Running Head: CULTURAL COMPETENCIES

Cultural Competencies for Global Collaboration

Marinus van Driel

Florida Institute of Technology and Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute

Daniel P. McDonald, Loring J. Crepeau. Kizzy Parks, Rebecca Marcum, William G. McGuire

Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute

James Szalma, Peter, A. Hancock

University of Central Florida and Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute

Paper prepared for the 19th International Congress of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychologists, Jacobs University, Bremen, Germany

ABSTRACT

Global organizations must develop cultural capabilities for cross-cultural success. International collaboration among governmental, commercial and NGO organizations is crucial for the promotion of global stability and provision of humanitarian aid. For such collaboration to be successful, it is imperative to overcome barriers posed by the racial and cultural backgrounds, language, histories and disparate cultural values of the interacting parties. A significant amount of such collaboration involves peacekeeping and national building efforts of militaries. Recent challenges faced by the U.S. military in its nation building efforts suggest a critical need for the enhancement of cultural competencies and "cultural intelligence" (CQ) in the United States military. A first step in this initiative is to attempt an assessment of the current cultural training needs and cultural capabilities at the individual and organizational levels of analysis within the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD). A qualitative (N= 282) survey was distributed to Equal Opportunity Advisors (EOAs). Two more quantitative surveys (N = 201893, N =20102) were distributed alongside the Defense Equal Opportunity Climate Survey - DEOCS) to deployed and non-deployed active duty personnel to assess their cultural training needs. Additionally another survey was distributed to senior military leaders to assess their own cultural preparedness as well as that of their subordinates. Content analysis of the qualitative results indicates a strong need for personnel to obtain more general cultural knowledge in order to be effective in different cultural contexts. Analyses of the DEOCS datasets indicated that DOD personnel value cultural understanding, require culture-general training, and that their commands could place more value on cultural training. An attempt was made to model these phenomena at a higher level of analysis (i.e. military unit), however, insufficient variance existed at the unit level to produce such models. Analysis of the senior leader dataset indicated that military leaders saw their subordinates as well prepared for cross-cultural work, however, indicated that their own preparation could be improved. The implications of these results for future cross-cultural training endeavors within the DOD are discussed in light of using frameworks such as CQ.

CULTURAL COMPETENCIES FOR GLOBAL COLLABORATION

The challenges of acquiring adequate cultural and linguistic capabilities are an ever more pressing concern for organizations with an international focus. This is a trend that is only set to increase as the world is becoming increasingly interconnected (Friedman, 2005; McFarland, Senen, & Childress, 1993). As an organization, the United States Department of Defense (DOD) is no different than most organizations with a multi-national reach in that it is experiencing these pressures in an increasingly acute manner. However, the reasons behind these pressures are uniquely military in nature.

Today, the DOD operates in a world where the United States' geo-political interests are increasingly affected by elusive divides carved by religious, linguistic, ethnic, tribal or other differences (McGinn, McDonald, Van Driel, Hancock, 2008). Furthermore, today there is a growing emphasis on military forces ensuring stability, promoting peace, and providing humanitarian aid rather than engaging in kinetic (armed) conflicts (Chiarelli & Smith, 2007). Consequently, nation-building is equally, if not more important to the success of the DOD's operations than eliminating threats with military force (Chiarelli & Smith, 2007).

The skills that are required to perform the tasks of nation building are decidedly different from those associated with armed military action (Chiarelli & Smith, 2007; McGinn et al., 2008; Peters, 2005). Therefore, traditional military training can only provide limited guidance and direction in terms of the new missions encountered by DOD personnel as they are deployed around the world (Hancock, 2008). Of critical importance to the new missions encountered by DOD personnel are socio-cultural skills that are difficult to teach and to obtain. However, these skills are of critical importance as they may hold immediate life and death consequences for deployed personnel and the individuals they encounter while deployed as well as have a direct impact on the long term security and stability of regions in which military personnel operate (McFate, 2007).

Teaching cultural skills is not a new concept to the DOD, as it has been providing this type of training for decades (Salmoni, 2007). In fact, many military personnel have defined their military careers in terms of their foreign deployments (Salmoni, 2007). However, teaching cultural skills in terms of ensuring stability and security to a large body of personnel is a new challenge. This is not a challenge that has gone unnoticed by the DOD. On the contrary, it has inspired large scale action in terms of both assessing existing and building new cultural capabilities within the entire DOD (McGinn et al, 2008).

A Shift in Perspective

As evidence of this action, the DOD has begun to implement a strategy defined within the *Defense Language Transformation Roadmap*. The strategy defined within the Roadmap emphasizes the importance of developing and sustaining strong language and cultural foundational capabilities within the entire DOD as well as the capability to meet any and all global needs as they arise (McGinn et al., 2008).

To facilitate the achievement of the goals of the *Roadmap*, one strategy that has been presented is to provide training aimed at teaching cultural and affective skills that are generalizable to all cultural contexts (Abbe, Gulick, & Herman 2008). In particular, this training, should focus on fostering cross-cultural competence, which can be defined as "a culture-general construct that contributes to intercultural effectiveness across a range of different cultures and context" (Abbe, 2007, p. vii). Cross-cultural competence may be defined more specifically as the "knowledge, affect and skill components that develop in response to experience, training and education" (Abbe, 2007, p. vii). In support of this argument, it is noted that general cultural competencies have been noted to contribute more to intercultural effectiveness and knowledge, skills, and language proficiency related to any region in particular or even prior international experience (Abbe, 2007).

This decidedly cross-cultural, or etic, approach is supported from a variety of theoretical perspectives including those relating to intercultural competence (Fantini, 2006; Sinicrope, Norris, & Watanabe, 2008) and empirical perspectives relating to expatriation. Sinicrope et al. (2008) for instance note that intercultural competence, defined as "a complex of abilities needed to perform *effectively* and *appropriately* when interacting with others who are linguistically and culturally different from oneself" (Fantini, 2006. p. 12) is becoming an increasingly popular and effective framework from which to provide cultural training in the workplace.

Similarly, Sussman (2000) provides additional support for a general cultural training framework in her discussion of the personal characteristics that expatriates require for international success. She notes that expatriates should have a *strong desire to succeed*, a *strong self concept* (i.e. strong beliefs about who they are that are structured, consistent and stable, yet flexible and complex), *centrality of identity* (i.e. knowledge of how culture impacts their self perceptions), *cultural flexibility* (the ability to make adjustments in behavior and thought), thorough cultural understanding, the ability to psychologically adjust (e.g. being able to have feelings of wellbeing and satisfaction) as well as exhibit socio-cultural competence (i.e. the ability to fit in with a new culture and being able to act interactively). In sum, according to Sussman (2000), expatriates should be proactive, flexible and resilient within new cultural contexts to be able to culturally adapt.

Assessing Alternatives

Even tough a training framework that is dedicated to teaching skills that are generalizable across cultural contexts seem to make intuitive sense, it also makes sense pragmatically. It is likely that cultural training that is useful in many cultures will be easier to construct and deliver, as well as constitute a considerably smaller time commitment from students than training that is dedicated to specific cultural contexts. Multiple training programs focused on specific cultures may require lengthy and intensive

training that would be difficult to develop. However, to miminize making far reaching strategic mistakes based strictly on convenience, it may be worthwhile to assess the viability and perceived utility of a training approach focused on teaching skills and knowledge focused on specific cultural contexts.

Support for a culture-specific, or an emic, approach to cultural training is readily available in the numerous anecdotal accounts from service members who have been deployed in different cultural settings, most notably Middle Eastern countries that have had to endure the unfortunate circumstances brought by the Global War on Terror. In attempts to help with the nation building in these countries, DOD personnel have had to come to terms with traditions, and practices that are specific to particular regions.

As an example, Peters (2005) notes the specific challenges that were encountered while training the newly formed army of Afghanistan. It is likely that similar projects in other regions of the world may require specific knowledge that addresses particular endemic cultural traditions and practices. Therefore, training that is region, or culturally specific may have merit even in military contexts. Within the realm of civilian expatriation, this type of training is common, and it is argued that organizations can aid in the adjustment of expatriates by providing specific training and aid (Guzzo, 1996; Lueke & Svyantek, 2000). To explore this issue in greater detail, a qualitative study was conducted assessing the utility of culturally specific training. This study and its findings are outlined below in Study 1.

Assessing Training Needs

Assessing the utility of culture-general as compared to culture-specific training with a relatively small-scale qualitative study is a starting point for providing additional information that can be used in terms of the cultural training required by DOD personnel. However, it was argued that a large scale quantitative study may offer additional insights that are not possible to gain from a qualitative study.

With this perspective, a quantitative study was conducted in conjunction with the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI).

The primary goal of this study was to determine the viability of assessing a number of concepts pertaining to the effectiveness of cultural training, and the value of such training to both rank and file personnel as well as senior military leaders. The secondary goal of this study was to explore the empirical measures derived from this endeavor from a multi level perspective. The purpose of this exploration was to determine whether the constructs could be used to assess military organizations in a meaningful way. This study and its findings are outlined below in Study 2.

In combination, these two studies are intended to provide a thorough overview of the type of cultural training as well as the cultural training needs that exist within the DOD.

STUDY 1

Study 1 was designed to be a purely exploratory endeavor aimed at obtaining information regarding the knowledge and skills that military personnel working as Equal Opportunity Advisors (EOAs) may need in different cultural contexts. EOAs are uniquely trained for handling personnel complaints within their units pertaining to equal opportunity (EO) related issues such as discrimination based on race, sex, religion, ethnicity, color, or national origin. Furthermore, EOAs are also trained to manage and deliver training to their units regarding different ethnic groups that comprise the United States military. Due to their training and job requirements, EOAs are uniquely positioned within military units to observe and monitor the cultural tensions that exist between personnel. However, EOAs also have to operate in foreign contexts upon deployment, and have to manage tensions that may arise due to cultural conflicts stemming from the interactions of DOD personnel and foreign nationals. Consequently, EOAs constitute a population of DOD personnel that are highly aware of the potential

pitfalls posed by both domestic as well as international cultural issues. Exposure to such problems qualify EOAs uniquely as informants regarding cultural training within the DOD.

Methods

Sample

A sample of 282 EOAs participated voluntarily in this study. A subset of this sample (n = 248) were EOAs attending the annual Army EO Worldwide Conference. Another subset of this sample (n = 34) were EOAs stationed in Japan.

Procedure

Qualitative surveys were distributed to the first subsample of participants at the Army EO Worldwide Conference during informational sessions hosted by DEOMi personnel. Participants were informed that the surveys were intended to gain information regarding improving existing training available to EOAs, and in particular training that is available through the internet. The same surveys were distributed to the second subsample of participants by a DEOMI mobile training team that was deployed to deliver training to EOAs stationed in Japan. These participants were also informed that the surveys were intended to gain information that could be used to improve existing EOA training.

Measures

The surveys that were distributed contained a number of demographic questions including questions about their primary duties, and their tenure at their current position. Furthermore, they were asked to select whether having certain job aids (including Regional cultural training, regional guidelines for cultural interactions, and having a regional cultural advisor) at their disposal would better prepare them for their EO related work. These questions were followed by a number of open ended questions listed in *Table 1*.

Data Coding and Statistics

All data obtained for open ended questions were assessed in terms of themes that emerged from participants' responses. All themes that emerged are listed in *Table 1*. Subsequently, descriptive statistics along with additional exploratory analyses were calculated. Specifically, to explore the prevalence of themes within each question, frequency analyses were performed along with Chi-square analyses to gain insight regarding the responses provided by subgroups within the sample of respondents

Findings

From a total sample of 282 service members who provided responses to the survey during the Equal Opportunity Advisor Worldwide Conference, only 48.06% indicated that cultural training was necessary. Of the 114 respondents that described the cultural training that is necessary, 20.18% noted that training specific to the United States was necessary, 13.16% noted the need to for training focused on the Middle East, 7.02% asked for training specific to other regions (including Africa, Europe, and the Pacific), and 1.75% of these respondents noted the need for training focused on the culture of coalition members. Despite these numbers being relatively low, another 57.89% of respondents requested some form of general culture training, that is culture that does not focus on a specific region, but rather on cultural skills and knowledge that will be beneficial in various cultural contexts.

Furthermore, 67.49% of participants indicated that guidelines for cultural interactions that are region specific would *not* be beneficial job aids. However, 36.17% of all respondents indicated that they needed some form of training to help them overcome the challenges posed by the laws and practices of other countries. Of this subset of respondents, 49.42% noted that they would like to receive some type of general cultural instruction prior to deployment to another culture. However, an additional 36.19%

indicated that they would like to receive instruction about the laws of the country or region to which they will be deploying.

A number of Chi-square calculations were also performed to assess whether respondents in any of the demographic groups were more likely to provide certain responses. The first of these Chi-Square calculations indicate that there is predictive utility in considering respondents' tenure category in terms of predicting their responses regarding the need for regional cultural training (X^2 =10.04, $p \leq .05$) and receiving regional cultural guidelines (X^2 = 6.08, $p \leq .05$). Respondents who have been serving for longer than 24 months are more likely to indicate that there is a need for both regional cultural training and regional cultural guidelines than their counterparts with shorter tenures as EOAs.

Additional Chi-Square calculations indicate that there is predictive utility in considering the subsample of respondents (EO Worldwide Conference Attendees or Mobile Training Team Trainees in Japan) (X^2 = 5.48, $p \leq .05$). EOA Worldwide conference attendees were more likely to indicate a need for regional cultural training than not. Interestingly, neither subsample indicated a higher need for regional guidelines, in fact, regardless of the subsample, respondents were more likely to indicate that they did not need regional cultural guidelines (X^2 =5.65, $p \leq .05$)

It was evident that few of the respondents to this survey (18.42%, N= 76) has received formal cultural training offered in university or other formal classroom settings. However, 22.37 of this subsample of respondents have received pre-deployment briefs, and 28.95% claimed to have obtained their cultural knowledge from self-study and personal experiences. Another 15.79% indicated that they have attended conferences where cultural material was discussed.

Discussion

The findings from this study indicate that there is a significant need for cultural training, especially culture general training. In general the findings from this study support the recommendations provided by Abbe (2007; 2008) regarding the necessity of providing culture-general training rather than culture-specific training to DOD personnel. The only finding that runs contrary to Abbe's recommendations is the Chi-square result indicating that EOAs with longer tenures are more likely to indicate a need for both culture-general and culture specific training. The reasons for this finding are open to speculation, however, this type of speculation is beyond the scope of the current paper.

STUDY 2

Similar to Study 1, Study 2 aimed at obtaining information regarding the knowledge and skills that military personnel require in different cultural settings. However, in contrast to Study 1, this study included a much broader sample of DOD employees. In fact, due to this study's quantitative nature, it was possible to distribute surveys much more widely than was possible during Study 1. The logic behind this approach was that a broader sampling of DOD personnel would allow for obtaining more information relating to cultural training, skills and knowledge within the DOD. Furthermore, with such a broad based sampling methodology, it was possible to assess the viability of using the items included in the surveys to assess the cultural capabilities and cultural training needs of whole military units (i.e. groups of individuals under the command of a single commanding officer). More detail regarding the sampling methodology is provided below.

Methods

Procedure

From the outset, Study 2 was intended to be much more empirical in nature than Study 1. Study 2 relied on the construction of a large pool of items that were related to the cultural training needs, cultural capabilities, and value of cultural capabilities of DOD personnel. These items were distributed in conjunction with the Defense Equal Opportunity Climate Survey (DEOCS) to DOD personnel. An additional survey focused on the issues pertaining to commanding officers was also distributed with the intent of ascertaining commanding officers' views regarding their subordinates' cultural training needs as well as their current level of cultural preparation.

Sample

Three samples were considered in this inquiry. The first two data collection endeavors involved using the DEOCS as a data collection vehicle. The first sampling of DEOCS data included individuals (N= 21893) representing various DOD organizations including military units and other organizations (k = 362), with an average size of 146.16 members. The largest unit in this sample included 563 members. The second sampling of DEOCS data also included individuals (N = 20102) representing DOD organizations including various DOD military units and other organizations (k = 293), with an average group size of 162.97. The largest unit in this sample included 561 members. Only units and organizations with 16 members or more were included in the sample. The reason for this limitation in group size is that DEOCS results are never reported for groups with fewer than 16 individuals due to anonymity concerns. Therefore, in keeping with this tradition, only data from units with more than 16 members were included in the final dataset. The third sample, representing the third data collection endeavor, included 47 senior military commanding officers.

Measures

The DEOCS is a survey that is deployed by DEOMI at the request of commanding officers and organizational leaders to assess the organizational effectiveness (OE) and the equal opportunity climate (EO climate) of their commands or organizations. Consequently, the DEOCS is used as a management tool that allows for the proactive measurement of critical organizational climate dimensions that can affect organizational effectiveness in both military and civilian contexts. The DEOCS also has the capability to incorporate research questions pertaining to issues of critical need to the DOD. This capability coupled with the tremendous number of respondents that complete the DEOCS each year (within the last year, the DEOCS was completed by more than 300 000 DOD personnel ranging from contractors and civilians to enlisted service members and senior officers) made it an effective vehicle to gather data for Study 2.

Three sets of 15 items were distributed alongside the DEOCS in a sequential fashion. All items were answered on a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "Totally Disagree with the Statement" to 5 = "Totally Agree with the Statement". The number of items was limited to 15 items per DEOCS administration. Of these items a number of items were found to constitute scales. These scales included the *value of cultural understanding (VCU)*, the *usefulness of cultural pre-deployment training(UCPT)*, and the *value a command places on cultural training(VCT)*. More detail is provided below regarding the construction of these scales.

To obtain data from senior commanding officers regarding their own and their subordinates' cultural training needs and preparation, a separate 20 item questionnaire was deployed via the internet. Similar to the items deployed alongside the DOECS, all items were answered on a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "Totally Disagree with the Statement" to 5 = "Totally Agree with the Statement".

Of these items a number of items were also found to constitute interpretable scales, namely, an *assessment of subordinates' cultural preparedness* and an *assessment of personal cultural preparedness*.

Statistics and Findings

In order to ascertain the viability of the scales, two principal components analyses (PCA) with Varimax rotation were performed on the data obtained during the first two data collection endeavors using the individual as the level of analysis. An additional two PCAs were performed on the data obtained from senior commanding officers.

DEOCS Data

The first PCA met all assumptions (KMO = .84, Bartlett's test of sphericity, X^2 = 154322.75, $p \leq .05$) and revealed 2 interpretable components that were identified as representing the *value of cultural understanding(VCU)*, and the *usefulness of cultural pre-deployment training(UCPT)*. The rotated component matrix of this PCA is displayed in Table 2. Subsequently, reliability analyses were computed. Both scales exhibited high scale reliability (alpha = .82 for *usefulness of cultural pre-deployment training* and alpha = .86 for *value of cultural understanding*).

The second PCA also met all assumptions (KMO = .91, Bartlett's test of sphericity, X^2 = 156047.07, $p \leq .05$), however only revealed 1 interpretable components. This component was identified as the *value a command places on cultural training (VCT)*. The rotated component matrix of this PCA is displayed in *Table 3*. Subsequently, reliability analyses were computed revealing a high scale reliability for *value a command places on cultural training* (alpha= .89).

Senior Commanding Officer Data

The items that were distributed to senior leaders were written in manner to reflect concerns of commanding officers regarding themselves as well as the concerns they had in terms of their

subordinates. Consequently, before PCAs were performed items that pertained to commanders themselves were separated from those pertaining to their subordinates. Subsequently, the third PCA was conducted. As the other PCAs did, it also met all assumptions (KMO = .74, Bartlett's test of sphericity, $X^2 = 218.62$, $p \leq .05$). This analysis revealed 1 interpretable component that was identified as representing an *assessment of subordinates' cultural preparedness (SPREP).* The fourth PCA also met all assumptions (KMO = .73, Bartlett's test of sphericity, $X^2 = 184.46$, $p \leq .05$) and revealed a single interpretable factor representing an *assessment of personal cultural preparedness (IPREP).* Both of these scales exhibited high reliabilities (alpha = .87 for *SPREP*, and alpha = .83 for *IPREP*). The rotated component matrices and descriptives for these two PCAs are displayed in *Table 4 and 5*.

Viability of Aggregation

In order to examine whether the scale contained within the DEOCS datasets would be suitable for assessing unit level phenomena, all scales were centered on their grand means as recommended by Enders and Tofighi (2007) to improve the interpretability of subsequent analyses focused on assessing random grouping variables. Subsequently, to provide empirical justification for aggregating any data, between group variability as indicated by ICC(1) values which were adjusted for group size, were calculated for each scale.

Larger ICC(1) values indicate more variance explained by grouping variables and therefore the need to give more importance to grouping variables . Values larger than 0.05 are needed to justify aggregation, however, values as small as .001 mean there is some degree of non-independence in the data, and may therefore also be used as justification for aggregation. Van de Fijver and Poortinga (2002) contend that if an ICC(1) indicates that group membership contributes to 5% or more of variance of a measure, there is utility in assessing group level differences of that measure. ICC(1) is therefore an estimate of the proportion of the total variance of a measure that is explained by group membership

(Bliese, 2000). Put another way, it is an estimate of the extent to which any one rater may represent all the raters within a group, are raters interchangeable (James, 1982).

No ICC(1) values in excess of .05 were observed. The ICC(1) value for both *Usefulness of cultural pre-deployment training(UCPT)* and *Value of cultural understanding (VCU)* equaled .01, while the ICC(1) value of *Value a command places on cultural training(VCT)* equaled .02. These low ICC(1) values obviated the need to pursue any unit level statistics. As such, none of the scales lent themselves to aggregation to the unit level of analysis, thereby making it impossible to meet the secondary aim of this project. However, this finding indicates that there is no significant variance that can be attributed to the unit or organizational membership of respondents, making the argument plausible that individuals tend to respond in a similar fashion regardless of their organizational membership when it comes to these scales. This finding makes it possible to explore scale score contrasts between individuals based on their demographic information.

Due to the size of the sample, it was decided to pursue effect size comparisons based on demographic variables. This approach was selected due to the high likelihood of comparisons utilizing traditional mean level comparison methodologies erroneously providing significant results due to the large sample sizes. The effect size indicator that was selected was η^2, which is representative of the proportion of the variance in a dependent variable that is due to the effect of an independent variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

A number of demographic variables of interest were identified, including the branch of service(Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, Navy, Other Military Service), type of employee (Military Officer, Warrant Officer, Enlisted Member), and deployment status (More than 6 months since last deployment, Returned from combat zone in past 6 months, Returned from non-combat zone in past 6 months, Deployed within the continental United States, Deployed outside of the United States in

combat zone, Deployed outside of the United States in non-combat zone). Of particular interest were the differences between the different services, the differences between military officers and enlisted service members and differences due to deployment status. The descriptive results associated with these analyses are displayed in *Table 6* and the inferential results for these analyses are displayed in *Table 7*.

Discussion

All results indicate that there are no differences between subgroups of respondents based upon the demographic variables selected. This finding coupled with the moderately positive valence of all respondent's responses indicates that regardless of the respondents' service branch, employment type, or deployment status they moderately agreed that their commands valued cultural knowledge, that pre-deployment cultural training was useful, and that they valued cultural understanding.

Coupling these results with the positive assessment provided by commanders of both their own and their subordinates' cultural preparedness, a positive picture emerges regarding the overall condition of the DOD's cultural training needs.

General Discussion

The aim of this project was to provide a comprehensive assessment of the training needs of military personnel. By assessing this need from three perspectives, it was possible to obtain unique insights regarding the needs of DOD personnel. From the perspective of the results provided by Study 1, it is evident that culture-general training rather than culture-specific training are both needed and preferred by EOAs, both at home and abroad. However, the results from Study 1 also indicated that very few EOAs have received formal cultural training other than that provided by DEOMI. This finding

may signal a need for additional formal training programs that should be made available to individuals who require such training.

This finding is supplemented by the results of Study 2. Study 2 results indicate clearly that rank and file military personnel agree that there is value in understanding other cultures. However, the results also indicates that there is only moderate agreement among respondents regarding the utility of cultural pre-deployment training. Furthermore the results also indicate that respondents only moderately agreed that their commands valued cultural training. These results were highly similar regardless of respondents 'affiliation to military branches, unit membership, rank, or even deployment status. In fact, there was no variance at all that could be effectively modeled at the unit level of analysis, and effect size comparisons between military branches, rank, and deployment status also revealed that little variance in participants' responses could be accounted for by these grouping variables. This result is a string indicator that DOD personnel do see value in cultural training, however, that their commands are lagging behind in terms of realizing the importance of this type of training. Furthermore, respondents also uniformly indicated that there is room for improvement in existing pre-deployment cultural training programs. These findings are tempered by the results gained from the assessment of senior military leaders. It was discovered that senior military leaders agreed that their subordinates are prepared in terms of the cross-cultural knowledge and skills required to perform their work. Leaders, were however, more modest, yet still positive in their assessment of their own cross- cultural preparedness.

Collectively, these findings indicate that strategically the DOD has implemented a sound cross-cultural training strategy that it is meeting the needs of its employees. However, the findings indicate that there is some room for improving existing pre-deployment training as well as increasing the

understanding of the value that commands can attain from employing cross-culturally competent personnel.

Limitations

This study employed two different survey methodologies, one qualitative and another quantitative. Both methodologies have their benefits and their shortcomings. The qualitative approach utilized in this study yielded rich insights; however, these insights were not gained without the interference of the researchers' judgment. All responses that were provided by participants to open ended questions were subject to interpretation of researchers while their content were being coded. This shortcoming does not, however, necessarily detract from the data provided by participants. The process of coding participants' responses rather facilitated obtaining a clear understanding of the message that respondents were conveying.

The quantitative approach that was utilized raised some clear concerns, the most notable which was a potential central tendency bias that was detected in the data. This concern stems from the limited amount of variability that was present in the data. All respondents, regardless of their affiliations tended to respond in a similar manner. This may not be a valid concern, however, with large samples such as those employed in this research endeavor it is plausible to expect variation in data based upon respondents' group memberships and other demographic characteristics. To explore this issue in greater depth, there may be utility in distributing surveys through other vehicles than the DEOCS. The reasoning for this observation stems from the possibility of respondent's responses being affected by their exposure to the DEOCS. The DEOCS asks respondents to provide sensitive information that may have far reaching consequences. Consequently, it is plausible to suspect that different patterns of responses may be observed if other vehicles for data collection were utilized. This is an issue

that should receive consideration from empirical and theoretical perspectives in order to ensure the quality of future data collection endeavors.

One last limitation of the current inquiry stems from the static nature of the data. All data were collected cross-sectionally, and not longitudinally. A study that assessed the views of service members over time would certainly yield insights that are not available through a cross-sectional study alone.

Recommendations and Conclusions

It is evident from the results obtained in this study that the DOD's decision to pursue a culture-general training approach is a sound decision. However, how this approach is implemented should also receive great consideration. Currently, there are a number of cultural competence frameworks available that may be viable as culture-general training frameworks. One such a framework is that of cultural intelligence (CQ) as discussed by Early and Ang (2003) as well as a host of other authors (e.g. Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006). CQ, which can be broadly defined as an individual's capability to adapt effectively to new cultural contexts" (Early & Ang, 2003, p 59) or the ability to generate appropriate behavior in new cultural settings (Early, 2002), has been proposed as an individual level characteristic that allows individuals to successfully meet the challenges encountered in an increasingly international workplace. CQ holds great promise for cross-cultural management theoreticians, trainers, as well as those who have to face the realities of managing individuals in cross-cultural contexts on a daily basis.

CQ includes a motivational component as well as meta-cognitive and behavioral components that represent personal attributes that may aid individuals to be effective in multiple cultural settings, however, CQ also includes a culture specific knowledge component. Even though one sample included in the present inquiry (EOAs) indicated that culture specific knowledge is not of high value, an additional, larger, pool of DOD personnel indicated that cultural understanding was valuable. This

finding suggests that some cultural specific training that could impart knowledge specific to particular cultures may hold some benefit.

Additional research regarding this matter is warranted, however, the current inquiry suggests that the DOD is providing the requisite training in order to equip its personnel to perform the difficult and intricate work of nation building.

REFERENCES

Abbe, A. (2008). Building cultural capability for full-spectrum operations. United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Abbe, A., Gulick, L.M.V., & Herman, J.L. (2008). Cross-cultural competence in Army leaders: A conceptual and empirical foundation. United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Ang, S., van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. Group & Organization Management, 31(1), 100-123.

Chiarelli, P. W. & Smith, S. M. (2007). Learning from our modern wars: The imperatives of preparing for a dangerous future. Military Review, September-October, 2-15.

Earley, P.C.(2002). Redefining interactions across cultures and organizations: Moving forward with cultural intelligence. Research in Organizational Behavior, 24, 271-299.

Early, P.C., & Ang, S. (2003). Cultural Intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures. Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA.

Fantini, A. E. (2006). Exploring and assessing intercultural competence. Retrieved May 1, 2007, from http://www.sit.edu/publications/docs/feil_research_report.pdf

Guzzo, R., A. (1996). The expatriate employee. Journal of Organizational Behavior: Trends in Organizational Behavior, 3, 123-137.

Friedman, T.L (2005) The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century. Farrar, Straus & Giroux: New York, NY.

Hancock, P.A. (2008). The science of cultural readiness. Defense Equal Opportunity Management Internal report. DEOMI: Patrick AFB, FL.

Lueke, S., B., Svyantek, D., J. (2000). Organizational socialization in the host country: The missing link in reducing expatriate turnover. International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 8, 380–400.

McFate, M. (2007). Socio-cultural knowledge for counterinsurgency. Institute for Defense Analysis.

McFarland, L. J., Senen, S., & Childress, J. R. (1993). Twenty-first-century leadership. New York: Leadership Press.

McGinn, G.H., McDonald, D.M., Van Driel, M. & Hancock, P.A. (2008). Developing language, regional and cultural capabilities in U.S. Department of Defense, paper presented at NATO conference, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Peters, K.M. (2005) a few good men. Government executive, 37, 44-49.

Salmoni, B.A. (2007). Advances in predeployment culture training: The U.S. Marine approach. Military Review, 86, 79-88.

Sinicrope, C., Norris, J., & Watanabe, Y. (2008). Understanding and Assessing Intercultural Competence: A Summary of Theory, Research, and Practice. Technical Report for the Foreign Language Program Evaluation Project.

Sussman, N.(2000). The Dynamic Nature of Cultural Identity Throughout Cultural Transitions: Why Home Is Not So Sweet. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4, 355-373.

Table 1

Qualitative Survey Open Ended Questions

Questions	Themes	Frequency
1. If you selected "Online training on various EO/EEO issues" above, please describe which issues you would like to have addressed through this online training	a. Cultural Training b. Diversity Training c. EOA Procedures	22 76 67
2. I f you selected "regional cultural training" above, please describe what type of knowledge/skills regarding regional cultures would be most useful to you:	a. US Regional training b. Middle East Regional Training c. Other International Regions d. General Cultural Training e. Culture of Coalition Allies	23 15 9 66 2
3. If you selected 5.d. "Regional guidelines for cultural interactions," please describe the types of guidelines that will be most beneficial to you when doing your job in different cultural settings:	a. EOA duties b. Cultural Do's and Don'ts c. Region Specific General Cultural Guidelines d. Non-region Specific General Cultural Guidelines e. US-centric Cultural Guidelines	3 8 8 34 8
4. U.S. EO laws and practices may conflict with the laws and practices of other countries. What kind of pre-deployment training would help you to overcome these conflicts?	a. Cultural Awareness/ General Cultural Training b. Legal Training c. EO Related Training d. Reference Material	52 38 8 4
5. During your career as an EOA, what kind of cultural training, other than that offered at DEOMI, have you received?	a. Work Shop/Conference a. Pre-Deployment Briefs/ Briefs During Deployment b. Self Study/ Personal Experiences c. Living Abroad d. Formal Training e. Observances	12 17 22 1 14 10

Table 2

Rotated Component Matrix for First DEOCS Data Collection Endeavor

Items	Component				Items included in UCPT	Items included in VCU
	1	2	3	4		
Q6. Class-room training on differences between cultures would be helpful in preparing me for an international deployment.	.841				*	
Q9 . Class-room training for development of cultural awareness/competency would be helpful in preparing me for an international deployment.	.810				*	
Q7. Brief descriptions of guidelines for behavior in international deployments (that is, do and dot lists) would be helpful in preparing me for an international deployment.	.748				*	
Q5. Engaging in role-play simulation, in which I interact with individuals from other cultures, would be helpful in preparing me for an international deployment.	.670			.334	*	
Q10. It is important to understand differences in the norms for social interactions between cultures.	.647	.467				*
Q11. Cultural awareness is important for mission effectiveness.	.645	.489				*
Q12. Understanding my own culture is important for mission effectiveness.	.591	.397				*
Q14. Multiple cultures are represented in my current branch of service.		.834				
Q15. Multiple cultures are represented in my unit.		.828				
Q1. I can apply the formal cultural training that I received to my interactions with other cultures.	.329	.446		.356		
Q13. Prior to working for the military, I interacted regularly with people from cultures different from my own.			.819			
Q2. Prior to working for military, I interacted regularly with people from different ethnicities from my own.			.776			
Q3. Prior to working for the military, I traveled outside of the United States.			.650			
Q8. Training in language is enough to prepare military personnel for an international deployment.				.811		
Q4. Prior to working for the military, I was involved in a study abroad program.		-.364	.355	.577		

Table 3

Rotated Component Matrix for Second DEOCS Data Collection Endeavor

Items	Component			Items included in VCT
	1	2	3	
Q9. My chain of command values training for interacting with individuals from other cultures.	.849			*
Q10. My chain of command values training for interacting with individuals from other cultures during a deployment.	.796			*
Q11. My chain of command values cultural skills in their personnel.	.792			*
Q7. My chain of command values foreign language training.	.784			*
Q4. My chain of command values training in cultural awareness.	.730			*
Q5. The formal cultural training that I received sufficiently prepared me for an overseas deployment.	.693			
Q6. My experience in the military has made me highly skilled at dealing with individuals from other cultures.	.506		.338	
Q13. Multiple cultures are represented in my current branch of service.		.865		
Q14. Multiple cultures are represented in my unit.		.850		
Q15. I perceive individuals from other cultures as being similar to me.		.642		
Q12. Understanding my own culture is important for mission effectiveness.	.332	.436	.367	
Q3. I would enjoy living in unfamiliar cultures.			.840	
Q2. I am interested in learning about other cultures.			.808	
Q1. I regularly interact with people from other countries as part of my job.			.484	
Q8. Understanding other cultures is important for mission effectiveness.		.453	.479	

Table 4

Rotated Component Matrix for Commander Subordinate-Directed Items

Items	Component		Items Included in SPREP
	1	2	
Q15. My subordinates would work more effectively with each other if they understood their own cultural background.	.896		
Q11. My subordinates would interact more effectively with those from different countries if they had an understanding of their own cultural background.	.865		
Q16. My subordinates would work more effectively if cultural training were interactive?	.737	.363	
Q20. My subordinates would work more effectively if they valued understanding how to interact effectively with those from different countries.	.727		
Q18. My subordinates would work more effectively if they enjoyed cultural training.	.671	.379	
Q14. My subordinates are sufficiently prepared to interact effectively with those from different countries.		.863	*
Q12. My subordinates value the importance of cultural training.		.814	*
Q13. My subordinates believe that cultural knowledge improves the mission effectiveness of the military.		.729	*
Q19. My subordinates understand that recognizing their personal biases can influence decision making.		.546	*
Q17. My subordinates understand that knowing the differences between Service cultures is important to operating effectively in a Joint military setting.		.540	*
		Mean	4.02
		N	47
		Std. Dev	.61

Table 5

Rotated Component Matrices for Commanding Officer Data Collection Endeavor

Items	Component			Items Included in IPREP
	1	2	3	
Q6. The formal cultural training that I received sufficiently prepared me for an overseas deployment.	.842			*
Q7. I can apply the formal cultural training that I received to my interactions with other cultures.	.706		.372	*
Q3. I regularly interact with people from other countries as part of my job.	.682			
Q9. I am able to effectively problem solve when communicating with people from different countries.	.674	.356		*
Q2. I am confident that I can direct my subordinates to resources regarding cultural training.	.637	.511		*
Q5. I enjoy living in unfamiliar cultures.		.850		
Q4. I enjoy learning about other cultures.		.819		
Q8. I am able to leverage the full range of skills and knowledge of my team.	.378		.728	
Q10. Understanding differences between Service cultures is important to maximize effectiveness in a Joint military setting.			.713	
Q1. I have the tools to train my subordinates to effectively interact with other cultures.	.425	.441	.462	
			Mean	3.90
			N	47
			Std. Dev	.73

Table 5

Descriptives for VCT, UCPT, and VCU

Value a command places on cultural training(VCT)

Grouping Variable	Levels	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Service Branch	Air Force	3.40	513	.95
	Army	3.34	3910	.92
	Coast Guard	3.40	246	.84
	Marines	3.35	2501	.89
	Navy	3.42	8627	.87
	Other military	2.86	19	1.01
	Non-military	3.25	4286	.75
Type of Employee	Military Officer	3.67	2520	.85
	Warrant Officer	3.61	210	.81
	Enlisted Member	3.33	13086	.89
	Federal DoD civilian Employee	3.22	3503	.75
	Federal non-DoD civilian employee	3.10	56	.87
	Other (e.g. contractor, private civilian)	3.37	727	.75
Deployment Status	Not deployed , more than 6 months since last deployment	3.35	14592	.84
	Not deployed, but returned from combat zone in past 6 months	3.39	1792	.92
	Not deployed, but returned from non-combat zone in past 6 months	3.37	841	.93
	Deployed (CONUS)	3.44	701	.84
	Deployed (OCONUS, in combat zone)	3.38	1247	.98
	Deployed (OCONUS, in a non-combat zone)	3.37	929	.99

Table 5 (continued)

Usefulness of cultural pre-deployment training(UCPT)

Grouping Variable	Levels	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Service Branch	Air Force	3.51	1799	0.95
	Army	3.72	3919	0.91
	Coast Guard	3.69	422	0.84
	Marines	3.54	2281	0.93
	Navy	3.52	9859	0.90
	Other military	3.70	20	0.84
	Non-military	3.59	3593	0.92
Type of Employee	Military Officer	3.78	2553	0.85
	Warrant Officer	3.61	261	0.96
	Enlisted Member	3.53	15486	0.92
	Federal DoD civilian Employee	3.58	2584	0.92
	Federal non-DoD civilian employee	3.49	168	0.95
	Other (e.g. contractor, private civilian)	3.64	841	0.89
Deployment Status	Not deployed , more than 6 months since last deployment	3.61	15003	0.90
	Not deployed, but returned from combat zone in past 6 months	3.42	2216	0.95
	Not deployed, but returned from non-combat zone in past 6 months	3.53	949	0.92
	Deployed (CONUS)	3.51	826	0.90
	Deployed (OCONUS, in combat zone)	3.52	1366	0.94
	Deployed (OCONUS, in a non-combat zone)	3.56	1533	0.94

Table 5 (continued)

Value of cultural understanding (VCU)

Grouping Variable	Levels	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Service Branch	Air Force	4.11	1799	0.85
	Army	4.19	3919	0.84
	Coast Guard	4.33	422	0.77
	Marines	3.93	2281	0.93
	Navy	4.05	9859	0.87
	Other military	4.48	20	0.61
	Non-military	4.25	3593	0.81
Type of Employee	Military Officer	4.43	2553	0.70
	Warrant Officer	4.12	261	0.92
	Enlisted Member	4.02	15486	0.88
	Federal DoD civilian Employee	4.25	2584	0.80
	Federal non-DoD civilian employee	4.18	168	0.91
	Other (e.g. contractor, private civilian)	4.26	841	0.80
Deployment Status	Not deployed , more than 6 months since last deployment	4.15	15003	0.84
	Not deployed, but returned from combat zone in past 6 months	3.95	2216	0.91
	Not deployed, but returned from non-combat zone in past 6 months	4.04	949	0.88
	Deployed (CONUS)	4.00	826	0.89
	Deployed (OCONUS, in combat zone)	4.00	1366	0.91
	Deployed (OCONUS, in a non-combat zone)	4.07	1533	0.89

Table 6

Group Comparisons for Command values

Grouping Variable	F-Value	Df	Significance	η^2
Comparisons for *Value a command places on cultural training(VCT)*				
Service Branch	22.02	(6, 20095)	p ≤ .001	.01
Type of Employee	90.101	(5, 20096)	p ≤ .001	.02
Deployment Status	2.11	(5, 20096)	n.s.	.00
Comparisons for the *usefulness of cultural pre-deployment training(UCPT)*				
Service Branch	21.59	(6, 21886)	p ≤ .001	.01
Type of Employee	32.34	(5, 21887)	p ≤ .001	.01
Deployment Status	19.24	(2, 21887)	p ≤ .001	.01
Group Comparisons for the *value of cultural understanding (VCU)*				
Service Branch	38.51	(6, 21886)	p ≤ .001	.01
Type of Employee	129.64	(5, 21887)	p ≤ .001	.03
Deployment Status	30.69	(5, 21887)	p ≤ .001	.01