Human Error, Reliability, Resilience, and Performance, Vol. 213, 2026, 46–56
https://doi.org/10.54941/ahfe1007553

The Role of Cultural Intelligence in Human Performance

Dimitrios Ziakkas[1], Debra Henneberry[2], and Konstantinos Pechlivanis[3]

[1] Coventry University, Faculty of Engineering, Environment and Computing, Coventry, CV1 5FB, U.K.

[2] Purdue University, School of Aviation and Transportation Technology, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

[3] Department of Production Engineering & Management, Technical University of Crete, Greece

ABSTRACT

Cultural intelligence (CQ) has emerged as a foundational component of human performance across safety-critical, multicultural, and technologically evolving environments. As globalisation reshapes organisational structures and workforce compositions, individuals are increasingly required to collaborate, make decisions, and solve problems in settings characterised by cultural diversity, differing communication norms, and varied cognitive frameworks. This paper examines the role of cultural intelligence in shaping human performance, analysing how CQ enhances adaptability, situational awareness, interpersonal effectiveness, and resilience in complex socio-technical systems such as aviation, healthcare, transportation, and emergency response. The analysis begins by defining cultural intelligence as a multidimensional capability encompassing metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioural components. These dimensions support an individual's capacity to interpret culturally influenced behaviours, reflect on assumptions, regulate affective responses, and adapt actions in culturally heterogeneous contexts. In operational environments where safety and efficiency depend on rapid coordination and shared understanding, cultural intelligence becomes a critical determinant of performance quality. High CQ improves a person's ability to recognise cultural influences on communication patterns, decision-making preferences, conflict-management approaches, and expressions of authority or uncertainty—factors directly linked to team cohesion and operational reliability. The paper then explores the mechanisms through which cultural intelligence influences individual cognitive and behavioural performance. CQ enhances metacognitive monitoring, allowing individuals to detect biases, question cultural assumptions, and adjust mental models when interpreting cues from diverse colleagues or stakeholders. Motivational CQ supports sustained engagement and psychological readiness in multicultural environments, reducing stress, misinterpretation, and cognitive overload. Behavioural CQ enables culturally adaptive action, enhancing clarity, rapport, and trust—essential elements for effective performance in high-pressure situations. Together, these capabilities strengthen resilience, error management, and collaboration in dynamic and uncertain environments. Organisational and systemic implications are also examined. Human performance frameworks often emphasise technical proficiency, workload management, and cognitive ergonomics but under-address cultural adaptability as a component of performance optimisation. In diverse teams, low CQ can manifest as communication breakdowns, reduced assertiveness, conflict escalation, misinterpretation of intent, and diminished psychological safety.

Received February 6, 2026; Revised April 2, 2026; Accepted April 18, 2026; Available online July 20, 2026

Conversely, high CQ contributes to safer and more efficient task execution, improved teamwork, and enhanced decision quality. Industries such as aviation, healthcare, and military operations—where multicultural teams are ubiquitous—demonstrate clear links between cultural intelligence, safety culture, and operational performance. Yet, many organisations lack structured CQ development within selection processes, leadership training, and competency-based assessment models. The paper concludes by proposing a framework for integrating cultural intelligence into human performance enhancement strategies. This model combines metacognitive training, intercultural simulations, behavioural adaptation exercises, and organisational interventions designed to strengthen cultural inclusivity and shared mental models. The findings underscore that cultural intelligence is not an optional interpersonal skill but a core human performance competency required to navigate the complexity of modern global work systems. Ultimately, the paper argues that optimising human performance in the 21st century requires recognising and cultivating CQ as a central driver of safety, collaboration, and organisational resilience.

Keywords: Cultural intelligence (CQ), Human performance, Multicultural teams, Cognitive adaptabilit, Communication, Resilience, Human factors

INTRODUCTION

Human performance in safetycritical systems has traditionally been examined through cognitive workload, procedural adherence, technical skill acquisition, and ergonomic design. These approaches have yielded substantial improvements in safety and efficiency across aviation, healthcare, nuclear power, and emergency response. However, as operational environments become increasingly globalised and culturally heterogeneous, the explanatory power of traditional models becomes constrained. Modern sociotechnical systems are no longer culturally neutral; they are shaped by national, organisational, and professional cultures that influence how individuals perceive risk, communicate uncertainty, and exercise authority.

Empirical evidence across highrisk domains demonstrates that culturally mediated behaviours—such as deference to authority, indirect communication, conflict avoidance, or differing interpretations of responsibility—can significantly influence operational outcomes. These behaviours do not necessarily reflect poor training or inadequate competence; rather, they represent culturally shaped performance strategies that may become maladaptive under certain conditions. When such dynamics are not explicitly addressed, they may erode situational awareness, distort decisionmaking, and introduce latent conditions that undermine system reliability. Empirical research substantiates this relationship: Samiei and Soltani (2022) documented a correlation of $r = 0.63$ between cultural intelligence and employee performance in organizational contexts, while Şahin, Gürbüz, and Şahin (2014) demonstrated that CQ predicts adaptive performance beyond self-efficacy and prior experience. These findings indicate that cultural intelligence accounts for unique performance variance not captured by traditional competency models, reinforcing its status as a distinct, measurable human performance capability.

Within contemporary human factors and safety science, culture is frequently acknowledged but rarely operationalised at the level of individual performance capability. Culture is often treated as a background variable

or organisational attribute rather than as a dynamic influence on cognition and behaviour. Cultural intelligence provides a structured response to this limitation. CQ conceptualises cultural effectiveness as a learnable, measurable capability that enables individuals to function effectively across culturally diverse contexts. This paper positions cultural intelligence as a core human performance variable and examines its role in error management, operational reliability, and resilience.

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CQ & HUMAN PERFORMANCE

Human performance in complex socio-technical systems is fundamentally shaped by the interaction between individual cognition, social structures, organisational norms, and technological constraints. Within this interaction, culture plays a decisive role by influencing how individuals perceive risk, interpret information, exercise authority, and coordinate action. Culture operates simultaneously at multiple levels, including national culture, organisational culture, and professional subcultures, each contributing to shared assumptions about acceptable behaviour and decision-making processes (Hofstede et al., 2010; Guldenmund, 2000).

Classical human factors and safety models have acknowledged culture primarily as a contextual or organisational influence. Reason's model of organisational accidents positions culture as a latent condition shaping defences, supervision, and organisational decision-making (Reason, 1997). Similarly, the Human Factors Analysis and Classification System (HFACS) incorporates cultural elements within the organisational influences layer, typically under broad constructs such as climate or norms (Wiegmann & Shappell, 2003). While these approaches marked an important shift away from individual blame, they offer limited explanatory power for understanding performance variability between individuals operating within the same cultural and organisational environment.

Contemporary safety science increasingly recognises that culture is not merely descriptive but predictive. Cultural patterns influence communication behaviour, error reporting tendencies, tolerance for uncertainty, and responses to authority, all of which have direct implications for operational reliability and resilience (Helmreich & Merritt, 1998). In aviation and other high-risk industries, empirical evidence demonstrates that culturally mediated behaviours can persist despite high technical proficiency, shaping how crews respond to abnormal situations and recover from disturbances (Maurino et al., 1995; Ziakkas et al., 2025).

From a systems perspective, culture functions as a performance-shaping factor analogous to workload, fatigue, or automation complexity. It modulates cognitive processes such as attention allocation, mental model formation, and decision thresholds. When cultural influences remain implicit or unexamined, they can introduce latent vulnerabilities that remain invisible until operational margins are exceeded. This recognition has prompted calls to move beyond static cultural descriptors toward more dynamic, capability-based models that capture how individuals navigate cultural variability in real time.

Conceptualising Cultural Intelligence

Cultural intelligence (CQ) emerged as a response to the limitations of traditional culture-generic and awareness-based approaches. Rather than treating culture as a fixed attribute of groups, CQ conceptualises cultural effectiveness as an individual capability that can be developed, assessed, and applied across contexts. Ang and Van Dyne (2008) define cultural intelligence as an individual's capability to function effectively in situations characterised by cultural diversity. This definition emphasises adaptability and performance rather than cultural knowledge alone.

The CQ construct is grounded in social and cognitive psychology and is operationalised through four interrelated dimensions: metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioural (Ang et al., 2007). These dimensions collectively regulate how individuals acquire cultural knowledge, interpret culturally influenced cues, sustain engagement, and enact adaptive behaviour.

Metacognitive CQ refers to higher-order cognitive processes that enable individuals to plan for, monitor, and adjust their cultural assumptions during interactions. It supports reflective judgment and situational awareness by allowing individuals to recognise when cultural expectations may be shaping interpretation or response (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008). In operational settings, metacognitive CQ is critical for detecting subtle mismatches between intended and perceived meaning, particularly under time pressure.

Cognitive CQ encompasses knowledge of cultural norms, practices, and conventions, including those embedded within professional and organisational subcultures. This dimension extends beyond surface-level awareness to include understanding how different cultures perceive authority, uncertainty, communication, and error. Cognitive CQ reduces attribution errors by providing contextual frameworks for interpreting behaviour accurately (Thomas et al., 2008).

Motivational CQ reflects the interest, confidence, and persistence required to engage effectively in culturally diverse situations. Recent research reveals that CQ's performance effects are partially mediated by psychological states: Yusuf, Rostiana, and Budiana (2024) found that job satisfaction mediates the relationship between cultural intelligence and work performance in multicultural organizations. This mediation pathway suggests that CQ enhances performance not only through direct cognitive and behavioral mechanisms but also by improving affective states that sustain engagement, reduce turnover intentions, and strengthen resilience under cultural ambiguity—particularly relevant in long-duration missions and geographically dispersed operations. It influences the allocation of effort and attention, particularly in challenging or ambiguous interactions. High motivational CQ is associated with greater willingness to initiate communication, seek feedback, and persist under stress, all of which are essential for maintaining performance in safety-critical environments (Ang et al., 2007).

Behavioural CQ refers to the capability to adapt verbal and non-verbal behaviour appropriately across cultural contexts. This includes flexibility in communication style, assertiveness, pacing, and interaction patterns. Behavioural CQ translates awareness and motivation into observable action, enabling effective coordination and trust formation without compromising procedural integrity (Livermore, 2024).

Cultural Intelligence as a Human Performance Capability

Positioning cultural intelligence within human performance theory requires moving beyond its treatment as an interpersonal or leadership skill. In safety-critical systems, CQ functions as a regulatory capability that shapes how cognitive and social processes unfold under operational constraints. By influencing perception, decision-making, and action, CQ directly affects error management, reliability, and resilience.

From a cognitive perspective, CQ enhances metacognitive monitoring and bias regulation. Individuals with higher CQ are more likely to recognise culturally driven assumptions, question initial interpretations, and recalibrate mental models in response to new information. This capability mitigates common error pathways such as confirmation bias, authority bias, and plan continuation bias, which are frequently implicated in accidents (Reason, 1997).

At the behavioural level, CQ supports adaptive communication and coordination. Effective performance in complex systems depends on shared mental models and timely information exchange. Behavioural CQ enables individuals to adjust interaction strategies to maximise clarity and mutual understanding, thereby strengthening coordination and reducing the likelihood of misunderstanding-driven errors (Helmreich & Merritt, 1998).

At the motivational level, CQ contributes to resilience by sustaining engagement and psychological readiness in culturally complex environments. Cultural ambiguity and interpersonal friction can increase cognitive load and stress; motivational CQ supports persistence and assertiveness, enabling individuals to remain effective under pressure (Edmondson, 2019).

Collectively, these mechanisms position cultural intelligence as a core human performance capability rather than a peripheral attribute. Integrating CQ into human performance frameworks aligns with contemporary safety paradigms that emphasise adaptability, learning, and resilience. As socio-technical systems continue to globalise, recognising and operationalising cultural intelligence becomes essential for designing systems that are not only technically robust but also socially and cognitively resilient (Table 1).

Table 1: Dimensions of cultural intelligence and human performance functions.

CQ Dimension	Definition	Primary Human Performance Function
Metacognitive CQ	Awareness and monitoring of cultural assumptions and mental models	Situational awareness, bias detection, error recognition
Cognitive CQ	Knowledge of cultural norms, practices, and expectations	Information interpretation, decision framing
Motivational CQ	Interest, confidence, and persistence in multicultural contexts	Engagement, stress tolerance, resilience
Behavioural CQ	Ability to adapt verbal and nonverbal behaviour	Communication clarity, coordination, trust formation

Metacognitive CQ supports reflective judgment and recalibration of assumptions. Cognitive CQ provides contextual understanding that reduces misinterpretation. Motivational CQ sustains engagement under ambiguity, while behavioural CQ translates awareness and motivation into adaptive action.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative, theory-driven research design grounded in integrative human factors and safety science methodologies. Given the conceptual and systems-oriented nature of cultural intelligence and its role in human performance, an exploratory and analytical approach was selected rather than an experimental or purely empirical design. The objective of the methodology is not to test a single causal hypothesis, but to synthesise established theory, empirical evidence, and regulatory frameworks into a coherent explanatory model suitable for safety-critical socio-technical systems.

The methodological approach aligns with established practices in human factors research, where complex constructs such as resilience, safety culture, and performance variability are examined through conceptual integration, comparative analysis, and framework development (Reason, 1997; Hollnagel et al., 2014). Cultural intelligence is examined as a performance-shaping factor through structured analysis of its dimensions and their interaction with cognitive, behavioural, and organisational performance mechanisms.

The primary data source for this study is an extensive structured review and synthesis of peer-reviewed literature across human factors, aviation psychology, organisational behaviour, and cultural intelligence research. Particular emphasis is placed on empirical findings and applied models documented in the aviation domain, supplemented by evidence from other safety-critical sectors such as healthcare, military operations, and emergency response. Sources include foundational safety theory, regulatory guidance from ICAO, EASA, and FAA, and established CQ measurement and theory literature (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008).

Rather than aggregating quantitative effect sizes, the analysis focuses on identifying recurring patterns, mechanisms, and relationships that link cultural intelligence to human performance outcomes such as error management, decision quality, coordination, and resilience.

The analytical procedure followed a multi-stage process. Firstly, key human performance constructs relevant to safety-critical operations were identified, including situational awareness, decision-making, communication, coordination, and resilience. Secondly, each dimension of cultural intelligence was systematically mapped against these constructs to identify theoretically and empirically supported linkages.

Thirdly, organisational and regulatory frameworks (SMS, CRM, CBTA, EBT) were examined to assess how cultural factors are currently addressed and where gaps exist. This comparative analysis enabled identification of misalignments between recognised performance needs and existing training or safety architectures. Finally, insights from these stages were synthesised

into an integrated Cultural Intelligence–Human Performance framework, presented in Section 5.

The methodology is intentionally conceptual and integrative, prioritising explanatory depth over statistical generalisability. While the framework is grounded in empirical literature, it does not constitute a controlled experimental validation of CQ effects. Instead, it provides a theoretically robust foundation for future empirical testing, simulation-based studies, and operational trials.

This approach is appropriate given the complexity of cultural intelligence as a construct and the ethical and practical constraints associated with experimental manipulation in safety-critical environments. The methodology supports theory building and system design, which are essential precursors to evidence-based intervention.

Table 2: Research methodology overview.

Element	Summary	Purpose
Design & Sources	Qualitative analysis using literature and regulatory guidance	Examine CQ as a performance capability
Core Analysis	Mapping CQ to human performance mechanisms	Identify functional relationships and gaps
Output	Integrated CQ–Human Performance framework	Support training, safety, and system design

FINDINGS

The analysis identifies cultural intelligence (CQ) as a foundational performance-shaping capability in safety-critical socio-technical systems, rather than a peripheral interpersonal skill. Across individual, team, and organisational levels, CQ shapes how risk is perceived, information is interpreted, and actions are coordinated under uncertainty and operational pressure. The synthesis of theory, empirical evidence, and regulatory perspectives indicates that variations in human performance within culturally diverse environments are more closely associated with differences in CQ capability than with technical proficiency alone. A second finding positions CQ as a latent condition within safety systems. When underdeveloped or unsupported, culturally mediated behaviours can exacerbate workload, fatigue, and system complexity, increasing vulnerability to error. In contrast, strong CQ functions as a buffering mechanism, supporting situational awareness, adaptive decision-making, error detection, and recovery. This aligns CQ with established performance-shaping factors and underscores its relevance to safety management, resilience, and human-centred system design.

Cultural Intelligence and Human Error Management

One of the most significant findings relates to the influence of cultural intelligence on human error pathways. The analysis demonstrates that CQ affects not only the occurrence of errors but also their detection, management,

and recovery. Metacognitive CQ, in particular, emerges as a critical factor in recognising weak signals, questioning assumptions, and interrupting error chains before they escalate into adverse outcomes. This finding aligns with empirical evidence from leadership contexts: Shankar and Patel (2025) demonstrated that leaders with higher CQ exhibit superior decision-making, conflict resolution, and team unity in diverse organizational settings. Similarly, Liao and Thomas (2020) established that CQ enhances cultural judgment, decision-making quality, and creativity—outcomes directly applicable to flight deck resource management, where captain decision-making under cultural variability can determine safety margins in non-normal and emergency situations.

In culturally diverse teams, communication behaviours such as indirect speech, silence, or deference to authority may obscure emerging risks. Without sufficient metacognitive and cognitive CQ, these behaviours are prone to misinterpretation, increasing the likelihood of plan continuation bias, confirmation bias, and delayed intervention. High CQ enables individuals to reinterpret such behaviours as potential safety signals rather than benign social conventions, thereby enhancing error sensitivity.

The findings further suggest that motivational and behavioural CQ influence the likelihood that errors are surfaced and addressed. Individuals with higher motivational CQ demonstrate greater willingness to engage, challenge, and persist in difficult interactions, even when cultural norms discourage assertiveness. Behavioural CQ supports the translation of this willingness into effective action, enabling culturally adaptive communication that preserves clarity without undermining procedural authority. Together, these mechanisms contribute to more robust error management and reduced escalation potential.

Implications for Operational Reliability and Resilience

From a resilience engineering perspective, the findings indicate that cultural intelligence strengthens a system's capacity to anticipate, absorb, and recover from disturbances. High-CQ individuals and teams display greater adaptability under stress, maintaining performance despite cultural ambiguity, interpersonal friction, or rapidly changing conditions. This adaptability is not random; it reflects the structured interaction of CQ dimensions with cognitive and behavioural regulation processes.

At the team level, the findings highlight the importance of collective cultural intelligence. Teams characterised by higher aggregate CQ are more likely to establish shared mental models, psychological safety, and mutual trust. These characteristics enable more effective coordination, particularly during non-normal operations where rigid adherence to standard communication patterns may be insufficient. Cultural intelligence thus contributes directly to operational reliability by stabilising interaction patterns in the face of variability. Kokubun, Nemoto, and Yamakawa (2025) provide longitudinal evidence that CQ mediates the relationship between lifestyle factors and expatriate performance, demonstrating that CQ can be improved through deliberate health-focused interventions. Gu (2023) further established that CQ enhances employee performance through improved cross-cultural

adjustment, reducing the adaptation time required for personnel operating in unfamiliar cultural environments.

At the organisational level, CQ-informed systems demonstrate enhanced learning capacity. When cultural dynamics are explicitly recognised and integrated into safety reporting, training, and feedback mechanisms, organisations are better positioned to identify systemic vulnerabilities and implement proactive interventions. This supports a shift from reactive error correction toward anticipatory performance management.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study extend existing human performance and human factors theory by explicitly integrating cultural intelligence into the performance variability discourse. Traditional models have focused on cognitive workload, procedural compliance, and skill degradation, often treating culture as a contextual backdrop. The present analysis demonstrates that culture actively shapes cognitive and behavioural processes and that CQ provides a viable mechanism for operationalising this influence.

By framing cultural intelligence as a human performance capability, the findings challenge the prevailing categorisation of CQ as a soft skill or leadership attribute. Instead, CQ emerges as a regulatory capacity that influences how humans interact with complex systems. This reframing aligns with contemporary safety paradigms that emphasise adaptability, learning, and resilience rather than strict compliance.

The discussion also highlights the limitations of existing safety frameworks. While SMS, CRM, CBTA, and EBT acknowledge communication and teamwork, they lack explicit constructs for assessing and developing cultural adaptability. The findings suggest that this omission contributes to persistent variability in performance outcomes across multicultural operations. Integrating CQ into these frameworks would enhance their explanatory and predictive power.

Organisational and Regulatory Interpretation

From an organisational perspective, the findings underscore the need to treat cultural intelligence as a design variable within training and safety management systems. Selection, training, and assessment processes that overlook CQ risk misattributing performance issues to individual deficiencies or procedural non-compliance. Recognising CQ enables a more nuanced understanding of performance variability and supports targeted interventions. Beyond individual performance, cultural intelligence strengthens organizational cohesion: Alifuddin and Widodo (2022) demonstrated that CQ significantly correlates with interpersonal communication quality, psychological capital, and organizational citizenship behavior. Liao and Thomas (2020) identified CQ as a predictor of trust, collaboration, knowledge transfer, and effective conflict management—outcomes that directly support Safety Management System (SMS) objectives including reporting culture, just culture, and learning culture. This evidence reinforces that CQ development is not merely an individual training objective but an organizational safety strategy. Regulatory bodies increasingly promote competency-based approaches, yet cultural adaptability remains under-specified. The findings suggest

that explicit recognition of CQ within regulatory guidance would support harmonisation across jurisdictions and improve consistency in performance assessment.

CONCLUSION

Cultural intelligence is a foundational human performance capability in modern safetycritical systems. By regulating perception, decisionmaking, communication, and adaptive action, CQ directly influences reliability, resilience, and error management. Treating cultural intelligence as a safetycritical competency rather than a soft skill enables organisations to anticipate performance variability and design more robust systems.Future safety frameworks should explicitly integrate CQ into training, assessment, and regulatory guidance. Optimising human performance in the twentyfirst century requires recognising that culture is not peripheral to safety but central to how humans perform under pressure.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank Technical University - Coventry University - Purdue University faculty members, and HF Horizons analysts for their invaluable feedback, which contributed to this work.

REFERENCES

Alifuddin, M., & Widodo, W. (2022). How is cultural intelligence related to human behavior? *Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental, 16*(9), e03632. https://doi.org/10.24857/rgsa.v16n9-024

Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008). *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications*. Routledge.

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. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x

Edmondson, A. C. (2019). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley.

Gu, G. (2023). Exploring the relationship of cultural intelligence, employee performance, and cross-cultural adjustment in the context of transnational operations. *Journal of Business Research, 167*, 114180. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2023.114180

Guldenmund, F. W. (2000). The nature of safety culture: A review of theory and research. *Safety Science, 34*(1–3), 215–257. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-7535(00)00014-X

Helmreich, R. L., & Merritt, A. C. (1998). *Culture at work in aviation and medicine: National, organizational, and professional influences*. Ashgate.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Hollnagel, E., Woods, D. D., & Leveson, N. (2014). *Resilience engineering: Concepts and precepts*. Ashgate.

Kokubun, K., Nemoto, K., & Yamakawa, Y. (2025). Expatriates' cultural intelligence mediates the relationship between lifestyle and performance: A cross-sectional analysis and a longitudinal pilot study. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 17*(1), e12584. https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12584

Liao, Y., & Thomas, D. C. (2020). Individual and interpersonal outcomes of cultural intelligence. In D. C. Thomas & K. Inkson (Eds.), *Cultural intelligence and global leadership* (pp. 163–188). Routledge.

Livermore, D. A. (2024). *Leading with cultural intelligence: The real secret to success* (3rd ed.). AMACOM.

Maurino, D. E., Reason, J., Johnston, N., & Lee, R. B. (1995). *Beyond aviation human factors: Safety in high-risk systems*. Ashgate.

Reason, J. (1997). *Managing the risks of organizational accidents*. Ashgate.

Samiei, M., & Soltani, A. (2022). Cultural intelligence in managing the performance of employees of organizations. Journal of System Management, 8(3), 115–128. *https://doi.org/10.30495/jsm.2022.1949990.1576*

Shankar, M. G., & Patel, M. S. (2025). Investigating the role of cultural intelligence (CQ) in enhancing leadership development in diverse contexts. International Journa*l of Advanced Research, 13(1),* 234–245. https://doi.org/10.21474/ijar01/18176

Thomas, D. C., Elron, E., Stahl, G., Ekelund, B. Z., Ravlin, E. C., Cerdin, J.-L., Poelmans, S., Brislin, R., Pekerti, A., Aycan, Z., Maznevski, M., Au, K., & Lazarova, M. B. (2008). Cultural intelligence: Domain and assessment. International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 8(2), 123–143. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595808091787

Wiegmann, D. A., & Shappell, S. A. (2003). *A human error approach to aviation accident analysis: The Human Factors Analysis and Classification System (HFACS)*. Ashgate.

Yusuf, L. I., Rostiana, *R., &* Budiana, I. M. (2024). Effect of cultural intelligence and knowledge sharing on work performance: Job satisfaction as a mediator. *International Journal of Application on Economics and Business, 2(1), 523–537. https://doi*.org/10.24912/ijaeb.21.523-537

Ziakkas, D., Henneberry, D., & Pechlivanis, K. (2025). *Cultural intelligence in aviation: Human performance, safety, and global operations*. Taylor & Francis.

Şahin, F., Gürbüz, S., & Şahin, F. *(2014). Cult*ural intelligence as a predictor of individuals' adaptive performance: A study in a multicultural environment. *International Journal of Business and Management, 9*(5), 109–121. *https://doi.org/10.5539/*ijbm.v9n5p109