

The Relationship of Cross Cultural Adaptability and Emotional Intelligence

CROSS CULTURAL ADAPTABILITY

April 2, 2008

Judith Meyers, Psy.D.

Associate Clinical Professor, Department of Psychiatry, University of California at San Diego

Richard Lewak, Ph.D.

Private Practice

Ronald Stolberg, Ph.D.

California School of Professional Psychology at Alliant International University

Joanna Savarese-Levine, MA

California School of Professional Psychology, at Alliant International University

A measure of cross-cultural adaptability, the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI), was administered along with measures of personality and psychopathology, ego strength, emotional intelligence and interpersonal relating styles to 205 applicants to a reality T.V. show that required cross-cultural resilience. The results of the study show convergent validity between the CCAI and measures of ego strength, emotional control, emotional intelligence and mental health. CCAI discriminate validity was revealed by the negative correlations between measures of psychopathology and cultural adaptability. The results show that cross-cultural adaptability is related to mental health, emotional resilience, attachment, and emotional intelligence.

Six key words: MMPI-II, Resilience, Emotional Intelligence, CCAI, Culture Shock,
Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory

The Relationship of Cross Cultural Adaptability and Emotional Intelligence

CROSS CULTURAL ADAPTABILITY

April 2, 2008

The Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) (Kelley and Meyers, 1995) was developed to enhance the assessment of cross-cultural adaptability. The authors identified four personality dimensions that were related to successful cross-cultural adaptation. These dimensions comprise the four scales of the CCAI: Emotional Resilience (ER), Flexibility/Openness (FO), Perceptual Acuity (PAC), and Personal Autonomy (PA). Recently, the construct of emotional intelligence, a measure of emotional resilience, has been identified by cross-cultural scholars as an important component of successful cross-cultural adaptability (Cherbosque, Gardenswartz and Rowe, 2005; Tang, 2001). Cross cultural adaptability involves effective stress management, and therefore should be correlated with ego strength, another construct describing effective functioning under stress. Additionally, an absence of mental illness should be predictive of good cross cultural adaptability, though little research has been done specifically addressing this issue. A goal of this study was to confirm that the CCAI correlates with these aspects of cross-cultural adaptability.

THEORIES OF CROSS-CULTURAL ADAPTATION

Culture shock, cross-cultural effectiveness and emotional intelligence

Culture shock

Cross-cultural adaptation theory began in the 1950s when Lysgaard proposed the “U” shaped curve theory of adaptation. According to this theory the lowest point on the “U” reflects the most difficult phase of adjustment. Following the initial enthusiastic period coined the “honeymoon phase” the dip is then followed by gradual adaptation, hence the resemblance to a “U” curve.

The actual term “culture shock” is attributed to Oberg (1960). He conceptualized culture shock as the emotional response to cultural differences. Culture shock involves the loss of acquired emotional meaning and patterns of interpersonal interactions. It is also a result of the fatigue from constant adaptation to interpersonal differences, suggesting that it is similar to Selye’s “stress response” (Selye, et al. 1976). Selye discussed the Exhaustion Stage of the General Adaptation Syndrome, when one’s defenses break down in the face of stimulus overload. Others have viewed culture shock as a transition (Bennett, 1977), and pathological mourning (Garza-Guerrero, 1974) for one’s abandoned society.

Cross-Cultural Adaptability

Cross-cultural adaptability and cross-cultural effectiveness are current terms which describe the relative effectiveness of individuals in dealing with adaptation to foreign cultures. Researchers have recognized that cultural adaptability varies amongst sojourners, and is dependant on a host of variables with interpersonal factors consistently being cited as of primary importance. For example Furnham and Bochner (1986) defined cultural adaptability as the ability to negotiate new situations and respond effectively to the intensity of emotional experiences. Gardner (1962) thought that cultural adaptability was associated with the ability to be a “universal communicator.” An individual with this skill possesses an unusual degree of psychological integration, perhaps another way of saying they reveal a low degree of neuroticism. He thought that this type of individual was extroverted, empathic, and had strong needs for affiliation. In addition, Gardner described the culturally resilient individual as having a value system which “values all men.” Ruben (1976) discussed both the need for empathy and tolerance for ambiguity as important factors in successful cultural adaptability. Cui and Awa (1992) agreed that cross-cultural success involved empathy, flexibility, patience, role flexibility, tolerance for ambiguity and the ability to establish and maintain relationships.

Emotional Intelligence

There are a number of links between the constructs of cross-cultural adaptability and emotional intelligence. Researchers in both fields agree that social and emotional skills are highly important variables in a person’s ability to successfully problem-solve. Mayer and Salovey (1997) described an *ability* model of emotional intelligence that centers on a person’s skill in recognizing emotional information and using that information to carry out abstract reasoning tasks. Social perceptiveness, empathy and a realistic emotional response to life’s vicissitudes can be as important to success in life as the ability to solve, for example, mathematical problems. According to Mayer and Salovey, emotional intelligence involves the “abilities to perceive, appraise and express emotion; to access and generate feelings when they facilitate thought; to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 10).

An alternative conceptualization of emotional intelligence posits that emotional

intelligence is a social and emotional skill that results in successful relationships. It involves interpersonal and intrapersonal sensitivity, impulse control, optimism, and empathy for oneself and others (Goleman, 1995; Bar-On, 1997b, 2000). Bar-On conceptualized subsets of skills that were involved in intrapersonal functioning, interpersonal relationships, stress management, and mood regulation. He developed a self-report measure of Emotional Intelligence called the Bar-On EQI (Bar-On, 1997a).

Cherbosque, Gardenswartz, and Rowe (2005) expanded the definition of emotional intelligence by incorporating the capacity for cultural adaptation into their construct. According to their model, the emotional ability to “feel, understand, articulate, manage and apply the power of emotions to interactions across lines of cultural difference” is a critical aspect of emotional intelligence. The EID model of emotional intelligence consists of four constructs: Affirmative Introspection, the introspective ability to understand one’s reaction to others; Self-Governance, the ability to maintain a positive attitude and self-control in the face of upsetting emotions; Intercultural Literacy, the ability to empathize with other’s cultural rules, norms and values; and Social Architecting, self-control and self-discipline in the service of building productive relationships.

The CCAI and Emotional Intelligence

The CCAI (Kelley and Meyers, 1995) was developed as a self-scoring training instrument designed to give feedback to the individual about his or her potential for cross-cultural effectiveness. Initially five constructs were developed from a review of the cross cultural literature and a polling of a panel of cross-cultural experts. Then the scales were refined using least-squares factor analysis and principal components extractions with varimax rotation. Factor scores were computed from these analyses, and correlations among items, scale scores, and between the principal components factors and the new scales were computed. The five factors were collapsed into four.

The first factor of the CCAI is Emotional Resilience (ER) which consists of eighteen questions measuring a person’s ability to handle stressful feelings and bounce back from setbacks. The items tap issues relating to the ability to tolerate ambiguity, a sense of humor, a high positive self-regard and effectiveness dealing with new people and situations.

The second factor of the CCAI is Flexibility/Openness (FO) a fifteen item scale

measuring tolerance towards others. The items tap issues relating to flexibility with new people, ideas and experiences.

The third factor of the CCAI is Perceptual Acuity (PAC). It is a ten item scale most closely associated with empathy. The items on this factor relate to an individual's ability to read non-verbal cues and to understand behavior outside the context of a familiar culture.

The fourth factor of the CCAI is Personal Autonomy (PA). It is comprised of seven items. It was initially designed to assess the strength of a person's values, beliefs and personal identity. However, the results are often modified by gender, past cross-cultural experience, cultural values (i.e. collectivism v. independence) and the overall Flexibility/Openness score.

The CCAI has been used in various research studies as a measure of cross-cultural effectiveness. The findings have shown that the CCAI correlates with impression management, (Montaglini and Giacalone, 1998), and empathy and social-emotional skills (Tang, 2001). All of the preceding constructs have been described as components of the construct of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 1997a; Goleman, 1995).

The issue of concurrent and predictive validity of the CCAI was explored in two studies assessing international students (Ward, Berno, and Main, 2000). One study revealed that emotional resilience and flexibility were related to fewer psychological and sociocultural adaption problems, while perceptual acuity and personal autonomy were associated with fewer sociocultural difficulties. In the second study, emotional resilience was found to be the strongest predictor of psychological wellbeing and perceptual acuity was the key factor in sociocultural adaptation. When psychological and sociocultural adaptation is used as the criterion variables, there is strong evidence for the concurrent validity of the CCAI. The authors concluded it was a reliable and valid instrument for assessing traits and abilities required for cross-cultural adaptation. The predictive validity as measured by re-entry scores was not established.

The CCAI is also recognized as having utility for use in organizations to establish baseline information or assessment for international assignments (Landis, Bennett, and Bennett, 2004). There is also agreement in the literature that the CCAI reflects the skills, attitudes, and abilities that contribute to intercultural adjustments both in terms of cultural transition and job performance (Ward, Bochner, and Furnham, 2001).

Tang (2001) explored the relationship between emotional intelligence and cross-cultural adaptability using the CCAI as a measure of cross-cultural effectiveness. She defined emotional

intelligence as empathy, communications of emotions and regulation of mood, and found that these abilities correlated with cross-cultural adaptability.

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between cross-cultural adaptability, emotional intelligence, ego strength and an absence of psychopathology. Emotional Intelligence was measured by the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQI) (Bar-On, 2000). Ego strength was measured by the Ego Strength (Es) scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Test 2 (MMPI-2) (Butcher et al., 1989). Psychopathology was measured by elevations on the individual scales of the MMPI-2. We hypothesized that cross culturally adaptive individuals would exhibit good ego strength and would lack psychopathology. We also hypothesized a correlation with emotional intelligence.

METHOD

The study consisted of 205 applicants to a reality T.V. show who would need to demonstrate cross-cultural travel abilities as well as cross-cultural problem solving skills. Participants were administered the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2 (MMPI 2), The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B), The Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI), and the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQI). This assessment battery was chosen to measure mental health, interpersonal relations, emotional intelligence and cross-cultural adaptability.

The Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) is a fifty question self-report self-scoring instrument designed to give feedback regarding an individual's capacity for a successful cross-cultural adjustment. The instrument is scored using a six point Likert scale and derives scores on four dimensions, described earlier.

The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation – Behavior Test (FIRO-B) (Shultz, 1989), consists of fifty-four items and examines two aspects of three dimensions of social or interpersonal needs. The two aspects are Expressed Behavior, how a person behaves or acts towards others, and Wanted Behavior, how a person desires to be treated by others. The three dimensions are: Inclusion, desiring being with people in general; Affection, measuring the need to be close to people; and Control, measuring the need to take control, or allow others to do so. The six expressed and wanted scores' split-half reliability ranges from 0.93 to 0.94 (Schutz, 1978).

The MMPI-2 is a 567 item true/false questionnaire. It provides a measure of personality and psychopathology. It was first published in 1943 and was revised in 1989. It consists of several validity scales, measuring test taking attitudes, and 10 original clinical scales measuring a range of psychopathologies and personality structures. It is the most widely used personality test in the world and its validity and reliability is well documented (Friedman, Lewak, Nichols, and Webb, 2001).

The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQI)(Bar-On, 2000) measures the construct of emotional intelligence. It consists of 133 questions that yield an overall emotional quotient with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15. There are five Composite Scales and 15 subscales. The EQI is based on 19 years of research by Dr. Reuven Bar-On and has been tested on over 48,000 individuals worldwide.

Participants

Participants for the study were 205 individuals, for whom there were complete assessment protocols, who had originally applied as teams of two. They were made up of friends, partners, married couples, siblings and parent/children combinations recruited by a television network to participate in a travel realty T.V. show. The study participants were contestant applicants from five seasons of the show. The sample consisted of 103 men with an average age of 34.9, with a range of 21-69 years old, and 102 women, with an average age of 32.5, with a range of 18-67 years old. Of the participants, 11% graduated high school, 32% finished some college and 56% graduated college.

As part of the screening process, the applicants were interviewed and assessed by two of the authors. In all, data from 205 applicants, who included the actual competitors, were used and analyzed in this study.

RESULTS

The results of the study reveal that the CCAI total score correlates negatively ($r = -0.294$, $p < .001$) with Welsh's (A) Anxiety Scale of the MMPI-2, a measure of maladjustment. The CCAI total score is positively correlated ($r = 0.377$, $p < .001$) with extraversion as measured by lower scores on Scale 0 (Si) scale of the MMPI-2, and positively correlated ($r = 0.327$, $p < .001$) with the Correction (K) scale, a measure of impression management and emotional control.

The data also reveals that cross-cultural adaptability (CCAI total score) is positively correlated ($r= 0.426$, $p< .001$) with the EQ total score, a measure of emotional intelligence. Further, the absence of mental illness, positive interpersonal skills, a desire to relate to others, and a capacity to manage stress well are all associated with cross-cultural adaptability as indicated by the convergent validity between scales of the MMPI and the CCAI. For example, Emotional Resilience (ER) correlates with “low neuroticism” on the MMPI-2, as measured by significant negative correlations with Depression (D), Social Introversion (Si), psychological distress as measured by the scale Infrequency (F), Welsh Anxiety (W-A), Anxiety (ANX), Anger (ANG), Low Self-Esteem (LSE), and Type A personality (TPA). There was also a significant positive correlation with Correction (K) and Ego Strength (ES). Several important scales and their relationships are described below:

The K (Correction) Scale

K is a validity scale on the MMPI-2 that measures conscious and unconscious defensiveness (Friedman et al, 2000; Caldwell, 1976). It correlates positively with socio-economic status, education and ego strength (Friedman, Levak, Nichols & Webb, 2000). K measures a person’s capacity to appropriately modulate emotional expressiveness, which can be a result of both unconscious and conscious factors. It reflects a person’s ability to “put their best foot forward” and to approach life’s stressors with poise and control. While the K scale can be elevated due to unconscious emotional constriction, it is also a measure of a person’s purposeful attempt to look emotionally healthy and resilient.

This latter component of the K scale is also known as Positive Impression Management. Studies have shown that the ability to successfully “look good” in the face of stress and to have the resilience necessary to create the right impression, has been correlated with cross-cultural success of business managers (Montagliana and Giacalone, 1998). Elevated K scores are also associated with healthy self-esteem (Caldwell, 1976; Nichols et al. 1989), a capacity to deal effectively with stress and an ability to maintain emotional equilibrium in the face of emotional turmoil. Additionally, The K scale, as a measure of ego strength, measures emotional stability and positive self-esteem.

The ER and FO scales of the CCAI positively correlated at 0.304 ($p<.001$) and 0.335 ($p<.001$) respectively with the K scale, suggesting that they measure a mixture of positive

impression management and emotional control and poise. The ER and FO scales appear to be measuring some of the same traits or constructs. The total CCAI score correlates at 0.327 with K. This suggests that the CCAI as a whole, measures to some degree the same personality traits as the K scale, that is, ego strength, impression management and emotional stability.

The Welsh Anxiety (A) Scale

The theory that cross-cultural adaptability is associated with good mental health has been explored in the above paragraphs. The Anxiety, or Welsh A scale, on the MMPI-2 is a measure of general distress. The scale items reflect anxiety, disturbed thinking, dysphoria, discouragement, inferiority feelings and general maladjustment, all symptoms that would predict poor adaptation to stressful situations (Friedman, et al., 2000). Since the Welsh Anxiety scale on the MMPI-2 is negatively correlated with the K scale at -0.718, the negative correlations with the CCAI scales ER at -0.327; FO at -0.282; and the Total CCAI at -0.294 are consistent. The results suggest that the CCAI is a measure of emotional control and resilience, and confirm the view in the literature that mental health and cross-cultural adaptability are related.

Scale 0 (Si: Social Introversion)

Scale 0 on the MMPI-2, is a measure of social introversion with high scores reflecting social introversion. It is negatively correlated with CCAI scales ER at -0.422 and FO at -0.337, as well as the CCAI Total Score at -0.377. This suggests that a need for social interaction is associated with the CCAI total score and the two CCAI scales measuring flexibility and emotional resilience. It confirms the assumption that shyness would be negative for cross-cultural adaptability. In a new cultural environment, withdrawal from people is not likely to accelerate the learning curve of adaptability. On the other hand, extroverted people are likely to be open to new ideas and be emotionally resilient, which presents more opportunities to be rewarded by others.

Scale 0 (Si scale) was developed by Drake (1946) to measure introversion and extroversion, a normal individual difference variable with high heritability. This scale is correlated with general maladjustment and dysphoric distress, as well as feelings of inadequacy. It is not a measure of the pure construct of introversion and extroversion, as it is saturated with maladjustment content. As Nichols (and colleagues, 1989) points out “it is sensitive to a pattern

of malaise not readily reflected on the other MMPI-2 scales- a blend of shyness, self-consciousness, and discomfort in group situations with a broad range of psychological distress; including dysphoric mood, tension, anxiety and fearfulness; problems with cognition, physical vulnerability; convictions of inefficacy, incapacity, incompetence ...and a nagging, ambivalent and unstable quality of alienation from others ...” (p. 195). It is a very noteworthy finding that the Si scale correlates significantly and negatively with the CCAI scales ER, FO and total CCAI scale at -0.442, -0.337 and -0.337 respectively. It gives insight into the behaviors and psychological factors that impede cross-cultural adaptation. It goes beyond the concepts of introversion/extraversion to illuminate that psychological well-being in addition to interpersonal skills are involved in cross-cultural adaptation.

CCAI and Interpersonal Relationships

Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B)

The FIRO-B, is a measure of interpersonal relating styles measuring an individual’s need for affection, control, and inclusion. The Total CCAI score correlated 0.309 with the Expressed Affection (EA) scale on the FIRO-B. The EA scale measures the tendency for an individual to be friendly and direct in expressing affection to others.

Caruso, Mayer, and Salovey, (2002) found a significant correlation on the FIRO-B between affection, both expressed and wanted, and a measure of emotional intelligence, the MEIS (Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso, 2002). The Affection scale measures a person’s warmth and friendliness, particularly in an intimate context, coined Expressed Affection. It also measures a person’s desire for closeness and attachment toward others, known as Wanted Affection. High scorers readily express their affection, and others see them as warm and expressive.

The correlation of the EA scale with the CCAI total score suggests that being a warm expressive person may aid in cross-cultural adaptation. The moderate correlation between EA and the total CCAI score contrasts with the Wanted Affection (WA), which only correlates with the Total CCAI at 0.193., which while significant is low. The WA scale measures an individual’s need for affection from others, thus high scorers seek out affectional bonds. More research needs to be done in this area to investigate the role of attachment theory in cross-cultural adjustment.

The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQI)

The EQI test measures emotional intelligence with an emphasis on psychological wellbeing (Bar-On, 2000). It consists of a number of scales that are broken down into sub-scales with face valid names. The Intrapersonal scale measures how well a person deals with intra-psychic issues. Its subscales include Self-Regard, Emotional Self-Awareness, Assertiveness and Independence. The Interpersonal Scale consists of three subscales: Empathy, Social Responsibility and Interpersonal Relationships. The Adaptability Scale has two subscales called Flexibility and Problem-Solving. The Stress Management scale has two subscales: Impulse Control and Stress Tolerance, while the General Mood scale has two subscales: Optimism and Happiness.

The correlation between the Total EQI score and the Total CCAI Score is 0.426 ($p < .001$). This confirms the connection between emotional intelligence and cross cultural adaptability. The total CCAI Score correlates with the EQI subscale Empathy at 0.442 ($p < .001$). The high Empathy correlation with the overall score on the CCAI suggests the importance of this skill in cross-cultural communications. It also indicates that the CCAI has utility as a measure of interpersonal sensitivity.

CONCLUSION

The results of this study conform with the theoretical literature that cross-cultural adaptability is related to extroversion, emotional poise and control, warmth, empathy and stress tolerance. These attributes have also been labeled as aspects of emotional intelligence, and as an extension of that, this study also suggests that emotional intelligence is related to cross-cultural adaptability.

Cross-cultural adaptability can now be assessed using measures of emotional intelligence, as well as the CCAI. Emotional factors clearly play a significant role in cross-cultural adjustment, confirming the link between emotional intelligence and cross-cultural adaptability postulated by Tang (2001). These findings also support the training model of a tool called Emotional Intelligence and Diversity (EID), which emphasizes the role of social intelligence in training for cultural adaptation.

There are implications for the use of the CCAI. The ER subscale of the CCAI appears to be a measure of freedom from psychological distress and emotional resilience. The positive

correlations with some of the MMPI-2 scales also shed light on the success factors in cross-cultural adaptability: ego strength, extroversion, positive self-esteem, and the ability to create a good impression, regardless of whether the impetus to do so comes from conscious role-playing or genuine warmth and stress tolerance.

The correlation of the CCAI with the EQI suggests the CCAI is a good measure of emotional intelligence as the CCAI and emotional intelligence are correlated. This has implications for training. Developing an individual's capacity for empathy, emotional resilience, effective emotional expression and interpersonal skills can improve intercultural functioning. The research also suggests there are certain personality types that are inherently suited for the challenges of cultural adaptability. Nonetheless, this study suggests that individuals can be taught the coping strategies that comprise the core of emotional intelligence. By training an individual in emotional intelligence, a person can increase their effectiveness in dealing with people from other cultures.

The results also call into question a popular trend in cross-cultural training to address only the developmental stages of cross-cultural sensitivity, without considering psychological and emotional factors (Bennett, 1986). This study underscores the need to address emotional and social factors, not just the cognitive understanding of cultural differences.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bar-On, R. (1997a). The Bar-On Model of Emotional-Social Intelligence. University of Texas Medical Branch.

Bar-On, R. (1997b) *The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): A Test of Emotional Intelligence*. Toronto, Canada. Multi-Health Systems.

Bar-On, R. (2000). Emotional and social intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i). In Reuven Bar-On and James D.A. Parker (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennett, J.M. (1977). "Transition Shock: Putting Culture Shock in Perspective." In Nemi C. Jain (Ed.), *International and Intercultural Communication Annual* 4:45- 52.

Bennett, M.F. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 10(2): 179-95.

Bochner, S. (1982). The social psychology of cross-cultural relations, in Bochner, S. (ed.), *Cultures in Contact: Studies in cross-cultural interaction*, Oxford, Pergamon.

Butcher, J.D., Dahlstrom, W.G., Graham, J.R., Tellegen, A., & Kaemmer, B. (1989). *MMPI-2: Manual of administration and scoring*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Caldwell, A.B. (1976, January). MMPI profile types. Paper presented at the 11th Annual MMPI Workshop and Symposium. Minneapolis, MN.

Caruso, D.R., Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P. (2002). Relation of an Ability Measure of Emotional Intelligence to Personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 79(2), 306-320.

Cherbosque, J., Gardenswartz, L., and Rowe, A. (2005), *Emotional Intelligence and Diversity Series*, Emotional Intelligence and Diversity Institute. Los Angeles, CA.

Cui, G. & Awa, N.E. (1992). Measuring intercultural effectiveness: An integrative approach. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 16, 311-328.

Drake, L. E. (1946). A social I.E. scale for the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 30.

Friedman, A. F., Lewak, R., Nichols, D. S., & Webb, J. T. (2000). *Psychological Assessment with the MMPI-2 (2nd ed.)*: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Furnham, A. & Bochner, S. (1986). *Culture shock: Psychological reactions to unfamiliar environments*. London: Methuen.

Gardner, G.H., (1962). Cross-cultural communication. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 58,

241-256.

Garza-Guerrero, A. (1974). 'Culture shock: Its mourning and the vicissitude of identity'. *Journal of American Psychoanalytic Association*, 24, 83-104.

Giacalone, R.A. & Rosenfeld, P. (eds.) (1991). *Applied Impression Management*. London: Sage.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.

Kelley, C. & Meyers J. (1987, 1989, 1992, 1995). *Cross-cultural adaptability inventory* (rev ed). Minneapolis: National Computer Systems.

Landis, D., Bennett, J., & Bennett, M. (2004). *Handbook of Intercultural Training*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Lewak, R.W., Marks, P.A., Nelson, G.E. (1990). *Therapist guide to the MMPI and MMPI-2: Providing feedback and treatment*. Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development Inc.

Lysgaard, S. (1955). 'Adjustment in a foreign society: Norwegian Fulbright grantees visiting the United States'. *International Social Science Bulletin*, 7, 45-51.

Montagliani, A., & Giacalone, R.A. (1998), Impression Management and cross-cultural adaption. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 138(5), 598-609.

Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D.R., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligent meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27, 267-298.

Mayer, J.D., & Salovey, P. (1997). What is emotional intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Implications for educators* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic.

Mayer, J.D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2002). *Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Tests (MSCEIR) User's Manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.

Nichols, D.S. Greene, R.L. & Schmolck, P. (1989). Criteria for assessing inconsistent patterns of item endorsement on the MMPI: Rationale for development of empirical trials. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, Vol. 45, 339-350.

Oberg, K. (1960). Culture shock: Adjustment to new cultural environments. *Practical Anthropology*, 7, 177-182.

Ruben, B. D. (1976). Assessing communication competency for intercultural adaptation. *Group and Organization Studies*. I., 335-354.

Searle, W. & Ward, C. (1990). The prediction of psychological and sociocultural adjustment during cross-cultural transitions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 14,

449-464.

Schutz, W. (1978), *The FIRO scales manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Schutz, W. (1989). *Fundamental interpersonal relations orientation – Behavior*, Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Selye, H. (1976). *The Stresses of Life* (Rev. Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tang, J. (2001). Towards Understanding the Role of Emotional Intelligence in Cross-Cultural Adaptability in Adults. Doctoral Dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles.

Ward, C., Berno, T., & Main, A. (2000, July). 'Can the Cross-cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) predict cross-cultural adjustment?'. Paper presented at the XV International Congress of the International Association for Cross-cultural Psychology, Pultusk, Poland.

Ward, C., Buchner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock*. Second edition, Hove, UK:Routledge.

Table 1

Correlations Between the CCAI and the MMPI-2, FIRO-B, and EQI

		<u>MMPI-2 Scale</u>	
	Welsh A	Scale 0 (Si)	Correction (K)
CCAI Total	-0.294**	-0.377**	0.327**
CCAI ER	-0.327**	-0.422**	0.304**
CCAI FO	-0.282**	-0.337**	0.335**

		<u>FIRO-B Scale</u>	
		Expressed Affection (EA)	Wanted Affection (WA)
CCAI Total		0.309**	0.193**

		<u>EQI Scale</u>	
	EQI Total	Empathy	
CCAI Total	0.426**	0.442**	

Note- ** = Significance level < .01

Table 2

Significant Correlations Between the CCAI and the MMPI-2, FIRO-B, and EQI

	<u>CCAIER</u>	<u>CCAIFO</u>	<u>CCAIPAC</u>	<u>CCAIPA</u>	<u>CCAITOT</u>
MMPI-2 K	.304 **	.335 **	.186 **		.327 **
MMPI-2 PT	-.165 *				
MMPI-2 SI	-.422 **	-.337 **	-.194 **		-.377 **
MMPI-2 A	-.327 **	-.282 **	-.178 **		-.294 **
MMPI-2 VR	-.266 **	-.254 **	-.211 **		-.275 **
MMPI-2 MT	-.284 **	-.316 **	-.222 **		-.304 **
MMPI-2 ANX	-.283 **	-.268 **	-.137 *		-.268 **
MMPI-2 FRS	-.239 **	-.146 *			-.172 **
MMPI-2 OBS	-.308 **	-.240 **	-.132 *		-.245 **
MMPI-2 DE	-.245 **	-.237 **	-.218 **		-.269 **
MMPI-2 HEA	-.182 **	-.185 **	-.186 **		-.217 **
MMPI-2 ANG	-.194 **	-.277 **	-.186 **		-.231 **
MMPI-2 CYN	-.157 *	-.231 **		-.126 *	-.189 **
MMPI-2 ASP	-.134 *	-.219 **		-.136 *	-.207 **
MMPI-2 TPA	-.243 **	-.315 **	-.155 *		-.246 **
MMPI-2 LSE	-.391 **	-.261 **	-.236 **	-.149 *	-.344 **
MMPI-2 SOD	-.303 **	-.230 **			-.245 **
MMPI-2 FAM	-.202 **	-.232 **	-.135 *		-.219 **
MMPI-2 WRK	-.384 **	-.329 **	-.213 **		-.344 **
MMPI-2 TRT	-.317 **	-.284 **	-.177 **		-.287 **
MMPI-2 PT	-.165 *				
MMPI-2 SI	-.422 **	-.337 **	-.194 **		-.377 **
MMPI-2 A	-.327 **	-.282 **	-.178 **		-.294 **
MMPI-2 ES	.224 **	.160 **			.187 **
MMPI-2 FB	-.199 **	-.171 **			-.182 **
MMPI-2 OH	.177 **	.136 *		-.167 **	
MMPI-2 DO	.204 **	.188 **		.141 *	.205 **
MMPI-2 RE	.162 **	.212 **	.156 *		.197 **
MMPI-2 MT	-.284 **	-.316 **	-.222 **		-.304 **
MMPI-2 GM	.218 **	.144 *			.163 **
MMPI-2 PK	-.251 **	-.237 **	-.151 *		-.240 **
MMPI-2 PS	-.154 *	-.171 *			-.160 *

<u>EQ Scale</u>	<u>CCAIER</u>	<u>CCAIFO</u>	<u>CCAIPAC</u>	<u>CCAIPA</u>	<u>CCAITOT</u>
TOTALEQ	.423 **	.356 **	.326 **	.260 **	.426 **
INTRAEQ	.358 **	.266 **	.250 **	.301 **	.355 **
INTEREQ	.382 **	.347 **	.360 **	.265 **	.415 **
ADAPEQ	.264 **	.170 *	.227 **	.144 *	.249 **
STRESSEQ	.352 **	.304 **	.238 **		.317 **
MOODEQ	.334 **	.291 **	.232 **	.223 **	.337 **
SELFEG	.226 **	.204 **	.166 *	.265 **	.252 **
EMOTSA	.286 **	.254 **	.286 **	.173 *	.308 **
ASSERT	.289 **	.179 *	.166 *	.201 **	.257 **
INDEP	.283 **			.216 **	.215 **
SELFACT	.168 *	.245 **	.171 *	.201 **	.235 **
EMPATHY	.379 **	.403 **	.391 **	.261 **	.442 **
SOCIALRE	.172 *	.247 **	.229 **	.142 *	.241 **
INTERREL	.402 **	.350 **	.326 **		.409 **
FLEX	.467 **	.386 **	.342 **		.432 **
STRESTOL	.453 **	.329 **	.224 **		.381 **
OPTIMISM	.480 **	.298 **	.278 **	.271 **	.388 **
HAPPINES	.221 **	.235 **	.156 *		.234 **
IMPULCON	.144 *	.173 *	.166 *		.152 *

<u>FIRO-B Scale</u>	<u>CCAIER</u>	<u>CCAIFO</u>	<u>CCAIPAC</u>	<u>CCAIPA</u>	<u>CCAITOT</u>
FIRO_EI	.131 *				.127 *
FIRO_EA	.268 **	.288 **	.287 **		.309 **
FIRO_WC	-.165 **				-.133 *
FIRO_WA	.140 *	.202 **	.165 **		.193 **
FIRO_EC				.202 **	

Note- ** = Significance level $p < .01$
 * = Significance level $p < .05$

The relationship of Emotional Intelligence to academic intelligence and the Big Five has been discussed for a number of countries – for example, the Netherlands, Greece, Spain (e.g., Pérez-González & Sanchez-Ruiz, 2014; Van der Linden, Tsaousis, & Petrides, 2012; Van der Zee, Thijs, & Schakel, 2002). Cross-cultural studies have established a higher level of emotional expression in countries with a higher level of individualism within the culture (Matsumoto, Yoo, & Fontaine, 2008). However, no intercultural differences were found in the accuracy of emotion recognition (Soto & Levenson, 2009). Cross-cultural challenges can rarely be resolved by EQ alone because what works well in one culture will not work well in another. How to be an effective, gregarious, sociable leader in Seattle may not work in São Paulo or Shanghai. The context differs in each culture, as do views on leadership and communication styles. The result? Cultural Intelligence (CQ) is the ability to understand and interpret the actions of a different culture and work more effectively across cultures. More and more companies like Coca-Cola are evaluating their high-potential leaders’ CQ scores to know who is best equipped for overseas assignments. There are several different models of CQ, but what they all have in common is that CQ is made up of several components