

**When Do Global Leaders Learn Best to Develop Cultural Intelligence?
An Investigation of the Moderating Role of Experiential Learning Style**

Ming Li, William H. Mobley and Aidan Kelly

Author Note

Ming LI, ESC School of Business, 35065 Rennes Cedex, France. E-mail:

lily-ming.li@esc-rennes.fr; William H. Mobley, University of Macau, Macau, China. E-mail:

Wmobley@umac.mo; Aidan Kelly, University College Dublin, Blackrock Co. Dublin,

Ireland. E-mail: aidan.kelly@ucd.ie

We are very grateful for the insightful and constructive comments from Editor Steve Armstrong, three anonymous reviewers, Anne Marie Francesco, Donald Bergh, Alan Roberts on earlier versions of this paper. Very special thanks to the comments from Alvin Huang and Christine Quinn Trank at *Academy Management Learning and Education* paper development workshop organized by Editor Ben Arbaugh, at the Academy meeting in San Antonio in 2011. We appreciate the sponsorship of this research by UCD Michael Smurfit Graduate Business School, China Europe International Business School, and HayGroup.

When Do Global Leaders Learn Best to Develop Cultural Intelligence? An Investigation of the Moderating Role of Experiential Learning Style

ABSTRACT

Cultural intelligence is believed to be an important quality for global leaders. To understand how this quality can be developed from international experience, the present study employs experiential learning theory to analyze the learning process. It hypothesizes that the extent to which the length of overseas work experience contributes to the development of cultural intelligence varies depending on the executive's learning styles. Analyses of data collected from 294 international executives and graduate business students in China and Ireland indicated that the positive relationship between the length of overseas experience and cultural intelligence is strengthened when global executives have a divergent learning style, not when they have an assimilative, convergent or accommodative learning style.

Keywords: Cultural Intelligence, Experiential Learning, International Experience, Learning Style, Moderation

INTRODUCTION

“In the emerging ‘global village’, ‘multicultural workplace’ and in ‘multinational empires’ where events in places we have barely heard of quickly disrupt our daily work and lives, the dizzying rate of change, and the exponential growth of knowledge all generate nearly overwhelming needs to learn just to survive.”

– David Kolb, 1984

In a world that is dynamically globally interconnected in a way we could not have imagined even a decade ago (Adler, 2006), global leaders are vital human assets for companies to implement global strategies (Conner, 2000). Global work is different from domestic work; while the “what’s” remain the same, the “how’s” are different (McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002). The main source of the differences in “how’s” are cultural differences. The capability to manage such cultural differences therefore has become one of the important skills for global leaders (Deal, Leslie, Dalton, & Ernst, 2003; Javidan, Teagarden, & Bowen, 2010). *Cultural intelligence* (CQ; Ang et al., 2007; Earley & Ang, 2003; Thomas et al., 2008) reflects such abilities to deal effectively with people from different cultural backgrounds. Investment in developing CQ among business leaders in global corporations is strategically important to maintain competitive advantage in a global environment (Ang & Inkpen, 2008; Earley & Peterson, 2004; Rose, Sri Ramalu, Uli, & Kumar, 2010). Thus far, very little research has investigated this topic. Previous research has examined the influence of personality traits (Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006) and international experience (Crowne, 2008) on CQ. Yet some executives learn from those experiences and some fail to learn. The cost of failure in such learning processes is extremely high (Hill, 2001). However, we know much less about the relationship between learning ability and international experience (Spreitzer,

McCall, & Mahoney, 1997). Without understanding more about this relationship, companies cannot make effective use of costly international experience to develop global leadership capability (Kohonen, 2005).

The present study aims to understand learning ability that develops CQ from international experience. This learning is similar to cross-cultural learning skills as outlined by Yamazaki and Kayes (2004) and fits naturally with experiential learning theory (Kolb & Kolb, 2005b; Kolb, 1984). Such exploration of experiential learning theory in the development of global leaders is part of a growing research interest. Very recently, Ng, Van Dyne and Ang (2010) proposed CQ as a learning capability moderator that enhances the likelihood that individuals actively engage in the four stages of experiential learning (experience, reflect, conceptualize, experiment) to develop global leadership on international assignments. Since Earley and Ang (2003) defined CQ as a dynamic end-state result rather than a born trait, there is a great deal that a person can do to shape and refine his or her CQ (Earley, Ang, & Tan, 2006), especially through learning from experience with different cultures (Thomas & Inkson, 2005). To date there has not been any examination of this relationship. To understand the relationship from both directions is not a simple 'chicken and egg' tautology. Rather, it gives us the opportunity to understand the influence of fundamental individual differences such as learning style (Kolb, 1984; Kolb and Kolb, 2005) in the development of CQ in global leaders, and hence advances our knowledge of management learning. The study is also valuable for further refinement in the conceptualization and measurement of the newly developed CQ concept. The results will inform business executives regarding the ways of accelerating their learning to develop CQ and inform

organizations regarding the methods to select and develop their global talent.

In this study, we begin with an analysis of the impact of international experience on cultural intelligence with a focus on overseas work experience. This is followed by a discussion of international experience as a unique learning context. Employing experiential learning theory, we analyze how executives go through four learning modes of the experiential learning cycle to develop CQ. Then, we examine the impact of four experiential learning styles on the development of CQ. The theoretical model proposed in this study is shown in Figure 1. We then report our empirical test of this model; this is the first attempted test of a relationship between experiential learning theory and CQ.

Insert Figure 1 about here

THOERY DEVELOPMENT

Cultural Intelligence and International Experience

According to Earley and Ang (2003), Cultural Intelligence (CQ) has both process and content features. They defined the general structure of CQ as consisting of three facets, namely cognitive, motivational, and behavioral elements. Cognitive CQ is a person's ability to develop patterns from cultural cues, drawing on both cognitive and metacognitive abilities. Metacognitive ability refers to the processes individuals use to acquire and understand cultural knowledge, including knowledge of and control over their thought processes. It happens when people form strategies before an inter-cultural encounter, check assumptions

during an encounter, and adjust mental maps when actual experiences are different from expectations. Cognitive CQ is the knowledge of the norms, practices, and conventions in different cultures. It includes general knowledge structures and mental maps about cultures that include information about economic, legal and social system of different cultures (Triandis, 1994). With this knowledge, individuals can understand both similarities and differences among cultures. Motivational CQ is a person's interest in experiencing other cultures and interacting with people from different cultures. It includes not only the intrinsic value people place on interactions with people from different cultures but also their belief that they can function effectively in those situations. Motivational CQ directs, focuses and applies energy toward learning about and functioning in cross-cultural situations. Individuals with higher motivational CQ tend to interact more with people from different cultures. And when they confront obstacles, setbacks, or failures, their level of interest and confidence also determines how persistently they will seek to learn from relevant experience (Ang et al., 2006). Behavioral CQ is a person's ability to appropriately enact selected behaviors in accordance with cognition and motivation, and to exhibit appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions when interacting with people from different cultures. Behavioral CQ requires individuals to overcome some deeply held reservations in an unfamiliar situation and try to adopt appropriate behaviors to interact with people from different cultures (Earley & Ang, 2003). This adaptability of behaviors significantly helps executives improve communication effectiveness, build relationships with others, and lead in a global context.

International experience has been recognized as the primary vehicle for developing global leadership skills (Jokinen, 2005; McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002). It provides cultural

exposure (Crowne, 2008) to develop cultural intelligence. As one of the most intense international experiences, overseas work experience such as the expatriate experience, has been the focus of much prior research (e.g. Aycan, 1997; Black & Gregersen, 1991; Morley, Burke, O'Regan, & Inwood., 1997; Waxin, 2004; Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004). Entering a new culture is often a confusing and disorientating experience, and expatriates are likely to experience culture shock after five months in a new culture (Adler, 2002). While others might look at culture shock as a barrier, it is also a unique learning experience which challenges assumptions of the expatriate's own culture. Those expatriates then develop more complex mental frameworks that help them to develop accurate expectations, to form strategies of interacting with people from different cultures and therefore to develop metacognitive CQ. It is also from these experiences that expatriates learn cultural knowledge about different economic, legal and social systems (cognitive CQ). McCall and Hollenbeck (2002) also documented in their research that one of the changes global executives felt over the course of their global career was an increase in self-confidence. Even though it is likely that executives with high self-confidence and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997) tend to take challenging international assignments, it is also important to recognize that individuals do develop their confidence and efficacy through international experience as new information and experience are acquired (Gist & Mitchell, 1992), in other words, motivational CQ. Knowledge and motivation will never be sufficient to be effective in interacting with people from different cultural backgrounds if the actual behavior that is required in certain situations is not displayed. The complexity of intercultural behavior is such that even if people know what they should do and have the necessary motivation, it does not always mean they will

enact the behaviors. Behavior changes take time and behavioral CQ inevitably takes time and practice; global executives are expected to develop their behavioral CQ from day-to-day happenings in their overseas work experience. Therefore overall, international managers develop their cultural intelligence from their overseas work experience. It is likely the longer the overseas work experience, the higher level of CQ international managers will develop.

***Hypothesis 1:** The length of overseas work experience is positively related to the level of CQ of international managers.*

Experiential Learning Theory and Cultural Intelligence

Experience accounts for over 70% of individual development (Morrison & Brantner, 1992). Evidence that people benefit differently from experience has also been confirmed in research focused on the concept of action learners (Allen & Young, 1997; Bunker & Webb, 1992). Global leadership is also a process of learning from international experience and global executives learn differently from similar international experiences (McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002). To develop cultural intelligence, one “must progress through a series of stages ranging from simply reacting to external stimuli to adjusting behavior in anticipation of subtle changes in cultural context. While there are numerous ways to accomplish this goal, including formal education and training, experiential learning is key to increase CQ” (Thomas & Inkson, 2005, p. 5).

Experiential Learning Theory (ELT)

Drawn from the foundational “theory of experience” of Dewey (1938) and Lewin (1951), experiential learning is defined by Kolb (1984) as the process whereby knowledge is

created through the transformation of experience. It emphasizes the central role that experience plays in the learning process and regards learning as a holistic process of adaptation to the world, which involves the integrated functioning of the total organism – thinking, feeling, perceiving, and behaving. Kolb’s Experiential Learning Theory (1984) remains one of the most pervasive theories about how managers learn from experience (Hoover, Giambatista, Sorenson, & Bommer, 2010; Kayes, 2002; Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004).

Kolb defined learning as “the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience, knowledge results from the combination of grasping and transforming experience” (Kolb, 1984, p. 41). Two fundamental processes, “grasping the experience” and “transforming the experience”, are both essential for learning. He further defined two dialectically related modes of *grasping* experience, namely concrete experience (CE) versus abstract conceptualization (AC); CE relies on the tangible and immediately felt qualities of the experience, while AC relies on conceptual interpretation and symbolic representation of the experience. The two dialectically related modes of *transforming* experience are reflective observation (RO) versus active experimentation (AE); RO transforms through internal processing, while AE transforms through actual manipulation of the external world. Kolb presents the experiential learning cycle of these four experiential learning modes as in Figure 2. It describes how immediate concrete experience serves as the basis for observation and reflection, in which the experience is subsequently assimilated into abstract conceptualization, and then formed into active experimentation with the world. Active experimentation both completes the cycle of learning and ensures that it begins anew by assisting the creation of new experiences (Kolb & Kolb, 2005a; Kolb, 1984).

Insert Figure 2 about here

Ideally learners can “touch all the bases” – experiencing, reflecting, thinking and acting – to learn from experience. However, in reality, few if any individuals can do so (Kolb, 1984). Through different social and learning experiences, they resolve the conflicts between being active (AE) and reflective (RO), and between being immediate (CE) and analytical (AC), and develop over time a unique possibility-processing structure of learning that emphasizing on the four different learning modes (Kolb, 1984). Based on the extent of emphasis on these four experiential learning modes - CE, RO, AC and AE, Kolb (1984) named and defined four learning styles - Divergent, Convergent, Assimilative, and Accommodative learning styles. The matching between learning context and learning style leads to enhanced learning performance (Kolb & Kolb, 2005b).

International Experience as a Learning Context

International experience is a unique and crucial learning context. It can occur in many forms including encounters with individuals from different cultures, short visits to international divisions, and long-term immersion in a new host culture. Overseas work experience is one of the most intensive international experiences. In this learning environment, there are many learning opportunities including one-on-one interactions with individuals, professional events and social engagements that international managers can be involved in. The knowledge that can be acquired from overseas work experience is not only

the content knowledge about a specific cultural domain (Thomas et al., 2008), but also tacit knowledge which is not explicit and must be acquired in the absence of direct instruction, and gained through practical experience and observation in various contexts (Grotenhuis & Weggeman, 2002). It often involves highly confusing cultural issues (Osland & Bird, 2000) and an emotional cultural shock experience (Adler, 2002). During the experience in a different culture, executives cycle through the four experiential learning modes to develop their CQ. The immediate cultural experience serves as the basis for observation and reflection, in which the cultural experience is subsequently assimilated into cultural knowledge, and then formed into active experimentation towards forming culturally appropriate behaviors.

Concrete Experience (CE) starts the executives' learning cycles. The level of their engagement in international cultural experience depends on their ability to employ feelings in those experiences and the ability to cope with unstructured and ambiguous situations (Kolb, 1984). CE enables individuals to grasp knowledge, relying on tangible and immediately felt qualities of the experience with different cultures, also being sensitive towards other peoples' emotions and values, and dealing with encounters with culturally different individuals in a personable way (Kolb, 1984). Knowledge from concrete cultural experience is then processed by *Reflective Observation* (RO) to uncover how and why things happen in different ways. RO enables individuals to look at things from different perspectives and appreciate different points of view (Kolb, 1984), to suspend judgment until multiple cues can be assessed (Triandis, 2006), and to critically reflect and challenge personal assumptions built on prior experience and knowledge (Taylor, 1994). The meaning is then assimilated into

new cultural knowledge by *Abstract Conceptualization* (AC). AC enables executives to think through what it means for similar situations in the future and to make systematic plans of what to do in those situations (Kolb, 1984). These plans are executed by *Active Experiment* (AE), which is focused on doing what works in different cultures and taking risks to enact different behaviors to test these ideas and change situations (Kolb, 1984). AE completes the cycle of cultural learning and also begins anew by assisting the creation of new cultural experiences (Kolb & Kolb, 2005a; Kolb, 1984).

The extent of emphasis on the four experiential learning modes is different for executives based on their learning styles (Kolb, 1984). When their learning styles fit the context of overseas work experiences, this leads to more effective learning. AC is not as critical an experiential learning skill for cross-cultural adaption as CE, RO and AE (Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004). Executives who prefer AC over CE do not seem to learn effectively from concrete cultural experience because AC grasps knowledge from abstract symbols such as ideas and concepts from books for example as opposed to the immediate quality of experience (Kolb, 1984).

Experiential Learning Styles and Cultural Intelligence

Divergent learning style emphasizes concrete experience and reflective observation. The greatest strength of this learning style lies in imaginative ability and the awareness of meaning and values (Kolb, 1984). Individuals who have this learning style tend to be imaginative and emotional (Kolb & Kolb, 2005b); therefore they can attach their feelings to the experience and thus can experience particular situations more concretely. In the experience of a new culture, people with this learning style are at their best in viewing

concrete situations from many different points of view (Kolb & Kolb, 2005b). Therefore, executives with this learning style will tend to check assumptions and adjust mental maps when actual experiences are different from expectations (metacognitive CQ); they will use different perspectives to understand both similarities and differences among cultures (cognitive CQ). People with a divergent learning style tend to have broad cultural interests; they tend to show high interest for international experience (motivational CQ). They are interested in people from different cultures, and are more likely to build relationships with people from different cultures. By gaining different cultural experiences, their perception of self-efficacy can also be enhanced (Bandura, 1997). Hence they process higher confidence to deal with cultural challenges (motivational CQ). The emphasis in this orientation is on learning by observation rather than action (Kolb, 1984). People with this learning style have great potential to understand what behaviors are appropriate in different cultural contexts (Phillion, 2002). However, as they are less active in taking actions, they may not be as proficient in applying these behaviors. Nonetheless, it has been suggested that the measure of CQ is concerned more with acquiring appropriate behaviors than with applying them in real-life situations (Johnson, Lenartowicz, & Apud, 2006); therefore CQ requires more learning of the appropriate behaviors than actually testing them out. People with this learning style also prefer to work in groups, to listen with an open mind and to receive personalized feedback (Kolb & Kolb, 2005b); these are important qualities to work effectively with people from different cultures. Overall, an executive with a divergent learning style does have the prerequisites or high potential to develop all four CQ facets.

Accommodative learning style emphasizes concrete experience and active experimentation. Kolb (1984) stated that the greatest strength of this orientation lies in doing things, carrying out plans and tasks and getting involved in new experiences. People with an accommodative orientation tend to solve problems in an intuitive trial-and-error manner, relying heavily on other people for information rather than on an analytical or reflective ability. It is best suited for those situations where one must adapt to changing circumstances. Therefore, executives with this learning style tend to get involved in new cultural experiences and be flexible in their behaviors for dealing with different cultural situations (behavioral CQ). However, although people with an accommodative learning style are generally at ease with people, they are sometimes seen as impatient, pushy and lacking in reflection (Kolb, 1984). Their pushiness may cause defensiveness from people with a different cultural background, and their impatience may cause them to withdraw from cultural experiences that are frustrating. Their lack of reflection may also lead executives to resort to convenient explanations and make rash conclusions (Ratiu, 1983), and therefore be unable to comprehend deep cultural meanings in their experiences. In consequence, as they may not understand the most appropriate behaviors in those cultural contexts, they simply mimic others' behaviors, which could be perceived as insincere (Thomas & Ravlin, 1995). Armstrong and Mahmud's study (2008) found the accommodative learning style the most effective among the four learning styles in acquiring managerial tacit knowledge from managerial work experience. Since there is a large part of cultural knowledge that is tacit, this learning style may be effective in acquiring cultural knowledge, which means higher

cognitive CQ. Overall, this learning style seems to be a double-edged sword, incorporating both strengths and weaknesses for the development of CQ.

Assimilative learning style emphasizes abstract conceptualization and reflective observation. The greatest strength of this style lies in inductive reasoning and the ability to create theoretical models in assimilating disparate observations into an integrated explanation (Kolb, 1984). It seems that this learning style will help global executives to assemble different observations into an integrated form of cultural knowledge and hence the development of higher cognitive CQ from experience. However this learning style is less focused on people. Instead, it is more concerned with ideas and abstract concepts (Kolb, 1984). Therefore, executives with this learning style do not seem to possess high motivational CQ to be involved with people from different cultures, a major source of cultural knowledge (cognitive CQ). This learning style does not seem to have particular strengths in the development of CQ.

Convergent learning style relies primarily on the dominant learning abilities of abstract conceptualization and active experimentation. The greatest strength of this approach lies in problem solving, decision making, and the practical application of ideas (Kolb, 1984). This learning style has similar characteristics to the assimilative learning style in that the preference is for dealing with technical tasks and problems rather than social and interpersonal issues. Hence executives with this learning style are less likely to acquire cultural knowledge from their interaction with people. They are more likely to acquire cultural knowledge from secondary sources such as films, readings, and formal training sessions. When these sources teach the right behaviors, convergent learning style individuals

can rigorously implement what they have learned. However, the secondary sources may lead to stereotypical expectations about a particular culture. When individuals and situations deviate from what is expected or assumed it can cause frustrating experiences. Executives with this learning style emphasize thinking, testing actions, and searching for explanations; these seem to be helpful in developing metacognitive CQ. However if the data they pick up from new experiences is used to confirm what they have already known, then this learning style may facilitate forming and reinforcing cultural stereotypes (Ratiu, 1983). They have the ability to solve problems and make decisions based on finding solutions to questions or problems (Kolb & Kolb, 2005b); this seems to lead to higher behavioral CQ. However, people with this learning style value precision, such as with the rigor and discipline of analyzing ideas (Kolb, 1984). They may appear to be judgmental in others' behaviors because of such a tendency, and therefore to have low behavioral CQ. Moreover, people with this learning style should be more effective in specialist and technology careers, not a management career (Kolb, 1984). Overall, this learning style does not appear to be helpful in the development of CQ.

Overall, individuals vary in their ability to learn from their international experiences. The positive relationship between the length of overseas work experience and cultural intelligence, which is proposed in Hypothesis 1, is influenced by the experiential learning style. It appears that divergent learning style fits the context of the overseas work experience, and is the most positive among the four learning styles for the development of CQ. The assimilative, convergent and accommodative have both positive and negative learning

characteristics for the development of CQ, their impacts on CQ are therefore uncertain.

Taken as a whole, we propose:

Hypothesis 2: Experiential learning styles moderate the level of CQ developed by global executives from their international experience. The positive relationship between the length of overseas experience and CQ is strengthened when global executives have a divergent learning style, not when they have an assimilative, convergent or accommodative learning style.

METHOD

Samples and Data Collection

To test the hypotheses, data were gathered from business managers representing different cultures and having had different exposures to international work experiences. We selected international managers from an Asian country China, and a Western country Ireland, for this study. The sampling frame comprises 350 business managers from three multinational companies in China and 250 expatriates in one expatriate association in Shanghai. We also sent surveys to 115 MBA students (including international MBA students) in one of the leading business schools in China and 100 postgraduate business students in the principal business school in Ireland. The MBA and international postgraduate business students in our sample either had work experience prior to their study or were working while they undertook their studies part time. All of them had exposure to different cultures from either working or studying abroad, or working in a multinational company.

294 participants completed the survey, representing a response rate of 36%. Males

accounted for 55.8% and females for 44.2% of the final sample. The average age was 31.5 years; more than 73% were above 28 years old and likely have over five years work experience. Thirty-one different nationalities were represented in the sample: 175 respondents were from China, 45 from Ireland, 16 from the US, 21 from Europe and the remainder from 16 other countries. 92% held a bachelor or master's degree. At the time they completed the survey, 64% of the sample were business professionals and 36% were undertaking business education. 41% had, or were currently engaged in, overseas work experience; and 10% had overseas experience of over five years. As shown in Table 1, they represented various managerial functions and positions. Among those who reported as executives ("department/unit manager", "director", "divisional/function head", "general manager/senior executive", "managing director/chief executive"), 48% had overseas work and about 13% had overseas experience of over five years. Among the rest who can be regarded as a "potential executives" group, 29% had overseas work experience, and about 6% had overseas experience of over five years. The percentage of executives and potential executives in the business professionals and graduate students groups were identical.

Insert Table 1 about here

We adopted a web-based survey utilizing www.surveymonkey.com; and an invitation email with the survey link was sent out to human resource departments in multinational companies, the coordinator of the expatriate association, and lecturers in business schools. Respondents were guaranteed confidentiality in the invitation email. We designed both

English and Chinese versions of the online survey in order to reach our target respondents.

For the Chinese survey, we asked the providers of the instruments to send us their Chinese version survey that had been tested in other research. The Cultural Intelligence Center (CQC) provided the CQ measure in Chinese. For the learning style and international experience questions, we had English-Chinese bi-lingual professionals provide translation and back translation of the questions.

A pretest was run with a small sub-sample of 10 respondents to detect problems in the online-survey design. After the pretest, the online survey was revised and tried again by two more respondents to make sure that there were no problems with completing the survey online.

Measures

Dependent Variable

Cultural Intelligence. We employed the 20-item inventory developed by Ang et al. (2007) to measure cultural intelligence. Each item was scored on a 7-point Likert scale from “1=strongly disagree” to “7=strongly agree”. The inventory includes four items to measure Metacognitive CQ ($\alpha=0.77$), six items for Cognitive CQ ($\alpha=0.85$), five items for Motivational CQ ($\alpha=0.79$), and five items for Behavioral CQ ($\alpha=0.76$). Sample items include “I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures” for metacognitive CQ; “I know the rules for expressing non-verbal behaviors in other cultures” for cognitive CQ; “I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures” for motivational CQ; and “I change my non-verbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it” for behavioral CQ.

Independent Variables

Learning Style. Learning Style was measured by the latest version of the Kolb Learning Style Inventory Version 3.1 (KLSI 3.1) (Kolb & Kolb, 2005a). The KLSI 3.1 is a forced-choice 12-item inventory that ranks an individual's relative choice preferences among the four learning modes - concrete experience (CE), reflective observation (RO), abstract conceptualization (AC), and active experimentation (AE). A sample question is "I learn best when:", and the answer choices given are "I listen and watch carefully", "I rely on logical thinking", "I trust my hunches and feelings", and "I work hard to get things done". Participants were asked to rank these four choices with "4=*most like you*", "3=*second most like you*", "2=*third most like you*" and "1=*least like you*". Four primary scores CE ($\alpha=0.73$), RO ($\alpha=0.77$), AC ($\alpha=0.80$) and AE ($\alpha=0.72$) were calculated based on the forced ratings of the 12 questions. Then two combination scores were calculated that measure an individual's preference for abstract conceptualization over concrete experience (AC-CE) and active experimentation over reflective observation (AE-RO). The learning style was decided by these two scores based on the Learning-Style Type Grid (version 3.1) provided by the Hay Group. We created four dichotomous learning style variables – convergent, assimilative, divergent and accommodative with values "1=yes, 0=no".

International Experience. Respondents were asked to answer the questions:

- (1) Do you have overseas work experience? Answer "0" represents "No" and answer "1" represents "Yes".
- (2) Totally how many months did you work overseas?

Control Variables

Bennett (2004) refers to people born into multicultural families as the *cultural margin* who are comfortable switching between relative perspectives of different cultures and have a sufficiently complex self-concept enabling the flexibility needed for CQ (Earley & Ang, 2003). Females tend to be more empathetic than males (Toussaint & Webb, 2005); thus, females are more likely to accurately perceive the internal frame of reference of another person and non-verbal communication; they are more likely to understand different cultures. Older participants may have more exposure to different cultures and as a consequence develop higher CQ. People who receive more education may develop more comprehensive frameworks to appreciate different cultures and develop CQ. Ethnicity captures more important elements of demographic difference beyond national origin (Olsen & Martins, 2009) and individuals have an implicit perception of the hierarchical ordering of certain ethnicities (Song, 2004). Those from higher order ethnicities may perceive themselves as possessing higher level of CQ. Hence age, gender, educational background, parents of different nationalities, and ethnicity were included as control variables in the analysis.

Common Method Variance

Since the data for CQ, learning style, international experience and other control variables for this study were collected on the same survey, there is a potential for common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). This potential problem was examined by conducting Harman's one factor test in which all the variables in our study were simultaneously entered into an exploratory factor analysis (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Four

factors were extracted accounting for 67.5% of the variance, with factor one accounting for 26.5% of the variance. There was no single factor emerged that accounted for most of the variance.

Analytical Procedure

Moderated multiple regression analysis (Aiken & West, 1991; Bedeian & Mossholder, 1994) is employed to test the hypotheses. We first mean centered the variables associated with the interaction terms to reduce multi-collinearity problems inherent in higher order terms. Then we ran four independent moderated multiple regression analyses for overall CQ and each learning style. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was examined to identify multicollinearity among the variables in the regression models. Three models were tested under each moderated multiple regression analysis:

Model 1 consisted of only the control variables age, gender, and educational background.

Model 2 added the independent variables International Experience (length of overseas work) and four learning style variables (convergent, assimilative, divergent and accommodative).

Model 3 added the moderating variables (International Experience×Divergent, International Experience×Assimilative, International Experience×Convergent, and International Experience×Accommodative) of the two independent variables.

The significance of the interaction effects was tested by the t test of the coefficients of interaction terms and F test of the models with added interaction terms (Aiken & West, 1991). Then, if the interaction effect of a specific learning style was significant, we also ran moderated multiple regression analysis of this learning style on the four facets of CQ to test its role in the development of all four facets of CQ in a post hoc analysis.

RESULTS

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics and correlations for all variables in this study.

Insert Table 2 about here

Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 summarize the results of the moderated multiple regression analyses of the four learning styles on the relationship between the length of overseas experience and overall CQ. The VIF values of the variables for all regression models were between 1.02 and 1.34, indicating multicollinearity was not a concern. We first tested whether the length of overseas experience positively related to overall CQ (Hypothesis 1). As shown in these four tables, in models 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 12, the length of overseas experience was significantly related to overall CQ ($b_2=0.193$, $b_3=0.149$, $b_5=0.193$, $b_6=0.241$, $b_8=0.194$, $b_9=0.173$, $b_{11}=0.182$, $b_{12}=0.239$, $p < .01$). These results provide support for Hypothesis 1.

Insert Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 about here

We then tested whether learning styles moderate the level of overall CQ developed by global executives from their overseas work experience. Specifically, we expected the positive relationship between the length of overseas work experience and CQ to be more positive when global executives have a divergent learning style. Table 3 indicates the interaction of the length of overseas work experience and divergent learning style (International Experience×Divergent) was positive and significant for overall CQ.

Table 4, 5 and 6 indicate that the interactions of length of overseas work experience with the other three learning styles (International Experience×Assimilative, International Experience×Convergent, and International Experience×Accommodative) were not statistically significant for overall CQ. Therefore these three learning styles neither strengthen nor weaken the positive relationship between the length of overseas work experience and CQ. Consequently, Table 3 and Table 4, 5 and 6, jointly support Hypothesis 2.

To further probe the results, we plotted the interaction effects using Aiken and West's (1991) procedure as shown in Figure 3. Simple slopes suggested that CQ is more positively related to the length of international experience when individuals have a divergent learning style, in comparison with other learning styles.

Insert Figure 3 about here

Post Hoc Analysis

To understand the impact of divergent learning style on the four facets of CQ, we run four moderated multiple analysis of divergent learning style on four facets of CQ respectively. As shown in Table 7, the interaction of the length of overseas work experience and divergent learning style (International Experience×Divergent) was positive and significant for all four CQ facets. These results are consistent with what Table 3 presents that divergent learning has a positive moderating effect on all four CQ facets, thus providing further evidence that divergent learning style strengthens the positive relationship between the length of overseas work experience and CQ. In addition, we ran robustness tests of moderated multiple regression analyses with the two subgroups – executives and potential executives. The results showed there were no significant differences between these two subgroups, and the results supported the main findings. The robustness tests further improved our confidence of our theory and findings.

Insert Table 7 about here

DISCUSSION

In this study, we examined the role of experiential learning in the development of CQ from international experience, and the extent to which the length of overseas experience contributes to the development of CQ varies depending on the learning styles individuals

have. Supporting our hypotheses, we found that the length of overseas work experience is positively related to the level of CQ, and that a divergent learning style strengthens this positive relationship, not the other three experiential learning styles. We next discuss the theoretical and managerial implications of our study's findings.

Theoretical Implications

Our findings contribute to management learning to develop global leaders in two ways. Firstly, our study enhanced understanding of experiential learning in the development of important capabilities managing cultural differences, in our case, CQ of global executives. Previously, one study hypothesized the relationship between experiential learning and expatriate adaptation skills (Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004), and another study hypothesized that cultural intelligence enhances the likelihood that individuals actively engage in four experiential learning modes to develop global leadership competencies (Ng, Van Dyne, & Ang, 2009). Yet to date, no research has empirically tested these relationships. Our study delineated and tested the relationship between experiential learning and the development of cultural intelligence and advanced our understanding of how international experience and experiential learning play a unique and important role in the development of cultural intelligence.

Our results demonstrate that the length of overseas work experience is positively related to the level of CQ, and a divergent learning style enhances this positive relationship even when more general individual backgrounds such as age, gender and educational background are controlled for. These findings imply that, firstly, cultural intelligence does not develop overnight. The longer one is immersed in a different culture or cultures, the higher level of

CQ one may develop. Such experience in a different culture is central to developing CQ. Even though it is likely that high CQ individuals self-initiate overseas work (Tharenou & Caulfield, 2010) and remain working overseas as they enjoy it and are confident they can deal with cultural challenges, there is ample evidence that showed international experience enhances CQ (Ng, 2011), expatriate adjustment (Selmer, 2002), and global leadership (Caligiuri & Santo, 2001). A meta-analysis study about expatriate adjustment also suggests that it takes five years on average to feel integrated in a society (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005). It may take similar time spans for executives to develop a satisfactory level of CQ.

More importantly, our results suggest the strength of the divergent learning style in developing CQ from overseas experience. Managers with this learning style can connect their feelings closely to their immediate overseas experience, they are sensitive about meaning and values (Kolb, 1984), and so they can acquire more cultural knowledge (cognitive CQ) from overseas experience. They view concrete cultural situations from many perspectives (Kolb & Kolb, 2005b) and emphasize on the reflection, the checking of assumptions and the adjustment of mental maps when actual experiences are different from expectations, thus developing higher metacognitive CQ. Moreover, they have a broad interest in cultures and people, thus can develop high motivational CQ. Their engagement in feeling and observing different cultural behaviors also leads to a better understanding of appropriate behaviors in different cultural contexts (Phillion, 2002); this results in high behavioral CQ. Our results also support the proposition by Yamazaki and Kayes (2004) that CE skills that are related to

interpersonal skills and therefore building human relationships may be of primary importance in cross cultural learning.

In addition to the findings of the strength of divergent learning style in the development of CQ from overseas experience, our results suggest assimilative, convergent and accommodative learning styles do not have apparent a positive or negative influence in comparison with a divergent learning style. These findings imply that the seemingly apparent strength of the assimilative learning style in assimilating different observations into an integrated cultural knowledge from experience is not supported. In fact, the lack of interest in people associated with this learning style may lead to the failure of accessing one major source of cultural knowledge learning - people from different cultures. Furthermore, the accommodative learning style does not seem to have evident strength in acquiring cultural knowledge. This is not in line with Armstrong and Mahmud (2008)'s finding that an accommodative learning style is the most effective among the four learning styles in acquiring managerial tacit knowledge from managerial work experience. Further, its influence on behavioral CQ is confirmed as we expected. This suggests that behavioral CQ is not about getting involved in new experiences by intuitive trial-and-error actions, opportunity seeking, and risk taking; rather, it is more focused on knowing appropriate behaviors through careful observation and reflection and practicing those behaviors (Johnson et al., 2006). In addition, the convergent learning style does not show strength in developing CQ from international experience. This implies that focusing on thinking and testing actions, which are the opposite of feeling and reflecting respectively, is not a learning strength in developing CQ. Typically, the lack of interest in dealing with social and interpersonal issues associated

with this learning style, similar to the assimilative learning style, is its limitation in developing CQ.

Secondly, our study contributes to the further development of measurement of cultural intelligence. Cultural intelligence as a fairly new concept has been reviewed as “falls short of specifying the construct as more than a loosely aggregated set of facets conceptually similar to intercultural competency, global mindset or host of other similar terms, or as an extension of constructs such as social intelligence in a new domain” (Thomas et al., 2008). Researchers continuously refine the definition and measurement of cultural intelligence, metacognitive CQ (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008) or CQ metacognition (Thomas et al., 2008) is one important facet of CQ. It differentiates CQ from other cross cultural competency measures that simply emphasizing on knowing what to do and being adaptable in adopting different behaviors based on such understanding. Metacognitive CQ is fundamentally a learning capability to acquire cultural knowledge. Ang et al. (2007) have defined metacognitive CQ as the process individuals control to acquire and understand knowledge; it includes planning, monitoring and revising mental models of cultural norms. The characteristics of the divergent learning style, which focuses on employing feeling and sensitivity in immediate intercultural encounters, and on understanding the meanings of by careful observation and reflection, can add more dimensions in the future development of the conceptualization and measurement of metacognitive CQ. Thomas et al. (2008) have included the focus on reflection of domain knowledge and skills from cross-cultural encounters in their conceptualization of CQ metacognition. The feeling (CE) dimension, which is the ability to employ feeling, the intuitive understanding of present reality, a sensitivity to other people’s emotions and values,

and the ability to view concrete cultural situations from many perspectives, has not been involved in the conceptualization of CQ to date. Even though Thomas et al. (2008) have incorporated an attention to conscious cognitive experience and affective and personal-motivational states with regard to the cultural milieu in the *monitoring* process of CQ metacognition, attention and intuition are different perspectives. As there continues to be substantial debate regarding the extent to which metacognitive processes operate at a purely conscious level, the openness, intuitiveness, and sensitivity captured by CE has become one even more important and interesting element to be considered for future CQ conceptualization.

Furthermore, our result that accommodative learning style does not have apparent strength in acquiring cultural knowledge is different from the finding of Armstrong and Mahmud (2008)'s finding that the accommodative learning style is the most effective among the four learning styles in acquiring managerial tacit knowledge from managerial work experience. This raises a question about cultural knowledge: is it "declarative/explicit knowledge" or "tacit/implicit knowledge"? The past conceptualization and measure of CQ focuses on the declarative content of cultural knowledge, for example, economic and legal systems, values and behaviors of other cultures. There is no doubt such explicit content knowledge of other cultures and also of one's own culture serves as an important mental map for reflection to generate new cultural knowledge (Ang et al., 2007; Thomas et al., 2008). However, culture knowledge is complex and dynamic. For example, a recent study reported that explicit knowledge of Chinese business culture as collectivism, long-term orientation and risk aversion, which is pervasive in management and cultural training programs, as three

myths (Meyer & Shen, 2010). In reality, what many expatriates experienced in China in recent years is the opposite - the rise of individualism, the real-time reaction of decision making, and risk tolerance. Such tacit knowledge is difficult to understand and describe when managers experience it, and it is of course difficult to be transformed into declarative knowledge. In addition, the changing nature of culture also suggests the tacit knowledge gained through real time cross-cultural experience is extremely important for CQ. Therefore, future conceptualization and measurement of cognitive CQ should capture tacit cultural knowledge in addition to declarative cultural knowledge. Ultimately, we hope the advancement of understanding experiential learning on the development of CQ from our study contributes to the future conceptualization and measurement of CQ and also other important capabilities of global leaders.

Managerial Implications

If international experiences are the source of learning, then it is essential for global executives to gain them. However, gaining international experiences does not, in and of itself, guarantee one will learn from them. By uncovering the impact of different learning styles on cultural intelligence, executives can self-evaluate their learning styles and understand their potential to develop cultural intelligence from possible international experience. Executives can employ the Kolb's Learning Style Inventory (KLSI3.1) (Kolb & Kolb, 2005a) as a self-assessment exercise and tool to understand their preferred approach to learning and learning style. More importantly, executives can manage their learning modes (CE, RO, AC and AE) during their international experience to develop cultural intelligence. As the divergent learning style is the most positive in developing CQ from international experience,

those executives with a convergent learning style, for example, can pay more attention to keep in touch with their “feelings” and reflecting; watching and listening very carefully and developing interpersonal skills to better develop their CQ.

“Developing global executives is a strategic business priority. To accomplish this successfully, the right mix of selection, training, and experiential procedures is necessary” (Fernandez, 2003, p37). The results of this study have important value for international executive selection and may be used to guide international corporations to form policies and practices to develop potential global leaders. The results suggest international corporations to endorse the consideration of learning style in assessment and development activities. The assessment of learning style points the way to developmental qualities rather than making decisions based on personality traits alone. Companies will want to give valuable international experiences to people most likely to learn from them. From the results of our study, executives with a divergent learning style have the greatest potential to develop cultural intelligence. Previous international experience is also an important factor to consider when companies are selecting and identifying their global high-potentials. Many companies typically need to send their technical experts to overseas operations to transfer knowledge, and quite a high percentage of technical professionals have a convergent learning style (Kolb, 1984). Therefore it becomes critical for companies to understand executives’ learning styles and design appropriate developmental opportunities to help them deal with cultural challenges.

Culture is perceived as too abstract, vague and complex in classroom training (Blasco, 2009). The most effective way to train cultural intelligence is through concrete international

experience, especially international experience of adequate length. Therefore it is important that longer term overseas experiences are provided for global potentials. During these assignments, cross-cultural coaching is an important development process to prevent derailment and unleash the potential of executives (Rosinski, 2003). The experiential learning cycle (feeling, reflecting, thinking, and acting) offers a framework and process that coaches can undertake to facilitate the learning from these experiences not by just doing it, but by being able to reflect and gain conceptual insight while doing it (Mintzberg & Gosling, 2002). To facilitate experiential learning, it is also important for corporations to create a supportive learning environment (Chen, Kirkman, Kim, Farh, & Tangirala, 2010) since feelings and emotions have primacy in determining whether and what people learn (Kolb & Kolb, 2005b). Positive feelings of interest and intuitive connection facilitate learning and negative emotions such as fear and anxiety block learning. Therefore a supportive learning organizational culture is desirable in order to facilitate the development of CQ among leaders and staff in a corporation and develops global operation capability.

Limitations and Future Research

As the first empirical research testing the relationship between experiential learning theory and cultural intelligence, these results shed light on the potential paths of inquiry for future researchers. The contributions of the current study also must be assessed in light of its limitations.

Based on the self-perception theories, people can often be active observers of their own behavior and can more accurately measure their own behaviors than others (Bem, 1967; Shrauger & Osberg, 1981), we adopted self-report surveys for the study. However, bias may

exist due to social desirability, halo effects, and acquiescence (Bagozzi, Yi, & Phillips, 1991); therefore future research should have independent evaluations, for example, evaluations from subjects' supervisors or colleagues. Such performance-based measure on CQ, especially on behavioral CQ is likely to reflect more accurately of individual's CQ and be more useful in the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation (Ward, Fischer, Lam, & Hall, 2009) and other performance outcomes. As with Lee and Templer (2003), we recommend that future research adopt multiple approaches such as interviews, observation, computer simulations, critical incidents, cultural assimilators, and assessment centers to assess the different facets of CQ. This study highlights some important issues for the future conceptualization and measurement of CQ, focusing on the ability to employ feeling, intuitive understanding in the present reality, sensitive to other people's emotions and values, and view concrete cultural situations from many perspectives. Some other elements of intercultural competencies such as a spirit of adventure, non-ethnocentric attitudes, and some communication competencies, such as displaying respect and clarity, are worthy of consideration as well.

We measured international experience by the time spent in overseas work experiences. International experience, by its very nature, is a multidimensional concept that includes both work experience and non-work experience (Takeuchi, Tesluk, Yun, & Lepak, 2005). Non-work experience, such as previous bicultural life experience (Bell & Harrison, 1996), is another important source of learning in developing CQ. Moreover, not all experiences are equal; both the quantity and quality of experience are important considerations. Challenging experiences force people to learn new things; bland experiences do not (McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002). It is likely that international experience in cultures that are dissimilar

from one's own can be more challenging and offer greater opportunity to learn. However, learning in these settings can involve a lengthy time period and require certain personal attributes such as a divergent learning style, self-compassion to learn from experience (Shepherd & Cardon, 2009), a coping orientation (Shepherd, Patzelt, & Wolfe, 2011), among others. Therefore, cultural similarity is possibly a double-edged sword in CQ development, similar to the paradoxical research findings about cultural distance (Shenkar, 2001) and cultural difference (Van De Vijver & Leung, 2000). It is intuitively appealing to hypothesize that there is an inverted U-shaped relationship between cultural similarity and CQ development in that global executives can learn the most when there is a moderate level of cultural similarity. In this study, we did not test this hypothesis because our focus was on length of overseas work experience. Similar to other studies that found the length of one's time on the job to be the most important factor for job learning (e.g., Morrison & Brantner, 1992), we considered the length of overseas work experience the most important factor to develop CQ. Also, the length of overseas work experience in our study was not limited to a single overseas assignment; in many cases, multiple overseas assignments were included. Nonetheless, we strongly encourage that future research to look into the impact of cultural similarity (novelty, distance or difference) on CQ.

In addition, this study does not answer the question of how other environmental factors influence the development of CQ, factors such as the social support provided by the organization and the host country (Chen et al., 2010; Lee, 2007); the cultural context (Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005) and the racial or ethnic composition of one's neighborhood, workplace or school environment (Bell & Harrison, 1996). These contextual factors need to

be examined in future studies to provide additional insights into the relevance of international experience to CQ.

In this study, other than the moderation effect of experiential learning styles, we did not study the relationship between experiential learning modes and CQ. Another important avenue of research is to conduct a longitudinal study to examine the relationship between experiential learning modes and CQ. In addition, learning style and learning flexibility can combine to produce unique patterns of adaptation to different learning contexts (Sharma & Kolb, 2010). Learning flexibility is likely to have an important impact on the development of CQ. Therefore, another avenue of study would be to test the influence of learning flexibility on the development of CQ through the administration of the Learning Flexibility Index (LFI) (Sharma & Kolb, 2010) and CQ questionnaire.

CONCLUSIONS

This study contributes to the management learning literature by employing experiential learning theory to explain the learning process in the development of CQ from international experience. It delineates the extent to which the length of overseas experience contributing to the development of CQ varies depending on the executives' learning styles. As the first empirical study testing the relationship between experiential learning theory and CQ, the hypothesis that experiential learning style moderates the positive relationship between length of overseas work experience and CQ was confirmed. Specifically, this positive relationship is strengthened when global executives have a divergent learning style, not when they have an

assimilative, convergent or accommodative learning style. As a result, this study offers valuable insight into the selection and development of global leaders.

REFERENCES

- Adler, N. J. 2002. *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior* (4th ed.). Mason, USA: Thomson, South-Western.
- Adler, N. J. 2006. The Arts & Leadership: Now That We Can Do Anything, What Will We Do? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(4): 486-499.
- Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. 1991. *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Allen, D., & Young, M. 1997. From tour guide to teacher: Deepening cross-cultural competence through international experience-based education. *Journal of Management Education*, 21(2): 168-189.
- Ang, S., & Inkpen, A. 2008. Cultural Intelligence and Offshore Outsourcing Success: A Framework of Firm-Level Intercultural Capability. *Decision Sciences*, 39(3): 337.
- Ang, S., Van-Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. 2007. Cultural Intelligence: Its Measurement and Effects on Cultural Judgment and Decision Making, Cultural Adaptation and Task Performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3): 335-371.
- Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. 2008. Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness, and nomological network. In S. In Ang, & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook on cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement and applications* 3-15. New York: M.E: Sharpe.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. 2006. Personality Correlates of the Four-Factor Model of Cultural Intelligence. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(1): 100-123.
- Armstrong, S. J., & Mahmud, A. 2008. Experiential Learning and the Acquisition of Managerial Tacit Knowledge. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7(2): 189-208.
- Aycan, Z. 1997. Expatriate adjustment as a multifaceted phenomenon: individual and organizational predictors. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8(4): 434-456.
- Bagozzi, R. P., Yi, Y., & Phillips, L. W. 1991. Assessing Construct Validity in Organizational Research. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(3): 421-458.
- Bandura, A. 1997. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bedeian, A. G., & Mossholder, K. W. 1994. Simple Question, Not So Simple Answer: Interpreting Interaction Terms in Moderated Multiple Regression. *Journal of Management*, 20(1): 159-165.
- Bell, M. P., & Harrison, D. A. 1996. Using Intra-national Diversity for International Assignments: A Model of Bicultural Competence and Expatriate Adjustment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 6(1): 47-74.
- Bem, D. J. 1967. Self-perception: An alternative interpretation of cognitive dissonance phenomena. *Psychological Review*, 74: 183-200.
- Bennett, M. J. 2004. Becoming Interculturally Competent. In J. Wurzel (Ed.), *Toward Multiculturalism: A Reader in Multicultural Education*, 2 ed.: 62-77. Newton, MA: Intercultural Resource Corporation.

- Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P., Harrison, D. A., Shaffer, M. A., & Luk, D. M. 2005. Input-based and Time-based Models of International Adjustment: Meta-Analytical Evidence and Theoretical Extensions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(2): 257-281.
- Black, J. S., & Gregersen, H. B. 1991. Antecedents to cross-cultural adjustment for expatriates in Pacific Rim assignments. *Human Relations*, 44: 497-515.
- Blasco, M. 2009. Cultural Pragmatists? Student Perspectives on Learning Culture at a Business School. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(2): 174-187.
- Bunker, K. A., & Webb, A. D. 1992. *Learning how to learn from experience*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Caligiuri, P., & Santo, V. D. 2001. Global competence: What is it, and can it be developed through global assignments? *Human Resource Planning*, 24(3): 27-35.
- Chen, G., Kirkman, B. L., Kim, K., Farh, C. I. C., & Tangirala, S. 2010. When Does Cross-Cultural Motivation Enhance Expatriate Effectiveness? A Multilevel Investigation of the Moderating Roles of Subsidiary Support and Cultural Distance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(5): 1110-1130.
- Conner, J. 2000. Developing the global leaders of tomorrow. *Human Resource Management*, 39(2/3): 147-157.
- Crowne, K. A. 2008. What leads to cultural intelligence? *Business Horizons*, 51(5): 391-399.
- Deal, J. J., Leslie, J., Dalton, M., & Ernst, C. 2003. Cultural Adaptability and Leading Across Cultures. In W. H. Mobley, & P. W. Dorfman (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership*, Vol. 3: 149-166. Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Dewey, J. 1938. *Education and Experience*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Earley, C. P., & Ang, S. 2003. *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Earley, C. P., Ang, S., & Tan, J. S. 2006. *CQ: Developing Cultural Intelligence at Work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Earley, C. P., & Peterson, R. S. 2004. The Elusive Cultural Chameleon: Cultural Intelligence as a New Approach to Intercultural Training for the Global Manager. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(1): 100-115.
- Fernandez, J. E. 2003. The making of a global executive. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 24(5): 36-38.
- Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. 1992. Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review*, 17.
- Grotenhuis, F. D. J., & Weggeman, M. P. 2002. Knowledge management in international mergers. *Knowledge & Process Management*, 9: 83-89.
- Hill, C. W. 2001. *International Business: Competing in the Global Marketplace*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Hoover, J. D., Giambatista, R. C., Sorenson, R. L., & Bommer, W. H. 2010. Assessing the Effectiveness of Whole Person Learning Pedagogy in Skill Acquisition. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9(2): 192-203.
- Javidan, M., Teagarden, M., & Bowen, D. 2010. Making It Overseas. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(4): 109-113.

- Johnson, J. P., Lenartowicz, T., & Apud, S. 2006. Cross-cultural competence in international business: toward a definition and a model. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(4): 525.
- Jokinen, T. 2005. Global leadership competencies: a review and discussion. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 29(2/3): 199-217.
- Kayes, D. C. 2002. Experiential Learning and Its Critics: Preserving the Role of Experience in Management Learning and Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1(2): 137-149.
- Kohonen, E. 2005. Developing global leaders through international assignments: An identity construction perspective. *Personnel Review*, 34(1): 22-36.
- Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. 2005a. *The Kolb Learning Style Inventory - Version 3.1 2005 Technical Specifications*. Boston: Hay Resources Direct.
- Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. 2005b. Learning Styles and Learning Spaces: Enhancing Experiential Learning in Higher Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(2): 193-212.
- Kolb, D. A. 1984. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the resource of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lee, C. H., & Templer, K. J. 2003. Cultural Intelligence Assessment and Measurement. In C. P. Earley, & S. Ang (Eds.), *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lee, H.-W. 2007. Factors that Influence Expatriate Failure: An Interview Study. *International Journal of Management*, 24(3): 403-413.
- Lewin, K. 1951. *Field Theory in Social Science*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McCall, J. M. W., & Hollenbeck, G. P. 2002. *Developing Global Executives - The Lessons of International Experience*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Meyer, E., & Shen, E. Y. 2010. China Myths, China Facts. *Harvard Business Review*, 88(1/2): 24-24.
- Mintzberg, H., & Gosling, J. 2002. Educating Managers beyond Borders. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 1(1): 64-76.
- Morley, M., Burke, C., O'Regan, T., & Inwood., S. 1997. The Irish in Moscow--a question of adjustment *Human Resource Management Journal*, 7(3): 53-66.
- Morrison, R., & Brantner, T. 1992. What enhances or inhibits learning a new job? A basic career issue. *Journal of Applied Psychology*(77): 926-940.
- 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.
- Ng, R. 2011. *Investigating the Effect of International Non-work Experience on Cultural Intelligence*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Annual Meeting, San Antonio, US.
- Olsen, J. E., & Martins, L. L. 2009. The effects of expatriate demographic characteristics on adjustment: A social identity approach. *Human Resource Management*, 48(2): 311-328.
- Osland, J. S., & Bird, A. 2000. Beyond sophisticated stereotyping: Cultural sensemaking in context. *The Academy of management Executive*, 14: 65-87.

- Phillion, J. 2002. Narrative Multiculturalism. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 34(3): 265-279.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. 2003. Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5): 879-903.
- Rose, R. C., Sri Ramalu, S., Uli, J., & Kumar, N. 2010. Expatriate Performance in International Assignments: The Role of Cultural Intelligence as Dynamic Intercultural Competency. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 5(8): 76-85.
- Rosinski, P. 2003. *Coaching Across Cultures: New Tools for Leveraging National, Corporate, and Professional Differences*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Selmer, J. 2002. Practice makes perfect? International experience and expatriate adjustment. *Management International Review*, 42(1): 71-87.
- Sharma, G., & Kolb, D. A. 2010. The learning flexibility index: Assessing contextual flexibility in learning style. In S. Rayner, & E. Cools (Eds.), *Style Differences in Cognition, Learning, and Management*. London: Routledge.
- Shenkar, O. 2001. Cultural Distance Revisited: Towards a More Rigorous Conceptualization and Measure of Cultural Differences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(3): 519-535.
- Shepherd, D. A., & Cardon, M. S. 2009. Negative Emotional Reactions to Project Failure and the Self-Compassion to Learn from the Experience. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(6): 923-949.
- Shepherd, D. A., Patzelt, H., & Wolfe, M. 2011. Moving forward from project failure: negative emotions, affective commitment, and learning from the experience. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6): 1229-1259.
- Shrauger, J. S., & Osberg, T. M. 1981. The relative accuracy of self-predictions and judgments by others in psychological assessment. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90(2): 322-351.
- Song, M. 2004. Introduction: Who's at the bottom? Examining claims about racial hierarchy. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27(6): 859-877.
- Spreitzer, G. M., McCall, M. W., & Mahoney, J. D. 1997. Early Identification of International Executive Potential. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(1): 6-29.
- Takeuchi, R. 2010. A Critical Review of Expatriate Adjustment Research Through a Multiple Stakeholder View: Progress, Emerging Trends, and Prospects. *Journal of Management*, 36(4): 1040-1064.
- Takeuchi, R., Tesluk, P. E., Yun, S., & Lepak, D. P. 2005. An Integrative View of International Experience. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(1): 85-100.
- Taylor, E. W. 1994. A Learning Model for Becoming Interculturally Competent. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 18(3): 389-408.
- Tharenou, P., & Caulfield, N. 2010. Will I stay or will I go? Explaining repatriation by self-initiated expatriates. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(5): 1009-1028.
- Thomas, D. C., & Inkson, K. 2005. People Skills for a Global Workplace. *Consulting to Management*, 16(1): 5-9.

- Thomas, D. C., & Ravlin, E. C. 1995. Responses of employees to cultural adaptation by a foreign manager. *Journal of Applied Psychology*(80): 133-146.
- Thomas, D. C., Stahl, G., Ravlin, E. C., Poelmans, S., Pekerti, A., Maznevski, M., Lazarova, M. B., Elron, E., Ekelund, B. Z., Cerdin, J. L., Brislin, R., Aycan, Z., & Au, K. 2008. Cultural intelligence: Domain and assessment. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 8(2): 123-143.
- Toussaint, L., & Webb, J. R. 2005. Gender Differences in the Relationship Between Empathy and Forgiveness. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(6): 673-685.
- Triandis, H. C. 1994. *Culture and Social Behaviour*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Triandis, H. C. 2006. Cultural Intelligence in Organizations. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(1): 20-26.
- Van De Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. 2000. Methodological Issues in Psychological Research on Culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(1): 33-51.
- Ward, C., Fischer, R., Lam, F. S. Z., & Hall, L. 2009. The Convergent, Discriminant, and Incremental Validity of Scores on a Self-Report Measure of Cultural Intelligence. *Educational & Psychological Measurement*, 69(1): 85-105.
- Waxin, M. F. 2004. Expatriates' interaction adjustment: the direct and moderate effects of culture of origin. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28: 61-79.
- Yamazaki, Y., & Kayes, D. C. 2004. An Experiential Approach to Cross-Cultural Learning: A Review and Integration of Competencies for Successful Expatriate Adaptation. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 3(4): 362-379.

Appendix

Figure 1. The role of experiential learning on the development of cultural intelligence





Figure 2. Experiential Learning Cycle



Source: <http://learningfromexperience.com>

Figure 3. Interaction Effect




Table 1 Job Background of Survey Participants

Job Function				Job Level			
	N	%	Cumul %		N	%	Cumul %
	5	1.7	2		4	1.4	1
Accounting/Finance	39	13.3	15	Administrative & Clerical	32	10.9	12
Administration/Operation	33	11.2	26	Department/Unit Manager	57	19.4	32
Customer Service	6	2.0	28	Director	19	6.5	38
Data Processing/Systems	6	2.0	30	Divisional/Functional Head	14	4.8	43
Distribution/Fulfillment	7	2.4	33	General Manager/Senior Executive	19	6.5	49
Human Resource/Personnel	15	5.1	38	Managing director/Chief Executive	11	3.7	53
Manufacturing	14	4.8	43	Not Applicable	35	11.9	65
Marketing/Sales	84	28.6	71	Professional & Technical	55	18.7	84
Not Applicable	42	14.3	85	Supervisor/Foreman	48	16.3	100
Research/Development	7	2.4	88	Total	294	100	
Technical/Engineering/Research	36	12.2	100				
Total	294	100					

Table 2 Mean, Standard Deviations, Reliability and Correlations for All Variables Used in This Study (n=294)

	Mean	SD	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1 Gender				1																		
2 Age	31.46	6.88		-.153**	1																	
3 Education	3.48	0.67		-.171**	.180**	1																
4 Ethnicity				-.023	-.102	.016	1															
5 Parents				-.039	.013	.060	.207**	1														
6 International Experience (months)	19.68	47.63		-.099	.352**	.107	-.085	.037	1													
7 CE	26.53	6.35	0.727	.129*	.044	-.071	.069	-.020	-.057	1												
8 RO	27.75	6.63	0.768	.050	-.108	-.076	-.009	.002	-.126*	-.267**	1											
9 AC	32.72	6.96	0.798	-.300**	.143*	.144*	.018	.012	.057	-.580**	-.235**	1										
10 AE	33.20	6.15	0.720	.155**	-.100	-.014	-.082	-.001	.120*	-.092	-.511**	-.299**	1									
11 Divergent	0.25	0.43		.062	-.096	-.067	-.017	-.062	-.138*	.368**	.449**	-.501**	-.279**	1								
12 Assimilative	0.29	0.45		-.120*	.040	-.022	.131*	.117*	.013	-.462**	.392**	.468**	-.480**	-.367**	1							
13 Convergent	0.24	0.42		-.121*	.019	.158**	-.072	-.048	.014	-.302**	-.421**	.394**	.305**	-.330**	-.341**	1						
14 Accommodative	0.23	0.42		.186**	.038	-.066	-.048	-.011	.117*	.411**	-.462**	-.372**	.495**	-.324**	-.335**	-.301**	1					
15 Metacognitive CQ	20.70	3.84	0.766	-.208**	.063	.185**	-.045	.040	.127*	-.042	-.090	.012	.122*	-.123*	-.035	.090	0	1				
16 Cognitive CQ	25.60	6.41	0.849	-.065	.112	.287**	-.011	.100	.201**	.068	-.069	.008	-.008	-.044	-.031	.012	.067	.566**	1			
17 Motivational CQ	26.48	4.72	0.792	-.192**	.131*	.186**	-.043	.087	.274**	.029	-.119*	-.008	.110	-.061	-.053	.020	.099	.654**	.541**	1		
18 Behavioral CQ	25.31	4.48	0.757	-.188**	.016	.087	.030	.034	.090	.070	-.006	-.026	-.036	.009	-.014	-.004	.010	.701**	.456**	.610**	1	
19 CQ	98.09	16.04		-.184**	.103	.238**	-.019	.084	.217**	.045	-.086	-.003	.048	-.062	-.040	.031	.076	.850**	.820**	.836**	.806**	1
Valid N (listwise)	294																					

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 3 Moderated Multiple Regression Analysis of Divergent Learning Style on CQ (n=294)

Variable	CQ					
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Gender	-0.151	**	-0.143	**	-0.136	*
Age	0.043		-0.022		-0.028	
Education	0.197	***	0.190	***	0.183	***
Ethnicity	-0.039		-0.029		-0.023	
Parents			0.084		0.080	
International Experience			0.193	***	0.149	**
Divergent			-0.010		0.075	
International Experience × Divergent					0.207	***
<i>F</i>	5.549	***	5.598	***	6.384	***
ΔF			5.301	**	10.559	***
R^2	0.089		0.122		0.153	
ΔR^2			0.033		0.032	

CQ = Cultural Intelligence

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001

Table 4 Moderated Multiple Regression Analysis of Assimilative Learning Style on CQ (n=294)

Variable	CQ					
	Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
Gender	-0.151	**	-0.149	**	-0.148	**
Age	0.043		-0.019		-0.017	
Education	0.197	***	0.188	***	0.189	***
Ethnicity	-0.039		-0.023		-0.021	
Parents	0.085		0.088		0.087	
International Experience			0.193	***	0.241	***
Assimilative			-0.052		-0.056	
International Experience × Assimilative					-0.086	
<i>F</i>	5.549	***	5.729	***	5.224	***
ΔF			5.718	**	1.604	
R^2	0.089		0.124		0.129	
ΔR^2			0.035		0.005	

CQ = Cultural Intelligence

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001

Table 5 Moderated Multiple Regression Analysis of Convergent Learning Style on CQ (n=294)

Variable	CQ					
	Model 7		Model 8		Model 9	
Gender	-0.151	**	-0.146	*	-0.143	*
Age	0.043		-0.022		-0.019	
Education	0.197	***	0.194	***	0.192	***
Ethnicity	-0.039		-0.031		-0.028	
Parents	0.085		0.083		0.083	
International Experience			0.194	***	0.173	**
Convergent			-0.025		-0.023	
International Experience × Convergent					0.051	
<i>F</i>	5.549	***	5.625	***	5.003	***
ΔF			5.389	**	0.689	
R^2	0.089		0.122		0.124	
ΔR^2			0.033		0.002	

CQ = Cultural Intelligence

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001

Table 6 Moderated Multiple Regression Analysis of Accommodative Learning Style on CQ (n=294)

Variable	CQ					
	Model 10		Model 11		Model 12	
Gender	-0.151	**	-0.161	**	-0.158	**
Age	0.043		-0.024		-0.025	
Education	0.197	***	0.195	***	0.191	***
Ethnicity	-0.039		-0.026		-0.024	
Parents	0.085		0.083		0.082	
International Experience			0.182	**	0.239	**
Accommodative			0.093		0.094	
International Experience × Accommodative					-0.085	
<i>F</i>	5.549	***	6.025	***	5.444	***
ΔF			6.665	***	1.323	
R^2	0.089		0.130		0.134	
ΔR^2			0.041		0.004	

CQ = Cultural Intelligence

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001

Table 7 Moderated Multiple Regression Analysis (N=294)

Variable	Metacognitive CQ			Cognitive CQ			Motivational CQ			Behavioral CQ		
	Model 13	Model 14	Model 15	Model 16	Model 17	Model 18	Model 19	Model 20	Model 21	Model 22	Model 23	Model 24
Gender	-0.185 **	-0.178 **	-0.171 **	-0.015	-0.008	-0.004	-0.162 **	-0.152 **	-0.147 **	-0.193 ***	-0.191 ***	-0.184 **
Age	0.001	-0.034	-0.041	0.061	0.002	-0.001	0.077	-0.006	-0.011	-0.016	-0.049	-0.055
Education	0.148 **	0.142 **	0.135 **	0.267 ***	0.261 ***	0.257 ***	0.137 **	0.128 **	0.123 **	0.053	0.051	0.044
Ethnicity	-0.058	-0.054	-0.048	-0.030	-0.020	-0.017	-0.059	-0.046	-0.042	0.013	0.019	0.025
Parents	0.029	0.024	0.019	0.098	0.098	0.095	0.090	0.089	0.085	0.045	0.046	0.042
International Experience		0.082	0.036		0.177 **	0.150 **		0.247 ***	0.213 ***		0.106	0.064
Divergent		-0.091	-0.001		0.005	0.057		-0.003	0.063		0.037	0.120
International Experience × Divergent			0.220 ***			0.127 *			0.162 **			0.201 **
F	4.256 ***	3.758 ***	4.859 ***	5.995 ***	5.632 ***	5.469 ***	4.823 ***	6.107 ***	6.253 ***	2.752 **	2.421 **	3.341 ***
ΔF		2.407	11.582 ***		4.368 **	3.924 **		8.668 ***	6.456 **		1.568	9.285 **
R ²	0.069	0.085	0.121	0.095	0.122	0.134	0.078	0.131	0.151	0.046	0.057	0.087
ΔR ²		0.016	0.036		0.027	0.012		0.053	0.019		0.010	0.030

CQ = Cultural Intelligence

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001