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Abstract
Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to establish under which conditions researchers should use the constructs cultural intelligence (CQ) and global mindset (GM). The authors further seek to understand the process through which these constructs emerge to a higher level and link unit-level knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) capital to pertinent firm-level outcomes.
Design/methodology/approach – This paper is a conceptual study with a multilevel model.
Findings – This paper differentiates two similar lines of research occurring concordantly on the CQ and GM constructs. Next, the authors develop a multilevel model to better understand the process through which CQ and GM emerge at higher levels and their underlying mechanisms. Finally, this paper adds meaning to the firm-level KSAs by linking firm-level KSAs capital to pertinent firm-level outcomes.
Research limitations/implications – The conclusion implies that researchers should use CQ when the context is focused on interpersonal outcomes and GM when focused on strategic outcomes. The multilevel model is a useful tool for scholars to select which rubric to use in future studies that have international managers as the subjects. The authors argue that if the scholar is interested in an individual’s ability to craft policy and implement strategy, then GM may be more parsimonious than CQ. On the other hand, if the focus is on leadership, human resources or any other relationship dependent outcome, then CQ will provide a more robust measure.
Practical implications – For practitioners, this study provides a useful tool for managers to improve individual-level commitment by selecting and training individuals high in CQ. On the other hand, if the desired outcome is firm-level sales or performance, the focus should be on targeting individuals high in GM.
Originality/value – This is the first theoretical paper to examine how CQ and GM emerge to the firm level and describe when to use each measure.
Keywords Organizational commitment, Cultural intelligence, Multilevel, Firm performance, Global mindset
Paper type Research paper
Introduction
In a world where countries’ perceived boundaries are reduced by globalization, multinational organizations have to rely more on global managers to overcome the hurdles of expansion. Yet, the skills that constitute a talented manager in the domestic market may not be the same as in international markets (Javidan et al., 2005). For example, managerial knowledge, skills and abilities (KSAs) that make a manager successful at home may not be sufficient to adequately mitigate the increased risk involved in an international business context (Nadkarni et al., 2011). Potential differences in KSAs among successful domestic and international managers have provoked the academic community to engage in a search for a personality type or mindset that might be correlated with superior international performance. Cultural intelligence (CQ; Ang et al., 2007) and the global mindset (GM; Javidan and Teagarden, 2011) are two streams of research attempting to answer this call.

CQ is defined as a person’s capability to adapt effectively to new cultural contexts (Earley and Ang, 2003). GM is defined as a way of approaching the world and a tendency to scan from a broader perspective (Srinivas, 1995). Both the concepts are measured with multiple-item Likert-type scales, resulting in a degree to which an individual is low to high on each. Although individuals with CQ or GM seem to possess similar abilities (e.g. the ability to scan and adapt), there are distinctive nuances between the two concepts that researchers suggest need to be explored (Earley et al., 2007). Furthermore, we aim to build on the Earley et al.’s (2007, p. 97) work by focusing on “understanding of the mechanisms through which a global mindset [and cultural intelligence] is developed intrapersonally”. The purpose of this paper is to address this issue by explicitly looking at similarities and differences between these two constructs and how they are developed. Next, we advocate the use of CQ for organizational behavior (OB) and human resources (HR) outcomes and GM for strategic outcomes because they are focused on micro- and macro-level processes, respectively.

Within the management context, micro-level scholars who focused on industrial/organization psychology, OB and HR have concentrated on how individual-level KSAs affect individual-level outcomes (e.g. job satisfaction or commitment to the firm). On the other hand, macro-level scholars concerned with strategy and organizational theory have studied how aggregated firm-level attributes of employees generate unit-level returns (e.g. sales or profits). Yet, despite a recent surge in both micro- and macro-level scholarship surrounding the human capital construct, “there is little understanding about how human capital manifests across organizational levels” (Ployhart and Moliterno, 2011, p. 127). Ployhart and Moliterno (2011) developed a new approach of how individual-level KSAs can emerge at higher levels by integrating the insights from micro-, intermediate- and macro-level organizational research with the concept of emergence from the multilevel theory. We aim to extend their work by looking at a specific set of KSAs (i.e. CQ and GM) and put forth a multilevel model of the emergence of CQ and GM. Additionally, we advocate that a unit-level CQ or GM capital has positive effects on unit-level commitment to the firm and performance, respectively.

Some scholars have attempted to study CQ at various levels. For instance, Imai and Gelfand (2010), as well as Rockstuhl and Ng (2008), utilized dyadic CQ, whereas Flaherty (2008) studied team-level CQ. More recently, Chen et al. (2012) showed that firm-level motivational CQ enhances the relationship between individual-level motivational CQ and individual cultural sales. Theoretical frameworks of firm-level CQ also suggest that
firm-level CQ leads to an increase in international and organizational performance (Moon, 2010). Scholars have stressed that there are still opportunities to further explore CQ at the firm level (Ng et al., 2012). Yet, despite the aforementioned attempts, relatively little has been done to incorporate both CQ and GM in a multilevel model.

Finally, we suggest that unit-level CQ and GM will have positive effects on unit-level commitment and performance, respectively. Addressing this issue is particularly important because if evidence confirms our propositions, companies may achieve results beyond those found at the individual level by developing one or both types of KSAs (CQ and/or GM) depending on the desired outcomes (e.g. OB/HR or strategic outcomes). For example, if a firm is having job commitment problems at the unit level, then it might implement a training program aimed at increasing unit-level CQ.

Determining under which conditions researchers should use CQ or GM and how they emerge to a higher-level construct has a wide range of consequences. First, it helps differentiate two similar lines of research occurring concurrently on CQ and GM. This differentiation will help scholars select which rubric to use in future studies of global managers. Second, understanding the process through which CQ and GM emerge at higher levels will help meso-level scholars understand the mechanisms that underlie this emergence. Finally, linking unit-level CQ and GM capital to pertinent unit-level outcomes (i.e. commitment and performance) will significantly add meaning to the unit-level KSAs (CQ or GM) and further justify the potential need for training on the concepts. The next section will go into more detail on CQ and GM. Then, we will discuss how these two constructs can emerge to the unit level. Next, we propose that unit-level CQ is related to unit-level commitment, and unit-level GM is related to unit-level performance. Finally we conclude with limitations, future research possibilities and relevance to practitioners.

Theory and propositions

Cultural intelligence

Although the globalization of firms offers exciting opportunities for the intercultural contact, it also comes with challenges due to misunderstandings, tensions and conflicts. CQ research is an across-culture paradigm that focuses on how to bridge cultural differences (Ang et al., 2015). CQ is the effective capability of a person to adapt to new cultural milieus (Earley and Ang, 2003). Individuals high in CQ can better detect, assimilate, reason and act appropriately in situations characterized by cultural diversity (Van Dyne et al., 2012). Ng et al. (2012) reviewed the CQ literature and found that CQ predicts a variety of important outcomes such as cross-cultural judgment and decision-making, cultural adjustment, idea sharing and job performance.

The context of different cultures is more specific to CQ than for other types of intelligence (e.g. emotional intelligence; Rockstuhl and Ng, 2008; Rockstuhl et al., 2010; Chua et al., 2012). Those researchers established a boundary condition of CQ in that it is particularly relevant in a culturally diverse context, not in a culturally homogeneous one. Based on Sternberg and Detterman’s (1986) multilocus framework, which integrates different perspectives of intelligence, CQ is often studied as a multi-dimensional construct that comprises four facets: metacognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008; Earley and Ang, 2003).

Before discussing each of the components of CQ and how they map onto the KSAs framework, it is useful to understand the difference between knowledge, skills and
abilities, especially, as the difference can be subtle (Lauby, 2013). Knowledge is the understanding of a subject. For example, an individual may know how to structure a meeting in Mexico. It does not mean that the individual can run the meeting. It means that he/she knows how to structure it. Skills are proficiencies learned through experience and training. So, we develop our skills through the transfer of knowledge. Finally, abilities are the qualities of being able to do something. Abilities are often considered innate. For example, prioritization and organization are abilities that can help an employee develop his/her meeting skills (Lauby, 2013).

The metacognitive facet is defined as the individual’s mental capability to acquire and understand cultural knowledge (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008). Metacognition refers to thinking about thinking, or knowledge about cognitive objects, which consists of metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive experience (Flavell, 1987). In terms of CQ, metacognition is a critical aspect of CQ, as much of what is required in a new culture is putting together patterns into a coherent picture (Earley, 2002). In a complex intercultural context, a high-CQ person inductively creates a proper mapping of the social situation to function effectively (Earley, 2002). Regarding KSAs, metacognitive CQ is closely tied to the ability part of KSAs, because it is more innate than a skill (Table I). Ramsey and Lorenz (2016) found that metacognitive CQ was the only component of CQ that did not improve after a semester of CQ training, suggesting that it is innate and cannot be learned.

Second, the cognitive facet is defined as an individual’s knowledge about cultures and cultural differences (Ang and Van Dyne, 2008; Earley and Ang, 2003). However, increased self-knowledge would not necessarily lead to increased behavioral effectiveness unless the individual is willing to work with and learn from others (Adler and Bartholomew, 1992). Moreover, an individual should possess strong reasoning skills to recognize, integrate and interpret contextual environmental and social signals. In summary, cognition reflects an individual’s skill in acquiring new cultural knowledge (Chen et al., 2012). In terms of human capital, the cognitive portion of CQ may fall under the knowledge and skill parts of KSAs. The aforementioned study by Ramsey and Lorenz (2016) found that the cognitive component of CQ changed the most in their study of students, suggesting that it might be the easiest to learn.

Third, the motivational facet is defined as the intensity and direction of cognitions and has two underlying constructs: self-efficacy and conscientiousness (Earley, 2002). Self-efficacy is the person’s belief in one’s ability to succeed. Self-efficacy is a critical criterion for individuals who face novel situations and conditions. Without it, adaptation to complex intercultural environments is difficult to achieve. A person high in self-efficacy initiates interactions even in uncertain and ambiguous cultural scenarios (Lovvorn and Chen, 2011). As for conscientiousness in the context of CQ, it is the desire to continually achieve goals regardless of uncertainty, setbacks, challenges, misunderstandings and failures that result when interacting with novel cultural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KSAs</th>
<th>Metacognitive</th>
<th>Cultural intelligence</th>
<th>Motivational</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
<th>Global mindset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I. Comparison of KSAs for CQ and GM
environments (Earley, 2002). According to the bioecological theory, motivational CQ provides not only agentic control of affect, cognition and behavior to guide goal accomplishment in intercultural environments but also the drive to actualize one’s CQ potential (Van Dyne et al., 2012). Thus, even if a person has the knowledge (cognitive component) and ability (behavioral component) to learn what should be done in a foreign context, if that person is not motivated to act, then the individual will not perform well (Earley and Ang, 2003; Ng et al., 2009). This aspect of CQ is primarily tied to the skills and ability parts of KSAs.

Finally, the fourth component of CQ is the behavioral facet. The behavioral facet is the person’s ability to relevantly and appropriately act, verbally and non-verbally, to contextual situations (Earley, 2002). To succeed in different cultural settings, a person must be able to rapidly adapt one’s actions to different situations by acquiring or mimicking the appropriate behaviors until one gets incorporated into those cultures and acts without hesitation (Lovvorn and Chen, 2011). The focus of this component is having the skills necessary to adapt to the current intercultural situation. In terms of human capital, the behavioral portion of CQ may fall under the skills part of KSAs.

Global mindset
Scholars have developed a number of complimentary definitions of GM. Rhinesmith (1995) states that individuals with a high GM have a broader perspective of the world, which pushes them to find unexpected trends and opportunities. Gupta and Govindarajan (2002) view GM as a combination of awareness and openness to the diversity of cultures and markets with an inclination and capability to integrate across the diversity. Javidan and Teagarden (2011, p. 14) define GM as “an individual’s ability to influence individuals, groups, organizations and systems that are unlike him or her or his or her own”. The authors state that GM is made up of three components:

1. intellectual capital;
2. social capital; and
3. psychological capital.

Intellectual capital consists of a leader’s knowledge and cognitive capabilities (e.g. knowledge and ability) regarding different cultural contexts. It comprises attributes such as global business savvy, cosmopolitan outlook and cognitive complexity. Social capital focuses on internal and external relationships; including a leader’s intercultural empathy, interpersonal impact and diplomacy (e.g. ability and skill). Psychological capital refers to a positive psychological profile and personality traits (e.g. ability), such as a passion for diversity, quest for adventure and self-assuredness (Javidan and Walker, 2013). These components encompass knowledge, skills and abilities.

Although knowledge according to GM is the understanding of the cultural differences, skills are related to the ability to take advantage of that knowledge and operationalize it (Kedia and Mukherji, 1999). On one hand, a high GM would allow a manager to understand the interdependence of the firm with the global economy. On the other hand, an individual with a high GM would have the ability to create and implement a strategy to improve both individual- and unit-level performance (Maznevski and Lane, 2004). In summary, the three components of GM are related to all three KSAs represented by CQ (Table I). Thus, what are the similarities and differences between CQ and GM?
Comparing cultural intelligence and global mindset

CQ and GM are both based on the transformative learning theory, albeit more so for CQ. The process of effectively changing one’s frame of reference is known as transformative learning (Cranton, 1994, 1996; Mezirow, 1991, 1995, 1996). Through experience, values and feelings, individuals define a specific frame of reference through which they view the world. Frames of reference, which are structures of assumptions, dictate individuals’ actions by shaping and delimiting their expectations, feelings, cognition and perceptions. Furthermore, individuals have a strong tendency to reject ideas that do not fit within their frame of reference. Yet, transformative learners constantly reshape their frames of reference, rendering them more inclusive, self-reflective, discriminating and integrative of experience (Mezirow, 1997). The ability to reshape one’s frame of reference in a cross-cultural context is important to individuals with either CQ or GM, which are, thus, grounded in the transformative learning theory.

Additionally, both CQ and GM seem to cover the same KSAs (Table I). One difference is that CQ focuses on the underlying psychological mechanisms that lead to the factors of CQ. GM is more general and addresses directly the knowledge, skills and abilities of the individual in a different culture, and CQ delves into the metacognitive, cognitive, behavioral and motivational underpinnings. Earley et al. (2007) point out two differences between the constructs. First, CQ adds the metacognitive element to the cognitive component. Although they admit that the cognitive aspect of CQ and GM is evident in both constructs, GM scholars do not “describe in detail what higher order metacognitive strategies might be useful for analyzing more proximate thought processes” (Earley et al., 2007, p. 95). Although any deeper understanding of the cognitive component of CQ (or GM for that matter) is valuable, the relative differences on the topic between the two constructs seem minor.

Conversely, a key difference between the two constructs is that GM behavior is focused on the ability to turn the cognitive understanding of cultural differences into some type of effective policy (Gupta and Govindarajan, 2002). GM scholars discuss behavior and adaptation as profitably applying the knowledge of cultural diversity, whereas CQ scholars are more concerned with the process of interacting effectively on an interpersonal basis (Earley et al., 2007). The fact that CQ focuses on the process of the interaction is based on its explicit inclusion of the metacognitive component, which is lacking in GM. “CQ posits the need to think about how information is processed and combined, while GM focuses more on making sure different types of information are represented and processed” (Earley et al., 2007, p. 95). This focus on the metacognitive strategies of interpersonal interactions (or how) is the primary departure between CQ and GM.

So how do scholars select which construct to use? If a scholar is interested in an individual’s ability to craft policy and implement strategy, then GM may be more appropriate than CQ, because GM is more focused on policy than CQ. On the other hand, if the focus is on leadership, HR or any other relationship-dependent outcome, then CQ may provide a more robust measure, as it deals with interpersonal interaction more than GM. There is one caveat that should be mentioned based on an Earley et al.’s (2007) review article. Because CQ is more focused on cultural differences, it “is in some ways narrower than a GM” (Earley et al., 2007, p. 99). For instance, GM takes into account broader issues such as unique economic and political differences of regions. Thus, it is
not as focused on purely cross-cultural issues. This broad vs deep approach further supports our recommendation of using GM for policy and strategy outcomes. Therefore we propose:

*P1. The outcome variable of interest determines whether cultural intelligence or global mindset is more applicable in an international context.

*P2. Cultural intelligence can aid in the understanding of OB/HR outcomes, such as managerial effectiveness and human resources management.

*P3. Global mindset can aid in the understanding of a firm’s strategic outcomes, such as policy implementation and performance.

The emergence of cultural intelligence and global mindset to the unit level
Multilevel research is primarily concerned with emergence, which is the process of explaining how and why phenomena at lower levels join to create a higher-level construct that is distinct from its lower-level origins (Ployhart and Moliterno, 2011). If scholars do not address the process of emergence, a number of misleading interpretations may arise (Kozlowski and Klein, 2000). This section begins by discussing human capital emergence. Human capital emergence will then be used as the basis for both CQ and GM emergence.

Leung et al. (2014) reviewed the cross-cultural competence literature and identified five major intercultural competency models:

1. global competencies;
2. GM;
3. multicultural personality;
4. intercultural development of intercultural sensitivity; and
5. CQ.

The authors suggest that the five intercultural competence models predict performance outcomes at different levels. The global leadership competency, multicultural personality and intercultural development inventory models only predict individual-level performance outcomes, whereas the CQ and GM models predict performance outcomes at both individual and organizational levels. This suggests that CQ and GM are the two intercultural competency models that researchers should focus on when looking at higher-level outcomes (Table II).

The human capital theory can be used to elevate all facets of the four-factor CQ model (metacognitive, cognitive, behavioral and motivational) and the three-factor GM model (intellectual, social and psychological) from the individual level to the business unit or organizational level. Originating from economics, the human capital theory emphasizes on values, costs and transferability of human capital across all the aggregated levels of an organization. This transfer begins with the individual. A central argument of the human capital theory is that both general and unit-specific human capital (KSAs) contribute simultaneously to the individual and unit effectiveness (Becker, 1964).

Ployhart and Moliterno (2011) also discuss whether the KSAs are context-generic or context-specific. For instance, cognitive ability, personality, values and interests are
context-generic because they are relatively stable over time and situations. Skills may be context-generic when they are tied to broad domains (e.g., social skills) or context-specific when they are tied to narrow domains (e.g., skill in navigating a firm’s political nuances). “Knowledge and experience may also be either context generic (e.g., knowledge of accounting principles) or context specific (e.g., knowledge of a client’s specific accounting situation)” (Ployhart and Moliterno, 2011, p. 134). We suggest that the KSAs that make up CQ and GM are more context-generic than context-specific and, hence, malleable. Yet, as Ployhart and Moliterno (2011) point out, these context-generic KSAs become context-specific human capital resources as a function of a unit-specific emergence enabling process.

The mechanism through which CQ and GM emerge in the human capital theory is the interaction of individuals within a unit. Kozlowski and Klein, (2000, p. 55) describe “a
phenomenon as emergent when it originates in the cognition, affect, behaviors, or other characteristics of individuals, is amplified by their interactions, and manifests as a higher-level, collective phenomenon. The process underlying the emergence of CQ and GM should be similar based on their underlying KSAs, and, thus, it will be considered simultaneously.

Individuals, who work together, not only interact on a daily basis but also intentionally or unintentionally learn from each other by exchanging ideas, information, experiences and knowledge. They also learn from each other by simply observing actions. CQ capabilities are, therefore, embedded in the individual’s web of intercultural interactions (Ang et al., 2011). Some organizational scholars suggest that an interactional view should be adopted to capture the interaction effects of individual characteristics and contextual factors on the importance of roles that individuals play in their organizations (Ang and Inkpen, 2008; Cantor et al., 1982; Shoda et al., 2002). In summary, it is the interaction of individuals (in both bottom-up and top-down processes) within a unit that builds unit-level KSAs (or KSA capital).

At the firm level, CQ or GM capital is dependent on the firm’s ability to channel its employees’ actions and energy to effectively learn about and function in cross-cultural environments (Ang and Inkpen, 2008; Chen and Kanfer, 2006). One way to achieve unit-level CQ or GM capital is the bottom-up process in which individuals’ CQ or GM can transfer into unit CQ or GM capital (Chen et al., 2012). This transfer happens via two types of interactions in which employees engage. First, a horizontal or peer-to-peer exchange takes place when employees share ideas, resources and assimilated attitudes regarding their personal cross-cultural experiences. These interactions not only strengthen the employees’ confidence and interests in dealing with cross-cultural issues but also create a collective knowledge that emerges as unit CQ capital. Second, a vertical exchange takes place when employees seek advice from, make suggestions to and ask for resources and support from their supervisors or leaders. Employees’ CQ stimulates their supervisors’ CQ, which in turn stimulates a culture-related learning and training process across the unit (Chen et al., 2012).

Similar to CQ, GM can transfer from individual-level to unit-level GM capital through the bottom-up processes. Within an organization, each individual has a mindset which continuously shapes and is shaped by the mindsets of others in the organization. Organizational mindsets can change with new experiences due to the organizational and social processes through which members meet and interact (Gupta and Govindarajan, 2002). Considering the process of individual CQ and GM emergence to unit-level capital as depicted in Figure 1, we propose:

\[ P4. \] Individual-level cultural intelligence emerges as business-unit cultural intelligence capital.

\[ P5. \] Individual-level global mindset emerges as business-unit global mindset capital.

Cultural intelligence and global mindset capitals’ effects on unit-level outcomes
A primary assumption in strategic human resource management research is that human resource practices lead to aggregate human capital (KSAs) at the business unit or organizational levels (Barney and Wright, 1998). This capital then
contrtributes to an increase in commitment (Story and Barbuto, 2011) and eventually superior performance for the business unit or organization (Ployhart et al., 2009). The resourced base view (RBV) provides a theoretical lens through which how this happens can be understood. After a short review of the RBV, a discussion on how CQ and GM capital affect unit-level outcomes (i.e. commitment and performance, respectively) will ensue.

The resource-based view of the firm (Barney, 1991) supports the claim that human capital leads to superior unit or organizational performance, because human capital is valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable (Wright et al., 2001). In the context of cross-cultural work environments, human capital is valuable because CQ and GM have core capabilities that are attributed to their rareness. This scarcity is not easily obtained because of the fact that there are intrinsic characteristics within individuals that can be aggregated to the unit, resulting in a competitive advantage. Furthermore, unit-level CQ and GM capital are inimitable because of the task and social complexity that is inherent in cross-cultural interactions (Ployhart and Moliterno, 2011). The greater the degree of complexity, the more difficult it will be for other firms to duplicate, resulting in a competitive advantage. Finally, CQ or GM capital can transform into a sustainable competitive advantage by being non-substitutable. This type of capital is less likely to be substituted because of its social complexity (due to the interactions between employees), causal ambiguity (there is not clear combination of practices that leads to it) and firm history (firm’s attractiveness to special talent) (Barney, 1991; Barney and Wright, 1998).

As discussed earlier, individual-level CQ is more appropriate than GM when the outcome of interest is based on relationships. For instance, if the business unit is concerned with commitment, then it may change its hiring strategy to acquire individuals that are high in CQ. These individuals would interact with each other, resulting in an increase in unit-level CQ capital. As suggested by the RBV, this CQ capital would lead to superior levels of commitment (Story and Barbuto, 2011). Although Story and Barbuto’s (2011) theoretical model suggests a positive relationship between GM and relationship-based outcomes (e.g. commitment and trust), their conceptualization of GM is primarily based on the concept and components of CQ. Thus, we propose:

As aforementioned, individual-level GM should be used when considering strategic unit-level outcomes (i.e. unit performance) because of its breadth. Specifically, it focuses on other elements of the environment than interpersonal, such as politics and economics. Thus, a GM capital that emerges at the unit level will provide sustainable rents according to the RBV (Figure 1). For instance, if a group of individuals can combine the diversity of their unit with the political and economic landscape of the region in which they are operating, they will most likely be able to outperform units that have not manifested such a resource (Chen et al., 2010). We assert that the mechanism underlying this phenomenon is a unit-level GM capital. With this in mind, we propose:

\[ P7. \] Business-unit global mindset leads to business-unit performance.

Discussion
The purpose of this article was three-fold. First, we sought to establish under which conditions researchers should use CQ and GM. In so doing, the article helps differentiate two similar lines of research. This differentiation will help scholars select which rubric to use in future studies that have global managers as the subjects. We argue that if the scholar is interested in an individual’s ability to craft policy and implement strategy, then GM may be more parsimonious than CQ. On the other hand, if the focus is on leadership, HR or any other relationship-dependent outcome, then CQ may provide a more robust measure. Second, understanding the process through which these constructs emerge to a higher level will help meso-level scholars with the mechanisms that underlie this emergence. Here, we focused on the underlying mechanism of emergence which is based on the interaction among the individuals within a unit. The elimination of this interaction would likely result in a loss of the gains (unit-level capital) available. Finally, linking unit-level KSAs capital to pertinent unit-level outcomes (i.e. commitment and performance) will significantly add meaning to the unit-level KSAs (CQ or GM) and further justify the need for training on the concepts.

Implications, limitations and future research

**Implications**
Practitioners will find these propositions useful because of their applicability to selection and training of potential international sojourners and expatriates. For instance, if the HR manager is having a problem with turnover of a particular unit’s international cadre of employees, then it might improve unit-level commitment by selecting and training individuals high in CQ. The paper also suggests that it is critical to provide an environment in which these individuals can interact. Without it, CQ capital will not emerge. On the other hand, if the HR manager notices a lack of unit-level performance, a program to select individuals high in GM may be in order. These individuals are focused on the “big picture” and will effectively operationalize policy and strategy, resulting in sustainable rents.

**Limitations and future research**
This paper is not without limitations. First, a deeper understanding of how and why CQ and GM capital emerge should be explored. Second, future research may consider possible interactive or reciprocal effects between CQ and GM. For instance,
Ng et al. (2011) argue that an organization’s global culture capital (e.g. firm-level GM values) may foster individual cosmopolitan human capital (e.g. individual-level CQ) through the process of situated learning. Third, we did not focus on the methodological issues associated with multilevel measurement and testing. Yet, this science has been improving rapidly and can be investigated by reviewing either the book by Kozlowski and Klein (2000) for a deep approach or the recent paper by Ployhart and Moliterno (2011) for a more recent applied dealing. Fourth, because this is a theoretical piece, we did not include empirical evidence to support our propositions. Future research would greatly enhance this work by testing the aforementioned propositions. Fifth, a deeper examination of the scales underlying the CQ and GM constructs was omitted for brevity concerns. Although both the scales were meticulously constructed and verified for validity, empirical analysts should compare and contrast the scales to better understand exactly how they differ from each other. Sixth, future studies should consider the potential different roles of each of the CQ components (Van Dyne et al., 2012) in the proposed model. Seventh, are individuals more prone to acquire skills related to CQ if they are people-oriented and acquire skills related to GM if they think more strategically? Finally, although work has recently begun to explore the emergence of CQ from the individual to the organizational level (Chen et al., 2012; Crotty and Brett, 2012; Groves and Feyerherm, 2011), it is still an open frontier (Ang et al., 2015).
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