

# Cultural Intelligence and Global Citizenship as Predictors of Intercultural Sensitivity among College Students

Julie Mae D. Hilario

*juliemae.hilario@hcdc.edu.ph*

*Sirawan, Toril, Davao City, Davao del Sur, 8000, Philippines*

---

## Abstract

Low intercultural sensitivity hinders students' engagement with diverse cultures. Intercultural sensitivity was predicted by cultural intelligence and global citizenship. Predictive research design was used. Data from 400 samples, selected via stratified random sampling, were analyzed using multiple linear regression. The results showed that the model's substantial strength (61.1%) in predicting intercultural sensitivity is significant, supporting the Intercultural Competence Model. Future research may explore additional variables to account for the remaining 38.9% of the criterion's variance. Qualitative research may identify themes that could serve as potential variables.

*Keywords: Cultural intelligence; global citizenship; predictors of intercultural sensitivity; college students*

---

## 1. Introduction

Low intercultural sensitivity among college students has emerged as a pressing concern in an increasingly interconnected global society. As higher education institutions become more culturally diverse, students' ability to recognize, respect, and appropriately respond to cultural differences remains inconsistent and often limited. Recent global studies indicated that many college students demonstrate insufficient awareness and openness toward cultural diversity, reflecting a gap in students' intercultural sensitivity in multicultural settings (Chen & Hu, 2023; Van Melle & Ferreira, 2023).

In the United States, difficulties in cultural understanding are evident within the highly diverse student population, where some students still demonstrate limited intercultural sensitivity in their interactions with culturally diverse peers (Ichikawa & Kim, 2025). Similarly, in Indonesia, findings demonstrated that students still exhibit limitations in intercultural sensitivity despite frequent cross-cultural exposure (Puspitasari, 2023). In Thailand, studies have also reported limited cultural understanding and communication among university students, highlighting continuing challenges in fostering intercultural sensitivity (Wang, Zhao, & Chang, 2023).

In the Philippines, low intercultural sensitivity among college students remains a relevant concern despite growing cultural diversity in higher education. Recent research reveals that a significant number of Filipino students often struggle to engage with different cultures, indicating challenges in developing intercultural sensitivity (Permangil & Reponse, 2025). In a more local context, a study reported that despite increasing diversity in modern classrooms, many college students still exhibit low levels of intercultural sensitivity and struggle to adapt to different cultural environments (Magsanay et al., 2024).

The persistence of low intercultural sensitivity among college students carries significant consequences in educational and social environments. It can result in misunderstandings, communication barriers, and reduced collaboration among students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Additionally, it may hinder the development of inclusive learning spaces and limit students' readiness for global engagement and professional interaction in multicultural contexts (Dong, Bryant, & Liu, 2024; He et al., 2023). Despite its importance, few studies have examined how cultural intelligence and global citizenship influence intercultural sensitivity among college students. Addressing this gap may help develop strategies that promote empathy, cultural awareness, and global competence among students in higher education. Hence, this study was conducted.

This study examined the influence of cultural intelligence and global citizenship on intercultural sensitivity among college students. It contributed to Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) by promoting cultural respect, empathy, and global awareness. It also highlighted the significance of integrating these competencies into education to improve intercultural interaction and collaboration among students. The findings provided a foundation for future research on cultural intelligence, global citizenship, and intercultural sensitivity.

This study determined the significance of cultural intelligence and global citizenship as predictors of intercultural sensitivity among college students. Specifically, it aims to achieve the following objectives: 1.) to determine the levels of cultural intelligence in terms of metacognitive awareness, cognition, motivation, and behavior; global citizenship in terms of social responsibility, global competence, and global civic engagement; and intercultural sensitivity in terms of interaction engagement, respect for cultural differences, interaction confidence, interaction enjoyment, and interaction attentiveness; 2.) to determine the significance of the correlation between cultural intelligence and global citizenship, and the intercultural sensitivity among college students; and 3.) to determine the significance of the strength of the model for intercultural sensitivity using cultural intelligence and global citizenship as predictors.

## **2. Methodology**

### *2.1. Research Design*

This research used a predictive research design. According to Creswell and Creswell (2018), this design involved collecting and analyzing data to identify patterns and relationships that could predict behaviors or outcomes. This design was appropriate for the study, as it measured levels of cultural intelligence, global citizenship, and intercultural sensitivity among college students. Furthermore, it examined the extent to which these factors enhance students' openness, empathy, and respect toward individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds. Through this approach, this research aimed to provide insights to inform educational initiatives that promote cultural understanding, global awareness, and positive intercultural interactions among students.

### *2.2. Locale of the Study*

This study was conducted in three Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Davao City, involving selected college students from different year levels. The selected institutions were recognized for their strong academic programs and their commitment to character formation, cultural awareness, and global engagement. These HEIs provided an appropriate setting for the study, as students were exposed to diverse cultural perspectives through academic activities, campus organizations, and community or international programs. This context provided insight into how cultural intelligence and global citizenship predict intercultural sensitivity among college students.

### *2.3. Sample and Sampling*

This study included 400 out of 6,170 college students from three private Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Davao City. The sample size of 400 exceeded the minimum requirement of 362 respondents for a finite population, as computed using Cochran's formula (Cochran, 1977). The respondents met the following criteria: (a) they were enrolled in the selected institutions during the school year 2025–2026, and (b) they were currently college students in the institution at the time of data collection, regardless of program or year level. The study used stratified proportional random sampling. In this approach, individuals are grouped into strata, and samples are randomly drawn from each stratum in proportion to its size to ensure fair representation (Rahman et al., 2022).

### *2.4. Data Gathering Technique*

A survey was the method used to gather the data. Survey technique is a method of data collection that gathers information from respondents using structured tools such as questionnaires or standardized interviews. It is commonly applied when researchers aim to gather data from large groups and generalize findings to a broader population, particularly in social science and educational research. This method is advantageous because it allows for wide reach,

cost-efficient data collection, standardized responses, and the ability to analyze trends across groups (Goodfellow, 2023; Gül, 2023).

The variables in this study were measured using three adapted questionnaires: the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS), Global Citizenship Scale (GCS), and Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (ICS). The CQS, adapted from Ang et al. (2007), measured cultural intelligence across metacognitive awareness, cognition, motivation, and behavior. The GCS, adapted from Lo et al. (2016), assessed global citizenship through social responsibility, global competence, and global civic engagement. The ICS, adapted from Chen and Starosta (2000), measured intercultural sensitivity based on interaction engagement, respect for cultural differences, interaction confidence, interaction enjoyment, and interaction attentiveness. All instruments were modified to align with the study's objectives and were administered using a 4-point Likert scale. This ranged from very low to very high. The results yielded Cronbach's alpha values of 0.826 for cultural intelligence, 0.840 for global citizenship, and 0.897 for intercultural sensitivity, indicating that all instruments were reliable for use in the study.

### 2.5. Data Analysis Technique

Descriptive analysis is the process of meaningfully organizing and summarizing collected data. It commonly uses statistical measures such as the mean and standard deviation to present an overall picture of the dataset without making inferences beyond the data collected (Alabi & Bukola, 2023). Moreover, correlation analysis is used to determine how variables are related. It shows both the strength and direction of their relationship, often using measures such as Pearson's  $r$ , which indicates how variables tend to vary together, without implying causation (Karch et al., 2024; Gao et al., 2025). Lastly, multiple linear regression analysis is a method used to examine how one outcome variable is affected by two or more predictor variables. It estimates the effect of each variable while controlling for the others (Lu et al., 2025; Heinze et al., 2023).

### 2.6. Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to the ethical protocols of the Society for Moral Integrity and Legal Ethics (SMILE) and obtained the school principal's approval to protect respondents and ensure research integrity. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained after the study's purpose and procedures were explained. Privacy and confidentiality were upheld by complying with the Data Privacy Act of 2012, ensuring that all data was properly stored and used solely for academic purposes. The study also ensured fair participant selection, transparent reporting, and a culturally sensitive environment, and shared the findings with stakeholders and the academic community.

## 3. Results and Discussions

### 3.1. Descriptive Results

Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics for the study. It includes the variables cultural intelligence, global citizenship, and intercultural sensitivity, along with their respective indicators. It also shows the number of respondents, computed means, standard deviations, and their corresponding descriptive interpretations.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics ( $n = 400$ )

| Variables                    | Number of Samples (n) | Standard Deviation | Mean        | Descriptive Level |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------|
| <b>Cultural Intelligence</b> | <b>400</b>            | <b>0.45</b>        | <b>3.18</b> | <b>High</b>       |
| Metacognitive Awareness      |                       | 0.50               | 3.34        | Very High         |
| Cognition                    |                       | 0.56               | 2.96        | High              |
| Motivation                   |                       | 0.58               | 3.17        | High              |
| Behavior                     |                       | 0.57               | 3.24        | High              |
| <b>Global Citizenship</b>    | <b>400</b>            | <b>0.45</b>        | <b>3.08</b> | <b>High</b>       |

|                                         |            |             |             |                  |
|-----------------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| <i>Social Responsibility</i>            |            | 0.56        | 3.00        | High             |
| <i>Global Competence</i>                |            | 0.50        | 3.11        | High             |
| <i>Global Civic Engagement</i>          |            | 0.54        | 3.14        | High             |
| <b>Intercultural Sensitivity</b>        | <b>400</b> | <b>0.43</b> | <b>3.30</b> | <b>Very High</b> |
| <i>Interaction Engagement</i>           |            | 0.47        | 3.37        | Very High        |
| <i>Respect for Cultural Differences</i> |            | 0.49        | 3.44        | Very High        |
| <i>Interaction Confidence</i>           |            | 0.61        | 3.09        | High             |
| <i>Interaction Enjoyment</i>            |            | 0.53        | 3.24        | High             |
| <i>Interaction Attentiveness</i>        |            | 0.49        | 3.35        | Very High        |

*1.00-1.75 Very Low, 1.76-2.50 Low, 2.51-3.25 High, 3.26-4.00 Very High*

As shown in Table 1, the cultural intelligence variable had a mean score of 3.18 (SD = 0.45), interpreted as a high descriptive level. This suggests that students' cultural intelligence is good. One indicator is rated very high, while the remaining indicators are described as high. The standard deviation value reflects highly consistent responses. On the other hand, the global citizenship variable yielded a mean score of 3.08 (SD = 0.45), which is described as high. This indicates that students demonstrated good global citizenship. All indicators fall under the high category, and the standard deviation likewise suggests highly consistent responses. Finally, the intercultural sensitivity variable recorded a mean of 3.30 (SD = 0.43), interpreted as very high. This reflects that the respondents' intercultural sensitivity is very good. Two indicators are rated high, while the rest are rated very high. The obtained standard deviation value denotes highly consistent responses.

Among the variables, intercultural sensitivity is considered the strongest, as it includes indicators that reach very high levels and receive high ratings, reflecting a more advanced demonstration of this competency. In comparison, cultural intelligence and global citizenship are both interpreted at a high level, indicating strong but less pronounced manifestations than intercultural sensitivity.

### 3.2. Correlation Results

Table 2 presents the correlation analysis. It contains the predictor and criterion variables, along with the *r*-value, *p*-value, decision on the null hypothesis, and its corresponding interpretation.

*Table 2: Correlation Table (n = 400)*

| Variables                    | Intercultural Sensitivity |         |                |                                                |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------|----------------|------------------------------------------------|
|                              | r-value                   | p-value | Decision on Ho | Interpretation                                 |
| <b>Cultural Intelligence</b> | 0.737                     | 0.000   | Reject Ho      | Positive, Strong, and Significant Relationship |
| <b>Global Citizenship</b>    | 0.726                     | 0.000   | Reject Ho      | Positive, Strong, and Significant Relationship |

*Level of Significance: 0.05*

*Decision Rule: Reject Ho if  $p < 0.05$*

Specifically, the table shows that the correlation between cultural intelligence and intercultural sensitivity yielded a *p*-value of 0.000, which is below the 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates a significant relationship between cultural intelligence and intercultural sensitivity. The corresponding *r*-value of 0.737 suggests a moderate correlation. This implies that a one-unit increase in cultural intelligence corresponds to an increase in intercultural sensitivity. Likewise, the correlation between global citizenship and intercultural sensitivity had a *p*-value of 0.000, which is below the 0.05 significance level. Hence, it rejected the null hypothesis. It indicates that the correlation between global citizenship and intercultural sensitivity is significant. The corresponding *r*-value of 0.726 reflects a moderate correlation. This implies that increases in global citizenship are

associated with increases in intercultural sensitivity. This suggests that for every unit change in global citizenship, there is a corresponding unit change in intercultural sensitivity.

Both cultural intelligence and global citizenship were found to be significantly related to intercultural sensitivity, indicating that increases in these variables are associated with corresponding increases in intercultural sensitivity. When compared, cultural intelligence showed a slightly stronger relationship with intercultural sensitivity than global citizenship, although both demonstrated similar levels of association.

### 3.3. Regression Results

Table 3 presents the results of the regression analysis. It includes the determinants and the criterion variable. Likewise, the standardized and unstandardized beta coefficients, the p-value, the decision on the null hypothesis and its corresponding interpretation, and the model summary were also presented.

Table 3: Regression Table (n = 400)

| Independent Variables | Intercultural Sensitivity |                 |       |      |       |                | Interpretation        |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------|------|-------|----------------|-----------------------|
|                       | Estimate                  | Stand. Estimate | SE    | t    | p     | Decision on Ho |                       |
| Intercept             | 0.798                     |                 | 0.101 | 7.91 | 0.000 |                |                       |
| Cultural Intelligence | 0.424                     | 0.442           | 0.046 | 9.31 | 0.000 | Reject Ho      | Significant influence |
| Global Citizenship    | 0.373                     | 0.394           | 0.045 | 8.31 | 0.000 | Reject Ho      | Significant influence |

Model Summary:  $R = 0.782$   $R^2 = 0.611$   $Adjusted R^2 = 0.609$   $F = 312.0$   $Sig. = 0.000$

Level of Significance: 0.05

Decision Rule: Reject  $H_0$  if  $p < 0.05$

Predictive Model:  $IS = 0.424 CI + 0.373 GC + 0.798$

The table specifically shows that the model predicting intercultural sensitivity is  $IS = 0.424 CI + 0.373 GC + 0.798$ . The  $R^2$  value of 0.611 indicates that the model is substantial in predicting intercultural sensitivity, with cultural intelligence and global citizenship as predictors. Moreover, the corresponding p-value of 0.000 is less than the 0.05 confidence level; hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. This indicates that the predictive model's strength for intercultural sensitivity is significant.

### 3.4. Cultural intelligence and global citizenship correlate with intercultural sensitivity

This study found that cultural intelligence and global citizenship significantly correlate with intercultural sensitivity. This finding supports the study by Yücekayalar et al. (2026), which reports a significant positive relationship between cultural intelligence and intercultural sensitivity, suggesting that individuals who are more culturally aware and adaptable tend to interact more effectively and appropriately in diverse cultural settings. Likewise, this current finding aligns with Al-Otaibi (2025), who reported that cultural intelligence and global citizenship are positively associated with intercultural sensitivity, emphasizing that individuals with a strong sense of global responsibility, openness, and awareness are more likely to develop respectful, sensitive attitudes toward other cultures. However, this finding contradicts the study by Skaria and Montayre (2023), which reports that cultural intelligence does not correlate with intercultural sensitivity and suggests that even broader, globally oriented attributes, such as global citizenship, may not always have a direct or significant relationship with intercultural sensitivity. Moreover, the present finding is based on a larger sample of 400 participants, whereas Skaria and Montayre's study involved only 30 respondents, highlighting a key difference in scope.

### 3.5. The model's ability to predict intercultural sensitivity is significant

The findings of this study revealed that the model's ability to predict intercultural sensitivity, using cultural intelligence and global citizenship as predictors, is significant. This corroborates the study by Haikuo (2025), which asserts that cultural intelligence significantly predicted intercultural sensitivity, indicating that individuals with higher cultural intelligence tend to exhibit higher levels of intercultural sensitivity in educational settings. Similarly, this finding confirms Choi's (2023) study, which found that individual factors such as cultural intelligence and global citizenship are reliably associated with intercultural sensitivity, suggesting that predictive models incorporating these constructs often reveal meaningful explanatory relationships in quantitative research. However, this current finding disagrees with the study of Chen and Hu (2023), which found that intercultural sensitivity is influenced more by demographic, educational, and experiential factors rather than a strong predictive model of cultural intelligence and global citizenship, suggesting that these variables may not always form a statistically significant model in explaining variations in intercultural sensitivity.

## 4. Conclusion

Based on the findings, it was concluded that cultural intelligence and global citizenship significantly correlate with intercultural sensitivity among college students. The model's substantial strength (61.1%) in predicting intercultural sensitivity, with cultural intelligence and global citizenship as predictors, is significant. These results partially affirm the Intercultural Competence Model, which posits that the interaction of attitudes, knowledge, and skills leads to positive intercultural outcomes.

## 5. Recommendations

Based on the conclusion, future studies may examine additional variables to explain the remaining 38.9% variance in intercultural sensitivity. This study may be replicated with different populations and locales. Furthermore, qualitative or mixed-method approaches may be pursued to identify other factors or emerging themes that could deepen understanding of intercultural sensitivity and guide effective interventions. Finally, educational institutions may develop and evaluate programs or activities that enhance students' cultural intelligence and global citizenship, further strengthening intercultural sensitivity.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to everyone who contributed to the completion of this research. I am especially thankful to Dr. Teresa P. Fabiania, my research adviser, for her guidance, support, and valuable insights throughout the process. I extend my deepest thanks to my family and loved ones for their unwavering support, understanding, and motivation, which have been my constant source of inspiration in accomplishing this work. Above all, I am deeply grateful to God Almighty for His wisdom, strength, and countless blessings that sustained me throughout this journey.

## References

- Alabi, O. & Bukola, T. (2023). Introduction to descriptive statistics. In *Recent advances in biostatistics*. IntechOpen. <https://www.intechopen.com/chapters/1141192>
- Al-Otaibi, N. (2025). Cultural intelligence and its relationship to digital citizenship skills among university students. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 12, 1816. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-06096-w>

- 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>
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (2000). The development and validation of the intercultural sensitivity scale. *Human Communication*, 3(1), 1–15. [https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1035&context=com\\_facpubs](https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1035&context=com_facpubs)
- Chen, H., & Hu, B. (2023). On the intercultural sensitivity of university students in multicultural regions: A case study in Macao. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1090775>
- Choi, J. (2025). A systematic review of intercultural sensitivity studies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 45(1), 296–313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2023.2291984>
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). Wiley.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 241–266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287002>
- Deardorff, D. K. (2020). *Manual for developing intercultural competencies: Story circles*. Taylor & Francis.
- Dong, S., Bryant, C., & Liu, L. (2024). Fostering intercultural interactions and outcomes for domestic graduate students through internationalization-at-home efforts. *Social Psychology of Education*, 27(4), 2059–2078.
- Gao, W., Chen, J., Tu, Z., & Li, M. (2025). Correlational research on college students' physical exercise behavior, academic engagement, and self-efficacy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1428365. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1428365>
- Goodfellow, L. T. (2023). An overview of survey research. *Respiratory Care*, 68(9), 1309–1313. <https://doi.org/10.4187/respcare.11041>
- Gül, Y. E. (2023). A theoretical perspective on survey method from quantitative research methods. *Universum*, 4(106), 64–68. <https://doi.org/10.32743/UniPsy.2023.106.4.15254>
- Haikuo, L. (2025). Exploring the impact of cultural intelligence on multicultural literacy in university students: A serial mediation model of cultural exposure and cross-cultural communication skills. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1661899>
- He, J., Song, X., Wang, C., & Zhang, R. (2023). Intercultural sensitivity as a mediator in the relationship between implicit intercultural identification and emotional disturbance: An exploratory study of international high school students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1098671>
- Heinze, G., Baillie, M., Lusa, L., Sauerbrei, W., Schmidt, C. O., Harell, F., & Huebner, M. (2024). Regression without regrets: Initial data analysis is a prerequisite for multivariable regression. *BMC Medical Research*

- Methodology*, 24, 178. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-024-02294-3>
- Ichikawa, A., & Kim, S. (2025). Critical considerations for intercultural sensitivity development: Transnational perspectives. *Education Sciences*, 15(4), 515. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15040515>
- Karch, J. D., Perez-Alonso, A. F., & Bergsma, W. P. (2024). Beyond Pearson's correlation: Modern nonparametric independence tests for psychological research. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 59(5), 957–977. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00273171.2024.2347960>
- Kotronoulas, G., Miguel, S., Dowling, M., Fernández-Ortega, P., Colomer-Lahiguera, S., Bağçivan, G., Pape, E., Drury, A., Semple, C., Dieperink, K., & Papadopoulou, C. (2023). An overview of the fundamentals of data management, analysis, and interpretation in quantitative research. *Seminars in Oncology Nursing*, 39(2), 151398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soncn.2023.151398>
- Lo, K. W., Kwan, K. P., Chan, S. C., & Ngai, G. (2016). Cross-cultural validation of the global citizenship scale for measuring impacts of international service-learning. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Service-Learning*, 1–35.
- Lu, X., Teh, S. Y., Tay, C. J., Kassim, N. F. A., Fam, P. S., & Soewono, E. (2025). Application of multiple linear regression model and long short-term memory with compartmental model to forecast dengue cases in Selangor, Malaysia based on climate variables. *Infectious Disease Modelling*, 10(1), 240–256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.idm.2024.10.007>
- Magsanay, M. A., Diamante, J., Carriedo, J. K., & Sinang, A. (2024). Cultural values and intercultural sensitivity among college of teacher education students. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 50(3), 132–143. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i31288>
- Permangil, J., & Reponde, R. (2025). A mixed-methods study on intercultural sensitivity and English language competence among BSED English students. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 45(2), 185–239. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.450205>
- Puspitasari, F. (2023). Intercultural sensitivity in the online multicultural community: Indonesian students' experiences. *LingTera*, 10(1), 41–53. <https://doi.org/10.21831/lt.v10i1.59649>
- Rahman, M. M., Tabash, M. I., Salamzadeh, A., Abduli, S., & Rahaman, M. S. (2022). Sampling techniques (probability) for quantitative social science researchers: A conceptual guideline with examples. *Seeu Review*, 17(1), 42–51. <https://doi.org/10.2478/seeur-2022-0023>
- Skaria, R., & Montayre, J. (2023). Cultural intelligence and intercultural effectiveness among nurse educators: A mixed-method study. *Nurse Education Today*, 121, 105714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2023.105714>
- Van Melle, J., & Ferreira, M. M. (2023). An essay about intercultural sensitivity and competence in higher education. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 4(2), 149–155. <https://doi.org/10.24018/edu.2023.4.2.624>
- Wang, X., Zhao, F., & Chang, C. (2023). Exploring intercultural sensitivity among Chinese undergraduates at a Thai university. *Journal of Studies in the English Language*, 18(2), 45–77. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jsel/article/view/265123>

Yücekayalar, A., Gedikoğlu, T., & Kılıç, M. Y. (2026). The mediating role of internationalization in higher education in the relationship between cultural intelligence and intercultural sensitivity. *Sustainability*, 18(2), 558. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su18020558>