Title
Expatriate Effectiveness and Cultural Intelligence Among Multicultural and Monocultural Abroad

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4r07d8dx

Author
Nguyen, Angela-MinhTu Dinh

Publication Date
2010

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation
Expatriate Effectiveness and Cultural Intelligence
Among Multiculturals and Monoculturals Abroad

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Psychology

by

Angela-MinhTu Dinh Nguyen

June 2010

Dissertation Committee:
    Dr. Verónica Benet-Martínez, Chairperson
    Dr. Thomas Sy
    Dr. Ruth Chao
The Dissertation of Angela-MinhTu Dinh Nguyen is approved:

________________________________
________________________________
________________________________

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside
Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my dissertation committee (Veronica Benet-Martinez, Thomas Sy, and Ruth Chao) for guiding me through every step of this dissertation and for having a profound impact on my life, and especially Veronica for advising me during the past five years. I am deeply grateful for the support of other UCR faculty, who have helped to make the Ph.D. program a pleasant learning experience for me: Steven Clark, Daniel Ozer, Robert Rosenthal, Michael Erickson, Howard Friedman, George Marcoulides, and Mariam Beevi-Lam. I am also forever indebted to faculty outside of UCR for their continual mentorship: Chi-Ah Chun, Kenneth Keith, Hannah-Hanh Nguyen, and John McArdle.

One of things I will remember most about the Ph.D. program is the lab. I would like to thank Daniel Miramontez, Tina Kim-Jo, and Que-Lam Huynh for being the best labmates a person could ask for. I am also grateful to my cohort (Lilia Briones) and colleagues (Susanna Tram, VIPers, and UCR GSOCC members) for their social support. I could not have completed this dissertation and program without the love and understanding of my family and friends.

I would like to acknowledge and thank the following individuals for their help with data collection for this dissertation: the UCR International Education Center (Diane Elton, Michael Cruz, LaSharon McLean-Perez, and Kiril Tomoff), Dianne Fewkes, and all my research assistants. This dissertation was partially funded by the UCR Graduate Dean's Dissertation Research Grant and the UCR Academic Senate Research Grant.
for my muse
ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Expatriate Effectiveness and Cultural Intelligence Among Multiculturals and Monoculturals Abroad
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With globalization, there is an increasing need for employees who can successfully work abroad. Unfortunately, international assignments are failing, with expatriates returning home prematurely. Multicultural individuals may be ideal candidates for these cross-cultural assignments; however, there is a dearth of research on both multicultural students and employees abroad, and no research testing the propositions that these multicultural individuals would be culturally intelligent and high-functioning expatriates.

In this dissertation, I investigated the expatriate effectiveness and cultural intelligence of multicultural and monocultural individuals using on-line longitudinal data from 57 study-abroad students (possible future expatriates). I found that cultural intelligence predicted greater expatriate adjustment and that it increases after the study-abroad experience. Furthermore, multicultural individuals were better psychologically
adjusted than monocultural individuals while abroad. I also examined differences in expatriate effectiveness and cultural intelligence based on bicultural individuals’ cultural integration (acculturation) and bicultural identity integration (BII), with the finding that cultural integration predicted better academic performance abroad. Exploratory analyses with transnational individuals revealed that they had poorer psychological adjustment and lower academic performance while abroad, and lower cultural intelligence after studying abroad (despite similar levels of cultural intelligence before studying abroad) compared to other multicultural individuals.

This dissertation was able to replicate previous findings on cultural intelligence and expatriate effectiveness and to extend those findings to study-abroad students and multicultural individuals. More research is needed to further understand the cultural intelligence of multicultural individuals, and the ways in which cultural intelligence might relate to BII. The findings regarding transnationalism suggest that the process of adapting to living and working in another country may be different when that country is the country of one’s heritage. This dissertation contributes to the understanding of multicultural individuals’ global mobility and provides a foundation on which to conduct further research on expatriate effectiveness, cultural intelligence, multiculturalism, and transnationalism. Finally, based on these findings, multinational corporations may want to select multicultural individuals for expatriation, and provide training to maximize the benefits of having multicultural expatriates by helping them to integrate their cultures and to minimize potential drawbacks by helping transnational multicultural expatriates develop realistic expectations of their heritage country.
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Expatriate Effectiveness and Cultural Intelligence among Multicultural and Monocultural Abroad

Globalization and global mobility constitute an undeniable reality for the US, with an estimated three to seven million U.S. citizens living abroad (Hale, 2004). Furthermore, U.S.-owned corporations comprise approximately 20% of the world's top 100 transnational or multinational corporations (United Nations, 2008), and such multinational corporations are in dire need of competent employees who have high cultural intelligence and can work in different countries and with people from different cultures. However, attempts at selecting and training such employees have yielded mediocre results (Mendenhall, Ehnert, Kühlmann, Oddou, Osland, & Stahl, 2004). A possible solution to this corporate crisis is multicultural individuals, a relatively untapped pool of potential expatriates. Therefore, in this dissertation, I aimed to understand the expatriate effectiveness and cultural intelligence (CQ) of multicultural individuals (a growing population that is greatly under-studied), and to explore the role of multiculturalism-related variables (i.e., multiculturalism, acculturation/integration, Bicultural Identity Integration or BII) in their international experience using longitudinal data from study-abroad students.

Expatriate Effectiveness

Expatriate effectiveness is an individual’s degree of success while abroad (e.g., ability to work with host nationals, culturally appropriate behaviors, accomplishment of objectives; Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black, & Ferzandi, 2006). More specifically, it is comprised of optimal expatriate adjustment, lack of withdrawal cognitions, and optimal
job performance (see Figure 1). First, expatriate adjustment (also known as cross-cultural, intercultural, international, or sojourner adjustment) involves increased comfort with and proficiency in the behaviors and values of a new culture (Black & Mendenhall, 1990). There are three facets of expatriate adjustment: work adjustment, interaction adjustment, and general adjustment (Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991). Work adjustment refers to the work environment, interaction adjustment refers to intercultural relations with host nationals, and general adjustment refers to overall adjustment in the host country. In other words, work and interaction adjustment are synonymous with sociocultural adjustment (behavioral and relational competencies), whereas general adjustment is similar to psychological adjustment (well-being; Searle & Ward, 1990). Black et al. (1991) proposed that expatriate adjustment is determined by individual factors, job factors (e.g., role clarity, role novelty), organizational factors (e.g., selection, socialization, social support), and non-work factors (e.g., culture novelty, family/spouse adjustment). Individual factors affecting expatriate adjustment include experience in cross-cultural training and in other countries, self-efficacy (and skills that promote one’s well-being), and skills for fostering relationships (relation skills) and for perceiving the host culture in a culturally appropriate way (perception skills; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985). Other individual factors, such as personality traits (higher extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness), may also affect expatriate adjustment (Caligiuri, 2006).

In addition to expatriate adjustment, the other two dimensions of expatriate effectiveness are lack of withdrawal cognitions and optimal job performance (Shaffer et
Withdrawal cognitions are intentions to turnover or quit the expatriate assignment (i.e., leave the host country and return home early), which indicates low expatriate effectiveness. In other words, the lack of withdrawal cognitions, or expatriate retention, is an indicator of high expatriate effectiveness. Job performance refers to both task and contextual performance, or meeting deadlines and standards as well as going above and beyond what is expected (e.g., organizational citizenship behavior).

A recent meta-analysis found that the above models of international adjustment (Black et al., 1991) and expatriate effectiveness (Shaffer et al., 2006) are largely supported by the empirical literature (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005). That is, individual, job, organizational, and non-work factors predict expatriate adjustment, which in turn predicts higher job satisfaction, fewer withdrawal cognitions, and better job performance. Building on Black et al.’s (1991) model of international adjustment, it was found that other individual factors predicting expatriate adjustment include broad and stable personality traits (i.e., conscientiousness, neuroticism, agreeableness, openness, and extraversion) and cross-culturally specific and dynamic competencies, such as cultural flexibility and lack of ethnocentrism (Shaffer et al., 2006).

Thanks to these empirically supported models, the personal characteristics and external factors that lead to expatriate effectiveness have been identified; however, many international assignments continue to fail, with 10% to 50% of expatriates returning home early, costing approximately $500,000 a year for companies sending employees abroad (Eschbach, Parker, & Stoeberl, 2001). A possible solution to this dilemma may
include the selection and training of multicultural individuals for international assignments.

*Study-abroad students.* The expatriates of tomorrow are the students of today; therefore, it is important to examine the potential and effectiveness of the student population for international assignments. Whereas expatriates are citizens of one country who live and *work* in another country, study-abroad students are citizens of one country who live and *study* in another country. Studying abroad is a popular choice for many students, with almost 150% more students from the US studying abroad now than 10 years ago (Institute of International Education, 2008). Study-abroad students are similar to expatriates in that they undergo the process of cultural adaptation and learning, cope with being an outsider in the host country, and have the pressure of performing well at work or in school. Unlike expatriates, study-abroad students may experience the added stress of exploring their personal identity and developing into adults (Church, 1982). On the other hand, adjustment may be easier for study-abroad students because studies have found that younger individuals adjust better and have better relations with host nationals (Church, 1982). In this dissertation, the term “expatriate” is applied to study-abroad students, whose “work” is school-related work, and whose “job” is to be a student.

There has been support for a portion of Black et al.’s (1991) model of international adjustment for study-abroad students (Hechanova-Alampay, Beehr, Christiansen, & van Horn, 2002). Specifically, for study-abroad students from other countries to the US (i.e., international students), self-efficacy predicted greater work adjustment, interaction adjustment, and general adjustment. However, Shaffer et al.’s
(2006) model of expatriate effectiveness has been completely unexplored for this population. Furthermore, thus far, relatively few non-European American have studied abroad (6.6% Asian American, 5.9% Latino, 4.0% African American, 1.2% multiracial, 0.5% American Indian; Institute of International Education, 2009); therefore, little is known about their experiences abroad. In the current dissertation, I address the limitations of previous research by applying Shaffer et al.’s (2006) tridimensional model of expatriate effectiveness (optimal adjustment, lack of withdrawal cognitions, and optimal performance) to study-abroad students, and by gathering data on multicultural individuals studying abroad.

**Cultural Intelligence (CQ)**

A cross-culturally specific and dynamic competency that may affect expatriate effectiveness is CQ. CQ is defined as the ability to understand and transcend cultural differences, and function effectively in culturally diverse settings (Earley & Ang, 2003). In addition to ability, it involves the knowledge of one’s self, one’s culture, and other cultures, and skills, such as relation and perception skills (Thomas et al., 2008). Related constructs from the intercultural communication and counseling psychology literatures are intercultural sensitivity (knowledge of and respect for cross-cultural differences as well as the necessary skills for bridging those differences; M. J. Bennett, 1986), universal-diverse orientation (the acceptance of cultural similarities and differences that is manifested cognitively, emotionally, and behaviorally; Miville et al., 1999), cultural competence (knowledge, skills, and awareness or attitudes necessary in a multicultural society; Sue, 1991), multicultural personality [identification with an international
community rather than one particular culture (Adler, 1976) or characteristics necessary for multicultural effectiveness (van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2001)], and intercultural personhood (perceiving commonalities across cultures and complementarities in differences; Kim, 2008). Because these constructs are defined and operationalized similarly to CQ, I used “CQ” loosely to refer to them as a whole. In addition, I do not use “CQ” to refer to cultural variations in intelligence or the definition of intelligence across cultures (Brislin, Worthley, & Macnab, 2006; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2006). In other words, in this dissertation, CQ is operationalized as an individual difference variable, rather than a type of intelligence.

Theorists tend to agree that CQ develops in stages, from neither seeing culture nor recognizing cultural differences to embracing cultural differences and having the ability to navigate across cultures (M. J. Bennett, 1986; Thomas & Inkson, 2003). According to M. J. Bennett (1986), individuals progress (with the possibility of regressing) through six stages in their development of CQ: denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration. Individuals in the denial stage have had little exposure to other cultures and do not believe that cultural differences exist. They might even isolate themselves and build barriers as not to experience other cultures. Individuals in the defense stage feel that their worldview is being threatened. In response, they might denigrate other cultures and tout their own culture as superior. Individuals in the minimization stage emphasize the importance and significance of cultural similarities over differences. They might do this by using biology (“we are one race: the human race”) or philosophy (“we are all god’s children”). Individuals in the acceptance stage develop an understanding and appreciation
of cultural differences, which includes differences in behaviors as well as values. Individuals in the adaptation stage develop skills necessary for intercultural relations, such as empathy. Finally, individuals in the integration stage create a new reality from their internalized cultures. From this new reality, they become “citizens of the world”, transcending cultural boundaries and allowing them to mediate cultural conflicts.

Research has found that CQ plays an important role in the lives of expatriates by affecting expatriate adjustment and other indicators of expatriate effectiveness (Landis & Bhawuk, 2004). CQ constructs, such as CQ, universal-diverse orientation, and multicultural personality, predict greater work, interaction, and general or psychological adjustment (Ang et al., 2007; Brummett, Wade, Ponterotto, Thombs, & Lewis, 2007; Ponterotto et al., 2007; Templer, Tay, & Chandrasekar, 2006). Furthermore, a recent meta-analysis found that CQ, specifically intercultural sensitivity, is a significant predictor of successful expatriate job performance (Mol, Born, Willemsen, & van der Molen, 2005).

In addition to being a predictor of expatriate effectiveness, CQ may also be an outcome of the expatriate experience. Living abroad may help individuals to progress through the stages of CQ and develop higher CQ. In fact, research with students has found increases in CQ as a result of studying abroad (Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006; Carlson & Widaman, 1998; Jackson, 2008). Furthermore, there may be individual differences in CQ, such that those with more multicultural, intercultural, or cross-cultural experiences (e.g., multicultural individuals) may have higher CQ.
Multiculturalism

Researchers have proposed that multicultural individuals have higher CQ than monocultural individuals, and subsequently, are more effective abroad (Bell & Harrison, 1996; J. M. Bennett, 1993; Selmer & Lam, 2004). Broadly speaking, multicultural individuals may be immigrants, refugees, sojourners, indigenous people, ethnic minorities, those in inter-ethnic relationships, and mixed-ethnic individuals (Berry, 2003; Padilla, 2006). In the US alone, multicultural individuals may include the 13% who are foreign-born, the 34% who are non-White, and the 20% who speak a language other than English at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). Psychologically, multicultural individuals are defined as those who have been exposed to and have internalized two or more cultures (Benet-Martínez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002).

Multiculturalism, expatriate effectiveness, and CQ. There are several possible reasons why multicultural individuals may have higher CQ and be more effective abroad than monocultural individuals. First, multicultural individuals may have experienced life as a minority, which prepares them for further experience as a minority when they work in another country (Bell & Harrison, 1996). Second, multicultural individuals are more likely to be aware of their cultural identity, of cultural differences, and of culture itself (Selmer & Lam, 2004; Sussman, 2000). That is, multicultural individuals may have more complex cultural schemas, developed through constant detection, processing, and accessing of cultural cues, which may help them to better understand and learn about their own and other cultures (Benet-Martínez, Lee, & Leu, 2006). Third, multicultural individuals have been through the process of learning at least two cultures; therefore, this
experience of cultural learning may give them a better understanding of a third (or more) culture than monocultural individuals might have of a second culture (Bell & Harrison, 1996). Because of this, multicultural individuals might be successful expatriates to any country or culture, not just one of their own cultures. Finally, multicultural individuals are more likely to possess cross-cultural or intercultural skills, such as verbal and non-verbal communication skills and the ability to perform behaviors appropriate to the cultural situation (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993; Selmer & Lam, 2004). In short, multicultural individuals acquired these skills in real life (as opposed to short-term cross-cultural competency training some expatriates receive before going abroad) and are probably more prepared to apply them abroad.

One of the most important skills to have in intercultural settings is the ability to switch behaviors and perspectives in accordance with what the cultural situation deems appropriate, which is characteristic of individuals with high CQ and those who are multiculturally competent. Researchers have studied a variety of these intercultural skills. One of the earliest switching behaviors to be studied is code-switching, or alternating between languages within one situation, conversation, or sentence (Scotton & Ury, 1977). A closely related concept is cross-cultural code-switching, which is the process of alternating languages and behaviors (Molinsky, 2007). Such code-switching behavior can be learned and can facilitate cross-cultural effectiveness. For multicultural individuals, this process of alternating between two or more cultural meaning systems (including languages and behaviors) in response to environmental cues is called cultural frame-switching (Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martínez, 2000). Switching between cultures is
not explicitly trained for multicultural individuals; it is a skill that they acquire through life experience, although some switch in a culturally appropriate manner whereas others do not (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002).

Relatedly, the adaptation of attitudes, behaviors, and cognitions to the situation, such as switching between work and non-work roles or identities, has also been considered important by industrial/organizational psychologists (DeLong & DeLong, 1992). For example, findings from qualitative studies showed the necessity of switching between being a manager and a father (DeLong & DeLong, 1992) or switching between the White work community and the Black non-work community (Bell, 1990). Switching is also important in educational institutions, where “acting White” is necessary for academic success, such that Black students adopt a White frame of reference at school but switch to a Black frame of reference in other settings (Ogbu, 2004). Thus, the body of research on intercultural skills and other literatures suggests that individuals who are able to understand cultural cues and perform culturally appropriate behaviors are more successful in intercultural situations, and multicultural individuals may possess these important skills due to their life experiences, making them better prepared for international assignments.

**Individual Differences in Biculturalism**

As mentioned above, CQ consists of the ability to appropriately switch behaviors and perspectives as well as an understanding and appreciation of (i.e., attitudes and knowledge regarding) cultural similarities and differences. However, before one can accept other cultural groups, it is necessary to explore and accept one’s own cultural
background (McAllister & Irvine, 2000; Phinney & Devich-Navarro, 1997). The acculturation and bicultural identity literatures provide frameworks for understanding these individual differences in cultural orientations and identities.

Acculturation strategies. Acculturation, the process of adapting to two cultural contexts, is an issue important to the understanding of bicultural individuals (i.e., individuals with two cultures; Berry, 2003; Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). It is operationalized as the degree of involvement with or orientation to the mainstream or dominant culture and the degree of involvement with or orientation to the heritage or ethnic culture. Individuals exposed to two cultures may subscribe to the values of, perform the behaviors appropriate to, and identify with both cultures, only one culture, or neither culture. Those oriented to both cultures are using the integration strategy. Those oriented to only one culture use either the assimilation strategy (if that one culture is the dominant culture) or the separation strategy (if that one culture is the ethnic culture). Those oriented to neither culture are using the marginalization strategy.

In the present dissertation, the acculturation strategies above refer to the interaction of dominant and ethnic cultures, not the interaction of home and host cultures commonly examined in expatriates, international students, and other sojourners (e.g., Ward & Kennedy, 1994; Ward & Rana-Deuba, 1999). In other words, the focus of this study is on individuals who are multicultural before studying abroad, rather than those who become multicultural through the study-abroad experience. Although there has been no research comparing the expatriate effectiveness of individuals using different acculturation strategies to negotiate dominant and ethnic cultures, there is some research
to suggest that bicultural individuals using the integration strategy would be more
effective in cross-cultural situations than those using other acculturation strategies (Bell
& Harrison, 1996; Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006).

First, integrated biculturals, in comparison to bicultural individuals using other
acculturation strategies, may have greater expatriate effectiveness due to their greater
bicultural competence. Bicultural competence consists of knowledge of cultural beliefs
and values (including awareness of cultural differences), positive attitudes toward both
cultures, bicultural efficacy (confidence in one’s ability to function effectively in both
cultures), communication ability and competency (effective verbal and non-verbal
communication skills in both cultures), a broad role repertoire (the ability to perform
different behaviors and behaviors appropriate to the cultural situation), and groundedness
(social networks with members from both cultures; LaFromboise et al., 1993). These
components of bicultural competence can be used to differentiate between successful and
unsuccessful expatriates. For example, cultural knowledge and the awareness of cultural
differences may help expatriates to better understand the host country and to be more
accepting of host nationals’ different ways of acting and thinking. A positive attitude and
greater bicultural self-efficacy may facilitate expatriates’ cultural transition and empower
them to succeed in their international assignments. Communication and behavioral skills
may allow expatriates to better perform their jobs and collaborate with their coworkers
from the host culture. Finally, groundedness may provide expatriates with social support,
and a social network of host nationals may help expatriates to navigate and understand
their new culture. These dimensions of bicultural competence are relevant to the
expatriate experience and may translate to greater effectiveness abroad (Bell & Harrison, 1996).

A second reason why integrated biculturals may have greater expatriate effectiveness than bicultural individuals using other acculturation strategies is because they higher levels of integrative complexity. Integrative complexity is the ability to accept the legitimacy of different perspectives, which is crucial for expatriate effectiveness (Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006). More specifically, integrative complexity involves the ability to shift from simple to complex reasoning and the ability to perform in work environments demanding high tolerance for ambiguity and interactions with diverse others (e.g., expatriate job assignments). With regard to acculturation, integrated biculturals must negotiate differences between their cultures, and because the resolution of these differences may require cognitively complex solutions, they develop greater integrative complexity (Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006). Furthermore, integrated biculturals’ integrative complexity generalizes from the acculturation context to other domains, such as work (Tadmor, Tetlock, & Peng, 2009), and may generalize to other situations, such as their experience as an expatriate (Tadmor & Tetlock, 2006).

In addition to having greater expatriate effectiveness, integrated biculturals may also have higher CQ – integration is the successful negotiation of two cultures within an individual, whereas CQ is the successful negotiation of two (or more) cultures across individuals. It seems intuitive that individuals who can accept and appreciate two cultures within themselves would also be able to do so with other cultures and with people from cultures different from their own. In comparison, individuals who choose one of their
cultures over the other (i.e., assimilation or separation strategy) might also believe that some groups’ culture is more “right” than another group’s (i.e., ethnocentrism, low CQ).

**Bicultural Identity Integration (BII).** Among bicultural individuals using the integration strategy, some may be involved in both cultures and perceive differences between their two cultures as complementary, whereas others may be involved in both cultures but perceive their cultures to be in opposition. These variations in the integration and experience of having two cultures are captured by the construct of BII (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002). Bicultural individuals with higher BII are identified with a combined third culture, emerging from their two cultures, and see a great deal of complementarity between their two cultures. Conversely, those with lower BII view their cultures as disparate and conflictual. Previous research suggests that BII is important to how individuals view themselves and others, and may influence their success in intercultural settings. Specifically, individuals with higher BII have richer social networks (Mok, Morris, Benet-Martínez, & Karakitapoglu-Aygun, 2007), more overlapping perceptions of their cultural ingroups (Miramontez, Benet-Martínez, & Nguyen, 2008), better psychological adjustment (Chen, Benet-Martínez, & Bond, 2007), and greater creativity (Cheng, Sanchez-Burks, & Lee, 2008).

BII can be conceptualized as a global construct or in terms of its two components (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; see Figure 2): cultural harmony (vs. conflict) and cultural blendedness (vs. compartmentalization). Cultural harmony is the perception of compatibility, rather than tension, between one’s two cultures (“I do not see conflict between the Chinese and American ways of doing things”), whereas cultural blendedness
is the perception of fusion, rather than compartmentalization, of one’s two cultures (“I am a Chinese-American”). Cultural harmony and cultural blendedness are conceptually and empirically distinct, relating to different aspects of the bicultural experience. Specifically, cultural harmony is more intra- and interpersonal in nature, having associations with lower neuroticism, fewer experiences of discrimination, and more harmonious intercultural relations (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). In comparison, cultural blendedness is more performance-related, having associations with greater cultural competence, greater openness, fewer linguistic barriers, and living in a culturally diverse community (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). In addition, cultural harmony and cultural blendedness are psychometrically independent, suggesting that BII should be understood as emerging or resulting from (rather than leading to) variations in cultural distance and conflict.

The ideas of harmony and blendedness have also been discussed within the context of role conflict in general (Goode, 1960) as well as with regard to interrole conflict and role transitions within the area of industrial/organizational psychology (Kopelman, Greenhaus, & Connolly, 1983). For example, high BII blendedness is analogous to the integration or blurring of work and non-work identities and roles, whereas low BII blendedness is analogous to the segmentation or separation of these identities and roles (Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000). Within cultural psychology, integrated biculturals who perceive their two cultures to be complementary and those who merge their two cultures are considered to have high global BII. Conversely, integrated biculturals who perceive their two cultures to be in conflict and those who
keep their two cultures segmented are considered to have low global BII. In sum, global BII captures individuals’ ability to resolve intrapersonal cultural differences.

Considering that BII involves the negotiation of intrapersonal cultural differences, whereas CQ involves the negotiation of interpersonal cultural differences, it is possible that integrated biculturals who are able to resolve intrapersonal cultural differences would also be more likely to resolve interpersonal cultural differences. In other words, integrated biculturals with higher BII should have higher CQ than those with lower BII. It was mentioned earlier that cultural frame-switching is a characteristic of CQ. Because those with higher BII are able to switch in a culturally appropriate manner (e.g., think and act like a Chinese person in a Chinese situation), and those with lower BII switch in an culturally inappropriate manner (e.g., think and act like an American person in a Chinese situation), it is probable that those with higher BII have higher CQ than those with lower BII (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002). Furthermore, because the ability to perceive differences as complementary instead of oppositional (i.e., cultural harmony) is a characteristic of CQ (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006), those who perceive cultural harmony should have higher CQ than those who perceive cultural conflict.

To date, the only research that has touched upon the possible relations between types of bicultural individuals and CQ is that comparing “constructive marginals” and “encapsulated marginals” (J. M. Bennett, 1993). In acculturation and BII terms, “constructive marginals” are bicultural individuals who use the integration strategy and perceive harmony between their two cultures (high BII harmony). Conversely, “encapsulated marginals” are bicultural individuals who use the integration strategy but
According to J. M. Bennett (1993), “constructive marginals” have high intercultural sensitivity (or high CQ), whereas “encapsulated marginals” are aware of cultural differences but do not appreciate them (i.e., lower intercultural sensitivity or CQ).

**Hypotheses**

Despite the theoretical and intuitive proposals above, no study has empirically investigated whether multicultural individuals have higher CQ and are more effective abroad than monocultural individuals. Furthermore, no study has empirically investigated whether bicultural individuals using the integration strategy, especially those with higher levels of BII (particularly cultural harmony) have higher CQ and are more effective abroad than those using other acculturation strategies, especially those with lower levels of BII (particularly cultural harmony). As Boski (2008) stated, the field is in desperate need of a longitudinal study examining the relations among integration, BII, and CQ. To address this gap, I tested the following hypotheses using longitudinal data from undergraduate students studying abroad (see Figure 3).

1. CQ after studying abroad is higher than CQ before studying abroad.

2. Individuals (multicultural or monocultural) with higher CQ are more effective as expatriates than those with lower CQ.

3a. Multicultural individuals are more effective as expatriates than monocultural individuals.

3b. Multicultural individuals have higher CQ than monocultural individuals.
3c. Multicultural individuals’ greater expatriate effectiveness is partially due to their higher CQ.

4a. Among bicultural individuals, integrated biculturals are more effective as expatriates than those using other acculturation strategies.

4b. Among bicultural individuals, integrated biculturals have higher CQ than those using other acculturation strategies.

4c. For integrated biculturals, greater expatriate effectiveness is partially due to their higher CQ.

5a. Among bicultural individuals using the integration strategy, those with higher BII (especially cultural harmony) are more effective as expatriates than those with lower BII.

5b. Among bicultural individuals using the integration strategy, those with higher BII (especially cultural harmony) have higher CQ than those with lower BII.

5c. For integrated biculturals with higher BII (especially cultural harmony), greater expatriate effectiveness is partially due to their higher CQ.

Method

Participants

Participants were undergraduate students enrolled in an education abroad program during either the summer 2009 or fall 2009 academic term. Of the 125 students signed up to participate in this dissertation, 57 actually completed the Time 1 measures. Of those, 87.72% participated in Time 2, and 82.46% participated in Time 3. (See Table 1 for sample size by time and academic term.) The sample was 66.67% female with a mean
age of 21.02 years ($SD = 1.77$). Fourth-year students comprised almost half the sample (45.61%), with the other half consisting of second-year (8.77%), third-year (35.09%), and fifth-year (10.53%) students. In addition, the sample was 49.12% Asian American, 35.09% White, 21.05% Latino, and 8.77% African American; one participant reported “other” as his race. (These numbers sum to more than 100% because participants were able to select more than race.) In terms of country of birth, 17.54% of the sample was born outside of the US and have lived in the US for a mean of 14.30 years ($SD = 5.46$).

The countries in which participants studied included the United Kingdom ($n = 12$), China ($n = 8$), Spain ($n = 7$), Italy ($n = 6$), France ($n = 4$), South Korea ($n = 3$), Australia ($n = 2$), Canada ($n = 2$), Germany ($n = 2$), Hong Kong ($n = 2$), Japan ($n = 2$), Thailand ($n = 2$), Chile ($n = 1$), Costa Rica ($n = 1$), Greece ($n = 1$), India ($n = 1$), and Sweden ($n = 1$). The study-abroad programs had a mean duration of 11.23 weeks ($Md = 9$, $Mo = 8$, range: 4 to 32 weeks). For approximately half the sample (54.89%), course instruction was conducted entirely in English; the remaining participants enrolled in courses where the host language was the primary language of instruction (21.05%) or courses that were taught in both English and the host language (24.56%). The majority (63.16%) of participants enrolled in courses with other study-abroad students from around the world, whereas the remaining completed courses with only American students (31.58%) or only students from the host country (5.26%). In the host country, participants lived with other study-abroad students from around the world (49.12%), only American students (29.82%), only students or families from the host country (12.28%), or by themselves (8.77%).
Measures

Expatriate effectiveness. To assess the work adjustment facet of the expatriate adjustment dimension of expatriate effectiveness, I used the two items relevant to students from the 3-item work adjustment subscale of the Expatriate Adjustment Scale (Black & Stephens, 1989) at Time 2. In addition, I used the item most relevant to students from the 3-item work challenges subscale of the Riverside Acculturation Stress Index (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). These items (see Appendix A) were rated on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), with higher scores indicating better work adjustment.

To assess the interaction adjustment facet of the expatriate adjustment dimension of expatriate effectiveness at Time 2, I asked participants questions regarding their comfort and satisfaction with contact with host nationals (i.e., their intercultural relationships). In addition, I administered a shortened version of the Intercultural Anxiety Scale (Stephan & Stephan, 1992). From the 15-item scale, I selected the 5 items that were most relevant to students and the study-abroad experience (see Appendix B). All items were rated on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) and reverse-coded so that higher scores indicate better interaction adjustment.

To assess the general adjustment facet of the expatriate adjustment dimension of expatriate effectiveness, I administered an adapted version of the Job-Related Anxiety-Comfort and Depression-Enthusiasm Scale (Warr, 1990) at Time 2. The adaptation consists of changing references to the job to references to the study-abroad experience. This scale contains 12 items (see Appendix C), each rated on a 6-point scale (1 = never, 6
= all of the time) and reverse-coded so that higher scores indicate better general adjustment.

To assess the withdrawal cognition dimension of expatriate effectiveness, I administered an adapted version of the Job Satisfaction Scale (Quinn & Shepard, 1974) at Time 2. The adaptation consists of changing references to the job to references to the study-abroad experience. In addition to capturing satisfaction with the study-abroad experience, these items also tap into lack of withdrawal cognitions by asking whether participants would have decided to study abroad if they had to do it again and whether they would recommend others to study abroad. The scale contains 4 items (see Appendix D), each rated on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), with higher scores indicating fewer withdrawal cognitions.

Finally, to assess the job performance dimension of expatriate effectiveness, I retrieved participants’ GPA from the registrar’s office for the academic term when students were studying abroad.

CQ. To assess CQ, I administered the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CIS; Ang et al., 2007) at Times 1 and 3. The CIS contains 20 items (see Appendix E), each rated on a 7-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree), with higher scores indicating higher CQ.

Multiculturalism-related variables. To assess multiculturalism, I asked questions at Time 1 regarding participants’ ethnic heritage(s) and strength of identification to their ethnic and the dominant American cultures (see Appendix F). These items were rated on a 5-point scale (1 = very weak, 5 = very strong), with higher scores indicating a stronger
cultural identification. In addition, at Time 1, I administered the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA; Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000; see Appendix G) to assess acculturation and the Bicultural Identity Integration Scale-2 (BIIS-2; Huynh, 2009; see Appendix H) to assess BII. The VIA has two 10-item subscales: dominant cultural orientation and ethnic cultural orientation. Items were rated on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), with higher scores indicating a higher cultural orientation. Integration is operationalized as the interaction of these two subscales. The BIIS has two subscales: cultural harmony (10 items) and cultural blendedness (9 items). Global BII is operationalized as the mean of all the cultural harmony and cultural blendedness items. Items were rated on a 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), with higher scores indicating higher BII.

Other questions. At Time 1, I asked about participants’ demographic characteristics and characteristics of the study-abroad program. Demographic questions included gender, age, year in school, socioeconomic status, religious affiliation, race/ethnicity, country of birth, language fluency, and previous international experience. Questions regarding the study-abroad program included living situation, student composition of classes, and language in which classes were taught (see Appendix I).

Procedure

Participants were recruited during university-sponsored study-abroad orientation sessions (see Appendix J for the recruitment letter). They completed the above measures on-line using QuestionPro.com at three time points: before studying abroad (Time 1), while studying abroad (Time 2), and after studying abroad (Time 3). The Time 1
measures (assessing CQ, multiculturalism-related variables, and demographic variables) were administered 2 to 4 weeks before the start of participants’ study-abroad program. The Time 2 measures (assessing expatriate effectiveness) were administered at the midpoint of the program (i.e., 2 to 3 weeks after the start of the program for summer students and 7 to 8 weeks after the start of the program for fall students). The Time 3 measures (assessing CQ in order to examine changes in CQ) were administered 2 to 4 weeks after the end of participants’ study-abroad program. As incentive to participate, students received monetary compensation in the form of Amazon.com gift cards. They received a $15 electronic gift card after completing Time 1 measures and a $30 electronic gift card after completing Time 3 measures.

Results

The means, standard deviations, correlations, and reliabilities for study variables appear in Table 2. For all longitudinal (cross-time) analyses, only responses from participants who were in the US during Time 1, the host country during Time 2, and the US during Time 3 were used as appropriate \( (n = 34) \); otherwise, responses from all 57 participants were used. Overall, there were no significant differences \( (p > .05) \) in the variables of interest (i.e., expatriate effectiveness, CQ, and multiculturalism-related variables) based on any of the demographic variables (i.e., gender, age, year in school, socioeconomic status, religious affiliation, or country of birth). However, summer study-abroad participants had significantly lower CQ at Time 1 \( [t(50) = 2.62, p = .01] \) but significantly higher work adjustment at Time 2 \( [t(48) = 2.03, p = .05] \) as compared to fall study-abroad participants; therefore, I controlled for academic term abroad in analyses.
involving Time 1 CQ and Time 2 work adjustment. It is possible that individuals with higher CQ before going abroad chose to study abroad during the fall term, which is more intensive and longer ($M = 16.00$ weeks) than the summer term ($M = 6.91$ weeks). Relatedly, because the summer term is shorter and possibly easier, summer study-abroad participants reported higher work adjustment while abroad. Interestingly, whether participants had previously travelled internationally was not significantly correlated with any indicator of expatriate effectiveness, or CQ at either Time 1 or Time 3 ($p$s > .05).

**CQ**

To test the hypothesis that studying abroad is associated with an increase in CQ (Hypothesis 1), I conducted a repeated-measures analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with academic term as a covariate. CQ scores at Time 3 were significantly higher than CQ scores at Time 1, $F(1, 35) = 5.88, p = .02$, partial $\eta^2 = .14$. In other words, supporting Hypothesis 1, participants had higher CQ after studying abroad. To determine whether the increase in CQ occurred for both multicultural individuals and monocultural individuals, I repeated the above analysis for each group separately. Multicultural individuals were operationalized as those who had a moderate to high identification with at least two cultures ($n = 44$); monocultural individuals were operationalized as those with a moderate to high identification with one culture only ($n = 13$). For multicultural individuals, there was a significant increase in CQ after studying abroad [Time 1: $M = 5.09, SD = 0.62$; Time 3: $M = 5.44, SD = 0.71$; $F(1, 24) = 5.30, p = .03$, partial $\eta^2 = .18$]. However, for monocultural individuals, the increase in CQ was not significant [Time 1: $M = 5.15, SD = 0.84$; Time 3: $M = 5.70, SD = 0.65$; $F(1, 9) = 1.71, p = .22$, partial $\eta^2$]
= .16], perhaps due to the small sample size. Therefore, not only was Hypothesis 1 supported for the sample as a whole, it was also supported for multicultural individuals alone.

To test the hypothesis that CQ predicts greater expatriate effectiveness (Hypothesis 2), I conducted regression analyses with CQ as the predictor variable (controlling for academic term abroad) and work adjustment, interaction adjustment, general adjustment, withdrawal cognitions, and grades as outcome variables. As hypothesized, CQ was a significant predictor of greater work adjustment [β = .35, t(43) = 2.34, p = .02], greater interaction adjustment [β = .44, t(43) = 2.95, p = .005], greater general adjustment [β = .34, t(43) = 2.14, p = .04], and fewer withdrawal cognitions [β = -.35, t(43) = 2.21, p = .03]. However, CQ did not significantly predict GPA while abroad, β = .17, t(23) = 0.80, p = .43. Overall, CQ was able to predict most indicators of expatriate effectiveness (see Table 3 for a summary of regression analyses). That is, individuals with higher CQ were more effective as expatriates than those with lower CQ.

**Multiculturalism**

Hypothesis 3a proposed that multiculturalism predicts greater expatriate effectiveness, such that multicultural individuals are more effective as expatriates than monocultural individuals. To test Hypothesis 3a, I conducted regression analyses with multiculturalism (dummy-coded) as the predictor variable and indicators of expatriate effectiveness as outcome variables. Although multicultural individuals had marginally significantly better general adjustment than monocultural individuals [β = .28, t(48) = 2.00, p = .05], multiculturalism did not significantly predict work adjustment [controlling
for academic term abroad; $\beta = .01, t(47) = 0.09, p = .93$, interaction adjustment [$\beta = .03, t(48) = 0.18, p = .86$], withdrawal cognitions [$\beta = -.15, t(48) = 1.07, p = .29$], or GPA while abroad [$\beta = -.04, t(27) = 0.21, p = .84$]. Overall, Hypothesis 3a was not supported (see Table 3 for a summary of regression analyses); however, multicultural individuals were better adjusted psychologically than monocultural individuals during their time studying abroad.

Hypothesis 3b proposed that multicultural individuals have higher CQ than monocultural individuals. Regressing CQ onto multiculturalism, I found that multiculturalism did not predict CQ at either Time 1 [controlling for academic term abroad; $\beta = -.05, t(49) = 0.39, p = .70$] or Time 3 [$\beta = -.18, t(38) = 1.13, p = .27$]. Contrary to what was expected, multicultural individuals and monocultural individuals had comparable levels of CQ. Because Hypothesis 3b was not supported (see Table 3 for a summary of regression analyses), I did not test the hypothesis that CQ partially mediates the relationship between multiculturalism and expatriate effectiveness (Hypothesis 3c).

To supplement the above analyses, I conducted analyses of variance (ANOVAs) – in the case of work adjustment and CQ, I conducted ANCOVAs with academic term as a covariate – to compare monocultural individuals, bicultural individuals (i.e., those with a moderate to high identification with exactly two cultures; $n = 38$), and individuals with three or more cultures (i.e., those with a moderate to high identification with more than two cultures; $n = 6$) on their expatriate effectiveness and CQ. Similar to the results above, these three groups had significantly different levels of general adjustment [$F(2, 46) =$
3.50, \( p = .04 \), partial \( \eta^2 = .13 \). As indicated by Tukey post-hoc tests, monocultural individuals had marginally significantly poorer general adjustment than bicultural individuals \((p = .07)\) and individuals with three or more cultures \((p = .07)\). However, these groups were not significantly different in their work adjustment \([\text{controlling for academic term abroad; } F(2, 45) = 0.17, p = .85, \text{ partial } \eta^2 = .01]\), interaction adjustment \([F(2, 46) = 0.35, p = .71, \text{ partial } \eta^2 = .01]\), withdrawal cognitions \([F(2, 46) = 2.23, p = .12, \text{ partial } \eta^2 = .09]\), or GPA while abroad \([F(2, 25) = 0.33, p = .72, \text{ partial } \eta^2 = .03]\). In addition, these three groups did not have significantly different levels of CQ at either Time 1 \([\text{controlling for academic term abroad; } F(2, 47) = 0.04, p = .96, \text{ partial } \eta^2 = .002]\) or Time 3 \([F(2, 36) = 1.09, p = .35, \text{ partial } \eta^2 = .06]\).

**Integration**

Using data from only bicultural individuals, I tested the hypothesis that integrated biculturals are more effective as expatriates than other bicultural individuals (Hypothesis 4a). Integration was operationalized as the interaction between participants’ score on the dominant cultural orientation subscale of the VIA and their score on the ethnic cultural orientation subscale of the VIA. (Note that cultural orientation is distinct from cultural identification because cultural orientation includes behaviors, values, and attitudes.) I conducted regression analyses with integration as the predictor variable and indicators of expatriate effectiveness as outcome variables. Among bicultural individuals, integration did not predict work adjustment \([\text{controlling for academic term abroad; } \beta = .27, t(30) = 1.58, p = .13]\), interaction adjustment \([\beta = .25, t(31) = 1.42, p = .17]\), general adjustment \([\beta = .14, t(31) = 0.76, p = .45]\), or withdrawal cognitions \([\beta = .02, t(31) = 0.09, p = .93]\).
However, integration significantly predicted better job performance or GPA while studying abroad, $\beta = .53, t(16) = 2.48, p = .02$. Note that although the effects on work adjustment and interaction adjustment were non-significant, they were moderate in size. Even though integrated biculturals were not significantly more effective than other bicultural individuals based on subjective indicators of expatriate effectiveness, they were more effective as expatriates based on the objective indicator of GPA; thus, Hypothesis 4a was partially supported (see Table 3 for a summary of regression analyses).

Again using data from only bicultural individuals, I tested the hypothesis that integrated biculturals have higher CQ than other bicultural individuals (Hypothesis 4b). Regressing CQ onto integration, I found that integration did not predict CQ at Time 1 [controlling for academic term abroad; $\beta = .24, t(31) = 1.57, p = .13$], but it significantly predicted higher CQ at Time 3 [$\beta = .50, t(20) = 2.58, p = .02$]. Note that at Time 1, the effect size for the relationship between integration and CQ is moderate though non-significant. Partially supporting Hypothesis 4b (see Table 3 for a summary of regression analyses), CQ was significantly higher for integrated biculturals as compared to other bicultural individuals at Time 3. Because CQ was not significantly higher for integrated biculturals at Time 1, I did not test the hypothesis that CQ partially mediates the relationship between integration and expatriate effectiveness (Hypothesis 4c).

**BII**

Because BII is relevant to bicultural individuals using the integration strategy, I used data from only these individuals ($n = 36$). That is, I used data from individuals with a moderate to high identification with exactly two cultures (i.e., bicultural) who scored at
or above the midpoint on both the dominant and ethnic cultural orientation subscales of
the VIA (i.e., integration strategy). (Note that only two bicultural individuals were
excluded from these analyses for using an acculturation strategy other than the integration
strategy.) To test the hypothesis that integrated biculturals with higher BII are more
effective as expatriates than those with lower BII (Hypothesis 5a), I conducted regression
analyses with BII as the predictor variable and indicators of expatriate effectiveness as
outcome variables. Among bicultural individuals using the integration strategy, BII did
not predict work adjustment [controlling for academic term abroad; $\beta = .09$, $t(29) = 0.50$,
$p = .62$], interaction adjustment [$\beta = .06$, $t(30) = 0.33$, $p = .74$], general adjustment [$\beta = -
.09$, $t(30) = 0.52$, $p = .61$], withdrawal cognitions [$\beta = .02$, $t(30) = 0.09$, $p = .93$], or GPA
while studying abroad [$\beta = .10$, $t(16) = 0.40$, $p = .70$]. To examine specifically cultural
harmony, I repeated the above analyses but with cultural harmony rather than BII as the
predictor. As with global BII, cultural harmony did not predict work adjustment
[controlling for academic term abroad; $\beta = .09$, $t(29) = 0.46$, $p = .65$], interaction
adjustment [$\beta = .16$, $t(30) = 0.86$, $p = .40$], general adjustment [$\beta = -.18$, $t(30) = 1.01$, $p$
$= .32$], withdrawal cognitions [$\beta = .10$, $t(30) = 0.52$, $p = .60$], or GPA while studying
abroad [$\beta = -.10$, $t(16) = 0.38$, $p = .71$]. Hypothesis 5a was not supported (see Table 3 for
a summary of regression analyses); integrated biculturals with higher BII and those with
lower BII were comparable in their expatriate effectiveness.

With data from only bicultural individuals using the integration strategy, I tested
the hypothesis that integrated biculturals with higher BII also have higher CQ than those
with lower BII (Hypothesis 5b). Regressing CQ onto BII, I found that BII did not predict
CQ at either Time 1 [controlling for academic term abroad; $\beta = -.08$, $t(31) = -0.50$, $p = .62$] or Time 3 [$\beta = .21$, $t(20) = 0.96$, $p = .35$]. Repeating these analyses with cultural harmony, I also found that cultural harmony did not predict CQ at either Time 1 [controlling for academic term abroad; $\beta = -.16$, $t(31) = 1.03$, $p = .31$] or Time 3 [$\beta = .19$, $t(20) = 0.89$, $p = .39$]. Contrary to what was expected, integrated biculturals with higher BII and those with lower BII had comparable levels of CQ (see Table 3 for a summary of regression analyses). Because neither Hypothesis 5a nor Hypothesis 5b were supported, I did not test the hypothesis that CQ partially mediates the relationship between BII and expatriate effectiveness (Hypothesis 5c).

**Exploratory Analyses**

Because the majority of participants were ethnic minorities, it is possible that some of them studied abroad in their heritage country. These individuals who traveled to their heritage country are described as transnational (Portes, Guarnizo, & Haller, 2002). To compare the expatriate effectiveness and CQ of multicultural individuals who are transnational ($n = 12$) vs. those who are not ($n = 31$), I conducted regression analyses with transnationalism (dummy-coded) as the predictor variable and expatriate effectiveness and CQ as outcome variables. Although transnationalism did not predict work adjustment [controlling for academic term abroad; $\beta = .03$, $t(35) = 0.18$, $p = .86$], interaction adjustment [$\beta = -.12$, $t(36) = 0.75$, $p = .46$], or withdrawal cognitions [$\beta = .21$, $t(36) = 1.28$, $p = .21$], transnational individuals had significantly lower general adjustment [$\beta = -.32$, $t(36) = 2.04$, $p = .05$] and marginally lower GPA while studying abroad [$\beta = -.39$, $t(20) = 1.90$, $p = .07$] as compared to other multicultural individuals. In
other words, transnational individuals suffered from relatively poorer adjustment and poorer job performance while abroad (see Table 3 for a summary of regression analyses). Regressing CQ onto transnationalism, I found that transnationalism did not predict CQ at Time 1 [controlling for academic term abroad; $\beta = .15, t(37) = 1.00, p = .33$], but it marginally significantly predicted lower CQ at Time 3 [$\beta = -.34, t(25) = 1.84, p = .08$]. In other words, transnational individuals ($M = 5.32, SD = 0.68$) and other multicultural individuals ($M = 4.96, SD = 0.56$) had comparable levels of CQ before studying abroad, but transnational individuals ($M = 5.08, SD = 0.71$) had lower CQ than other multicultural individuals ($M = 5.59, SD = 0.66$) after studying abroad.

In addition to studying in their heritage country, most of these transnational individuals ($n = 9$) had also previously traveled to their heritage country (and other countries). It is important to note that transnational individuals and other multicultural individuals did not significantly differ on their degree of integration [$t(37) = 0.76, p = .45$] or their level of BII [$t(32) = 0.67, p = .51$].

Discussion

Summary of Results

The goals of this dissertation were to examine the CQ-expatriate effectiveness associations for study-abroad students, and to compare the levels of CQ and expatriate effectiveness for multicultural vs. monocultural individuals, as a function of integration, and as a function of BII. In summary, Hypothesis 1, stating that CQ after studying abroad is higher than CQ before studying abroad, was fully supported for the sample as a whole and for multicultural individuals alone, and Hypothesis 2, regarding CQ as a predictor of
greater expatriate effectiveness, was supported for all indicators of effectiveness except GPA. Partially supporting Hypothesis 3a, multicultural individuals were better adjusted psychologically while abroad than monocultural individuals, but they were not more effective based on the other facets and indicators of expatriate effectiveness. With regard to multiculturalism and CQ, Hypothesis 3b that multicultural individuals would have higher CQ than monocultural individuals was not supported. Partially supporting Hypothesis 4a, integrated biculturals performed better on international assignments (as indicated by GPA) in comparison to other bicultural individuals, but they were not more effective based on the other indicators of expatriate effectiveness. Partially supporting Hypothesis 4b, integrated biculturals had higher CQ than other bicultural individuals after studying abroad, but they had comparable levels of CQ before studying abroad. As for BII (and cultural harmony), neither Hypothesis 5a regarding expatriate effectiveness nor Hypothesis 5b regarding CQ were supported. Lastly, none of the hypotheses about CQ as a mediator between multiculturalism-related variables and expatriate effectiveness (Hypotheses 3c, 4c, and 5c) were supported. See Table 4 for a summary of hypotheses and results.

Although not hypothesized, I found that transnational individuals seemed to suffer more than other multicultural individuals while abroad and did not benefit from the study-abroad experience as much as other multicultural individuals; that is, they were less adjusted psychologically and performed worse while abroad, and they had lower CQ than other multicultural individuals after studying abroad.
Replicating previous findings on CQ and expatriate effectiveness (e.g., Bhaskar-Shrinivas et al., 2005; Carlson & Widaman, 1998) and extending those findings to study-abroad participants, I found that the experience of living and working abroad is related to an increase in knowledge of one’s self, one’s culture, and other cultures, intercultural skills, the ability to understand cultural differences, and the ability to function effectively in culturally diverse settings. Moreover, I found that increases in these intercultural knowledge and skill areas predict better expatriate effectiveness, including expatriate adjustment and lack of withdrawal cognitions. This is important because poor expatriate adjustment and strong withdrawal cognitions are implicated in failed international assignments (Shaffer et al., 2006). However, increases in CQ do not predict job performance (GPA) for study-abroad students. First, GPA was not available for all students because some of them were graded on a pass/fail basis; thus, sample size was smaller for these analyses. Second, there is considerable variation in grading among the different programs sampled (e.g., some programs had more lenient grading policies than others); thus, GPA may not be an accurate indicator of job performance for some study-abroad students. Moreover, it is possible that because GPA is dependent upon many other variables, such as conscientiousness, work habits, and difficulty of course load during the term, CQ may not be directly related to GPA. With non-student samples whose job performance is measured with universal standards and tangible products, CQ may be able to better predict expatriate performance. However, CQ does predict the other expatriate effectiveness components that are related to cultural transition (i.e., greater work
adjustment, greater interaction adjustment, greater general adjustment, and fewer withdrawal cognitions), which suggests that it is an important component of understanding success for individuals living and working abroad.

**Multiculturalism, Integration, and BII**

As the first study to investigate multicultural individuals’ expatriate effectiveness and CQ, this dissertation contributes greatly to the literature and provides a more nuanced perspective on multicultural individuals’ experience abroad. In comparison to previous research that has focused on mostly monocultural individuals’ study-abroad experience, this is the first study to focus solely on the potential benefits of studying abroad for multicultural individuals. Multicultural individuals (including integrated biculturals) are not more effective across the board on international assignments; they may be more effective based on some criteria (e.g., general adjustment, job performance) but not others (e.g., work adjustment, interaction adjustment, lack of withdrawal cognitions).

In addition, although multicultural individuals experience increases in CQ after studying abroad, they (including integrated biculturals) do not have higher CQ than monocultural individuals from the onset (before going abroad). However, it is possible that current conceptualizations of CQ may not be valid for multicultural individuals. Most theories and measures of CQ have been tested using predominantly White and male samples, and these populations develop and manifest CQ differently from ethnic minorities and women (Sparrow, 2000). For example, whereas White men with high CQ transcend cultural boundaries, experience an in-betweenness, live on the margins and fringes of their cultures, are detached from their cultures, and experience their cultures
objectively, ethnic minorities and women with high CQ are rooted in their cultural experiences, live at the center of their cultures, are connected to others from their cultures, and experience their cultures subjectively (Sparrow, 2000).

In terms of the null findings regarding BII, CQ, and expatriate effectiveness, there are several possible explanations. First, I found that higher BII was not related to higher CQ. A characteristic of higher BII (and higher CQ) is the ability to culturally frame-switch appropriately (e.g., think and act like a Chinese person in a Chinese situation; Benet-Martínez et al., 2002), but learning this frame-switching skill requires repeated exposure to cultural situations that call for such switching behavior and in-depth cultural knowledge. Because these study-abroad programs were relatively short, it is possible that participants had not acquired the cultural knowledge and skills necessary to effectively frame-switch. In other words, appropriate cultural frame-switching skills characteristic of higher BII did not translate to the new cultural situation because participants were still in the cultural learning stage. Thus, there was no relationship between BII and CQ. If participants were to have spent a longer period of time in their respective host country, I may have been able to uncover an association between BII and CQ.

Second, I found that higher BII was not related to higher expatriate effectiveness. It is possible that regardless of BII level, individuals were equally effective in their international assignments but for different reasons. For individuals with higher BII, cultural differences may not be a source of conflict for them (an aspect of higher CQ); thus, they can adapt successfully to new cultural situations, making them effective expatriates. For individuals with lower BII, they are able to recognize cultural differences
(another aspect of higher CQ) due to their higher levels of cognitive complexity (Benet-Martínez et al., 2006), and they are able to constructively transform the knowledge of those differences to effective adaptation and performance abroad. Therefore, because higher BII may relate to one aspect of CQ and lower BII may relate to another aspect of CQ, BII may appear to have a null relationship with CQ when examining global CQ. In other words, although they possess skills that make up different facets of CQ, my analyses show that individuals with higher vs. lower BII are equally high on global CQ and equally effective as expatriates. More research is needed to explore how the behaviors, skills, and knowledge characteristic of higher BII and higher CQ may function together to help multicultural individuals adjust in their international assignments.

**Transnationalism**

The interesting findings on transnationalism also deserve discussion. Although transnationalism has garnered increasing attention in anthropology, sociology, and ethnic studies, the study of transnational is relatively new to psychology. Transnationalism includes activities such as frequent communication with and travel to the heritage country, and sending remittances to the heritage country (Sanders, 2002). In this dissertation, I used the term “transnational” to categorize ethnic minorities from the US who lived and studied in their heritage country. Previous research has found that transnationalism is associated with attitudes toward the ethnic culture and the development of ethnic and cultural identities (Dlamini & Anucha, 2009; Haller & Landoldt, 2005). With regard to mental health, transnationalism is positively related to both depression and life satisfaction (Murphy & Mahalingam, 2004). My findings that transnational individuals
had lower general adjustment while abroad and suffered a decrease (rather than an increase) in CQ after studying abroad may be better understood by considering the psychology of transnational individuals and return migrants.

First, transnational individuals may have a nostalgic, romanticized, or idealized image of their heritage culture (Dlamini & Anucha, 2009), possibly due to cultural encapsulation, or the crystallization of the heritage culture from the era when they or their ancestors entered the dominant culture (Kim-Jo, Benet-Martinez, & Ozer, in press). When they return to their heritage (now host) culture, they may experience disappointment or disillusion because the host culture does not meet their expectations or is different from what they had imagined (Takenaka, 1999). Second, they may not meet the expectations that host nationals have of them as compatriots and may experience social rejection (Takenaka, 1999; Tsuda, 1999). Transnational individuals may look like host nationals and have similar names to host nationals, but they may not act or think entirely like host nationals (Potter & Phillips, 2006; Tsuda, 1999). These unmet expectations may contribute to transnational individuals’ lower adjustment while abroad and prevent them from fully benefiting from the study-abroad experience and developing greater CQ. Third, because transnational individuals are those returning to their heritage country, they may also be loosely considered repatriates (or expatriates returning to their home country; Sussman, 2000). Like repatriates, transnational individuals may experience a misfit between who they are or who they have become from their experience outside the heritage culture, and the heritage culture itself. As a result, they may suffer
from psychological stress upon return to the heritage country, as I found in this dissertation.

Limitations

A major limitation of this dissertation is the sample, specifically the sample size and sample composition. However, despite the relatively small sample (N = 57), in this longitudinal study, power is greater than .80 for detecting a medium effect using a repeated-measures analysis of variance with two time points. Nevertheless, the sample is too small to compare groups based on host country (which may relate to the development of CQ) or ethnicity (which may relate to the multiculturalism-related variables). Moreover, the sample consists of undergraduate students, who may not be representative of the general population or the population from which expatriates are selected; however, when embarking on new research (such as how expatriate effectiveness and CQ relate to multiculturalism), it is necessary to start with a homogenous group (e.g., in terms of age, education, experience) before attempting to generalize the findings to a wider population.

In addition, the research design may pose other limitations. Although I measured participants at three time points and employed a longitudinal design, the data are correlational and comparisons are cross-sectional (such as those between multicultural and monocultural individuals); therefore, causal conclusions cannot be made. Given the research design, I can conclude that one variable (e.g., studying abroad) precedes another (e.g., CQ), but because I did not control for all possible confounding variables, I cannot conclude that changes in the second variable (CQ) is due to the first variable (studying abroad; Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1991). Relatedly, data were collected using self-report,
retrospective measures; therefore, variables may be biased by common method (Friedrich, Byrne, & Mumford, 2009; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), perceptions, or hindsight. For example, CQ assessed via self-report measures may not reflect actual CQ, but rather participants’ self-efficacy in cross-cultural situations or their level of comfort in different cultures. In addition, the measure of withdrawal cognitions used is reflective in nature and relies on hypothetical situations. Withdrawal cognitions may be better assessed by asking about participants’ current situation (e.g., “I want to return to my home country right now” or “I do not want to study abroad anymore”). Nevertheless, this dissertation provides a foundation for future, more sophisticated, multi-method studies that would allow for causal interpretations regarding multiculturalism, CQ, and expatriate effectiveness.

**Future Directions**

To address the above limitations, future studies should employ larger samples drawn from a non-student population of employees. Furthermore, these studies should collect data using multiple methods and sources, such as observer reports of participants’ CQ or ratings of expatriate effectiveness by teachers, co-workers, supervisors, or others in the host country with whom the expatriates interact and work. Experiments should also be conducted to determine the causes of higher CQ and greater expatriate effectiveness among multicultural individuals.

Expanding on the current dissertation’s findings, future studies should explore the conceptualization of CQ by ethnic minorities and compare this to the current definitions and theories of CQ. Qualitative research and open-ended data may help to increase the
understanding of multicultural individuals’ CQ. These future studies may also contribute to the development of a culturally appropriate measure of CQ for multicultural individuals. With regard to BII, future research is needed to better understand the relation between BII and CQ, and to explore differences in the facets of CQ based on BII. In addition, there is a dearth of psychological research on transnational individuals and return migrants. Future studies should focus on this under-studied category of multicultural individuals.

Related to the topic of this dissertation are other questions that desire answers and empirical data. For example, previous multicultural experience is associated with greater creativity (Leung, Maddux, Galinsky, & Chiu, 2008). Does CQ also relate to greater creativity? It is possible that greater creativity is not due to the previous multicultural experiences themselves but due to the higher CQ derived from those experiences. Moreover, integrated biculturals have greater integrative complexity, or the ability to understand and connect different perspectives (Tadmor et al., 2009). How is CQ related to integrative complexity for integrated biculturals? Does integrative complexity mediate the relationship between the integration acculturation strategy and CQ? Researchers have asserted that training multicultural individuals for international assignments may be easier than training monocultural individuals (Bell & Harrison, 1996; Selmer & Lam, 2004). Empirical studies are needed to determine whether this assertion is warranted and to determine what form training should take for multicultural individuals to be effective abroad. Further research on the CQ and expatriate effectiveness of multicultural individuals is needed to answer the above questions.
Implications

My dissertation study has important implications for expatriates and multinational corporations, study-abroad students and study-abroad programs, multicultural individuals, and research on expatriate effectiveness, CQ, and multiculturalism. Study-abroad program administrators and multicultural individuals may be relieved to learn that the widely touted benefits of studying abroad (based on research from mostly monocultural individuals) may also occur for multicultural individuals. More generally, all stakeholders (those going abroad and those sending others abroad) are interested in the factors that make individuals more or less effective or successful when abroad. This dissertation helps to identify whether CQ, previous cultural experiences (e.g., multiculturalism), cultural strategies (e.g., the integration strategy of acculturation), and perceptions of one’s own cultures (e.g., BII) impact individuals’ experiences abroad.

Based on the finding that CQ predicts expatriate effectiveness, multinational corporations and study-abroad program administrators may want to increase potential expatriates’ CQ through pre-departure training so that they have a more positive experience abroad. In addition, multicultural individuals may be more effective (at least in their general adjustment) as expatriates; therefore, multinational corporations may witness higher success rates on international assignments if they select multicultural individuals for expatriation. With the increasing presence of multicultural individuals in the US, employing them as expatriates would be advantageous to both parties. Multinational corporations would reap strategic and economic benefits, and multicultural individuals can work in a context that would allow them to showcase their talents and
skills. Furthermore, because integrated biculturals performed better abroad in comparison to other biculturals, corporations and universities may benefit from implementing multicultural policies that encourage individuals to integrate their ethnic culture with the dominant culture. Lastly, trainings focused on potential expatriates’ expectations for the international assignment and the host country may buffer transnational individuals from experiencing lowered general adjustment and lowered CQ. Research-wise, this dissertation fills the gap on multiculturalism, CQ, and expatriate effectiveness. It is the first to provide data to test the propositions made by other researchers regarding multicultural individuals’ higher CQ and greater expatriate effectiveness. In addition, future studies, using this dissertation as a starting point, can explore the conditions for when and why multicultural individuals are more successful abroad.
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Appendix A

Work Adjustment

Two items adapted from the Expatriate Adjustment Scale: Work Adjustment Subscale (Black & Stephens, 1989)
1. I am very adjusted to the specific academic responsibilities that I have.
2. I am very adjusted to the academic performance standards and expectations with which I am faced.

One item adapted from the Riverside Acculturation Stress Index (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005)
3. I feel the pressure that what “I” do is representative of the abilities of people from the United States. (R)
Appendix B

Interaction Adjustment

1. I enjoy interacting with people from [HOST COUNTRY].
2. I am comfortable interacting with people from [HOST COUNTRY].

Shortened version of the Intercultural Anxiety Scale (Stephan & Stephan, 1992)

For the following situations, imagine that the other people are from [HOST COUNTRY] and you are the only person from the United States. It would bother me if...

3. People stare at me and talk about me among themselves. (R)
4. I am unable to make myself understood when it is important. (R)
5. I am laughed at for a minor mistake I have made. (R)
6. I am totally ignored by the people at a social gathering. (R)
7. I unintentionally offend a member of the other group by making a small social error. (R)
Appendix C

General Adjustment

Adapted version of the Job-Related Anxiety-Comfort and Depression-Enthusiasm Scale (Warr, 1990)

*During your time studying abroad, how much did each problem distress or bother you?*

1. Tense (R)
2. Uneasy (R)
3. Worried (R)
4. Calm
5. Contented
6. Relaxed
7. Depressed (R)
8. Gloomy (R)
9. Miserable (R)
10. Cheerful
11. Enthusiastic
12. Optimistic
Appendix D

Withdrawal Cognitions

Adapted version of the Job Satisfaction Scale (Quinn & Shepard, 1974)
1. All in all, I am very satisfied with my study abroad experience. (R)
2. If a good friend of mine told me that he/she was interested in studying abroad, I
   would strongly recommend it. (R)
3. Knowing what I know now, if I had to decide all over again whether to study abroad,
   I would. (R)
4. In general, my study abroad experience measures up to what I wanted when I decided
to go. (R)
Appendix E

CQ

Cultural Intelligence Scale (Ang et al., 2004)
1. I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds.
2. I adjust my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from a culture that is unfamiliar to me.
3. I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions.
4. I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures.
5. I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures.
6. I know the rules (e.g., vocabulary, grammar) of other languages.
7. I know the cultural values and religious beliefs of other cultures.
8. I know the marriage systems of other cultures.
9. I know the arts and crafts of other cultures.
10. I know the rules for expressing non-verbal behaviors in other cultures.
11. I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.
12. I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me.
13. I am sure I can deal with the stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me.
14. I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me.
15. I am confident that I can get accustomed to the shopping conditions in a different culture.
16. I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.
17. I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations.
18. I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it.
19. I change my non-verbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it.
20. I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.
Appendix F

Cultural Identification

1. Please rate your identification with [ETHNIC] culture.
   (presented $x$ times, where $x$ = the number of ethnic groups to which participants reported belonging)
2. Please rate your identification with mainstream American culture.
Appendix G

Acculturation (Integration Strategy)

Vancouver Index of Acculturation (Ryder et al., 2000)

Ethnic Cultural Orientation Subscale
1. I often participate in my heritage culture traditions.
2. I would be willing to marry a person from my heritage culture.
3. I enjoy social activities with people from the same heritage culture as myself.
4. I am comfortable working with people of the same heritage culture as myself.
5. I enjoy entertainment (e.g., movies, music) from my heritage culture.
6. I often behave in ways that are typical of my heritage culture.
7. It is important for me to maintain or develop the practices of my heritage culture.
8. I believe in the values of my heritage culture.
9. I enjoy the jokes and humor of my heritage culture.
10. I am interested in having friends from my heritage culture.

Dominant Cultural Orientation Subscale
11. I often participate in mainstream American cultural traditions.
12. I would be willing to marry an American person.
13. I enjoy social activities with typical American people.
15. I enjoy American entertainment (e.g., movies, music).
16. I often behave in ways that are typically American.
17. It is important for me to maintain or develop American cultural practices.
18. I believe in mainstream American values.
19. I enjoy typical American jokes and humor.
20. I am interested in having American friends.
Appendix H

BII

Bicultural Identity Integration Scale-2 (Huynh, 2009)

Harmony Subscale
1. I find it easy to harmonize [ETHNIC] and American cultures.
2. I rarely feel conflicted about being bicultural.
3. I find it easy to balance both [ETHNIC] and American cultures.
4. I do not feel trapped between the [ETHNIC] and American cultures.
5. I feel torn between [ETHNIC] and American cultures. (R)
6. Being bicultural means having two cultural forces pulling on me at the same time. (R)
7. I feel that my [ETHNIC] and American cultures are incompatible. (R)
8. I feel conflicted between the American and [ETHNIC] ways of doing things. (R)
9. I feel like someone moving between two cultures. (R)
10. I feel caught between the [ETHNIC] and American cultures. (R)

Blendedness Subscale
11. I cannot ignore the [ETHNIC] or American side of me.
12. I feel [ETHNIC] and American at the same time.
13. I relate better to a combined [ETHNIC]-American culture than to [ETHNIC] or American culture alone.
15. I feel part of a combined culture.
16. I find it difficult to combine [ETHNIC] and American cultures. (R)
17. I do not blend my [ETHNIC] and American cultures. (R)
18. I am simply an [ETHNIC] who lives in North America. (R)
19. I keep [ETHNIC] and American cultures separate. (R)
Appendix I

Demographic and Program-Related Questions

1. Gender:
   a. Female
   b. Male
2. Age: ______ years
3. Year in school:
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Other (please specify): ______
4. Annual Household Income (before tax). If you are not financially independent, please report the annual household income of your parents or guardians:
   a. $0 - $17,970
   b. $17,971 - $33,314
   c. $33,315 - $53,000
   d. $53,001 - $83,500
   e. More than $83,500
5. Your religious affiliation or preference:
   a. Agnostic
   b. Atheist
   c. Baha’i
   d. Buddhist
   e. Catholic
   f. Hindu
   g. Jewish
   h. Muslim
   i. Protestant
   j. Other (please specify):
   k. I do not subscribe to any formal religious traditions.
6. Your ethnicity (cultural background): Select all that apply. If your ethnicity is mixed, indicate approximate percentages or fractions.
   a. Asian American (specify): ______
   b. African American (specify if applicable): ______
   c. European/Anglo American (specify if applicable): ______
   d. Latino-a/Hispanic (specify): ______
   e. Native American (specify if applicable): ______
   f. Other (specify): ______
7. Your country of birth: ______
   a. If you were not born in the U.S., what year did you arrive in the U.S.? ______
8. Please rate your fluency in each language.
   \(1 = \text{not at all fluent}, \ 5 = \text{very fluent}\)
   a. English
   b. [OTHER LANGUAGE]
      (presented \(x\) times, where \(x\) = the number of languages in which participants reported fluency)

9. Besides the U.S., in what countries have you lived? _____
   a. How long did you live in [COUNTRY]? _____ years and _____ months
      (presented \(x\) times, where \(x\) = the number of countries in which participants reported living)

10. To what countries have you traveled? _____

11. In what country will you be studying? _____

12. With whom will you be living in [HOST COUNTRY]?
   a. Host family
   b. Only students from [HOST COUNTRY]
   c. Students from around the world
   d. Only students from the United States
   e. Only students from the University of California, Riverside
   f. I will be living alone.

13. With whom will you be taking classes?
   a. Only students from [HOST COUNTRY]
   b. Students from around the world
   c. Only students from the United States
   d. Only students from the University of California, Riverside

14. In what language will you be taking classes?
   a. English only
   b. The official language of [HOST COUNTRY]
   c. Both English and the official language of [HOST COUNTRY]
   d. Other (please specify): _____
Appendix J

Recruitment Letter
Get Paid $45 for Sharing Your Study Abroad Experience

May 2, 2009

Dear study abroad student:

I am a doctoral student at UCR, and I need your help in order to finish my dissertation and graduate! My dissertation is on the study abroad experiences of UCR students. I would like to examine the role of cultural intelligence in your study abroad experience.

All you have to do is complete some Internet surveys. In exchange for less than 2 hours of your time, you will be paid $45! You will be asked to complete three different sets of surveys:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Study Abroad Program</th>
<th>Survey Length</th>
<th>Monetary Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Before</td>
<td>~ 45 minutes</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>During</td>
<td>~ 5 minutes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>After</td>
<td>~ 30 minutes</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>~ 1.5 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: In order to participate in Part 3 and receive $30, you must participate in Part 1 and Part 2.

To be eligible to participate in this study, you must be studying abroad in Summer or Fall 2009. In the process of completing the surveys, you may learn more about yourself and your study abroad experience. In addition, there are no known harms or discomforts associated with this study beyond those encountered in daily life.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please contact me:

- angela-minhtu.nguyen@email.ucr.edu
- anguy025@ucr.edu

You can also find this study on-line:

- Facebook: EAPstudy (one word)
- Twitter: EAPstudy

Spots are limited. Only the first 100 students can participate. Sign-up now!

As an undergraduate student, I studied abroad in Guadalajara, Mexico. It was one of the best experiences in my life! I hope that you will also have an enjoyable, memorable, and life-changing study abroad experience. Have a great trip!

Thank you very much for your help!

Angela-MinhTu Nguyen, M.A.
Ph.D. Candidate
Department of Psychology
University of California, Riverside
Table 1

*Number of Participants by Time and Academic Term*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Academic Term</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* One summer student and one fall student participated in Time 1 and Time 3 but not in Time 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CQ (Time 1)</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CQ (Time 3)</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Multiculturalism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Integration</td>
<td>1-25</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. BII</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cultural Harmony</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.89***</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cultural Blendedness</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.30†</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>(.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work Adjustment</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.30†</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Interaction Adjustment</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. General Adjustment</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.28†</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.28†</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Withdrawal Cognitions</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-.35*</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.24†</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.65***</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Performance (GPA)</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.34†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Reliability coefficients (Cronbach’s α) are in parentheses along the diagonal. Sample size is in brackets under each correlation coefficient. †p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 3

Summary of Regression Analyses (β)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Criterion Variables</th>
<th>Expatriate Effectiveness</th>
<th>CQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work Adjustment</td>
<td>Interaction Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35*†</td>
<td>.44**†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[46]</td>
<td>[46]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism vs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01†</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>monoculturalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>[50]</td>
<td>[50]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27†</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[33]</td>
<td>[33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BII</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09†</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[32]</td>
<td>[32]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09†</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[32]</td>
<td>[32]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03†</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[38]</td>
<td>[38]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Sample size is in brackets under each standardized regression coefficient. †p < .10. *p < .05. **p < .01. ‡Controlling for academic term abroad.
**Table 4**

*Summary of Hypotheses and Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Supported?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CQ after studying abroad is higher than CQ before studying abroad</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Individuals with higher CQ are more effective as expatriates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work adjustment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction adjustment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General adjustment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of withdrawal cognitions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Multicultural individuals are more effective as expatriates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work adjustment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction adjustment</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General adjustment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of withdrawal cognitions</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Multicultural individuals have higher CQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1 (before studying abroad)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 3 (after studying abroad)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Multicultural individuals’ greater expatriate effectiveness is partially due to their higher CQ</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. Among bicultural individuals, integrated biculturals are more effective as expatriates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work adjustment  No
Interaction adjustment  No
General adjustment  No
Lack of withdrawal cognitions  No
Job performance  Yes

4b. Among bicultural individuals, integrated biculturals have higher CQ

Time 1 (before studying abroad)  No
Time 3 (after studying abroad)  Yes

4c. For integrated biculturals, greater expatriate effectiveness is partially due to their higher CQ

5a. Among bicultural individuals using the integration strategy, those with higher BII (especially cultural harmony) are more effective as expatriates

Work adjustment  No
Interaction adjustment  No
General adjustment  No
Lack of withdrawal cognitions  No
Job performance  No

5b. Among bicultural individuals using the integration strategy, those with higher BII (especially cultural harmony) have higher CQ

Time 1 (before studying abroad)  No
Time 3 (after studying abroad)  No

5c. For integrated biculturals with high BII (especially cultural harmony), greater expatriate effectiveness is partially due to their higher CQ
Figure 1. Dimensions of expatriate effectiveness.
Figure 2. BII as a result of cultural harmony and cultural blendedness. Adapted from Benet-Martínez (2010).
Figure 3. Summary of hypotheses.