

A Work Project, presented as part of the requirements for the Award of a Master's degree in
Management from the Nova School of Business and Economics.

**DEVELOPING INTERCULTURAL INTELLIGENCE: HOW DOES THE LEVEL OF
CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE INFLUENCE THE TYPES OF STRATEGIES INDI-
VIDUALS USE TO ADAPT TO A FOREIGN COUNTRY?**

PAULINE TRIGO TEIXEIRA

Work project carried out under the supervision of:

Professor Helena Martins

Alexandra Ribeiro da Costa

15/01/2024

Abstract

This master's thesis explores the dynamic relationship between Cultural Intelligence (CQ) and adaptation strategies employed by individuals in cross-cultural settings. Utilizing a quantitative approach, it systematically investigates how various levels of CQ influence the adoption of cultural adaptation strategies. The study confirms a significant positive correlation between different CQ dimensions and the adoption of such strategies, highlighting CQ's crucial role in successful cultural assimilation. The findings offer valuable insights for individuals and organizations in international contexts, emphasizing the multifaceted nature of CQ and its practical relevance in globalized environments.

Keywords

Cultural Intelligence

Adaptation

Cross-Cultural Environment

Strategy

International

Cross-Cultural Adaptation

This work used infrastructure and resources funded by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (UID/ECO/00124/2013, UID/ECO/00124/2019 and Social Sciences DataLab, Project 22209), POR Lisboa (LISBOA-01-0145-FEDER-007722 and Social Sciences DataLab, Project 22209) and POR Norte (Social Sciences DataLab, Project 22209)

1 Introduction

In a progressively globalized world, the ability to navigate and adapt to diverse cultural landscapes is not just a valuable skill but a critical necessity. The renowned anthropologist, Edward T. Hall, captured the essence of this challenge when he stated, "Culture hides more than it reveals, and strangely enough, what it hides, it hides most effectively from its own participants." (Hall 1959, p.39 in Kunert 2022). With the world and the workforce becoming increasingly interconnected, Cultural Intelligence (CQ) and adaptation are a vital part of everyday life and business. They emerge as pivotal tools in understanding and bridging the culturally diverse landscape that characterizes modern societies. The speed of globalization has intensified interactions among people from varied cultural backgrounds, making the study of CQ more relevant than ever. With businesses expanding across borders and individuals increasingly finding themselves abroad, the ability to adapt effectively has not only become a valuable asset, but a necessity.

Therefore, this master's thesis, through an empirical study, delves into a significant aspect of cultural intelligence and adaptation: the relationship between an individual's CQ and their likelihood to adopt cultural adaptation strategies when encountering a cross-cultural setting.

2 Literature Review

The following section provides a review of already existing literature in this field, aiming to clarify the concept of Cultural Intelligence (CQ), explaining already explored relationships between CQ and other variables, and describing possible adaptation strategies for international experiences.

2.1 Antecedents of Cultural Intelligence

To start, the concept of general intelligence should be defined. An overall conceptualization of intelligence is the capability of a person to adapt to different situations in the environment effectively and is supposedly situated in four main locations: biology, motivation, behavior, and

cognition (Sternberg 1986; Sternberg 2012). From the general intelligence conceptualization, the concept of cultural intelligence can be drawn and understood better.

The authors Ang, van Dyne, and Rockstuhl first conceptualized intercultural intelligence in 2003 and defined it as “[...] the capability to function effectively in intercultural contexts” (Ang, van Dyne, and Rockstuhl 2015). Similarly to this definition, Earley and Masakowski (2004) explain intercultural intelligence as the ability of an outsider to naturally interpret gestures of people of other cultures that are unfamiliar and ambiguous to them as if they were a compatriot or colleague. However, these authors expand the understanding of cultural intelligence towards departmental differences in a company, not solely aimed at different cultures (Early and Mosakowski 2004). Another definition of cultural intelligence is given by Leung, Soon, and Tan (2014), who define CQ as “[...] set of malleable capabilities that enable an individual to effectively function in and manage cultural diverse settings [...]”. This definition indicates the possibility of learning and developing cultural intelligence in individuals.

As described above, the general understanding of intelligence and how cultural intelligence is formed can be sectioned into three different loci: cognitive, physical, and emotional/motivational (Early and Mosakowski 2004). Therefore, the authors identify that cultural intelligence comes from the body, the heart, and the head; even though not all areas are developed the same in culturally intelligent people, a lack in one area significantly influences the other two. Where Early and Mosakowski identify three loci that precede cultural intelligence, another point of view refines the CQ model which includes four main drivers: metacognitive cultural intelligence, cognitive cultural intelligence, motivational cultural intelligence, and behavioral cultural intelligence (Ang, Leung, and Tan 2014). CQ, therefore, is established through these four subdimensions. The metacognitive component describes an individual’s mental capacity to gain and be conscious of cultural knowledge (Early, Ang, and Tan 2006; Ang et al. 2007; Ang and van Dyne 2008). Next, the cognitive component refers to general cognition and constitution of knowledge

of culturally specific norms and practices (Ng and Early 2006; Ang et al. 2007). The behavioral component can be defined as an individual’s capacity to communicate appropriately, both verbally and non-verbally, during interactions with culturally different individuals (Ang et al. 2007; Ang and van Dyne 2008). Lastly, the motivational component relates to the desire and intent of an individual to assimilate into an unknown cultural setting (Ang et al 2007; Ang and van Dyne 2008). The motivational component is especially emphasized as one of the main drivers as it defines the amount of energy that an individual directs toward learning about and understanding how cultures differ (Ang, Leung, and Tan 2014). In general, it is to assume that an established CQ in an individual requires all four components mentioned above (Early and Peterson 2004; Ang, Livermore, and van Dyne 2010). Figure I visualizes the concept of CQ and its antecedents and provides the basis of understanding for the continuation of this research.



Figure I: Concept of Cultural Intelligence (CQ). Own representation.

A list of more specific antecedents was given in a journal entry by Frías-Jamilena et al. (2017) and included: “[...] openness to experience, risk orientation and need for control [...], self-efficacy [...], language skills or living on culturally different environments [...], parental and educational experiences [...], or the personality of the individual [...]” which are outcomes of the four CQ subdimensions.

2.2 Consequences of Cultural Intelligence

After establishing the antecedents of CQ, the consequences of an increased CQ should be highlighted. In the section above, the provided definitions already mention effects of an increased CQ. Now, the following section shows precise consequences.

To measure CQ, Ang et al. (2007) drew on the four-component model of CQ localization to create a Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS), based on a four-factor 20-item structure. Results from this scale show that CQ “[...] consistently predicts psychological outcomes such as intercultural adjustment, behavioral outcomes such as idea sharing and development of social networks with culturally different others, and performance outcomes such as task performance and cross-border leadership [...]” (Ang, Leung, and Tan 2014). In 2012, the CQS was further developed to be a 37-item scale, which includes subdimensions of the four CQ drivers mentioned above (Ang et al.). Moreover, Bückner et al. (2014) mention the anxiety-reducing effect during intercultural situations when an individual has an increased CQ.

To summarize the two sections, cultural intelligence can be defined as the ability of a person to successfully adapt to their surroundings, even if unknown to them, which influences the psychological, behavioral, and performance outcomes in cross-cultural settings.

2.3 Differentiators between CQ and other models

Leung, Soon, and Tan (2014) show a distinction between CQ and intercultural competence in their work. They define intercultural competence as “[...] an individual’s ability to function effectively across cultures [...]” (Leung, Soon, and Tan 2014). Another definition by Johnson et al. (2006) aims at a person’s ability to use their existing knowledge, skills, and attributes to work effectively in intercultural environments. A clear distinction can be seen between this definition and the one mentioned by Leung, Soon, and Tan (2014), where CQ’s key identifier is being malleable, whereas Intercultural Competence (IC) draws on already existing factors. However,

research on IC predates research on CQ, which is why it can be seen as a relative of CQ (Ang, van Dyne, and Rockstuhl 2015).

Moreover, Ang, van Dyne, and Rockstuhl (2015) draw clear distinctions towards other intelligence types and personality traits to show what cultural intelligence does not encompass. They first show the similarity and distinction between CQ and general cognitive ability. Even though both are seen as key performance predictors, general cognitive ability centers around only the cognitive loci of intellectual abilities whereas CQ includes behavioral, biological, motivational, and cognitive loci of specifically intercultural capabilities. Moreover, CQ is seen as a specific performance predictor in intercultural settings and general cognitive ability in a wider range of jobs and environments. (Ang, van Dyne, and Rockstuhl 2015)

Next, the differentiation between CQ and personality traits is shown. Personality traits are defined as “[...] a person’s general and enduring behavioral tendencies across situations and time.” (Costa and McCrae 1992; Funder 2001). Taking the definitions above into account, CQ and personality traits are conceptually different but associated, as an individual’s experiences and the following development of CQ are influenced by that individual’s behavioral tendencies (Ang, van Dyne, and Rockstuhl 2015).

As follows it can be said that CQ is related to, but different from intercultural competence, general cognitive ability, and personality traits.

2.4 Existing relationships with Cultural Intelligence

To further understand the concept and importance of CQ, already-identified relationships are explained to show the influences on other psychological concepts.

2.4.1 Cultural Intelligence and Communication Competence

Communication is an important aspect of the adaptation to cross-cultural settings as it creates common understandings between people from different cultures, which can reduce the anxiety related to those cross-cultural settings (Bücker, et al. 2014).

Intercultural communication competence (ICC) is therefore defined as the ability to understand behaviors and attitudes in communication with individuals from different cultures and revolves around the perception of the communication process (Beamer 1992). However, intercultural communication does not solely include verbal communication but also non-verbal, behavioral aspects (Durant and Shepherd 2009). As seen above, this is reflected in the behavioral component of CQ, too. Yeke and Semerciöz (2016) concluded that CQ has a positive effect on ICC, as individuals who show an increased CQ can better understand and therefore take on behaviors, thoughts, and emotions of individuals from other cultures. As follows, CQ is a major factor in the ability to efficiently communicate interculturally. This result is backed by other research, e.g., a study by Bücker et al. (2014). They validated their hypothesis that “[...] the level of CQ is positively associated with the level of communication effectiveness.” (Bücker et al. 2014). Moreover, another study conducted by Arasaratnam (2006) discovered that ICC is enhanced by the positive attitudes of an individual toward other individuals of different cultures since they show an increased motivation to communicate with people of other cultures, which is reflected in the four-component model by Ang, Leung, and Tan (2014).

2.4.2 Cultural Intelligence and Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence (EI) can be defined as “[...] the capability to deal effectively with emotions – both one’s own and those of others. Thus, emotional intelligence is the capability to adapt effectively to emotional environments.” (Mayer and Salovey 1993 in Ang, van Dyne, and Rockstuhl 2015). EI can further decrease social anxiety and predict social adaptability. Since it

is a learnable (acquired) skill, it can develop over a person's life. (Vera 2008; Colfax, Rivera & Perez 2010).

Even though the chapter above draws a differentiation between CQ and Intercultural Competence (IC), a relation between these two was discussed. Therefore, the following content, though specifying IC, will be transferred analogically to the concept of CQ. A relationship between EI and IC can specifically be seen in the shared factor of being assimilative to other individuals' needs and being empathetic toward appropriate responses (Arghode, Lakshmanan, and Nafukho 2021). EI is therefore seen by these authors as a precursor of IC. Even though EI focuses more on the connection on an individual level, whereas IC on group settings, a general foundation of EI is necessary to acquire IC, and a higher EI is needed to increase the IC further. Moreover, Early and Masakowski (2004) denote a specific identifier that EI and CQ share "a propensity to suspend judgment – to think before acting". In detail, research shows that five main components of EI drive IC: self-awareness, self-regulation, social skills, empathy, and motivation (Goleman 2006).

2.4.3 Emotional Intelligence and Communication Competence

Lastly, the relationship between emotional intelligence and intercultural communication competence, and intercultural communication apprehension (ICA), was analyzed.

A study by Fall et al. (2013) hypothesized that EI has a negative relationship with ICA, which means that individuals with higher EI have a lower ICA. In this context, ICA is a type of anxiety that is formed by uncertainty in communication between individuals of different cultures (Neuliep and McCroskey 1997). This leads to a reduced inclination to engage with individuals from diverse cultures, subsequently fostering greater intolerance (Fall, et al. 2013). From this point of view, a higher EI leads to a lower ICC, meaning that an individual is more willing to communicate with culturally diverse people and tends to be less intolerant.

2.5 Adaptation Strategies

The term cross-cultural adaptation can be defined as “[...] a complex process in which a person becomes capable of effectively functioning in a culture that differs from his or hers own culture.” (Haslberger 2005). A study by Francis (1991) indicates that successful business relationships necessitate at least a moderate level of adaptation to the host culture. Similarly, an understanding of the culture outside the workplace is an important factor in successfully adapting to the new workplace (Lin 2004; Jun et al 2001).

Early research by Hofstede showed that it is of utmost importance for successful cross-cultural collaboration to learn customs, courtesies, and business etiquette as well as cultural aspects like the national mindset, or management philosophies (Moran, Abramson, and Moran 2014). A general understanding of the host culture can therefore reduce the consequences of culture shock and increase the effectiveness of cross-cultural collaboration. Hyun and Conant (2019) give certain suggestions specifically for leaders working in a cross-cultural environment. Firstly, being mindful of one’s areas of improvement and seeking impartial feedback givers. Secondly, the importance of open-mindedness and a willingness to embrace change is highlighted, which goes along with staying non-judgemental towards differing environments. Lastly, seeking advice and feedback from representatives of different cultures rather than assuming their interpretations. The authors specifically highlight two aspects: being empathic towards thoughts, feelings, and concerns and finding ways to truthfully connect. (Hyun and Conant 2019)

Tarique and Caligiuri (2004) describe organizational training methods to prepare expatriates for their host country, which in the context of this work will be transferred to the individual level. The authors describe the need for cultural context, which can be developed through the culture's language, history, customs, and appropriate behaviors in diverse settings. Ways of development are for example personal interactions with individuals from the host country, look-and-seek trips, role-play, coaching, or language courses. Appendix B proposes a list of possible strategies and

activities to adapt to the culture in and outside the workplace. These strategies were used within the questionnaire.

To summarize, the concept of CQ, its scale, and differentiators have already been researched as well as put into relationships with other intelligence types and competencies. Moreover, adaptation strategies are apparent through corporate cultural training. However, there is little academic research addressing cultural adaptation strategies on an individual level, or on the relationship between CQ and the likelihood of adopting such strategies.

3 Objectives and Hypothesis

As seen above, a gap in the literature on the relationship between an individual's CQ score and the likelihood of adopting adaptation strategies was identified, resulting in the following research question for this work:

How does the level of Cultural Intelligence (CQ) influence the types of strategies individuals use to adapt to a foreign country?

There are multiple objectives this research question covers. Firstly, it implies the assessment of levels of cultural intelligence in a variety of individuals. Secondly, relevant cultural adaptation strategies must be identified and categorized to study the relationship between these variables. Lastly, and mainly, the relationship between the levels of CQ and the adaptation strategies should be investigated.

The preceding chapter discussed the benefits of possessing a higher Cultural Intelligence (CQ) such as enhanced cultural assimilation, effective networking with individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds, and a heightened receptivity towards varied perspectives (Ang, Leung, and Tan 2014). To examine the veracity of these assertions, the correlation between the overall CQ score and the overall strategy adaptation will be analyzed. Further, the adaptation strategies will be categorized to deepen the understanding of CQ and its subdimensions and their influences

on identified strategy components. Therefore, three sub-hypotheses of each *H1* to *H5* aim to identify these relationships. The full hypothesis (*H1a* to *H5c*) can be seen in Appendix I.

***H1:** Individuals with higher levels of cultural intelligence are more likely to employ adaptive strategies (incl. H1a, H1b, H1c) when adapting to a foreign country.*

Conversely, while all four sub-dimensions are necessary to cultivate a higher level of CQ (Early and Peterson, 2004; van Dyne, Ang, and Livermore, 2010), it is imperative to ascertain which of these sub-dimensions show a more pronounced influence on the adoption of adaptation strategies. Consequently, hypotheses *H2a* to *H5c* will investigate the relationships between each CQ subdimension and the comprehensive adoption of adaptation strategies:

***H2:** Individuals with higher metacognitive CQ are more likely to employ adaptive strategies (incl. H2a, H2b, H2c) when adapting to a foreign country.*

***H3:** Individuals with higher cognitive CQ are more likely to employ adaptive strategies (incl. H3a, H3b, H3c) when adapting to a foreign country.*

***H4:** Individuals with higher motivational CQ are more likely to employ adaptive strategies (incl. H4a, H4b, H4c) when adapting to a foreign country.*

***H5:** Individuals with higher behavioral CQ are more likely to employ adaptive strategies (incl. H5a, H5b, H5c) when adapting to a foreign country.*

4 Methodology

The following section describes the use of selected methodologies to answer the posed research question and corresponding hypothesis. It dives into the reasoning for which and why the methodologies were chosen, as well as their limitations. To evaluate and analyze the data, the statistical tool SPSS was used. For the proposed research question, an exploratory quantitative research method was selected. As this topic is, at the current time, partially unexplored, the

exploratory quantitative approach allows for an introductory explanation and sets the stone for future research. The focus of the research lies in evaluating the CQ of participants and exploring the relationship between high CQ and certain adaptation strategies.

4.1 Data Collection

Both primary and secondary data were used during this research. Firstly, secondary data in the form of a literature review scanned already existing research in the field of study. This serves both the purpose of introducing the topic and specifying the questionnaire in a way that contains valid scales and includes the relevant questions to fill the literature gap. Notable secondary data includes article entries, journals, books, and research papers. This data was collected using academic research platforms such as Google Scholar, Science Direct, or Research Gate. Primary data was collected via a structured survey, which included socio-demographic questions, the CQ scale, and adaptation strategies. The corresponding questions of the survey can be found in appendices A to B.

4.2 Sample and Subjects

Data from the survey was collected through a sample of participants answering the online survey. There was no specific targeted population during the data collection and the convenience sampling method was used in combination with the snowballing method; as only individuals in the targeted communication channels and their referrals had the chance to answer the survey, true randomization was not achievable. Seven main channels were used to communicate the survey (LinkedIn, Instagram, WhatsApp, Facebook, Expat Groups, E-Mail, and SurveyCircles) and the survey was accessible for a total of two weeks. (Wright 1997)

The chosen methods of sampling pose a risk of selection bias. Since only a small portion of the population was targeted, this might lead to blurred results. However, in this format true randomization was not within the scope of the possibilities and the resonance of the survey (n = 192) can be seen as a valid representation of a sample population. Another risk factor is seen in

the limited timeframe that the survey was conducted. Due to time constraints, it was not feasible to collect data for longer than two weeks, which might reduce the possibility of a representative, diverse sample. Moreover, the survey relies on self-reported data, meaning that participants evaluate their capabilities. This may lead the participants to provide answers they deem as “socially admirable” and do not accurately represent their behaviors. Considering these limitations, collected data can still be seen as viable and will be used for this research. (Wright 1997)

4.3 Instruments

CQ was measured using a pre-validated, 20-item scale created and tested by Ang, van Dyne, and Koh (2007). It is divided into four dimensions (cognitive, meta-cognitive, behavioral, and motivational) and measures answers using a seven-point Likert scale. Next, adaptation strategies were selected through prior literature research, filtering out the most mentioned and significant ones. They were also measured using a seven-point Likert scale. Both variables used the range: 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree, and their subsets in between.

Socio-demographic control variables included in the survey were as follows: age, gender, nationality, education, language proficiency, international experiences, lengths of international experiences, occupation, and industry of work.

The reliability of all instruments and their subgroups were tested and verified using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient in SPSS. As seen in the table below, all instruments including their subsets show a reliability of > 0.7 , which is acceptable and shows internal consistency.

Table 1: Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistics		
Scale	Cronbach’s Alpha	N of Items
Mean_CQ	.927	20
Mean_Metacognitive	.866	4
Mean_Cognitive	.863	6
Mean_Motivational	.882	5

Mean_Behavioral	.870	5
Mean_Strategies	.911	17
Strategy_Category1	.805	5
Strategy_Category2	.805	4
Strategy_Category3	.796	4

4.4 Statistical Test and Assumptions

Two statistical tests were used to analyze the data and interpret it regarding the hypothesis: factor analysis and linear regression analysis. Firstly, a factor analysis supported categorizing the strategies. Factor analysis identifies underlying relationships within given variables and is commonly used to explore an existing structure to understand relationship patterns. Secondly, linear regression assesses the relationship and explains the variation between an independent (predictor) and a dependent variable. A linear regression output shows the correlation coefficient, which indicates relationships between two or more variables and provides insights into the strength and direction of the relationships. However, it is important to note that correlation is not equal to or imply causation. Correlated variables do not necessarily mean one variable is the cause of the other since other external factors might influence the observed correlation. Before testing the linear regression models, linearity between dependent and independent variables was verified using scatter plots. Further, as $n > 30$, the Central Limit Theorem applies, implying a normal distribution of the sample mean. (Nicol and Pexmann 2007; Wright 1997)

5 Results

The ensuing chapter systematically presents and evaluates the results obtained from the statistical analyses conducted on the sample. It is structured in a chronological sequence of the executed tests, initially investigating the associations between Cultural Intelligence (CQ) and its subgroups concerning the overall adoption of strategies. After, it focuses on CQ and its subgroups with distinct subcategories of strategies, including an exploratory factor analysis. This

structured format ensures a transition from a broad analysis to a more detailed examination, following a logical progression in the research methodology.

Results H1 to H5

Several individual linear regression analyses were conducted to investigate the influence of CQ and its subdimensions on the likelihood of adopting adaptation strategies in general (*H1-H5*). Each dimension of CQ – overall, metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral – was assessed for its predictive value regarding the employment of adaptation strategies, operationalized as Mean_Strategies. The table below provides the model summary for *H1-H5*, visualizing R, R², and the adjusted R². Appendix C showcases the full coefficient table for *H1-H5*.

Table 2: Model Summary- CQ and Strategies overall (no control variables)

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²
1	.516 ^a	.266	.262
2	.414 ^b	.171	.167
3	.413 ^c	.171	.166
4	.403 ^d	.162	.158
5	.427 ^e	.182	.178

Influence of overall CQ on Strategies overall (H1)

The model explained 26.6% (R² = .266) of the variance in adaptive strategies, which indicates a substantial effect. With $p < .001$, the positive relationship (R = .516) was found to be significant, suggesting the confirmation of *H1*.

Influence of metacognitive CQ on Strategies overall (H2)

Further, the regression model for metacognitive CQ revealed a positive association (R = .414) with the employment of adaptive strategies ($p < .001$), accounting for 17.1% of the variance (R² = .171). This endorses the confirmation of *H2*.

Influence of cognitive CQ on Strategies overall (H3)

Similarly, the subdimension cognitive CQ showed a significant, positive relationship ($p < .001$; $R = .413$) towards adaptation strategies with an $R^2 = .171$, confirming *H3*.

Influence of motivational CQ on Strategies overall (H4)

Motivational CQ was also found to significantly predict the employment of adaptive strategies ($R = .403$, $p < .001$), with the model explaining 16.2% of the variance (R^2), verifying *H4*.

Influence of behavioral CQ on Strategies overall (H5)

Lastly, behavioral CQ's contribution to the model was statistically significant too with $p < .001$ accounting for 18.2% of the variance explained and a correlation of $R = .427$, therefore, supporting *H5*.

Control Variables

To further analyze hypotheses *H1* to *H5*, test the strength of these models, and identify whether the control variables make up a significant part of the model, additional linear regression models for the dependent variable and the independent variables were run with control variables (gender, education level, number of proficient languages, international experience Yes/No, and length of international experiences). Corresponding regression tables are listed in Appendix D and E. Using a correlation matrix, the correlation of independent variables was identified and showed no multicollinearity.

Comparing the adjusted R^2 of all linear regression models, it is apparent that the control variables add a slightly higher percentage of variance explained ($.183 \leq \text{adjusted } R^2 \leq .277$) in these models. However, this increase (between .025 and 0.152) is only marginal. Moreover, looking at the individual p -values, the control variables are not significant for the common significance levels to explain the relationship, with $.008 \leq p \leq .945$. Therefore, the control variables

do not show significant effects on the dependent variable, which suggests that the CQ dimensions are more robust predictors of Mean_Strategies compared to demographic and background factors included as controls.

To summarize, while the models including control variables may explain a slightly higher proportion of variance in Mean_Strategies, the lack of significance for most control variables suggests that their inclusion does not greatly enhance the model's explanatory power. As follows, the analysis of *H1a* to *H5c* was conducted using the simple linear regression models not including the control variables.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Currently, there exists a limited body of research concerning the categorization of adaptation strategies, which have been formulated through the application of an exploratory factor analysis. This technique allows the exploration of potential underlying factor structures in a set of observed variables without imposing a preconceived structure on the outcome. Strategy items from the survey were sorted into the component (category) with the highest loading. Items with loadings in multiple categories were excluded from the scale as it suggests that the item shares a strong association with more than one underlying construct. This can lead to ambiguity in interpreting the factors since it is unclear which construct the item truly represents. Therefore, the following items were excluded from the factor analysis: 59, 61, 62, and 66 (see Appendix B for full item descriptions). The factor analysis then resulted in three strategy categories, visualized in Table 3, which were given names based on their underlying characteristics:

Strategy_Category1: Self-Directed Cultural Learning

Strategy_Category2: Structured Cultural Integration

Strategy_Category3: Social and Experiential Cultural Engagement

Table 3: Categorization of Exploratory Factor Analysis

Categorization		
Strategy_Category1	Strategy_Category2	Strategy_Category3
53. Investing time to actively research about the country	56. Taking coaching lessons from a local coach	57. Immersing myself in the local culture by partaking in local events or joining WhatsApp/Facebook groups
51. Learning about local business etiquette by talking to local colleagues	64. Taking intercultural trainings	63. Going to multicultural events
50. Learning about the national culture	55. Going on a look-and-see or casual trip prior to my assignment to get familiar with the location	60. Integrating into groups in the destination country
52. Seeking impartial feedback from local individuals regarding my behavior	65. Consuming the local culture through literature	58. Going to local restaurants to get accustomed to the local cuisine
54. Learning the local language		

The full results (factor loadings, categorization, total variance explained, and communalities) are visualized in Appendix F.

Results H1a to H5c

To continue, each subcategory (*a, b, c*) of the main hypothesis (*H1-H5*) was tested. These hypotheses examined the influence of CQ and its subdimensions on the employment of three distinct categories of adaptive strategies (Strategy_Category1, Strategy_Category2, Strategy_Category3). Individual model summaries and coefficient tables are listed in Appendix G and H.

Influence of overall CQ on strategy categories 1-3 (H1a, H1b, and H1c)

First, the regression model for *H1a* indicates a positive relationship with $R = .568$ and $R^2 = .323$; *H1b* reveals a slightly weaker association at $R = .368$ with an $R^2 = .136$; for *H1c*, the correlation of $R = .445$ is averagely strong too with $R^2 = .198$. All results are significant at $p < .001$, indicating the validity of *H1a, H1b, and H1c*.

Influence of metacognitive CQ on strategy categories 1-3 (H2a, H2b, and H2c)

Next, though slightly lower than the results of *H1a*, *H2a* is supported as an average positive relationship ($R = .498$) with $R^2 = .248$ can be seen, indicating that metacognitive CQ influences the adoption of Strategy_Category1. *H2b* shows again a slightly weaker relationship at $R = .281$ and $R^2 = .079$. For *H2c*, the findings ($R = .355$; $R^2 = .126$) suggest a less pronounced impact on Strategy_Category3 than Strategy_Category1. All results support *H2a*, *H2b*, and *H2c* and are significant at $p < .001$ indicating model fit.

Influence of cognitive CQ on strategy categories 1-3 (H3a, H3b, and H3c)

Further, the results for *H3a* demonstrate a similarly strong and significant result for Strategy_Category 1 ($p < .001$; $R = .492$), with $R^2 = .242$. For *H3b*, again a slightly weaker, but still significant ($p < .001$) effect was observed with the correlation coefficient R being $= .301$ and $R^2 = .091$. *H3c* also reveals a significant relationship ($R = .316$; $p < .001$) with $R^2 = .100$. Therefore, Hypotheses *H3a*, *H3b*, and *H3c* can be confirmed based on the regression results.

Influence of motivational CQ on strategy categories 1-3 (H4a, H4b, and H4c)

At $R = .429$ and $R^2 = .184$, the results for *H4a* indicate an average, positive, and significant ($p < .001$) influence on Strategy_Category1. *H4b* demonstrates a lower effect at $R = .237$ and $R^2 = .056$ at $p < .001$, therefore showcasing a positive relationship too. The influence on Strategy_Category3 (*H4c*) is the highest ($p < .001$), with a correlation coefficient $R = .442$ and $R^2 = .195$. Based on these results, *H4a*, *H4b*, and *H4c* can be statistically confirmed.

Influence of behavioral CQ on strategy categories 1-3 (H5a, H5b, and H5c)

Lastly, the results for *H5a* show a substantial link to Strategy_Category1 with $R = .416$ and $R^2 = .173$ at all common significance levels ($p < .001$). A slightly weaker correlation is seen between behavioral CQ and Strategy_Category2 ($R = .349$ with $R^2 = .122$), still confirming *H5b*

on all common significance levels ($p < .001$). Lastly, the regression model for *H5c* indicates a similar relationship ($R = .336$), explaining 11.3% of the residual variance, verifying the hypothesis at $p < .001$. Therefore, *H5a*, *H5b*, and *H5c* can be substantiated.

Overall, with Pearson's Correlation Coefficient (R) ranging between .237 and .568, an averagely strong, positive correlation is visible between CQ with its subdimensions and adopting adaptation strategies (incl. its categories). As R^2 ranges between .056 and .323, the regression model explains between 5.6% to 32.3% of the variance in adaptive strategies. R^2 is the coefficient of determination, which explains the proportion of variance in the dependent variables, explainable by the independent variable (s). While R^2 , if higher, can give an initial understanding of the quality of fit for the model, it does not necessarily mean that a higher value is always better. The value of R^2 and how it determines the quality is both context (e.g., mathematical vs. social sciences) and sample size-dependent (Wright 1997). The table and values above clearly indicate a relationship between the dependent variables and the independent variables. Moreover, as the F-statistics for all the regression models were significant at $p < .001$, strong evidence points towards the verification of *H1a* to *H5c* for this sample set. This shows a significant positive relationship between each subdimension of CQ and each strategy category, indicating that higher levels of different aspects of CQ are associated with the increased employment of cross-cultural adaptation strategies.

The table presented in Appendix I provides a comprehensive summary of the 20 hypotheses.

6 Discussion

The study's findings establish a clear positive correlation between CQ and its subdimensions and the adoption of adaptation strategies in cross-cultural environments for this sample population. This overlaps with prior literature, which emphasizes the importance of all subdimensions of CQ to adapt to a new cultural setting effectively. The empirical evidence therefore

validates the theoretical implications that establish CQ as a critical determinant in cultural adaptation and intercultural interactions, based on sample results at $n = 192$.

Drawing on the conceptualization of CQ by Ang, van Dyne, and Rockstuhl (2015), the study reinforces the importance of CQ in multicultural settings as it suggests that each dimension of CQ contributes uniquely to an individual's ability to employ adaptive strategies effectively. This is further grounded in the conceptualization of CQ by Ang and Van Dyne (2008), as well as Earley and Ang (2008), who establish that individuals with higher CQ are more adept at navigating cross-cultural environments. These insights extend the theoretical understanding of CQ by demonstrating its practical application in strategy adoption, aligning with the views of Early and Masakowski (2004) on CQ's applicability in real-world settings.

As the individual subdimensions of CQ show a positive correlation with strategy adaptation, a distinct influence of each dimension can be assumed. Moreover, the assumption of several authors that effective CQ development requires all four subdimensions, is consistent with the study's results (Early and Peterson 2004; Ang, Livermore, and van Dyne 2010). Therefore, as the correlation coefficients are harmonious over the four subdimensions, a fairly equal contribution towards adaption strategies can be postulated. Taking this into account and drawing back to the definitions of each dimension from theoretical literature (visualized in Figure I), each dimension reflects a nuanced influence on the overall CQ of an individual. Therefore, it can be theorized that each dimension also has a distinct influence on an individual's strategy adoption. Metacognitive CQ, involving high-level cognitive processes, may enable individuals to better understand and interpret multicultural situations, leading to more effective strategy formulation. Cognitive CQ, on the other hand, provides the necessary knowledge about cultures, enhancing one's ability to find appropriate adaptation strategies and integrate them into the adaptation process. Motivational CQ, which has been established as the key driver in an individual's desire to adapt to a foreign environment, likely drives the desire to engage in and learn from multicultural

interactions as well as frequently use established strategies. Finally, behavioral CQ, which involves the capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and non-verbal actions, may directly influence the execution of adaptive strategies. (Early, Ang, and Tan 2006; Ang et al. 2007; Ang and van Dyne 2008; Ng and Early 2006)

In the examination of strategy categories, it is evident that overall cultural intelligence and its subdimensions show a predominantly strong influence on the first strategy category: Self-Directed Cultural Learning. Notably, the metacognitive and cognitive components of CQ emerge as the most influential subgroups in this category. This may be due to their roles in processing and understanding cultural knowledge, which aligns with theories suggesting that higher cognitive abilities facilitate deeper learning and comprehension in new cultural contexts. This would further support the discussed assumptions above, detailing possible distinctive influences of the metacognitive and cognitive components on strategy adoption overall.

In the case of Strategy_Category 2, which describes Social and Experiential Cultural Engagement, there is a slight variation in the degree of association within the four components of CQ. However, these relationships remain robust. These robust associations across all CQ components in this category could be explained by the interactive nature of these strategies, which require a blend of cognitive understanding, behavioral adaptation, and motivational drive. However, the slightly higher association of motivational and behavioral components, compared to cognitive and metacognitive, would align with the nature of this strategy category. Social and experiential engagement requires a higher intrinsic drive to interact with other individuals and requires the appropriate verbal and non-verbal behavior.

Conversely, Strategy_Category 3 exhibits the most fragile connections with CQ and its subdimensions, suggesting a comparatively weaker influence in this area. Here, the lesser impact might be due to this category's reliance on aspects less directly influenced by an individual's

CQ, but more on situational factors or external support systems. Items of the category “Structured Cultural Integration” include for example coaching sessions, or intercultural training, which open the possibility of externalities being influential drivers. Therefore, the impact of an individual’s CQ might be less since the adoption of such strategies is also bound to third-party involvement (e.g., company-mandated intercultural training).

Interestingly, while still significant, the motivational component of CQ does not exhibit the strongest correlations out of the CQ dimensions and strategy adaptation. This finding presents a subtle contradiction from the assumptions posited by Ang, Leung, and Tan (2014). Nonetheless, this deviation is marginal and can be supposed to be related to the sample. Further, the overarching results still demonstrate a substantial and positive association between motivational CQ and the adoption of strategies.

As seen, the statistical significance of the relationship between CQ and adaptation strategies in our study underscores the importance of CQ as a critical component in the toolkit of professionals working in multicultural environments. Theoretically, this finding enriches the discussion around intercultural communication and adaptation by providing empirical evidence that supports and expands existing theories. It positions CQ as not just a desirable trait but as a pivotal factor influencing the efficacy of adapting in multicultural workplaces. As this study is relatively narrow in its sample group and sample size, it opens the topic of CQ and adaptation for further research. Moreover, the creation of an adaptation strategy scale through the identification of underlying constructs enables future development and possible enrichment of said scale.

The results highlight the importance of developing and enhancing different aspects of CQ to facilitate effective cross-cultural adaptation. Practically, these insights suggest that enhancing various aspects of CQ could be a strategic focus for organizations and individuals operating in international settings, particularly for expatriates or those in multicultural workplaces. Companies operating in multicultural environments can therefore benefit from assessing the CQ of their

employees. The outcomes of such assessments may be a valuable tool in determining the likely success of individuals in international assignments as well as developing and guiding targeted training programs to enhance intercultural competencies. Moreover, the CQ subcategories and the factor analysis show clear categories that may be useful for developing personal development measures toward identified weak points or appropriate adaptation strategies. This would support the concept of increasingly personalized employee development, showing flexibility, adaptability, and appreciation in HR departments and companies themselves.

It is to note, however, that several contextual and sample-dependent factors might influence the likelihood of strategy adoption. These include the diverse backgrounds of the participants, the nature and execution of previous international experiences, and the subjective nature of self-reported data on CQ and strategy use. Additionally, the dynamic and complex nature of cross-cultural interactions could lead to variability in how individuals perceive and report their use of adaptive strategies. Through the inclusion of selected control variables, the models were tested on some externalities, but this does not indicate the non-existence of further influential factors in the dynamic nature of cultural adaptation.

7 Conclusion

To summarize, this research explored the dynamic relationship between Cultural Intelligence (CQ) and the adoption of various strategies for cross-cultural adaptation by individuals in foreign countries. Using quantitative research, it systematically investigated this relationship through the lens of CQ and its subdimensions.

The results confirmed all hypotheses (*H1* to *H5*) and their sub-hypotheses (*H1a* to *H5c*), demonstrating a significant positive correlation between each component of CQ and adaptation strategies (incl. three identified categories). This implies that higher levels of CQ are associated with increased employment of adaptive strategies in foreign environments. Therefore, these findings have significant implications for individuals and organizations operating in international

contexts since they reinforce the theoretical understanding of CQ as a multifaceted construct that is crucial for successful cultural adaptation. For this sample, they empirically validate the idea that different dimensions of CQ play a vital role in navigating cross-cultural environments effectively.

While the study provides valuable insights, it is not without limitations. The reliance on self-reported data may introduce biases. Moreover, the geographic and age distribution of the sample, which did not achieve full randomization, could influence the answers further. Next, specific cultural contexts might impact the results of CQ and strategy adoption, which was not integrated into the study's sample. Therefore, future research could include additional sample diversification, as well as the geographic and cultural contexts that should be scanned (e.g., Cross-Cultural Validation Studies). Further, as the strategy categorization was newly created in and for this work, advanced research validating or extending this would be of use to gain deeper insights. Lastly, the impact of moderating factors as well as the influence of new developments (e.g., digital communication, hybrid expatriations, etc.) should be further investigated.

In summary, this work contributes to intercultural studies by empirically validating the importance of CQ in cultural adaptation processes. It underscores the complexity of cultural intelligence and its practical relevance in today's globalized world. By highlighting the multifaceted nature of CQ and its impact on adaptive strategies, the study opens avenues for future research and practical applications in cross-cultural training and development.

Bibliography

- Ang, S., and PC. Early. 2003. *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions Across Cultures*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- Ang, Soon, Kwok Leung, and Mei Ling Tan. 2014. "Intercultural Competence." *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 489-519.
- Ang, S., L. van Dyne, C. Koh, K-Y. Ng, KJ. Templer, et al. 2007. "Cultural intelligence: its measures and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation, and task performance." *Mang. Organ. Rev.* 3:335-71.
- Ang, Soon, L. van Dyne, and T. Rockstuhl. 2015. "Cultural Intelligence." In *Handbook of Advances in Culture and Psychology Vol. 5*, by Chi-yue Chiu, Michele J. Gelfand, and Ying-yi Hong, 273-323. Oxford University Press.
- Ang, S., and L. van Dyne. 2008. Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: definition, distinctiveness, and nomological network.
- Ang, S., C. Koh, K.Y. Ng, T. Rockstuhl, M. L. Tan, and L. van Dyne. 2012. "Subdimensions of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence: Expanding the conceptualization and measurement of cultural intelligence." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 6 295-313.
- Ang, S., D. Livermore, and L. van Dyne. 2010. "Cultural intelligence: a pathway for leading in a rapidly globalizing world." In *Leading across differences*, by K. Hannum, B. B. McFeeters and L. Booyesen. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Arasaratnam, L.A. 2006. "Further testing of a new model of intercultural communication competence." *Communication Research Reports* 23, 93-99.
- Arghode, Vishal, Gandhi Lakshmanan, and Fredrick Muyia Nafukho. 2021. "Emotional intelligence, intercultural competence, and online instruction: Review and reflection." *European Journal of Training and Development* Vol. 47 No. 5/6 437-455.
- Beamer, L. 1992. "Learning Intercultural Communication Competence." *The Journal of Business Communication* 29 (3), 285-303.
- Bücker, J., E. Poutsma, O. Furrer, and D. Buyens. 2014. "The impact of cultural intelligence on communication effectiveness, job satisfaction and anxiety for Chinese host country managers working for foreign multinationals." *The International Journal of Human Resources Management*.
- Colfax, R.S., J.J. Rivera, and K.T. Perez. 2010. "Applying emotional intelligence (EQ-I) in the workplace: Vital to global business success." *Journal of International Business* 9, 89-98.
- Costa, P.T., and R.R. McCrae. 1992. *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and New Five-Factor Inventory (NEO FFI) Professional Manual*. Odessa: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Durant, A., and I. Shepherd. 2009. "Culture" and "communication" on intercultural communication." *European Journal of English Studies* 13, 147-162.

- Early, P.C., S. Ang, and J.S. Tan. 2006. *CQ: developing intercultural intelligence at work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Business Books.
- Early, P. Christopher, and Elaine Mosakowski. 2004. "Cultural Intelligence." *Harvard Business Review* 139-146.
- Early, P.C., and R.S. Peterson. 2004. "The elusive cultural chameleon: Cultural intelligence as a new approach to intercultural training for the global manager." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 3, 100-115.
- Fall, Lisa T., Stephanie Kelly, Patrick MacDonald, Charles Primm, and Whitney Holmes. 2013. "Intercultural Communication Apprehension and Emotional Intelligence in Higher Education: Preparing Business Students for Career Success." *Business Communication Quarterly* 76(4): 412-426.
- Francis, J.N. 1991. "When in Rome? The effects of cultural adaptation on intercultural business negotiations." *Journal of International Business Studies* 403-428.
- Frías-Jamilena, Dolores M., Carmen M. Sabiote-Ortiz, Josefa D. Martín-Santana, and Asunción Beerli-Palacio. 2017. "Antecedents and consequences of cultural intelligence in tourism." *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management* 350-358.
- Funder, D.C. 2001. "Personality." *Annual Review of Psychology* 52, 197-221.
- Goleman, D. 2006. "Emotional Intelligence." *Harvard Business Review Press*.
- Hall, Edward T. 1959. *The silent language*. Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Haslberger, A. 2005. "Facets and dimensions of cross-cultural adaptation: refining the tools." *Personnel Review*, 34(1) 85-109.
- Hyun, Jane, and Doug Conant. 2019. "3 Ways to Improve Your Cultural Fluency."
- Johnson, JP, T. Lenartowicz, and S. Apud. 2006. "Cross-cultural competence in international business: toward a definition and a model." *J. Int. Bus. Stud.* 37:525-43.
- Jun, S., J.W. Gentry, and Y.J. Hyun. 2001. "Cultural adaptation of business expatriates in the host marketplace." *Journal of International Business Studies* 369-777.
- Kunert, Sophie. 2022. *The Eight Universal Dimensions of Culture from a Synthesis of Cultural Taxonomies*. Wiesbaden: Springer Gabler.
- Lin, X. 2004. "Determinations of cultural adaptation in Chinese-US joint ventures." *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, 11(1) 35-47.
- Mayer, J.D., and P. Salovey. 1993. "The intelligence of emotional intelligence." In *Intelligence*, 17, 433-442.
- Moran, Robert T., Neil Remington Abramson, and Sarah V. Moran. 2014. *Managing Cultural Differences*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Neuliep, J.W., and J.C. McCroskey. 1997. "The development of intercultural and interethnic communication apprehension scales." *Communication Research Reports* 14, 385-398.
- Ng, K.Y., and P.C. Early. 2006. "Culture and intelligence: Old constructs, new frontiers." *Groups and Organization Management* 31, 4-19.

- Nicol, Adelheid A.M., and Penny M. Pexman. 2007. *Presenting your findings*. Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Sternberg, R.J. 1986. "A framework for understanding conceptions of intelligence." In *What is intelligence? Contemporary viewpoints on its nature and definition*, by D.K. Detterman and R.J. Sternberg, 3-15. Norwood: Ablex.
- Sternberg, R. J. 2012. "Intelligence in its cultural context." In *Advances in Culture and Psychology Vol. 2*, by C.-Y. Chiu, M.J. Gelfand and Y.-Y. Hong, 205-248. New York: Oxford Press.
- Tarique, Ibraiz, and Paula Caligiuri. 2004. "Training and development of international staff." In *International Human Resource Management*, by Anne-Wil Harzing and Joris Van Ruysseveldt, 283-306. SAGE Publications.
- Vera, M. 2008. "Emotional intelligence and communication apprehension in intercultural relationships." Paper presented at the 93rd annual meeting of the National Communication Association. San Diego, CA, November.
- Wright, Daniel B. 1997. *Understanding Statistics*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Yeke, S., and F. Semerciöz. 2016. "Relationships between personality traits, cultural intelligence, and intercultural communication competence." *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 313-319.

Appendix

Appendix A: Survey measure - Cultural Intelligence Scale

Dimensions	Items in questionnaire
Metacognitive CQ	<p>Q1: I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds.</p> <p>Q2: I adjust my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from a culture that is unfamiliar to me.</p> <p>Q3: I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions.</p> <p>Q4: I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures.</p>
Cognitive CQ	<p>Q5: I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures.</p> <p>Q6: I know the rules (e.g., vocabulary, grammar) of other languages.</p> <p>Q7: I know the cultural values and religious beliefs of other cultures.</p> <p>Q8: I know the marriage systems of other cultures.</p> <p>Q9: I know the arts and crafts of other cultures.</p> <p>Q10: I know the rules for expressing nonverbal behaviors in other cultures.</p>
Motivational CQ	<p>Q11: I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures.</p> <p>Q12: I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me.</p> <p>Q13: I am sure I can deal with the stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me.</p> <p>Q14: I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me.</p> <p>Q15: I am confident that I can get accustomed to the shopping conditions in a different culture.</p>
Behavioral CQ	<p>Q16: I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.</p> <p>Q17: I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations.</p> <p>Q18: I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it.</p> <p>Q19: I change my nonverbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it.</p> <p>Q20: I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.</p>

Appendix B: Survey measure - Adaptation Strategies

Adaptation Strategies

50. Learning about the national culture
 51. Learning about local business etiquette by talking to local colleagues
 52. Seeking impartial feedback from local individuals regarding my behavior
 53. Investing time to actively research about the country
 54. Learning the local language
 55. Going on a look-and-see or casual trip prior to my assignment to get familiar with the location
 56. Taking coaching lessons from a local coach
 57. Immersing myself in the local culture by partaking in local events or joining WhatsApp/Facebook groups
 58. Going to local restaurants to get accustomed to the local cuisine
 59. Learning about the religion
 60. Integrating into groups in the destination country
 61. Having a point of contact from the parent company in the destination country
 62. Participating in activities of the destination country, while still in the home country
 63. Going to multicultural events
 64. Taking intercultural trainings
 65. Consuming the local culture through literature
 66. Consuming the local culture through videos (movies, TV shows, YouTube...)
-

Appendix C: Coefficients – CQ and Strategies Overall

Coefficients – CQ and Strategies overall
(no control variables)

Model		Beta	SE	CI 95%		β	<i>p</i>
				LL	UL		
1	(Constant)	1.610	.386	.848	2.372		<.001
	Mean_CQ	.610	.074	.465	.755	.516	<.001
2	(Constant)	2.399	.384	1.641	3.157		<.001
	Mean_Metacognitive	.423	.067	.290	.555	.414	<.001
3	(Constant)	2.942	.300	2.350	3.534		<.001
	Mean_Cognitive	.398	.064	.272	.523	.413	<.001
4	(Constant)	2.357	.403	1.561	3.152		<.001
	Mean_Motivational	.419	.069	2.83	.555	.403	<.001
5	(Constant)	3.017	.278	2.470	3.565		<.001
	Mean_Behavioral	.353	.054	.246	.459	.427	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: Mean_Strategies

Appendix D: Model Summary – CQ and Strategies overall (with control variables)

Model Summary – CQ and Strategies overall
(with control variables)

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²
6	.547 ^a	.300	.277
7	.461 ^b	.213	.187
8	.456 ^c	.208	.183
9	.463 ^d	.214	.189
10	.468 ^e	.219	.193

a. Predictors: (Constant); Mean_CQ

b. Predictors: (Constant); Mean_Metacognitive

c. Predictors: (Constant); Mean_Cognitive

d. Predictors: (Constant); Mean_Motivational

e. Predictors: (Constant); Mean_Behavioral

a-e Predictors control: gender, education level, international experience, length of international experience, language proficiency

Appendix E: Coefficients – CQ and Strategies overall (with control variables)

		Coefficients – CQ and Strategies overall (with control variables)					
Model		Beta	SE	CI 95%		β	<i>p</i>
				LL	UL		
6	(Constant)	1.570	.630	.328	2.813		.014
	Mean_CQ	.596	.075	.448	.743	.503	<.001
	Gender	.123	.135	-.143	.388	.057	.364
	Education Level	.025	.032	-.038	.089	.050	.435
	Language Proficiency	.081	.068	-.054	.215	.076	.237
	International Experience	-.240	.538	-1.301	.821	-.028	.656
	Length of International Experience	-3.559E-5	.000	.000	.000	-.154	.015
7	(Constant)	2.107	.662	.801	3.414		.002
	Mean_Metacognitive	.407	.068	.273	.541	.398	<.001
	Gender	.091	.143	-.191	.372	.042	.526
	Education Level	.020	.034	-.047	.088	.040	.551
	Language Proficiency	.092	.072	-.050	.234	.086	.203
	International Experience	.039	.567	-1.079	1.158	.005	.945
	Length of International Experience	-4.128E-5	.000	.000	.000	-.178	.008
8	(Constant)	2.696	.627	1.459	3.934		<.001
	Mean_Cognitive	.380	.064	.253	.507	.393	<.001
	Gender	.110	.143	-.172	.392	.051	.444
	Education Level	.011	.034	-.057	.078	.021	.754
	Language Proficiency	.075	.073	-.068	.218	.071	.300
	International Experience	.058	.568	-1.063	1.180	.007	.918
	Length of International Experience	-4.203E-5	.000	.000	.000	-.182	.007
9	(Constant)	1.985	.670	.663	3.307		.003
	Mean_Motivational	.420	.070	.283	.558	.402	<.001
	Gender	.073	.143	-.209	.354	.034	.611
	Education Level	.032	.034	-.036	.099	.062	.358
	Language Proficiency	.110	.072	-.032	.252	.103	.128
	International Experience	-.068	.569	-1.191	1.054	-.008	.905
	Length of International Experience	-4.434E-5	.000	.000	.000	-.192	.004
10	(Constant)	2.616	.625	1.382	3.849		<.001
	Mean_Behavioral	.338	.055	.230	.447	.410	<.001
	Gender	.170	.143	-.111	.451	.079	.235
	Education Level	.022	.034	-.046	.089	.043	.525
	Language Proficiency	.103	.072	-.039	.244	.096	.154
	International Experience	.059	.564	-1.054	1.172	.007	.917
	Length of International Experience	-3.393E-5	.000	.000	.000	-.147	.029

a. Dependent Variable: Mean_Strategies

Appendix F: Factor Analysis

Factor Analysis			
	Components		
	1	2	3
53. Investing time to actively research about the country	,805		
51. Learning about local business etiquette by talking to local colleagues	,746		
50. Learning about the national culture	,725		
52. Seeking impartial feedback from local individuals regarding my behavior	,722		
54. Learning the local language	,440		
56. Taking coaching lessons from a local coach		,870	
64. Taking intercultural trainings		,757	
55. Going on a look-and-see or casual trip prior to my assignment to get familiar with the location		,671	
65. Consuming the local culture through literature		,641	
57. Immersing myself in the local culture by partaking in local events or joining WhatsApp/Facebook groups			,775
63. Going to multicultural events			,760
60. Integrating into groups in the destination country			,754
58. Going to local restaurants to get accustomed to the local cuisine			,605

Categorization		
Strategy_Category1	Strategy_Category2	Strategy_Category3
53	56	57
51	64	63
50	55	60
52	65	58
54		

Total Variance Explained

Component	Total	Initial Eigenvalues		Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
		% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	5,478	42,135	42,135	5,478	42,135	42,135
2	1,358	10,447	52,582	1,358	10,447	52,582
3	1,243	9,565	62,147	1,243	9,565	62,147

Communalities

Item	Initial	Extraction
50	1,000	,662
51	1,000	,654
52	1,000	,608
53	1,000	,695
54	1,000	,337
55	1,000	,590
56	1,000	,789
57	1,000	,717
58	1,000	,503
60	1,000	,684
63	1,000	,640
64	1,000	,671
65	1,000	,530

Appendix G: Model Summaries (Strategy Categories 1 – 3)

Model Summary – Strategies Category 1 (no control variables)

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²
11	.568 ^a	.323	.319
12	.498 ^b	.248	.244
13	.492 ^c	.242	.238
14	.429 ^d	.184	.179
15	.416 ^e	.173	.169

- a. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_CQ
- b. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Metacognitive
- c. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Cognitive
- d. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Motivational
- e. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Behavioral

Model Summary – Strategies Category 2 (no control variables)

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²
16	.368 ^a	.136	.131
17	.281 ^b	.079	.074
18	.301 ^c	.091	.086
19	.237 ^d	.056	.051
20	.349 ^e	.122	.117

- a. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_CQ
- b. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Metacognitive
- c. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Cognitive
- d. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Motivational
- e. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Behavioral

Model Summary – Strategies Category 3 (no control variables)

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²
21	.445 ^a	.198	.193
22	.355 ^b	.126	.122
23	.316 ^c	.100	.095
24	.442 ^d	.195	.191
25	.336 ^e	.113	.108

- a. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_CQ
- b. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Metacognitive
- c. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Cognitive
- d. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Motivational
- e. Predictors: (Constant): Mean_Behavioral

Appendix H: Coefficients (Strategy Categories 1 – 3)

Coefficients – CQ and Strategy Category 1 (no control variables)

Model		Beta	SE	CI 95%		β	<i>p</i>
				LL	UL		
11	(Constant)	1.663	.381	.911	2.414		<.001
	Mean_CQ	.690	.072	.547	.833	.568	<.001
12	(Constant)	2.304	.376	1.563	3.045		<.001
	Mean_Metacognitive	.523	.066	.393	.653	.498	<.001
13	(Constant)	2.999	.294	2.418	3.580		<.001
	Mean_Cognitive	.487	.062	.364	.610	.492	<.001
14	(Constant)	2.600	.409	1.794	3.406		<.001
	Mean_Motivational	.457	.070	.319	.595	.429	<.001
15	(Constant)	3.481	.286	2.915	4.046		<.001
	Mean_Behavioral	.353	.056	.243	.463	.416	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: Strategy_Category1

Coefficients – CQ and Strategy Category 2 (no control variables)

Model		Beta	SE	CI 95%		β	<i>p</i>
				LL	UL		
16	(Constant)	.791	.590	-.373	1.954		.182
	Mean_CQ	.613	.112	.392	.835	.368	<.001
17	(Constant)	1.699	.570	.574	2.824		.003
	Mean_Metacognitive	.405	.100	.207	.602	.281	<.001
18	(Constant)	2.092	.442	1.220	2.965		<.001
	Mean_Cognitive	.408	.094	.223	.593	.301	<.001
19	(Constant)	1.971	.603	.783	3.160		.001
	Mean_Motivational	.346	.103	.143	.550	.237	<.001
20	(Constant)	1.955	.405	1.156	2.754		<.001
	Mean_Behavioral	.405	.079	.249	.561	.349	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: Strategy_Category2

Coefficients – CQ and Strategy Category 3 (no control variables)

Model		Beta	SE	CI 95%		β	<i>p</i>
				LL	UL		
21	(Constant)	2.042	.472	1.112	2.972		<.001
	Mean_CQ	.614	.090	.437	.791	.445	<.001
22	(Constant)	2.848	.461	1.938	3.757		<.001
	Mean_Metacognitive	.424	.081	.264	.584	.355	<.001
23	(Constant)	3.591	.365	2.871	4.312		<.001
	Mean_Cognitive	.355	.077	.203	.508	.316	<.001
24	(Constant)	2.136	.462	1.225	3.048		<.001
	Mean_Motivational	.536	.079	.380	.692	.442	<.001
25	(Constant)	3.614	.338	2.948	4.280		<.001
	Mean_Behavioral	.324	.066	.194	.454	.336	<.001

a. Dependent Variable: Strategy_Category3

Appendix I: Overview Hypothesis

Hypothesis	Confirmed/Rejected
H1: Individuals with higher levels of cultural intelligence are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H1a: Individuals with higher levels of cultural intelligence are more likely to employ Strategy_Category1 adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H1b: Individuals with higher levels of cultural intelligence are more likely to employ Strategy_Category2 adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H1c: Individuals with higher levels of cultural intelligence are more likely to employ Strategy_Category3 adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H2: Individuals with higher cognitive CQ are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H2a: Individuals with higher metacognitive CQ are more likely to employ Strategy_Category1 adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H2b: Individuals with higher metacognitive CQ are more likely to employ Strategy_Category2 adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H2c: Individuals with higher metacognitive CQ are more likely to employ Strategy_Category3 adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H3: Individuals with higher behavioral CQ are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H3a: Individuals with higher cognitive CQ are more likely to employ adaptive Strategy_Category1 strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H3b: Individuals with higher cognitive CQ are more likely to employ adaptive Strategy_Category2 strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H3c: Individuals with higher cognitive CQ are more likely to employ adaptive Strategy_Category3 strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed

H4: Individuals with higher motivational CQ are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H4a: Individuals with higher motivational CQ are more likely to employ adaptive Strategy_Category1 strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H4b: Individuals with higher motivational CQ are more likely to employ adaptive Strategy_Category2 strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H4c: Individuals with higher motivational CQ are more likely to employ adaptive Strategy_Category3 strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H5: Individuals with higher meta-cognitive CQ are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H5a: Individuals with higher behavioral CQ are more likely to employ adaptive Strategy_Category1 strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H5b: Individuals with higher behavioral CQ are more likely to employ adaptive Strategy_Category2 strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
H5c: Individuals with higher behavioral CQ are more likely to employ adaptive Strategy_Category3 strategies when adapting to a foreign country.	Confirmed
