

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

2013

The Role of Personality and Cultural Intelligence in the Desire to Study Abroad

Tara Katrina Luchkiw

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Luchkiw, Tara Katrina, "The Role of Personality and Cultural Intelligence in the Desire to Study Abroad" (2013). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 183.

<https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd/183>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

THE ROLE OF PERSONALITY AND CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE IN THE DESIRE TO
STUDY ABROAD

A Thesis presented in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Psychology
The University of Mississippi

By

TARA K. LUCHKIW

December 2012

Copyright Tara K. Luchkiw 2012
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Study abroad during undergraduate education is believed to be a means by which students develop intercultural skills and cultural competence. Previous studies have examined benefits of study abroad and report growth in the areas of cross-cultural skills, global understanding, intercultural development, and intercultural connectedness. However, students who choose to go abroad may have different characteristics than students who do not choose to go. Such characteristics may predispose students to the development of the above-mentioned cultural skills. The current study assessed personality and Cultural Intelligence, two constructs that have been implicated in the success of and interest in international travel, in 188 undergraduate students. Participants completed measures of personality, Cultural Intelligence, previous multicultural experiences, and desire and intent to study abroad as an undergraduate student. Previous multicultural experience and the personality factor of Openness accounted for more than half of the variance in overall Cultural Intelligence scores. The personality factor of Openness was a significant predictor of intent to study abroad, but neither personality factors nor facets of Cultural Intelligence were able to predict desire to study abroad beyond the variance accounted for by previous multicultural experience. Implications for these findings are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I express my deepest appreciation to my advisor, Dr. Alan Gross, who inspires logical and scientific thinking.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
<i>Personality</i>	2
<i>Theory of Cultural Intelligence</i>	8
<i>Relationship Between Personality and Cultural Intelligence</i>	13
METHOD.....	16
<i>Participants</i>	16
<i>Measures</i>	16
<i>Procedures</i>	18
RESULTS.....	19
<i>Preliminary Analysis</i>	19
<i>Predictors of Cultural Intelligence and of Desire and Intent to Study Abroad</i>	19
DISCUSSION.....	26
<i>Limitations and Future Directions</i>	28
<i>Conclusion</i>	29
REFERENCES.....	30
APPENDIX.....	35
VITA.....	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Key Variables.....	19
Table 2. Bivariate Relationships Among Dependent, Control, and Demographic Variables.....	20
Table 3. Bivariate Relationships Among Key Variables.....	21
Table 4. Bivariate Relationships Between Predictor Variables and Dependent Variables.....	21
Table 5. Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis for Desire to Study Abroad.....	23
Table 6. Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis for Intent to Study Abroad.....	24

INTRODUCTION

We live in a society with growing demands for professionals who are culturally competent. The racial and ethnic minority population of the United States is increasing. It is projected that by 2050, nearly half (i.e., 47%) of the United States population will be composed of racial and ethnic minorities (Census Bureau, 2004). In any professional job, employees must be able to communicate and cooperate with others. In a diverse population, employees must also have the skills to effectively interact with people from backgrounds that are culturally different than their own. This is especially true for young adults who are about to enter the workforce. Necessary skills include knowledge of cultural differences, self-awareness, awareness of cultural norms, sensitivity to cultural context, tolerance for uncertainty, and flexibility, to name a few.

Students expect to acquire these skills and training as part of their college education. Study abroad is believed to be one avenue through which higher levels of cultural competence can be attained. For example, study abroad students who identified cultural competence as a personal goal showed improvement in cross-cultural skills and global understanding (Kitsantras, 2004). Similar studies have found increases in intercultural development and intercultural connectedness in study abroad students (Rexeisen & Al-Khatib, 2009; Clarke III, Flaherty, Wright, & McMillen, 2009). Criticisms of research that examines study abroad benefits include the notion that students who choose to go abroad for study are a self-selected group of participants. In other words, students who study abroad may be fundamentally different than those who do not, and therefore may already possess the qualities of interest or are predisposed

to the development of them. Although the study of personality characteristics sheds some light on this question, personality alone does not provide a full explanation of differences between students who do and do not go abroad for study. The theory of Cultural Intelligence, which intends to explain why some people adapt more readily to different cultures than others, may be able to provide additional information regarding differences in these students. The purpose of this study is to assess the role of personality factors and Cultural Intelligence in the desire to study abroad. Following a review of personality factors as they relate to cultural outcomes, the theory of Cultural Intelligence will be discussed.

Personality

Personality traits describe what an individual typically does across time and situations. The foremost model of personality used by researchers is the five-factor model of personality, which describes five dimensions that characterize individual differences. These dimensions can be measured with high reliability and validity (Digman, 1990). The five factors, commonly referred to as the “Big Five,” are Openness (being receptive to new things), Conscientiousness (denotes rationality, ambition, and an inclination for working hard), Extraversion (having a preference for social interaction and lively activity), Agreeableness (having concern for and trust of others), and Neuroticism (tendency to experience distress). Each factor name can be considered the extreme pole of a continuum that defines a dimension of personality (McCrae & Costa, 2003).

Certain personality factors and traits have been used to predict such cultural outcomes as intercultural effectiveness, cultural adjustment, and multicultural activity (including a desire to go or be abroad). Zhang, Mandl, and Wang (2010) investigated the role of personality in sociocultural adjustment in culturally diverse settings. Participants completed measures of the

Big Five factors of personality, acculturation (preference for and identification with mainstream and heritage culture), sociocultural adaptation, academic adjustment, depression, self-esteem, and satisfaction with life. Results showed that Neuroticism and Openness were shared predictors of sociocultural adjustment. Agreeableness and mainstream acculturation were related to general adjustment, while Conscientiousness was related to academic adjustment. The authors concluded that personality factors have a significant impact on cultural adjustment outcomes.

Leong (2007) examined the predictive validity of Multicultural Personality (Cultural Empathy, Open-Mindedness, Social Initiative, Emotional Stability, and Flexibility) factors, which are subsets of the Big Five factors, of socio-psychological adaptation. In a longitudinal study, students who either went abroad or did not completed a measure of Multicultural Personality, which in this study was considered to be dimensions of intercultural effectiveness, a measure of Socio-cultural Adaptation, and a measure of Depression. Measures were completed at two points in time, the first before departure for the exchange program (or beginning of the academic semester), and the second 2-3 months later. Students who studied abroad reported significantly higher scores on four out of five dimensions of Multicultural Personality (Open-Mindedness, Social Initiative, Flexibility, and Emotional Stability), and lower scores on Depression. Among the exchange students, those who had never lived abroad and who had experienced depression prior to departure had more distress during travel. Furthermore, those who scored higher on Social Initiative prior to travel had more effective adaptation 2-3 months later. In the non-exchange group, none of the personality dimensions predicted socio-cultural adaptation. The author found assessment of Multicultural Personality to be useful for the measurement of intercultural competencies, but noted that the exchange sample was likely a self-selected group of students, as they reported higher average ratings of multicultural competence

(personality) than the comparison group. Overall, this study points to the Multicultural Personality trait of Social Initiative as being important in cultural adaptation, as well as to the notion that students who choose to travel abroad may be fundamentally different on a personality level than those who choose not to go.

Van der Zee and van Oudenhoven (2000) examined the relationship between personality traits and indicators of multicultural experiences (e.g., having lived abroad; having work experience in a foreign country). Participants were administered measures of Multicultural Personality along with measures of the Big Five personality factors, Need for Change (need for continuous change with respect to environment and social contact), Rigidity (tendency to stick to old customs and principles), and questions regarding involvement in multicultural activities. The Multicultural Personality trait of Open-mindedness was strongly correlated with the Big Five factor of Openness, Multicultural Emotional Stability negatively correlated with Big Five Neuroticism, Multicultural Social Initiative positively correlated with Big Five Extraversion, and Multicultural Flexibility positively correlated with Need for Change. Multicultural Personality traits of Open-mindedness and Social Initiative were predictors of multicultural activity, although the relationships were not strong. Flexibility was a strong predictor of inspiration for an international career and international orientation. In this study, Big Five dimensions were also able to predict these two variables, but accounted for less variance than the more narrow trait of Flexibility. The authors concluded that Multicultural Personality traits were able to explain variance above and beyond Big Five factors regarding multicultural behavior. Results from this study indicate that personality traits may be indicative of an individual's decision to seek out multicultural experiences.

Although not providing information on the initial choice to go abroad, Caligiuri (2000) examined whether personality traits could predict individuals who wished to terminate an international assignment. Participants (American expatriate employees working in foreign countries) completed a measure of the Big Five personality factors and were asked if they would like to be sent home from their assignment early if it would have no impact on their careers. Results showed that Extroversion, Agreeableness, and Emotional Stability were negatively related to the desire to terminate. Extraversion and Agreeableness explained a large amount of the variance in whether or not an employee expressed desire to terminate the assignment early. The author suggested that personality factors are an indicator that some people may be predisposed to be successful on international assignments, and therefore personality assessment may be useful for employees when trying to determine if accepting an international assignment is a good choice for themselves. This study points to the need for assessing the role of personality in the decision to travel abroad.

Schroth and McCormack (2000) examined the personality characteristics of Sensation Seeking (risk-taking; need for a variety of sensations and experiences) and Need for Achievement (intrinsic achievement motivation) in students who had previously spent a semester or year abroad. Participants completed measures of the above-mentioned characteristics. A measure of Sensation Seeking included four subscales: thrill and adventure seeking (desire to engage in activities involving danger or speed), experience seeking (desire for unusual experiences or sensations associated with a nonconformist lifestyle), disinhibition (desire for social and sexual experiences as expressed in social drinking, partying, and a variety of sexual partners), and boredom susceptibility (aversion to repetition, routine, and dull people). The three subscales on the measure of Need for Achievement assess work (willingness to work hard),

mastery (preference for difficult tasks and the desire for excellence), and competitiveness (desire to compete against others). Compared to a regular college student sample, males from the study abroad sample had higher scores on Experience Seeking, but lower scores on Thrill and Adventure Seeking, Disinhibition, Boredom Susceptibility, and on total scores. Compared to the college student sample, females in the study abroad sample had higher scores on Experience Seeking, and lower scores on Thrill and Adventure Seeking, Disinhibition, and total score. Regarding achievement motivation, men and women in the study abroad sample had higher scores on Work, Mastery, and Competitiveness than norms for a comparable U.S. population. Given that the personality profile for Sensation Seeking in this sample of study abroad students does not fit a stereotype of seekers looking for dangerous experiences or parties, the researchers suggested this particular sample represents a group of serious students who are seeking to enhance learning through opportunities not available at home. Although this study provides further information regarding the relationship between personality traits and students who choose to go abroad, it is not clear whether or not these traits are precursors to the decision to travel.

In a study that examined the role of Risk Propensity and Perceived Value of study abroad programs in the likelihood of engaging in an international experience, Relyea, Cocchiara, and Studdard (2008) noted that study abroad comes with several types of risk, including physical, financial, performance-related, psychological, and social. Participants were students enrolled in a business course in a program with study abroad opportunity. They completed measures of attitudes about travel, fear of the unknown, awareness of global issues, propensity for risk (personality trait), and perceived value of study abroad programs. Results of this study indicated that although high risk propensity participants were more likely to engage in an international experience (even after controlling for age, gender, and foreign language experience), students

who perceived the value of study abroad to be low were less likely to engage in an international experience whether or not they had high or low risk propensity than when the value of study abroad was perceived to be high. The authors suggested that recruitment for study abroad participants could benefit from placing a high emphasis on the value of engaging in an international experience, as well as demonstrating how potential risk of study abroad can be manageable. This study also demonstrates that while individuals who choose to go abroad are more likely to have high levels of risk propensity, there are other factors that weigh heavily in the decision process.

In a study that examined the role of personality in the decision of whether or not to study abroad, participants (international trade students) completed measures of Openness and Tolerance of Ambiguity as personality characteristics (Bakalis and Joiner, 2004). Participants were separated into two groups: those who completed an exchange program (exchange students), and those who did not apply for an exchange program (non-exchange students). Participants with high Openness scores were more likely to be exchange students, and those with low Openness scores were more likely to be non-exchange students. Likewise, exchange students were more likely to have high Tolerance for Ambiguity, and non-exchange students to have low Tolerance for Ambiguity. The authors suggest that these two personality characteristics may be helpful in explaining why some students choose to study abroad and others do not.

From the above studies, we see that personality is related to intercultural interactions and cultural adjustment. It is also related to making decisions to engage in multicultural activities. However, it is clear that personality alone cannot account for an individual's skills and decisions regarding cultural engagement, as other factors exist that may weigh more heavily in the decision process. The theory of Cultural Intelligence may add some useful information to the question of

differences between students who choose to go and not go abroad for study. A review of this theory and related research follows.

Theory of Cultural Intelligence

The theory of Cultural Intelligence intends to explain why some people adapt more readily to different cultures than others (Verghese & D'Netto, 2011). It is defined as an individual's ability to deal effectively in culturally diverse contexts (Earley & Ang, 2003). Cultural Intelligence is a state-like individual difference, meaning that the individual's feelings and behaviors as related to Cultural Intelligence are dependent on the situation at a given time. Cultural Intelligence is malleable, and therefore it can be improved through experience, education, and training.

Cultural Intelligence (CQ) is based on the idea of intelligence as a multidimensional construct that goes beyond general mental ability (Van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2009; Ang, Van Dyne, & Tan, 2011). General intelligence is reflected in an individual's ability to acquire, retain, and interpret information and experiences, whereas the notion of multiple intelligences posits that there are different types of intelligences that exist in various domains of human functioning (Gardner, 1983). Cultural Intelligence is considered to be one such type, and is defined as "an individual's capability to deal effectively in situations characterized by cultural diversity" (Earley & Ang, 2003). The culturally intelligent individual is able to identify which features are true of all people and groups, which are peculiar to a given person or group, and which are neither universal nor idiosyncratic (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). Along with social and emotional intelligence, this type of intelligence has been referred to as "nonacademic," "real-world," and "behavioral" (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Cultural intelligence is distinct from cultural competence, in which ability is often mixed with personality traits, making measurement imprecise (Ang et al., 2007; Van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2009). Theories of cultural competence do not encompass mental, motivational, and behavioral aspects of intelligence, and therefore are less comprehensive explanations of cultural effectiveness than Cultural Intelligence. Other similarly overlapping, yet less inclusive constructs, include cultural sensitivity and empathy, global mindset or understanding, intercultural skills, and intercultural connectedness (Thomas et al., 2008). Instead of adding another term to the already disjointed literature, Cultural Intelligence provides a unified framework by which existing research on cultural competencies can be systematically organized (Ang et al., 2007).

Four components are recognized as qualitatively different facets of the overall capability to be effective in culturally diverse settings (Ang et al., 2007). They are the Cognitive facet (knowledge and experience regarding cultural adaptation, specific norms and customs, and structure of culture), Metacognitive facet (having knowledge of and control over one's cognitions), Motivational facet (the capability to direct attention and energy toward cultural differences; interest in culturally diverse settings), and Behavioral facet (ability to adapt or acquire behaviors that are appropriate for the new culture).

Like personality, Cultural Intelligence has also been used to predict cultural outcomes such as intercultural effectiveness, cultural adjustment, and multicultural activity. To test a model of differential relationships between Cultural Intelligence facets and three intercultural effectiveness outcomes (cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation, and task performance in culturally diverse settings), data were collected across three separate studies (Ang et al., 2007). In the first study, undergraduate students in Singapore and the United States

completed measures of Cultural Judgment and Decision Making, Cultural Adaptation, Cultural Intelligence, Cognitive Ability, Emotional Intelligence, and Big Five Factors of Personality. Results showed that Cognitive and Metacognitive CQ were positively related to Cultural Judgment and Decision Making effectiveness. Motivational and Behavioral CQ predicted interaction adjustment and well-being over and above other predictors (general mental ability, emotional intelligence, cross-cultural adaptability, Big Five personality factors, rhetorical sensitivity, social desirability, age, sex, dyadic similarity, and cross-cultural experience).

In the second study by Ang et al. (2007), participants were international managers in an executive development program at a public university in Singapore who completed measures of Cultural Judgment and Decision Making, Cultural Intelligence, and Cognitive Ability. They also completed a peer-rated Task Performance exercise in which they worked in randomly assigned dyads to solve a problem, produce a business plan, and give a presentation on the plan development. Again, Cognitive and Metacognitive CQ predicted Cultural Judgment and Decision Making effectiveness, accounting for variance over and above other predictors. Additionally, Metacognitive and Behavioral CQ predicted Task Performance.

Finally, in the third study by Ang et al. (2007), the authors sought to replicate the above-mentioned results in a field setting. Participants consisted of foreign professionals and their supervisors. Professionals completed measures of cultural adjustment (interactional, work, and general adjustment) and well-being, and the supervisors completed measures on task performance and adjustment (interactional and work adjustment). Participants completed a measure of Cultural Intelligence as well. Motivational and Behavioral CQ predicted supervisor-rated effectiveness, while Metacognitive and Behavioral CQ predicted supervisor-rated task performance.

From these three studies, the authors concluded that Cultural Intelligence is empirically distinct from other individual differences (emotional intelligence and personality factors) and makes a unique contribution to the explanation of the three aspects of intercultural effectiveness examined in these studies. Furthermore, the authors concluded that there is a systematic pattern of relationships between facets of Cultural Intelligence and intercultural effectiveness outcomes. Specifically, there is value in aligning particular CQ facets with particular aspects of intercultural interaction adjustment and work adjustment, as well as cultural adaptation.

A similar study investigated the relationship between Motivational CQ and cross-cultural adjustment (work, general, and interaction adjustment; Templer, Tay, & Chandrasekar, 2006). Participants (global professionals from diverse backgrounds) were administered measures of Motivational CQ, Realistic Job Preview (accurate portrayal of job related aspects provided by the organization), Realistic Living Conditions Preview (accurate portrayal of general living conditions), and cross-cultural adjustment (work, general, and interaction). Motivational CQ was positively correlated with all three aspects of cross-cultural adjustment, as well as with having a realistic preview of living conditions. Motivational CQ predicted work adjustment over and above Realistic Job Preview and control variables (gender, age, months spent in host country, and previous foreign assignment), and predicted general adjustment over and above Realistic Living Conditions Preview and controls. The authors concluded that professionals who were more interested and motivated to explore diverse cultures adjusted better to the demands of working, living, and socializing in a foreign environment. From this study, we again see that Cultural Intelligence, particularly Motivational CQ, is useful in the explanation of intercultural effectiveness.

Other research has found Motivational CQ to be inferior to differences between cultures when predicting cultural adaptation. For example, in a longitudinal study that examined Motivational CQ as a predictor of cross-cultural adaptation problems, international students studying in New Zealand completed a measure of Cultural Intelligence before going abroad and a measure of psychological (anxiety, depression, distress) and sociocultural (managing everyday situations) adaptation problems after return (Ward, Wilson, & Fischer, 2011). Motivational CQ was related to fewer psychological symptoms and fewer sociocultural difficulties. However in a predictive model, Motivational CQ did not account for significant variance in the outcome over and above the influence of cultural distance (differences between cultures). The authors concluded that there is not convincing evidence to say that Motivational CQ can provide predictive validity as an independent and significant contribution to the explanation of cross-cultural adaptation problems.

Theoretically, it is supposed that experiences abroad are antecedents to the development and further growth of Cultural Intelligence. Crowne (2008) found that individuals who had spent time abroad for education or employment generally had higher levels of Cultural Intelligence than individuals who had not spent time abroad. Specifically, those who had been abroad for education and employment had higher levels of Metacognitive CQ. Those who were abroad only for education had higher levels of Cognitive, Motivational, and Behavioral CQ than individuals who did not have international experience. Furthermore, individuals who visited more countries had higher levels of Cognitive and Behavioral CQ. The author concluded that cultural exposure contributes to Cultural Intelligence. However, as this research was correlational, it is unclear whether individuals who had high levels of Cultural Intelligence sought out an international

experience for work or study. There is therefore a need to explore whether higher levels of Cultural Intelligence existed beforehand in individuals who choose to travel abroad.

From the above review, we see that Cultural Intelligence predicts many of the same characteristics of cultural effectiveness as personality. This is not surprising, given that personality characteristics are believed to be antecedents, or causal agents, of Cultural Intelligence (Earley & Ang, 2003; Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006).

Relationship Between Personality and Cultural Intelligence

It has been postulated that some stable individual traits may predispose individuals to acquiring learning experiences that fit their personality profile (Thomas et al., 2008). Because choices regarding experiences and behaviors are influenced by disposition, it follows that personality traits should be related to Cultural Intelligence (Ang et al., 2007; Rose, Kumar, & Subramaniam, 2008). Specifically, certain personality traits are believed to be antecedents to certain facets of Cultural Intelligence, and therefore should be able to predict levels of Cultural Intelligence among individuals (Rose, Kumar, & Subramaniam, 2008).

In a study examining personality characteristics as predictors of Cultural Intelligence, Ang, Van Dyne, and Koh (2006) looked at the personality factors of Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability, Extraversion, and Openness to Experience as they relate to the four factors of Cultural Intelligence (Metacognitive, Cognitive, Motivational, and Behavioral CQ). Participants were first administered a measure of Cultural Intelligence and then completed a Five Factor Model personality inventory six weeks later. The authors found that Conscientiousness was positively related to Metacognitive CQ, Agreeableness was positively related to Behavioral CQ, and Extraversion was positively related to Motivational CQ, Behavioral CQ, and Cognitive CQ. Surprisingly, Emotional Stability was negatively related to

Behavioral CQ. Finally, Openness to Experience was positively related to all four factors of Cultural Intelligence. These results show discriminant validity between the four factors of Cultural Intelligence and the five factors of personality, as well as demonstrate associations between personality and Cultural Intelligence. The authors concluded that there is value in differentiating factors of personality and facets of Cultural Intelligence.

In a study that examined the role of individual differences in the effectiveness of intercultural awareness training, Fischer (2011) investigated the relationship between Open-Mindedness and Motivational CQ. Participants completed several weeks of awareness training that included cognitive, affective, and behavioral components. Before and after the intervention, participants completed measures of Cultural Intelligence, the Multicultural Personality trait of Open-Mindedness (similar to the Big Five factor of Openness), and Cultural Essentialism (beliefs about social categories). The Multicultural Personality trait of Open-Mindedness moderated the effects of the training intervention. Individuals who had higher Open-Mindedness before the training had greater changes in Motivational CQ compared to individuals with lower initial Open-Mindedness scores when measured again after the training. Following intercultural training, those who were more open to new experience and more tolerant of different cultural norms had an increased motivation to engage with people from other cultures. The author concluded that intercultural interventions appear to be particularly beneficial for certain types of individuals, namely those who have a high level of Multicultural Open-Mindedness.

From the above research, we see that personality factors and Cultural Intelligence have been found to be overlapping constructs, both related to involvement in multicultural activities and various outcomes related to intercultural effectiveness. Students who go abroad for study show differences from those who have not been abroad on measures of Cultural Intelligence and

personality traits. It is unclear however, whether these differences are acquired through the international learning experiences, or if these differences are preexisting in the individuals who choose to seek out such experiences. Previous research provides useful information regarding the relationship between Cultural Intelligence, particularly Motivational CQ, and the ability to adapt and adjust in a diverse cultural setting, however, there has been no research thus far that investigates whether Cultural Intelligence is associated with the choice to seek out intercultural experiences such as study abroad. This is important because the intercultural adjustment of individuals may be impacted in part by their motivation to be in a context characterized by cultural diversity. Cultural Intelligence and personality factors are related to each other, and may also be related to a person's decision to engage in activities characterized by diversity, such as study abroad experiences. Measures of personality and Cultural Intelligence should therefore be able to distinguish between students who have a desire to travel abroad for study and those who do not.

The purpose of the present investigation is to assess the role of personality factors and Cultural Intelligence in the desire and intent to study abroad. A sample of undergraduate students completed questionnaires that assessed their personality characteristics and levels of Cultural Intelligence, as well as their inclinations to engage in a multicultural activity, specifically, study abroad. It was expected that previous multicultural involvement and Big Five personality dimensions would be predictors of Cultural Intelligence. Furthermore, it was expected that Cultural Intelligence would predict desire and intent to study abroad over and above personality factors.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 188 undergraduate students at a mid-sized public university located in the southeastern United States. Sample size was determined by calculating 15 subjects per predictor variable, as recommended by Stevens (2002) for producing reliable prediction equations that have generalizability. Participants received course credit for their participation. Participants ranged in age from 18-45 years, with 96.3% being traditional college age (18-22 years). More than half of the participants (58.8%) were 18 years of age. The participants were mostly Caucasian (76.1%), with a smaller representation of African American (17%) and Asian (4.8%) participants, and respondents who identified as “other” (2.1%). The sample was predominantly comprised of females (80.9%). Freshmen composed 71.8%, sophomores 19.7%, juniors 5.3%, and seniors 3.2% of the total sample.

Measures

Personality: The Big Five Inventory (BFI; John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991) is a 44-item measure of the Big Five dimensions of personality (Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Openness). Items on the BFI consist of short phrases that are known to be prototypical markers of the Big Five dimensions. Participants are asked to describe their personal characteristics by rating items on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Disagree Strongly*) to 5 (*Agree Strongly*). Five scales, one for each dimension, contain 8 to 10 items each. Alpha reliabilities of the scales range from .75 to .90, with an average above .80

(John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008). The BFI demonstrates strong convergent validity with two other measures of Big Five personality dimensions (.95 and .93). In the current sample, Cronbach alpha coefficients were .80 (Extraversion), .80 (Agreeableness), .76 (Conscientiousness), .84 (Neuroticism), and .72 (Openness).

Cultural Intelligence: The Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS; Van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2009) is a 20-item measure designed to assess the four facets of Cultural Intelligence (Cognitive, Metacognitive, Motivational, Behavioral), and yields a score for each facet as well as an overall score. Participants are asked to describe their capabilities by rating statements on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 7 (*Strongly Agree*).

The CQS was developed using 1,350 respondents with diverse demographic and cultural backgrounds over a series of several studies. Confirmatory factor analysis supports a four-factor structure, each factor with high internal consistency (alpha coefficients ranging from .71 to .85) and test-retest reliability. In a test of temporal stability, mean scores for Cognitive and Behavioral CQ increased from Time 1 to Time 2 (respondents studied cultural values and participated in experiential activities during the time interval), but mean scores for Metacognitive and Motivational CQ showed no significant changes, yielding results that demonstrate both malleability and test-retest reliability of CQ factors. Each factor of the CQS also demonstrates discriminant validity compared to cognitive ability, emotional intelligence, cultural judgment and decision-making, interactional adjustment, and mental well-being, (Van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2009). Cronbach alpha coefficients in the current sample were .86 (Metacognitive CQ), .88 (Cognitive CQ), .86 (Motivational CQ), .88 (Behavioral CQ), and .93 (Total CQ score).

Multicultural Activity: The Multicultural Experiences Questionnaire (MEQ; Narvaez & Hill, 2010) is a 15-item measure that asks participants to indicate the frequency with which they

participate in various multicultural activities, as well as to indicate their attitudes toward such activities. Items are rated on a Likert-type scale that ranges from 1 to 5.

The MEQ was developed using a sample of 164 undergraduates. Participants were mostly White/Caucasian (79%), with a smaller representation of Hispanic (12%) and Asian (9%) respondents. It measures a single factor with an adequate overall internal consistency ($\alpha = .80$). A test of construct validity found the MEQ to be negatively correlated with closed-mindedness. The Cronbach alpha coefficient in the current sample was .79.

Desire to Study Abroad: The desire to go abroad for study was measured using a Likert-type item (“*I want to study abroad while I am a university student*”) used by previous researchers to measure the desire to study abroad (Cardon, Marshall, Patel, Goreva, & Fonenot, 2009). An additional Likert-type item (“*I will study abroad while I am a university student*”) was added to distinguish between *desire* and *intent* to study abroad.

Procedures

Participants were recruited through the Psychology Study Participant Manager (PSPM), an online recruitment site. The questionnaires were administered via a computer program (Qualtrics) designed to allow surveys to be completed on computer. Participants were first given an overview of the study and then provided informed consent. They were given an unlimited amount of time for completion of the questionnaires.

Participants completed a demographic questionnaire, the Big Five Inventory, the Cultural Intelligence Scale, the Multicultural Experiences Questionnaire, and two items to measure the desire and intent to study abroad. Counterbalanced presentation of these questionnaires was ensured by the use of Qualtrics.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis

The use of Qualtrics ensured there were no missing values or errors in data entry. As shown in Table 1, descriptive statistics were obtained for all scales.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Key Variables

	Mean	SD	Range
Extraversion	3.53	.683	1.75-5.00
Agreeableness	4.01	.633	1.78-5.00
Conscientiousness	3.73	.606	2.22-5.00
Neuroticism	2.91	.849	1.00-4.63
Openness	3.58	.577	1.90-4.80
Metacognitive CQ	4.62	1.40	1.00-7.00
Cognitive CQ	3.25	1.28	1.00-6.67
Motivational CQ	4.74	1.38	1.20-7.00
Behavioral CQ	4.05	1.43	1.00-7.00
Overall CQ	16.67	4.41	4.20-27.47
Multicultural Experience	45.66	7.82	24.00-67.00
Desire to Study Abroad	5.37	2.09	1.00-7.00
Intent to Study Abroad	2.86	.99	1.00-4.00

Predictors of Cultural Intelligence and of Desire and Intent to Study Abroad

Summary statistics were computed and tests for violations of statistical assumptions were conducted. Skew and Kurtosis indices indicated non-normality for Agreeableness. A reflect and logarithm data transformation was performed on this variable for the purpose of conducting a

hierarchical regression. Variables of desire and intent to study abroad were found to have strong negative skew and kurtosis. For example, with regard to the first dependent variable (“*I want to study abroad while I am a university student*”), 51.6% of participants rated “7” on a scale of 1-7 (*Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree*). Due to the lack of variability in responding on the dependent items, the responses were recoded into dichotomous categories. Responses that indicated agreement, whether *strongly* or *somewhat*, were coded as “1,” and responses that indicated disagreement or were neutral were coded as “0.” This procedure was repeated for the second dependent variable (“*I will study abroad while I am a university student*”), with “*some chance*” and “*very good chance*” recoded as “1” and “*little chance*” and “*no chance*” recoded as “0.” After recoding, 69.7% of participant responses indicated desire to study abroad, and 67.6% of responses indicated intent to study abroad.

Mahalanobis distance was used to test for multivariate outliers. A single case exceeded the critical value ($F = 29.29, \alpha = .001$), indicating the presence of an outlier. However, the outlier was determined to be non-influential as Cook’s distance was less than 1, and therefore this case was retained in the data. Pearson’s bivariate correlations were computed to examine correlation coefficients among dependent, control, and demographic variables (Table 2), among predictor variables (Table 3), and between the predictor and dependent variables (Table 4). Additionally, the variance inflation factors (VIF) for the predictor variables indicated no presence of multicollinearity.

Table 2

Bivariate Relationships Among Dependent, Control, and Demographic Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Desire	-	.566**	.446**	-.031	-.091	.070	-.067
2. Intent		-	.223**	-.246**	-.154*	-.044	-.305**

3. Multi.	-	.116	.022	.284**	.131
4. Age		-	.212**	.124	.718**
5. Gender			-	-.037	.178*
6. Ethnicity				-	.067
7. Academic Classification					-

Note. * $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two tailed. Desire = Desire to Study Abroad; Intent = Intent to Study Abroad; Multi = Multicultural Experiences Questionnaire

Table 3

Bivariate Relationships Among Key Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Extraver.	-	.228**	.121	-.194**	.065	.144*	-.009	.079	.031
2. Agreeabl.		-	.392**	-.338**	.050	.109	-.054	.200**	.053
3. Conscien.			-	-.255**	-.027	.091	.028	.167*	.020
4. Neurotic.				-	.008	-.093	.032	-.177*	-.067
5. Openness					-	.387**	.320**	.338**	.397**
6. Meta CQ						-	.503**	.489**	.593**
7. Cog CQ							-	.516**	.498**
8. Mot CQ								-	.551**
9. Beh CQ									-

Note. * $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two tailed. Extraver = Extraversion; Agreeabl = Agreeableness; Conscien = Conscientiousness; Neurotic = Neuroticism; Meta CQ = Metacognitive Cultural Intelligence; Cog CQ = Cognitive Cultural Intelligence; Beh CQ = Behavioral Cultural Intelligence

Table 4

Bivariate Relationships Between Predictor Variables and Dependent Variables

	Multicultural Experience	Desire to Study Abroad	Intent to Study Abroad
Extraversion	.116	.085	.181*

Agreeableness	.194**	.147*	.157*
Conscientiousness	.105	.005	-.005
Neuroticism	-.038	-.008	-.004
Openness	.467**	.331**	.225**
Meta CQ	.625**	.299**	.094
Cog CQ	.549**	.302**	.079
Mot CQ	.693**	.364**	.186*
Beh CQ	.545**	.235**	.018
Total CQ	.752**	.373**	.117

Note. * $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. Meta CQ = Metacognitive Cultural Intelligence; Cog CQ = Cognitive Cultural Intelligence; Beh CQ = Behavioral Cultural Intelligence; Total CQ = Cultural Intelligence Total Score

A hierarchical regression was conducted to test predictors of Cultural Intelligence (Overall Cultural Intelligence score). Multicultural Experience explained 56.5% of the variance in overall Cultural Intelligence. After entry of the personality dimensions in step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 58.9%, $F(6, 181) = 43.19, p < .0005$, R^2 change = .024, F change (5, 181), $p = .069$. In the final model, only two variables were statistically significant (Multicultural Experience, $beta = .701, p < .0005$, and the personality dimension of Openness, $beta = .13, p < .05$).

A power analysis was conducted to ensure that the sample size was large enough to conduct a logistic regression. With the current sample size ($n = 188$) and an alpha level of .05, the power achieved was .82. A logistic regression was conducted to examine what factors predict the likelihood that respondents would report that they have a desire to study abroad.

Multicultural Experience was entered in Step 1, followed by the five dimensions of personality in Step 2, and finally the four facets of Cultural Intelligence in Step 3. Original data, as opposed to transformed data, were used in this analysis, as logistic regression is robust with regard to the assumption of normality. The full model containing all predictors was statistically significant, χ^2

(10, N = 188) = 51.48, $p < .001$, indicating that the model was able to distinguish between participants who reported and who did not report having a desire to study abroad. The model as a whole explained between 24% (Cox and Snell R Square) and 33.9% (Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in desire to study abroad, and correctly classified 74.5% of cases. As shown in Table 5, only one of the variables (Multicultural Experience) made a unique statistically significant contribution to the model.

Table 5

Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis for Desire to Study Abroad

Variable	B	S.E.	Exp (B)	Sig. (p)	95% C.I.
Multicultural Experience	.103	.041	1.109	.011	1.024-1.201
Extraversion	.098	.283	1.103	.729	.633-1.921
Agreeableness	.460	.341	1.584	.178	.811-3.093
Conscientiousness	-.346	.342	.708	.312	.362-1.383
Neuroticism	.074	.252	1.076	.771	.657-1.764
Openness	.671	.372	1.957	.071	.945-4.054
Metacognitive CQ	.014	.186	1.014	.941	.704-1.461
Cognitive CQ	.321	.204	1.378	.116	.924-2.055
Motivational CQ	.172	.196	1.187	.382	.808-1.744
Behavioral CQ	-.178	.186	.837	.338	.582-1.2-4

A second logistic regression was conducted to examine what factors predict the likelihood that respondents would report that they have intent to study abroad. Demographic variables that were correlated with intent to study abroad (gender, age, and academic classification) were entered in Step 1 as control variables, along with Multicultural Experience,

followed by the five dimensions of personality in Step 2, and finally the four facets of Cultural Intelligence in Step 3. As above, non-transformed data were used in this analysis. The full model containing all predictors was statistically significant, $\chi^2 (13, N = 188) = 44.8, p < .001$, indicating that the model was able to distinguish between participants who reported and who did not report an intent to study abroad. The model as a whole explained between 21.2% (Cox and Snell R Square) and 29.6% (Nagelkerke R squared) of the variance in intent to study abroad, and correctly classified 75.5% of cases. As shown in Table 6, only one of the predictor variables (Openness) made a unique statistically significant contribution to the model after statistically controlling for gender, age, and academic classification.

Table 6

Summary of Logistic Regression Analysis for Intent to Study Abroad

Variable	B	S.E.	Exp (B)	Sig. (p)	95% C.I.
Gender	-.430	.485	.651	.385	.252-1.682
Age	-.065	.205	.937	.751	.627-1.401
Academic Classification	-.934	.355	.393	.008	.196-.788
Multicultural Experience	.058	.038	1.060	.123	.984-1.141
Extraversion	.225	.299	1.253	.452	.697-2.252
Agreeableness	.258	.338	1.294	.446	.667-2.511
Conscientiousness	-.318	.337	.727	.344	.376-1.407
Neuroticism	-.160	.263	.853	.544	.509-1.427
Openness	.851	.379	2.342	.025	1.114-4.926

Metacognitive CQ	-.020	.181	.980	.911	.687-1.398
Cognitive CQ	.012	.184	1.012	.950	.705-1.452
Motivational CQ	.241	.200	1.272	.229	.860-1.884
Behavioral CQ	-.341	.185	.711	.065	.495-1.021

DISCUSSION

A Pearson's bivariate correlation matrix indicated several interesting significant correlations among variables. As expected, the personality trait of Openness was correlated with all four facets of Cultural Intelligence. This finding is consistent with previous research that examined relationships between personality and Cultural Intelligence (Ang, Van Dyne & Koh, 2006; Ang et al., 2007; Rose, Kumar & Subramaniam, 2008). Additionally, Motivational Cultural Intelligence was positively correlated with Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, and it was negatively correlated with Neuroticism. Extraversion was positively correlated with intent, but not desire, to study abroad.

Although all four facets of Cultural Intelligence (and total score) were positively correlated with desire to study abroad, only Motivational Cultural Intelligence was positively correlated with intent to study abroad. These findings suggest that Extraversion and Motivational Cultural Intelligence may be important characteristics for individuals to move beyond wanting to study abroad to having the intent to study abroad. It may be that having a preference for social interaction and lively activity (Extraversion) and an interest to turn one's attention and energy toward cultural differences and settings (Motivational Cultural Intelligence) suggests a more active, rather than passive, stance in relation to engagement of cultural activities.

Several demographic variables (Gender, Age, Academic Classification) were related to intent, but not desire, to study abroad. Females were more likely than males to indicate an intention of studying abroad, and respondents who were older and more advanced in their undergraduate education were less likely to indicate an intention of studying abroad. The gender

difference is consistent with study abroad enrollment reports that more females than males study abroad (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). It makes sense that younger participants are more likely to have plans to study abroad as they still have plenty of time left in their academic careers to make arrangements to do so. Furthermore, they may have fewer obligations (e.g., work, family) to prevent them living abroad for several months.

The first hypothesis, that previous multicultural activity and personality factors would be predictive of Cultural Intelligence, was supported. Previous multicultural experience accounted for more than half of the variance (56.5%) in overall Cultural Intelligence scores. This finding is consistent with theory that multicultural experience is an antecedent to Cultural Intelligence (Earley & Ang, 2003). Individuals who have acquired an extensive learning history through their previous multicultural experiences should have a greater knowledge of cultural concerns and how to behave adaptively in future cross-cultural situations. The personality factor of Openness also accounted for variance (2.4%) beyond what was accounted for by multicultural activity. This is consistent with the notion that the personality trait of Openness is theorized to be an antecedent to Cultural Intelligence (Earley and Ang, 2003), as it is believed to lead the individual to seek out involvement in new and culturally diverse opportunities.

The second and third hypotheses, that Cultural Intelligence would predict desire and intent to study abroad over and above personality factors, were not supported. Neither personality factors nor facets of Cultural Intelligence were able to predict desire to study abroad beyond the variance accounted for by previous multicultural experience. The personality factor of Openness was a significant predictor of intent to study abroad, which is consistent with previous research in which students with higher levels of open-mindedness were more likely to be exchange students and engage in other types of multicultural activities (Bakalis & Joiner,

2004; Leong, 2007; van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2000). One reason the overall results for these hypotheses are inconsistent with previous studies may be that the act of going abroad for study is a decision that incorporates many practical factors (e.g., work/family obligations; financial considerations, academic timeline constraints) that may be weighted more heavily than an individual's personal characteristics. A high number of previous multicultural experiences may be indicative of an individual who has prioritized the cultural experience over these other factors. Additionally, engaging in study abroad is an activity that can be subsumed under the broader category of multicultural experiences. Therefore, it may be of more benefit to know whether personality and Cultural Intelligence predict general engagement in multicultural experiences.

Limitations and Future Directions

Demographics of the present sample indicate a majority of female participants (80.9%). In order to determine generalizability of these data, future work should involve a more even sample of male and female participants. Furthermore, 67.7% of the respondents indicated *some chance* or *very good chance* they would study abroad as a university student, but only a small percentage of those respondents are statistically likely to follow through with those plans. For example, only 1.32% of students in the United States studied abroad during the 2009-2010 academic year (NAFSA, 2011). This may indicate respondents' overestimation of the likelihood that they will indeed enroll in a study abroad program. It could be that students who follow through with the enrollment process and study abroad program may possess the personality and Cultural Intelligence characteristics of interest for this study, and therefore, future work should assess students who are enrolled but have not yet begun travel for their study abroad programs.

Self-reported levels of Cultural Intelligence were not found to be significant predictors of either desire or intent to study abroad. However, actual levels of Cultural Intelligence were not assessed in the current study. It would be beneficial for future studies to include a behavioral measure of Cultural Intelligence that assesses levels of ability and performance. It may be informative to examine the relationship between self-reported Cultural Intelligence and actual task performance related to Cultural Intelligence. Additionally, measurement of desire and intent to study abroad was problematic in the current study given that there was little variability in responses to Likert-type items. Future work should include dichotomous items for measuring these constructs.

Conclusion

The present data suggest that previous multicultural experience and the personality factor of Openness play a role in students' inclination to go abroad for academic study. Since previous involvement in multicultural activities accounts for a large amount of variance in both desire and intent to study abroad, recruitment efforts may be well spent on putting forth effort to engage students in such activities on their home campuses. These activities may include events that introduce students to traditions, art, media, and current news of other cultures/countries, facilitate practicing conversations in foreign languages, and provide a social context for interacting with individuals from diverse cultures.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. (2006). Personality Correlates of the Four-Factor Model of Cultural Intelligence. *Group & Organization Management, 31*, 100-123.
- Ang, S., Dyne, L.V., Koh, C., Ng, K.Y., Templer, K.J., Tay, C. and Chandrasekar, N. (2007). Cultural intelligence: its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review, 3*, 335-71.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Tan, M. (2011). Cultural intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg, S. Kaufman, R. J. Sternberg, S. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence* (pp. 582-602).
- Bakalis, S., & Joiner, T. A. (2004). Participation in Tertiary Study Abroad Programs: The Role of Personality. *International Journal Of Educational Management, 18*, 286-291.
- Caligiuri, P. M. (2000). The Big Five personality characteristics as predictors of expatriate's desire to terminate the assignment and supervisor-rated performance. *Personnel Psychology, 53*, 67-88.
- Cardon, P.W., Marshall, B.A., Patel, N., Goreva, N., & Fonenot, R.J. (2009). A comparison of study abroad and globalization attitudes among information systems, computer science, and business students: Recommendations for IS curriculum design. *Issues in Information Systems, 10*, 28-39.
- Census Bureau. 2004. Projected population of the United States, by race and hispanic origin: 2000 to 2050. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, Population Projections Branch. Available from: www.census.gov/ipc/www/usinterimproj/. Accessed December 31, 2011.
- Clarke III, I., Flaherty, T.B., Wright, N.D., & McMillen, R.M. (2009). Student intercultural proficiency from study abroad programs. *Journal of Marketing Education, 31*, 173-181.
- Crowne, K. A. (2008). What leads to cultural intelligence? *Business Horizons, 51*, 391-399.

- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review Of Psychology, 41*, 417.
- Earley, P., & Ang, S. (2003). Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures. Stanford University Press.
- Earley, P., & Mosakowski, E. (2004). Cultural Intelligence. *Harvard Business Review, 82*, 139-146.
- Fischer, R. (2011). Cross-cultural training effects on cultural essentialism beliefs and cultural intelligence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*, 767-775.
- Gardner, H. 1983. Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. New York: Basic.
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). The Big Five Inventory—Versions 4a and 54. Berkeley, CA: University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm Shift to the Integrative Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Conceptual Issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 114-158). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Kitsantas, A. (2004). Studying abroad: The role of college student's goals on the development of cross-cultural skills and global understanding. *College Student Journal, 38*, 441-452.
- Leong, C. (2007). Predictive validity of the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire: A longitudinal study on the socio-psychological adaptation of Asian undergraduates who took part in a study-abroad program. *International Journal Of Intercultural Relations, 31*, 545-559.

- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. r. (2003). *Personality in adulthood: A five-factor theory perspective* (2nd ed.). New York, NY US: Guilford Press.
- NAFSA (2011). Study Abroad Participation by State 2009-2010. Retrieved from http://www.nafsa.org/Resource_Library_Assets/Public_Policy/Study_Abroad_Participation_by_State_2009-2010/
- Narvaez, D., & Hill, P. L. (2010). The relation of multicultural experiences to moral judgment and mindsets. *Journal Of Diversity In Higher Education, 3*, 43-55.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2010). Number of U.S. students studying abroad and percentage distribution, by sex, race/ethnicity, academic level, host region, and duration of stay: 1996–97 through 2007–08. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/dt10_233.asp
- Rexeisen, R.J. & Al-Khatib, J. (2009). Assurance of learning and study abroad: A case study. *Journal of Teaching in International Business, 20*, 192-207.
- Relyea, C., Cocchiara, F. K., & Studdard, N. L. (2008). The Effect of Perceived Value in the Decision to Participate in Study Abroad Programs. *Journal Of Teaching In International Business, 19*, 346-361.
- Rose, R., Kumar, N., & Subramaniam. (2008). A review on individual differences and cultural intelligence. *Journal Of International Social Research, 1*, 504-522.
- Schroth, M. L., & McCormack, W. A. (2000). Sensation seeking and need for achievement among study-abroad students. *The Journal Of Social Psychology, 140*, 533-535.
- Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (4th ed.). Mahwah, NJ US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

- Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. (2006). Motivational Cultural Intelligence, Realistic Job Preview, Realistic Living Conditions Preview, and Cross- Cultural Adjustment. *Group & Organization Management, 31*, 154-173.
- Thomas, D. C., Elron, E., Stahl, G., Ekelund, B. Z., Ravlin, E. C., Cerdin, J., & ... Lazarova, M. B. (2008). Cultural intelligence: Domain and assessment. *International Journal Of Cross Cultural Management, 8*, 123-143.
- Van der Zee, K. I., & van Oudenhoven, J. (2000). The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire: A multidimensional instrument of multicultural effectiveness. *European Journal Of Personality, 14*, 291-309.
- Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Koh, C. (2009). Cultural intelligence: Measurement and scale development. In M. A. Moodian, M. A. Moodian (Eds.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations* (pp. 233-254). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Verghese, T. & D'Netto, B. (2011). Cultural Intelligence and Openness: Essential elements of effective global leadership. *International Review of Business Research Papers, 7*, 191-200.
- Ward, C., Wilson, J., & Fischer, R. (2011). Assessing the predictive validity of cultural intelligence over time. *Personality And Individual Differences, 51*, 138-142.
- Zhang, J., Mandl, H., & Wang, E. (2010). Personality, acculturation, and psychosocial adjustment of Chinese international students in Germany. *Psychological Reports, 107*, 511-525.

APPENDIX: SELF-REPORT MEASURES

Instructions: Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who *likes to spend time with others*? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

1	2	3	4	5
Disagree strongly	Disagree a little	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree a little	Agree strongly

I see myself as someone who ..

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. ___ Is talkative | 24. ___ Is emotionally stable, not easily upset |
| 2. ___ Tends to find fault with others | 25. ___ Is inventive |
| 3. ___ Does a thorough job | 26. ___ Has an assertive personality |
| 4. ___ Is depressed, blue | 27. ___ Can be cold and aloof |
| 5. ___ Is original, comes up with new ideas | 28. ___ Perseveres until the task is finished |
| 6. ___ Is reserved | 29. ___ Can be moody |
| 7. ___ Is helpful and unselfish with others | 30. ___ Values artistic, aesthetic experiences |
| 8. ___ Can be somewhat careless | 31. ___ Is sometimes shy, inhibited |
| 9. ___ Is relaxed, handles stress well | 32. ___ Is considerate and kind to almost everyone |
| 10. ___ Is curious about many different things | 33. ___ Does things efficiently |
| 11. ___ Is full of energy | 34. ___ Remains calm in tense situations |
| 12. ___ Starts quarrels with others | 35. ___ Prefers work that is routine |
| 13. ___ Is a reliable worker | 36. ___ Is outgoing, sociable |
| 14. ___ Can be tense | 37. ___ Is sometimes rude to others |
| 15. ___ Is ingenious, a deep thinker | 38. ___ Makes plans and follows through with them |
| 16. ___ Generates a lot of enthusiasm | 39. ___ Gets nervous easily |
| 17. ___ Has a forgiving nature | 40. ___ Likes to reflect, play with ideas |
| 18. ___ Tends to be disorganized | 41. ___ Has few artistic interests |
| 19. ___ Worries a lot | 42. ___ Likes to cooperate with others |
| 20. ___ Has an active imagination | 43. ___ Is easily distracted |
| 21. ___ Tends to be quiet | 44. ___ Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature |
| 22. ___ Is generally trusting | |
| 23. ___ Tends to be lazy | |

Please check: Did you write a number in front of each statement?

Note. From John, Donahue, and Kentle (1991). Copyright 1991 by Oliver P. John. Reprinted by permission.

Read each statement and select the response that best describes your capabilities. Select the answer that BEST describes you AS YOU REALLY ARE (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree)

<i>CQ factor</i>	<i>Questionnaire items</i>
Metacognitive CQ	
MC1	I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds.
MC2	I adjust my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from a culture that is unfamiliar to me.
MC3	I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions.
MC4	I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures.
Cognitive CQ	
COG1	I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures.
COG2	I know the rules (e.g., vocabulary, grammar) of other languages.
COG3	I know the cultural values and religious beliefs of other cultures.
COG4	I know the marriage systems of other cultures.
COG5	I know the arts and crafts of other cultures.
COG6	I know the rules for expressing nonverbal behaviors in other cultures.
Motivational CQ	
MOT1	I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.
MOT2	I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me.
MOT3	I am sure I can deal with the stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me.
MOT4	I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me.
MOT5	I am confident that I can get accustomed to the shopping conditions in a different culture.
Behavioral CQ	
BEH1	I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.
BEH2	I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations.
BEH3	I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it.
BEH4	I change my nonverbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it.
BEH5	I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.

© Cultural Intelligence Center 2005. Used by permission of the Cultural Intelligence Center.

Note: Use of this scale granted to academic researchers for research purposes only. For information on using the scale for purposes other than academic research (e.g., consultants and non-academic organizations), please send an email to cquery@culturalq.com. The Chinese version of the scales is available on the *MOR* website.

1. I travel out of the country.	<i>Never</i>	<i>1 to 2 times in my life</i>	<i>3 or more times</i>	<i>Regularly</i>
2. I want to travel outside of my country.	1	2	3	4
	<i>Not true at all</i>			<i>Very true</i>
3. I speak well.	1 language	2 languages	3 languages	More than 3 languages
4. I want to learn or am learning to speak another language.	1	2	3	4
	<i>Not true at all</i>			<i>Very true</i>
5. I correspond currently with people from other countries [or cultures].	<i>Never</i>	1 country	2 to 3 countries	More than 3 countries
6. I have friends from cultural-racial-ethnic backgrounds different than my own.	0 friends	1 friend		2, 3, 4, 5, or more friends
7. I want to have friends from different cultural-racial-ethnic backgrounds.	1	2	3	4
	<i>Not true at all</i>			<i>Very true</i>
8. I work with people with cultural-racial-ethnic backgrounds different from my own.	1	2	3	4
	<i>Never</i>			<i>Always</i>
9. I go out of my way to hear/read/understand viewpoints other than my own.	1	2	3	4
	<i>Never</i>			<i>Always</i>
10. I try to get to know people who are different from me.	1	2	3	4
	<i>Never</i>			<i>Always</i>
11. I respect the traditions of a culture.	1	2	3	4
	<i>Strongly disagree</i>			<i>Strongly agree</i>
12. I have had courses in intercultural communication.	0	1 course	2 courses	3 or more courses
13. I have lived in a contrasting community (with a very different culture from my own).	0	1 to 2 months	3 to 6 months	6 to 9 months
				over 9 months
14. I pay attention to news about the world beyond the U.S.A.	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>
				<i>Always</i>
15. I enjoy media and art from different cultures.	<i>Never</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Frequently</i>
				<i>Always</i>

VITA

EDUCATION

August 2006 – August 2007 Stephen F. Austin State University, TX
M.A. General Psychology

- GPA: 3.73

August 2001 – December 2004 Pennsylvania State University, PA
B.A. Applied Psychology

- GPA: 3.94

RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS

Luchkiw, T.K. (2010, August). *Study Abroad: A Life-Changing Experience?* Poster Session at the One Hundred Eighteenth Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Diego, CA.

Johnson, L.R., Schwartz, K.D., Howe, T.R., Luchkiw, T.K., Mobley, C.L., & Sawyer, R.J. (2010, August). *Finding and Creating Opportunities to Internationalize Graduate Education*. Roundtable Discussion at the One Hundred Eighteenth Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Diego, CA.

Campbell, S.W. & Luchkiw, T.K. (2010). Recent Publications of Interest to Logotherapists. *The International Forum for Logotherapy*, 33, 58-63.

Luchkiw, T. K., & Schulenberg, S. E. (2009, June). *Logotherapy and study abroad: Personal growth in international learning experiences via discovery of meaning and values clarification*. Presentation at the Seventeenth World Congress on Viktor Frankl's Logotherapy, Dallas, TX.

Schnetzer, L. W., Luchkiw, T. K., & Schulenberg, S. E. (2009, June). *The Diving Bell and the Butterfly: Viewing and discussing a movie of interest to logotherapists*. Presentation at the Seventeenth World Congress on Viktor Frankl's Logotherapy, Dallas, TX.

Campbell, S.W. & Luchkiw, T.K. (2009). Recent Publications of Interest to Logotherapists. *The International Forum for Logotherapy*, 32, 123-128.

Campbell, S.W. & Luchkiw, T.K. (2009). Recent Publications of Interest to Logotherapists. *The International Forum for Logotherapy*, 32, 58-63.

Newell, K.E., Luchkiw, T.K., Tran, J.K., & Heider, J.D (2009). *A Continuation The Development of a New Scale to Measure Prejudice Against Christians*. Poster Session at the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Tampa, Fl.

Wood, S. & Luchkiw, T.K. (2008). Recent Publications of Interest to Logotherapists. *The International Forum for Logotherapy*, 31, 121-125.

Luchkiw, T.K. (2008). Movies of Interest to Logotherapists. *The International Forum for Logotherapy*, 31, 116-118.

Wood, S., Melton, A.M.A. & Luchkiw, T.K. (2008). Recent Publications of Interest to Logotherapists. *The International Forum for Logotherapy*, 31, 59-64.

Luchkiw, T.K. (2008). Movies of Interest to Logotherapists. *The International Forum for Logotherapy*, 31, 52-54.

Luchkiw, T.K., Newell, K.E., Tran, J.K., & Heider, J.D (2008). *The Development of a New Scale to Measure Prejudice Against Christians*. Poster Session at the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Albuquerque, NM.

TEACHING

August 2012 – April 2013 University of Mississippi University, MS
Graduate Instructor

- Responsible for the preparation and teaching of Social Psychology at the undergraduate level

August 2011 – April 2012 University of Mississippi Tupelo/Desoto, MS
Graduate Instructor

- Responsible for the preparation and teaching of Social Psychology at the undergraduate level

May 2008 – June 2008 University of Mississippi Tupelo, MS
Graduate Instructor

- Responsible for the preparation and teaching of Social Psychology at the undergraduate level

August 2006 – May 2007 Stephen F. Austin State Univ. Nacogdoches, TX
Teaching Assistant

- Responsible for administering and grading exams
- Responsible for holding weekly office hours for student assistance

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

August 2009 – Present Psychological Assessment Center University, MS
Contract Assessment Examiner

- Administer and score full batteries of standardized intellectual and personality tests
- Compose professional psychological evaluation reports
- Provide feedback regarding psychological evaluations to clients

August 2010 – June 2012 Baptist Children's Village Water Valley, MS
Behavioral Consultant

- Facilitate implementation of token economy system in a group foster home setting
- Write individualized functional behavior plans
- Provide consultation to staff

August 2008 – June 2010 Communicare Pittsboro, MS
Mental Health Therapist

- Responsible for providing outpatient individual, family, and group therapy with a wide variety of clients
- Provide hospital consults for mental health evaluations

August 2008 – January 2009 Student Disability Services Oxford, MS
Verification Specialist

- Review of psychological evaluation documentation for the purpose of verification of disability for academic accommodations
- Conduct interviews with applicants to assess need for specific academic accommodations

October 2005 – August 2006 Every Child, Inc. Pittsburgh, PA
Family Based Clinician

- Responsible for providing in-home family therapy with a wide variety of clients in various home settings
- Utilization of different family modalities that accentuate the family's overall coping skills and resources with emphasis on positive outcomes
- Bi-monthly clinical presentations with a doctoral-level supervision

December 2004 – October 2005 Every Child, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA
Permanency Specialist

- Prepare children and families for foster placements, adoptive placements, or reunification with birth families

- Identify and coordinate the delivery of formal and informal supports, community-based resources, and concrete items to assist families in parenting children who have special needs
- Provide parent education, informal counseling, advocacy, emotional support, and transportation according to individual family needs
- Plan and assist in execution of adoptive family retreats