CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE, GLOBAL MINDSET, AND COSMOPOLITANISM:

A TALE OF THREE CONSTRUCTS

Hyun-Jung Lee

London School of Economics, UK
(ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3386-4959)

Orly Levy

SOAS University of London, UK
(ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8040-5635)

Manuscript to be published in:

David C. Thomas and Yuan (Echo) Liao (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence Research.*

Abstract

Over the past two decades, much of the discussion on cross-cultural capabilities has been dominated by three central constructs: Cultural intelligence, global mindset, and cosmopolitanism. Anchored in distinct disciplinary discourses, these constructs were largely developed in parallel and examined independently from one another. While this diversity of perspectives has imbued the field of cross-cultural and international management with vitality, relevance, and promise, it has also created a rather unruly landscape with multiple theoretical influences and conceptual constructs competing for attention and authority. In this chapter, we offer a comparative analysis of these three constructs along five key dimensions— *theoretical foundation, definitions, core properties and key dimensions, salient contexts,* and *key propositions and findings* — and clarify the crux and relevance of each construct. Our 'compare and contrast' analysis thus elucidates inter-construct conceptual ambiguities and could potentially facilitate a more informed use of the constructs, thereby reducing empirical research inconsistencies that has pervaded the field.

Keywords: cultural intelligence, global mindset, cosmopolitanism, international business, comparative construct development

The last two decades of the 20th century witnessed a dramatic expansion of economic, political, and cultural activities that span national borders. As a result, an increasing number of individuals had begun to work across national and cultural boundaries and interact on a daily basis with people from diverse cultural backgrounds. Furthermore, companies had begun to realize that while systems, processes, and activities had become ever more global, identifying individuals who can effectively work across borders requires a new set of conceptual and diagnostic tools. This realization has led to the proliferation of multiple constructs purportedly fit for a globalizing world, all aimed at identifying and recognizing those individuals who can work effectively across national and cultural boundaries. However, while this diversity of perspectives and definitions has imbued the field of cross-cultural and international management with vitality, relevance, and promise, it has also created a rather unruly landscape with multiple theoretical influences and conceptual constructs competing for attention and authority. Constructs such as *cultural intelligence* (Earley, 2002), *global mindset* (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2002), and *cosmopolitanism* (Hannerz, 1990) have come to dominate much of the discussion of cross-cultural capabilities, but were often developed in parallel, i.e., elaborated and studied independently of one another rather than comparatively. Consequently, fundamental aspects of these constructs were not subjected to comparative analysis that could potentially, for example, elucidate their divergent theoretical foundations and core properties and further specify their relevance across levels of analysis and social contexts. In short, the somewhat parallel paths of these constructs and limited "compare and contrast" analyses have resulted in inter-construct conceptual ambiguities, as well as less than discerning use of the constructs.

In light of the conceptual centrality and practical significance of cultural intelligence, global mindset, and cosmopolitanism in international management, we analyse these three constructs along five key dimensions — *theoretical foundations, definitions, core properties*

and key dimensions, *salient contexts*, and *key propositions and findings* — in order to clarify the crux and relevance of each construct. Comparative approach often facilitates construct development by highlighting the differences even in minute details, and thus helping crystalize what it *is* by eliminating what it *is not*. Further, it can facilitate a more informed use of the constructs, thereby reducing empirical research inconsistencies that pervade the field.

We should note, however, that our aim is not to provide a systematic literature review of each of the three constructs (for systematic literature reviews or meta-analysis of the empirical findings, see, e.g., Andresen & Bergdolt, 2016; Hruby, Watkins-Mathys, & Hanke, 2016; Levy, Peiperl & Jonsen, 2016; Ott & Michailova, 2018; Rockstuhl & Van Dyne, 2018; Yari, Lankut, Alon, & Richter, 2020). Rather, we seek to analyse the historical, intellectual, and operational contexts, as a way to elucidate their divergent, as well as convergent, origins and trajectories. Our decidedly comparative approach thus contributes to the literature by offering insights into how each of the three constructs might be positioned and used in ways that bring to the fore each construct's conceptual foresight and empirical efficacy. Thus, we underscore the different demands and challenges each construct is predicated on and responds to.

Our chapter is structured according to five key comparative dimensions listed previously. In section 1, we discuss the theoretical foundations and unique intellectual roots of the three constructs to elucidate the historical background of the birth of the three constructs. In section 2, we compare the nature of the constructs by compiling the exemplar definitions of each construct. In section 3, we discuss some details in terms of the core properties and key dimensions of the three constructs to further elucidate the nature of the three constructs in comparison. Section 4 compares the salient contexts that best position the three constructs. In section 5, we briefly compare the key research propositions and findings.

Finally, in section 6, we evaluate the current state of knowledge of the three constructs and propose future research directions by addressing the construct-specific challenges and some critical questions.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

Although all three constructs (re)emerged in the early 1990s in the context of intensified and pervasive globalization processes, they highlight different aspects of globalization and are rooted in relatively distinct theoretical traditions. We briefly discuss ahead these varied emphases and foundations.

The notion of ***global mindset*** first emerged as part of the strategic perspective on globalization that highlighted the increasing *strategic complexity* of the global business environment. Building on the work of Bartlett and Ghoshal in international strategy, particularly on the integration–responsiveness framework (e.g., Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989; Prahalad & Doz, 1987), this perspective suggests MNCs confront dual challenges of integrating geographically distant operations and strategically diverse businesses while responding to local conditions and needs. Managing these challenges requires cultivating a complex managerial mindset, or a global mindset, that enables managers to understand complex global dynamics, balance between competing demands and concerns, reconcile tensions between the global and the local, differentiate between and integrate across cultures and markets, and examine and attend to global issues (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1990). Thus, global mindset was initially rooted in international strategy, indicating the core characteristics of a global mindset are high cognitive and information-processing capabilities.

Later work (e.g., Levy, Beechler, Taylor, & Boyacigiller, 2007) extended the construct, identifying two additional perspectives on global mindset: cultural and multidimensional. Building on the work of Perlmutter (1969), the cultural perspective

suggests managing challenges associated with cultural diversity inherent in the globalization process requires overcoming ingrained ethnocentrism and rising above nationally entrenched views by cultivating a global mindset that is characterized by cultural self-awareness, openness to and an understanding of other cultures, and the selective incorporation of foreign values and practices. In addition to focusing on mindset or perspective, many writers in the cultural stream often discuss global mindset in terms of cross-cultural skills and abilities. Finally, the multidimensional perspective builds on the work of Rhinesmith (1996), incorporating both the cultural and strategic dimensions, as well as several additional characteristics such as personality traits, dispositions, and behaviors drawn from the literature on global and cross-cultural leadership.

Cultural intelligence (or CQ: Cultural intelligence Quotient) has emerged in response to new forms of global work that required a *culture-general* set of skills and capabilities as opposed to country-specific knowledge and expertise. Although international assignments typically involved long-term expatriate assignments, global staffing in the 1990s increasingly included short-term assignments, frequent travelling, and virtual assignments in addition to the traditional long-term assignments (Collings, Scullion, & Morley, 2007). This transformation instigated a shift from in-depth knowledge of the host country to more culture-general capabilities that would enable adjusting to multiple cultural environments and interacting with multiple cultural others, often simultaneously (Hinds, Liu, & Lyon, 2011; Thomas, 2010).

Thus, cultural intelligence can be seen as a response to the changing nature of global work and the new set of demands it engenders. First appearing in Earley (2002), the cultural intelligence construct drew upon intelligence research in psychology, where intelligence is defined as "comprising the mental abilities necessary for adaptation to, as well as selection and shaping of, any environmental context" (Sternberg, 1997: p. 1030; for a comprehensive

review of intelligence, see Sternberg & Detterman, 1986). The thrust of this contemporary definition is that although (intelligent) behaviors may differ from one context to another, the mental processes underlying various (intelligent) behaviors do not. Rather, intelligence involves underlying *abilities* that can be flexibly applied to correspond to the external world while maintaining various knowledge in a coherent internal structure. Such a contemporary view of intelligence is aptly fitting to the scholars who searched for a construct that captures culture-general abilities. Although cultural intelligence shares some similarities with social intelligence (Thorndike, 1936) and emotional intelligence (Beldoch & Davits, 1976), it is explicitly positioned in an intercultural context, emphasizing that understanding culturally different others requires a distinct set of abilities that are not captured in social and emotional intelligence. As such, a person who is high in social and emotional intelligence may not be culturally intelligent.

Cosmopolitanism resurged in the early 1990s largely in response to the intensification, expansion, and growing complexity of global activity across economic, political, and cultural domains. With an ever-expanding body of literature (see Levy, Peiperl, & Jonsen, 2016, for a comprehensive review), cosmopolitanism now represents a complex, multilevel, and multi-layered phenomenon manifested in a variety of social spheres (Vertovec & Cohen, 2002).

As an individual-level disposition, cosmopolitanism is explicitly situated in a broader social and economic context, recognizing that the growth and proliferation of global systems and transnational cultures that have provided more and more people with the opportunity to become cosmopolitan through experiencing cultural multiplicity (e.g., Szerszynski & Urry, 2002), interacting across cultural boundaries (e.g., Mau, Mewes, & Zimmermann, 2008), and developing social ties that span cultural and national boundaries (e.g., Levy, Peiperl, & Bouquet, 2013). Thus, cosmopolitanism highlights the increasing diversity of individuals

who experience *the global* within their daily life and are keenly aware of the world as a whole (Tomlinson, 1999). Further, it emphasizes that diversity of cosmopolitan individuals is also associated with a variety of cosmopolitan dispositions, because the contemporary landscape promotes complex, multi-layered, and diverse enactments of cosmopolitanism (Levy, Lee, Jonsen, & Peiperl, 2019). By contrast, although global mindset and cultural intelligence are informed by the global context and emphasize the need for certain individual capabilities in the age of globalization, they are largely independent of macrolevel phenomena and structural dynamics associated with globalization (Levy, et al., 2016).

DEFINITIONS

The research community generally agrees on the definition of cultural intelligence among the three constructs, whereas the definitions of global mindset and cosmopolitanism are in flux and diverge considerably. A strong conceptual convergence exists for cultural intelligence such that it is the "capability or ability" that helps individuals adapt effectively in multicultural settings. By contrast, the growing interest in the global mindset has led to the proliferation of inconsistent and conflicting definitions derived from both the cross-cultural and international strategy literatures. In a recent review, for example, Andresen and Bergdolt (2017) identified 25 unique definitions of global mindset that are predicated on distinct assumptions and include distinct dimensions. Finally, many writers describe the characteristics, attributes, or dispositions of cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitans without necessarily defining cosmopolitanism as a construct. What is common among the writers, however, is the individual's relationship with the global *others* and/or with *the world as a whole* (e.g., Beck, 2002; Delanty, 2006; Hannerz, 1990; Szerszynski & Urry, 2002). As such, the (shifting) cultural identification and belongingness are commonly recognized, either

directly or indirectly, in the definitions of cosmopolitanism. We present ahead some of the widely acknowledged definitions of the three constructs:

Cultural Intelligence

- Cultural intelligence is a person's capability to adapt effectively to a new cultural context (Earley, 2002).
- Cultural intelligence is a seemingly natural ability to interpret someone's unfamiliar and ambiguous gestures (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004).
- Cultural intelligence is the ability to interact effectively with people who are culturally different (Thomas & Inkson, 2004; Thomas, 2006).
- Cultural intelligence is an individual's capability to function and manage effectively in culturally diverse settings (Ang et al., 2007).
- Cultural intelligence is a system of interacting knowledge and skills, linked by cultural metacognition, that allows people to adapt to and shape the cultural aspects of their environment (Thomas et al., 2008).

Global Mindset

- Global mindset is characterized by openness, an ability to recognize complex interconnections, a unique time and space perspective, emotional connection, a capacity for managing uncertainty, an ability to balance tensions, and savvy (Kedia & Mukherji, 1999).
- Global mindset combines an openness to and awareness of diversity across cultures and markets with a propensity and ability to synthesize across this diversity (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2002).
- Global mindset is the ability to develop, interpret, and implement criteria for personal and business performance that are independent from assumptions of a single country, culture, or context (Maznevski & Lane, 2004).

- Global mindset is a highly complex cognitive structure characterized by an openness to and articulation of multiple cultural and strategic realities on both global and local levels, and the cognitive ability to mediate and integrate across this multiplicity (Levy, Beechler, Taylor, & Boyacigiller, 2007)
- A global mindset is defined as the capacity to function effectively within environments that are characterized by high cultural and business complexity. To function effectively within cross-cultural environments that are also characterized by high strategic business complexity, possessing—in addition to cognitive and motivational prerequisites—a specific attribute (mindset) characterized particularly by openness and cosmopolitanism is vital (Andresen & Bergdolt, 2016).

Cosmopolitanism

- Cosmopolitanism is a state of readiness, a personal ability to make one's way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting, and reflecting (Hannerz, 1990).
- Cosmopolitanism is a cultural disposition involving an intellectual and aesthetic stance of *openness* toward peoples, places, and experiences from different cultures, especially those from different *nations* (Szerszynski & Urry, 2002).
- Cosmopolitanism is an individual's identity horizons that transcend the conventional local boundaries of social entities such as nation states or countries of origin (H-J. Lee, 2014; H-J. Lee, 2015).
- Cosmopolitanism is an embodied disposition characterized by high levels of cultural transcendence and openness that are manifested in and enacted along varied trajectories of cultural embeddedness in one's own culture and cultural engagement with the cultural other (Levy, Lee, Jonsen & Peiperl, 2019).

CORE PROPERTIES AND KEY DIMENSIONS

As discussed above, the three constructs capture different aspects of individual differences: *capability* (cultural intelligence), *cognitive structure* (global mindset), and *personal disposition* (cosmopolitanism). Whereas researchers generally agree on what the core properties of cultural intelligence and cosmopolitanism, the consensus is less clear regarding what are/should be the core properties of the construct of global mindset. We discuss ahead the core properties and key dimensions of each construct in detail.

As noted in previous section, cultural intelligence has a rather strong conceptual convergence that it is a culture-general capability. In terms of the key dimensions and how they are structured, however, some disagreement exists. For example, Ang and colleagues (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Earley & Ang, 2003) proposed a four-factor structure of cultural intelligence consisting of *metacognitive* (i.e., the mental capability to acquire cultural knowledge), *cognitive* (i.e., the knowledge about cultures and cultural differences), *motivational* (i.e., the capability to direct and sustain effort toward functioning in intercultural situations), and *behavioral* dimensions (i.e., the ability to be flexible in intercultural situations) (see Van Dyne et al., 2012, for further refinements of 11 subdimensions with four higher-order dimensions). Although the four-factor structure has advantages of possibly observing differentiated effects of four dimensions on various outcomes, it also creates certain confusion over the inter-relationships between the four components as well as their relationships with the overall CQ. For example, cultural metacognition (or metacognitive CQ) has received the most research attention as a stand-alone single factor (e.g., Mor, Morris, & Joh, 2013), which raises the question of whether the respective factors individually represent cultural intelligence or whether they must be combined to be labelled as cultural intelligence. Thomas and colleagues (2008, 2015), on the other hand, proposed a latent-factor model whereby cultural intelligence is conceptualized as a latent factor that is manifested along the three observable facets of cultural knowledge, cross-cultural skills, and cultural

metacognition. Recently, reconciling the four-factor model and latent-factor model, Rockstuhl and Van Dyne (2018) proposed a bi-factor model that consists of the latent factor CQ as well as four facets of CQ (for a detailed discussion, see Rocksthul & Van Dyne, 2018).

Despite the ongoing debates summarized above, research on cultural intelligence is beginning to be viewed as *normal science*. However, considerable disagreement still exists regarding what are the core properties of global mindset. The dominant perspective on global mindset is *cognitive*, conceptualizing it in terms such as "knowledge structure," "cognitive structure," "sensemaking," and "attention" (e.g., Gupta & Govindarajan, 2001; Maznevski & Lane, 2004; Levy et al., 2007). Others have suggested the core properties of global mindset to be *behavioral* (i.e., "propensity to engage," "ability to adapt," "curiosity," "emotional connection," "capacity for managing uncertainty," and "savvy" (e.g., Kedia and Mukherji, 1999), and *existentialist* (i.e., "way of being," "state of mind," and "orientation" (e.g., Jeannet, 2000). Drawing from the multiple perspectives, Levy et al. (2007) proposed global mindset to be a multidimensional construct operationalized by the facets of *cognitive complexity* and *cosmopolitanism*. Others suggest further expanding the construct to include additional aspects such as psychological, social, and intellectual capabilities (e.g., Beechler & Javidan, 2007; Bowen & Inkpen, 2009; Javidan, Hough, & Bullough, 2010). A recent review by Andresen and Bergdolt (2017) indicates that out of 25 unique definitions of global mindset, the majority include cognitive (88%) and personal-attributes (76%) dimensions, whereas behavioral (56%) and motivational (40%) dimensions were less important in defining global mindset.

For cosmopolitanism, on the other hand, at least two core characteristics are widely accepted: *openness* to the cultures of others and *transcendence* of conventional cultural boundaries (Levy, Lee, Jonsen, & Peiperl, 2019). Many researchers consider *openness* to the cultural other or "towards people, places, and experiences from other cultures" a core

property of cosmopolitan disposition (Hannerz, 1990; Skey, 2012; Skrbis & Woodward, 2007; Szerszynski & Urry, 2002). *Transcendence* captures the individual's tendency to go beyond his or her own cultural habitus and thus reflect on it from a distance (Lee, 2014). Cosmopolitans, therefore, often experience their own cultures from afar (Szerszynski & Urry, 2006), which creates the psychological space and resources for individuals to take in and appreciate the cultures of others (Delanty, 2006). These two characteristics are conceptually distinct yet interrelated. Openness is likely to facilitate crossing existing cultural boundaries, and the practices of crossing boundaries can encourage individuals to become open to and appreciate the cultures of other. Experiencing unfamiliar cultural systems, ideas, and people can induce mediation over one's own culture, which would usually not be called into question or reflection. Whereas cosmopolitanism is characterized by high levels of transcendence and openness, it is proposed to vary along two dimensions: cultural embeddedness and cultural engagement (Levy et al., 2019). *Cultural embeddedness* denotes the extent to which individuals are anchored in a specific culture. Individuals who are culturally disembedded (popularly referred to as "rootless") do not have a principal cultural influence in their lives, whereas culturally embedded cosmopolitans share similar taken-for-granted assumptions and norms with those around them, and thus, their thoughts and actions are primarily guided by their cultural group. *Cultural engagement* reflects a general capacity to cross cultural boundaries, or the level at which cosmopolitans engage with the cultural other. It ranges from *thin* or *consumerist* engagement, which refers to the surface level of consumptive and aesthetic openness and appreciation of other cultures (Szerszynski & Urry, 2002), to *thick* or *reflexive* engagement. Which refers to the openness and appreciation at a deeper level of cultural cores, including social customs, norms, and values of other cultures (Hannerz, 1990).

SALIENT CONTEXTS

The three constructs also vary in their emphasis on context, including macro-level dynamics associated with globalization (cosmopolitanism), meso-level strategic complexity of the global business environment (global mindset), and micro-level cultural complexity in interpersonal interactions (cultural intelligence). Cosmopolitanism as an individual-level disposition highlights the intensification, expansion, and growing complexity of global activity (Held, 2002) that leads to increased interaction and interdependence between the local and the global. This macro-level context has resulted in a widespread experience of cultural diversity that often destabilizes the fabric of society and the relations between self and others. Thus, cosmopolitanism is not limited to particular situations of, for example, cultural consumption or cultural diversity; rather, it is present on a daily basis as an ongoing intra-individual process of balancing between self, other, and world (Delanty, 2006). By contrast, the construct of global mindset is specifically situated in a global business context and has a distinct strategic focus. It underscores the cultural and strategic complexities, multiple cultural and strategic dynamics, and interactions between the global and the local under intensified globalization. Finally, cultural intelligence has an interpersonal focus and is applicable to a wide range of contexts involving any two or more culturally different individuals of all levels and positions. Such contexts include, for example, interactions between expatriate managers and host-country nationals, interactions between members of a multicultural team, and interactions between individuals in cross-cultural negotiations.

KEY PROPOSITIONS AND FINDINGS

All three constructs have degrees of commonality in their key propositions that suggest *effective functioning* of an individual who is in the context characterized by cultural diversity, multiplicity and complexity. Of the three constructs, cultural intelligence has generated the

most traction in empirical studies, primarily helped by the development of and accessibility to the cultural intelligence scale (CQS) (Ang et al., 2007). The empirical findings on global mindset, however, are largely fragmented, primarily due to the lack of conceptual convergence and the absence of a widely accepted scale measure in the research community. Compared to the research in cultural intelligence and global mindset, which takes a positivist perspective with testable hypotheses, cosmopolitanism has multiple epistemological entry points with an experiential streak. A strand of cosmopolitanism research investigates the performance implications of high levels of cosmopolitanism in person, yet a significant amount of empirical research revolves around the experiential cosmopolitanism on how cosmopolitans relate to their own and other cultures (Levy et al., 2019). We highlight ahead some of the key findings.

The grand proposition of cultural intelligence is that a culturally intelligent person functions effectively in intercultural interpersonal contexts. A recent literature review (Ott & Michailova, 2018) counted 73 studies published in major research outlets between 2002 and 2015, and a recent meta-analysis (Rockstuhl & Van Dyne, 2018) included 169 empirical articles (also including unpublished and conference papers) of cultural intelligence between 2003 and 2017. Overall, the research showed cultural intelligence is positively associated with sociocultural adjustment (e.g., Huff, Song, & Gresch, 2014; Malik, Cooper-Thomas, & Zikic, 2014), creativity (e.g., Chua & Ng, 2017), task performance (e.g., Bücker, Furrer, Poutsma, & Buyens, 2014; Xu & Chen, 2017), citizenship performance (e.g., Malek & Budhwar, 2013), intercultural negotiation (e.g., Groves, Feverherm, & Gu, 2015; Imai & Gelfand, 2010), and intercultural collaboration (e.g., Chua, Morris, & Mor, 2012; Stoermer, Davies, & Froese, 2020). Alongside the accumulated evidence of a series of positive effects, the developmental side of cultural intelligence also draws great interest from scholars and practitioners. Thus far, studies have identified international experience (e.g., Crowne, 2013;

Moon, Choi, & Jung, 2012), classroom education and training (e.g., Eisenberg, Lee, et al., 2013; MacNab & Worthley, 2012; Mor, Morris, & Joh, 2013; Ng, Van Dyne, & Ang, 2009; Ramsey & Lorenz, 2016), and personality characteristics (e.g., Huff, et al., 2014) as key contributors to cultural intelligence. Finally, studies have attempted to further refine the psychometric structure of cultural intelligence, and a number of new scale measures were developed. For example, Thomas and colleagues (2015) developed a short-form 10-item measure that reflects a latent-factor structure with three facets: cultural knowledge, cross-cultural skills, and cultural metacognition. Researchers have also continued to try to refine the four-factor model, and the outcome includes a new measure based on a refined second-order 11-factor structure (Van Dyne et al., 2012).

For global mindset, although the overarching proposition can lead to positive outcomes across multiple levels of analysis (see Hruby, Watkins-Mathys, & Hanke, 2016 for a recent review), its effects are most pronounced at the normative and strategic-leadership levels (Andresen & Bergdolt, 2017). At the normative level, which primarily deals with the raison d'etre of the company and its defining mission, vision, norms, and culture, global mindset can foster a vision and set of goals that transcend national and subunit boundaries, unifying the workforce around a set of global superordinate goals. Further, global mindset can foster adaptation to the global environment and achieving competitive advantage through promoting learning about and responding to multiple local environments and integrating and coordinating across geographically distant and culturally diverse operations and markets (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989; Murtha, Lenway, & Bagozzi, 1998; Prahalad & Doz, 1987). For example, Felício, Meidutė, and Kyvik (2016) found a managerial global mindset strongly influences a corporate global mindset. They also found a managerial global mindset strongly influences various aspects of internationalization, including international knowledge-acquisition activities, and moderately influences international networking activities. At the

strategic level, which involves translating the guiding principles defined at the normative level through formulating and enacting global strategies, global mindset can lead to more effective decision-making in a global context, superior global strategies, and higher organizational performance. In fact, empirical research has consistently found global mindset influences various dimensions of strategy, including internationalization of the firm (e.g., Felício, Duarte, & Rodrigues, 2016; Felício, Meidutė, and Kyvik, 2016; Lappe & Dörrenbächer, 2017) and entry-mode decisions (Jiang, Ananthram, & Li, 2018).

The key propositions of cosmopolitanism are twofold. The first focuses on the *intrapersonal* outcome of experiential cosmopolitanism, or the process of destabilizing and redefining the identity and belonging. The second relates to the impacts of cosmopolitanism at the interpersonal and intergroup relations in and around the firms and society. The research on experiential cosmopolitanism predicts that individuals (constantly) define and redefine identity and belonging as a result of dynamic interactions with cultural others and the global (Beck, 2002). Thus, the research question here is to understand individuals' *intrapersonal* learning process that unfolds through encounters with competing systems of meaning and alternative cultural models (Delanty, 2006). For example, Bourgouin (2012) describes the lived experience of South African financial professionals through their cosmopolitanism lifestyle and identities, whereas Colic-Peisker (2010) explores the transnational knowledge workers' identity and belonging. In a study of the financial elites in Switzerland, Bühlmann, David, and Mach (2013) show how the international managers of transnational networks redefined cosmopolitanism as a legitimate capital. Others highlight the interplay between the individual circumstances and the external globalizing environment such that similar external circumstance may generate a variety of cosmopolitanism (e.g., Cichelli & Octobre, 2017; Hannerz, 2007; Lee, 2014; Levy, et al., 2019; Peterson 2010). For the specific consequences for high levels of cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitanism is found to be associated with positive

outcomes in interpersonal and intergroup interactions (e.g., Lee & Reade, 2018; Sobre-Denton, 2016; Werbner, 1999). For example, Lee and Reade (2018) show Chinese employees' cosmopolitanism is positively related to their organizational commitment to foreign firms. Others show cosmopolitanism is related to active community building (Sorbre-Denton, 2016) and to creating transnational community (Werbner, 1999).

Table 1.

Comparisons of three constructs

	Cultural Intelligence	Global Mindset	Cosmopolitanism
Intellectual tradition	Psychology, Cross-cultural management	International business, Cognitive psychology	Philosophy, Sociology, Anthropology
Core property	Capability	Cognitive structure	Embodied disposition
Metaphorical mode of a person	Engaging	Information processing	Being situated in-between
Salient context	Interpersonal interactions between two or more culturally different individuals	Normative and strategic level in complex organizations	Encounters with cultural others—both purposeful as well as casual and unintentional encounters
Key propositions	Adjustment to and effective functioning in intercultural situations	Integration of cultural and global complexity in generating normative and strategic choices for the unit	Globalization-driven changes in cultural identity and belonging; transcultural brokering by bridging across structural and cultural holes in global networks

DISCUSSION

In an attempt to understand the individual attributes that might have a bearing in the era of pervasive intercultural contacts and global connectedness, scholars have invested in three distinct constructs: cultural intelligence, global mindset, and cosmopolitanism. These constructs highlight different aspects of multicultural and global challenges of the contemporary world we live in. Bridging the intelligence research in psychology and cross-cultural management, cultural intelligence is conceptualized as an intercultural *capability*, whereas global mindset was born out of the debate in international business and draws from cognitive psychology to conceptualize it as a *cognitive structure*. The overarching proposition of both cultural intelligence and global mindset is an individual's effective functioning in complex multicultural contexts, although the salient operating contexts differ such that cultural intelligence highlights interpersonal-level effectiveness for the front-line individuals, whereas global mindset highlights the strategic and normative-level outcomes for global firms and organizations. Cosmopolitanism, on the other hand, has a rich and long history in philosophy and social science, and resurged in the 1990s to capture the sociocultural response to globalization. It has been reconceptualized recently as an individual's *embodied disposition*, with implications for cultural identity and belonging as well as interpersonal and intergroup outcomes. If an individual of high cultural intelligence can be described as someone who engages with culturally different others at the front line of intercultural work, an individual with a high global mindset can be portrayed as someone who performs complex information processing tasks for making high-level, strategic decisions for the unit/collective. An individual with high levels of cosmopolitanism can be understood as someone who deals daily with cultural plurality arising from casual and unintentional encounters as well as purposeful encounters with cultural and global others.

Our comparison of multiple constructs is a powerful approach to construct development and theory building because it underscores the overlapping, distinctive, and

complementary aspects of each construct. By bringing together three constructs, we create a more complete theoretical picture of individual-level qualities viewed as essential in the field of cross-cultural and international management. We have traced the historical and intellectual origins of the constructs and identified their operational contexts, thereby explicating their distinctive contributions and trajectories, as well as overlapping characteristics. Our decidedly comparative approach thus highlights the current state of knowledge of each construct. We conclude our chapter by sharing our critical reflections on each construct ahead.

On Cultural Intelligence

Empirical research in cultural intelligence has been fruitful in the past two decades since its first appearance in 2002, partly due to the development of the widely accepted measure CQS, although the debate still continues on the key dimensions and the inter-relations between the key dimensions. Although addressing these structural and methodological issues is evidently the next step for future research, we propose that future research also reflect on a rather fundamental question relating to the basic assumptions behind the conception of cultural intelligence. As discussed earlier, the desire to move beyond (or away from) the dominant cross-cultural management paradigm, such as Hofstedian cultural dimensions, was pivotal to the conception of cultural intelligence. Scholars have thus far remained silent on the relation between the culture-specific knowledge (of other cultures) and cultural intelligence, as if the research community assumes culture-specific knowledge does not play an important role in cultural intelligence. We encourage future research to explore some of the difficult questions. For example, is some culture-specific knowledge, in fact, a prerequisite for (developing) cultural intelligence? Is the culture-specific knowledge of a particular other culture (in relation to one's own) perhaps more valuable in developing cultural intelligence? In addition,

is cultural intelligence equally useful when one is interacting with all culturally different others or is it more useful in one cultural context than others? Addressing these questions may require scholars to open Pandora's box as the fundamental question becomes, "Is there a such thing as *acultural* cultural intelligence, or is cultural intelligence also culture-bound?"

On Global Mindset

Over the past two decades, research has focused mainly on defining and refining the core properties of global mindset and its main dimensions. Empirical research has investigated the influence of global mindset on a rather narrow set of variables typically related to firms' internationalization activities. Although this focus is understandable when considering constructs in their infancy, the time may have come for research on global mindset to go beyond this stage and take a step forward both conceptually and empirically. Essentially, global mindset captures a fundamental capacity: the ability to see and understand the world from a global perspective (Levy, Beechler, Taylor, & Boyacigiller, 2007). Building on this *lean* or rather simplified insight can facilitate defining and conceptualizing the *logical opposite* of global mindset as a way to elucidate global mindset. Accordingly, we suggest that global *blindset*—a profound inability to see and comprehend the world from a global perspective (Levy, 2017)—can be viewed as the conceptual polar opposite of global mindset. Empirically, such blindness or short-sightedness has been increasingly evident in recent years as a host of global events that have had major and far-reaching implications (e.g., the 2008 financial crisis, the 2011 Arab Spring, Brexit, the rise of Trump, the migration crisis, and the COVID-19 pandemic) initially went undetected and unforeseen by global leaders (Levy, 2020; Osland, 2020). We suggest that analyzing such unforeseen events can shed light on global mindset or the capacity to foresee and understand the world from a global perspective. We therefore encourage researchers to temporarily move away from the core of global

mindset and explore the edge, to engage in examining its conceptual and empirical opposite, and then *travel back* to elucidate what acting in the world with a global mindset means.

On Cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitan and anti-cosmopolitan sentiments have a long, intertwined history. If the current phase of cosmopolitanism was ushered in by globalization processes in the 1990s, the current phase of anti-cosmopolitanism may have been formally announced by the former British Prime Minister Theresa May, who asserted in 2016 that "if you believe you are a citizen of the world, you are a citizen of nowhere. You don't understand what citizenship means" (*The Telegraph*, 2016). Ms. May's denunciation of cosmopolitans is, of course, nothing new, and she continues a long tradition of anti-cosmopolitan propaganda practiced to detrimental effect in Nazi Germany and Communist Russia against Jews and Bolsheviks. Nevertheless, the question of whether the current phase of anti-cosmopolitanism is indeed an extension of the past or a significant new development calls for more careful consideration. Furthermore, as immigration becomes increasingly widespread and contentious, anti-cosmopolitan attitudes are likely to emerge across multiple locales and in various forms, many of which may be unique to our era. Therefore, we encourage future research to examine the interrelation between cosmopolitanism as a lived experience of both cosmopolitans and anti-cosmopolitans, how and why such realities shape anti-cosmopolitan sentiment and politics, and what may be their present-day manifestations and consequences.

REFERENCES

Andresen, M., & Bergdolt, F. (2017). A systematic literature review on the definitions of global mindset and cultural intelligence–merging two different research streams. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28*(1), 170-195.

Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K.Y., Templer, K.J., Tay, C. and Chandrasekar, N.A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3, 335–371.

Ang, S., Ng, K. Y., & Rockstuhl, T. (2020). Cultural intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence* (pp. 820–845). Cambridge University Press.

Ang, S., Ng, K. Y., & Rockstuhl, T. (2015). Cultural intelligence and competencies. *International encyclopedia of social and behavioral sciences, 2*, 433-439.

Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1989). *Managing Across Boarders: The Transnational Solution*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1990). Matrix Management: Not a Structure, a Frame of Mind. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(4), 138-145.

Beck, U. (2002). The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society, 19(1–2)*, 17–44.

Beechler, S., & Javidan, M. (2007). Leading with a Global Mindset. In M. Javidan, R. M. Steers, & M. A. Hitt (Eds.), *The Global Mindset* (Vol. 19, pp. 131-169): Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Beldoch, M. & Davitz, J. R. (1976). The communication of emotional meaning. Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press.

Bourgouin, F. (2012). On Being Cosmopolitan: Lifestyle and Identity of African Finance Professionals in Johannesburg. *Ethnos, 77*(1), 50-71.

Bowen, D. E., & Inkpen, A. C. (2009). Exploring the role of "global mindset" in leading change in international contexts. *The Journal of applied Behavioral science, 45*(2), 239-260.

Bücker, J. J., Furrer, O., Poutsma, E., & Buyens, D. (2014). The impact of cultural intelligence on communication effectiveness, job satisfaction and anxiety for Chinese host country managers working for foreign multinationals. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 25*(14), 2068-2087.

Bühlmann, F., David, T., & Mach, A. (2013). Cosmopolitan capital and the internationalization of the field of business elites: Evidence from the Swiss case. *Cultural Sociology, 7*(2), 211-229.

Cho, J., Morris, M. W., & Dow, B. (2018). How do the Romans feel when visitors "Do as the Romans Do"? Diversity ideologies and trust in evaluations of cultural accommodation. *Academy of Management Discoveries, 4*(1), 11-31.

Chua, R. Y., 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*(2), 116-131.

Cicchelli, V. & Octobre, S. (2017). Aesthetico-cultural cosmopolitanism among French young people: beyond social stratification, the Role of Aspirations and Competences. *Cultural Sociology, 11*(4), 416-437.

Colic-Peisker, V. (2010). Free floating in the cosmopolis? Exploring the identity-belonging of transnational knowledge workers. *Global Networks, 10*(4), 467-488.

Collings, D. G., Scullion, H., & Morley, M. J. (2007). Changing patterns of global staffing in the multinational enterprises: Challenges to the conventional expatriate assignment and emerging alternatives. *Journal of World Business, 42*, 198-213.

Crowne, K. A. (2013). Cultural exposure, emotional intelligence, and cultural intelligence: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 13*(1), 5-22.

Delanty, G. (2006). The cosmopolitan imagination: Critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *The British Journal of Sociology, 57(1),* 25–47.

Earley, P.C. (2002). Redefining interactions across cultures and organizations: moving forward with cultural intelligence. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *24*, 271– 299.

Earley, P.C. and Mosakowski, E. (2004). Cultural intelligence. *Harvard Business Review*, 82,

Eisenberg, J., Lee, H.-J., 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.

Engle, R. L., & Crowne, K. A. (2014). The impact of international experience on cultural intelligence: An application of contact theory in a structured short-term programme. *Human Resource Development International, 17*(1), 30-46.

Engle, R. L., & Nash, B. (2015). Does it matter if researchers use individual dimension constructs or only aggregated constructs of cultural distance and cultural intelligence? *Journal of International Business Research, 14*(2), 47.

Felício, J. A., Duarte, M., & Rodrigues, R. (2016). Global mindset and SME internationalization: A fuzzy-set QCA approach. *Journal of Business Research, 69*(4), 1372-1378.

Felício, J. A., Meidutė, I., & Kyvik, Ø. (2016). Global mindset, cultural context, and the internationalization of SMEs. *Journal of Business Research, 69*(11), 4924-4932.

French, R. (2018). *Global Mindset: Cultivating Knowledge in Multinational Organizations*: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Gelfand, M. J., Imai, L., & Fehr, R. (2015). Thinking intelligently about cultural intelligence: The road ahead. In *Handbook of cultural intelligence* (pp. 393-406): Routledge.

Groves, K. S., Feyerherm, A., & Gu, M. (2015). Examining cultural intelligence and cross-cultural negotiation effectiveness. *Journal of Management Education, 39*(2), 209-243.

Gupta, A. K. & Govindarajan, V. (2002). Cultivating a global mindset. *Academy of Management Perspective*, *16*(1), 116-126.

Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory Culture & Society*, 7, 237–251.

Hannerz, U. (2007). Foreign correspondents and the varieties of cosmopolitanism. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 33*(2), 299-311.

Held, D. (2002). Culture and political community: national, global, and cosmopolitan. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving Cosmpolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice* (pp. 48-58). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hinds, P., Liu, L., & Lyon, J. (2011). Putting the global in global work: An intercultural lens on the practice of cross-national collaboration. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1), 135-188.

Hruby, J., Watkins-Mathys, L., & Hanke, T. (2016). Antecedents and Outcomes of a Global Mindset: A Thematic Analysis of Research from 1994 to 2013 and Future Research Agenda. In *Advances in Global Leadership* (Vol. 9, pp. 213-280): Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Huff, K. C., Song, P., & Gresch, E. B. (2014). Cultural intelligence, personality, and cross-cultural adjustment: A study of expatriates in Japan. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 38*, 151-157.

Javidan, M., Hough, L., & Bullough, A. (2010). Conceptualizing and measuring global mindset®: Development of the global mindset inventory. *Glendale, AZ: Thunderbird School of Global Management*.

Jiang, F., Ananthram, S., & Li, J. (2018). Global mindset and entry mode decisions: Moderating roles of managers' decision-making style and managerial experience. *Management International Review, 58*(3), 413-447.

Kedia, B. L., & Mukherji, A. (1999). Global Managers: Developing a Mindset for Global Competitiveness. *Journal of World Business, 34*(3), 230-251.

Lappe, C., & Dörrenbächer, C. (2017). Organizational identity, global mindset and the internationalization of small and medium-sized enterprises. In C. Dörrenbächer, M. Tomenendal, & S. Stanske (Eds.), *Organizational identity and firm growth: Properties of Growth, Contextual Identities and Micro-Level Processes* (pp. 183-207). London: Springer.

Le, H., Jiang, Z., & Radford, K. (2020). Leader-member exchange and subjective well-being: the moderating role of metacognitive cultural intelligence. *Personnel Review*.

Lee, H.-J., and Reade, C. (2018). The role of Yin-Yang leadership and cosmopolitanism in employee commitment to foreign firms in China: A paradox perspective, *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management, 25(2),* 276-298.

Lee, H.-J. (2015). Cosmopolitanism. *Wiley Encyclopaedia of Management (3rd edition), 6*, 1-2, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

Lee, H.-J. (2014). Identities in the global world or work. In B. Gehrke and M-T. Claes (Eds.), *Global leadership practices: A cross-cultural management perspective* (pp. 85-101). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Levy, O. (2017). *Global mindset: From the core to the edge and back*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Atlanta.

Levy, O., Beechler, S., Taylor, S., & Boyacigiller, N. (2007). What We Talk About When We Talk About "Global Mindset": Managerial Cognition in Multinational Corporations. *Journal of International Business Studies, 38*(2), 231-258.

Levy, O., Lee, H.-J., Jonsen, K., & Peiperl, M. A. (2019). Transcultural brokerage: The role of cosmopolitans in bridging structural and cultural holes. *Journal of Management, 45*(2), 417-450.

Levy, O., Peiperl, M., & Bouquet, C. (2013). Transnational social capital: A conceptualization and research instrument. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 13*(3), 319-338.

Levy, O., Peiperl, M. A., & Jonsen, K. (2016). Cosmopolitanism in a Globalized World: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. In *Advances in Global Leadership* (Vol. 9, pp. 281-323): Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Li, M. (2020). An examination of two major constructs of cross-cultural competence: Cultural intelligence and intercultural competence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 164*, 110-105.

Lima, J. E., West, G. B., Winston, B. E., & Wood, J. A. (2016). Measuring organizational cultural intelligence: The development and validation of a scale. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 16*(1), 9-31.

MacNab, B. R. (2012). An experiential approach to cultural intelligence education. *Journal of Management Education, 36*(1), 66-94.

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.

Malek, M. A., & Budhwar, P. (2013). Cultural intelligence as a predictor of expatriate adjustment and performance in Malaysia. *Journal of World Business, 48*(2), 222-231.

Malik, A. R., Cooper-Thomas, H. D., & Zikic, J. (2014). The neglected role of cultural intelligence in recent immigrant newcomers' socialization. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 14*(2), 195-213.

Mau, S., Mewes, J., & Zimmermann, A. (2008). Cosmopolitan attitudes through transnational social practices? *Global Networks, 8*(1), 1-24.

Maznevski, M. L., & Lane, H. W. (2004). Shaping the Global Mindset: Designing Educational Experiences for Effective Global Thinking and Action. In N. Boyacigiller, R. M. Goodman, & M. Phillips (Eds.), *Crossing Cultures: Insights from Master Teachers* (pp. 171-184). London: Routledge.

Michailova, S., & Ott, D. L. (2018). Linking international experience and cultural intelligence development. *Journal of Global Mobility: The Home of Expatriate Management Research, 6*(1), 59-78.

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

Moon, H., Choi, B., & Jung, J. (2012). Previous international experience, cross-cultural training, and expatriates' cross-cultural adjustment: Effects of cultural intelligence and goal orientation. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 23*(3), 285-330.

Murtha, T. P., Lenway, S. A., & Bagozzi, R. P. (1998). Global Mind-Sets and Cognitive Shift in a Complex Multinational Corporation. *Strategic Management Journal, 19*(2), 97-114.

Ng, K.-Y., Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (2012). Cultural intelligence: A review, reflections, and recommendations for future research. In A. M. Ryan, F. T. Leong, & F. L. Oswald (Eds.), *Conducting multinational research: Applying organizational psychology in the workplace* (pp. 29-58). American Psychological Association.

Osland, J. S., Mendenhall, M. E., Reiche, B. S., Szkudlarek, B., Bolden, R., Courtice, P., . . . Maznevski, M. (2020). Perspectives on Global Leadership and the COVID-19 Crisis. In J. S. Osland, B. Szkudlarek, M. E. Mendenhall, & B. S. Reiche (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership* (Vol. 13, pp. 3-56). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Ott, D. L., & Michailova, S. (2018). Cultural intelligence: A review and new research avenues. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 20*(1), 99-119.

Peterson, M. A. (2010). Agents of hybridity: Class, culture brokers, and the entrepreneurial imagination in cosmopolitan Cairo. In D. C. Wood (Ed.), *Economic Action in Theory and Practice: Anthropological Investigations* (Vol. 30, pp. 225-256). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Perlmutter, H. (1969). The tortuous evolution of the multinational corporation. *Columbia Journal of World Business, 4*(1), 9-18.

Prahalad, C. K., & Doz, Y. L. (1987). *The multinational mission: balancing local demands and global vision*. New York: The Free Press.

Ramsey, J. R., & Lorenz, M. P. (2016). Exploring the impact of cross-cultural management education on cultural intelligence, student satisfaction, and commitment. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 15*(1), 79-99.

Rhinesmith, S. H. (1996). *A manager's guide to globalization: six skills for success in a changing world* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rockstuhl, T., & Van Dyne, L. (2018). A bi-factor theory of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence: Meta-analysis and theoretical extensions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 148,* 124-144.

Skrbis, Z., & Woodward, I. (2007). The ambivalence of ordinary cosmopolitanism: Investigating the limits of cosmopolitan openness. *The Sociological Review, 55*(4), 730-747.

Sobré-Denton, M. (2016). Virtual intercultural bridgework: Social media, virtual cosmopolitanism, and activist community-building. *New Media & Society, 18*(8), 1715-1731.

Sternberg, R. J. (1997). The concept of intelligence and its role in lifelong learning and success. *American Psychologist,* 52(10), 1030.

Sternberg, R. J. (2004). Culture and intelligence. *American Psychologist*, 59, 325-338.

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

Stoermer, S., Davies, S., & Froese, F. J. (2020). The influence of expatriate cultural intelligence on organizational embeddedness and knowledge sharing: the moderating effects of host country context. *Journal of International Business Studies, 52*, 432-453.

Szerszynski, B., & Urry, J. 2002. Cultures of cosmopolitanism. *The Sociological Review, 50(4),* 461–481.

Szerszynski, B., & Urry, J. (2006). Visuality, mobility and the cosmopolitan: inhabiting the world from afar. *The British Journal of Sociology, 57*(1), 113-131.

Telegraph. (2016). Theresa May's Conference Speech in Full *http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/10/05/theresa-mays-conferencespeech-in-full/. October 5, 2016*.

Thomas, D. C. (2010). Cultural intelligence and all that jazz: a cognitive revolution in international management research? In *The past, present and future of international business & management*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Thomas, D. C., Elron, E., Stahl, G., Ekelund, B. Z., Ravlin, E. C., Cerdin, J.-L., . . . Aycan, Z. (2008). Cultural intelligence: Domain and assessment. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 8*(2), 123-143.

Thomas, D. C., & Inkson, K. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: People skills for global business*. San Francisco, CA: Berret-Koehler.

Thomas, D. C., Liao, Y., Aycan, Z., Cerdin, J. L., Pekerti, A. A., Ravlin, E. C., Stahl, G. K., Lazarova, M. B., Fock, H., Arli, D., Moeller, M., Okimoto, T. and van de Vijver, F. (2015). Cultural intelligence: a theory-based, short form measure. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *46*, 1099– 1118.

Thorndike, R. L. (1936). Factor analysis of social and abstract intelligence. *Journal of educational psychology, 27*(3), 231.

Thorndike, R. L., & Stein, S. (1937). An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin, 34*(5), 275.

Tomlinson, J. (1999). *Globalization and Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., Ng, K.-Y., Rockstuhl, T., Tan, M., L., & Koh, C. (2012). Sub-dimensions of the four factor model of cultural intelligence: Expanding the conceptualization and measurement of cultural intelligence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 6,* 295-313.

Vertovec, S., & Cohen, R. (2002). Introduction: conceiving cosmpolitanism. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmpolitanism: theory, context, and practice* (pp. 1-22). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Werbner, P. (1999). Global pathways. Working class cosmopolitans and the creation of transnational ethnic worlds. *Social Anthropology, 7*(1), 17-35.

Woodward, I. (2017). Cosmopolitanism. *The international encyclopedia of intercultural communication*, 1-10.

Xu, X.-J., & Chen, X.-P. (2017). Unlocking expatriates' job creativity: The role of cultural learning, and metacognitive and motivational cultural intelligence. *Management and Organization Review*, *13*, 767–794.

Yari, N., Lankut, E., Alon, I., & Richter, N. F. (2020). Cultural intelligence, global mindset, and cross-cultural competencies: a systematic review using bibliometric methods. *European Journal of International Management*, *14*(2), 210-250.

Biography

Hyun-Jung LEE (PhD, LSE) is Associate Professor of Organizational Behavior and Cross-Cultural Management at the London School of Economics and Political Science, UK. Trained as a psychologist, her research interests include cross-cultural management, cosmopolitanism, intercultural collaboration, and cultural identity. Her latest research focuses on understanding how individuals and firms can transcend their socio-cultural boundaries and collaborate across organizational, national and symbolic boundaries. She has published in leading management journals including *Journal of Applied Psychology, Journal of Management, Journal of Management Studies,* and *Organization Studies.*

Orly LEVY (PhD in sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA) is Reader in International Management and Director of Research of the School of Finance and Management at SOAS University of London. Orly conducts research on multinational corporations and transnational networks, focusing on global mindset and cosmopolitan disposition, transnational social capital and cultural capital, power and politics in multinational corporations, and transcultural brokerage. Her research has appeared in journals such as Journal of Management, Journal of International Business Studies, Organization Studies, and Journal of Organizational Behavior. For her work, she received multiple awards, most recently the Emerald Literati Award for Outstanding Author Contribution in 2017 and 2021.