Cross-Cultural Competence in Higher Education Faculty and Staff

Guillermo Puppo
Regent University

Intercultural sensitivity is a function of developmental stages based on relativistic realities of the individual. Intercultural competence, on the other hand, draws on Cultural Intelligence (CQ) and intercultural sensitivity to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to cultural commonality and difference to accomplish cross-cultural goals. Cross-cultural leadership, thus, is a hybrid leadership encompassing ideological diversity and allowing an organization, of any type, to perform at its best not only domestically, but also at the international level. This study analyzed the relationship and differences between independent variables such as gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, religious identity, ability and international status, travel and living abroad, training, interactions with culturally diverse individuals and conversations about cultural difference, and work experience, and dependent variables such as cultural intelligence CQ, cognitive and metacognitive CQ, motivational CQ, and behavioral CQ. The study surveyed U.S. faculty and staff (n=144) from U.S. universities by purchasing responses through SurveyMonkey.com. The researcher collected the data via a web-based survey built-in SurveyMonkey, which included the Personal Data Form (PDF) and the Cultural Intelligence Survey (CQS). Multivariate analysis was used to understand the relationship between each of the independent and dependent variables. The results could not support previous research.

According to Hussar and Bailey (2007), in just six years, as many as 39% of the students enrolled at U.S. colleges and universities will be racially and ethnically different from the White majority. The educational benefits of a diverse student body, including enhanced intellectual and social development (Chang, 2000; Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin, 2002; Pike & Kuh, 2006), as well as openness and commitment to racial understanding (Astin, 1993; Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996) are clear. However, Franklin-Craft (2010) argud that "in order to reap the benefits associated with a diverse student body, leaders must endeavor to create a campus environment that is welcoming and affirming and fosters cross-cultural interactions."

Student affairs professionals are uniquely positioned within the university to be instrumental to this process (Castellanos, Gloria, Mayorga, & Salas, 2007; Gordon & Bonner, 1998; Pope & Reynolds, 1997). To be effective, however, practitioners must be capable of understanding and interacting competently with diverse groups of students (Jenkins & Walton, 2008). The recognition that student affairs practitioners must be capable of effectively working with diverse groups of students has led to the identification of a problem (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 146).

Literature Review

Cross-Cultural Leadership

Culture is defined as "the learned beliefs, values, rules, norms, symbols, and traditions that are common to a group of people" (Northouse, 2013, p. 384).

Implicit to all or any views of cultural studies is that culture shapes the values and attitudes that affect people's perceptions, as well as in leadership phenomena (Ayman, Mead, & Bassari, & Huang, 2012; Gerstner & Day, 1997). Most of the leadership studies within the past fifty years originated from the U. S., Canada, and Western Europe and are mainly supportive of North American leadership paradigms. In recent years, additional analysis from different areas of the globe has emerged, although not of comparative dimensions (Dickson, Castaño, Magomaeva, & Den Hartog, 2012). Comparative and extensive cross-cultural leadership research is rare. However, a few groundbreaking research initiatives have emerged during recent decades and have become a basis for analyzing how national culture shapes leadership. Thus, the concept of cross-cultural sensitivity and competence reflects the capacity of a leader to accept the others as they are, to accept their culture, to be openminded and flexible when making decisions and acting as such. On the other hand, cross-cultural leadership may be defined as differences in leadership styles, manifested across various cultures. It means that leadership might be partially or even wholly different as approach from one region, country or continent to another one. This definition, however, is not implying, of course, that one type of leadership is better than another one, but merely reflecting a distinct perception of the surrounding world, emerged from different history, educational system and social environment (Hudea, 2014).

Leadership goes beyond management. A leader is a person who, by the power of example, by his/her behavior, can make other people follow him/her. For a cross-cultural leader, the adoption and adaptation to various cultures turn into a vital part of the skills set necessary for achieving the main goals of the related organization. In this context, cross-cultural leadership is a hybrid leadership encompassing ideological diversity and allowing an organization, of any type, to perform at its best not only domestically, but also at the international level. (Hudea, 2014). The field of academic

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

leadership is no exception. The traffic of international students is higher than ever before in modern history. These academic travelers bring their knowledge and acquire new skills, becoming international free traders of knowledge. This opportunity involves coming into contact with other conceptions, mentalities, in one word with other cultures. Their integration in the new community does not depend only on one's own capacity of adaptation, but also, chiefly, to the openness of the target organization to receive him/her in the middle of it. Furthermore, the leader of that community must be an example of the proper attitude (Hudea, 2014). Also, ideas generated from different minds and put together can lead to impressive results. More unity in diversity in such areas, more chances to progress not only as for the said researchers or leaders but for the human evolution as a whole. Again, the person mainly responsible for a successful result is the leader of the organization, who should help his/her followers understand the unexpected dimension of intense collaboration beyond borders. (Hudea, 2014). Nonetheless, the actions a leader must take in this field do not differ from other areas of social sciences (Hudea, 2014):

- Discouraging discrimination within the organization: A leader must discourage anyone in the organization from enacting any form of discrimination of people, irrespective of their nature, convictions or mentalities so that they feel like fully belonging to the assembly.
- Fostering diversity: To discover the most interesting aspects of other cultures and to take advantage of the different related manners of thinking and acting, a leader must prepare the soil for diversity in the organization. An environment that is friendly and welcoming to a variety of cultures should "teach" people to feel comfortable working in a varied environment.
- Establishing healthy practices: The leader must ensure that the implementation of rules, procedures, and policies and are consistent with values such as diversity, inclusion, and provide a safe place for people from different groups.
- Making changes: A leader should be flexible and opened to change whenever necessary to permanently maximize the potential of all people involved;
- Encouraging feedback: It is always recommendable to require and receive feedback, but it is necessary to do so when working in diversity.
- Treating others as they like to be treated: In a homogenous environment, a leader should treat others as he/she likes to be treated, but in a heterogeneous one, the problem is more profound. Different individuals have different expectations, sometimes fully distinguished in nature from one another, so the most important is to treat each of them as he/she likes to be treated.

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

- Being open and flexible: A leader should be aware that his/her point of view is not necessarily the best, that the multitude of points of view emerged from diversity could bring the organization infinitely much more benefits.
- Getting to know the people: A leader should come to know his/ her people. This principle does not mean to become acquainted with every detail of their life but to understand how they think and act, what motivates them, what makes them happy. By perceiving them as they indeed are, with their specific characteristics, the leader can develop strong relationships with the same, with a positive synergic effect at the level of the entire organization (Hudea, 2014).

Cultural Competence and Cultural Awareness

In their study, Stahl and Brannen (2013) designed as a two-survey method, a Global Leader Survey (Survey 1) and a Supervisor Assessment Survey (Survey 2). The sample included global leaders from three large multinational conglomerates. Each organization identified a group of leaders worldwide who were involved in a variety of global work activities and were categorized by the organization as global leaders. There were 582 prospective participants identified by human resource executives across each of the three companies. The study comprised seven constructs: Non-work cross-cultural experiences, Organization-initiated cross-cultural experiences, The Big Five personality characteristics, Cultural flexibility, Tolerance for ambiguity, Ethnocentrism, and Supervisor ratings of global leadership effectiveness (Stahl & Brannen, 2013). The findings showed that dynamic cross-cultural competencies are related to global leadership effectiveness and contributes to the global leadership development research in several ways. These findings highlighted the importance of dynamic cross-cultural competencies in predicting global leadership effectiveness. To be effective, global leaders need high levels of both cultural flexibility and tolerance of ambiguity, and low levels of ethnocentrism required in jobs with complicated international and multicultural responsibilities. In other words, dynamic cross-cultural competencies are drivers of job performance among global leaders. This finding also supports research that has theorized the importance of dynamic cross-cultural competencies in improving global leadership effectiveness. These findings showed that individuals with dynamic cross-cultural competencies could meet the challenges of working in a complex global environment. They are more likely to meet others' needs and expectations and the higher the likelihood of responding effectively to global challenges (Stahl & Brannen, 2013). Also, the finding that high contact organization-initiated cross-cultural experiences are positively related to cultural flexibility and tolerance of ambiguity. These findings support prior conceptual and empirical research that suggests that high contact or experiential developmental experiences are effective in bringing about cognitive and behavioral changes required to develop dynamic cross-cultural

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

competencies. Participation in high-contact or experiential developmental experiences provides individuals with more significant opportunity to improve their ability to learn and reproduce appropriate behaviors. The findings also highlighted the importance of overlearning. Greater participation in high contact developmental experiences allows the individual to over-learn the appropriate skills and behaviors so to retain these competencies over time better. Also, this finding emphasized the need to take a systemic approach to fully understand the impact of several high contact organization-initiated cross-cultural experiences on dynamic cross-cultural competencies (Stahl & Brannen, 2013).

Intercultural sensitivity, as defined by Bennett (1993), is a function of developmental stages based on relativistic realities of the individual and the nature of the current experience. Bennett (1993) posits in his developmental model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS) that there is a progression related to exposure, one's intercultural orientation (mindset), and developmental support through the process. Intercultural competence, as outlined by Hammer (2009), draws on CQ and intercultural sensitivity "to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to cultural commonality and difference to successfully accomplish cross-cultural goals" (Lokkesmoe, Kuchinke, & Ardichvili, 2016). Their study presented the findings of a four-year, government-sponsored university exchange program involving 40 professional management and agriculture science students. Participants were from four US and Brazilian top research educational institutions. The students participated in a semester-long study abroad experience. Pre-departure and post-exchange data were collected using the well-established Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) (Lokkesmoe et al., 2016). The IDI profile captures the following information:

- Perceived orientation (PO): It reflects where an individual places him or herself along the intercultural development continuum. The PO can be denial, polarization (defense/reversal), minimization, acceptance, or adaptation.
- Developmental orientation (DO): It indicates the individual's primary orientation toward cultural differences and commonalities along the continuum. The DO is the perspective one most likely uses in those instances where cultural differences and commonalities need to be bridged, in particular in situations that are stressful, conflict-laden, or complex. The DO can be denial, polarization (defense/reversal), minimization, acceptance, or adaptation.
- Orientation gap (OG): It is the difference along the continuum between one's PO and DO. A gap score of seven points or higher indicates a meaningful difference between the PO and the assessed DO. The greater the gap, the more likely a person may be surprised by the discrepancy between the PO score and DO score.

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

- Trailing orientations (TOs): They are those orientations that are in the back of the DO on the intercultural continuum that are not resolved. When an earlier orientation is not resolved, this trailing perspective may be used to make sense of cultural differences at particular times, around certain topics or in specific situations. TOs, when they arise, tend to pull an individual back from the DO for dealing with cultural differences and commonalities.
- Leading orientations (LOs): They are those orientations that are immediately in front of the DO. A LO is the next step to take in the further development of intercultural competence. For example, if one's DO is minimization, then the LOs would be acceptance and adaptation.

Despite intensive pre-departure preparation, in-country support, and cultural immersion, findings did not show significant levels of intercultural awareness. Self-perception of cross-cultural competence was commonly hight than reality with all participants. Although students stated to have a satisfactory experience studying abroad, levels of cross-cultural awareness did not align with self-evaluations (Lokkesmoe et al., 2016). The paper suggested that cross-cultural development requires carefully designed interventions, feedback, and mentoring/coaching. Nonetheless, the effort of sending and receiving instutions alone do not ensure the enhancement of multi-cultural attitudes in the participants (Lokkesmoe et al., 2016).

Cross-Cultural Education

The ability and knowledge to facilitate cross-cultural conversations and respond to multicultural issues are often deferred to those perceived as the diversity experts on campus, who have a more vested interest in the subject and may have had advanced training or education in the area. However, Pope and Reynolds (1997) offer a conceptual model of multicultural competence, which unlike other sets of identified competencies urges student affairs to adopt multicultural competence as a core competency for all professionals in the field rather than a few designated experts. Given the evidence and support for creating opportunities for students to engage in cross-cultural conversations (Dugan, Komives, & Segar, 2008), it may be particularly relevant to consider the multicultural competence of those professionals responsible for developing these opportunities and facilitating these conversations (Wilson, 2013).

Previous research demonstrated that student affairs practitioners are underprepared to work in multicultural environments, as their graduate preparatory experiences have provided limited information on multiculturalism (Mueller & Pope, 2001; Talbot, 1992). Given this inadequacy, Pope and Reynolds (1997) identified multicultural competence as a necessary prerequisite for competent and ethical student affairs practice expanding

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

beyond graduate coursework. They proposed a tripartite definition and model consisting of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. The Dynamic Model of Student Affairs Competence (Pope & Reynolds, 1997) builds upon other core competencies and standards of good practice such as administrative, management and leadership skills; ethical and legal knowledge and decision making skills; student development theory and translation; individual and group helping and interpersonal skills; and, assessment, evaluation and research skills (Pope & Reynolds, 1997). However, unlike other models, the Dynamic Model of Student Affairs Competence suggests that multiculturalism should be infused and integrated into each of the core competence areas such that effective management and leadership would include the encouragement of diverse perspectives and diverse approaches to supervision.

Earlier studies on the multicultural competence of student affairs professionals have suggested that racial identity, select demographic variables (i.e., gender, sexual orientation, degree level), and multicultural educational and experiential opportunities (i.e., supervision, diversity workshops, course work, increased cross-cultural exposure) may also be related to multicultural competence (King & Howard-Hamilton, 2003; Miklitsch, 2005; Kegan, 1982; Mueller & Pope, 2001). Participants for these studies were student affairs professionals who self-identified as being responsible for some portion of leadership education at colleges and universities throughout the United States (Shannon & Begley, 2008). Concerning the relationship between racial identity and multicultural competence, the study demonstrated that both phases of racial identity development strongly correlated with multicultural competence (Wilson, 2013). This finding is consistent with previous research on multicultural competence in student affairs. In their studies of student affairs professionals, Miklitsch (2005) found that racial identity accounted for 45% and 41% of the variance in multicultural competence above and beyond demographics, respectively. This finding is also consistent with the theoretical perspective. According to Helms (1995), Phase I represents a less mature racial identity status; therefore, it would make sense that participants who had higher Phase I racial identity scores would score lower on multicultural competence. Likewise, Phase II racial identity development represents a more mature racial identity status, substantiating the finding that participants who demonstrated higher Phase II racial identity scores were more likely to have higher multicultural competence scores. Overall, racial identity was a strong predictor of multicultural competence among student affairs professionals responsible for leadership education, above and beyond demographic variables. This finding supports Pope and Reynolds (1997) assertion that developing multicultural competence involves more than external factors, such as attending cultural events and appearing to be culturally sensitive. Instead, this unique relationship between racial identity and multicultural competence suggests a need for student affairs professionals to continue to reflect on experiences and challenge existing worldviews, stereotypes, and assumption. Also, the results of this study suggest that

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

multicultural education and experiences may also be a factor in achieving multicultural competence (Kegan, 1982).

Overall, multicultural education accounted for 20.5% of the variance in multicultural competency scores (Miklitsch, 2005), consistent with similar studies exploring the relationship between multicultural competence and multicultural education. In 2005, Miklitsch (2005) reported variance of 36.8% in MCSA-P2 scores among residence life professionals, both after controlling for key demographic variables. Similarly, Mueller and Pope (2001) found multicultural training and education to correlate significantly with multicultural competence. Also significant was the relationship between multicultural competence and diversity courses taken. Consistent with previous research those who were required to take one or more diversity courses had significantly higher multicultural competence scores than those who did not take any diversity courses, lending support and evidence for the benefits of requiring graduate students to complete a diversity course as part of the professional preparation (Wilson, 2013, p. 47). Similarly, multicultural experience as a factor also correlated with multicultural competence. This finding supports earlier research (Franklin-Craft, 2010; Miklitsch, 2005; Mueller & Pope, 2001) demonstrating the significant relationship between multicultural experiences and multicultural competence. While all of the individual items demonstrated significance, in descending order the strongest were: (a) participants' self-rating of their level of experience with multicultural issues, (b) frequency of diversity discussions with peers/colleagues, (c) number of diversity workshops presented in the last two years, (d) formal diversity discussions with supervisors, (e) the number of diversity workshops planned in the last two years, (f) informal diversity discussions with supervisor, (g) diversity research projects conducted in the past two years, and (h) the frequency of feedback from their supervisor on their ability to work with diverse students and colleagues. Of significance to note, professionals who had formal conversations with supervisors regarding diversity issues and multiculturalism had slightly higher, though non-significant, multicultural competence scores than those who had more informal discussions. These results may reflect a level of intentionality on the part of the supervisor or supervisee that indicates a heightened sense of multicultural awareness and a need for these types of conversations. (Wilson, 2013, p. 47).

The results indicated that together, the multicultural education and experiences accounted for over half of the variance in multicultural competence scores above and beyond that accounted for by the demographics. Thus, the combination of multicultural education and experience is by far a stronger predictor of multicultural competence than either construct on its own, as supported by previous studies (Miklitsch, 2005). These findings provide strong evidence for student affairs professional responsible for leadership education to continue to find ways and invest time in purposeful

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

educational and experiential activities focused on multicultural or diversity issues, as a way of personally enhancing their multicultural competence. (Wilson, 2013, p. 47).

Today's U.S. higher education institutions can easily identify the benefits of a diverse student body. Campus leaders have the opportunity to reap the benefit of the country's diverse student body by designing campuses with cross-cultural environments that foster and affirm positive interactions among cultures (Hoover, 1994). Student affairs personnel can be of inmense help in this design, but they need to understand and interact with students from all backgrounds in effective ways (Franklin-Craft, 2010).

In spring 2009, 465 student affairs practitioners completed three web-based instruments, the Cultural Intelligence Survey (CQS), developed by Ang et al. (2004), the Multicultural Competence in Student Affairs-Preliminary 2 Scale (MCSA-P2) (Mueller & Pope, 2001), and a researcher-developed Personal Data Form. A total of 53 practitioners ngaged in a snowball sampling method, sharing namesof professional and students who could participate in the study, yielding a total of 185 participants (Franklin-Craft, 2010). A summary of the findings shows that: 1). (see APA 3.04 for how to format a series in a sentence) Race and identification with a socially marginalized group were not related to intercultural competence as assessed by the CQS; 2) five experience variables, including travel or living abroad, attending trainings or workshops relateds to cross-cultural topics, interactions in work/study-environments with individuals from different identity groups, and workplace conversations about cultural difference accounted for 20% of the variance in intercultural competency (Franklin-Craft, 2010; and 3) of the four factors that comprise cultural intelligence, practitioners prceived their meta-cognitive abilities as the highest, and their cognitive ability as the lowest (Franklin-Craft, 2010). Finally, "practitioner self-assessed intercultural competence was not related to peer-assessed intercultural competence" (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 45).

The Research Hypotheses

RH1: There is a difference in faculty's metacognitive CQ by gender.

RH2: There is a difference in faculty's cognitive CQ by gender.

RH3: There is a difference in faculty's motivational CQ by gender.

RH4: There is a difference in faculty's behavioral CQ by gender.

RH5: There is a difference in faculty's metacognitive CQ by ethnicity.

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

RH6: There is a difference in faculty's cognitive CQ by ethnicity.

RH7: There is a difference in faculty's motivational CQ by ethnicity.

RH8: There is a difference in faculty's behavioral CQ by ethnicity.

RH9: There is a difference in faculty's metacognitive CQ by religious identity.

RH10: There is a difference in faculty's cognitive CQ by religious identity.

RH11: There is a difference in faculty's motivational CQ by religious identity.

RH12: There is a difference in faculty's behavioral CQ by religious identity.

RH13: There is a difference in faculty's metacognitive CQ by intercultural experience.

RH14: There is a difference in faculty's cognitive CQ by intercultural experience.

RH15: There is a difference in faculty's motivational CQ by intercultural experience.

RH16: There is a difference in faculty's behavioral CQ by intercultural experience.

Proposed Method

This study combined two instruments: the Personal Data Form developed by Franklin-Craft (2010) and the Cultural Intelligence Survey (CQS) (Ang et al. , 2004).

The Franklin-Craft Personal Data Form (PDF)

The Personal Data Form developed by Franklin-Craft (2010) aimed to identify the demographical characteristics of the Student Affairs personnel. It addresses the following elements: gender, ethnic background, level of education, job titles, job responsibilities, job tenure, and organization size. It has been adapted for this study to measure the demographics of the participants in the area of job characteristics.

The Cultural Intelligence Survey

The Cultural Intelligence Survey (CQS) is the primary measure of intercultural competence of student affairs administrators. Ang et al. (2004) developed the CQS to measure the capacity of operate and interact in effective and competent way in cross-cultural environments. The instrument aims to measure and individual's performance when situations involve engagement with people from other reace, ethnicity, or background (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 113). According to Earley and Ang (2003), the four factors associated with cultural intelligence include metacognition, cognition, behavior,

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

and motivation. The CQS uses a 7-point Likert scale with twenty affirmations that espress the individual's self-perception. Participants respond to these affirmations with a "strongly disagree", "moderately disagree", "slightly disagree", "neutral", "slightly agree", "moderately agree", or "strongly agree" response (Ang et al., 2007, p. 56).

Results of instrument testing showed that "the item-to-total correlations for each subscale demonstrate a strong relationship between the items and their scales, supporting internal consistency" (Ang et al. , 2007, p. 56). The composite, as well as individual scale reliabilities, are as follows (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 56): Meta-cognitive a = .72; Cognitive a = .86; Behavioral a = .83; Motivation a = .76. This study is not interested in the overall score of the CQS but in the differences in each subsection of the CQS by the independent variables. Thus, the overall score will not be measured, only the score of each of the four subsections.

Types of Variables

There are six types of variables associated with this study: two of them are categories of independent variables, of which one is related to the participant demographics and the other is related to the participant developmental experiences. Also, there are four types of dependent variables related to the participant's cultural intelligence. The demographic variables utilized in this study are: race/ethnicity, gender identity; the developmental experiential variables will be religious identity and ability/multicultural experience (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 148).

Independent Variables - Demographic Variables

Gender: While some past reasearch indicate that cross-cultural competence is correlated to gender (Blanshan, 2007; Castellanos et al., 2007; King & Howard-Hamilton, 2003; Martin, 2005; Mueller & Pope, 2001), other foiindings indicate that such correlation does not exist (Howlett, 2006; Mastrodicasa, 2004; Miklitsch, 2005; Mueller & Pope, 2001).

Race and Ethnicity: Past research in this category (King & Howard-Hamilton, 2003; Martin, 2005; Mastrodicasa, 2004; Miklitsch, 2005; Mueller & Pope, 2001) showed that higher education practitioners from a White ethnic background exhibit lower level of multicultural competence than those from socially marginalized racial and ethnic groups (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 151).

Developmental Experience Variables

Religious Identity: Providing participants with a broader array of religious identities from which to select can be beneficial for future research. This study, however, only

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

provided four options. However, the study of religious difference and intercultural competency is confounded and thus, beyond the scope of this dissertation (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 155).

Ability and Multicultural Competence: The purpose of the first question is to explore the relationship between various facets of identity and intercultural competence (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 156). Past research showed that individuals from socially mrginalized groups display higher levels of intercultural competence (King & Howard-Hamilton, 2003; Martin, 2005; Mastrodicasa, 2004; Miklitsch, 2005; Mueller & Pope, 2001).

Dependent variables

Cultural Intelligence (CQ): It is defined as an individual's capacity to function effectively in culturally diverse settings (Franklin-Craft, 2010). Earley and Ang (2003) defined CQ as "comprised of three dimensions: cognition includes two sub-dimensions, learned, or procedural knowledge (cognition) and abstract reasoning (meta-cognition), motivation, and behavior" (p.37).

Cognitive and Metacognitive CQ: The cognitive and metacognitive facets of cultural intelligence (CQ) "represent the cognitive abilities that are used to create new conceptions of how to function and operate with a new culture as well as culture-specific knowledge (both declarative and procedural)" (Earley & Ang, 2003, p. 37). Earley and Ang (2003) drew not only from reasoning frameworks but also from "several theories of cognitive development including self, social cognition, and role-identity theory to develop the cognitive facet of CQ" (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 37).

Motivational CQ: Motivation is one factor of CQ that has been neglected in all but Bennett's (1993) model of intercultural competence. Motivation goes beyond intention or even interest to act accordingly. It encompasses the drive to thrive in multicultural environments (Earley & Ang, 2003; Templer, Tay, & Chandrasekar, 2006). Individuals high in motivational CQ possess a natural tendency to place themselves in multicultural situations that challenge their abilities brcause they see them as a growth opportunity. Motivation, therefore, "serves to explain Mueller and Pope's (2001) finding that competency was positively associated with a disposition to seek out opportunities to learn about diverse others" (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 39).

Behavioral CQ: The behavioral facet of CQ speaks directly to the ability to both acquire and act upon newly acquired behaviors to be competent in cross-cultural situations (Earley & Ang, 2003). Thus, t"he behavioral facet of CQ is often a product of both the cognitive and the motivational facets of CQ" (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 39).

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Data Needed To Test The Hypotheses

Participants answered the two forms mentioned above. However, due to issues of potentially limited scope and sampling, the study only analyzed the PDF questions related to the variables relevant to the study: gender, ethnicity, and religion and multicultural competence. The next section of this proposal provides further detail in the variables of the study.

The study tested the differences in the four cultural intelligence factors (metacognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral) through one-way multivariate analysis of variance separately (MANOVA) for gender, ethnicity, religious identity, and multicultural experience. It was not adequate to include all independent variables in one MANOVA, as that way, the sample size assumption would be violated (cells with less than four cases). Before conducting multivariate analyses, two cases were excluded as outliers, due to Mahalanobis distances above the critical value of 18.47 for four dependent variables (Tabachnick, & Fidell, 2007). No violations of the assumptions of sample size, normality, and linearity were detected. Additionally, the study interpreted tests of between-subjects effects adjusting significance level using Bonferroni correction, by dividing the standard threshold significance value of $p = .05$ with the number of dependent variables (four). Therefore, the significance threshold level for separate effects of independent variables on the four cultural intelligence factors was .01. The study considered tests of between-subjects effects only in cases where the results of multivariate tests for the linear combination of the outcome variables were statistically significant ($p < .05$).

Method To Collect Data

The researcher collected the data via a web-based survey built-in SurveyMonkey, which included the Personal Data Form (Franklin-Craft, 2010) to gather participant demographic information and the Cultural Intelligence Survey (CQS) developed by Ang et al. (2004). These instruments can be found in Appendices A and B.

Sample Plan

Because the sample does not specify the population included in the sample, the study used Non-probability sampling (Wilson, 2016). The weakness of a nonprobability sample is that it does not permit generalizing from the sample to the population because the researcher has no reassurance that the sample is representative of the population. The type of sampling was accidental, which implies selecting the cases at hand (all faculty and staff employees) until the desired number of people/items is reached (Wilson, 2016). Participants included faculty and staff from U.S. universities, obtained through a paid service of SurveyMonkey.com. The way the service works is

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

the researcher creates a profile for the participant and SurveyMonkey.com establishes the number of potential participants as well as the cost per head. Thus, the researcher did not have to deal with contacting participants directly. The number of participants required to complete a statistical analysis is dependent upon the number of cells in a factorial design (Wiersma, 1995). Given the number of variables and to obtain an equal distribution in each cell, the number of participants was 100 (n=100), but the study ended up collecting 144 (n=144).

Findings and Analysis

Descriptive characteristics of the sample

The sample included N = 144 participants, 54.2% females, and 45.8% males. Tables 1-6 show distributions of the sample by age group, ethnicity, religious identity, international status, household income, and region.

Table 1

Distribution of the sample by age group

Age	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)
18-29	32	22.2	23.9
30-44	38	26.4	28.4
45-60	42	29.2	31.3
> 60	22	15.3	16.4
Total	134	93.1	100.0
Missing	10	6.9	

N = 144

Table 2

Distribution of the sample by ethnicity

Ethnicity	Frequency	Percent (%)
White	108	75.0
Asian	17	11.8
Latino or Hispanic	12	8.3

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

African American or Black	6	4.2
Native American	1	.7

N = 144

Table 3

Distribution of the sample by religious identity

Religion	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)
Christian	76	52.8	52.8
Atheist	21	14.6	14.6
Buddhist	4	2.8	2.8
Hindu	5	3.5	3.5
Other	38	26.4	26.4

N = 144

Table 4

Distribution of the sample by their multicultural competence

Lived abroad after the 18th birthday	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)
Never	97	67.4	67.4
Less than a month	5	3.5	3.5
One to six months	15	10.4	10.4
More than six months	27	18.8	18.8

N = 144

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Table 5

Distribution of the sample by their household income

Household income	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)
$0-$9,999	1	.7	.7
$10,000-$24,999	10	6.9	7.5
$25,000-$49,999	21	14.6	15.7
$50,000-$74,999	36	25.0	26.9
$75,000-$99,999	18	12.5	13.4
$100,000-$124,999	15	10.4	11.2
$125,000-$149,999	11	7.6	8.2
$150,000-$174,999	7	4.9	5.2
$175,000-$199,999	1	.7	.7
$200,000+	6	4.2	4.5
Prefer not to say	8	5.6	6.0
Total	134	93.1	100.0
Missing	10	6.9	

N = 144

Table 6

Distribution of the sample by region

Region	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)
East North Central	15	10.4	11.4
East South Central	6	4.2	4.5
Middle Atlantic	24	16.7	18.2
Mountain	9	6.3	6.8
New England	4	2.8	3.0
Pacific	32	22.2	24.2
South Atlantic	16	11.1	12.1
West North Central	10	6.9	7.6

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

West South Central	16	11.1	12.1
Total	132	91.7	100.0
Missing	12	8.3	

N = 144

Reliability

The overall reliability of the Cultural Intelligence scale, measured through Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of internal consistency, was excellent, α = .92. Internal consistency coefficients of the subscales were high as well, Strategy α = .87, Knowledge α = .87, Motivation α = .84, and Behavior, α = .80.

Differences in cultural intelligence by gender, ethnicity, religious identity, and international status

Differences in cultural intelligence between the genders

The assumption of equality of covariance matrices was not violated, based on the result of Box's M test, $p > .001$. The assumption of equality of error variances was also not violated for any of dependent variables, according to the Levene's test, $p > .05$. Table 7 presents the results of the descriptive statistics. According to the results of multivariate tests, there was a statistically significant effect of gender on the overall cultural intelligence, as the linear combination of its four components, Wilks' $\lambda = .93$, $F(4, 127) = 2.53$, $p < .05$, partial $\eta 2 = .07$.

Table 7

Means, standard deviations, and group sizes for each of the cultural intelligence factors categorized by gender

Cultural intelligence factor	*Gender*	Mean	Std. Deviation	*N*
Strategy	Female	4.16	.61	70
	Male	3.95	.66	62
	Total	4.06	.64	132
Knowledge	Female	3.13	.72	70
	Male	3.19	.85	62

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

	Total	3.16	.79	132
Motivation	Female	3.96	.73	70
	Male	4.03	.70	62
	Total	3.99	.72	132
Behavior	Female	3.82	.65	70
	Male	3.76	.74	62
	Total	3.79	.69	132

Table 8 presents the results of tests of between-subjects effects for gender. There were no effects of gender on any of the cultural intelligence components, except for its marginal effect on strategy ($p < .10$). Females, therefore, have somewhat higher strategy component of cultural intelligence than males, as well as the overall cultural intelligence. Therefore, the four gender-related hypotheses (RH1: There is a difference in faculty's metacognitive CQ by gender; RH2: There is a difference in faculty's cognitive CQ by gender; RH3: There is a difference in faculty's motivational CQ by gender; RH4: There is a difference in faculty's behavioral CQ by gender) are rejected due to that all four *p* scores were higher than .05 (.01 per each cultural intelligence factor).

Table 8

Results of tests of between-subjects effects for gender

Cultural intelligence factor	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Strategy	1.438	1	1.438	3.552	.062	.027
Knowledge	.118	1	.118	.190	.663	.001
Motivation	.134	1	.134	.261	.610	.002
Behavior	.116	1	.116	.240	.625	.002

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Differences in cultural intelligence depending on ethnicity

The assumption of equality of covariance matrices was not violated, based on the result of Box's M test, $p > .001$. The assumption of equality of error variances was also not violated for any of dependent variables, according to the Levene's test, $p > .05$. Table 9 presents the results of the descriptive statistics. According to the results of multivariate tests, there was no effect of ethnicity on the overall cultural intelligence, as the linear combination of its four components, Wilks' $\lambda = .88$, F (12, 328.36) = 1.42, $p = .16$, partial $\eta 2 = .04$.

Table 9

Means, standard deviations, and group sizes for each of the cultural intelligence factors by ethnicity

Cultural intelligence factor	*Ethnicity*	Mean	Std. Deviation	*N*
Strategy	White	4.04	.62	98
	Asian	4.22	.69	16
	Latino or Hispanic	4.00	.72	11
	Afro-American or Black	3.96	.68	6
	Total	4.06	.64	131
Knowledge	White	3.09	.81	98
	Asian	3.56	.64	16
	Latino or Hispanic	3.06	.74	11
	Afro-American or Black	3.31	.63	6
	Total	3.16	.79	131
Motivation	White	4.01	.69	98
	Asian	4.08	.92	16
	Latino or Hispanic	3.66	.71	11
	Afro-American or Black	3.96	.62	6
	Total	3.99	.72	131
Behavior	White	3.81	.64	98
	Asian	4.02	.82	16
	Latino or Hispanic	3.27	.79	11
	Afro-American or Black	3.83	.74	6

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Cultural intelligence factor	*Ethnicity*	Mean	Std. Deviation	*N*
	Total	3.79	.69	131

Table 10 shows that there were also no effects of ethnicity on any of the four components of cultural intelligence and the four ethnicity-related hypotheses (RH4: There is a difference in faculty's behavioral CQ by gender; RH5: There is a difference in faculty's metacognitive CQ by ethnicity; RH6: There is a difference in faculty's cognitive CQ by ethnicity; RH7:There is a difference in faculty's motivational CQ by ethnicity; RH8: There is a difference in faculty's behavioral CQ by ethnicity) are rejected due to that all four p scores were higher than .05 (with the exception of Behavior, p=.046), as the linear combination of its four components.

Table 10.

Results of tests of between-subjects effects for ethnicity

Cultural intelligence factor	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Strategy	.538	3	.179	.433	.730	.010
Knowledge	3.282	3	1.094	1.796	.151	.041
Motivation	1.385	3	.462	.901	.443	.021
Behavior	3.803	3	1.268	2.744	.046	.061

Differences in cultural intelligence depending on religion

The assumption of equality of covariance matrices was not violated, based on the result of Box's M test, $p > .001$. The assumption of equality of error variances was also not violated for any of dependent variables, according to the Levene's test, $p > .05$. Table 11 presents the results of the descriptive statistics. According to the results of multivariate tests, there was a statistically significant effect of religion on the overall cultural intelligence, as the linear combination of its four components, Wilks' $\lambda = .89$, F (12, 331.03) = 1.21, p = .27, partial $\eta 2 = .04$.

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Table 11

Means, standard deviations, and group sizes for each of the cultural intelligence factors by religion

Cultural intelligence factor	*Religion*	Mean	Std. Deviation	*N*
Strategy	Christian	4.03	.64	70
	Atheist	4.12	.70	21
	Buddhist / Hindu	4.07	1.02	7
	Other	4.10	.53	34
	Total	4.06	.64	132
Knowledge	Christian	3.16	.83	70
	Atheist	3.17	.73	21
	Buddhist / Hindu	3.64	.89	7
	Other	3.05	.68	34
	Total	3.16	.79	132
Motivation	Christian	3.99	.68	70
	Atheist	4.23	.69	21
	Buddhist / Hindu	3.68	1.30	7
	Other	3.93	.64	34
	Total	3.99	.72	132
Behavior	Christian	3.78	.67	70
	Atheist	3.92	.68	21
	Buddhist / Hindu	3.96	1.18	7
	Other	3.71	.63	34
	Total	3.79	.69	132

Table 12 shows that there was no effect of religion on the overall cultural intelligence. There were, hence, also no effects of religion on any of the cultural intelligence components. Therefore, the four religion-related hypotheses (RH9: There is a difference in faculty's metacognitive CQ by religious identity; RH10: There is a difference in faculty's cognitive CQ by religious identity; RH11:There is a difference in faculty's motivational CQ religious identity; RH12: There is a difference in faculty's behavioral

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

CQ religious identity) were rejected due to that all four *p* scores were higher than .05, as the linear combination of its four components.

Table 12

Results of tests of between-subjects effects for religious identity

Cultural intelligence factor	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Strategy	.222	3	.074	.176	.913	.004
Knowledge	2.052	3	.684	1.112	.347	.025
Motivation	1.957	3	.652	1.282	.283	.029
Behavior	.793	3	.264	.547	.651	.013

Differences in cultural intelligence depending on intercultural experience

The assumption of equality of covariance matrices was not violated, based on the result of Box's M test, $p > .001$. The assumption of equality of error variances was also not violated for any of dependent variables, according to the Levene's test, $p > .05$. Table 13 presents the results of the descriptive statistics. According to the results of multivariate tests, there was a statistically significant effect of religion on the overall cultural intelligence, as the linear combination of its four components, Wilks' $\lambda = .86$, F (12, 331.01) = 1.59, $p = .09$, partial $\eta 2 = .05$. There was no effect of intercultural experience on the overall cultural intelligence.

Table 13

Means, standard deviations, and group sizes for each of the cultural intelligence factors by intercultural experience

Cultural intelligence factor	*Intercultural experience*	Mean	Std. Deviation	*N*
Strategy	Never	4.02	.63	89
	Less than a month	3.65	.72	5
	One to six months	3.89	.79	11
	More than six months	4.34	.51	27
	Total	4.06	.64	132

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Cultural intelligence factor	*Intercultural experience*	Mean	Std. Deviation	*N*
Knowledge	Never	3.10	.78	89
	Less than a month	3.13	.25	5
	One to six months	3.36	.83	11
	More than six months	3.28	.85	27
	Total	3.16	.79	132
Motivation	Never	3.93	.67	89
	Less than a month	4.10	.68	5
	One to six months	4.00	.77	11
	More than six months	4.19	.85	27
	Total	3.99	.72	132
Behavior	Never	3.73	.67	89
	Less than a month	3.45	.48	5
	One to six months	3.68	.78	11
	More than six months	4.11	.70	27
	Total	3.79	.69	132

Table 14 shows that there were, hence, also no effects of intercultural experience on any of the cultural intelligence components. Therefore, all four intercultural-related hypotheses (RH13: There is a difference in faculty's metacognitive CQ by international status; RH14: There is a difference in faculty's cognitive CQ by international status; RH15:There is a difference in faculty's motivational CQ by international status; RH16: There is a difference in faculty's behavioral CQ by international status) are rejected due to that all *p* scores are higher than .05 (with the exception of Strategy, *p*=.037), as the linear combination of its four components.

Table 14

Results of tests of between-subjects effects for intercultural experience

Cultural intelligence factor	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	*F*	*p*	Partial η^2
Strategy	3.453	3	1.151	2.912	.037	.064
Knowledge	1.223	3	.408	.656	.580	.015
Motivation	1.541	3	.514	1.004	.393	.023
Behavior	3.806	3	1.269	2.758	.045	.061

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Discussion

This study analyzed the result of an online survey. The dependent variables were degrees of cultural intelligence based on independent variables, including gender, ethnicity, religion, and intercultural experience. The results of the multivariate analysis do not align with the wealth of previous research. For example, as mentioned before, studies on the multicultural competence of student affairs professionals demonstrated that gender could be related to multicultural competence (King & Howard-Hamilton, 2003).

Nonetheless, the findings in this study do not support the hypotheses related to gender. Ethnicity is also generally connected with multicultural competence (Miklitsch, 2005). The findings of this study do not support previous research connected to the hypotheses related to race/ethnicity. In the introduction of the independent variables, it was stated that a comprehensive study of religious difference and intercultural competency is beyond the scope of this dissertation (Franklin-Craft, 2010, p. 155). The results of this study do not show a correlation between religious preference and multicultural competence, and thus the hypotheses related to religion cannot be accepted. Last, previous studies found that cross-cultural exposure may also be related to multicultural competence. The current study did not find enough evidence to support the hypotheses related to intercultural experience. Cross-cultural leadership is reflected in the leader's ability to lead, communicate, and collaborate with others from a different culture. Mueller and Pope (2001) found multicultural training to be correlated with multicultural competence. Flowers (2003) demonstrated that U.S. faculty and university staff are underprepared to work in multicultural environments. Wilson (2013) demonstrated that racial identity and multicultural competence are strongly related. This study based its hypotheses on the results of the studies mentioned before. However, none of them could be corroborated by the data collected.

There may be several reasons for the discrepancy between the results of this study and other research on the topic. One of them, however, can be the unequal distribution in the sampling. For example, the participants were predominantly White (75%), Christian (53%), and never lived abroad after the eighteenth birthday (67%). Thus, the predominant profile of the participants matched what Hall (2016) describes as the typical White person who has a low awareness of his or her color-blindness. Furthermore, this type of person assumes equality and wishes not to notice or acknowledge racial or cultural differences (Hall, 2016). Therefore, the sampling method can be one of the reasons that explain the results of this study.

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Conclusion

The CQS has been demonstrated to fit a four-factor model and does represent domains that are conceptually and behaviorally distinct. Also, the CQS was designed to be not only a self-report measure but can assess observer feedback of intercultural competency. Thus, the CQS arguably may provide a clear picture of intercultural competence (Franklin-Craft, 2010). In despite of the CQS high validity levels, the view of intercultural competence it displays may be limited. Part of the limitation comes from the fact that Pope and Reynolds (1997) assumed that higher education professional posses knowledge of educational and developmental theories that inform their attitudes towards students. The CQS, however, does not measure such knowledge (Franklin-Craft, 2010). The current study did not measure the participants' level of education in this field.

About the Author
Guillermo Puppo is a third-year Ph.D. student at Regent University, where he is studying organizational leadership. Guillermo teaches Spanish at Colorado Christian University. He is the Senior Pastor of Ciudad de Dios Foursquare Church and Leader of Vocational Formation at Fuller Seminary.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Guillermo Puppo at puppoguillermo@gmail.com

References

Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C. S. K., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2004). The four-factor model of cultural intelligence: A multisample study of effects on performance and adjustment. *Group & Organizational Management, 31*(1), 100-123. DOI: 10.1177/1059601105267

Astin, A. W. (1993). Diversity and multiculturalism on the campus: How are students affected?. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *25*(2), 44-49.

Ayman, R., Mead, A. D., Bassari, A., & Huang, J. (2012). Implicit leadership in Iran: Differences between leader and boss and gender. In *Worldly Leadership* (pp. 135-157). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. *Education for the intercultural experience*, *2*, 21-71.

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Blanshan, B. K. (2007). *A descriptive study of the multicultural awareness of professional residence hall directors in California colleges and universities*. ProQuest.

Castellanos, J., Gloria, A. M., Mayorga, M. M., & Salas, C. (2007). Student affairs professionals' self-report of multicultural competence: Understanding awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Naspa Journal*, *44*(4), 643-663.

Chang, M. J. (2000). Improving campus racial dynamics: A balancing act among competing interests. *The Review of Higher Education*, *23*(2), 153-175.

Dickson, M. W., Castaño, N., Magomaeva, A., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2012). Conceptualizing leadership across cultures. *Journal of world business*, *47*(4), 483-492.

Dugan, J. P., Komives, S. R., & Segar, T. C. (2008). College student capacity for socially responsible leadership: Understanding norms and influences of race, gender, and sexual orientation. *NASPA journal*, *45*(4), 475-500.

Earley, P., & Ang, S. (2003). Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Flowers, L. A. (2003). National study of diversity requirements in student affairs graduate programs. *NASPA Journal, 40*(1), 72-82.

Franklin-Craft, A. (2010). *An assessment of the intercultural competence of student affairs administrators* (Order No. 3435119). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (815412147). Retrieved from http://eres.regent.edu:2048/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.regent.edu/docview/815412147?accountid=13479

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). A meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(1) 827-844.

Gordon, S., & Bonner, F. (1998). Best practices in diversity: The student affairs perspective. *College Student Affairs Journal, 18*(1), 40-51.

Gurin, P., Dey, E., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(3), 330-366.

Hall, P. D. (2016). White fragility and affirmative action. *The Journal of Race & Policy, 12*(2), 7.

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Hammer, M. (2009). The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI): an approach for assessing and building intercultural competence. In Moodian, M. (Ed.), *Contemporary Leadership and Intercultural Competence: Understanding and Utilizing Cultural Diversity to Build Successful Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms' White and People of Color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling*, (pp.181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hoover, C. K. (1994). *An investigation of the preparedness of student affairs professionals to work effectively with diverse populations on campus* (Ph.D. dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9507970)

Howlett, B. (2006). *A descriptive study of the multicultural attitudes of chief housing officers in California colleges and universities* (Ed.D. Dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No 3234461).

Hudea, O. S. (2014). Cross-cultural leadership. *Manager, 19*(1), 45-52. Retrieved from http://eres.regent.edu:2048/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.regent.edu/docview/1619354089?accountid=13479

Hussar, W. J., & Bailey, T. M. (2007). Projections of Education Statistics to 2016. National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, NCES 2008-060.

Jenkins, T. S., & Walton, C. L. (2008). Student affairs and cultural practice: A framework for implementing culture outside the classroom. In: S. Harper (Ed.), *Creating inclusive campus environments: For cross-cultural learning and student engagement* (pp. 87-101). Washington, D.C.: National Association for Student Personnel Administrators.

Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self, problem, and process in human development. President and Fellows of Harvard College.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

King, P., & Howard-Hamilton, M. (2003). An assessment of multicultural competence. *NASPA Journal, 40*(2), 8. DOI:10.2202/0027-6014.1226

Lokkesmoe, K. J., Kuchinke, K. P., & Ardichvili, A. (2016). Developing cross-cultural awareness through foreign immersion programs: Implications of university study abroad research for global competency development. *European Journal of Training and Development, 40*(3), 155-170. DOI:10.1108/EJTD-07-2014-0048

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Martin, S. C. (2005) - *A pragmatic exploration of the multicultural competence of community college student affairs practitioners.* (Ph.D. Dissertation) Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3145013)

Mastrodicasa, J. M. (2004). *The impact of diversity courses in student affairs graduate programs on multicultural competence of student affairs professionals* (Ph.D. dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3135202)

Miklitsch, T. (2005). *The relationship between multicultural education, multicultural experiences, racial identity, and multicultural competence among student affairs professionals.* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (UMI No. 3185290)

Mueller, J., & Pope, R. (2001). The Relationship between Multicultural Competence and White Racial Consciousness among Student Affairs Practitioners. *Journal of College Student Development*, *42*(2), 133-44.

Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Oh, H., Lee, J., & Schepp, K. G. (2015). Translation and evaluation of the cultural awareness scale for Korean nursing students. *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship, 12*(1), 9-16. DOI:10.1515/ijnes-2014-0067

Pascarella, E. T., Edison, M., Nora, A., Hagedorn, L. S., & Terenzini, P. T. (1996). Influences on student's openness to diversity and challenge in the first year of college. *Journal of Higher Education, 67*(1) 174-195.

Pike, G. R., & Kuh, G. D. (2006). Relationships among structural diversity, informal peer interaction, and perception of the campus environment. *Review of Higher Education, 29*(4), 425-450.

Pope, R., & Reynolds, A. (1997). Student affairs core competencies: Integrating multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. *Journal of College Student Development, 38*(3), 266.

Shannon, L. M., & Begley, T. (2008). Antecedents of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. In: S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.) *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications* (pp. 41-55). New York: M. E. Sharp.

Stahl, G. K., & Brannen, M. Y. (2013). Building cross-cultural leadership competence: An interview with Carlos Ghosn. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 12*(3), 494-502. DOI:10.5465/amle.2012.0246

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Talbot, D. (1992). *A multi-method study of the diversity emphasis in master's degree programs In college student affairs* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Digital Dissertations (532198A)

Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2006). Motivational cultural intelligence, realistic job preview, realistic living conditions preview, and cross-cultural adjustment. *Group & Organization Management*, *31*(1), 154-173.

Wiersma, W. (1995). *Research methods in education* (6 ed.). Boston: Simon and Schuster Publishing.

Wilson, A. B. (2013). Exploring the multicultural competence of leadership educators. *Journal of Leadership Education, 12*(2), 35-55. DOI:10.12806/V12/I2/35

Wilson, V. (2016). Research methods: Sampling. *Evidence-Based Library and Information Practice, 11*(1(S)), 69-71. DOI:10.18438/B8333VAppendix A: Personal Data Form

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Personal Data Form

Please indicate your age _____

What is the gender to which you identify?
- o Male
- o Female
- o Transgender

What is your race or ethnicity (check all that apply)?
- o African American or Black
- o American Indian/Alaska Native
- o Asian
- o Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- o White
- o Latino/Hispanic
- o Non-Resident Alien

What is your highest degree held?
- o Bachelors
- o Masters (in process)
- o Masters
- o Educational Specialist
- o Doctorate
- o Other

What is your current position title/status in student affairs?
- o Graduate student
- o Advisor/counselor
- o Residence Hall/Area Director
- o Assistant Dean/Director
- o Associate Dean/Director
- o Director
- o Dean
- o Vice-President
- o Other

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Which functional area is most descriptive of your primary responsibilities?

- o Academic advising
- o Admissions
- o Adult learning
- o Assessment/research
- o Career planning/placement
- o Commuter services
- o Counseling
- o Disabled student services
- o Financial aide
- o Food services
- o GLBT awareness
- o Fraternity/Sorority affairs
- o Health/drug education
- o International students
- o Intramural education
- o Judicial affairs
- o Leadership development
- o Multicultural affairs
- o Academic affairs
- o Orientation
- o Religious programs
- o Residence life/Housing
- o Recruitment/retention
- o Service learning
- o Student affairs administration
- o Student union/activities
- o Women's resources
- o Other
- o Multiple responses

How many years have you worked in student affairs?_____

Please indicate your institutional type

- o 4 year public
- o 4 year private
- o 2 year public
- o 2 year private

Please indicate the size of your current institution

- o 30,000
- o 20,000-29,999
- o 10,000-19,999
- o 2,000- 9,999
- o Fewer than 1,999

Please indicate your graduate degree/major

- o Student Personnel
- o Higher education
- o Counselor education
- o Counseling Psychology
- o Educational Psychology
- o Educational Administration
- o Social work
- o Other

Please indicate the numerical frequency of workplace conversation you typically have with individuals of a different race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity or ability status over the course of a two week period _____

Please indicate the numerical frequency of conversations with co-workers or supervisors about racial, ethnic, religious, sexual orientation, gender identity or ability status difference _____

Please indicate the number of multicultural workshops or training programs you have attended over the past two years _____

Since your 18th birthday, how many times have you traveled outside the US?

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Please indicate the number of continuous months you have lived outside the US
- I have never lived outside the US.
- I lived abroad less than one month
- I lived abroad between one and six months
- I lived abroad more than six months (please specify)

Please check all of the identities that apply to you
- Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual
- Transgender
- Christian
- Disabled
- International

Please indicate the location of your current or most recent institution of employment
- **Pacific Northwest** (Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington)
- **West** (Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota; Utah, Wyoming)
- **Midwest** (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Wisconsin)
- **South West** (Arizona, California, Hawaii, New Mexico, Nevada, Oklahoma, Texas)
- **North Eastern** (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont)
- **Mid-Atlantic** (Delaware, the District of Columbia Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia,)
  - **South** (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia)

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu

Appendix B: Cultural Intelligence Survey

Cultural Intelligence Survey and Observer Survey

Questionnaire Items

CQ-Strategy:

1. I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds.
2. I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions.
3. I adjust my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from a culture that is unfamiliar to me.
4. I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures.

CQ-Knowledge:

5. I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures.
6. I know the values and religious beliefs of other cultures.
7. I know the marriage systems of other cultures.
8. I know the arts and crafts of other cultures.
9. I know the rules (e.g., grammar) of other languages.
10. I know the rules for expressing non-verbal behaviors in other cultures.

CQ-Motivation:

11. I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.
12. I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me.
13. I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me.
14. I am confident that I can get accustomed to the shopping conditions in a different culture.
15. I am sure I can deal with the stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me.

CQ-Behavior:

16. I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.
17. I change my non-verbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it.
18. I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations.
19. I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it.
20. I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.

ISSN 1930-806X | editorelj@regent.edu