacity and desire. In this way, CQ reflects a participatory approach to intercultural communication that accounts for individual differences (Thomas, et al., 2008). One should keep in mind, though, that similar to other intelligence measures (e.g., cognitive ability; emotional intelligence; social intelligence), higher ratings does not necessitate successful adaptation in one's native culture extends to comparable adaptive success in foreign cultures (Moon, 2010; Thomas, et al., 2008).

Cultural intelligence indicators, however, may remain more elusive. Thomas and colleagues (Thomas, et al., 2008) note, "By definition, the outcome of culturally intelligent behavior is more effective intercultural interaction," (p. 125). Initially, this summation appears contradictory to the arguments for CQ presented in this manuscript thus far. However, the critical difference between CQ and previous cultural models is the nuanced approach to adaptation in multicultural or cross-cultural contexts. This adaptability is illustrated by behavior that "can shape the context of the interaction to create a unique environment, as opposed to merely adjusting to it," (Thomas, et al., 2008, p. 131).

Cultural intelligence provides a dual interpretive and guiding framework within which both organizations and individuals may benefit. This framework supports the two key principles of Systems Thinking (Conrad & Poole, 2012) that ground the current paper: (1) systems must adapt or they perish; and (2) systems must constantly learn and grow. Given the fundamental construction of organizations as groupings of individuals, a dual macro-level (organizational mission and vision) and micro-level (individual organizational members; individuals) integration of CQ may create an encompassing frame.

Consistent with Systems Thinking (Conrad & Poole, 2012), organizations' ability to adapt supports sustainability. Further, consideration of an organizations' behavior as culturally intelligent affords greater pronouncement of an organic (versus mechanistic) system. In this way, the system maintains an active rather than static existence. The system maintains the capacity and ability to evolve and co-construct the context rather than merely adjust.

10. Cultural Intelligence and Strategic Risk of Systems Thinking

Tailored business strategies in-tune with emergent globalization factors may create strategic tunnel vision within institutions of higher education. As the organization pivots, adapts, and shifts business strategies to accommodate external environmental factors, they may inadvertently create or exacerbate problems. For example, globalization suggests mutual business and academic benefits exist for both universities and international students. However, hyper-focus on international markets may blind the organization to cultural attributes influence on learning. Further, as Kim (2001) notes,

Educators in higher education need to understand the complex experiences of international students in the classroom. These learners may experience the classroom differently from how educators and students assume, and their source of difficulties may reside in cultural practices that members of the dominant culture fail to notice. Therefore, the adaptation process needs to be dialogical and collaborative effort between international students and their professors and classmates. (p. 292)

This assertion is further supported by Ng and colleagues (Ng, et al., 2009) assertion that an experiential component is critical to optimizing cultural competence.

Aligning business approaches with cultural norms does not account for contextual variables contributing to individuals' and organizations' growth. Further, gross acceptance and adaptation to globalization may create an overarching expectation that all organizations and individuals maintain the desire or capacity to expand their cultural competence or international experiences. Extending conceptualization of cultural competence, as it manifests for organizations holistically (in mission and vision) and individuals to encompass a developmental perspective, rather than solely a performative (mechanistic) view facilitates adaptation fueled by an organic approach. This adaptation is consistent with systems thinking (Conrad & Poole, 2012). Further, this type of developmental engagement embraces the interdependence of globalization, identity, and leadership.

Institutions of higher education may play a pivotal role in this developmental endeavor specifically because of their tripartite mission (e.g., knowledge creation; student learning; social charter; Nickolai, 2008). Further, their unique position in the nexus of the contemporary marketplace poises them to influence and respond to emergent challenges and opportunities afforded within a thriving multicultural context. Kim (2011) notes, "...language, is used, created and acquired through interaction in specific historical, political and sociocultural contexts," (Kim, 2011, p. 282). Framed in these contexts, learning reflects a process involving individuals and individuals in the broader cultural context, co-constructed through engagement with other individuals and the overarching rhetorical moment in time. Thus, individuals' learning is "a social and cultural act," (Kim, 2011, p. 282). Organizational approaches and responses to internationalization may benefit from intercultural competency development that engages both cognitive and experiential elements (Ng, et al., 2009; Thomas, 2006).

11. Intersection of Identity and Leadership

In order to appreciate transformative leadership's organizational impact on multicultural optimization at a macro level, consideration of contributing constructs influencing each individual is imperative. Considering the notion of identity across the individual (e.g., self-

identity; role identity; Stryker, 1987) and group (e.g., social identity; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) levels provides a platform of understanding individuals singularly, and subsequently a foundation to examine leadership processes – across leaders and followers. Identity provides a connective thread across the study of leadership by highlighting the critical, and often overlooked, role of the individual – and his or her *self*.

However, as MacDonald and colleagues (MacDonald, Sulsky, & Brown, 2008) note, while identity entrenchment may increase willingness to contribute to the group, it does not ensure individual action. Given the multiplicity of individuals' identities, salience may not suffice to foster cognitive integration of transformative leadership expectations. Organizational leaders may serve as organizational catalysts, consistent with Bass' (1985) four dimensions of transformational leadership guide engagement. By extension, leaders may contribute to individuals' expansions of existing identity schemas or nurture their forging new transformed identities. Considered holistically, this influence contributes to overarching organizational systems operating within the dynamics of the present moment in time.

Burns (2003) highlights the co-constructive relationship that intertwines identity and transformational leadership stating, "transforming leadership mobilizes only those who are, if latently, ready to be mobilized, and then only if the frame is true to their wants," (p. 169). Transformational leadership's power exists in its capacity to "strike a deep cord" (Burns, 2003, p. 169) and engages individuals to become a "reflective participant" (p. 169). Consistent with Burn's (2003) questioning of the validity of traits of leadership research, MacDonald and colleagues' (MacDonald, et al., 2008) suggest identity is and should be examined as a state rather than a trait(s). Fisher (1997) notes the pivotal role of time, "people change over time as the result of the accumulation of experience. As adults grow older, choices and commitments accumulate, which causes lives to grow different from each other," (p. 24). Time is a common factor across both identity and transformational leadership. Recognizing individuals are not limited to specific time-bound mandates further highlights the individual differences that exist across human beings.

Further, it extends the intersecting role of time and engaged relationships in two ways. First, inherent processual variance exists across individuals' development of trust (of themselves and others). Second, similar variance may exist across individuals regarding the quantifiable increments of time necessary for them to engage in perceived authentic relationships with leaders (e.g., amount of time per interaction; number of interactions across a time period). This dual pronged connection considered in tandem with the notion of identity may provide another explanatory dimension regarding transformational leaderships' effectiveness (or variance across contexts).

Identity construction – like transformation – is a process that occurs over time influenced by the individual in and of a social context. Hirst and colleagues' (2009) observation supports this assertion:

By definition any work that involves groups engenders some degree of follower identification and so one's identification with this group is an ever-present motivational lever which is changeable and amenable to the influence of the manager (p. 979).

Further, they suggest, "leaders help catalyze this effort by both rendering the team and its goals salient, and further building the individual's belief in the value and efficacy of the team," (p. 967).

Exploration and consideration of the impact of globalization and internationalization on identity levels, enactment, and leadership influence within and across organizational contexts is warranted. Specifically, consideration of both Burns' (1978; 2004) and Palmer's (2003) recognition of the imperative role of the *self* in transformational leadership. This complexity supports and extends Ciulla's (2004) observation that:

The point is that no matter how much empirical information we get from the "scientific" study of leadership, it will always be inadequate if we neglect the moral implications. The reason why leadership scholarship has not progressed very far is that most of the research focuses on explaining leadership, not understanding it. (p. 14)

Linguistically, identity provides an interdisciplinary passport to examine this construct across contexts through a lens focused on the interconnectivity of identity and transformational leadership. This approach honors Burns' (1978) and Palmer's (2003) observation of intrapersonal processes within community. Exploration of multidisciplinary conceptualizations and research of the notion of identity provide a spectrum of perspectives for scrutiny and subsequent implications related to globalization and the influence of cultural intelligence.

Identity construction and maintenance entails creativity – embracing risk to transcend the status quo and build a new reality. Applied to organizational contexts, identity construction, for both individual stakeholders and organizations as a whole, reflect a co-constructive risk taking event. This type of risk taking reflects the fundamental presence of *trust* – a hallmark of transformational leadership (Burns, 1978; Palmer, 2004).

As research in transformational leadership continues, individual researchers must remain mindful and boldly engage in introspective submersion. Subsequently, the inner well of trust – in each individual – in his or her authenticity, his or her identities – will regenerate. This trust will fortify subsequent endeavors and support continuous transformations. In this regards, individuals (and organizations) are co-creators of the current moment in time, and the associated identities created therein. Grounded in this trust, researchers may confidently move forward – as leaders and followers – in guiding integration of cultural intelligence within and across contexts globally.

12. Interdependence of Cultural Intelligence, Globalization, Identity, and Leadership

Cultural intelligence (CQ) embodies knowledge and experience dimensions. Deeper examination and integration of cultural differences models may complement and extend individuals' CQ knowledge base. Through critical scrutiny, individuals' sensemaking processes may infuse the knowledge presented, previously helped perceptions, and prior experiences within a cognitive matrix. This cognitive engagement may motivate deeper (rather than surface level) consideration.

Cultural intelligence, as a metacognitive and individualized approach, aligns with fundamental attributes of identity (e.g., cognition, affect, behavior; Ng, et al., 2009) and transformational leadership (e.g., choice, time; relationships; Ang, et al., 2003; Ng, et al., 2009). Further, these elements are collectively unified in their contribution to the notion of self and organizational sensemaking in the context of the contemporary marketplace.

Burns (2003) highlights the co-constructive relationship that intertwines identity and transformational leadership stating, “transforming leadership mobilizes only those who are, if latently, ready to be mobilized, and then only if the frame is true to their wants,” (p. 169). Transformational leadership’s power exists in its capacity to “strike a deep cord” (Burns, 2003, p. 169) and engages individuals to become a “reflective participant” (p. 169).

Consistent with Burn’s (2003) questioning of the validity of traits of leadership research, MacDonald and colleagues’ (MacDonald, et al., 2008) suggest identity is and should be examined as a state rather than a trait(s). Fisher (1997) notes the pivotal role of time, “people change over time as the result of the accumulation of experience. As adults grow older, choices and commitments accumulate, which causes lives to grow different from each other,” (p. 24). Time is a common factor across both identity and transformational leadership. Recognizing individuals are not limited to specific time-bound mandates further highlights the individual differences that exist across human beings.

Further, it extends the intersecting role of time and engaged relationships in two ways. First, inherent processual variance exists across individuals’ development of trust (of themselves and others). By extension, “knowledge of self and one’s own culture are also important components of cultural intelligence,” (Thomas, et al., 2008, p. 128). Self-awareness facilitates leader effectiveness. This awareness of one’s culture intersecting with high levels of self-awareness may further inform leaders who optimize multicultural dynamics.

Second, similar variance may exist across individuals regarding the quantifiable increments of time necessary for them to engage in perceived authentic relationships with leaders (e.g., amount of time per interaction; number of interactions across a time period). This dual pronged connection considered in tandem with the notion of identity may provide another explanatory dimension regarding transformational leaderships’ effectiveness (or variance across contexts).

Morgan (2006) suggests through active engagement, organizations construct “new ways of organizing,” (p. 365). Through a CQ approach, universities may provide an ideological platform of cross-cultural cognitive and relational engagement that simultaneously preserves individuals’ choice of the degree of participation and identity entrenchment while fulfilling the tripartite organizational mission. This multifaceted theoretical paradigm provides a macro-organizational narrative shrouded in humane versus mechanistic approaches. Rather than static cultural behavior skill set guidelines, individuals may develop cross-cultural competencies that fuel cognitive engagement and active participation in the co-construction of their emergent organizational and global realities.

13. Emergent Culturally Intelligent Organizational Contexts and Practices

Specifying precise Cultural Intelligence (CQ) indicators is beyond the scope of the current article (see Thomas, et al., 2008, p. 126 for a comprehensive overview). General indicators suggest an ability to utilize cultural knowledge as a component of behavioral engagement rather than sole focus on scripts designed based on cultural generalizations (see Thomas, 2006). Further, such specification would diminish the interpretive approach to cultural competence for organizations and individuals argued thus far. Such a limitation would provide greater attention to a mechanistic view, a static representation, as opposed to an evolving organic one. This observation is echoed in Thomas and colleagues’ (Thomas, et al., 2008) suggestion that sole quantitative measure of CQ does not capture the multifaceted nature of the

construct. To address this deficiency, they call for behavioral oriented measures that illustrate cultural knowledge translated into behavior (Thomas, et al., 2008). Examination of behavioral engagement, at the organizational level, may facilitate the identification of generalized organizational level CQ indicators.

Thus, the following section explores the overarching theme of the perpetual evolution of institutions of higher education's CQ aligned with their tripartite mission and responsive to key influence variables. Integrating a Cultural Intelligence ideological paradigm poises Universities' to embrace humane approaches to organizing. This process honors and represents the living organism conceptualization of organizations through enactment of fundamental human behavior consistent with Freire's (1970) contention that "human activity consists of action and reflection, it is praxis, it is transformation of the world" (p. 125).

14. Risks and Challenges

Specific risks and challenges remain within this proposed approach, and warrant consideration. Risks include goal complexity, relational choice, technologically facilitated engagement, and individual differences. The following sections detail each of these risks.

Goal complexity. Fundamental organizational goal duality exists for universities. As Fellows (2013) suggests,

Organizational goal duality is broadly conceptualized (in this manuscript) as academic and business. Below the surface of the goal categories is an intricate web of strategies, tactics, and stakeholders (e.g., students and local, regional, or national community). Each stakeholder maintains individual broad goal conceptualization and appropriate means to accomplish and measure success. (p. 130)

A co-constructive progression (between stakeholders and the organization) toward successful goal attainment is warranted. Recognition of the contributive value of conflicting conceptualizations among internal and external stakeholders is anticipated in the organic (versus mechanistic) growth and engagement of the organization within the polis (Fellows, 2013).

Goal complexity may also manifest across individual stakeholders' role and social identities (e.g., students; international students; employees; alumni) – both in conceptualization and intersection with emergent organizational goals and mission interpretation. For example, as universities respond to globalization and embrace internationalization, organizational identity connectedness may diverge from prior knowledge and experience associated therein.

Finally, as universities' expand their relationships with businesses (at the local, national, and global levels), organizational identity confusion may emerge. This confusion may occur across internal and external stakeholders as traditional roles are expanded and tailored to globalization's influence. Careful consideration of such approaches and their alignment with organizational mission should be considered and communicated across stakeholders to deepen organizational identity and connectedness.

Relational choice. From a relational perspective, communication (and the broader construct of communicology) is an integral component of relational initiation, maintenance, and dissolution. When applied to a platonic or romantic relationship, the notion of choice occurs throughout the foundation. In professional contexts, though, individuals' notion of choice – and by extension relational options – may become blurred. For example, organizational hi-

erarchies provide overt and implied power-distance dynamics. As Conrad and Poole (2012) note, “eventually less powerful members communicate less and less and more powerful members begin to dominate the decision-making process,” (p. 120).

The notion of relational choice permeates consideration of globalization and internationalization across organizational contexts, generally, and universities, specifically. As stakeholder diversification expands, individuals may have a desire to engage with individuals from foreign countries. However, non-native students may not share this mutual desire – a reflection of their personal preference. At an organizational level, preservation of individuals’ relational preferences should be honored and respected. Forced relational interaction between native and international students creates artificial situations that may elicit backlash or oppressed status. Organizations should provide and encourage opportunities for stakeholders to engage in a variety of contexts (beyond classroom encounters) to support breadth and depth of intercultural experiential opportunities.

Technologically facilitated engagement. Learning is a hallmark of higher education. Learning, though, is a user-driven choice. Recognition of this choice informs universities’ delivery channels and content within the globalization context. From instructional delivery platforms to relational engagement with stakeholders, technology simultaneously provides both geographic boundary transcending opportunities and mechanistic engagement.

Mindful integration and utilization of technology as a tool will foster balanced information dissemination, authentic relationship building, and engaged learning. Asynchronous interactions complement synchronous ones, and should not replace the essence of organizations – the human beings and associated interactions. Exploration of synchronous and asynchronous multicultural encounters empirically scrutinized at the organizational and individual level may provide a foundation for scrutinizing the evolution of cultural intelligence across communication channels upon cumulative encounters (Thomas, 2006).

Individual differences. Integration of cultural intelligence (and the aforementioned cultural differences models) reflects generalized observations of human phenomena. One should consistently recognize cultural factors represent one aspect within a spectrum of potential influence variables contributing to each individual’s uniqueness. Culture is a contextual frame that facilitates sensemaking (Fellows & Rubin, 2006; 2013; Triandis, 1995; 2004; Gudykunst, 2001). Mere cultural knowledge does not ensure culturally responsive or respective behavior (Thomas, et al., 2008). Cross-cultural knowledge is one component of CQ contrary to previously proposed cultural models (e.g., Hofstede, 1980; Trompenaars, 1997; Hall, 1987). To fully develop one’s CQ, cultural knowledge and cross- and inter-cultural experiences are equally relevant.

15. Conclusion

Globalization, technological advancement, and internationalization individually and collectively influence contemporary business organizations. As organizations adapt to these influences, nuanced consideration of identity, transformational leadership, and organizational communication reflect the human composition of organizations and the inherent complexities therein. Integration of Cultural Intelligence (CQ) as an ideological paradigm reflects an engaged approach to cross-cultural knowledge, competency, and skill development.

Integral throughout this approach is a malleable spirit. Embracing an active learning approach will facilitate cross-cultural competency development. Adaptability and evolution

poise individuals and organizations to actively embrace globalizations' influence across professional and personal contexts. In this regards, each individual currently possesses the critical tool necessary to optimize the metaphorical machine's performance in the 21st century – his or her *curiosity*.

References

- Abeles, T. P. (2001). The Impact of Globalization. *On the Horizon – The Strategic Planning Resource for Education Professionals*, 9(2), 2-4.
- Ahmad, Z., Ali, L., & Ahmad, N. (2012). Organizational Climate: A Study of Pharmaceutical Industry in Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(49), 11880-11886. doi: 10.5897/AJBM09.463
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Yee Ng, K., 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.
- Angelaina, S., & Jimoyiannis, A. (2012). Analysing Students: Engagement and Learning Presence in an Educational Blog Community. *Educational Media International*, 49(3), 183-200.
- Arnett, J. J. (2002). The Psychology of Globalization. *American Psychologist*, 57(10), 774-783. doi: 10.1037//0003-066X.57.10.774
- Ascalon, E., Schleicher, D. J., & Born, M. P. (2008). Cross-Cultural Social Intelligence – An Assessment for Employees Working in Cross-National Contexts. *Cross-Cultural Management*, 15(2), 109-130.
- Awang, F., & Roach-Duncan, J. (2010). Cultural Differences and their Effects on Conflict Resolution in Business Settings. *Journal for Global Business Education*, 10, 27-36.
- Barth, M., & Rieckmann, M. (2012). Academic Staff Development as a Catalyst for Curriculum Change Towards Education for Sustainable Development: An Output Perspective. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 26, 28-36.
- Becker, W. E., & Round, D. K. (2009). 'The' market for higher education: Does it really exist? (No. 4092). IZA discussion papers.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bouwma-Gearhart, J. (2012). Science Faculty Improving Teaching Practice: Identifying Needs and Finding Meaningful Professional Development. *International Journal of Teaching & Learning in Higher Education*, 24(2), 180-188.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming Leadership: A New Pursuit of Happiness* (Vol. 213). Grove Press.
- Cardos, S., Carvalho, T., & Santiago, R. (2011). From Students to Consumers: Reflections on the Marketization of Portuguese Higher Education. *European Journal of Education*, 46(2), 271-284.
- Central Intelligence Agency (2014). *The World Factbook*. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html>.
- Ciulla, J. B. (Ed.). (2004). *Ethics, the Heart of Leadership*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Conrad, C., & Poole, M. S. (2012). *Strategic Organizational Communication*. New York: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Cornelissen, J. P., Lock, A. R., & Gardner, H. (2001). The Organisation of External Communication Disciplines: An Integrative Framework of Dimensions and Determinants. *International Journal of Advertising*, 20(1), 67-88.
- Donald, D. J., Scheer, L. K., & Kozlenkova, I. V. (2013). Culture's Impact on the Importance of Fairness in Interorganizational Relationships. *Journal of International Marketing*, 21(4), 21-43.
- Downs, C. L., & Adrian, A. D. (2004). *Assessing Organizational Communication: Strategic Communication Audits*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions Across Cultures*. Stanford University Press.
- Eisenbeiß, S. A., & Boerner, S. (2010). Transformational Leadership and R&D Innovation: Taking a Curvilinear Approach. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(4), 364-372.
- Eisenberg, J., Lee, H.-L., Brück, F., Brenner, B., Claes, M.-T., Mironski, J., & Bell, R. (2013). Can Business Schools Make Students Culturally Competent? Effects of Cross-Cultural Management Courses On Cultural Intelligence. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12(4), 603-621.
- Erez, M., Lisak, A., Harush, R., Glikson, E., Nouri, R., & Shokef, E. (2013). Going Global: Developing Management Students' Cultural Intelligence and Global Identity in Culturally Diverse Virtual Teams. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12(3), 330-355.
- Fellows, K. L. (2013). Ethically constructing *Common Grounds* one cyber latte at a time: A thought leadership examination of emergent ethical dilemmas in designing technologically based nontraditional graduate student social support. *Journal of Scholastic Inquiry: Education*, 1, 120-137.
- Fellows, K. L., & Rubin, D. L. (2006). Identities for Sale: How the Tobacco Industry Construed Asians, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 35(3), 265-292.
- Ferguson, M. (1992). The Mythology About Globalization. *European Journal of Communication*, 7(1), 69-93.
- Foreman-Wernet, L., & Dervin, B. (2011). Cultural Experience in Context: Sense-Making the Arts. *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 41(1), 1-37. doi:10.1080/10632921.2011.545725
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Bloomsbury
- French, W., Zeiss, H., & Schere, A. G. (2001). Intercultural Discourse Ethics: Testing Trompenaars' and Hampden-Turners' Conclusions About Americans and French. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 34(3-4), 145-159.
- Gelmon, S., Blanchard, L., Ryan, K., & Seifer, S. D. (2012). Building Capacity for Community-Engaged Scholarship: Evaluation of the Faculty Development Component of the Faculty for the Engaged Campus Initiative. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 16(1), 21-45.
- Gong, Y., Huang, J.-C., & Farh, J.-L. (2009). Employee Learning Orientation, Transformational Leadership, and Employee Creativity: The Mediating Role of Employee Creative Self-Efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4), 765-778.
- Gregory, R., Prifling, M., & Beck, R. (2009). The Role of Cultural Intelligence for the Emergence of Negotiated Culture in IT Offshore Outsourcing Projects. *Information Technology & People*, 22(3), 223-241.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (2001). *Asian American Ethnicity and Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Lee, C. M. (2002). Cross-Cultural Communication Theories. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.). *Cross-Cultural And Intercultural Communication* (pp. 7-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Yoon, Y. C., & Nishida, T. (1987). The Influence of Individualism-Collectivism on Perceptions Of Communication in Ingroup and Outgroup Relationship. *Communication Monographs*, 54, 295-306.
- Hall, E. T. (1989). *Beyond Culture*. New York: Random House.
- Hammer, M. (2012). The Intercultural Development Inventory: A New Frontier in Assessment and Development of Intercultural Competence. In M. Vande Berg, R.M. Paige, & K.H. Lou (Eds.), *Student Learning Abroad* (Ch. 5, pp. 115-136). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Helgesen, S. (2005). *The Web of Inclusion*. Washington, DC: Doubleday.
- Hofstede, G. (1983). National Cultures in Four Dimensions – A Research-Based Theory of Cultural Differences Among Nations. *International Studies Management and Organization*, 13(1-2), 46-74.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context. *Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 1-26.
- Hofstede, G. (2014). *Cultural Tool, Country Comparison*. Retrieved from <http://geert-hofstede.com/countries.html>.
- Hofstede, G. & Bond, M. (1988). The Confucius Connection: From Cultural Roots to Economic Growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(4), 5-21.
- Hofstede, G., & Minkow, M. (2010). Long- Versus Short-Term Orientation: New Perspectives. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 16(4), 493-504.

- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A Social Identity Theory of Leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, 184-200.
- Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social Identity and Self-Categorization Processes in Organizational Contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 121-140.
- Institute of International Education (2013). *Open Doors Report 2013*. Retrieved from www.iie.org/~media/Files/Corporate/Open-Doors/Fast-Facts/Fast-Facts-2013.ashx.
- Johnson, R., & Buko, S. (2013). Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS): Testing Cross-Cultural Transferability of CQS in Ukraine. *Studies of Changing Societies: Comparative & Interdisciplinary Focus*, 4(10), 51-67.
- Kahn, W. A. (2012). The Functions of Dysfunction: Implications for Organizational Diagnosis and Change. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 64(3), 225-241.
- Kanten, P. (2014). The Effect of Cultural Intelligence on Career Competencies and Customer-Oriented Service Behaviors. *Istanbul University Journal of the School of Business Administration*, 43(1), 100-119.
- Kidd, T. T., & Keengwe, J. (2010). Information Literacy in the Digital Age: Implications for Adult Learning. In T. R. Kidd & J. Keengwe (Eds.) *Adult Learning in the Digital Age: Perspectives on Online Technologies and Outcomes*. Hershey, NY: Information Science Reference.
- Kim, H. Y. (2011). International Graduate Students' Difficulties: Graduate Classes as a Community of Practice. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(3), 281-292.
- Kim, D., Pan, Y., & Park, S. H. (1998). High- Versus Low Context Cultures: A Comparison of Chinese, Korean, and American Cultures. *Psychology & Marketing*, 15(6), 507-521.
- Kukulski-Hulme, A. (2012). How Should the Higher Education Workforce Adapt to Advancements in Technology for Teaching and Learning? *Internet and Higher Education*, 15, 247-254.
- Lee, L.-Y., Veasna, S., & Wu, W.-Y. (2013). The Effects of Social Support and Transformational Leadership on Expatriate Adjustment and Performance – The Moderating Roles of Socialization Experience and Cultural Intelligence. *Career Development International*, 18(4), 377-415.
- Li, M., Mobley, W. H., & Kelly, A. (2013). When do Global Leaders Learn Best to Develop Cultural Intelligence? An Investigation of the Moderating Role of Experiential Learning Style. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12(1), 32-50. doi:10.5465/amle.2011.0014
- Lipnack, J., & Stamps, J. (1999). Virtual Teams: The New Way to Work. *Strategy & Leadership*, 27(1), 14-19.
- MacDonald, H. A., Sulsky, L. M., & Brown, D. J. (2008). Leadership and Perceiver Cognition: Examining the Role of Self-Identity in Implicit Leadership Theories. *Human Performance*, 21, 333-353. DOI: 10.1080/08959280802347031
- MacNab, B., Brislin, R., & Worthley, R. (2012). Experiential Cultural Intelligence Development: Context and Individual Attributes. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(7), 1320-1341. doi:10.1080/09585192.2011.581636
- Magnusson, P., Westjohn, S. A., Semenov, A. V., Randrianasolo, A. A., & Zdravkovic, S. (2013). The Role of Cultural Intelligence in Marketing Adaption and Export Performance. *Journal of International Marketing*, 21(4), 44-19.61
- Miriam, E., Alon, L., Raveh, H., Ella, G., Rikki, N., & Efrat, S. (2013). Going Global: Developing Management Students' Cultural Intelligence and Global Identity in Culturally Diverse Virtual Teams. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12(3), 330-355. doi:10.5465/amle.2012.0200
- Moon, T. (2010). Emotional Intelligence Correlates of The Four-Factor Model of Cultural Intelligence. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 25(8), 876-898.
- Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of Organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mohrman, K., Ma, W., & Baker, D. (2008). The Research University in Transition: The Emerging Global Model. *Higher Education Policy*, 21(1), 5-27.
- Mokros, H. B. (2003). A Constitutive Approach to Identity. In H. B. Mokros (Ed.), *Identity Matters: Communication-Based Explorations and Explanations* (pp. 3-28). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Morsing, M. (2006). Corporate Social Responsibility As Strategic Auto-Communication: On the Role of External Stakeholders for Member Identification. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 15(2), 171-182. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8608.2006.00440.x

- Mosakowski, E., Calic, G., & Christopher Earley, P. P. (2013). Cultures as Learning Laboratories: What Makes Some More Effective Than Others?. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12(3), 512-526. doi:10.5465/amle.2013.0149
- 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 & Education*, 8(4), 511-526.
- Nickolai, D. H., Hoffman, S. G., & Trautner, M. (2012). Can a Knowledge Sanctuary also be an Economic Engine? The Marketization of Higher Education as Institutional Boundary Work. *Sociology Compass*, 6(3), 205-218. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9020.2011.00449.x
- Palmer, P. (2004). *A Hidden Wholeness: The Journey Toward an Undivided Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Phinney, J. S. (1992). The Multiple Group Ethnic Identity Measure. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 7, 156-176.
- Ramalu, S., Raduan Che, R., Kumar, N., & Uli, J. (2010). Doing Business in Global Arena: An Examination of The Relationship Between Cultural Intelligence and Cross-Cultural Adjustment. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 15(1), 79-97.
- Ravasi, D., & Schultz, M. (2006). Responding to Organizational Identity Threats: Exploring the Role of Organizational Culture. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(3), 433-458.
- Rienties, B., Brouwer, N., & Lygo-Baker, S. (2013). The Effects of Online Professional Development on Teachers' Beliefs and Intentions Towards Learning Facilitation and Technology. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 29, 122-131.
- Rosenblatt, V., Worthley, R., & MacNab B. (2013). From Contact to Development in Experiential Cultural Intelligence Education: The Mediating Influence of Expectancy Disconfirmation. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12(3), 356-379.
- Seymen, O. A. (2006). The Cultural Diversity Phenomenon in Organizations and Different Approaches for Effective Cultural Diversity Management: A Literary Review. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 13(4), 296-315.
- Singh, N. (2004). From Cultural Models to Cultural Categories: A Framework for Cultural Analysis. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 5(1/2), 95-101.
- Stryker, S. 1987. Identity Theory: Developments and Extensions. In K. Yardley & T. Honess (Eds.), *Self and identity: Psychosocial perspectives* (pp. 89-103). Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worschel (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33-47). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Thomas, D. C. (2006). Domain and Development of Cultural Intelligence: The Importance of Mindfulness. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(1), 78-99.
- Thomas, D. C., Elron, E., Stahl, G., Ekelund, B. Z., Ravlin, E. C., Cerdin, J. L., ... & Lazarova, M. B. (2008). Cultural intelligence domain and assessment. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 8(2), 123-143.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995) *Individualism & Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Triandis, H. C. (2004). The Many Dimensions of Culture. *Academy of Management Executives*, 18(1), 88-93.
- Trompenaars, A. (1996). Resolving International Conflicts: Cultural and Business Strategy. *Business Strategy Review*, 7(3), 51-68.
- Trompenaars, A. & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Global Business*. London: Nicholas-Brealey.
- Veach, M. S., & Kirsch, R. (2012, September 9). The Broken Wing Job [Television series episode]. In C. Downey and J. Rogers (Executive producers), *Leverage*. TNT.
- Walsh, I. J., & Glynn, M. A. (2008). The Way We Were: Legacy Organizational Identity and The Role of Leadership. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 11(3), 262-276.
- Winn, B. (2013). Learning to Lead with Cultural Intelligence (CQ): When Do Global Leaders Learn Best?. *People & Strategy*, 36(3), 10-13.