


CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE AND INTERPERSONAL TRUST AS DRIVERS FOR INNOVATIVE WORK AND INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT AT ORGANIZATIONS

Oksana Lentjushenkova,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6494-1534>
Associate professor, Dr.Sc., EKA University of Applied Sciences, Latvia
Corresponding author: Oksana Lentjushenkova, oksana@augstskola.lv
Type of manuscript: research paper

Abstract: *The main purpose of this study is to determine how cultural intelligence and interpersonal trust impact innovative work behaviour and intellectual capital development in organizations. Research conducted by various authors shows that managers with higher levels of cultural intelligence have higher levels of interpersonal trust. As a result, they are more flexible in the adoption and creation of new ideas and solutions. Most of them are not afraid to share their knowledge and experience by accepting different opinions and creating an appropriate organizational culture. It enables an opportunity to strengthen all elements of intellectual capital and facilitates the competitiveness of the organization. Cultural intelligence and interpersonal trust create opportunities for innovative behaviour in organizations by developing intellectual capital. The scientific literature presents various studies about cultural intelligence and its impact on organizational performance. Most of the studies focused on the integration of migrants into the organizations' work. Currently, the working environment is cross-cultural, especially after the COVID-19 pandemic and considering globalization and digitalization issues. Despite the various benefits of working in a multicultural environment, there are some significant challenges organizations face, such as interpersonal trust development and cultural intelligence. The current study focused on local employees at organizations: 93 managers of higher education institutions from Latvia were interviewed. The author used qualitative and quantitative research methods for data collection and analysis. Semistructured interviews were used for data collection. The research tool was developed on the basis of scientific literature using different statements about interpersonal trust, work engagement and level of cultural intelligence. One of the significant results found during research is that managers with international experience (working or studying abroad) are more critical of working in international teams and building interpersonal trust within cross-cultural teams. This fact could be the research object in future research. The research results can be used for future research exploring factors influencing cultural intelligence development in cross-cultural organizations and its role in innovation development and intellectual capital management.*

Keywords: cultural intelligence; innovative work behaviour; intellectual capital; trust.

Received: 19 June 2023

Revised: 31 August 2023

Accepted: 6 September 2023

Funding: There was no funding for this research.

Publisher and Founder: Sumy State University

Cite as: Lentjushenkova, O. (2023). Cultural Intelligence and Interpersonal Trust as Drivers for Innovative Work and Intellectual Capital Development at Organizations. *Marketing and Management of Innovations*, 14(3), 153–162. <https://doi.org/10.21272/mmi.2023.3-14>



1. Introduction. The end of the last century and twenty years of this century have been marked by several crises that caused several waves of migration. At the same time, the collapse of the PSSR, the expansion of the EU and other political-economic and social processes in the countries of the world created a situation where people of different cultures work in the same organization. Several organizations have faced situations where it is necessary to find opportunities to work together to move towards achieving goals. At the same time, for more than 50 years, organizations have had to promote the development of innovation, which is also based on the development of intellectual capital, which has become one of the driving forces of the organization's competitiveness, providing opportunities to offer unique products or services. An essential prerequisite for the development of intellectual capital is also the creation of an organizational culture in which all components and elements of intellectual capital could complement one another and ensure the development of innovations. Currently, elements of intellectual capital such as cultural intelligence and trust are gaining importance.

Despite the challenges of globalization in the scientific literature, cultural intelligence has been studied mostly in the context of migration or in the context of leaders' work with migrants. Currently, as the structure of the national economy is changing, as well as in the postpandemic period and the age of digitalization, organizations are increasingly faced with the need to work in multinational teams. More and more often, teams work in a hybrid format, and therefore, people have not moved to other countries. However, when working with representatives of different cultures, organizations face new challenges, including the ability to perceive representatives of other nationalities and cultures and the traditions, values and peculiarities of business culture.

Several studies show that the diversity of people in a team contributes to the development of innovations because people with different experiences in different business environments and cultures are able to generate more ideas (Afsar et al., 2021, Ng et al., 2012). On the other hand, the collaboration of different people requires one of the basic competencies of modern day - cultural intelligence and trust development among employees. Trust enables openness and facilitates internal motivation that promotes collaboration in organizations. When employees trust one another, they are not afraid to generate ideas, to analyse information and to cooperate with colleagues and managers (Agbejule et al., 2021). At the same time, in the scientific literature, research on trust is mostly related to the PR sphere (more than 50%); in the field of management, such research accounts for 2.9% (Valentini, 2021). This shows the relevance of the research topic in the context of modern changes. The main purpose of the current study is to determine how cultural intelligence and interpersonal trust enhance innovative work behaviour and intellectual capital development in organizations. Research question: Do people with international experience accept cultural diversity in the teams, and are they able to build trust for innovative work behaviour?

2. Literature Review. In the scientific literature, the term "intelligence" has been studied mostly in the context of emotional, social and cognitive intelligence, which is one of the most valuable resources of an individual who affects the results of individual and organizational activity (Albrecht, 2012, Cote et al., 2006, Crawford et al., 2010, Lin et al., 2012). Cultural intelligence is a "capability for successful adaptation to new cultural settings, that is, for unfamiliar settings attributable to cultural context" (Earley and Ang, 2003, p. 9). Cultural intelligence helps to adapt to an environment where an individual's previously acquired habits and behaviour model do not fit. The highest level of intelligence allows one to perceive cross-cultural differences faster and adapt to a new environment (Presbitero, 2016). Initially, cultural intelligence was divided into three components according to the classification offered by Earley & Ang (2003): cognitive, motivational, and behavioural. Later, Ang et al. (2007) supplemented this classification with another component - metacognitive. Metacognitive cultural intelligence indicates personal conscious cultural awareness and general knowledge of other cultures (Lee et al., 2018). Metacognitive cultural intelligence helps an individual perceive other cultures, behavioural norms and traditions, going beyond usual behaviour and existing knowledge. It helps to be more flexible and open and to adapt faster in a new environment. Cognitive cultural intelligence is knowledge about norms, practices, and conventions in other countries that persons acquire while studying or working in cross-cultural environments (Ang et al., 2007). It allows us to see differences in cultures. Motivational cultural intelligence is related to a person's willingness to discover other cultures (Afsar et al., 2021). Behavioural cultural intelligence determines a person's ability to use various behavioural norms (verbal and nonverbal) in interactions with representatives of different cultures (Ott & Michailova, 2018).

People with higher cultural intelligence trust other colleagues more (Rockstuhl & Ng, 2015), while a higher level of trust promotes innovative behaviour in a team (Lee, 2008). Trust is "a shared psychological state among team members comprising willingness to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of a specific other or others" (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Trust facilitates the development of common perceptions,

expectations and behaviour among employees, which encourages a positive psychological climate in organizations (Agbejule et al., 2021) when an employee recognizes the goodness, ability, and integrity of another employee and is more likely to be involved in cooperative behaviour (e.g., delegating, cocreation, brainstorming, decision making) with that employee. This behaviour facilitates productivity and goal achievement. (Morrisette & Kisamore, 2020). Trust helps to share even negative aspects and criticism (Barnett et al., 2010) and plays a crucial role in creating an environment for innovation and transparency (Jahansoozi, 2006). Trust is one of the preconditions for exchanging behaviour (Buvik & Tvedt, 2017), which promotes collaboration and knowledge sharing. The climate for trust also motivates employees to find new opportunities for collaboration and makes employees engage in change-orientated behaviours (Fainshmidt & Frazier, 2017). Cultural intelligence determines the attitude with which employees perform at an organization (Kistyanto et al., 2022). Cultural intelligence promotes knowledge sharing in the organization and, as a result, the creation of innovations (Berraies, 2020). Scientific studies confirm that cultural intelligence contributes to the innovative behaviour of individuals (Bogilovic et al., 2017; Hu et al., 2017; Leung et al., 2008; Ng et al., 2012; Ott & Michailova, 2018). Innovative behaviour is defined as "problem recognition and the generation of ideas or solutions, either novel or adopted" (Scott & Bruce, 1994, p. 581). It is a process in which new ideas are created, developed, perfected, and used in the development of the organization. Innovative behaviour also includes analysing problem situations, finding solutions, and performing challenging tasks (Tang & Werner, 2017). Dyer et al. (2011) determined four behavioural types that are essential for innovative behaviour:

- 1) questioning – asking questions;
- 2) observing – intensely observing the world and seeking new opportunities;
- 3) experimenting – making experiments for finding new solutions and unique competitive advantages;
- 4) idea networking – developing networks of employees with different experiences and different points of view.

Cultural intelligence allows the use of knowledge and experience from different cultures and ensures the creation of new ideas, approaches and solutions, promoting the development of intellectual capital. Currently, intellectual capital plays a crucial role in the transition to innovative, competitive and sustainable development. The development of intellectual capital facilitates innovation, improves the competitiveness of an organization, increases the trust of stakeholders and provides sustainable growth in the future (Alvino et al., 2021). Intellectual capital is an intangible asset that promotes the ability to innovate and create value within an organization (Dost et al., 2016; Kianto et al., 2017). There are different approaches to the classification of intellectual capital. Studies traditionally divide intellectual capital into three main components: human capital, organizational capital and relational capital.

Human capital is skills, knowledge, experience, capabilities, motivation and abilities (Buenechea-Elberdin et al., 2018; Oliveira et al., 2020), and it includes trainings and educational programmes (Murray & Palladino, 2021; Singh et al., 2019), motivational programmes and recruitment plans. Human capital and relational capital have positive impacts on innovation performance in organizations (Hanifah et al., 2022). Organizational capital includes organizational structures, processes, procedures, policies, manuals, programmes, and databases (Buenechea-Elberdin et al., 2018; Berraies et al., 2020). Organizational capital captures the knowledge within organizations, stores it and works as "knowledge infrastructure" (Ghahtarani et al., 2020). Relational capital is defined as a relationship among the organization and internal and external stakeholders (Bontis, 1998; Li et al., 2019). Relational capital involves communication among stakeholders and organizations, which influences the innovation process and, as a result, organizational performance (Koranteng & Wiafe, 2019; Vatamanescu et al., 2020). Through communication, employees can develop new ideas and promote innovation in organizations. Despite technological development and digital transformation, human capital development is still a challenge for organizations. Recently, organizations have switched to hybrid work or remote work, which opens new opportunities for the development of a team and the attraction of human resources. Organizations recruit people worldwide, which brings benefits and problems. One of the problems is the management of the team because of cross-cultural differences. Members of the team have different beliefs, values, and traditions, and they have different behaviour models dealing with other cultures. By building trust among employees and developing strong relational capital at the organization, it is possible to benefit from multinational teams and increase the competitiveness of the organization.

3. Methodology and research methods. The author used qualitative and quantitative research methods for data collection and analysis. For data collection as a research tool, a structured survey was used. The survey was developed using research tools and qualifications used in studies conducted by Ang et al. (2007), McAllister (1995) and De Jong & Den Hartog (2010). The survey consists of 4 sections.

Section A: statements about cultural intelligence (Ang et al., 2007) – 18 statements:

- metacognitive (4 items);
- cognitive (5 items);
- motivational (4 items);
- behavioural (5 items).

Section B: statements about interpersonal trust (McAllister, 1995) – 10 statements:

- affective-based trust (5 items);
- cognition-based trust (5 items).

Section C: innovative work behaviour (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010) – 9 statements.

Table 1. Statements in the survey (sections A-C)

Code	Statement
Section A: Cultural intelligence	
CI01	I consciously use knowledge about cross-cultural differences in communication with representatives of different cultures
CI02	I try to adapt my cultural knowledge to people whose culture I am not familiar with and with whom I communicate
CI03	I communicate confidently in a cross-cultural environment
CI04	I check information about different cultures before communicating with people from different cultures
CI05	I know the legal and economic systems of other countries
CI06	I know the culture and religion of other countries
CI07	I know marriage traditions in other cultures
CI08	I know the art of other countries
CI09	I know the norms of nonverbal language expression of other countries
CI10	I like to communicate with representatives of different cultures
CI11	I am confident that I can communicate freely with people whose culture I do not know
CI12	I would like to live in a country which culture I am not familiar with
CI13	I am sure that I can get used to shopping habits in another country
CI14	I change the form of expression of verbal communication (e.g. tone) when required by intercultural communication
CI15	I use pauses and accents in my speech if it is necessary for successful cross-cultural communication
CI16	I change my speaking pace when necessary for successful cross-cultural communication
CI17	I change the way I communicate nonverbally when necessary for successful cross-cultural communication
CI18	I change my facial expression when it is necessary for successful cross-cultural communication
Section B: Interpersonal trust	
IT01	At work, I can freely share my ideas, emotions and hopes
IT02	I can freely talk about difficulties at work with my colleagues
IT03	If I share problems at work with colleagues, they help with constructive suggestions
IT04	I have experienced when one of my colleagues has been transferred to another job and we can no longer work together
IT05	I make an effort ("make an emotional investment") in building relationships with colleagues
IT06	My colleagues perform work tasks professionally
IT07	Seeing the achievements of my colleagues, I have no doubts about their competence and the quality of their work
IT08	I can rely on my colleagues
IT09	In our team, colleagues trust one another
IT10	My colleagues collaborate with one another in carrying out professional tasks
Section C: Innovative work behaviour	
IB01	I am interested in issues that are not part of my job
IB02	I like when things and processes are improved
IB03	I am looking for new ideas, methods and tools
IB04	I always try to find new ways to solve problems
IB05	I inspire colleagues to generate new ideas
IB06	I always try to convince other colleagues to support new ideas
IB07	I regularly innovate my work
IB08	I am involved in the implementation of new ideas
IB09	I am involved in the creation of new products/services

Sources: developed by the author based on Ang et al. (2007), McAllister (1995) and De Jong & Den Hartog (2010).

Section D: respondent's profile, which includes information about gender, age, education, working experience, position and international experience (10 statements).

A Likert scale was used for sections A, B, and C, where 1 was "Absolutely agree", 2 was "Agree", 3 was "Difficult to answer", 4 was "Disagree" and 5 was "Absolutely disagree". Positive formulation for all statements is used (e.g., "I like", "I do").

Respondents were selected from educational and research organizations as organizations with multicultural teams and international experience. The author interviewed 93 managers (top and middle management) of these organizations using a developed research tool.

The independent variable analysis was performed using the SPSS program. Independent variable analysis was used to compare the opinions of groups of respondents. In case of revealing a significant pattern ($p < 0.05$), the hypothesis that the statement has a significant difference for respondents of compared groups. For the analysis, the author compared the answers from four groups of respondents using the Mann–Whitney U test method.

On testing the research tool for reliability, it was concluded that the scale used is reliable (Cronbach's alpha ≥ 0.7): cultural intelligence 0.931 ($n=18$); interpersonal trust: 0.874 ($n=10$); innovative work behaviour: 0.861 ($n=9$).

4. Results. Analysing the respondents' profile, it can be concluded that 85.1% of the respondents were women and 14.9% were men. This distribution of respondents can be explained by the situation, which is characteristic of the education sector in Latvia, where the largest proportion are representatives of the female family. Most respondents had higher education: 26.6% had a bachelor's degree, 43.6% had a master's degree, and 18.1% had a doctoral degree. Considering the selected group of respondents, the age distribution is even, except for respondents younger than 30 years and older than 60 years: 17% – 30-34 years old; 11.7% – 35-39 years old; 14.9% – 40-44 years old; 12.8% – 45-49 years; 16% – 50-54 years old; and 9.6% – 55-59 years old. A total of 69.1% of respondents had experience working with or in an international team. At the same time, only 30.9% of respondents indicated that they had lived or worked abroad. More than half (58.5%) of the respondents regularly travel abroad on business trips. Based on the analysis of the respondents' profile and the respondents' international experience, the author compared the obtained results in four groups:

- respondents with work experience in international teams;
- respondents without work experience in international teams;
- respondents who lived/worked abroad;
- respondents who did not live/work abroad.

Table 1. Mann–Whitney U test analysis of respondents' cultural intelligence according to their international experience

Code	Life/Studies Abroad				Working experience in international teams			
	Mean Rank – Have experience	Mean Rank – No experience	Mann–Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Rank - Have experience	Mean Rank - No experience	Mann–Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
CI01	32.18	54.06	500.5	0.000	39.13	64.38	424.0	0.000
CI02	38.53	51.03	691.0	0.018	42.55	56.81	643.5	0.008
CI03	41.33	49.70	775.0	0.138	39.19	64.24	428.0	0.000
CI04	40.85	49.93	760.5	0.096	44.84	51.76	790.0	0.208
CI05	35.35	52.55	595.5	0.003	42.59	56.74	645.5	0.015
CI06	35.17	52.63	590.0	0.002	43.25	55.28	688.0	0.037
CI07	36.47	52.02	629.0	0.007	42.95	55.93	669.0	0.027
CI08	31.83	54.22	490.0	0.000	42.27	57.00	638.0	0.012
CI09	37.08	51.72	647.5	0.012	43.17	55.45	683.0	0.036
CI10	38.05	51.26	676.5	0.014	40.97	60.31	542.0	0.000
CI11	37.12	51.71	648.5	0.009	40.65	61.02	521.5	0.000
CI12	43.50	48.67	840.0	0.368	43.45	54.83	701.0	0.050
CI13	43.52	48.66	840.5	0.340	43.66	54.36	714.5	0.049
CI14	35.85	52.31	610.5	0.003	41.32	59.53	564.5	0.001
CI15	40.67	50.02	755.0	0.090	42.88	56.10	664.0	0.017
CI16	41.30	49.71	774.0	0.125	41.66	58.79	586.0	0.002
CI17	38.62	50.99	693.5	0.028	41.78	58.52	594.0	0.003
CI18	41.98	49.39	794.5	0.194	41.79	58.50	594.5	0.004

Sources: developed by the author.

The results of the Mann–Whitney U test (Table 2) on having life/studies experience abroad show a significant difference (where $p \leq 0.05$) between variables in ten cases:

- Metacognitive cultural intelligence statements: "I consciously use knowledge about cross-cultural differences in communication with representatives of different cultures" ($U = 500.5$; $p = 0.000$) and "I try to adapt my cultural knowledge to people whose culture I am not familiar with and with whom I communicate" ($U = 691.0$; $p = 0.018$).
- Cognitive cultural intelligence statements: "I know the culture and religion of other countries" ($U = 590.0$; $p = 0.002$), "I know marriage traditions in other cultures" ($U = 629.0$; $p = 0.007$), "I know the art of other countries" ($U = 490.0$; $p = 0.000$), and "I know the norms of nonverbal language expression of other countries" ($U = 647.5$; $p = 0.012$).
- Motivational cultural intelligence: "I like to communicate with representatives of different cultures" ($U = 676.5$; $p = 0.014$), "I am confident that I can communicate freely with people whose culture I do not know" ($U = 648.5$; $p = 0.009$).
- Behavioural cultural intelligence: "I change the form of expression of verbal communication (e.g., tone) when required by cross-cultural communication" ($U = 610.5$; $p = 0.003$), "I change the way I communicate nonverbally when necessary for successful cross-cultural communication" ($U = 693.5$; $p = 0.028$).

The results of the Mann–Whitney U test (Table 3) on having working experience in international teams show differences (where $p \leq 0.05$) between variables in all cases, except two: "I check information about different cultures before communicating with people from different cultures" and "I would like to live in a country whose culture I am not familiar with". Comparing two groups of statements and answers to these questions, the author can suppose that respondents prefer to make decisions about other cultures on the basis of verified information.

Mean values in all cases are higher for respondents without international experience. This means that respondents without such experience are more flexible and readier in adjusting their knowledge and behaviour to cross-cultural environments.

Table 3. Mann–Whitney U test analysis of respondents' interpersonal trust according to their international experience

Code	Life/Studies Abroad				Working experience in international teams			
	Mean Rank – Have experience	Mean Rank – No experience	Mann–Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Rank – Have experience	Mean Rank – No experience	Mann–Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
IT01	44.87	48.02	881.0	0.571	45.77	49.71	849.5	0.483
IT02	49.43	35.84	872.0	0.522	47.03	46.93	926.0	0.986
IT03	45.08	47.91	887.5	0.610	46.40	48.33	889.5	0.731
IT04	47.60	46.71	927.0	0.877	47.91	45.00	870.0	0.631
IT05	37.97	51.30	674.0	0.018	40.66	61.00	522.0	0.000
IT06	50.72	45.23	833.5	0.320	47.16	46.66	918.0	0.928
IT07	53.45	43.93	751.5	0.085	48.72	43.21	818.0	0.324
IT08	50.75	45.30	838.0	0.345	47.37	46.19	904.5	0.834
IT09	44.67	48.11	875.0	0.542	45.78	49.69	859.0	0.493
IT10	49.80	45.67	861.0	0.455	45.73	49.81	846.5	0.465

Sources: developed by the author.

The results of the Mann–Whitney U test (Table 4) show a difference in only one statement in all groups: "I make an effort ("make an emotional investment") in building relationships with colleagues". Respondents without international experience (living/studying abroad and working in international teams) put more effort into developing strong relationships with colleagues than people who have such experience.

Test results by living/studying abroad show differences in three statements: "I am looking for new ideas, methods and tools" ($U = 720.0$; $p = 0.028$), "I always try to find new ways to solve problems" ($U = 667.5$; $p = 0.012$), and "I inspire colleagues to generate new ideas" ($U = 721.0$; $p = 0.049$). Test results by working experience in international teams show significant differences in four statements: "I am looking for new ideas, methods and tools" ($U = 693.0$; $p = 0.021$), "I inspire colleagues to generate new ideas" ($U = 628.5$; $p = 0.008$), "I am involved in the implementation of new ideas" ($U = 617.5$; $p = 0.003$), and "I am involved in the creation of new products/services" ($U = 566.0$; $p = 0.002$). Mean values in all cases are higher for those respondents who have no international experience. This means that people without such experience are more open to looking for new solutions and put more effort into new idea generation and implementation.

Table 4. Mann–Whitney U test analysis of respondents’ innovative behaviour according to their international experience

Code	Life/Studies Abroad				Working experience in international teams			
	Mean Rank – Have experience	Mean Rank – No experience	Mann–Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Rank - Have experience	Mean Rank - No experience	Mann–Whitney U	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
IB01	46.75	47.12	937.5	0.946	44.38	52.79	760.0	0.125
IB02	43.82	4.52	849.5	0.231	46.23	48.69	879.0	0.535
IB03	39.50	50.57	720.0	0.028	43.33	55.10	693.0	0.021
IB04	37.75	51.40	667.5	0.012	44.77	51.93	785.0	0.192
IB05	39.53	50.56	721.0	0.049	42.32	57.33	628.5	0.008
IB06	42.47	49.16	809.0	0.229	44.77	51.91	785.5	0.203
IB07	40.00	50.33	725.0	0.065	44.21	53.16	749.5	0.113
IB08	42.17	49.30	800.0	0.170	42.15	57.71	617.5	0.003
IB09	40.73	49.98	757.0	0.105	41.34	59.48	566.0	0.002

Sources: developed by the author.

5. Conclusions. The current study shows contradictory results compared with previous studies conducted by other researchers. It has been found that respondents without international experience in living/studying abroad and working in international teams are more flexible and readier in adjusting their knowledge to cross-cultural environments. People who have no living/studying abroad experience demonstrate a higher level of knowledge about other cultures and a higher ability to use this knowledge adapting behaviour and communication styles for certain cultural environments. Analysing results in groups of respondents who have/do not have working experience in international teams, the same situation is observed. People with such working experience are more critical and are not ready to adapt their behaviour and use knowledge for working in a cross-cultural environment.

The author assumes that people without international experience could be motivated to obtain such experience and prepare themselves for that by studying and exploring information about other cultures. At the same time, people with international experience build their communication and behaviour on certain experiences, which can be either positive or negative. This explains the significant difference in statements about innovative work behaviour: people without international experience are more open to new idea generation, new solutions and the implementation of new ideas and demonstrate a higher level of innovative behaviour. Since education is not possible without exploring other cultures and studying/working in a cross-cultural environment, it is important to consider these results for intellectual capital development in the education sector. Recruiting people at organizations, it is necessary to consider not only their experience but also their motivation to obtain such experience on the basis of their knowledge, which can be a key factor for innovation and, as a result, intellectual capital development.

The current study results can be used for further studies by analysing the differences in other sectors of national economies and other countries. On the one hand, the educational sector is very innovative, but on the other hand, there are many regulations and many bureaucracies that impact people’s behaviour. At the same time, in the period when people face migration flows and globalization, they would like to feel safe working in a known environment and save their cultural identity and traditions. It can be viewed as a barrier for cross-cultural environment development and organizational culture development in the future.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

References

- Agbejule, A., Rapo, J. & Saarikoski, L. (2021). Vertical and horizontal trust and team learning: the role of organizational climate. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 14(7), 1425–1443. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Afsar, B., Al-Ghazali, B. M., Cheema, S., & Javed, F. (2021). Cultural intelligence and innovative work behavior: the role of work engagement and interpersonal trust. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 24 (4), 1082-1109. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Albrecht, S. L. (2012). The influence of job, team and organizational level resources on employee wellbeing, engagement, commitment and extrarole performance: test of a model. *International Journal of Manpower*, 33(7), 840–853. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Alvino, F., Di Vaio, A., Hassan, R. and Palladino, R. (2021). Intellectual capital and sustainable development: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 22(1), 76–94. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- 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. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Berraies, S. (2020). Effect of middle managers' cultural intelligence on firms' innovation performance: Knowledge sharing as mediator and collaborative climate as moderator. *Personnel Review*, 49 (4), 1015–1038. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Berraies, S., Lajili, R., & Chtioui, R. (2020). Social capital, employees' well-being and knowledge sharing: does enterprise social networks use matter? Case of Tunisian knowledge-intensive firms. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 21(6), 1153–1183. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bogilovič, S., Černe, M., & Škerlavaj, M. (2017). Hiding behind a mask? Cultural intelligence, knowledge hiding, and individual and team creativity. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(5), 710–723. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bontis, N. (1998). Intellectual capital: an exploratory study that develops measures and models. *Management Decision*, 36 (2), 63-76. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Buenechea-Elberdin, M., Sáenz, J., & Kianto, A. (2018). Knowledge management strategies, intellectual capital, and innovation performance: a comparison between high-and low-tech firms. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 22(8), 1757–1781. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Buvik, M. P. & Tvedt, S. D. (2017). The influence of project commitment and team commitment on the relationship between trust and knowledge sharing in project teams. *Project Management Journal*, 48(2), 5–21. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Cote, S., & Miners, C. T. (2006). Emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and job performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(1), 1-28. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- De Jong, J. and Den Hartog, D. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(1), 23-36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00547.x>
- Dost, M., Badir, Y. F., Ali, Z., & Tariq, A. (2016). The impact of intellectual capital on innovation generation and adoption. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 17(4), 675–695. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Dyer, J., Gregersen, H., & Christensen, C. (2011). *The Innovator's DNA: Mastering the Five Skills of Disruptive Innovators*. Harvard Business Press, Boston, MA.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Cultures*. Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, CA. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
- Fainshmidt, S., & Frazier, M. L. (2017). What facilitates dynamic capabilities? The role of organizational climate for trust. *Long Range Planning*, 50(5), 550–566. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Fulmer, C. A., & Gelfand, M. J. (2012). At what level (and in whom) we trust: trust across multiple organizational levels. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), 1167–1230. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ghahtarani, A., Sheikhmohammady, M., & Rostami, M. (2020). The impact of social capital and social interaction on customers' purchase intention, considering knowledge sharing in social commerce context. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, 5 (3), 191–199. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hanifah, H., Abd Halim, N., Vafaei-Zadeh, A., & Nawaser, K. (2022). Effect of intellectual capital and entrepreneurial orientation on innovation performance of manufacturing SMEs: mediating role of knowledge sharing. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 23(6), 1175–1198. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hu, S., Gu, J., Liu, H., & Huang, Q. (2017). The moderating role of social media usage in the relationship among multicultural experiences, cultural intelligence, and individual creativity. *Information Technology and People*, 30(2), 265–281. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Jahansoozi, J. (2006). Organization-stakeholder relationships: exploring trust and transparency. *Journal of Management Development*, 25(10), 942–955. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kianto, A., Sáenz, J., & Aramburu, N. (2017). Knowledge-based human resource management practices, intellectual capital and innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 81, 11–20. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Kistyanto, A., Rahman, M. F. W., Adhar Wisandiko, F., & Setyawati, E. E. P. (2022). Cultural intelligence increase student's innovative behavior in higher education: the mediating role of interpersonal trust. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 36(4), 419–440. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Koranteng, F. N., & Wiafe, I. (2019). Factors that promote knowledge sharing on academic social networking sites: An empirical study. *Education and Information Technologies*, 24(2), 1211–1236. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Lee, S. H. (2008). The effect of employee trust and commitment on innovative behavior in the public sector: An empirical study. *International Review of Public Administration*, 13(1), 27–46. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Leung, A. K. Y., Maddux, W. W., Galinsky, A. D., & Chiu, C. Y. (2008). Multicultural experience enhances creativity: the when and how. *American psychologist*, 63(3), 169. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Li, Y., Song, Y., Wang, J., & Li, C. (2019). Intellectual capital, knowledge sharing, and innovation performance: Evidence from the Chinese construction industry. *Sustainability*, 11(9), 2713. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Lin, Y. C., Chen, A. S. Y., & Song, Y. C. (2012). Does your intelligence help to survive in a foreign jungle? The effects of cultural intelligence and emotional intelligence on cross-cultural adjustment. *International Journal of intercultural relations*, 36(4), 541–552. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect-and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24–59. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256727>

Morrisette, A. M., & Kisamore, J. L. (2020). Trust and performance in business teams: a meta-analysis. *Team Performance Management: an international journal*, 26(5/6), 287–300. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Murray, A., & Palladino, R. (2021). Developing human capitals in today's entrepreneurs: a practitioner perspective. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 22(4), 681–702. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Ng, K. Y., Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (2012). Cultural intelligence: A review, reflections, and recommendations for future research. *Conducting multinational research: Applying organizational psychology in the workplace.*, 29–58. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Oliveira, M., Curado, C., Balle, A. R., & Kianto, A. (2020). Knowledge sharing, intellectual capital and organizational results in SMES: are they related?. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 21(6), 893–911. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Ott, D. L., & Michailova, S. (2018). Cultural intelligence: A review and new research avenues. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(1), 99–119. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Presbitero, A. (2016). Culture shock and reverse culture shock: The moderating role of cultural intelligence in international students' adaptation. *International journal of intercultural relations*, 53, 28–38. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Rockstuhl, T., & Ng, K. Y. (2015). The effects of cultural intelligence on interpersonal trust in multicultural teams. In *Handbook of cultural intelligence* (pp. 224–238). Routledge. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)

Singh, S. K., Mittal, S., Sengupta, A., & Pradhan, R. K. (2019). A dual-pathway model of knowledge exchange: linking human and psychosocial capital with prosocial knowledge effectiveness. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 23(5), 889–914. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of management journal*, 37(3), 580–607. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Tang, M., & Werner, C. H. (2017). An interdisciplinary and intercultural approach to creativity and innovation: Evaluation of the EMCI ERASMUS intensive program. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 24, 268–278. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Valentini, C. (2021). Trust research in public relations: an assessment of its conceptual, theoretical and methodological foundations. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 26(1), 84–106. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Vătămănescu, E. M., Cegarra-Navarro, J. G., Andrei, A. G., Dincă, V. M., & Alexandru, V. A. (2020). SMEs strategic networks and innovative performance: a relational design and methodology for knowledge sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 24(6), 1369–1392. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

Оксана Лентюшенкова, доцент, доктор наук, Університет прикладних наук ЕКА, Латвія

Культурний інтелект та міжособистісна довіра як драйвери інноваційної розвитку інтелектуального капіталу в організаціях

Основною метою дослідження є визначення впливу культурного інтелекту та міжособистісної довіри на інноваційну поведінку працівників та розвиток інтелектуального капіталу в організаціях. Дослідження науково-теоретичного ландшафту теорій інноваційного розвитку та управління трудовими ресурсами свідчать про те, що менеджери з вищим рівнем культурного інтелекту мають більший рівень міжособистісної довіри. У результаті вони є більш гнучкими в прийнятті та створенні нових ідей та рішень. Більшість з них діляться своїм досвідом та знаннями, приймають різні точки зору і сприяють формуванню відповідної організаційної культури. Це надає можливість зміцнення всіх складових інтелектуального капіталу та сприяє конкурентоспроможності організації. Культурний інтелект та міжособистісна довіра створюють передумови для інноваційної поведінки в організаціях через розвиток інтелектуального капіталу. Наукова література містить різні дослідження щодо культурного інтелекту та його впливу на результати діяльності організацій. Більшість з них спрямовані на інтеграцію мігрантів у роботу організацій. У сучасному робочому середовищі, особливо після пандемії Covid-19 і в умовах глобалізації та цифровізації, спостерігаємо міжкультурні виклики, такі як розвиток міжособистісної довіри та культурного інтелекту. Об'єктом цього дослідження 93 менеджери закладів вищої освіти Латвії. Для збору та аналізу даних використано якісні та кількісні методи дослідження. Для збору даних використано напівструктуровані інтерв'ю. Методичний інструментарій дослідження розроблено на основі систематизації існуючих характеристик міжособистісної довіри: залученість до роботи; рівень культурного інтелекту. Одним із важливих результатів, отриманих під час дослідження, є той факт, що менеджери з міжнародним досвідом (робота чи навчання за кордоном) є більш критичними у співпраці в міжнародних командах та розвитку міжособистісної довіри в міжкультурних командах. Цей факт може стати об'єктом подальших досліджень. Отримані результати та рекомендації можуть бути корисними для майбутніх досліджень щодо факторів, які впливають на розвиток культурного інтелекту в міжкультурних організаціях та його роль у розвитку інноваційного управління інтелектуальним капіталом.

Ключові слова: культурний інтелект; інноваційна поведінка; інтелектуальний капітал; довіра.