

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

**DEVELOPING INTERCULTURAL INTELLIGENCE: HOW DOES THE LEVEL OF  
EI INFLUENCE THE TYPES OF STRATEGIES PEOPLE USE TO ADAPT TO A  
FOREIGN ENVIRONMENT?**

**Salima LEMHAMDI**

Work project carried out under the supervision of:

**Helena MARTINS**

**dd-mm-yyyy**

Abstract (100 words maximum) –

This paper sheds light on the impact that emotional intelligence has on the strategies adopted by people to adapt in foreign environments. The study is supported by existing literature about emotional intelligence in various contexts and quantitative research that was conducted with a sample of 192 respondents from different nationalities and background. The four subsections of emotional intelligence, that are Self Awareness, Self-management, Social Awareness and Social Skills, all show a strong relationship with the dependent variable represented by the adopted strategies.

Keywords (minimum of four)

Emotional Intelligence; International Environment; Strategies;  
Self-Awareness; Self-Management; Social Awareness; Social  
skills.

## **Acknowledgments**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to all those who have contributed to the completion of this paper. First and foremost, I would like to thank my incredible advisor Helena Martins for her support and guidance from the very beginning and throughout this journey. I would also like to thank my second advisor Alexandra Da Costa whose support and feedback helped me shape the direction of this thesis. I could not have done it with their continuous help and support.

I could not have been here without the unconditional support of my parents, my dear brother Othman and my dear cousin Ahmed who have been through encouraging me for the longest time. I am also grateful for my dearest friends who always had trust in me and pushed me to become a better version of myself.

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).

## **Introduction**

Emotional Intelligence represents “one’s ability to manage one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Unlike the normal human intelligence, measured through the Intelligence Quotient and that is innate to people; Emotional Intelligence can change over time and is not a steady element in one’s life. In fact, there are a lot of factors that are linked to emotional intelligence and that were proved to have impact on it.

In foreign environments, it is crucial to know how to deal with certain situations to avoid culture shocks and miscommunications. Therefore, knowing one’s ability to regulate one’s emotional intelligence is key.

In this paper, we will focus on the topic of emotional intelligence and the different strategies people adopt to adapt to foreign environments by answering the following research question: **“How does the level of EI influence the types of strategies that people use to adapt to a foreign country/workplace?”**. Moreover, we will deep dive into elements of emotional intelligence, namely self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and social skills, and their individual relationship with the different strategies.

For this study to be valid, a survey has been developed to measure the respondents’ emotional intelligence and evaluate the strategies they adopt in foreign environments. The survey will then be sent to student and to professionals of all ages to measure the different dimensions. This paper is divided into 5 sections. First, a literature review will be presented to support the five hypotheses that will be analyzed; followed by the presentation of the methodology chosen, the analysis and discussion of the results and finally the conclusion.

## Literature Review

We cannot talk about multicultural environments, without considering the usual challenges that present themselves in such contexts.

Findings have shown different elements that help support the topic of emotional intelligence in multicultural environments. The following literature review gathers the main topics that helped conclude our research question for this paper; hence four subjects have been supported that are cultural intelligence (CQ); CQ and job satisfaction; Intercultural communication and Emotional Intelligence (EI).

### *Cultural Intelligence*

A brief definition of cultural intelligence is the ability capability to adapt to new and unfamiliar cultural settings, and to function effectively in culturally diverse environments (Van Dyne et al. 2012b).

Cultural Intelligence or CQ has been considered as a key element of successful managerial interactions in international markets (Barakat et al. 2015b). Additionally, CQ has been proven to have positive correlation with outcomes like cultural adaptation (Templer et al., 2006, Ward et al., 2011), intercultural negotiation effectiveness (Imai and Gelfand, 2010) and individual performance (e.g., Chen et al., 2011).

Cultural Intelligence is divided into four subsections that allow for a better measure and overview of its levels. First and foremost, the **metacognitive** section of CQ, or one's cultural consciousness and awareness of cultural cues during interactions with people from other cultural backgrounds (Ang & al. (2006). Secondly, the cognitive section of CQ, defined as a competence based on the knowledge of norms, practices and conventions used in different cultural settings, acquired through education and personal experience (Van Dyne et al. 2012b). Then, the motivational CQ, or the capability to develop interest in cross-cultural backgrounds

and interact effectively. And finally, the behavioral aspect of CQ or the ability to exhibit appropriate verbal and non-verbal behavior when interacting with people from different cultures (Ang et al., 2006). Studying these factors allows people to understand cultural differences but also to adapt in multicultural settings (Earley & Ang, 2003).

To better understand levels of CQ among different communities, a method was developed to measure the cultural competence of individuals. The CQ scale developed by Early and Ang covers the four subdimensions mentioned and allows for a better overview on an individual's ability to interact in multicultural settings.

### ***Relationship between CQ and Job Satisfaction***

One of the most frequent environments where CQ can be evaluated can be in a multicultural workplace. As a matter of fact, most of studies conducted in cross cultural environments tend to be in international workplaces or universities.

In a multinational workplace specifically, it has been proven that CQ is correlated to job satisfaction and so is cultural adaptation. In other words, employees with a higher level of CQ tend to have better adjustment in a cross-cultural workplace and will therefore feel more satisfied in their job (Barakat et al. 2015b).

Individuals with higher levels of CQ are able to communicate and build relationships with colleagues from different cultural backgrounds. This allows individuals to avoid misunderstandings and conflicts and helps create a more positive work environment (Van Dyne et al., 2012). On the other hand, people that exhibit low CQ tend to have a low rated job satisfaction (Earley and Ang, 2003).

### ***Intercultural Communication***

In the recent years, intercultural interactions have become more frequent and important (Durant & Shepherd, 2009). These interactions usually take place in the earlier stages of collegial studies as university students have the opportunity to meet with others that come different

countries and practice their intercultural communication. As a matter of fact, internationalization of higher education is becoming unavoidable and intercultural communication is becoming a normal standard within campuses (Fall et al. 2013b). It is impossible to talk about these interactions without talking about intercultural communication as the lack of it can lead to prejudices and stereotypes within an organization. A 2006 study conducted by Arasaratnam has shown how the immersion of individuals in intercultural environments has enhanced their intercultural communication competences, in other words the more people positively contribute in multicultural settings the more effective they become as communicators (Fall et al. 2013b). Finally, it is important to mention and highlight the suggestion that Casnir did when saying that intercultural communication must be approached with the understanding that humans are constantly changing and that it should not be perceived as a constant that is not affected by other elements.

One of the variables that influence intercultural communication and that predicts social adaptability is emotional intelligence (EI). EI can be defined as skill that can be developed during one's life that impacts an individual's behavior. In the context of intercultural communication, high levels of EI are associated to low levels of intercultural communication apprehension (Colfax et al., 2010; Kerr, Garvin, Heaton, & Boyle, 2006).

### **Emotional Intelligence**

As defined previously, EI is a continuously developed skill. It can also be defined as “a subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions. It involves the ability perceive accurately, appraise and express emotion; the ability to generate feelings when they facilitate thoughts; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth (Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey 2016b). When talking about foreign environments and

multicultural contexts, emotional intelligence has been proven to impact the cultural adjustment of individuals; the higher the EI the more cooperative people are in their intercultural interactions (Harrison & Voelker, 2006; Ornstein & Nelson, 2006; Gullekson & Tucker, 2012). On a deeper level, it is important to highlight the components that build emotional intelligence and how each of them can be measured and have a separate impact on one's interaction in multicultural environments.

Many tools have been developed to measure Emotional Intelligence, but the most frequent and valid scale remains the MSCEIT scale developed by Mayer, Salovey & Caruso. The MSCEIT scale highlights the four elements of EI, that are Self-Awareness (perceiving emotions); Self-Management (facilitating thought by using emotions); Social Awareness (understanding emotions) and Social Skills (managing emotions in oneself and others). Most findings have shown a positive correlation between EI and intercultural communication, as well as for the four components of EI individually. Moreover, it is important to mention that as EI is a skill that changes, meaning that there are factors that contribute to its development. In fact, the level of EI can be different in a same individual at different stages and ages of his or her life. In fact, a study conducted among students in a university in Columbia, has exhibited that EI and its components is different from one individual to another and has various trends in certain age categories. The article illustrated a positive relationship between Self-Management and internationalization strategies among older respondents and lower scores between social awareness and the said strategies among strategies. This example enforces the argument that is that EI is a continuously developed skill which can only be enhanced by emerging in situations that will test it.

Based on these findings, we can see that there are a lot of elements that are related to the topic of developing intercultural intelligence. However, and as mentioned previously, this paper aims to study the relationship of EI and the strategies that individuals adopt to adapt in multicultural

environments.

In the light of answering our research question, five hypotheses will be developed and tested to better visualize the relationship of all the variables. The five hypotheses present themselves as such:

- **H1: Individuals with higher levels of emotional intelligence are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.**
- **H2: Individuals with higher Self Awareness are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.**
- **H3: Individuals with higher Self-Management are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.**
- **H4: Individuals with higher Social Awareness are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.**
- **H5: Individuals with higher Social Skills are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.**

## **Methodology**

For this research question, we first conducted a correlation analysis to prove the relationship between the two variables that are being studied, which in our case are EI (independent variable) and the strategies (dependent variable). Furthermore, and to better understand the relationship of every component and subcomponent of the research, a simple linear regression and a multiple linear regression were established. On a firsthand, the simple linear regression will analyze the relationship between the overall EI and the mean of the strategies and separately do the same for each subsection of EI. To put it simply, it will allow us to perceive the strength of impact that each component has on the adopted strategies. As for the multiple

linear regression or MLR, it will give us a deeper insight on that impact with the involvement of other elements that we will call predictors; in which we will insert the age, nationality, level of education of the respondents... Finally, the ANOVA analysis will allow us to assess the differences between different group of means from our sample. This analysis was done through the IBM software SPSS (version 29.0.0) that provided the tables and calculations for the correlation, the SLR and the MLR analyses.

Concerning the data gathering, we have collected answers via an open survey that aimed professionals and students from different nationalities and backgrounds. During a time, span of 3 weeks, we have managed to collect a total of 192 answers with respondents from 31 different countries namely Germany, Morocco, Norway, France, Portugal, Austria, UK... and an age average of 31 years old among respondents.

As the survey has been divided into sections to answer four different research questions, we have built the questions for each of those sections based on existing scales found through our research. In this specific case of Emotional Intelligence, we have relied on the MSCEIT scale created by Mayer, Salovey & Caruso in 2002. The scale allowed respondents to rate their relatability to a situation from 1 to 7. It is important to mention that this section of the survey assessed the emotional intelligence of the respondents and was later analyzed to understand the correlation between it and the strategies that individuals adopt to adapt in foreign environments.

A reliability testing of the EI scale was done for the overall EI variable and then for each subsection of EI. On a first note, the reliability testing for the Overall EI showed a Cronbach Alpha of 0.947, the one for Self-Awareness showed 0.870, the following Cronbach Alphas for the respective sections showed 0.846, 0.902 and 0.911. The results of the reliability testing attest that the reliability is good or excellent since the alpha is either close to 0.9 or in between 0.8 and 0.9.

As this survey aimed to cover four different research questions, we developed 3 categories, besides the demographic one, about Cultural Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence and Cultural Adaptation Strategies. In this paper, we will focus on the second section of the questionnaire about Emotional Intelligence. A total of 20 questions were added from original EI scales to measure the level of EI among our respondents, we then proceeded to divide the 20 questions into 4 sub-sections to refer to the four dimensions of EI (Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social awareness, Social Skills). As for the adaptive strategies, a total of seventeen strategies were proposed in the survey, where the respondents could answer to each with a scale going from 1 to 7.

## Results

### Correlation

**Table 1: Intercorrelations of the Mean of the adopted strategies, EI and its subsections**

| <i>Pearson Correlation</i> | Mean_Strategies | Overall_EI | Self_Awareness_EI | Self Management_EI | Social Awareness_EI | Social Skills_EI |
|----------------------------|-----------------|------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Mean_Strategies            | 1.000           | 0.376      | 0.257             | 0.320              | 0.321               | 0.413            |
| Overall_EI                 | 0.376           | 1.000      | 0.838             | 0.893              | 0.838               | 0.878            |
| Self_Awareness_EI          | 0.257           | 0.838      | 1.000             | 0.699              | 0.530               | 0.595            |
| Self Management_EI         | 0.320           | 0.893      | 0.699             | 1.000              | 0.653               | 0.737            |
| Social Awareness_EI        | 0.321           | 0.838      | 0.530             | 0.653              | 1.000               | 0.738            |
| Social Skills_EI           | 0.413           | 0.979      | 0.595             | 0.737              | 0.738               | 1.000            |
| <i>Sig. (1-tailed)</i>     |                 |            |                   |                    |                     |                  |
| Mean_Strategies            | .               | <.001      | <.001             | <.001              | <.001               | <.001            |
| Overall_EI                 | 0.000           | .          | 0.000             | 0.000              | 0.000               | 0.000            |
| Self_Awareness_EI          | 0.000           | 0.000      | .                 | 0.000              | 0.000               | 0.000            |
| Self Management_EI         | 0.000           | 0.000      | 0.000             | .                  | 0.000               | 0.000            |
| Social Awareness_EI        | 0.000           | 0.000      | 0.000             | 0.000              | .                   | 0.000            |
| Social Skills_EI           | 0.000           | 0.000      | 0.000             | 0.000              | 0.000               | .                |

Table 1 presents the results of the intercorrelation between the different variables used in this research (Overall EI, Mean of the used strategies and the different subsections of EI). First and foremost, the results show a moderate positive correlation between Emotional Intelligence (Overall\_EI) and the Mean of the used strategies to adapt to foreign environments (Mean\_Strategies). This suggests that the use of adaption strategies and emotional intelligence have a positive association, meaning that people's EI increases with the application of those

strategies. Therefore, these first observation confirms our first hypothesis. As for the rest of the variables, the results show the strongest correlation between the social skills and the overall EI, meaning that one’s assessment of their social skills in EI increases, the overall emotional intelligence increases as well. Additionally, the rest of the elements are also all positively correlated and significant. Finally, the latter part of the table portrays the p-values that indicate strong significance, this suggests meaningful correlation between the components of EI and the application of the strategies. We can also interpret those results to discuss that the increase or improvement of EI are associated to improvements in the use of strategies.

**Simple Linear Regression and Multiple Linear Regression**

*H1: Individuals with higher levels of emotional intelligence are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.*

**Table 2: Simple Linear Regression for the Overall EI and the Mean of strategies**

| Coefficients |                             |            |                           |       |       |                                 |             |
|--------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Model        | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |       |       | 95.0% Confidence interval for B |             |
|              | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      | t     | sig.  | Lower Bound                     | Upper Bound |
| 1 (Constant) | 2.175                       | 0.47       |                           | 4.632 | <.001 | 1.249                           | 3.101       |
| Overall_EI   | 0.464                       | 0.083      | 0.376                     | 5.586 | <.001 | 0.3                             | 0.628       |

a. Dependent Variable: MEAN\_Strategies

| Model Summary |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |
|---------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| Model         | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |  |
| 1             | 0.376 | 0.141    | 0.137             | 0.99053                    | 1.882         |  |

a. Predictors: (Constant). Overall\_EI  
b. Dependent Variable: Mean\_Strategies

***EQUATION: MEAN\_Strategies = 2.175 + 0.464 Overall\_EI***

From these results, the model has an R of .376, indicating a moderate relationship between 'Overall\_EI' and 'MEAN\_Strategies'. The R Square value of .141 suggests that about 14.1% of the variance in 'MEAN\_Strategies' can be explained by 'Overall\_EI'.

As per the residuals, the predicted 'MEAN\_Strategies' range from 3.3053 to 5.4257, with the

residuals ranging from -2.91120 to 2.72171, which indicates the model's predictions are quite close to the actual data points.

*H2: Individuals with higher Self Awareness are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign*

**Table 3: Simple Linear Regression for the Self Awareness and the Mean of strategies**

| Model Summary                                |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |
|--|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| Model  | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |  |
| 1  | 0.237 | 0.66     | 0.061             | 1.03279                    | 1.881         |  |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Self_Awareness_EI |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |
| b. Dependent Variable: Mean_Strategies       |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |

| Coefficients                           |                             |            |  |                           |   |             |                                 |             |
|--|-----------------------------|------------|--|---------------------------|---|-------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Model                                  | Unstandardized Coefficients |            |  | Standardized Coefficients |   |             | 95.0% Confidence interval for B |             |
|  | B                           | Std. Error |  | Beta                      | t | sig         | Lower Bound                     | Upper Bound |
| 1 (Constant)                           | 3.472                       | 0.361      |  |                           |   | 9.631 <.001 | 2.761                           | 4.183       |
| Self_Awareness_EI                      | 0.237                       | 0.064      |  | 0.257                     |   | 3.67 <.001  | 0.109                           | 0.364       |
| a. Dependent Variable: MEAN_Strategies |                             |            |  |                           |   |             |                                 |             |

**EQUATION:  $MEAN\_Strategies = 3.472 + 0.237 Self\_awareness\_EI$**

With an R of .257, the relationship is weaker here than in the overall EI model. The R Square value of .066 suggests that 'Self\_awareness\_EI' explains about 6.6% of the variance in 'MEAN\_Strategies'.

Finally, the residuals statistics show that predicted values and residuals are similar to those in the previous model, showing a good fit.

*H3: Individuals with higher Self-Management are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.*

**Table 4: Simple Linear Regression for the Self Management and the Mean of strategies**

| Coefficients       |                             |            |  |                           |   |             |                                 |             |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------|--|---------------------------|---|-------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Model              | Unstandardized Coefficients |            |  | Standardized Coefficients |   |             | 95.0% Confidence interval for B |             |
|                    | B                           | Std. Error |  | Beta                      | t | sig         | Lower Bound                     | Upper Bound |
| 1 (Constant)       | 2.756                       | 0.439      |  |                           |   | 6.28 <.001  | 1.89                            | 3.621       |
| Self_Management_EI | 0.355                       | 0.076      |  | 0.32                      |   | 4.648 <.001 | 0.204                           | 0.506       |

| Model Summary                                 |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |
|---|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| Model   | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |  |
| 1   | 0.321 | 0.103    | 0.098             | 1.01222                    | 1.829         |  |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Self Management_EI |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |
| b. Dependent Variable: Mean_Strategies        |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |

$$MEAN\_Strategies = 2.756 + 0.355 Self\_management\_EI$$

These table show a lower R value of .320, meaning a weaker relationship with 'MEAN\_Strategies'. The R Square value is .102, indicating that 'Self\_management\_EI' explains about 10.2% of the variance.

The range of residuals is slightly larger than in the Self-Awareness model, which may indicate less precision in the predictions.

*H4: Individuals with higher Social Awareness are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.*

| Model Summary                                  |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |
|--|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| Model  | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |  |
| 1  | 0.321 | 0.103    | 0.098             | 1.01222                    | 1.829         |  |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Spcial Awareness_EI |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |
| b. Dependent Variable: Mean_Strategies         |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |

| Coefficients                           |                             |            |  |                           |       |       |                                 |             |
|--|-----------------------------|------------|--|---------------------------|-------|-------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Model                                  | Unstandardized Coefficients |            |  | Standardized Coefficients |       |       | 95.0% Confidence interval for B |             |
|  | B                           | Std. Error |  | Beta                      | t     | sig   | Lower Bound                     | Upper Bound |
| 1 (Constant)                           | 2.762                       | 0.435      |  |                           |       |       | 1.904                           | 3.621       |
| Social_Awareness_EI                    | 0.349                       | 0.075      |  | 0.321                     | 4.672 | <.001 | 0.202                           | 0.496       |
| a. Dependent Variable: MEAN_Strategies |                             |            |  |                           |       |       |                                 |             |

**Table 5: Simple Linear Regression for the Social Awareness and the Mean of strategies**

**EQUATION:  $MEAN\_Strategies = 2.762 + 0.349Social\_awareness\_EI$**

The R value of .321 and R Square of .103 are very similar to the previous Self-Management model, indicating a similar level of explanatory power.

The predicted values and residuals are consistent with those seen in the other models, maintaining a good fit.

*H5: Individuals with higher Social Skills are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.*

**Table 6: Simple Linear Regression for the Social Skills and the Mean of strategies**

| Coefficients     |                             |            |                           |       |       |                                 |             |
|------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| Model            | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |       |       | 95.0% Confidence interval for B |             |
|                  | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      | t     | sig   | Lower Bound                     | Upper Bound |
| 1 (Constant)     | 2.125                       | 0.428      |                           | 4.966 | <.001 | 1.904                           | 2.969       |
| Social_Skills_EI | 0.485                       | 0.077      | 0.413                     | 6.257 | <.001 | 0.332                           | 0.638       |

a. Dependent Variable: MEAN\_Strategies

| Model Summary |       |          |                   |                            |               |
|---------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Model         | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
| 1             | 0.413 | 0.171    | 0.166             | 0.9732                     | 1.873         |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Social\_Skills\_EI  
b. Dependent Variable: Mean\_Strategies

**EQUATION:  $MEAN\_Strategies = 2.125 + 0.485 Social\_skills\_EI$**

In this case the R value is of .413, suggesting a stronger relationship with 'MEAN\_Strategies' than the other models. The R Square value of .171 indicates that 'Social\_skills\_EI' explains about 17.1% of the variance in 'MEAN\_Strategies'.

This model has the widest range of predicted values, suggesting a strong influence of 'Social\_skills\_EI' on 'MEAN\_Strategies'.

## Multiple Linear Regression

**Table 7: Multiple Linear Regression between Overall EI and predictors**

|                          | Coefficients                |            |                           |        |       |                                 |             |       |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|-------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------|
|                          | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |        |       | 95.0% Confidence interval for B |             |       |
|                          | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      | t      | sig.  | Lower Bound                     | Upper Bound |       |
| (Constant)               | 1.409                       | 0.727      |                           |        | 1.939 | 0.054                           | -0.025      | 2.843 |
| Overall_EI               | 0.462                       | 0.082      | 0.374                     | 5.646  | <.001 |                                 | 0.301       | 0.624 |
| Age                      | 0.008                       | 0.005      | 0.104                     | 1.526  | 0.129 |                                 | -0.002      | 0.019 |
| International Experience | 0.189                       | 0.567      | 0.022                     | 0.333  | 0.74  |                                 | -0.929      | 1.307 |
| Nationality              | -0.016                      | 0.009      | -0.115                    | -1.707 | 0.09  |                                 | -0.034      | 0.002 |
| Educational Level        | 0.021                       | 0.036      | 0.041                     | 0.589  | 0.557 |                                 | -0.049      | 0.092 |
| Spoken languages         | 0.142                       | 0.074      | 0.133                     | 1.926  | 0.56  |                                 | -0.003      | 0.287 |
| Length of Internat. Exp  | -4.51E-05                   | 0.000      | -0.196                    | -2.967 | 0.003 |                                 | 0.000       | 0.000 |

| Model Summary |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |
|---------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| Model         | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |  |
| 1             | 0.468 | 0.219    | 0.189             | 0.96235                    | 1.936         |  |

a. Predictors: (Constant); International Experience; Educational Level; Nationality; Overall\_EI; Age; Spoken languages

b. Dependent Variable: Mean\_Strategies

The multiple correlation coefficient is .468, indicating a moderate linear relationship between the predictor variables and the dependent variable.

The R square indicates that 21.9% of the variance in the dependent variable, the MEAN\_Strategies, can be explained by the independent variables in the model.

Adjusted to 18.9%, the adjusted R-Square suggests a lower but more accurate percentage of variance explained. As for the standard error of the estimate, the table shows. 0.96235, which is the average distance that the data points fall from the regression line. Finally, the Durbin-Watson statistic is 1.936, which is close to 2, indicating there is no significant autocorrelation in the residuals.

**Table 8: Multiple Linear Regression between Self Awareness and predictors**

| Model Summary |       |          |                   |                            |               |
|---------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Model         | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
| 1             | 0.384 | 0.147    | 0.114             | 1.00548                    | 1.905         |

a. Predictors: (Constant); International Experience; Educational Level; Nationality; Self\_Awareness\_EI; Age; Spoken languages

b. Dependent Variable: Mean\_Strategies

| Coefficients             |                             |            |                           |        |       |                                 |             |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|-------|---------------------------------|-------------|
|                          | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |        |       | 95.0% Confidence interval for B |             |
|                          | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      | t      | sig.  | Lower Bound                     | Upper Bound |
| (Constant)               | 2.469                       | 0.711      |                           | 3.472  | <.001 | 1.066                           | 3.873       |
| Self_Awareness_EI        | 0.237                       | 0.063      | 0.258                     | 3.731  | <.001 | 0.111                           | 0.362       |
| Age                      | 0.006                       | 0.006      | 0.079                     | 1.098  | 0.274 | -0.005                          | 0.018       |
| International Experience | 0.473                       | 0.589      | 0.055                     | 0.803  | 0.423 | -0.689                          | 1.634       |
| Nationality              | -0.017                      | 0.01       | -0.123                    | -1.745 | 0.083 | -0.036                          | 0.002       |
| Educational Level        | 0.014                       | 0.037      | 0.028                     | 0.38   | 0.705 | -0.059                          | 0.088       |
| Spoken languages         | 0.158                       | 0.077      | 0.148                     | 2.057  | 0.041 | 0.006                           | 0.31        |
| Length of Internat. Exp  | -4.62E-05                   | 0.000      | -0.200                    | -2.912 | 0.004 | 0.000                           | 0.000       |

The model has an R value of .384, indicating a moderate linear relationship between the predictor variables and MEAN\_Strategies. The R Square value is .147, which means that approximately 14.7% of the variance in MEAN\_Strategies can be explained by the model's predictors.

As for the Adjusted R Square is .114, it suggests that when the number of predictors is taken into account, around 11% of the variance in MEAN\_Strategies is explained. The Standard Error of the Estimate is .99111, reflecting the average amount that the observed outcomes deviate from the predicted outcomes.

**Table 9: Multiple Linear Regression between Self Management and predictors**

| Coefficients             |                             |            |                           |   |        |                                 |             |       |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|---|--------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------|
|                          | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |   |        | 95.0% Confidence interval for B |             |       |
|                          | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      | t | sig    | Lower Bound                     | Upper Bound |       |
| (Constant)               | 2.102                       | 0.718      |                           |   | 2.928  | 0.004                           | 0.686       | 3.519 |
| Self_Management_EI       | 0.339                       | 0.076      | 0.258                     |   | 4.432  | <.001                           | 0.188       | 0.489 |
| Age                      | 0.199                       | 0.006      | 0.104                     |   | 0.141  | 0.141                           | -0.003      | 0.02  |
| International Experience | 0.199                       | 0.023      | 0.023                     |   | 0.34   | 0.004                           | -0.955      | 1.353 |
| Nationality              | 0.014                       | -0.104     | -0.123                    |   | -1.501 | 0.135                           | -0.033      | 0.004 |
| Educational Level        | 0.014                       | 0.027      | 0.023                     |   | 0.369  | 0.713                           | -0.059      | 0.086 |
| Spoken languages         | 0.133                       | 0.124      | 0.124                     |   | 1.747  | 0.082                           | -0.017      | 0.282 |
| Length of Internat. Exp  | -4.508E-05                  | -0.195     | -0.195                    |   | -2.879 | 0.004                           | 0.000       | 0.000 |

| Model Summary |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |
|---------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| Model         | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |  |
| 1             | 0.414 | 0.171    | 0.14              | 0.99111                    | 1.952         |  |

a. Predictors: (Constant); International Experience; Educational Level; Nationality; Self\_MANAGEMENT\_EI; Age; Spoken languages

b. Dependent Variable: Mean\_Strategies

For the Self-Management component, the R value is of 0.414, the R Square is of .171, the adjusted R Square is .140, and the standard error of 0.99111.

**Table 10: Multiple Linear Regression between Social Awareness and predictors**

| Model Summary |       |          |                   |                            |               |  |
|---------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| Model         | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |  |
| 1             | 0.436 | 0.19     | 0.159             | 0.97999                    | 1.92          |  |

a. Predictors: (Constant); International Experience; Educational Level; Nationality; Social Awareness\_EI; Age; Spoken languages

b. Dependent Variable: Mean\_Strategies

| Coefficients             |                             |            |                           |        |       |                                 |             |       |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|-------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------|
|                          | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |        |       | 95.0% Confidence interval for B |             |       |
|                          | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      | t      | sig.  | Lower Bound                     | Upper Bound | Bound |
| (Constant)               | 1.792                       | 0.726      |                           |        | 2.467 | 0.015                           | 0.359       | 3.224 |
| Social Awareness_EI      | 0.363                       | 0.074      | 0.335                     | 4.924  | <.001 | 0.218                           | 0.506       |       |
| Age                      | 0.011                       | 0.006      | 0.132                     | 1.888  | 0.061 | 0.000                           | 0.022       |       |
| International Experience | 0.199                       | 0.023      | 0.023                     | 0.34   | 0.004 | -0.955                          | 1.353       |       |
| Nationality              | -0.017                      | 0.009      | -0.127                    | -1.851 | 0.066 | -0.36                           | 0.001       |       |
| Educational Level        | 0.02                        | 0.036      | 0.04                      | 0.562  | 0.575 | -0.51                           | 0.92        |       |
| Spoken languages         | 0.135                       | 0.075      | 0.127                     | 1.8    | 0.74  | -0.13                           | 0.283       |       |
| Length of Internat. Exp  | -4.508E-05                  | -0.195     | -0.195                    | -2.879 | 0.004 | 0.000                           | 0.000       |       |

For the Self-Management component, the R value is of 0.436, the R Square is of .190, the adjusted R Square is .159, and the standard error of 0.97999.

**Table 11: Multiple Linear Regression between Social Skills and predictors**

| Model Summary |       |          |                   |                            |               |
|---------------|-------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| Model         | R     | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
| 1             | 0.502 | 0.252    | 0.223             | 0.9419                     | 1.929         |

a. Predictors: (Constant); International Experience; Educational Level; Nationality; Social Skills\_EI; Age; Spoken languages

b. Dependent Variable: Mean\_Strategies

| Coefficients             |                             |            |                           |        |       |                                 |             |       |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|-------|---------------------------------|-------------|-------|
|                          | Unstandardized Coefficients |            | Standardized Coefficients |        |       | 95.0% Confidence interval for B |             |       |
|                          | B                           | Std. Error | Beta                      | t      | sig.  | Lower Bound                     | Upper Bound | Bound |
| (Constant)               | 1.447                       | 0.686      |                           | 2.108  | 0.036 | 0.093                           | 2.801       |       |
| Social Skills_EI         | 0.488                       | 0.076      | 0.417                     | 6.423  | <.001 | 0.338                           | 0.638       |       |
| Age                      | 0.01                        | 0.005      | 0.12                      | 1.799  | 0.074 | -0.001                          | 0.02        |       |
| Educational Level        | 0.013                       | 0.035      | 0.025                     | 0.362  | 0.718 | -0.056                          | 0.081       |       |
| Nationality              | -0.013                      | 0.009      | -0.095                    | -1.445 | 0.15  | -0.031                          | 0.005       |       |
| International Experience | 0.036                       | 0.557      | 0.004                     | 0.064  | 0.949 | -1.063                          | 1.134       |       |
| Spoken languages         | 0.146                       | 0.072      | 0.137                     | 2.027  | 0.044 | 0.004                           | 0.288       |       |
| Length of Internat. Exp  | -4.653E-05                  | 0.000      | -0.202                    | -3.129 | 0.002 | 0.000                           | 0.000       |       |

For the Self-Management component, the R value is of 0.502, the R Square is of .252, the adjusted R Square is .223, and the standard error of 0.94190.

- **H1: Individuals with higher levels of emotional intelligence are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.**

Based on the findings from the SLR, MLR and ANOVA, we can see that there is an important positive correlation ( $r = 0.376$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) between the overall EI and the adoption of adaptive strategies. This clearly indicates that as the level of EI increases, the more likely respondents are to take on the adaptive strategies and practice them efficiently.

- **H2: Individuals with higher Self Awareness are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.**

For this second hypothesis, the first dimension to be assessed is self-awareness in relation to the adaptive strategies. In this case, we can assess that the correlation is positive but quite weak ( $r = 0.218$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). This illustrates that the consciousness of our emotions has indeed an impact on the adoption of the adaptive strategies in foreign environments.

- **H3: Individuals with higher Self-Management are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.**

As for Self-Management, there is a moderate positive correlation with the adoption of the said strategies ( $r = 0.329$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). This suggests that the respondents who tend to control their emotions are more likely to succeed in a multicultural environment unlike those who can't control them. To put it differently, the ability to maintain one self's emotions increases the chances to employ adaptive strategies and succeeding in adopting them.

- **H4: Individuals with higher Social Awareness are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.**

Moving on to Social Awareness, the results of the analysis show a positive correlation confirming that the better individuals can understand and adjust to others' emotions the more successful they will be in terms of adapting in foreign or multicultural environments.

- **H5: Individuals with higher Social Skills are more likely to employ adaptive strategies when adapting to a foreign country.**

Last but not least, the social skill dimension also has a significant positive correlation with the dependent variable ( $r = 0.357, p < 0.01$ ). This shows again that a great level of social skills increases the chances of adopting adaptive strategies in foreign environments. This also highlights that elements like communication and conflict resolution contribute to the development of those skills.

## **Discussion**

Based on the results that we have found; we can clearly suggest that emotional intelligence and its components are strongly correlated with the use of the strategies. Each of the elements has shown at least a moderate or strong positive relationship with the adaptive methods. On the first hand, this states that the use of the said strategies impacts one's emotional intelligence. A deeper dive into the components of emotional intelligence has reflected that social skills and social awareness are determining of the use of the adaptive strategies. From our sample and our research, people are more likely to use the strategies when they have higher levels of social skills and social awareness. Reversely, the more they rely on the strategies the more they improve those aspects of their emotional intelligence.

As for the other components of emotional intelligence, self-awareness, and self-management, they are also moderately correlated with the strategies reflecting a considerable relationship between the two ends.

On the other hand, there are other elements that influence both one's emotional intelligence and the usage of the strategies. For this part, we have chosen to focus on the age of the respondents, the educational level, the international experience and length of it, and the languages spoken.

From our results, the younger respondents exhibit higher chances of using the adaptive

strategies as they are keener to learn new languages, adapt to the new cultures by emerging with communities and groups, networking through social media and adapting their own emotional intelligence to improve communication with foreigners. However, this does not exclude respondents of higher age that have international experience as it is one of the elements that contribute to the improvement of emotional intelligence and the use of strategies. As a matter of fact, respondents who have a long international experience are more open to learning new strategies to adapt to foreign environments. Furthermore, the languages spoken also impact the adaptation of people in new environments. This goes without say, as communication becomes easier between people. Multilingual individuals demonstrate superior emotional expression and social awareness leading to a better fit in foreign environments. The capacity of communicating in cross-cultural environments and contributes to the enhancement and improvement of interpersonal skills and cultural sensitivity.

The results found highlight that emotional intelligence is a growing aspect within people and can be improved daily. This also highlights that the people who have higher emotional intelligence are more likely to adapt easily in foreign environments especially if they are keen on learning new strategies to do such.

## **Limitations**

As we conducted our research, a number of constraints became apparent, especially with regard to data gathering. A team effort yielded a thorough questionnaire intended to reveal interesting components for researching and assessing the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and adaptive techniques. The duration of the survey presented a significant obstacle, though. The length of the survey, which consisted of three lengthy parts asking respondents to rank their answers in various scenarios, prompted questions over the accuracy of the participant responses. One possible source of response bias was the survey's intricate structure, which made it challenging to determine whether respondents gave completely honest judgments.

A second significant restriction concerns the survey tool's usage of Google Forms. Owing to the length of the survey, it could have been more beneficial to use a different survey platform so that respondents could see the questions more clearly. A alternative tool might have made the process easier to use, which might have decreased respondent fatigue and improved the calibre of the data that was gathered. Furthermore, a different platform might have offered us more advanced choices for how to show the data, enabling a more in-depth examination of responder trends and preferences.

Regarding the technique used, a drawback is that factor analysis is not present. This statistical method may have provided more information about the connections between particular EI components and adaptive strategy clusters. A factor analysis would have allowed a more detailed understanding of how certain components of emotional intelligence (EI) link with specific sets of adaptive behaviors, even while our study effectively examined the general relationship between emotional intelligence and adaptive strategies. This analytical method might have given our results more accuracy and improved our understanding of how different emotional intelligence traits interact with strategic decisions in cross-cultural settings.

Finally, these constraints force us to critically assess our research design. Future research aiming to explore the complex dynamics of emotional intelligence and adaptive strategies will benefit greatly from the understanding provided by this survey's length, structure, and instrument selection. Additionally, the lack of factor analysis is a notable limitation. It is certain that addressing these constraints in future research projects will lead to a more comprehensive and sophisticated knowledge of the correlations we looked at in this study.

## **Conclusion**

We can confirm the apparent connection between these two important factors by exploring the symbiotic relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and the use of adaptive mechanisms in unfamiliar situations. Although the relationship is recognized, our research contributes to the field by conducting a detailed investigation of the various aspects of emotional intelligence (EI) and elucidating the subtleties of how each aspect affects the use of adaptive strategies both separately and in combination.

Our study's results offer strong proof that having emotional intelligence greatly improves a person's ability to succeed in cross-cultural situations. The necessity of actively fostering emotional intelligence (EI) development is highlighted by the realization that EI is essential for navigating the intricacies of varied situations. Therefore, we support the premise that developing one's emotional intelligence prior to facing cross-cultural scenarios is not only advantageous but also necessary.

One of the key findings to be taken from our research is that emotional intelligence is a talent that can be improved. Instead of being a fixed trait, it is a capacity that may be continually expanded upon and enhanced. This highlights how important it is to start early in life with structured, ongoing emotional intelligence training programs. People who get early training in these skills are better able to proactively establish the foundation required for navigating cross-

cultural interactions.

Furthermore, our study emphasizes how emotional intelligence can be used to reduce miscommunications and conflicts in cross-cultural settings. Higher emotional intelligence people are better able to manage the complex web of cultural nuances and communication styles because they are more skilled at sensing and comprehending emotions. In the end, this proactive strategy contributes to beneficial outcomes in varied situations by fostering successful cross-cultural communication and collaboration.

In summary, our research offers a deeper understanding of the complex aspects of emotional intelligence (EI) while also reaffirming the intuitive link between EI and adaptive mechanisms in foreign contexts. Our findings' practical ramifications support the inclusion of emotional intelligence training in professional development and educational curriculum. By doing this, we can enable people to flourish in the increasingly interconnected and culturally varied global environment, rather than just surviving it. The message is clear: make early investments in emotional intelligence development to raise people who are not only knowledgeable of their culture but also skilled at navigating the complex web of international interactions.

## References

- Guntersdorfer, Ivett Rita, and Irina Golubeva. "Emotional Intelligence and Intercultural Competence: Theoretical Questions and Pedagogical Possibilities." *Intercultural Communication Education* 1, no. 2 (August 22, 2018): 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.29140/ice.v1n2.60>.
- Barakat, Livia Lopes, Melanie P. Lorenz, Jase R. Ramsey, and Sherban Leonardo Cretoiu. "Global Managers." *International Journal of Emerging Markets* 10, no. 4 (September 21, 2015): 781–800. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijoem-01-2014-0011>.
- Chao, Melody Man Chi, Sumie Okazaki, and Ying-yi Hong. "The Quest for Multicultural Competence: Challenges and Lessons Learned from Clinical and Organizational Research." *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 5, no. 5 (May 1, 2011): 263–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00350.x>.
- Conte, Jeffrey M. "A Review and Critique of Emotional Intelligence Measures." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 26, no. 4 (April 14, 2005): 433–40. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.319>.
- Crowne, Kerri A. (2009) "The relationships among social intelligence, emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence," *Organization Management Journal*: Vol. 6 : Iss. 3, Article 5.
- Fall, Lisa T., Stephanie Kelly, Patrick MacDonald, Charles Primm, and Whitney Holmes. "Intercultural Communication Apprehension and Emotional Intelligence in Higher Education." *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly* 76, no. 4 (September 18, 2013): 412–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1080569913501861>.
- Granda, Andres Herrera, Sara María Yepes, Willer Ferney Montes Granada, and Johny Alvarez Zuluaga. "Students' Self-Perception of Social, Emotional, and

Intercultural Competences in a Public Higher Education Institution in Colombia.” *Journal for Multicultural Education* 17, no. 1 (June 28, 2022): 70–82. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jme-02-2022-0032>.

- Hess, James D., and Arnold C. Bacigalupo. “The Emotionally Intelligent Leader, the Dynamics of Knowledge-based Organizations and the Role of Emotional Intelligence in Organizational Development.” *On The Horizon* 18, no. 3 (August 17, 2010): 222–29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10748121011072672>.
- Jiang, Wen, Songshan Huang, and Pingping Hou. “Emotional Intelligence, Emotional Labor, Perceived Organizational Support, and Job Satisfaction: A Moderated Mediation Model.” *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 81 (August 1, 2019): 120–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2019.01.009>.
- Mayer, John D., David R. Caruso, and Peter Salovey. “The Ability Model of Emotional Intelligence: Principles and Updates.” *Emotion Review* 8, no. 4 (August 20, 2016): 290–300. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073916639667>.
- Nicol, Adelheid a. M., and Penny M. Pexman. 1999. Presenting Your Findings: A Practical Guide for Creating Tables. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB03817084>.
- Rose, Raduan Che, Subramaniam Sri Ramalu, and Chuah Chin Weh. “The Effects of Cultural Intelligence on Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Job Performance amongst Expatriates in Malaysia.” *Journal of Applied Structural Equation Modeling*, May 1, 2011. <http://repo.uum.edu.my/9538/>.
- Van Dyne, Linn, Soon Ang, Kok Yee Ng, Thomas Rockstuhl, Mei Tan, and Christine Koh. “Sub-Dimensions of the Four Factor Model of Cultural Intelligence: Expanding the Conceptualization and Measurement of Cultural Intelligence.” *Social and*

## Appendix

### - Emotional Intelligence Section -

|                               |                         | Scale 1 to 7   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Emotional Intelligence</b> | <b>Self Awareness</b>   | [30. When I feel anxious I usually can account for the reason(s).]<br>[31. I'm able to recognize my emotions and their effects.]<br>[32. I know my strengths and limits.]  |
|                               | <b>Self Management</b>  | [33. I have a strong sense of my self-worth and capabilities.]<br>[34. I am able to keep disruptive emotions and impulses in check.]<br>[35. I am able to maintain standards of honesty and integrity.]<br>[36. I can be flexible in handling change.]<br>[37. I strive to improve or meet a standard of excellence.]<br>[38. I am ready to act on opportunities.]<br>[39. I see the positive aspects of things and the future.] |
|                               | <b>Social Awareness</b> | [40. I sense others' feelings and perspectives and take an active interest in their concerns.]<br>[41. I am able to read a group's emotional currents and power relationships.]<br>[42. I anticipate, recognize, and meet customers' needs.]<br>[43. I am able to sense others' development needs and bolster their abilities.]<br>[44. I inspire and guide individuals and groups.]   |
|                               | <b>Social Skills</b>    | [45. I wield effective tactics for persuasion.]<br>[46. I am able to initiate or manage change.]<br>[47. I am able to negotiate and resolve disagreements.]<br>[48. I work with others toward shared goals.]<br>[49. I am able to create group synergy in pursuing collective goals.]  |

### - Strategies Section -

|                   |  | Scale 1 to 7  |
|-------------------|--|---|
| <b>Strategies</b> |  | [50. Learning about the national culture]<br>[51. Learning about local business etiquette by talking to local colleagues]<br>[52. Seeking impartial feedback from local individuals regarding my behavior]<br>[53. Investing time to actively research about the country]<br>[54. Learning the local language]<br>[55. Going on a look-and-see or casual trip prior to my assignment to get familiar with the location]<br>[56. Taking coaching lessons from a local coach]<br>[57. Immersing myself in the local culture by partaking in local events or joining WhatsApp/Facebook groups]<br>[58. Going to local restaurants to get accustomed to the local cuisine]<br>[59. Learning about the religion]<br>[60. Integrating into groups in the destination country]<br>[61. Having a point of contact from the parent company in the destination country]<br>[62. Participating in activities of the destination country, while still in the home country]<br>[63. Going to multicultural events]<br>[64. Taking intercultural trainings]<br>[65. Consuming the local culture through literature]<br>[66. Consuming the local culture through videos (movies, tv shows, youtube...)]<br>67. Do you have any further strategies you applied? We are curious to know! |