Organizational Psychology, 2025, Vol. 15, No. 4, P. 240–254.
DOI: 10.17323/2312-5942-2025-15-4-140-154

ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

www.orgpsyjournal.hse.ru

Cultural intelligence, perceived inclusion, trust in colleagues among employees from Russian disability-inclusive organizations

Zijun LI
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5290-4197
Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russian Federtion

Lyudmila V. TOKARSKAYA
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2385-9227
Ural Federal University, Yekaterinburg, Russian Federation

Abstract. The workplace is becoming increasingly culturally diverse, the ability and skill to effectively function in intercultural contexts is a necessity for most contemporary employees. Cultural intelligence highlights the reason why certain individuals could adapt and perform more productively than others. It has been growingly discussed in the business area and noticed in the field of ethnic identity and cultural conflicts. However, there is rare finding about cultural intelligence in the disability-involved work environments. *Purpose*. This present study aims to investigate cultural intelligence of employees from disability inclusive organizations in Russia, and its significantly positive influence for individual perceived inclusion and trust in colleagues in the workplace. *Method*. A 26-item questionnaire (including Cultural Intelligence Scale, Affective Trust Scale, and Work Social Inclusion Scale) was managed with a sample size of 153 employees (48 employees with physical disabilities; 105 cooperative able-bodied colleagues). The data obtained was analyzed using descriptive analysis via SPSS 26.0 and a Structural Equation Model analysis via AMOS 26.0. *Findings*. Motivational and behavioral cultural intelligence were found to significantly foster individual perceived inclusion in disability-inclusive environment. Additionally, individual perceived inclusion was indicated to significantly facilitate their trust in colleagues. *Research implications.* This present paper sheds light on cultural intelligence as a new solution for interactive effectiveness in disability-inclusive work contexts.

Keywords: cultural intelligence, perceived inclusion, trust in colleagues, disability-inclusive work environment, confirmatory factor analysis.

Introduction

As the anthropologist Robert Murphy wrote in his book The Silent Body, the body is not a thing, it is a situation, it is a social identity, and the disabled community is not isolated from society, nor is it fully integrated into society (Murphy, 1995). Employees with disabilities in the workplace are also faced with identity and delicate situation, whether it is social identity or cultural identity, they are different from non-disabled groups, they are absorbed into the workplace, but they are often not fully integrated, and the interaction with non-disabled colleagues or superiors is often ineffective.

Address: Lenin Avenue, 51, Yekaterinburg 620075, Russian Federation. **E-mail**: tszytsziun.li@urfu.ru

Employees with disabilities in the work environment seem to be blurred, rarely mentioned their work ability, occupational personality characteristics, career development, work-related cognition, emotion and behavior, and the relationship between colleagues and the work environment are relatively isolated.

With growing workforce diversity and inclusive hiring, people with disabilities (PWD) have been considered as the worldwide largest minority and one of the most undervalued potential workforces. More and more employers and managers consider hiring and retaining PWD. It has reported various advantages of hiring PWD, such as financial profits, improved retention and reducing turnover, great company image, competitive benefits, innovation skills, employee loyalty, reliability, punctuality and so on (Lindsay et al., 2018).

Whereas, from the perspective of cultural model, disability is considered as the diversity and different culture (Michalko, 2002; Snyder, Mitchell, 2006; Titchkosky, 2007). One of the most recognized definitions of culture considers it as "the collective programming of the mind that differentiates members of one category or group from people of another" (Hofstede, 2001; Hofstede, 1980). Building on it culture to be the synthesis of collective patterns of thought, perception and action of a society (Fischer, 2022). Individuals in different cultural groups often differ in perception and behavior patterns and so on. This is precisely in line with the social identity of persons with disabilities and their own cultural identity, and disabled groups themselves feel that they are different from non-disabled groups in the work environment. Thereby, employees with disabilities may face a lower sense of inclusiveness. And followingly, they are usually confronted with discomfort, high stress, far social distance, low sense of belonging, low trust, and low job satisfaction in the workplace (O'Reilly et al., 1989; Tsui et al., 1992; Zenger, Lawrence, 1989; Chan, Goto, 2003; Ayub, Jehn, 2014). On the other hand, able-bodied colleagues who co-work with employees with disabilities are feeling also difficult to trust competency of PWD and build affective trust and emotional bonds with them.

The importance of trust and inclusion in diverse teams has been well-documented. Henry and colleagues yielded trust in colleagues as crucial element for PWD to build an employment collaborative in work environment (Henry et al., 2015). They discussed its significance for effective communication and collaborative process between employees with and without disabilities. It has been supported by Schwartz and Durkin's research (Schwartz, Durkin, 2020). But scarce research has been done on how to improve trust and inclusion in disability-inclusive work teams.

Therefore, this article introduces the new concept of cultural intelligence in the field of disability-inclusive work team, aims to explore cultural intelligence as an effective solution to enhance employees' perceived inclusion and following trust between colleagues.

Theoretical background

Cultural intelligence (CQ) is conceptualized as the ability of the individual to adapt and interact effectively to new cultural contexts. It was first introduced by P. C. Earley and S. Ang (Earley, Ang, 2003). It refers to a capability that allows individuals to realize, understand and act appropriately across a broad range of cultural situations (Thomas, 2006). Scholars and practitioners have widely discussed about conceptualization, factors, relations and outcomes of CQ for the last two decades in the trend of globalization, international management, and workforce diversification. Ang and colleagues defined CQ as a four-factor construct which encompasses metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral facets (Ang et al., 2007). Metacognitive CQ refers to the mental ability to acquire and evaluate cultural knowledge. It concentrates on awareness and controlling of cognitive processes (Flavell, 1979). Cognitive CQ includes general knowledge and related systems about cultures and cultural differences. And motivational CQ focuses on the mental ability to direct and support functioning and performing in intercultural contexts. Behavioral CQ refers to the ability to adapt

and flexibly behave in different cultural situations (van Dyne et al., 2012; Ng et al., 2012). Furthermore, van Dyne and colleagues expanded the concept of CQ from four primary facets towards more detailed sub-dimensions for each facet (van Dyne et al., 2012). Regarding metacognitive CQ, they delineated planning, awareness and checking as sub-dimensions. Regarding cognitive CQ, they listed cultural-general knowledge and context-specific knowledge (Cushner, Brislin, 1996). Regarding motivational CQ, they underlined intrinsic interest, extrinsic interest and self-efficacy as its sub-dimensions (Deci, Ryan, 1985; Bandura, 2002). Besides, in regard to behavioral CQ, they identified verbal and non-verbal behavior, and speech acts as its sub-dimensions (Spencer-Oatey, 2008).

In order to realize the predicting role of CQ in the business practices, growing attention has been paid to outcomes of CQ in intercultural situations, such as intercultural adjustment (Templer et al., 2006; Earley, Peterson, 2004; Ayoko et al., 2022; Wawrosz, Jurásek, 2023), global leadership (Rockstuhl et al., 2011; Yalçınyigit, Aktas, 2023), expatriate effectiveness (Chen et al., 2010; Lee, Sukoco, 2010), intercultural negotiation effectiveness (Imai, Gelfand, 2010; Ayoko et al., 2022). In detail, the positive relationship has been demonstrated between motivational CQ and cross-cultural adjustment (Templer et al., 2006). Findings from international university students shew that facets of CQ best predict intercultural adjustment (Wawrosz, Jurásek, 2023). And it has been found that CQ strongly predicted cross-border leadership effectiveness among 126 Swiss military officers, who were equipped with domestic as well as cross-border leadership responsibilities (Rockstuhl et al., 2011). Four factors of CQ have been highlighted to have positive relationship with leadership styles, and metacognitive CQ positively related to transformational leadership (Yalçınyigit, Aktas, 2023). Chen and colleagues drew on the findings that motivational CQ was positively related with work adjustment and job performance among expatriates (Chen et al., 2010). It has also been underlined that the positive influence of CQ on expatriate performance was mediated by cultural adjustment and cultural effectiveness (Lee, Sukoco, 2010). Controlling for other types of intelligence, personality and international experience, CQ has been examined influencing intercultural negotiation processes and outcomes between American and East Asian negotiators. Consistently, O. B. Ayoko and colleagues suggested that intercultural communication and conflict were directly related to socio-cultural adaptation, and facets of CQ moderated the link between them (Ayoko et al., 2022). In the last decade, the field of research on cultural intelligence has become broader, and many new research concerns have emerged.

Even though it was initially described in the field of intercultural business, CQ should have much more broad fields rather than merely business and management narratives. Earley and Peterson believed that CQ "is the ability to engage in a set of behaviors that uses skills (e.g. language or interpersonal skills) and qualities (e.g. tolerance for ambiguity, flexibility) that are tuned appropriately to the culture-based values and attitudes of the people with whom one interacts" (Earley, Peterson, 2004). CQ is not only defined as an individual's capability in adjusting to a new cultural context, but also his or her ability to manage people who have dissimilar cultural backgrounds and mindsets (Earley, Ang, 2003; Earley et al., 2006; Ang et al., 2007). Recently, scholars have suggested new implications and avenues for CQ. It has been suggested that facets of CQ moderated the relation between conflict communication behaviors and socio-cultural adaptation among international organizational employees from 30 countries (Ayoko et al., 2022). Likewise, CQ includes both content and process components (Earley et al., 2006). It has been considered as a "cultural-free concept", that is, CQ could be applied across cultures rather than in the specific cultural context (Ng, Earley, 2006). Recently, scholars have been expanding the links to CQ in ethnic and social minority issues. T. T. Olonisakin shew that CQ was directly related with ethnic identification (Olonisakin, 2023). As well, CQ was suggested to encourage an open-mindedness which helps productive social interactions in multi-group countries.

Chigarkova and Soldatova reviewed its concept and studying trends of empirical research into CQ (Chigarkova, Soldatova, 2018). It provoked the popularity in studies of it in Russia and highlighted the new research points in other intercultural phenomena like ethnic identity rather than only in the field of management and organizational psychology. Furthermore, their empirical study

has underlined the relations between cultural intelligence, ethnic identity and intercultural tolerance among Russian respondents. It investigated cultural intelligence, tolerance and ethnic identity types, and found that compared with mono-ethnic residents, bi-ethnic and multi-ethnic residents hold higher cultural intelligence and tolerance (Soldatova et al., 2018; Soldatova, Chigarkova, 2019). In general, concept of cultural intelligence has been recognized overseas, however, so far scarcity has been underlined in the Russian psychological science. Moreover, studies of cultural intelligence still have poorly uncovered intercultural interactive situations like ethnic identity, interactions with minority social groups.

Hypotheses development

Perceived inclusion

Perceived inclusion has been well-documented as vital element of the effective cooperation in culturally diverse organization. It has been conceptualized as an individual's perceptions of belonging and being valued for what makes them unique and different within a group (Shore et al., 2011; Mor Barak, 2016). The relation between CQ with perceived inclusion has been gradually discussed recently. CQ equips individuals the competence to realize the cultural differences, to value and appreciate the unique skills of each cultural group. Thus, high CQ individuals are more able to well interact with out-group teammates despite distinctions and to gain their acceptance as well as to build a sense of familiarity (Joardar et al., 2007; Afsar et al., 2021).

In specific, it has been identified that individuals' CQ predicts their perceived inclusion in workgroups among international business course undergraduates (Alexandra et al., 2020). Besides, study by Randel and Alexandra supported that CQ significantly influence individual perceived inclusion (Randel, Alexandra, 2024). And their study enriched with more complicated framework in which CQ facilitated perceived inclusion through the mediating effects of synchrony preference and perceived workgroup similarity. Yet there is limited research revealing the relation between CQ with perceived inclusion in culturally diverse contexts. Thereby, this study originally aims to investigate the effect of CQ on perceived inclusion in the disability-inclusive situation and poses hypotheses building on existing evidence.

H1: Cultural intelligence significantly fosters perceived inclusion of employees in inclusive workplace;

Considering four facets of CQ, this present extends four sub-hypotheses as follows.

H1a: Metacognitive cultural intelligence significantly fosters perceived inclusion of employees in inclusive workplace;

H1b: Cognitive cultural intelligence significantly fosters perceived inclusion of employees in inclusive workplace;

H1c: Motivational cultural intelligence significantly fosters perceived inclusion of employees in inclusive workplace;

H1d: Behavioral cultural intelligence significantly fosters perceived inclusion of employees in inclusive workplace.

Interpersonal trust

A key challenge in building an effective disability-inclusive workplace is to increase trust among employees. Currently, trust is broadly defined as a state of mind, specifically, a willingness to accept vulnerability or risk based on positive expectations of the intentions or actions of others (Rousseau et al., 1998). Trust is the vital element of any positive communication relationship (Gould-Williams, Davies, 2005) and an essential prerequisite for interaction in the face of uncertainty and vulnerability. In disability-inclusive workplaces, there are differences in behavior patterns among colleagues, and the uncertainty and vulnerability of interpersonal cooperation are also increased, which makes trust an important determinant.

Perceived inclusion indicates the degree to which a person feels part of a group within an organization. From the aspect of self-classification theory (Turner, Reynolds, 2011), which explains the process of internalizing in-group and out-of-group membership, individuals value their in-group membership, which helps promote positive cooperative relationships with other members of the group (Hogg, 2016). In-group acceptance often leads to many positive outcomes (Turner, 1975), such as increased loyalty, cooperation, and trustworthiness (Brewer, 2007; Brewer, Kramer, 1986). Hence, individual with high perceived inclusion may feel easy to trust in colleagues in his or her work environment. Existing study has provided supportive proof that perceived inclusion is an important and critical factor in building trust. For instance, S. Akram and Z. Peraiz's study has suggested that social inclusion has positive and significant effect on trust in the work environment (Akram, Peraiz, 2024). Hence, this present paper proposes Hypothesis 2.

H2: Perceived inclusion significantly fosters trust in colleagues in the inclusive work environment.

Method

Sample

Totally 153 valid responses from employees with and without disabilities in Russia (Yekaterinburg, Chelyabinsk, Kazan, Tyumen, Kaliningrad) were collected. They all work in the disability-inclusive organizations including institutes, museums, social enterprises and companies. In details, 48 employees with physical disabilities and 105 able-bodied employees who co-work with PWD in work environment have participated in our survey. Demographics of samples are shown in Table 1. Forms were filled out either on paper or via Google Form at participants' convenience. For instance, for visually impaired employees, filling out the questionnaire online is more comfortable. All participants were informed that survey responses would be kept anonymous by the research team.

Table 1. Sample characteristics (N = 153)

Variables	Classifications	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Female	89	58.2
	Male	64	41.8
	Total	153	100
Age	20-30 years old	10	6.5
	30-40 years old	40	26.1
	40-50 years old	52	34.0
	50-60 years old	38	24.8
	More than 60 years old	13	8.5
	Total	153	100
Type of disability	Blindness	18	11.8
	Mobility impairment	29	18.9
	Hearing loss	1	0.7
	Able-bodied	105	68.6
	Total	153	100
Educational level	No high education	65	42.5
	High education	79	51.6
	Graduated	9	5.9
	Total	153	100
Tenure	1-3 years	43	28.1
	3-6 years	28	18.3
	6-10 years	22	14.4
	More than 10 years	60	39.2
	Total	153	100

Position	Initial position	42	27.5
	Middle position	60	39.2
	Managerial position	51	33.3
	Total	153	100

Measurement of constructs

Our scale was developed building on existing literature and previously validated scales.

The traditional four-dimension ***Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS)*** developed by S. Ang with colleagues in 2007 has been selected as technique to measure cultural intelligence (Ang et al., 2007). This original scale was created according to four-dimension concept of CQ and it was validated firstly in Singapore and U.S. (Ang et al., 2007; Ang, van Dyne, 2008). It totally encompasses four constructs and 20 items in the format of seven-dimensional Likert Scale, four items for metacognitive construct, six items for cognitive construct, five items for motivational construct and five items for behavioral construct. Gradually, it has been commonly used to measure CQ with good construct validity by far (Matsumoto, Hwang, 2013).

In Russia, E. V. Belovol with colleagues in 2012 firstly translated the original four-facet 20-item CQS and assessed the adaptive Russian scale by a panel of psychological experts (Belovol et al., 2012). As well, the Russian adaptive version was conducted among 87 Russian participants, and its reliability and construct validity were well supported (Cronbach's alpha = 0.877). Thereby, we apply the Russian adaptive Cultural Intelligence Scale (Belovol et al., 2012) to investigate cultural intelligence.

Besides, three-item ***Work Social Inclusion Scale*** (Pearce, Randel, 2004) has been double-blindly translated and adapted for measuring perceived inclusion with the help of two Russian psychology experts. Likewise, this present article measured trust in colleagues by three-items, which following the standard ***Affective Trust Scale*** (McAllister, 1995).

In general, we compiled 26 statements on a seven-dimensional Likert scale and surveyed 153 subjects. Response categories towards each statement range from 1 to 7, where "1" indicates "strongly disagree", and "7" indicates "strongly agree". Detailed constructs and items are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Constructs and their items.

Constructs	Items
Metacognitive Cultural Intelligence (Ang, van Dyne, 2008; Belovol et al., 2012)	1. I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds (CQMC1). 2. I adjust my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from a culture that is unfamiliar to me (CQMC2). 3. I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross- cultural interactions (CQMC3). 4. I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures (CQMC4).
Cognitive Cultural Intelligence (Ang, van Dyne, 2008; Belovol et al., 2012)	5. I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures (CQK1). 6. I know the rules (e.g., vocabulary, grammar) of other languages (CQK2). 7. I know the cultural values and religious beliefs of other cultures (CQK3). 8. I know the marriage systems of other cultures (CQK4). 9. I know the arts and crafts of other cultures (CQK5). 10. I know the rules for expressing non-verbal behaviors in other cultures (CQK6).
Motivational Cultural Intelligence (Ang, van Dyne, 2008; Belovol et al., 2012)	11. I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures (CQM1). 12. I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me (CQM2). 13. I am sure I can deal with the stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me (CQM3). 14. I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me (CQM4). 15. I am confident that I can get accustomed to the shopping conditions in a different culture (CQM5).

Behavioral Cultural Intelligence (Ang, van Dyne, 2008; Belovol et al., 2012)	16. I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it (CQB1). 17. I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations (CQB2). 18. I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it (CQB3). 19. I change my non-verbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it (CQB4). 20. I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it (CQB5).
Perceived inclusion (Pearce, Randel, 2004)	21. I feel like an accepted part of a team (PI1). 22. I feel included in most activities at work (PI2). 23. I feel appreciated for my skills or competence in the work team (PI3).
Trust in Colleagues (McAllister, 1995)	24. I have a sharing relationship with colleagues we can freely share ideas feelings and hopes (T1). 25. I can talk freely to my colleagues about difficulties I am having at work and know that they will want to listen (T2). 26. I would have to say that we have both made considerable emotional investments in our working relationship (T3).

Results

Reliability and validity

Before verifying the structural model of the hypotheses, it is crucial to examine the measurement model. Therefore, we first confirmed the validity and reliability of the selected constructs through internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha), composite reliability (CR) and convergent validity (average variance extracted) and all results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Convergent validity and reliability

Construct	Items	FL	Alpha	CR	AVE
Metacognitive cultural intelligence	CQMC1	.943	.980	.969	.886
	CQMC2	.940			
	CQMC3	.946			
	CQMC4	.937			
Cognitive cultural intelligence	CQK1	.898	.965	.965	.822
	CQK2	.825			
	CQK3	.939			
	CQK4	.888			
	CQK5	.942			
	CQK6	.942			
Motivational cultural intelligence	CQM1	.908	.901	.889	.620
	CQM2	.894			
	CQM3	.659			
	CQM4	.691			
	CQM5	.750			
Behavioral cultural intelligence	CQB1	.792	.830	.852	.536
	CQB2	.753			
	CQB3	.752			
	CQB4	.681			
	CQB5	.675			
Perceived inclusion	PI1	.811	.832	.799	.572
	PI2	.753			
	PI3	.701			
Trust	T1	.752	.800	.769	.528
	T2	.787			
	T3	.632			

Notes: FL = factor loading, Alpha = Cronbach's alpha, CR = composite reliability, AVE = average variance extracted.

This present paper conducted Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) via AMOS 26.0 analysis software (Kline, 2023; Byrne, 2010; Babin et al., 2008). All factor loadings are above the threshold of 0.6, which suggests all items of constructs are statistically meaningful and they represent their latent variable well. The internal consistency reliability was assessed via SPSS 26.0 and all Cronbach's alpha values are above 0.8, which suggests that the questionnaire has high internal consistency. Moreover, composite reliability (CR) has been calculated based on factor loadings. All composite reliability (CR) exceeding the threshold of 0.7 (Hair et al., 2017; Hair et al., 2020) suggests that the measurement model is reliable (Fornell, Larcker, 1981). Likewise, all average variance extracted (AVE) values of all the constructs are above the recommended level of 0.5 (Hair et al., 2017), which suggests the convergent validity of the questionnaire and measurement model could be accepted.

In addition, the discriminant validity was tested via Fornell — Larcker criterion. From table 4, it is apparent that the square roots of the AVE's for each of the constructs are greater in comparison with the inter-construct correlations. The findings underline the existence of discriminant validity among constructs.

Table 4. Discriminant validity (Fornell — Larcker criterion)

Variance	CQMC	CQK	CQM	CQB	PI	Trust
CQMC	.941					
CQK	.033	.907				
CQM	.474	.218	.787			
CQB	.417	.349	.568	.732		
PI	.364	.279	.682	.662	.756	
Trust	.220	.341	.480	.549	.679	.727

Note: CQMC = metacognitive cultural intelligence, CQK = cognitive cultural intelligence, CQM = motivational cultural intelligence, CQB = behavioral cultural intelligence, PI = perceived inclusion, Trust = trust in colleagues.

Hypotheses testing

This article verifies the hypotheses by a Structural Equation Model (SEM) via AMOS 26.0 (Hershberger, 2003). The model has a good fit which indicated by the factor analysis results. The χ^2/df = 2.049, which is lower than 3. And Comparative Fit Index (CFI) is 0.982, the Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) is 0.967, Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) is 0.948, GFI, AGFI and CFI all above the threshold level of 0.9. Additionally, the Root Mean Square Error Approximation (RMSEA) equals 0.046, which is less than the 0.05 level (Hair et al., 2010). And Table 5 provides the results of hypotheses testing.

Table 5. Summary of hypotheses results

Hypothesis	Unstd.	Std.	P-value	Remark
H1a: CQMC → PI	.083	.112	.412	Not supported
H1b: CQK → PI	.152	.187	.175	Not supported
H1c: CQM → PI	.385	.304	.040*	Supported
H1d: CQB → PI	.536	.492	.005**	Supported
H1: CQ → PI	–	–	–	Partly supported
H2: PI → Trust	.896	.869	***	Supported

Note: significance * — $p < 0.05$; ** — $p < 0.01$, *** — $p < 0.001$.

Results partly confirmed five hypotheses posed by this present paper. H1c, H1d and H2 are supported, while H1a and H1b are rejected. Building on the hypotheses testing results, 1) motivational cultural intelligence significantly fosters individual perceived inclusion in disability-inclusive environment (at the significance level of 0.05); 2) behavioral cultural intelligence significantly facilitates individual perceived inclusion in disability-inclusive environment (at the significance level of 0.01); 3) individual perceived inclusion significantly facilitates their trust in colleagues in disability-inclusive environment (at the significance level of 0.001).

Discussion

This present article focused on three facets such as cultural intelligence, perceived inclusion and trust in colleagues of employees from disability-inclusive organizations in Russia. It proposed to investigate the dependence of individual perceived inclusion on cultural intelligence and its impact on trust in colleagues in the work team. Our methodology partly reinforced proposed hypotheses and allowed to prompt several findings as follows.

The dependence of personal perceived inclusion on behavioral and motivational cultural intelligence has been revealed, which is in line with past literature (Alexandra et al., 2021; Alexandra, 2023; Bourke et al., 2020; Eden et al., 2024). Motivational and behavioral cultural intelligence serve as crucial contributors to make employees feel more included in their organizations. It has been highlighted by the past evidence that motivational and behavioral cultural intelligence predict cultural adaptation, cultural adjustment and well-being (Ang et al., 2007). From the perspective of identification theory, intercultural adaptation is closely connected with perceived inclusion. An employee in disability-inclusive work environment with higher motivational or behavioral cultural intelligence feels greater sense of belongingness and more acknowledged with his uniqueness in the organization.

While the significant influence of metacognitive or cognitive cultural intelligence on perceived inclusion was not detected in our study. This is an interesting finding. It suggests the need for further research. To some extent, previous research has also laid supportive evidence. Ang and colleagues demonstrated that four facets of cultural intelligence have differential links to affective, cognitive, and behavioral cross-cultural effectiveness (Ang et al., 2007). Metacognitive and cognitive cultural intelligence are generally considered to be related to cross-cultural decision-making or task performance, whereas motivational and behavioral cultural intelligence are more predictive of cross-cultural adaptation.

Lastly, this research provided evidence that employee's perceived inclusion significantly facilitates his trust in colleagues in the context of disability inclusion. It is consistent with past evidence, which perceived inclusion has been argued to moderate the relationship between diversity practices and trust climate (Downey et al., 2015). Building on theories of in-group and out-group identity, inclusion describes the degree to which an individual perceives he is a part of the organization's in-group. High acceptance into the in-group promotes positive relationships among group members such as trustworthiness and cooperation (Brewer, 2007; Brewer, Kramer, 1986).

Conclusion

Building trust among employees in an organization has been a hot topic for many years, especially in the current trend of becoming more cross-cultural and diverse. In this article, we discussed a type of organizational environment that has received less attention, that is, disability-inclusive organizations. For disability inclusion organizations, where have been brave enough to break down the "untouchable" wall, trust plays a vital role from acceptance to integration. Moreover, the diversity of the workforce highlights the need for inclusion. This article reveals the importance of employee's cultural intelligence and its impact on perceived inclusion and the latter's subsequent role in promoting trust among employees. There have been scarce studies aimed at relations among cultural competence, perceived inclusion and trust in Russian disability-inclusive organizations. It theoretically enriches the research into disability inclusion effectiveness and provides evidence about the significance of cultural intelligence in disability-inclusive work team. In the meantime, it sheds new insight for consultants and organizational managers to pay more attention on developing employee's cultural intelligence and perceived inclusion.

2013Apart from useful insights generated by the present study, it has several shortcomings. These shortcomings will pave the way for further research in the future.

Firstly, the sample size of this present study is relatively limited. There are certain objective reasons behind it. At present, in Russia, there are not sufficient organizations that truly accept employees with physical disabilities for full-time employment, the proportion of disabled employees and the proportion of physically able-bodied employees who have direct and regular cooperation and interaction with disabled employees in the organization is relatively small. This study encountered certain setbacks in the sample collection stage, and the questionnaire recovery rate was generally low. However, with the continuous development of inclusive hiring, the supporting conditions for subsequent research will be created. Future research is warranted to be based on larger and more representative samples.

Secondly, this study relying on self-reported data is considered the second limitation as participants may not exactly assess themselves, which could lead to common method bias. This study suggests thorough investigations with diverse approaches on this topic in the future.

Considering that the effectiveness of employment for people with disabilities is still a relatively new topic, even though it has been put on the agenda, there is still a lot of work to be done. The creation of interactive programs that promote the development of employees' cultural intelligence and perceived inclusion and tracking the benefits this brings to disability-inclusive organizations will be a further research direction for this paper.

Funding

The study was carried out within the framework of a grant from the Russian Science Foundation (RSF) for research project No. 24-28-01409 "Fundamental approaches to designing sensory-friendly environments for people with disabilities".

Acknowledgement

All participants and all involved disability-inclusive organizations are gratefully acknowledged by the authors.

References

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.

Alexandra, V., Ehrhart, K. H., Randel, A. E. (2021). Cultural intelligence, perceived inclusion, and cultural diversity in workgroups. *Personality and Individual Differences, 168*, 110285.

Alexandra, V. (2023). Cultural intelligence as key competency for inclusion in diverse workgroups and organizations. In D. C. Thomas and Yu. Liao (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence Research* (310–323). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Akram, S., Pervaiz, Z. (2024). The role of institutions and social inclusion in trust building. *Quality & Quantity*, 1–17.

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

Ang, S., van Dyne, L. (2008). Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness, and nomological network. In S. Ang, L. van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications* (3– 15). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Ayoko, O. B., Zhang, Y., Nicoli, J. (2022). Conflict and socio-cultural adaptation: the mediating and moderating role of conflict communication behaviors and cultural intelligence. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 33*(17), 3451–3491. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2021.1910535

Ayub, N., Jehn, K. (2014). When diversity helps performance: Effects of diversity on conflict and performance in workgroups. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 25*(2), 189–212.

Babin, B. J., Hair, J. F., Boles, J. S. (2008). Publishing research in marketing journals using structural equation modeling. *Journal of marketing theory and practice, 16*(4), 279–286.

Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in a cultural context. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 51*, 269–290.

Belovol, E. V., Shkvarilo, K. A., Khvorova, E. M. (2012). Russian-Language Verification of P. C. Earley and S. Ang's "Cultural Intelligence Scale". *RUDN Journal of Psychology and Pedagogics,* (4), 5–14. (in Russian)

Bourke, J., Titus, A., Espedido, A. (2020). The key to inclusive leadership. *Harvard Business Review, 6*, H05GLB.

Brewer, M. B., Kramer, R. M. (1986). Choice behavior in social dilemmas: Effects of social identity, group size, and decision framing. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 50*(3), 543.

Brewer, M. B. (2007). The importance of being we: human nature and intergroup relations. *American psychologist, 62*(8), 728.

Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: basic concepts, applications, and programming (multivariate applications series)*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

Chan, D. K. S., Goto, S. G. (2003). Conflict resolution in the culturally diverse workplace: Some data from Hong Kong employees. *Applied Psychology, 52*(3), 441–460.

Chen, G., Kirkman, B. L., Kim, K., Farh, C. I. C., Tangirala, S. (2010). When does cross-cultural motivation enhance expatriate effectiveness? A multilevel investigation of the moderating roles of subsidiary support and cultural distance. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(5), 1110–1130. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2010.54533217

Chigarkova, S., Soldatova, G. (2018). Cultural intelligence as a socio-psychological phenomenon: a review of the conception. *National Psychological Journal, 4*, 27–38. (in Russian)

Cushner, K., Brislin, R. W. (1996). *Intercultural Relations: A Practical Guide* (2nd edn). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum.

Downey, S. N., van der Werff, L., Thomas, K. M., Plaut, V. C. (2015). The role of diversity practices and inclusion in promoting trust and employee engagement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 45*(1), 35–44.

Dyne van, L., Ang, S., Ng, K. Y., Rockstuhl, T., Tan, M. L., Koh, C. (2012). Sub-dimensions of the four factor model of cultural intelligence: Expanding the conceptualization and measurement of cultural intelligence. *Social and personality psychology compass, 6*(4), 295–313. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2012.00429.x

Earley, P. C., Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford University Press.

Earley, P. C., Ang, S., Tan, J. S. (2006). *CQ: Developing cultural intelligence at work*. Stanford University Press.

Earley, P. C., Peterson, R. S. (2004). The elusive cultural chameleon: Cultural intelligence as a new approach to intercultural training for the global manager. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 3*(1), 100–115. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMLE.2004.12436826

Eden, C. A., Chisom, O. N., Adeniyi, I. S. (2024). Cultural competence in education: strategies for fostering inclusivity and diversity awareness. *International Journal of Applied Research in Social Sciences, 6*(3), 383–392.

Fischer, N. (2022). *Cultural Intelligence — A key competence in intercultural sales? A study across three cultural contexts (France, India & England)* (Doctoral dissertation, Université de Montpellier).

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Meta-cognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive inquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*, 906–911.

Fornell, C., Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research, 18*(1), 39–50.

Gould-Williams, J., Davies, F. (2005). Using social exchange theory to predict the effects of HRM practice on employee outcomes: An analysis of public sector workers. *Public management review, 7*(1), 1–24.

Hair, J., Hollingsworth, C. L., Randolph, A. B., Chong, A. Y. L. (2017). An updated and expanded assessment of PLS-SEM in information systems research. *Industrial management & data systems, 117*(3), 442–458.

Hair Jr, J. F., Howard, M. C., Nitzl, C. (2020). Assessing measurement model quality in PLS-SEM using confirmatory composite analysis. *Journal of business research, 109*, 101–110.

Henry, A. D., Laszlo, A., Nicholson, J. (2015). What does it take to build an employment collaborative for people with disabilities? *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 43*(1), 1–15.

Hershberger, S. L. (2003). The Growth of Structural Equation Modeling: 1994-2001. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 10*(1), 35–46. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM1001_2

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International studies of management & organization, 10*(4), 15–41.

Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online readings in psychology and culture, 2*(1), 8.

Hogg, M. A. (2016). Social identity theory. In S. McKeown, R. Haji, N. Ferguson (Eds.), *Understanding Peace and Conflict Through Social Identity Theory Contemporary Global Perspectives* (3–17). Springer International Publishing.

Imai, L., Gelfand, M. J. (2010). The culturally intelligent negotiator: The impact of cultural intelligence (CQ) on negotiation sequences and outcomes. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 112*(2), 83–98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.02.001

Joardar, A., Kostova, T., Ravlin, E. C. (2007). An experimental study of the acceptance of a foreign newcomer into a workgroup. *Journal of International Management, 13*(4), 513–537.

Kline, R. B. (2023). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling. Guilford publications.

Lee, L. Y., Sukoco, B. M. (2010). The effects of cultural intelligence on expatriate performance: The moderating effects of international experience. *The international journal of human resource management, 21*(7), 963–981. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585191003783397

Lindsay, S., Cagliostro, E., Albarico, M., Mortaji, N., Karon, L. (2018). A systematic review of the benefits of hiring people with disabilities. *Journal of occupational rehabilitation, 28*, 634–655. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-018-9756-z

Matsumoto, D., Hwang, H. C. (2013). Assessing cross-cultural competence: A review of available tests. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology, 44*(6), 849–873.

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect-and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of management journal, 38*(1), 24–59.

Michalko, R. (2002). The difference that disability makes. Temple University Press.

Mor Barak, M. E., Lizano, E. L., Kim, A., Duan, L., Rhee, M. K., Hsiao, H. Y., Brimhall, K. C. (2016). The promise of diversity management for climate of inclusion: A state-of-the-art review and meta-analysis. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance, 40*(4), 305–333.

Murphy, R. (1995). Encounters: The body silent in America. In B. Ingstad and S. R. Whyte (Eds.), *Disability and culture* (140–158). University of California Press

Ng, K. Y., Earley, P. C. (2006). Culture + intelligence: Old constructs, new frontiers. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(1), 4–19.

Ng, K.Y., van Dyne, L., Ang, S. (2012). Cultural intelligence: A review, reflections, and recommendations for future research. In A. M. Ryan, F. T. L. Leong, F. L. Oswald (Eds.), *Conducting multinational research: Applying organizational psychology in the workplace* (29–58). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13743-002

Olonisakin, T. T. (2023). Need for closure and ethnic identification: The varied roles of cultural intelligence in a multiethnic group society. *Journal of Community Psychology, 51*(5), 2035–2051.

O'Reilly III, C. A., Caldwell, D. F., Barnett, W. P. (1989). Work group demography, social integration, and turnover. *Administrative science quarterly, 4*(1), 21–37.

Pearce, J. L., Randel, A. E. (2004). Expectations of organizational mobility, workplace social inclusion, and employee job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 25*(1), 81–98.

Randel, A. E., Alexandra, V. (2024). From cultural intelligence to workgroup inclusion through synchrony preference and perceived workgroup similarity. *Journal of World Business, 59*(1), 101490.

Rockstuhl, T., Seiler, S., Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Annen, H. (2011). Beyond general intelligence (IQ) and emotional intelligence (EQ): The role of cultural intelligence (CQ) on cross-border leadership effectiveness in a globalized world. *Journal of Social Issues, 67*(4), 825–840. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01730.x

Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of management review, 23*(3), 393–404.

Schwartz, A. E., Durkin, B. (2020). "Team is everything": Reflections on trust, logistics and methodological choices in collaborative interviewing. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities, 48*(2), 115–123.

Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K., Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of management, 37*(4), 1262–1289.

Snyder, S., Mitchell, D. (2006). Afterword–regulated bodies: disability studies and the controlling professions. In D. M. Turner and K. Stagg (Eds.), *Social Histories of Disability and Deformity* (175–189). London: Routledge.

Soldatova, G., Chigarkova, S., Rasskazova, E. (2018). Approbation of Expanded Cultural Intelligence Scale in Russian. *Psychology. Journal of Higher School of Economics, 15*(3), 510–526. (in Russian)

Soldatova, G., Chigarkova, S. (2019). The relationship between the feature so finter cultural experience and cultural intelligence. In *XVI European congress of psychology* (1418–1418).

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). Face, (im)politeness, and rapport. In H. Spencer-Oatey (ed.), *Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication, and Politeness Theory*. 2nd ed. (11– 47). London: Continuum.

Templer, K. J., Tay, C., Chandrasekar, N. A. (2006). Motivational cultural intelligence, realistic job preview, realistic living conditions preview, and cross-cultural adjustment. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(1), 154–173. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275293

Thomas, D. C. (2006). Domain and Development of cultural intelligence: The importance of mindfulness. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(1), 78–99. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275266

Titchkosky, T. (2007). *Reading and writing disability differently: The textured life of embodiment.* University of Toronto Press.

Tsui, A. S., Egan, T. D., O'Reilly III, C. A. (1992). Being different: Relational demography and organizational attachment. Administrative science quarterly, 549–579.

Turner, J. C. (1975). Social comparison and social identity: Some prospects for intergroup behaviour. European journal of social psychology, 5(1), 1–34.

Turner, J. C., Reynolds, K. J. (2011). Self-categorization theory. In P. A. M. van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, E. T. Higgins (Eds.), Handbook of theories in social psychology (399–417). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Wawrosz, P., Jurásek, M. (2023). The Role of Cultural Intelligence Facets in Cross-Cultural Adjustment. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 52*(2), 216–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2022.2155863

Yalçınyiğit, S., Aktaş, H. (2023). A Research on the Relationship of Social Intelligence and Cultural Intelligence with Leadership Styles. *Istanbul Business Research, 52*(1). DOI: 10.26650/ibr.2023.52.947907

Zenger, T. R., Lawrence, B. S. (1989). Organizational demography: The differential effects of age and tenure distributions on technical communication. *Academy of Management journal, 32*(2), 353–376.

Received 11.06.2024

Культурный интеллект, воспринимаемая инклюзивность и доверие к коллегам у сотрудников российских инклюзивных организаций

ЛИ Цзицзюнь
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5290-4197
Уральский федеральный университет, Екатеринбург, Российская Федерация

ТОКАРСКАЯ Людмила Валериевна
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2385-9227
Уральский федеральный университет, Екатеринбург, Российская Федерация

Аннотация. Рабочие места становятся всё более культурно разнообразным, и способность и умение эффективно функционировать в межкультурном контексте необходимы большинству современных сотрудников. Культурный интеллект объясняет, почему одни люди могут адаптироваться и работать более продуктивно, чем другие. Он всё чаще обсуждается в деловой сфере и отмечается в области этнической идентичности и межкультурных конфликтов. Однако исследования культурного интеллекта в инклюзивной рабочей среде, встречаются редко. *Цель*. Целью данного исследования является изучение культурного интеллекта сотрудников инклюзивных организаций в России, а также его значимой положительной связи с индивидуально воспринимаемой инклюзивностью и доверием к коллегам на рабочем месте. *Метод*. Был использован опросник из 26 пунктов, который включал адаптированную на русском языке «Шкалу культурного интеллекта», а также «Шкалу аффективного доверия» и «Шкалу социальной инклюзии на рабочем месте»). Выборку составили 153 сотрудника: 48 сотрудников с физическими ограничениями; 105 сотрудничающих сотрудников без ограничений. Полученные данные были проанализированы с помощью описательного анализа в программе SPSS 26.0 и моделирования структурными уравнениями в программе AMOS 26.0. *Результаты*. Было установлено, что мотивационный и поведенческий культурный интеллект значительно способствуют индивидуально воспринимаемой инклюзии в рабочей среде для людей с инвалидностью. Кроме того, было отмечено, что индивидуально воспринимаемая инклюзивность значимо предсказывает доверие к коллегам. *Значимость исследования*. Данная работа проливает свет на культурный интеллект как на новое решение для повышения эффективности взаимодействия в инклюзивных рабочих условиях для людей с инвалидностью.

Ключевые слова: культурный интеллект, воспринимаемая инклюзивность, доверие к коллегам, инклюзивная рабочая среда для людей с инвалидностью, подтверждающий факторный анализ.