Globalization, Cultural Intelligence and Maritime Education

Graham Benton，Timothy Lynch

Dr., The California Maritime Academy
A Campus of the California State University
200 Maritime Academy Drive
Vallejo, California, USA, 94590-8181
Email: gbenton@csum.edu
Tel: 707-654-1147
Fax: 707-654-1110

Abstract   While many business leaders and political theorists wrestle with the significance of cultural difference and its impact on transnational relations in the current era of globalization, there is still much work to be done in this field. The concept of Cultural Intelligence (CQ) explores the relevance of cultural intelligence given the increasing globalization of business organizations, and seeks to determine why some individuals are more adept at dealing in situations of cultural diversity than others.

Maritime industries are among the most diverse and global in the world, and as such, elevating cultural intelligence should be a prime goal and objective of maritime academies.   At California Maritime, this is accomplished not only through instruction in courses in history, comparative world religions, cultures of globalization, and foreign language study, but also through the experiential opportunity afforded by the Training Ship Golden Bear. This summer, everyone participating in the training cruises was asked to complete a survey designed by the original CQ developers.   The compilation of this data will serve to quantify an area of inquiry that by its nature resists easy assessment; furthermore, this data could be used to identify and address shortcomings in maritime education as they pertain to interpersonal dynamics and transcultural knowledge exchanges. Such findings should prove immensely significant in preparing students to adapt to an increasingly globalized workplace.

Keywords   cultural intelligence; CQ; cognition; Meta-cognition; maritime education

0 Introduction

Despite its ubiquity in academic and popular usage, the term "globalization" is notoriously elusive

and difficult to define. There are as many conceptualizations of globalization as there are disciplines, and these varying conceptualizations are not only often contradictory, they are sometimes incommensurable with each other. Nonetheless, any project that invokes "globalization" as one of its key objects of inquiry must establish some theoretical framework, no matter how contingent that foundation may be. A formulation of globalization useful to this paper comes from the sociologist Jan Nederveen Pieterse: "globalization is an objective empirical process of increasing economic and political connectivity, a subjective process unfolding in consciousness as the collective awareness of growing interconnectedness, and a host of specific globalizing projects that seek to shape global conditions."[1] The operative idea in this explanation is that of "connectivity." Because one of the hallmarks of globalization is its complex connectivity across the planet, it must also be acknowledged that this connectivity extends not just from physical place to place, but, as noted by John Tomlinson, "the complexity of the linkages established by globalization extend to phenomena which have been separated out into the categories which we now break down into human life: the economic, the political, the social, the interpersonal, the technological, the environmental, the cultural. Globalization confounds such taxonomy."[2] In other words, the very "complex connectivity" that characterizes globalization (technological advances in transportation and communication, increased international trade, increased interdependence of countries) also corresponds to the connectivity between previously well-demarcated knowledge regimes and academic disciplines.

Even though the processes of globalization are often theorized and interrogated through their most visible manifestations in the political and economic arenas, we cannot easily separate, say, the political from the social or the cultural from the economic because of the tendrils that connect them all. Many attempt to theorize globalization are flawed, claims Nederveen Pieterse, because "economic, political, cultural, and social dynamics are not simply different facets of a single globalization; rather, they are each prisms through which globalization takes shape and is experienced and mapped differently, yet they all mingle and interpenetrate as well."[3] The recognition of the interpenetration of disciplinary fields provides the springboard for our analysis, for while the purpose of this essay is to examine globalization through the prism of culture (and, obviously, its significance for MET), one cannot easily separate issues of culture from those other structures with which it is indissolubly linked.

That said, the category of "the cultural" has, to some extent, been marginalized and subordinated in discussions of globalization, but it is rapidly emerging as an important field. Many business leaders and political theorists have turned their attention to the problem of cultural difference and its implications for transnational business relations. Several books and articles have been published, web-based programs initiated, and seminars created–all devoted to cross-cultural understanding. The bulk of these projects are directed toward international managers of corporate conglomerates, but the importance of understanding cultural difference has also been recognized as significant in maritime education and training. Maritime industries are among the most diverse and global in the world, and a nascent body of literature is emerging which points to the significance of culture, and cultural differences, in all aspects of maritime operations–from communication between multicultural crews to issues of port security(See especially, Benton, "Multicultural Crews and the Culture of Globalization;" Badawi and Halawa, "Maritime Communication: The Problem of Cross Cultural and Multilingual Crews;" Chaudry, "Cross Cultural Understanding is the Key to New Crewing Challenges;" Weihua, "Maritime English Education in the Context of Globalization;" Dzugan, "Cross Cultural Communication: Implications for Maritime Trainers;" and Erol and Sampson, "Transnational Seafarer

Communities."[4]). The arguments overwhelmingly call for an urgent need to study and assess cross-cultural relationships because (1) the forces of globalization will only move organizations toward greater cultural integration, and (2) confusion brought about through cross-cultural miscommunication has serious implications for ship and port safety.

This work on cultural difference and MET is earnest, well-intentioned, and as the first stage in an evolving field, certainly provides a necessary foundation. However, there is, to our minds, a problem with much of this early work on culture and MET, and this problem is two-fold. First, programs that *only* provide basic knowledge of cultural difference tend to reduce complex cultural negotiations into a laundry list of "do's and don'ts" (i.e., "Japanese behave this way and Americans behave that way"). This may be a useful primer, but such instruction is superficial and may even reproduce some antiquated cultural stereotypes. Also, such guides are usually only bilateral–situating one cultural group against another–and neglect to provide for circumstances when there may be several different cultural groups involved. Not only are 80% of the world's merchant ships multi-ethnic in crew composition,[5] but one in ten ships operates with crews composed of five or more nationalities.[6] Therefore a more multilateral, systematic approach is needed to accommodate this multiplicity.

Second, too often the pedagogical methodologies used to teach cross-cultural negotiations remain unrigorous, and often amount to no more than exposure to cultural differences coupled with simplistic entreaties to "tolerate difference." Such instruction is obviously well-intentioned and even necessary, but it doesn't provide meaningful, lasting skill sets, and in worst case scenarios such programs may promote an atmosphere of ethnocentric cultural superiority–certainly the very opposite effect of what is intended.

Into this arena, then, emerges a new theory within management and organizational psychology called Cultural Intelligence, or CQ. Various terms, including "intercultural competence," "global mindset," and "global competencies" had been in use for a number of years, but the definition of CQ as a special type of intelligence can be attributed to Christopher Early in his 2002 article in *Research in Organizational Behavior* and his Stanford University Press text of 2003.[7] Later developed and refined by a consortium of professors from the U.S., the U.K, and Asia, Cultural Intelligence seeks to systematically evaluate an individual's capability to deal with people of different cultures. While most people are familiar with IQ–the measure of the ability to reason–and perhaps also EQ–a measure of one's "emotional intelligence"–CQ is "a new idea that builds on these earlier concepts, while incorporating the capability to interact effectively across cultures."[8]

Because CQ researchers' key objective is to address the problem of why people fail to adjust to and understand new cultures, their work is rapidly gaining acceptance in the international business community. Obviously CQ projects are designed with transnational economic relationships in mind: academics across the globe work in conjunction with corporations to build and solidify trade relationships and to streamline the efficacy of capitalism in the globalized arena. However, the theory of CQ has been appropriated by other institutional apparatuses as well: most notably the United States Marine Corps' Small Wars Center for Excellence, which now administers CQ texts to prospective candidates.[9]

In 2004, Professor Soon Ang from the Nanyang Business School of Singapore presented a detailed paper on the measurement of cultural intelligence. CQ, in this context, is a multi-faceted

construct with mental (both cognitive and meta-cognitive), motivational, and behavioral components. A brief description of each component follows.

1 The quotient of cultural intelligence

"Culture Intelligence," the authors note, differs from "existing formulas of intelligence such as emotional intelligence and social intelligence because it focuses specifically on capabilities that are relevant to settings and interactions characterized by cultural diversity."[10] The first of factors to measured, "meta-cognition," is an awareness of the process of learning which leads to information processing at a deeper level. Those with greater meta-cognitive capabilities "learn and perform more effectively because they monitor their progress, determine when they are having problems, and adjust their behavior accordingly."[11] Meta-cognitive CQ, therefore, refers to an individual's *cultural* consciousness and awareness during interactions with those who have different cultural backgrounds: "being high in meta-cognitive cultural intelligence should cause individuals to consciously question cultural assumptions, think about culture and cultural assumptions or norms before and during interactions with others, plus check and adjust their mental models based on interactions with those from other cultures."[12]

While meta-cognition focuses on higher-order cognitive processes, the second category in this assessment program–"cognition"–focuses on knowledge acquired from education and experience. To return to Ang, "when individuals are knowledgeable and skilled in a specific area, their knowledge structures are rich, complex, and well-organized. Cognitive CQ is an individual's knowledge of specific norms, practices, and conventions in different cultural settings. This includes knowledge of cultural universals as well as cultural differences. Cultural knowledge includes knowledge of the economic, legal, and social systems in other cultures. Cognitive CQ should allow individuals to assess similarities and differences across cultural situations in ways that enhance their performance in culturally relevant ways."[13]

In the third category, "motivational CQ," an individual's drive and interest in learning about and functioning in situations characterized by cultural differences are evaluated. Again, according to the Center for Cultural Intelligence, "those with high motivational CQ should be confident about their ability to engage in cross-cultural interactions and should experience intrinsic satisfaction from being in culturally diverse settings. When people are curious about other cultures, they are more attentive to similarities and differences. They are willing to ask questions, expose themselves to novel situations, and try new things even when signals are confusing and things don't quite make sense."[14]

The final component of CQ assesses individual behavior, particularly in regards to flexibility in one's ability to adjust verbal and non-verbal actions in response to specific characteristics of a given situation, and thus "behavioral CQ' measures an individual's capacity for adjusting to culturally diverse situations by picking up subtle cultural signals from others and making adjustments to talk with people from other cultures in an easy and relaxed manner.[15]

2 Application of cultural intelligence to MET

After extensive research and consultation with academics and international executives with

cross-cultural expertise, Ang and her associates devised a twenty item, four factor cultural intelligence scale [See Appendix A]. Distilled from a much larger pool of questions, the twenty items of the scale comprehensively yet efficiently measure cultural intelligence via the aforementioned categories: meta-cognition, cognition, motivation, and behavior. In the summer of 2006, this Cultural Intelligence Scale was distributed to cadets from the California Maritime Academy who would be participating in exercises aboard the Training Ship Golden Bear. Cal Maritime conducts two cruises per summer, and the CQ Survey was distributed twice per cruise–one immediately after the ship departed, and once just prior to its return. During the cruise, four port stops totaling sixteen days were made, and shipboard classroom instruction in cultural awareness complemented these stops. Using the matrix provided by the Center for Cultural Intelligence, it was our desire to see if the experiential learning opportunities available on cruise had a positive impact on cultural intelligence. The following results–hampered somewhat by a smaller than expected sample–are taken from the first cruise only, because as of this time, data has not yet been received from the second cruise [See Appendix 2].

It was found that for Part One (the evaluation of meta-cognitive CQ), post-cruise cadets scored themselves significantly higher in assessing their consciousness of cultural knowledge in cross-cultural interactions. An aggregate score of 33.3% of cadets ranked themselves as "strongly agreeing" with the statements regarding their high level of meta-cognitive act before cruise, whereas post-cruise scores averaged 51.6%. In the section evaluating Behavioral CQ, initial pre-cruise aggregate scores for the highest level averaged 34.7% and post-cruise scores for the same category measured 43.4%. An even more dramatic increase was found for motivational CQ: pre-cruise numbers (using the same formula as above) measured 12.6% and post cruise numbers more than doubled to 26.6%.

In all these categories, a higher level of cultural intelligence was registered after participating in international exercises through ports of call. Interestingly, the one category that did not conform to expectations was cognitive CQ. Only 4.3 % of students before cruise felt strongly that, for example, they knew the legal and economic systems of other cultures, or that they knew the religious beliefs of other cultures. This number dropped precipitously to only 1.1% on the post-cruise aggregate high score. This decrease reverses predictions, and thus merits further attention.

To review, this category simply measures cognition–discrete, graspable knowledge units–that should be relatively easy to transmit in a traditional classroom environment, either on the ship or on campus prior to cruise. Those of us who teach in the humanities and social sciences–especially those whose courses cover political, economic, and cultural ramifications of globalization–should pay particular attention to these egregiously low scores.

However, on a more optimistic note, there may be a way to reconcile the increase in meta-cognitive CQ with this decrease in actual CQ cognition. There is an inverse relationship between the two categories: the more students are aware of their own capacity to think cross-culturally (meta-cognitive CQ), the more they may come to understand they know less about a foreign culture than they originally perceived. In sum, it is a classic example of discovering "the more you learn, the more you realize how little you know."

3 Future directions for CQ and MET

We believe the results of this first foray into measuring the cultural intelligence of maritime cadets is promising, and that future testing and assessment can only have positive outcomes in developing particular curricula devoted to cross-cultural problems. There are also, however, some adjustments to be made, and cautionary notes to strike.

First, much of the work at the Cultural Intelligence Center is designed to select, train, and develop a more culturally-intelligent workforce and therefore CQ has immediate practical application for "human resource professionals, assessment centers, international consulting firms [and] expatriate adjustment education centers."[16] Furthermore, the CIC proponents add: "The CQ scale could also be used to screen out those who are proficient in domestic settings but unlikely to succeed in cross-cultural settings or in jobs that require frequent interaction with those who have other cultural backgrounds."[17] Certainly this is not the intention of administering CQ tests at maritime universities: to "screen" potential mariners for industry positions based on their cultural intelligence. However–and this is a crucial point to make–if more and more industries choose to include a CQ test as part of the application process, we want to insure our graduates do as well as possible. This could be accomplished because CQ, unlike other IQ tests (and EQ tests that measure stable personality traits), is "a malleable state that may change based on cultural exposure, training, modeling, mentoring, socialization, and other experiences."[18] Cultural intelligence is not an innate sensibility, but rather a set of psycho-social and mental strategies. Because these are strategies, not instincts, they can be taught, and therefore learned.

Second, in regard to the data gleaned from the Cal Maritime survey, we are not so naïve as to assume just that a few weeks in foreign port cities spread out over one summer in and of itself elevate CQ. Rather, the cruise and port experiences should be viewed as part of a larger curriculum issue–one that sees the importance of culture as a significant challenge in the era of globalization and which can be met through the introduction and maintenance of instruction in world religions, globalization and culture, world history, and any other number of interdisciplinary perspectives on the issue.

Future work in this field could also be directed toward a more sophisticated collection and interpretation of data. A statistician trained in the behavioral sciences could run a much deeper analysis of the numbers than we have presented here. Also, the CQ test could be gauged by different factors: are third-year students more culturally intelligent that first year students? How might breakdowns by different majors look like? Do CQ results change depending on the cruise schedule and ports of call? Should the 20 point, four factor survey be altered? (There is an alternative, 54 point survey now available.) Is there a way to tailor the CQ test specifically for maritime purposes? These questions and many more will provide the basis for further research and advances.

4 Conclusion

Globalization is a multidimensional process, which, like all significant social processes, unfolds in multiple realms of existence simultaneously. Therefore globalization has created the conditions in

which issues of cross-cultural communication impact many other aspects of trade and transportation. Tests, surveys, questionnaires, and other evaluative tools that purport to measure cultural intelligence are becoming more sophisticated, more elaborate, and are increasingly being used across a wider strata of public and private sectors. Those of us who work in maritime education and training need to monitor and adopt these tools to our own use without compromising the missions of our individual universities. Elevating cultural intelligence should prove immensely significant in preparing students to survive and thrive in an increasingly globalized workplace.

Appendix 1

The 20 Item Four Factor Cultural Intelligence Scale.

Read each statement and select the response that best describes your capabilities.

Select the answer that BEST describes you AS YOU REALLY ARE (1=strongly disagree;

5=strongly agree)

CQ Factor	Questionnaire Items
Meta-cognitive CQ:	
MC1	I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds.
MC2	I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions.
MC3	I adjust my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from a culture that is unfamiliar to me.
MC4	I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures.
Cognitive CQ	
COG1	I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures.
COG2	I know the religious beliefs of other cultures.
COG3	I know the marriage systems of other cultures.
COG4	I know the arts and crafts of other cultures.
COG5	I know the rules (e.g., grammar) of other languages.
COG6	I know the rules for expressing non-verbal behaviors in other cultures.
Motivational CQ	
MOT1	I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.
MOT2	I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me.
MOT3	I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me.
MOT4	I am confident that I can get accustomed to the shopping conditions in a different culture.
MOT5	I am sure I can deal with the stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me.
Behavioral CQ	
BEH1	I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.
BEH2	I change my non-verbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it.
BEH3	I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations.
BEH4	I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it.
BEH5	I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.

Resource from Cultural Intelligence Center, 2004.

California Maritime

CQ Survey

Golden Bear, First Cruise, 2006

Section One: Meta-Cognitive CQ

(MC1) I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with

different cultural backgrounds

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	3.7	3.7	40.7	22.2	29.6
Post-Cruise %	0.0	0.0	13.3	40.0	46.6
% Change	-3.7	-3.7	-27.4	17.8	17.0

(MC2) I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions.

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	7.4	0.0	44.4	29.6	18.5
Post-Cruise %	0.0	6.6	13.3	26.6	53.3
% Change	-7.4	6.6	-31.1	-3.0	34.8

(MC3) I adjust my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from a culture that is

unfamiliar to me

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	3.7	3.7	18.5	33.3	40.7
Post-Cruise %	0.0	0.0	13.3	26.6	60.0
% Change	-3.7	-3.7	-5.2	-6.7	19.3

(MC4) I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different

cultures

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	7.4	11.1	22.2	25.9	33.3
Post-Cruise %	0.0	6.6	13.3	33.3	46.6
% Change	-7.4	-4.5	-8.9	7.4	13.3

Section Two: Cognitive CQ

(COG1) I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	22.2	25.9	25.9	14.8	7.4
Post-Cruise %	0.0	46.6	40.0	13.3	0.0
% Change	-22.2	20.7	14.1	-1.5	-7.4

(COG2) I know the religious beliefs of other cultures

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	7.4	37.0	29.6	18.5	11.1
Post-Cruise %	0.0	20.0	66.6	13.3	0.0
% Change	-7.4	-17.0	37.0	-5.2	-11.1

(COG3) I know the marriage systems of other cultures

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	37.0	18.5	33.3	11.1	3.7
Post-Cruise %	6.6	40.0	40.0	13.3	0.0
% Change	-30.4	-21.5	6.7	2.2	-3.7

(COG4) I know the arts and crafts of other cultures

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	14.8	29.6	44.8	14.8	0.0
Post-Cruise %	6.6	20.0	40.0	26.6	0.0
% Change	-8.29	-9.6	-4.8	11.8	0.0

(COG5) I know the rules (e.g., grammar) of other languages

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	40.7	29.6	25.9	3.7	3.7
Post-Cruise %	6.6	46.6	40.0	6.6	0.0
% Change	-34.1	17.0	14.1	2.9	-3.7

(COG6) I know the rules for expressing non-verbal behaviors in other cultures

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	29.6	37.0	22.2	14.8	0.0
Post-Cruise %	13.3	13.3	46.6	20.0	6.6
% Change	-16.3	-23.7	24.4	5.2	6.6

Section Three: Motivational CQ

(MOT1)I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	7.4	3.7	14.8	22.2	51.8
Post-Cruise %	0.0	0.0	13.3	20.0	66.6
% Change	-7.4	-3.7	-1.5	-2.2	14.8

(MOT2) I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	11.1	11.1	18.5	33.3	25.9
Post-Cruise %	0.0	6.6	26.6	26.6	40.0

% Change	-11.1	-4.5	8.1	-6.7	14.1

(MOT3) I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	0.0	7.4	33.3	37.0	22.2
Post-Cruise %	0.0	6.6	20.0	33.3	4.0
% Change	0.0	-.8	-10.3	-3.7	-18.2

(MOT4) I am confident that I can get accustomed to the shopping conditions in a different

culture

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	0.0	11.1	11.1	44.4	33.3
Post-Cruise %	0.0	0.0	6.6	33.3	60.0
% Change	0.0	-11.1	-4.5	-11.1	26.7

(MOT5) I am sure I can deal with the stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	3.7	3.7	14.8	37.0	40.7
Post-Cruise %	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.3	46.6
% Change	-3.7	-3.7	-14.8	16.3	5.9

Section Four: Behavioral CQ

(BEH1) I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction

requires it

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	11.1	7.4	37.0	33.3	11.1
Post-Cruise %	6.6	6.6	6.6	33.3	40.0
% Change	-4.5	-.8	-30.4	0.0	-28.9

(BEH2) I change my non-verbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	7.4	0.0	33.3	40.7	14.8
Post-Cruise %	6.6	6.6	13.3	33.3	33.3
% Change	-.8	6.6	-20.0	-7.4	18.5

(BEH3) I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations

	1	2	3	4	5

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	11.1	11.1	37.0	29.6	11.1
Post-Cruise %	0.0	13.3	33.3	33.3	20.0
% Change	-11.1	2.2	-3.7	3.7	8.9

(BEH4) I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	3.7	14.8	37.0	25.9	18.5
Post-Cruise %	0.0	20.0	13.3	46.6	20.0
% Change	-3.7	5.2	-23.7	-20.7	1.5

(BEH5) I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it

	1	2	3	4	5
Pre-Cruise %	7.4	11.1	44.4	29.6	7.4
Post-Cruise %	13.3	6.6	20.0	40.0	20.0
% Change	5.9	-4.5	-24.4	10.4	12.6

Reference

[1] Nederveen Pierterse Jan. Globalization and Culture: Global Melange. Rowman and Littlefield, Publishers, 2004: 16.

[2] Tomlinson John. Globalization and Culture. The University of Chicago Press, 1999: 12.

[3] Nederveen Pierterse Jan. Globalization and Culture: Global Melange. Rowman and Littlefield, Publishers, 2004: 14.

[4] a. Benton Graham. Multicultural Crews and the Culture of Globalization. Proceedings of the International Association of Maritime Universities, 6th Annual General Assembly, 2005.

[4] b. Badawi, Essam El Sayed Ahmed, Halawa, Ashraf Mohamed. "Maritime Communication: The Problem of Cross Cultural and Multilingual Crews. Proceedings of the International Association of Maritime Universities, 4th General Assembly, 2003.

[4] c. Chaudry, Cross Cultural Understanding is the Key to New Crewing Challenges. Loyd's List, 2005.

[4] d. Weihua Luo. "Maritime English Education in the Context of Globalization" ESP in Multilingual and Multicultural Texts. Dzugan. Cross Cultural Communication: Implications for Maritime Trainers, 1998 *WMU*.

[4] e. Erol, Sampson, Transnational Seafarer Communities. Seafarers International Research Centre, 2004.

[5] Trenker, Peter and Cole, Clive. Profiling the Maritime English Instructor. Proceedings of the 4th General Assembly of the International Association of Maritime Universities. 2003. CDROM

[6] Badawi, Essam El Sayed Ahmed, Halawa Ashraf Mohamed. Maritime Communication: The Problem of Cross Cultural and Multilingual Crews. Proceedings of the International Association of Maritime Universities, 4th General Assembly(CDROM), 2003.

[7] Earley Christopher, Ang Soon, Tan Joo-Seng. CQ: Developing Cultural Intelligence at Work. Stanford University Press, 2006.

[8] Thomas David C, Inkson Kerr. Cultural Intelligence. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc. 2004: 14.

[9]   United State Marine Corp. Small Wars Center of Excellence. <http://www.smallwars.quantico. usmc.mil>/

[10] Ang Soon, Van Dyne, Linn Koh, Christine, Ng Kok Yee. The Measurement of Cultural Intelligence. Paper Presented at Academy of Management Symposium on Cultural Intelligence, 2004: 4.

[11] Ang Soon, Van Dyne, Linn Koh, Christine, Ng Kok Yee. The Measurement of Cultural Intelligence. Paper Presented at Academy of Management Symposium on Cultural Intelligence, 2004: 6.

[12] Ang Soon, Van Dyne, Linn Koh, Christine, Ng Kok Yee. The Measurement of Cultural Intelligence. Paper Presented at Academy of Management Symposium on Cultural Intelligence, 2004: 6.

[13] Ang Soon, Van Dyne, Linn Koh, Christine, Ng Kok Yee. The Measurement of Cultural Intelligence. Paper Presented at Academy of Management Symposium on Cultural Intelligence, 2004: 7.

[14] Ang Soon, Van Dyne, Linn Koh, Christine, Ng Kok Yee. The Measurement of Cultural Intelligence. Paper Presented at Academy of Management Symposium on Cultural Intelligence, 2004: 8.

[15] Thomas David C, Inkson Kerr. Cultural Intelligence. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc, 2004: 83.

[16] Ang Soon, Van Dyne, Linn Koh, Christine, Ng Kok Yee. The Measurement of Cultural Intelligence. Paper Presented at Academy of Management Symposium on Cultural Intelligence, 2004. 24.

[17] Ang Soon, Van Dyne, Linn Koh, Christine, Ng Kok Yee. The Measurement of Cultural Intelligence. Paper Presented at Academy of Management Symposium on Cultural Intelligence, 2004: 25.

[18] Ang Soon, Van Dyne, Linn Koh, Christine, Ng Kok Yee. The Measurement of Cultural Intelligence. Paper Presented at Academy of Management Symposium on Cultural Intelligence, 2004: 16.