

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

Gene M. James for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Counseling
presented on March 17, 2007

Title: The Relationship between Individualism vs. Collectivism and the Culturally Intelligent Behavior of Counselor Trainees

Abstract approved:

Cass Dykeman

Multicultural competency has been established as important component of communicating within a cross-cultural ecology. Yet, there is evidence that many counselors struggle to communicate and interact outside of their own cultural communication norms. Until this study, no one has attempted to integrate culture and intelligence as a unitary counseling construct. This study attempted to discover if a relationship existed between individualism vs. collectivism and the culturally intelligent behavior of counselor trainees. The results of this study found no relationship between individualism vs. collectivism and the culturally intelligence behavior of these counselor trainees. Explanations for the results are discussed. The results of this study create future researchers an opportunity to explore the relationship of individualism vs. collectivism or cultural intelligence to other counseling constructs.

© Copyright by Gene M. James
March 17, 2007
All Rights Reserved

The Relationship between Individualism vs. Collectivism and the Culturally
Intelligent Behavior of Counselor Trainees

by
Gene M. James

A DISSERTATION

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Presented on March 17, 2007
Commencement June 2007

Doctor of Philosophy dissertation of Gene M. James
Presented March 17, 2007

APPROVED:

Major Professor, representing Counseling

Dean of the College of Education

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my dissertation will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my dissertation to any reader upon request.

Gene M. James, Author

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I, Gene M. James would like to express sincere appreciation to the living God for accepting me. I would also like to humbly thank Dr Cass Dykeman. Dr Dykeman exhibits high-level professionalism. Dr Dykeman is able to translate complex ideas into information bits that become understandable and usable. I would like to honor Dr Dale Pehrsson for her timely leadership and guidance. I would like also to thank Dr Michael Ingram for mentoring me throughout my program. I would like to thank Dr Debbie Rubel for her wisdom and support throughout this process. I would also like to thank Dr Paula Belcher and Dr Paula McMillen for their support that includes their writing expertise, and encouragement throughout this process. I would like to thank Dr LeoNora Cohen and Dr Erlind Gonzales-Berry for graciously joining my committee on short notice. I would like to thank Dr Amy Bartley for her prayers and support throughout this process. I would like to thank Dr Kathy Biles, and Dr Louis Downs and their students for allowing me into their classrooms. I would like to thank Dr. Tim Berquist for his expert help with statistics. I would like to thank E Laine King, Karen Littell, and Angela Doty for assisting with data entry and proofreading. I would like to thank my wife, Susan, my children and grandchildren for keeping me centered throughout my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.10 Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.11 Rational for the Study	6
1.12 Culture.....	11
1.13 Individualist vs. Collectivist Identity	13
1.14 Intelligence.....	18
1.15 Purpose of Study	19
1.16 Research Question.....	20
1.17 Statement of Research hypothesis.....	20
1.18 Glossary of Terms	21
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	28
2.10 Individualist vs. Collectivism	28
2.11 Self	31
2.12 In-group and Out-group Variations.....	33
2.13 I/C Alternate Modes	34
2.14 I/C Theoretical Approaches	38
2.15 I/C as Cultural syndromes.....	41
2.16 Multidimensionality of I/C.....	41
2.17 I/C Horizontal vs. Vertical Patterns	44
2.18 Intelligence	46

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
2.19 Behavioral Domains of Intelligence.....	46
2.20 Academic Intelligence	46
2.21 Non-academic Intelligence.....	49
2.22 Cultural Intelligence Development	52
2.23 Cognition.....	55
2.24 Motivational theory	56
2.25 CQ Knowledge Process	56
2.26 CQ Motivational Facet.....	66
2.27 Self-Enhancement	66
2.28 Self-Efficacy	68
2.29 Self-Consistency Motive.....	68
2.30 Emotional Intelligence	70
2.31 Mindfulness.....	76
2.32 Four-step Conceptualization	78
2.33 Developmental Stages of CQ.....	80
2.34 Early CQ Assessment.....	82
2.35 Individualist vs. Collectivist Identity Scale	85
2.36 INDCO-VERTCO.....	87
2.37 Cultural Intelligence Scale.....	88
2.38 CQB	90

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER III: METHODS	93
3.10 Measures	93
3.11 INDCO	93
3.12 CQB	94
3.13 Data Coding	96
3.14 I/C.....	96
3.15 VERTCO.....	96
3.16 Demographics	97
3.17 Race.....	98
3.18 Gender	98
3.19 Participants.....	98
3.20 Procedures	99
3.21 Data analysis	99
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS	101
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION	103
5.10 Explanations.....	104
5.11 Explanation 1: Constructs do not Covary	104
5.12 Explanation 2: Different Path to the Same End	104
5.13 Explanation 3: Social Desirability	105
5.14 Explanation 4: Inherent Problems with the Culture Construct .	107
5.15 Explanation 5: Inherent Problems with the I/C Construct	108

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
5.17 Limitations of the Study.....	108
5.17 Procedure.....	109
5.18 Demographics	109
5.19 CIS	110
5.20 Recommendations for Future Practice and Research.....	111
5.21 I/C.....	111
5.22 CQ	113
5.23 TA	116
5.24 Conclusion	117
Bibliography.....	118
Appendices	142
Appendix A	142
Appendix B	143
Appendix C	144
Appendix D	145

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Result of IND-COL Sample.....	101
2. Descriptive Statistics of Continuous Variables.....	101
3. Two-tailed Zero-order Correlation.....	102
4. Correlation Matrix.....	102

DEDICATION

I dedicate this study to my family

The Relationship between Individualism vs. Collectivism and the Culturally Intelligent Behavior of Counselor Trainees

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“The survival of mankind will depend to a large extent on the ability of people who think differently to act together”
(Hofstede, 1980)

Thousands of years ago, the Greeks inscribed, “know thyself” over their temple doorways (Thales, 635 BC). The human desire to understand the multiplicity of the “self” is ongoing. Analyzing the constructs of culture and identity are a needful and unremitting learning process (Brewer & Hewstone, 2004). The process to understand the relationship of the different dimensions of the “self” (James, 1890), eventually produced a mandate within the social sciences for multicultural competency training (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). In spite of these significant changes, including the importance of understanding cultural differences, effective communication within a cross-cultural counseling ecology continues to be a stumbling block for many counseling trainees.

Studies about cultural identity, values, and beliefs exist in many disciplines. Advances in understanding the complexity of cross-cultural counseling are promising. For example, many professional counseling organizations like the American Counseling Association (ACA) and the

Council for Accreditation of Counselors and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) mandated that multicultural competencies be included in core curricula and standards (e.g., ACA Cross-Cultural Competencies and Objectives, 1994; CACREP, Standards, 2001, Eligibility Requirements, 3b; Section II, 2, a-e; Section IV, G; Section V, H; Glossary, Common Core, 2). Despite these requirements and similar ones in allied fields, few studies exist about a counselor's ability to make behavioral adjustments to the communication and interaction norms of a client whose culture is unfamiliar (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Statement of the Problem

In many professions where cross-cultural encounters occur, it is often glaringly visible that many individuals do not possess the ability to understand how to interact or communicate with people from cultures different from their own (Earley & Ang, 2003; Rolland, 1996). There are strong ethical rationales for counselors to develop the necessary skills required to interact and communicate within the cultural norms of the client (Nagayama-Hall, 2001). For example, counselors who strive to communicate within the client's cultural behavioral norms are more likely to lay the groundwork for a strong therapeutic alliance (TA) (Earley & Ang, 2003).

According to Dykeman and LaFleur (1996), TA can predict psychotherapy outcomes. It is important to note that clients' ratings of alliance

are more predictive of successful outcomes than clinicians' ratings (Hersoug, Høglend, Monsen, & Havik, 2001). Impaired outcomes or an inadequate TA is more likely to occur if counselors are not equipped or lack the ability to interact or communicate within a cross-cultural ecology (Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, in press; Earley & Ang, 2003; Triandis, 1995a). Lack of adequate training, mono-cultural pedagogy, and epistemology are responsible for many recurring therapist missteps. Counselors and clinicians from related fields who practice within the cultural communication and interaction norms of the client can create a stronger TA and positive client-driven outcomes are more likely to occur (Ang, et al.; Earley & Ang; Triandis, 1995a).

Difficult or negative cultural and emotional repercussions may await some non-dominant students upon entering U.S. higher education (Rolland, 1996). At least a portion of this phenomenon may be due to some non-dominant students' inability to make a communication or interaction adjustment or to make necessary "cultural shifts." Cultural shifts occur when individuals willingly make necessary cognitive and behavioral communication or interaction adjustments to their usual and accustomed interaction and communication norms to match those of an unfamiliar culture.

The motivation to culturally-shift is to increase the potential for acceptance by members of a new or foreign group. Anyone can experience a cultural-shift. For example, a participant who differs in gender, race, or social status from the other participant of a communication or interaction experience

may be required to use cultural-shift in order to be accepted by the other participant. A student's inability to adjust appropriately to different interaction and communication modalities can potentially be detrimental to a student's emotional or physical health, which in turn can affect academic success (Triandis & Suh, 2002).

Many clinicians hold the view that mental health is not a unitary universal construct. However, the clinical decision-making process is mainly subjugated to the dominant group's view of communication and interaction norms (Chen, Froehle, & Morran, 1997). According to Fondiller, Rosage, and Neuhaus (1990), variables that influence the dominant culture's clinical decision-making process are mostly cognitive-related. Due to this practice, clinical decision-making was often focused on dispositional variables at the expense of critical contextual errors. The culture of the client was rarely a consideration in this process. Due to this practice, clinicians made frequent inferential errors about a client's behavior or misattributed psychopathology to many clients from non-dominant cultures (Chen et al; Caldwell-Harris & Ayçiçeği, 2006). The clinician may misattribute psychopathology to what was normal communication or interaction behavior in the client's culture.

The inability to communicate effectively can influence the behavior of some college students. College and university cultures often challenge a student's coping process (Brislin, Worthley, & Macnab, 2006). For example, similar to most incoming college students, non-White students experience

considerable emotional conflict attempting to adapt to American college and university culture (Rolland, 1996). Studies have discovered that lower percentages of non-White students look to counseling centers for help compared to their White counterparts (Constantine, Wilton & Caldwell, 2003; Dingman, Mroczka & Brady, 1995). Research has also found that ethnic minorities with strong cultural affiliations prefer ethnically similar therapists to White therapists if the qualifications of the counselor are unknown (Erdur, Rude, Barón, Daper, & Shankar, 2000). Studies indicated that the majority of counselors in all fields are usually White (Erdur et al.). It was reported that after an initial session non-White students not only distrusted university staff but that resulting cultural interaction and communication barriers inhibited many non-White students from seeking further help (Constantine et al.).

A history of dominant group oppression or perceived oppression can create communication challenges for counselors working in a cross-cultural ecology (Bernard, 1994; Bernard & Goodyear, 1998). Swann (1997) stated, “Being understood by a therapist may reduce feelings of alienation, for it tells patients that someone thought enough of them to learn who they are” (p. 179). Many times, the dominant group places the burden to adjust (i.e. cultural shift) on non-dominant group members (Cook, 1994). It is often the counselor’s inadequate training or lack of ability to communicate and interact within non-dominant cultural norms that exacerbates interaction and communication problems.

Rationale for the Study

Counselors who are willing to make appropriate adjustments specific to a client's cultural communication and interaction norms are more likely to be cross-culturally competent (Triandis, 1995a). Scholars have debated about which interventions are appropriate for cross-cultural training purposes (Earley & Peterson, 2004). Most counseling programs include education and training about non-dominant client's cultural values and beliefs. This approach has not totally prepared counselors to interact or communicate effectively with clients from unfamiliar cultures (Earley & Ang, 2003; Earley & Mosakowski, 2004; Rolland, 1996).

Traditional efforts to train counselors to become cross-culturally competent were usually via the values awareness approach (Earley & Peterson, 2004). Instructors usually exposed counseling trainees to different cultural values, beliefs, and practices. Yet, being aware that cultures are different does not substitute for more direct interpersonal interaction. For example, cultures can define the personal attributes of a group (Triandis, 1995a). According to most available Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) multicultural course textbooks, Native American clients present specific behavioral attributes and communication styles that reflect collectivist cultural norms compared to most of their American non-Indian counterparts (Pedersen, Draguns, & Trimble, 1996; Sue, Ivey, & Pedersen,

1996). There are different levels of self-identification for those who claim an American Indian heritage (Churchill, 2004; Huffman, 2003). American Indian identity development is affected depending on tribal affiliation (federally recognized or not) and numbers of years spent living on or off a reservation (Huffman). Often, these subtle but meaningful differences receive little or no attention. A tool to predict a counselor's ability to interact or communicate with a Native client predicated on these differences is not readily available. As a result of neglecting the importance of understanding cross-cultural societal interaction and communication norms, many academic institutions are struggling to meet the pedagogical needs of an increasing number of diverse counseling students and counselor educators (Patterson, 1996, 2004; Weinrach & Thomas, 1996, 1998, 2004).

No two people are alike. Nevertheless, general societal laws create acceptable communication and interaction boundaries in order to establish and maintain societal norms for the entire group (Earley & Ang, 2003; Hofstede, 2001). Unfortunately, many dominant cultures used power as a way of resolving social conflict (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996). The dominant groups of most pluralistic societies share the privilege of not having to think about or adjust to the non-dominant groups' social strategies for interacting or communicating successfully in an unfamiliar cultural paradigm. For example, most of the multicultural pedagogy is structured from the epistemology, pedagogy, and curriculum designs derived from mostly

dominant group perspectives. This could potentially disallow less dominant group members in the process to create cultural competence training models for counselor trainees.

For example, TA is a widely accepted counseling construct defined as the collaboration between the client and therapist that leads to a working relationship (Sarfan & Muran, 2006). A functional TA is rarely analyzed from the perspective of the dominant group's assessed ability or inability to effectively work within the ecology of a cross-cultural client's interaction and communication norms.

Center (2005) stated, "Our pedagogy for teaching multicultural/multiethnic literature has failed to help students adapt the tools that work well in their readings of familiar situations and characters to a valid reading of unfamiliar worlds presented in these texts" (p. 225). However, students can be taught by being exposed to experiential trainings that can take the form of various experiences (Triandis, 2006). For example, one Iowa teacher began an experiment by instructing her students that those who have dark eyes are "better" than those who have blue eyes and for 3 days imposed norms of discrimination commonly found in American society (Paige & Martin, 1996). In order to give all the students a taste of discrimination, the instructor then pronounced that persons with blue eyes were "better." The experience produced intense emotions. The students realized how distressing it is to be discriminated against. This simple experience changed the lives of

these students. When they returned to their school 10 years later, they were more tolerant of minorities than fellow students who had not had this experience (Paige & Martin, 1996).

Most cross-cultural training attempts have failed to provide trainees with knowledgeable frameworks and skills that improve cross-cultural communication and interaction (Deal, 2003). Most multicultural textbooks usually teach the “do’s and don’ts” when counseling a client who is identified, or who self-identified with a non-dominant culture (Bowker, 2004). Pedagogy and curriculum with the intent to inform students about unfamiliar cultures purport to help emerging counselors become better equipped to understand individuals who self-identify or are identified by the dominant group as culturally different from the counselor trainee. Curricula that identify the habits and customs native to clients or counselors in cross-cultural relationships are inadequate (Bowker, 2004). Bailey (2004) stated, “The problem—not uncommon in training venues—is the ‘one-stop shopping’ philosophy that treats all participants identically, overemphasizes informational components, assumes uniform behavior from cultural actors, and over-relies on analogical reasoning” (p. 99). Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars (2006) stated that mostly superficial stereotypical features are used to categorize cultures, which misses deeper and subtler realities.

Curriculum shortfalls, less than desirable counseling outcomes reported by cross-cultural clients in colleges and universities, combined with ineffective

pedagogy and shortsighted epistemology highlight the need to reanalyze counseling trainees' aptitude for working with unfamiliar cross-cultural clients (Van Dyne & Ang, 2005). Having the ability to understand one's personal aptitude, strategy, knowledge, motivation, and behavior in a cross-cultural ecology enhances cultural competence (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Engaging in communication or interaction in an unfamiliar paradigm is a process. Energy must be applied toward learning about and functioning in a different culture (Ang et al., in press). A strategy may require seeking ways to gain a deeper knowledge of the communication and interaction norms that are unfamiliar. These abilities can also provide a counselor trainee with greater insight into their own cultural interaction and communication norms and the impact those have on a cross-cultural counseling ecology.

Often, the miscommunication that exists in a cross-cultural counseling relationship is not merely the oral miscommunications of either party. Most counselors experience situations that require a quick, instinctive grasp of cultural cues, behaviors, and preferences no matter what the clinical environment (Earley & Ang, 2003). The responsibility falls on the counselor, who holds the power-position in the relationship to understand the personal interaction style within the cultural norms of the client. Fractures in the relationship may occur because the counselor unwittingly missed one or more culturally relevant behavioral cues presented by the client (Wiseman, 1995).

Empirical studies from many disciplines produced informative data about the constructs of cultural identity and intelligence as undeniable realities of the world (Ibarra, 2001). Culture plays a significant role in people's learning, thinking, and communication (Ibarra, 2001; Li, Cohen, & Ibarra, 2004). The subjectivity of cultural values makes it difficult to empirically assess culture as a construct. Culture asks the question, where do I belong (Hofstede, 2001)? Cultural differences and similarities in societal behavior occur (Berry, 1994; Kâğitçibaşı & Berry, 1989; Rhee, Uleman, & Lee, 1996). General societal laws govern the behavior of people in any given society (Early & Gibson, 1998). Understanding one's cultural interaction and communication norms positively affects the behavioral process of interacting or communicating with others (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004; Ibarra, 2001).

Culture

Culture is a learned behavior (Ang et al., in press.). Culture is learned through child-rearing practices, peer transmission, and media (Brislin, Worthley, & Macnab, 2006). A child's cultural development is skewed by "knowledge." Estkell-Bloakland (2005) stated, "Any knowledge base has its roots in an epistemological ground, which forms the base for further knowledge production" (p. 104). High-status group members usually define what constitutes high-status or low-status knowledge (Bowers, 2001). Formal educators often decide what constitutes high-status knowledge or low-status

knowledge. High-status knowledge is what is included in classroom curricula, and low-status knowledge is often marginalized or omitted. Omission of “low-status” knowledge makes predicting and analyzing low status group members’ interaction and communication behavior difficult.

An important task of social science research is to predict behavior. However, predictions often lead to labeling the behavior of an entire group (Trafimow & Finlay, 1996). According to Lustig and Koester (1999), deciphering when or how to employ appropriate behaviors or nonverbal expressions varies across cultures. Many clinicians hold the view that adopting culturally generated labels or categories increases generalizability limitations or even does harm (Niemonen, 1997). “Expert” knowledge that is required to label behavior is not culture neutral (Bowers, 2001). As the world economy becomes globalized, culture becomes more pluralistic, and thus, cultural boundaries can be difficult to ascertain or maintain. Ascertaining the communication and interaction norms of foreign people is difficult without understanding the influence that one’s own culture has on the process of interpreting thought, feelings, and behavior (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004; Rolland, 1996).

Interpersonal norms are influenced by culture (Triandis & Suh, 2002). The dominant group or members with higher social status frequently determine what societal behaviors and communication and interaction behaviors are acceptable for other group members. The extent of observing cultural norms of

any given society usually depends on how closely a member identifies with general in-group societal norms. Challenges may occur when group members whose learned behaviors are already established attempt to interact or communicate with members of dissimilar cultures (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Individualist vs. Collectivist Identity

Interaction and communication difficulties often arise because participants differ on the individualist vs. collectivist construct (I/C) (Triandis, 1995a). I/C influences communication and interaction behaviors (Deal, 2003). Neither individualism nor collectivism is culturally absolute for all group members in any given society (Triandis, 1995a). Sinha and Tripathi (1994) rightly warned that it is possible to stereotype a whole culture or society if it is pigeonholed into an either/or category.

In every culture, there are those who are more allocentric (act like collectivists) or who are more likely idiocentric (act like individualists) (Triandis, 1995b; Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clack, 1985). For example, individualistic Americans are 10 times more likely to attend church, a behavior that is a more collectivist-oriented trend, than their individualist Western European counterparts (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006). Another example is that many Chinese, who are generally more collectivistic, have strong entrepreneurial ambitions. Americans and Chinese are only proportionally individualistic vs. collectivistic. Often, collectivist cultures tend

to nurture the individuality of its members, while individualist cultures contribute in many ways benefiting community and society in general. Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars asserted that adaptations are necessary and occur in all cultures. Neither individualistic nor collectivistic cultures can be categorized as more intelligent than the other can.

Stalinski (2004) stated that questioning whether existing norms are appropriate is a critical ingredient of successful learning and enhancing the potential for cultural sustainability. Cultural values are adopted to ensure the survival of that culture. Cultural survival-values are generational (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006). For example, early American individualistic values served to promote European immigrants perceived entitlement to “free” land and resources for private gain in the “New World.”

American individualistic values compared with the more collectivistic values of the Chinese who work together in order to grow rice successfully for the entire village may appear to embrace opposite worldviews. However, both the Americans and Chinese acculturated values and beliefs allowed them to survive. Americans and Chinese learned to operate aggregately within their respective cultural values and behavioral norms or risk becoming outcasts (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006).

I/C has distinct communication and interaction behaviors that can adversely affect the TA based on the nature of the specific therapeutic ecology. I/C has contrasting communication and interaction styles that may create

tension in the relationship (Triandis, 1995a). Studies seem to affirm that counselors who understand the communication and the dynamics of I/C cultural communication and interaction norms are more likely to establish a stronger TA and facilitate healthier client directed outcomes than counselors who do not (Triandis, 1995a).

It is difficult to create or establish value-free concepts or terminology in any study or analysis (Kâğitçibaşı, 1994). The evolution of a clear conceptualization of I/C is no exception (Kâğitçibaşı). For the purpose of this study:

- Collectivism/allocentrism is a social pattern consisting of closely linked individuals who see themselves as parts of one or more collectives (family, coworkers, tribe, and nation) (Triandis, 1995a).
- Individualism/idiocentrism is a social pattern that consists of loosely linked individuals who view themselves as independent of collectives (Triandis, 1995a).

Early analysis of I/C determined that collectivists think in terms of groups, whereas individualists think in terms of the individual separate from the group (Kim, Triandis, Kâğitçibaşı, Choi, & Yoon, 1994). When individualism is the dominant cultural orientation, members tend to define themselves as independent of the group, autonomous, unique, and guided by goals and values that are more likely to benefit only them (Jetten, Postmes, & McAuliffe, 2002).

Triandis, Leung, Villareal, and Clack (1985) found that idiocentrism (i.e., individualism) positively correlated with an emphasis on achievement and perceived loneliness. Conversely, there is a strong emphasis on social goals, interdependence, and desire to maintain group harmony for collectivists (Hofstede, 1980). Triandis et al. (1985) found that allocentrism (i.e., collectivism) positively correlated with social support and with low levels of alienation and anomie. Triandis et al. (1985) also found that those who are allocentric are more likely to emphasize the values of cooperation, equality, and honesty. Those who are idiocentric tended to emphasize the values of a comfortable life, competition, pleasure, and social recognition. Those who were allocentric reported receiving more social support and a better quality of social support; those who were idiocentric were higher in achievement motivation, alienation, anomie, and reported greater loneliness.

Collectivist-oriented individuals may experience communication anomalies if they encounter a counselor who is individualist-oriented or vice-versa (Triandis, 1995a). For example, a counselor who self-identifies as an individualist may not be able to relate to a client who self-identifies as a collectivist when the primary therapeutic issue is family-related. Collectivist definition of family often includes extended family members along with immediate family members, whereas an individualist may define family as only immediate family members. Many times, the formation of an adequate

working alliance is less problematic where both participants are either allocentric or idiocentric (Triandis, 1995a).

Student's interaction with faculty and peers in the classroom can often be misinterpreted if they self-identify with a collectivist-oriented cultural paradigm. A student whose culture is collectivist-oriented has more of a tendency to operate from the paradigm of wanting to develop a collectivist form of self-liking which may appear to inhibit self-competency (Tafarondi & Walters, 1999). A student from a collectivist-orientation may have difficulty outwardly disagreeing with a peer or faculty in the classroom. In many collectivistic cultures, the individual's well-being is closely associated with the well-being of the group (Triandis, 1995a). Openly disagreeing with a peer or faculty may be a sign of disrespect. Rather than confrontation, silence is often the preferred method of dealing with disagreements among members of a collectivist culture (Triandis, 1995a). Individualists may interpret this type of collectivist behavior as incompetence. The opposite is more likely if the student is individualist-oriented.

For example, an individualistic interaction and communication paradigm assumes students will actively participate in competitive behavior and openly challenge faculty or peer with opposing points of view. Advocating for "self" when "I" disagree with "other" is an individualist model of self-liking (Triandis, 1995a). It is less likely that individualist-oriented individuals will make cultural adjustments in order to communicate with

non-dominant group members then for collectivist-oriented individuals to adjust to individualist in a cross-cultural ecology (Triandis, 1995a).

Individualist interaction and communication norms are more likely to be hierarchically self-centered, unlike collectivists who are more likely to adjust to group norms. The adjustment is cultural rather than dominant vs. non-dominant.

Intelligence

Researchers have historically struggled to define intelligence or devise an empirical way to measure intelligence as a construct. For the purpose of this study, intelligence is defined as possessing the capabilities to gather and manipulate information, draw inferences, and enact cognitive, emotive, or behavioral actions in response to stimuli (Earley & Ang, 2003). Many assessment tools have been designed in an attempt to measure the different attributes of intelligence. Intelligence research and analysis have explored the genetic, cognitive, emotional, social and behavioral attributes of intelligence. Few studies have given significant attention to combining intelligence and culture as a single construct. Until now, it was unknown how combining these constructs might predict one's ability to communicate and interact in a cross-cultural ecology (Ng & Earley, 2006).

Technological advances have allowed societies around the world to merge. Cultures are more likely to acculturate each other's communication and

interaction behavioral styles. As communication and interaction evolve, cultural exchanges become more pluralistic in order for the participants to communicate and interact successfully. Already possessing the ability or having the aptitude to be trained to identify cultural communication and interaction cues of other cultures can significantly reduce communication barriers (Earley & Peterson, 2004). Undesirable college counseling outcomes combined with curriculum shortfalls highlight the need to reexamine counseling pedagogy in order to maximize the diversity that currently exists in many CACREP programs.

Inadequate counselor Cultural Intelligence (CQ) contributes to these troublesome dilemmas (Ang et al., in press). CQ is the capability to function in situations characterized by cultural diversity (Ang et al., in press). A solution to ameliorate recurring episodes that misidentify or misinterpret the communication and interaction styles in any cross-cultural ecology may be to increase the CQ of all members of a counselor program (Ang et al.; Earley & Ang, 2003; Petersen, 2004; Thomas & Inkson, 2004).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine if a relationship exists between I/C and CQ in counselor trainees. There are no counselor or allied field empirical studies that examined I/C relationship to CQ. If a relationship exists between the I/C and CQ, the next step would be to posit and test a

specific causal chain (Chu & Shaw, 2005). The results of this study could potentially fuel a line of research that could improve counselor competency.

Research Question

Is there a relationship between I/C and CQ?

Statement of Research Hypothesis

The formal hypotheses with respect to this study are:

H₀: There is no relationship between I/C and CQ.

H₁: I/C and CQ are related.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Aboriginal/American Indian/Indian/Native American/Native/First People:

is a person or group who is a member of a federally recognized Indian tribe or band in the United States (Code of Federal Regulations, Title 25, 2004).

Causal chain: are used to reconstruct a series of connected events in the past to remember what happened by establishing a plausible chain of causes and events (Chu & Shaw, 2005).

Collectivism: is a social pattern consisting of closely linked individuals who see themselves as parts of one or more collectives (family, coworkers, tribe, and nation) (Triandis, 1995a).

Collectivist/Allocentric: Individualists who are primarily motivated by the norms and duties imposed by collectives; are willing to give priority to these collectives over their own personal goals; and emphasize their connectedness to members of these collectives (Triandis, 1995a).

Commitment: is the process through which individual interest become attached to carrying out socially organized patterns of behavior which are seen as fulfilling those interests, as expressing the nature and needs of the person (Kanter, 1968).

Commitment Mechanisms: are strategies developed by high status members so that other members remain committed the group (Kanter, 1968).

Communication: is what happens whenever someone responds to the behavior, or residue of the behavior, of another person. Communication happens because of the need of human beings to connect and interact with others (Samovar & Porter, 1994).

Culture: is a learned behavior. Culture is the acquired knowledge of values, traits, or list of characteristics used to define people (Ibarra, 2001).

Cultural Intelligence: is the capability to function in situations characterized by cultural diversity (Earley & Ang, 2003). Cultural intelligence is the ability to recognize cultural myths, our own and those of others, and replace them with current realities (James, 2004).

Cultural Pluralism: is differences within a defined cultural group (Ibarra, 2001). Defining variables that influence cultural pluralism for an individual are the multilayered, multidimensional perception of one's self (gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, education level) (Rolland, 1996).

Cultural-shift: occurs when an individual must make necessary cognitive and behavioral communication or interaction adjustments to their usual and accustomed interaction and communication norms to match those of the dominant culture.

Cultural Syndrome: is a pattern characterized by shared beliefs, attitudes, norm roles, and values that are organized by a theme and that can be found in certain geographical regions during a particular historic period (Triandis, 1995a).

CQ-Behavior: is a personal capability to adapt verbal and nonverbal behavior so that it is appropriate for different cultures. It includes having a flexible repertoire of behavioral responses that are appropriate in a variety of situations and having the capability to modify both verbal and nonverbal behavior based on those involved in a specific interaction or in a particular setting (Ang et al., in press).

CQ-Knowledge: is a personal understanding of how cultures are both similar and different. It reflects general knowledge structures and mental maps about cultures. It includes knowledge about economic and legal systems, norms for social interaction, religious beliefs, aesthetic values, and language in different cultures (Ang et al., in press).

CQ-Motivation: is a person's interest in experiencing other cultures and interacting with people from different cultures. Motivational CQ is magnitude and direction of energy applied toward learning about and functioning in cross-cultural situations. It includes the intrinsic value people place on culturally diverse interactions as well as their sense of confidence that they can function effectively in settings characterized by cultural diversity (Ang et al., in press).

CQ-Strategy: is how a person makes sense of inter-cultural experiences. It reflects the processes individuals use to acquire and understand cultural knowledge. It occurs when people make judgments about their own thought processes and those of others. This includes strategizing before an inter-cultural encounter, checking assumptions during an encounter, and adjusting

mental maps when actual experiences differ from expectations (Ang et al., in press).

Diverse: infers a multitude of differences including ethnic identity but not limited to ethnic differences (i.e., gender, economic status, sexual orientation, and education level).

Dominant Group: is the social group who initiates overt or covert discrimination involving negative outcome distributions against low power (i.e., degree of the control one has over another's fate) non-dominant groups (Amiot & Bouris, 2005).

Emotional Intelligence: is having the ability to recognize and discriminate the emotions of self and others during interaction. This information is used to guide cognitive and behavioral options (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

Ethnicity: is lived experiences or intellectual concepts that are real or perceived primordial qualities that accrue to a group by virtue of shared race, religion, or national origin, including in the latter category linguistic and other cultural attributes associated with a common territorial ancestry (Alexander, 1980; Cayton & Williams, 2001). An individual may claim one or more ethnicities.

Identity: is the outcome of a self-interpretation process of the "I," "me," or "we" that takes shape at the meso (organizational) level of the immediate interaction situation or context (Leary & Tangney, 2003; Simon, 2004).

Individualism: is a social pattern that consists of loosely linked individuals who view themselves as independent of collectives (Triandis, 1995a).

Individualist/Idiocentric: Individualists who give priority to their personal goals over the goals of others and emphasize the rational analysis of the advantages and disadvantages to associating with others (Triandis, 1995a). Their own preferences, needs, rights, and the contracts they establish with others primarily motivate individualists.

In-group: are sets of individuals with whom a person feels familiar (Kim et al., 1994). The in-group defined norms, goals, and values shape the behavior for the ascribed members of the group (Rhee, Uleman, & Lee, 1996; Triandis, 1989). In-groups may be identified based on similar demographic attributes and attitudes or because of sharing time, place, language, and experiences (Hui, 1988).

Intelligence: is capabilities to gather and manipulate information, draw inferences, and enact cognitive, emotive, or behavioral actions in response to stimuli (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Intercultural Communication: Intercultural communication occurs whenever a message produced in one culture must be processed in a different culture (Samovar & Porter, 1994).

Knowledge: is a justified “true” belief (Nonaka, 1994). High-status knowledge influences one’s intra- and interpersonal developmental of societal communication and interaction behavioral norms (Bowers, 2001). New information may alter one’s knowledge.

Metacognition: refers to an understanding of one’s own cognitive behavior in the planning and monitoring of performance and in the use of cognitive strategies (Schoenfeld, 1987).

Non-Dominant Group: is the social group who is the recipient of overt or covert discrimination involving negative outcome distributions of the dominant group. The dominant group has high power (i.e., degree of the control one has over another’s fate) over a non-dominant group (Amiot & Bouris, 2005).

Non-Indian: is any person or group not federally recognized as American Indian by the U. S. government (Code of Federal Regulations, 25) (2004).

Non-White: is a label associate with a person or group who is not White. A non-White person cannot claim a Caucasian European biological connection, and cannot claim origins to the original people groups of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa (NCES, 2005).

Out-group: are sets of individuals with whom the in-group feels unfamiliar and shows less favoritism compared to fellow in-group members (Kim, Triandis, Kâğitçibaşı, Choi, & Yoon, 1994).

Power Distance: involves the different approaches societies have towards human inequality (Mulder, 1977).

Priming: is the situational influence of a word or concept that could trigger a memory and make it more accessible (Trafimow, Triandis, & Goto, 1991).

Self: is the human capacity for reflexive thinking—the ability to take oneself as the object of one’s attention and thought (Leary & Tangney, 2003).

Uncertainty Avoidance: is how cultures or individuals use technology, law, and religion to cope with the uncertainty about their future (Hofstede, 1980, 1984, 2001).

White/European Descent: is a label associated with a person or group who claims a Caucasian European biological connection, or who claims origins to the original people groups of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa (IPEDS, 2005).

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review examined I/C and CQ constructs. At present, few studies integrate culture and intelligence as a unitary construct. Until this study, no counselor education studies assessed the relationship between I/C and CQ of counselor trainees.

Individualism vs. Collectivism

According to Triandis (1995), I/C constructs have a history dating back hundreds of years. Early researchers laid the empirical groundwork that led to a contemporary I/C definition (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). Currently, the I/C construct includes different identified factors of the “self” (Realo, Koido, Ceulemans, & Allik, 2002). A major component of I/C is how dominant group members define the role of the “self” (Earley & Gibson, 1998).

Markus and Kitayama (1991) stated that the self is either independent or interdependent within the same construct. Triandis (1995a) argued that I/C is a polythetic construct rather than a dichotomy within the same construct. Triandis (1989) conceded that the definition of self emphasizes personal or collective aspects. For example, individualist cultures emphasize the “I vs. you” distinction, whereas collectivist cultures emphasize the “we vs. I” distinction (Kim et al., 1994).

Early researchers experienced similar struggles defining I/C-like constructs. Emile Durkheim (1887/1933) used the terms “organic” (a collective focus) and “mechanical solidarity” (an individual focus) to contrast the contemporary relations formed in complex societies. Tönnies (1887/1957) contrasted the community focused (Gemeinschaft) relationships of small villages with association based (Gesellschaft) relationships with urban societies.

Lombroso (1923) stated that men and women’s attitudes about life are derived differently. Lombroso stated that women are “altercentrist” (i.e., the needs of others are more important than their needs). Lombroso also asserted that men are “egocentrists” (i.e., men consider themselves the center of the world). Max Weber (1930) contrasted individual-focused Protestants versus collective-focused Catholics. Parsons and Shils (1951) described how individuals relate to one another with self-orientation vs. collective-orientation. According to Parsons and Shils, having to choose either orientation created a moral dilemma between augmenting private vs. collective benefit.

Shweder and Bourne (1984) stated that moral decision-making exists in three domains, universalism, evolutionism, and relativism. Decision making in the universalism-domain (everyone is just like me) emphasizes sameness but ignores differences. Decision making in the evolutionism-domain is accomplished by exacting a linear hierarchy (primitive to advanced or incipient to elaborated) in order to locate a normative model. The normative model

becomes the decision-making endpoint of development. Decision making in the relativism-domain seeks to preserve differences and establish parity.

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) defined the relational “aspects” of value orientation as individualism, collaterality, and linearity. An individual’s value-orientation referred to the level of autonomy relating to an individual’s chosen behavior. A collaterality-orientation referred to group goals and welfare primacy above the individual. Lineal-orientation referred to the prioritization of the group’s goals over time.

Ziller’s (1965) study focused on “open” and “closed” groups. Ziller stated that open groups keep changing their members while closed groups members remain relatively stable over time. Open groups have limited leverage imposing social norms because membership is always in flux. Closed groups have relatively stable social norms. Closed groups are limited to a narrow frame of reference. Lower status members in closed groups can potentially be subjected to oppression from higher status members. According to Triandis (1990), attributes of closed groups resemble collectivism and open groups tend to resemble individualism.

Moreland and Levine (1982) noted that commitment to the group increased as the perceived reward from the group increased. Commitment mechanisms are observed sequentially by cohesion, control, and continuance (Kanter, 1968). Cohesion commitment is cathectic (i.e., affective investments) that bind members to the community. Individual gratification stems from

involvement with all members of the group. Control mechanisms are the process of evaluating the demands of the group that determine if the demands are moral and just. Continuance is the cognitive process determining whether the cost of remaining with the group outweighs leaving the group.

According to Kâğitçibaşı (1994), four specific types of empirical evidence accelerated interest in I/C constructs. First, identifying I/C systemic differences in societies allowed members to be ranked either collectivist or individualist (Hofstede, 1980). Second, behaviors of a society reflected norms and values that related to either individualists or collectivists (Triandis, 1994). Later I/C studies discovered that some of these behaviors could be either I/C depending on context (Triandis, 1995a). The third type of evidence determined that predictions could be made for a wide variety of behaviors because differences are in the psychological process as well (Triandis, 1994). Fourth, I/C culture variability occurs at the individual level, “therefore can be used in explaining individual/group differences in various psychological characteristics” (Kâğitçibaşı, 1994, p. 53). Psychological characteristics are multidimensional and alterations can occur contextually when one transitions from the private-self to public-self.

Self

There are concise distinctions between private, collective, and public aspects of the self. According to Greenwald and Pratkanis (1984), the private

self includes cognitions that involve traits, state, or behaviors (e.g., I am honest). The collective aspects of the self consist of cognitions about group memberships (e.g., I am a son). Finally, the public self includes cognitions about how generalized views of the “private” or “collective” self are viewed by others (e.g., People think I am an honest son).

Triandis (1989) attempted to decipher whether or not culture affected cognitions contained in the organization of memory in the private self and the collective self. Triandis questioned whether or not the private and collective elements of the self were in a single cognitive structure. Trafimow, Triandis, and Goto (1991) discovered that private and collective self-cognitions are stored in separate locations in memory. The researchers manipulated the individualism-collectivism perspective by asking participants to think what makes them different/similar to a collective, or by reading a text reflecting individualistic/collectivistic behavior. They found that priming a particular aspect of the self (e.g., collective or private) increased the probability of retrieving that same type of self-cognition rather than retrieving a different type previously retrieved.

Trafimow et al. (1991) obtained nearly identical scores collected in a lab to those scores by individualistic/collectivistic cultures collected in the field. According to Trafimow et al., the significance of this finding opened the door for an analysis of culture in the laboratory. Trafimow et al. stated that future studies only needed to identify key attributes of contrasting cultures and

then devise laboratory manipulations that resulted in obtaining similar phenomena in the field.

In-group and Out-group Variations

I/C distinctions between in-group and out-groups could now be made using lab experiments (Rhee et al., 1996). A crucial distinction of I/C is a differentiation between in-groups and out-groups (Rhee et al., 1996).

Kâğitçibaşı (1994) noted that it could not be assumed that the referents that determined the basis of common categorization can serve as the basis of in-group favoritism or that they hold the same meanings across cultures. The distinction between in-groups and out-groups are particularly important in a collectivist society (Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, & Lucca, 1988).

Collective cultures are more likely to treat out-group members individualistically compared to in-group members (Triandis et al., 1988).

Knowledge about the emphasis on context vs. content of a culture is vital to understanding interaction and communication norms of a culture (Triandis, 2006). Triandis stated that important characteristics of collectivist cultures relative to those in individualist cultures are the emphasis on context more than on content. Mobility, affluence, or status, likely increases one's individualistic tendencies (Triandis & Trafimow, 2001). Collectivistic tendencies are more likely to increase if one is financially dependent, a low-status member, or is less mobile. Collectivists must balance the need to

fulfill individual needs vs. meeting the needs of the group. The well-being of most collectivistic group members is closely tied to the well-being of the group (Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clack, 1985). Individualists are concerned about achieving goals that are mostly beneficial to their personal well-being. The well-being of most individualists is accomplished apart from the group (Triandis, et al., 1985). Variations of group I/C models or I/C alternate modes occur (Kim, Triandis, Kâğitçibaşı, Choi, & Yoon, 1994).

I/C Alternate Modes

Behavioral and interaction subtleties of I/C occur. Kim et al. (1994) stated that collectivism consists of an undifferentiated mode, relational mode, and coexistence mode. Collectivists operate in a dual dimension of the self (i.e., private and public). Kim et al. (1994) also stated that individualism consists of the aggregate mode, distributive mode, and the static mode. Individualists have one undifferentiated self (i.e., private).

Group members operating in a collectivist-undifferentiated mode require explicit group boundaries (e.g., arranged marriages or identical dress code). The individual instills an independent view of self and yet identifies as a member of the group (e.g., modal personality or the personality characteristic held by the most people in the group). An individual in a cult may operate in a collectivistic undifferentiated mode. The collectivistic undifferentiated mode is a rare occurrence (Kim et al., 1994). In-group relationships are the focus of the

collectivistic relational mode. Boundaries are permeable allowing thoughts, ideas, and emotions to flow freely. One must be willing and able to express and feel empathy for others. Helping others accomplish a goal is a key feature of collectivistic operational relational mode (Kim et al., 1994). Collectivistic relational mode clients may feel shame about their perceived inability to help a family member through a crisis.

Collectivistic coexistence is all-inclusive. Coexistence freely allows all types of personalities to coexist (Sinha & Tripathi, 1994). The private-self separates from the public-self. The private-self coexists with the public-self. Family, in-group solidarity, and national identity are important to the public-self. The private-self embraces self-cultivation and personal striving (Kim et al., 1994).

An important distinction between individualism and collective coexistence is that individualists mostly achieve self-actualization for individual gratification or personal gain, while collective coexistence persons attempt to advance the group by their achievements. For example, collectivistic college students are willing to leave family for school but often desire to succeed for the good of the group (i.e., common good) rather than for personal gain. Career goals are often discussed and decided by higher status family members (i.e., group-actualization). Individualistic cultures often encourage group members to set career goals and achieve them (i.e., self-actualization) as the highest form of self-gratification regardless of what other family members

want (i.e., individuation). An attempt to convert collectivistic coexistence oriented clients to an individualistic worldview (i.e., group-centered vs. self-centered) or vice-versa can potentially cause tension in a therapeutic relationship.

People are an entity unto themselves in the individualistic aggregate mode. A firmly individuated-self characterizes the person. A person's emphases are on abstract moral principles regarding others. Individuals interact based on such principles as equality, competition, equity, noninterference, and exchanges based on contracts. People are voluntary agents (Kim et al., 1994).

Three critical features define the aggregate mode:

1. Emphasizes distinct and independent individuals
2. Individuals detach themselves from ascribed relationships (i.e., family, relatives, community, and region)
3. Rational principles, rules, and norms provide mechanisms through which unrelated individuals interact with one another (Kim et al., 1994).

The majority of modern American counselors are trained in one or more modes of individualism. Autonomy is the goal. Emerging counselors and sometimes their clients who operate in the aggregate mode often feel guilty that they have difficulty achieving autonomy. Contracts supposedly guarantee the "other" will satisfactorily fulfill the obligations stated in the agreement. Clients are often asked to fill out a contract in order to meet a behavioral or

cognitive goal. Competition and winning are often important aspects of aggregate mode individuals. For example, in order to be accepted into most CACREP graduate counseling programs prospective students, who often have similar credentials, must compete with one another (CACREP Standards, 2001).

Common interests and attributes define the nature of the group in the distributive mode. Permanent membership to the group is not a requirement. Explicit and/or implicit contracts are essential. Superficial intimacy is offered to everyone in the group. Doctors', lawyers', accountants', teachers', counselors', and professors' behavior can often operate in the distributive mode (Kim et al., 1994). Individuals who operate in the individualistic distributive mode may have problems when a relationship becomes too personal, which may require renewed or additional boundaries.

The static mode is bi-level. An individual has inalienable rights regardless of ascribed or achieved status that are protected by institutional entities and laws. Lawbreakers experience injury or loss when convicted. Static mode boundaries are firm, but are not necessarily permanent. For example, the abortion laws in the United States have evolved over time (Kim et al., 1994). The civil rights movement helped created positive social change and forced lawmakers to create anti-discrimination laws.

I/C Theoretical Approaches

A movement beginning in the 1980s to bring people together in spite of ontological differences over identity validated I/C as relevant empirical constructs. According to Oyserman, Coon, and Kimmelmeier (2002), Hofstede's (1980) findings of cultural differences of IBM international employee attitudes at the aggregate level are groundbreaking. Hofstede (2001) noted, "A capitalistic market economy fosters individualism and depends on it, although to various degrees" (p. 223). Hofstede (2001) further stated, "Various socialist types of economic order foster collectivism and in turn depend on it, although to various degrees" (p. 233).

By his own admission, Hofstede's (2001) findings had limited generalizability. Economic and historical circumstances shaped Hofstede's findings (Oyserman et al., 2002). Mostly middleclass IBM workers from 58 countries were the focus of Hofstede's study. The environmental scope was at the country level rather than the individual level (Shulruf, Hattie, & Dixon, 2003). Hofstede (1980, 1984) pointed out that his country-level analysis could not explain individual behavior.

Hofstede (1980) employed the terms collectivism-individualism in his study. Hofstede (1980, 2001) stated that collectivism vs. individualism is a dichotomy of the same dimension. Hofstede asserted that culture consists of four dimensions. Power distance, uncertainty avoidance,

individualism-collectivism and, masculinity-femininity explained about one-half of the country-to-country differences

Hofstede (2001) described I/C as, “the relationship between the individual and the collectivity that prevails in a given society” (p. 209). The relationship between the individual and the collectivity of a society strongly influences societal norms, mental programming (i.e., self-concept), and the structure and functioning of institutions outside of the family. Hofstede stated,

Individualism stands for a society in which the ties between individuals are loose: Everyone is expected to look after him/herself and his/her immediate family only. Collectivism stands for a society in which people from birth onwards are integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups, which throughout people’s lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty. (p. 225)

Hofstede’s (1980, 2001) definition of I/C closely resembles the operational definition of I/C of this study.

Triandis (1995a) posited that the proper definition of individualism must include four attributes. These attributes are personal goals that have priority over in-group goals. First, individualism prioritized what the “I” or “me” wants and needs are more important than the goals of the group (i.e., family, region, or country), or vice-versa (collectivism) (Triandis, 1990; Yamaguchi, 1994). Second, the emphasis of the self is on exchange

(individualism) rather than communal relationships (collectivism) (Mills & Clark, 1982).

Individualism consciously determines if a relationship is beneficial before he or she commits to that relationship. Collectivism is relationship driven. Third, the emphasis of the self is on rationality (individualism) rather than relatedness (collectivism) (Kim et al., 1994). For example, an individualist may consider the rationality or “what’s in it for me?” before helping another person regardless of the relationship to that person. Individualism does not require one to develop close relationships with family members if that relationship is not beneficial. Often collectivist-oriented individuals develop a close relationship to both immediate and extended family. Finally, the importance of attitudes and norms are determinants of behavior across cultures (Kashima, Siegel, Tanaka, & Kashima, 1992; Trafimow & Finlay, 1996).

A common theme throughout many early studies of I/C-like constructs focused on group behaviors rather than individual group member’s behaviors. Rarely did these early studies analyze cultural interaction or communication differences within group. Worldview differences are rarely mentioned. Studies that are more contemporary examined I/C as components of the self within a network of cultural syndromes (Kâğitçibaşı & Berry, 1989; Triandis et al., 1988).

I/C as Cultural Syndromes

I/C include a network of cultural syndromes (Triandis, 1993, 1995a, 1995b). I/C incorporate a reflection of “shared attitudes, beliefs, categorizations, norms, roles, and values organized around a central theme, that are found among individuals who speak a particular language, and live in a specific geographic region, during a specific period of time” (Triandis, et al., 1995, p. 462). Culture chronically shapes the way people perceive and evaluate their worldview. Worldview in turn influences perceptions of one’s daily experiences, judgments, and expressions of a subjective well-being (SWB) (Benet-Martínez & Karakitapog-Lu-Aygün, 2003). Variables that can affect SWB in a cultural context include a syndrome encompassing norms, attitudes and beliefs about what is desirable and meaningful in terms of defining “self” and relationships with “others.”

Multidimensionality of I/C

According to Triandis (1995a), I/C constructs contain four universal dimensions. First, the definition of the individualist-self is independent of others while the collectivist-self is interdependent. A client from a collectivistic culture may struggle with the inability to meet in-group expectations (e.g., feeling ashamed because caring for aging parents may mean parent/child role reversal). Whereas, an individualistic client may struggle

meeting personal expectations (e.g., feeling guilty for finding an adequate retirement home for aging parents in order to experience more individual freedom) (Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clack, 1985).

Second, personal goals are the priority of individualism, whereas collectivism personal goals are closely aligned with in-group goals. An individualistic client may struggle with saving enough money to buy a home. On the other hand, a collectivistic client may struggle with helping an extended family member make a car payment.

Third, social behaviors for collectivists are guided by attitudes about in-group norms, obligations, and duties. Individualists' social behaviors are guided by attitudes about personal needs, rights, and contracts. A collectivistic client may struggle with conflict resolution in a family dispute. An individualistic client is more likely to demand a resolution.

Fourth, collectivism focuses on relationships. The relationship does not necessarily have to be personally advantageous. The individualist focuses on the rational analysis of the advantages or disadvantages of maintaining a relationship (Triandis, 1995a). Collectivistic clients may exhibit distress or anxiety if a relationship is compromised. However, individualistic clients will analyze the cost to themselves vs. the benefits of maintaining the relationship before they act.

Hofstede's (1980) ecological factor analysis posited that I/C operated as a dichotomy of the same dimension. This dichotomy reflects cultural

normative and value assessments (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1989). The defining attributes of collectivism and individualism seem to validate this argument (e.g., Triandis, 1994). Individual factor analyses suggested the two could coexist simultaneously within the same dimension (Kim et al., 1994; Sinha & Tripathi, 1994). It is possible for an individual to be high in either collectivism or individualism in one group and low in other group affiliations (Triandis, 1990).

Ho and Chui (1994) stated that I/C operated within all societies. According to Ho and Chui, the individual and the group derive meaning from one another. They conducted an analysis of collectivism vs. individualism impact within Chinese culture. Ho and Chui's study focused primarily on the definition of "self" and "other" relationships. Their study embodied three major principles. First, I/C were a multidimensional construct, second, I/C embodied a constellation of components, and finally, I/C had different implications for social organizations.

The components proposed by Ho and Chui are complex. According to Ho and Chiu (1994), there are five major components of I/C, (i.e., values, autonomy, responsibility, achievement, and self-reliance). They also introduced the "Components of Social Organization" (CSO) that were comprised of components independent of I/C components (i.e., shared leadership and responsibility, altruism, public morality, group discipline, harmony, and hierarchical loyalty). The CSO components are either integrative

or non-integrative organization constructs. The integrative organization construct is based on the CSO components. Conversely, non-integrative organizational constructs negate those principles.

Overall, Ho and Chiu's (1994) study validated the expectation that Chinese culture is typically integrative (collectivistic) vs. non-integrative (individualistic). However, Ho and Chui discovered that traditional interpersonal relationships were evolving in Hong Kong society. Historically, Chinese valued relationships were based on biological or marriage ties, but evidence showed an ascendance of voluntary and instrumental relationships (e.g., relationships that benefit the individual rather than the group as a whole). According to Ho and Chui, this reversal in valuing relationships suggested a decline in Chinese collectivism. Ho and Chui also found that many Chinese endorsed cooperation and a heightened intensity of reciprocal involvements in voluntary and instrumental relationships compared to their Western counterparts. They concluded it was highly conceivable for a culture to successfully integrate individualistic as well as well as collectivistic attributes. Triandis and Gelfand (1998) posited that Ho and Chui's (1994) findings created the need to reanalyze the patterns of I/C.

I/C Horizontal vs. Vertical Patterns

Triandis and Gelfand (1998) agreed that I/C are a multifaceted construct. Triandis and Gelfand affirmed both individualism and collectivism

could be distinctively “horizontal” (emphasizing equality) or “vertical” (emphasizing hierarchy) (p. 118). Horizontal patterns assume that one self is practically like every other self. Conversely, a vertical pattern assumes hierarchies exist and one self is independent from other selves. These combined I/C patterns produced four distinct patterns. These patterns are, horizontal individualism (HI), horizontal collectivism (HC), vertical individualism (VI), and vertical collectivism (VC) (Triandis, Chen, & Chan, 1998; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

HI individuals are not that interested in achieving high status or comparing themselves to others and want to “do their own thing” (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). HC individuals do not submit to authority. Yet, HC individuals emphasize common goals with others, such as interdependence, and sociability (Triandis et al., 1998; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). HC individuals merge with in-groups (e.g., family, tribe, coworker, and nation) but do not feel subordinate to these groups (Triandis et al., 1998).

VC individuals are willing to sacrifice their personal goals in favor of the in-group’s goals (Triandis et al., 1998; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). If it benefits the in-group VC, individuals are willing to submit to in-group authorities without question (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). VI individuals are especially concerned with comparing themselves to others and want to compete with others to be the best (Triandis et al., 1998; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). Triandis (1995a) asserted that all humans carry all four of the HI, HC,

VI, and VC cognitions but varied the cognition combinations depending on the situation.

Intelligence

Behavioral Domains of Intelligence

Early cognitive and motivational theorists examined specific mental processes of intelligence (Earley & Ang, 2003). However, neither cognitive nor motivational theory could answer certain questions about a person's action or behavioral relationship to intelligence. Behavioral theorists tend to examine a person's actions rather than the mental process. Most behavioral theories of intelligence are likely to emphasize the different domains in which intelligent behaviors are observed.

Behavioral studies are broadly categorized into either academic or nonacademic domains. Academic intelligence refers to behaviors exhibited in school environments (i.e., language, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, and the arts). Nonacademic intelligence refers to social, emotional, and practical intelligence. The Intelligence Quotient (IQ) test is one of the most significant contributions of behavioral intelligence research.

Academic Intelligence

Alfred Binet is considered the father of intelligence testing (Aiken, 1996). Alfred Binet and Theodore Simon developed the Binet-Simon Scale in 1905 (Boake, 2002). The Binet-Simon Scale comprised a composite of many mental abilities that related to schoolwork (i.e., memory, reasoning, numerical faculties, comprehension, time orientation, object comparison, knowledge, and combining ideas into wholes) (Aiken, 1996; Boake, 2002).

David Wechsler (1981), a noted intelligence test designer, assessed academic intelligence utilizing psychometric methods. According to Wechsler, the Binet-Simon Scale was not specifically developed for assessing adults, nor was it generalizable. Wechsler defined intelligence as “the global capacity to act purposefully, to think rationally, and to deal effectively with his environment” (Plucker, 2003).

Prior to the Wechsler, intelligence assessments were not generalizable (Boake, 2002). The Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS) and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC) were notable intelligence tests that emerged after the Binet-Simon Intelligence scale (Boake, 2002). The Wechsler-Bellevue Scale replaced the ratio IQ with a deviation IQ score. Changing the meaning of IQ from a mental age to a chronological age ratio score established a standard score with the same distribution at each age level (Boake, 2002).

Based on existing intelligence research, it is reasonable to assume that syllogistic reasoning should only play a small part in assessing one's IQ. Not all things human are linear. For example, according to Ackerman (1996), earlier intelligence tests did not assess the level of knowledge developed throughout the adult lifespan. Intellect was often defined as what a person could perform or achieve. Ackerman stated that distinctions between methods of assessing one's IQ exist. For example, the medical method suggested pathological causation for inferior intelligence. The pedagogy method judged intelligence by the sum of acquired knowledge one possessed and the psychological method made direct observations and measurements of the degree of intelligence. Ackerman argued that the medical method, pedagogy method, and the psychology method did not include how one's personality, interest, and abilities interact over a lifetime to create higher assessed intellect.

According to Ackerman (1996), the personality domains of intelligence appeared to be either intelligence-as-process or intelligence-as-knowledge. Intelligence-as-process included the acceleration or decline of an individual's reasoning, short-term or working memory span, perceptual speed, and spatial rotation during different age-related developmental stages of life.

Using Holland's (1959, 1973) model for vocational interests (i.e., realistic, artistic, investigative, social, enterprising, and conventional), Ackerman and Heggstad (1997) found that realistic, investigative, and artistic domains of interests were linked to intelligence. For example, persons who

expressed realistic interests (motoric interests), “enjoy activities requiring physical strength, aggressive action, motor coordination and skill” (Holland, 1959, p. 36). Persons expressing investigative interests (intellectual interests) are, “task-oriented people who generally prefer to ‘think through,’ rather than ‘act out’ problems and usually have marked needs to organize and understand the world” (p. 36). Persons who expressed artistic interests (esthetic interests) “preferred indirect relations with others” (p.36). He or she usually prefers dealing with environmental problems through self-expression in artistic media. Ackerman found that the degree of realistic and investigative interests showed correlations with intelligence-as-process and mechanical knowledge (i.e., reasoning, math, and spatial). Differences in artistic interests are most closely aligned with intelligence-as-knowledge (e.g., verbal/crystallized abilities). Investigative interests showed substantial correlations with verbal/crystallized abilities as well.

Non-Academic Intelligence

E. L. Thorndike (1920) originally coined the term social intelligence. Thorndike classified intelligence into “abstract intelligence” (i.e., ability to understand and manage ideas), “mechanical intelligence” (i.e., ability to manage and understand concrete objects), and “social intelligence” (SIQ) (i.e., ability to manage and understand people) (Thorndike). Thorndike stated, “Social intelligence is the ability to understand and manage men and women,

boys and girls—to act wisely in human relations” (p. 228). Thorndike noted that standardizing SIQ was difficult. The inability to select criteria against which a scale could be validated led to a declining interest in assessing SIQ (Kihlstrom & Cantor, 2000).

It was not until Guilford (1967) developed the Structure of Intellect Model (SIM) that interest in SIQ was revived. Guilford affirmed that SIQ comprised five categories of operations (i.e., cognition, memory, divergent production, convergent production, and evaluation), four categories of content (figural, symbolic, semantic, and behavioral), and six categories of products (units, classes, relations, systems, transformations, and implications).

Guilford (1967) considered the SIM an expansion of the tripartite classification of intelligence originally proposed by E.L. Thorndike (1920). According to Kihlstrom and Cantor (2000), the SIM symbolic and semantic content domains correspond to abstract intelligence, the figural domain to practical intelligence, and the behavioral domain to SIQ. The very nature of the behavioral domain raised serious technical problems for test development. Guilford described and essentially established convergent and discriminate validity by showing that tests of the various behavioral abilities were not contaminated by other abilities outside the behavioral domain.

Although SIQ proved difficult for psychometricians to operationalize, SIQ appeared to play a major role in people's intuitive concepts of intelligence (Kihlstrom & Cantor, 2000). Rather than answering the question how socially

intelligent is a person, social intelligence asks the question: What does a person possess that guides social behavior? For example, SIQ has always played a role in the concept of mental retardation. A mental retardation diagnosis requires not only evidence of subnormal intellectual functioning (i.e., $IQ < 70$) but also demonstrated evidence of impairments in "communication, self-care, home living, social and interpersonal skills, use of community resources, self-direction, functional academic skills, work, leisure, health, and safety" (American Psychiatric Association, 1994, p. 46). Mental retardation involves deficits in both academic and social intelligence (Kihlstrom & Cantor, 2000).

Discovering the distinction between adult vs. child intelligence and academic vs. nonacademic intelligence was significant, because it allowed new ways to assess intelligence. One of the most salient and distressing features of the history of academic vs. nonacademic intelligence research was the limited analytical data shared between the individual differences in intellectual assessments and one's personality traits (Sternberg, Conway, Ketron, & Bernstein, 1987). Personality traits and intelligence are shape by culture (Earley & Ang, 2003). To address this gap, Earley and Ang incorporated cultural components into an intelligence assessment (i.e., Cultural Intelligence Scale).

Cultural Intelligence Development

The concept of intelligence is widely researched (Earley & Ang, 2003). The definition of intelligence is culturally bound thereby creating controversy about establishing an acceptable definition (Triandis, 2006). The difficulty to define intelligence was highlighted in a 1921 symposium on intelligence. Scholars were unable to agree specifically what intelligence was. A simple definition of intelligence emerged 2 years later that concluded that intelligence was simply what the test tested (Earley & Ang, 2003). Sixty-five years later at a 1986-symposium on intelligence, specific intelligence constructs surfaced. Intelligence was broadly “theorized and measured as an intra-individual attribute or as a characteristic of the context or environment, or an attribute located at the interaction between individual and his or her context/environment” (Earley & Ang, 2003, p. 27).

A relationship exists between neurophysiology, psychophysiology, and behavioral genetics when assessing one’s intelligence quotient (IQ) (Earley & Ang, 2003). For example, neurophysiologist’s sought to understand intelligence in term of brain size. The assumption was that the size, shape and structure of the brain correlated with the amount of intelligence a person possessed (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Psychophysiology researchers provided important data about how much energy was expended during cognitive or information processing.

Psychophysicologists found that individuals who are more intelligent used fewer neurons to process familiar stimulus compared to novel stimulus than those who were less intelligent (Earley & Ang, 2003). It was discovered that the brain possesses hemispheric intellectual functions that are very different (i.e., hemispheric specialization). The left hemisphere tended to process information analytically while the right hemisphere tended to process information holistically. Linguistic ability is associated with the left hemisphere while visual and spatial functions appear to be localized in the right hemisphere.

Discovery of hemispheric brain specialization enabled researchers to focus on problems associated with agnosia (i.e., inability to recognize familiar objects) and apraxia (i.e., the inability to perform movement on request). Neurophysiologists were able to determine where specific intellectual functions occur in different regions of the brain but not how much energy the brain used doing specific functions (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Genetic behavioral researchers were able to demarcate the contribution of heredity and environment to intelligence (Earley & Ang, 2003). Intelligence A is the inherited physiological intelligence of a person (genetics), whereas Intelligence B is the portion of intelligence that is acquired experientially (environmental) (Earley & Ang). Research designs utilizing findings on twins' (monozygotic and identical) IQ was the focal point of the research. Differences in measured IQs of twins reared apart were attributed to environment. Adopted

children's IQ differences with their unrelated genetic siblings were attributed to genetics. It was determined that heredity (genetics) explained at least half of the variation in intelligence test scores (Earley & Ang).

Neurophysiological, psychophysiological, and genetic study results have improved knowledge about the relationship between brain function and intelligence. Geneticists proved that heredity plays a key role in most intelligence test scores. A simple correlation between Psychophysiology measures with a psychometrically derived IQ scores do not demonstrate causality (Earley & Ang). Earley & Ang (2003) concluded that biology explained only a portion of intelligence, albeit, significant.

Most scientists believed that intelligence attributes could be conceptualized as biological, cognitive, motivational, or behavioral. Attempts were made to assess these specific intelligence attributes. What is glaringly missing in much of existing research is the effect a person's culture had on those attributes (Earley & Ang). Most documented scientific studies did not explain how intelligence relates to interacting and communicating with self or others. Ng and Earley (2006) stated that culture and context influenced the attributes of intelligence to the extent that the attributes of intelligence may differ across cultures. However, it is arguable that Cultural Intelligence (CQ) cannot occur if one is not already intelligent. Cultural Intelligence is the capability to function in situations characterized by cultural diversity (Earley & Ang).

Cognition

Most cognitive theorists concern themselves with identifying the process by which information is encoded, stored, retrieved and utilized by the brain in performing cognitive tasks (Earley & Ang, 2003). How individuals cognitively process information can affect their behavior. Detailing the cognitive steps of the cognitive process during information gathering and problem solving was the goal of some cognitive researchers. Individuals who were able to encode information, process rapidly and execute performance are deemed more intelligent than others who required more time to carry out the same tasks (Aiken, 1996). Results of several studies found that individuals with higher intelligence were more flexible in their attention shifting, could mobilize a greater amount of attention, and were better able to focus on the task at hand (Sternberg, 1988).

Sternberg (1988) stated that the cognitive process of intelligence extended beyond a purely internal information-processing model of intelligence on at least two levels. First, the internal components and information processing of intelligence interacted with an individual's daily experiences. Second, the external and the internal aspects of intelligence combine creating a strong motivation to primarily focus on practical application behavioral strategies in a real-world context.

Motivational Theory

Ackerman (1996) advocated for the inclusion of a motivational component in the definition of intelligence. According to Ackerman (2000), how enthusiastic one's interest was in any subject determined the motivation and time spent acquiring intelligence-as-knowledge. Ackerman (2000) found significant correlations between investigative interests (i.e., people who enjoy thinking through rather than acting out problems) and knowledge in science ($r = .409$) between artistic interests (i.e., people who enjoy aesthetic activities) and knowledge in humanities ($r = .390$). Ackerman (2000) concluded that one's level of interest represented a key component of adult intelligence.

CQ Knowledge Process

Organization of knowledge is made up of declarative or procedural categories (Earley & Ang, 2003). Declarative knowledge is what people know about something and procedural knowledge is what people know about how to do something (Ackerman & Heggstad, 1997). For example, most people know that automobile engines need oil to run properly (declarative). However, not everyone knows how to change the oil (procedural).

An ability to distinguish living from nonliving or being able to differentiate self from others is an example of declarative knowledge.

Categories may include features stored in an existing mental structure such as a

schema. People vary on their capability to store and process knowledge. Innate capabilities can include processing speed or can require hemispheric specialization. Memory storage and recall, sensory encoding and capacity for communication are examples of procedural knowledge. According to Earley and Ang (2003), high CQ individuals have a greater capacity to store and categorize new experiences than persons with lower CQ.

Storing information about the characteristics of a cultural encounter often occur during the mediate-level of declarative and procedural knowledge (Earley & Ang, 2003). For example, a collectivistic client may wish to discuss how to determine his or her future in the context of what is best for the family. According to Triandis (1995a), individualists are unlikely to value extended family as highly as collectivists are.

High CQ counselors would store any information that helps them determine the interaction and communication cultural norm of the client in order to move toward the client's interaction and communication cultural norm that related to family. The high CQ counselor in this case may draw from various acceptable areas of declarative knowledge unique to his or her own culture (i.e., cultural-level) before addressing the issue about how one's future may be tied to what is best for family. Conversely, a high self-consistency counselor may form an impression or reaction to this client that is inconsistent with the client's cultural communication and interaction norms based on what that counselor judged "normal."

The counselor may further process this information at the procedural level in order to understand the significance of how this client's future is tied in with what is best for the family. For example, a collectivist client may do what is best for the group by not accepting a higher paying job if it meant that the client would move to another state. On the other hand, an individualist client may struggle with what it might cost him or her professionally to take the job or not, regardless of family member's needs. A high CQ counselor formulates an answer by using cultural-specific procedural and declarative knowledge to deal with the uniqueness of this client.

In order to maintain or strengthen the TA, the high CQ counselor processes the proximate-level information by adjusting personalized communication and interaction styles in the session that may infringe on or impede the client "normal" decision-making process. Questions arise for the counselor. Do most people in this client's culture consider what is best for the family in the decision-making process? Is the decision-making protocol gender-specific? Does age have anything to do with the decision-making protocol? What role does each "family" member have in the decision-making process? The culturally intelligent counselor does not jump to conclusions or make assumptions based on one or two clues. The CQ counselor collects much biographical and environmental information about the client's communication and interaction cultural norms from the client before moving to that level (Triandis, 2006). The high CQ counselor, similarly to most competent

counselors, is able to allow the client to specify likes, dislikes, preferences, and subjective/emotional experiences in order to discover how these experiences influenced the client's information processing style and how this process may have influenced what the client attends to or presents in a session (Markus, Kitayama, & Heinman, 1996). The counseling outcome is client-driven and accomplished within the cultural communication and interaction behavioral paradigms of the client.

According to Thomas (2006), content knowledge is fundamental to CQ. Content knowledge forms the basis for comprehending and decoding the behavior. Content knowledge about self vs. other includes cultural identities, values, attitudes, and practices. A counselor who possesses content knowledge has a better grasp of the internal logic and modal behavior of another culture and is more likely to predict appropriate interventions that are congruent with the interaction and communication norms of a cross-cultural client.

Lane, DiStefano, and Maznevski (2000) defined this process as "mapping." Mapping is the ability to make predictions of potential areas of cultural similarity and difference. As a counselor collects information about a client's cultural interaction and communication norms, it is more likely that a counselor will discover common ground (i.e., inter-subjective consensus) and communicate or interact with the client successfully (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006).

CQ Construct Development

American business management and organization psychology were the driving forces that developed CQ. It was discovered that American and other executives from Western countries seemed to consistently encounter communication and interaction problems in foreign countries (Early & Peterson, 2004). Corporate globalization caused many Western executives to interact with high-level international personnel whose communication and interaction norms were foreign. The inability to interact and communicate successfully in foreign settings often created barriers for furthering or constructing new business contacts. There are similar interaction and communication barriers that occur with many counselor trainees attempting to work in a cross-cultural ecology (Earley & Ang, 2003; Earley & Mosakowski, 2004; Rolland, 1996).

Earley and Ang (2003) introduced a form of intelligence that reflected the adaptation to varying cultural contexts, which they termed “cultural intelligence”. Broadly defined, CQ is a person’s capability to function effectively in situations characterized by cultural diversity (Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2005; Earley & Ang, 2003; Earley & Mosakowski, 2005). Others have defined CQ differently. James (2004) stated that CQ includes one’s ability to examine and recognize intrapersonal cultural mythology as well as those of foreign cultures. For this purposes of this study is cultural Intelligence is

defined as a state-like individual difference that describes an individual's acquiescent capability to communicate and interact effectively with people from other cultures (Ang et al., 2005).

Earley and Ang's (2003) approach to intelligence diverged from the more traditional approach of many former studies in that they viewed intelligence as social recognition. They asserted that intelligence also needed to be viewed as an interpersonal skill. Earley and Ang were interested in developing the concept of self (i.e., the dynamic structure that mediates most significant intrapersonal and interpersonal processes) in relationship to communicating and understanding others successfully (Marcus & Wurth, 1987).

Earley and Ang (2003) stated, "In the broader nomological network of cultural intelligence personality characteristics are conceptualized as antecedents or causal agents of cultural intelligence" (p. 160). "Personality" is not included in Earley & Ang's definition of CQ. According to Early and Ang, personality characteristics are broad as well as stable characteristics of an individual that can describe his or her trait-like behavior rather than describing a specific behavior. For example, labeling a person "inconsiderate" is an effective way of communicating what is meant when describing a person who is often late to meetings or who continually interrupts others.

Earley and Ang (2003) conceptualized CQ as having both process and content features that are included in three facets (i.e., cognitive, motivational,

and behavioral). They described the cognitive aspects of CQ as knowledge of self, social environment and information handling. According to Marcus & Wurth (1987), the intrapersonal processes included cognitive information processing, affect, and motivation. The interpersonal processes on the other hand reflected the strategy for social interaction, including social perception and reaction to feedback.

Earley and Ang (2003) integrated the framework of Identity Theory to determine behavioral response patterns unique to situations involving group memberships. Role identity and identity salience are important components of the cognitive facet of CQ. Identity theory's conceptualization of identities involved accepting role expectations and behaviors that are incorporated into the self as opposed to reactions to collective identities based on socially defined categories (Stryker & Serpe, 1982). For example, a counselor trainee could accurately state that she or he was made up of several separate identities, such as student, family member, and employee at the same time. The dominant identity is the one most committed to in context as it occurs (Stryker, 1987). Therefore, one's dominant identity within a cross-cultural ecology can be fluid and contextual.

The salience of an identity is closely associated with the commitment level to a specific social network (Earley & Ang, 2003). Stryker (1987), defined commitment as "the costs to the person in the form of relationships foregone were she/he no longer to have a given identity and play a role based

on that identity in a social network” (p. 90). For example, an individualist-oriented client is more likely to commit to a form of normative control that reflects his or her individual needs rather than the needs of the group (Kunda, 1992). A client from a collectivist culture will more likely have a higher commitment to a form of normative control that reflects the interests of the group (Triandis, 1995a).

Normative control evokes identities whose behavioral patterns are constructed around the merged interests of a client’s culture (Kunda, 1992). A client who operates under normative control has higher levels of commitment to familiar cultural communication and interaction norms than to cultural communication and interaction that are foreign (Earley & Ang, 2003). Therefore, in order to form a working alliance or to enhance client commitment to counseling, a counselor must foster a form of normative control familiar to the client’s model of social cognition or cognitive information processing.

An assumption of metacognition is that individuals not only process information but also have knowledge of their cognitive process. The immediate social environment determines the facet of the self that is the most accessible in order to communicate or interact successfully (Earley & Ang, 2003). Those who have cognitive flexibility and are able to inductively recognize their self-concept are more likely to possess a higher CQ. Abandoning preexisting conceptualizations of how and why people function as they do may be required

to understand new cultural communication and interaction norms. Having the ability to reformulate one's self-concept and the self-concept of others into complex configurations is often necessary in a cross-cultural counseling ecology.

Social cognition enables clients to understand how information from their social environment and internal cues are sampled, processed, interpreted, and stored in cognitive schemas (Earley & Ang, 2003; Wyer & Srull, 1989). Triandis (2006) asserted that members of different cultures differ in the way they sample information from the environment and in the weight attributed to that information. Interpreting sampled information in turn leads to the development of social schemas about self and others.

Social cognitive schemas are generalizations about what the "self" is (Kihlstrom et al., 1988). The "self-concept" activates either abstract or factual knowledge gained from life experiences (Kihlstrom et al.). Acquired knowledge from a cognitive process influences behavior to the extent that one's behavior can be self-regulated (Wyer & Srull, 1989). Conflicting information is less likely to be accepted or acted on than information that fits into a person's cultural communication and interaction behavioral norms. The process of social cognitive self-schema development is structured and derived from social experiences that are instrumental in the cognitive process, and activation of normative controlled behavior (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Knowing one's self in itself is not sufficient for CQ enhancement (Earley & Ang, 2003). Possessing the cognitive flexibility and having the ability to make self-concept adjustments for others is necessary to increase CQ. CQ reflects the self-concept and motivates behavioral adaptations to new cultural surroundings. Ng and Earley (2006) asserted that CQ is a culture-free construct. CQ is the capacity to be effective within cultures, as well as across cultures. Ng and Earley stated that the emic perspective of intelligence examines cultural definitions of intelligence in a particular culture, and determines the relationship of that definition of intelligence to other constructs of that culture. Flexibility is necessary when one distinguishes between cultural variation vs. the CQ approach or the etic or emic distinction.

The etic perspective of intelligence is more general and views intelligence as an ability that transfers across cultures. An etic perspective of intelligence comprises the capabilities to be effective in multiple cultures. Thus, a person who has the capacity to be effective in many cultures (i.e., emic perspective) displays high cultural intelligence and is likely to operate effectively regardless of the cultural environment he or she experienced. It cannot be presumed that a person who possesses high CQ in a single cross-cultural ecology will have high CQ in others. Ng and Earley stated the nomological networks for intelligence might not generalize across the cultures. They argued the possibility that antecedents and/or correlates and outcomes of intelligence in one culture may be quite different from those of another culture.

CQ Motivational Facet

Motivational CQ refers to an individual's extent of interest and drive to adapt to new cultural surroundings (Ang et al., 2004). Earley & Ang (2003) stated, "The motivational aspect of CQ requires a personal sense of efficacy and desire for enactive mastery as well as a positive evaluation of such situations" (p. 138). CQ motivation stimulates and channels cultural knowledge about self and others into guided purposeful action in novel cultural experiences (Templer, Tay, & Chandrasekar, 2006).

Self-enhancement

Self-concept plays a significant role influencing motivation (Earley & Ang, 2003). According to Earley and Ang, CQ not only reflects self-concept but also directs and motivates adaptation to new cultures. Ang et al. (2004) found that motivational CQ was related to general adjustment over and above gender, age, and citizenship. The three self-motives that underlie CQ cognitive structure are enhancement, efficacy, and consistency.

Self-enhancement is influenced by past external events or opportunities (Earley & Ang, 2003). Self-enhancement occurs during self-serving and self-regulating information processing of sampling. The self-selected sampled data are interpreted for hierarchical self-relevancy (Kunda, 1987). Individuals are more likely to efficiently process self-congruent stimuli vs. incongruent

stimuli (Marcus & Wurth, 1987). The fact that self-relevant information is more likely to be recalled than any other type of information attests to the centrality of self-concept in the cognitive network (Kihlstrom, et al., 1988; Markus, Kitayama, & Heinman, 1996). Self-enhancement is often increased with self-gratification (Earley & Ang, 2003). Satisfaction with delayed gratification is an important facet of CQ self-enhancement. Erez and Earley (1993) described this type of delayed self-gratification as “collective self-enhancement.” Collective self-enhancement occurs when a person obtains a feeling of importance and significance from others. Individuals with high CQ are more likely to experience collective self-enhancement interaction and reward even if the reward or gratification is delayed (Earley & Ang, 2003). A person with high CQ self-concept is tied to the social milieu and is more likely to engage others proactively for culturally relevant information than a person whose enhancement is based on internalized monoculture referents.

An altered manifestation of self-enhancement can occur when an individual distorts reality in order to maintain a positive self-image or to enhance self-efficacy (Earley & Ang, 2003). For example, one can judge others by communication and interaction norms relevant to personal cultural norms but still ignore the communication and interaction norms of foreign cultures that are not personally salient. A counselor who ignores clients’ cultural interaction and communication norms in order to enhance their self-efficacy may inhibit or do harm to working alliance development.

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy plays a key role in CQ, because successful communication and interaction outside one's cultural norm is based on one's general sense of confidence for social discourse in a novel setting (Earley & Ang, 2003). According to Ng and Earley (2006), positive outcomes of cross-cultural communication and interaction may serve to increase self-efficacy. The CQ facet of self-efficacy is a self-perceived "judgment of one's capability to accomplish a certain level of performance" (Bandura, 1986, p. 391). Self-efficacy occurs individually or collectively (Bandura, 1997). Self-efficacy is decreased if a task exceeds one's perceived capability (Earley & Ang). Tasks that promote success (i.e., within one's perceived capability) are more likely to be chosen than those that do not (i.e., tasks beyond one's perceived capability). Choosing to venture beyond one's cultural communication and interaction comfort zone to embrace a previously unknown communication and interaction style is more likely to decrease reliance on one's self-consistency motive.

Self-consistency Motive

According to Earley and Ang (2003), "self-consistency refers to a desire for individuals to maintain coherence and consistency in their experiences and cognitions" (p. 75). Self-consistency motive is negatively

related to CQ. Self-consistency leads to selective-self-perception and active construction of memories of previous events allowing the individual or group to behave congruently within their cultural values and norms. A self-consistency motive allows people to exhibit continuity of a perceived self-image in order to view themselves similar to others in their primary group across time (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Inconsistent behavior by a person likely requires a high self-consistency individual to make situational attributions for that inconsistency. A high self-consistency person's tendency is to resist information that may contradict preexisting views. For example, if an A student who was high in self-consistency motive failed a math test, it is likely that the A student would blame something or someone else for his or her failure (e.g., I always get A's, so the textbook is no good or the instructor is a bad math teacher). One must be able to assess and discriminate emotive responses accurately to any given situation in order to make informed cognitive and behavioral decisions rather than blaming someone or something else (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Salovey and Mayer labeled this ability emotional intelligence (EI).

Emotional Intelligence

Wechsler (1940) stated that it was necessary to include non-intellective factors (i.e., affective and conative abilities) as factors of general intelligence.

Gardener (1983) described EI:

The core capacity at work here is access to one's own feelings—one's range of affects or emotions; the capacity instantly to effect discriminations among these feelings and, eventually, to label them, to enmesh them in symbolic codes, to draw upon them as a means of understanding and guiding one's behavior. In its most primitive form, the intrapersonal intelligence amounts to little more than the capacity to distinguish a feeling of pleasure from one of pain...At its most advanced level, intrapersonal knowledge allows one to detect and to symbolize complex and highly differentiated sets of feelings. (p. 239)

Individuals with high EI are better able to scrutinize and discriminate their emotions, as well as others' emotions in order to analyze this information to guide cognitive and behavioral options (Salovey & Mayer, 1990).

According to Cherniss (2000), EI has a firmly established scientific foundation. For example, in one study when a group of people saw an upsetting film, those who scored high on emotional clarity (i.e., the ability to identify and give a name to a mood being experienced) recovered more quickly (Salovey, Mayer, Goldman, Turvey, & Palfai, 1995). Salovey, et al. found that

individuals who scored higher in the ability to perceive accurately, understand, and appraise others' emotions were better able to respond flexibly to changes in their social environments and build supportive social networks. A high CQ counselor would not only be able to assess his or her own emotive responses to new situations and events but she or he would be able to assess the emotive responses of their client within the communication and interaction behavioral norms of the client accurately (Earley & Ang, 2003).

Persons who are able to scrutinize their emotions, as well as others' emotions or who are able to assess emotive responses accurately of their client may not necessarily possess high CQ. However, one does not necessarily have to make a cultural shift in order to do so. For example, the graduate student who felt minimized because none of the faculty ate the food prepared for them at the student's final defense had specific emotions attached to the experience. It could have been that one or more faculty sensed an emotional event had occurred for the student, but by sensing that the student was feeling emotion does not necessarily mean that CQ was involved.

It was reported later that the grad-student was embarrassed and assumed the faculty did not like or accept him. The student had been in the program for almost 2 years. Yet, the faculty was not aware that sharing a meal in this student's culture was important, especially during special occasions. The faculty advisor was made aware of the distress caused to this student and made necessary behavioral adjustments for future use. The faculty member

discussed how to honor this student in the future. The faculty found that in this student's culture, subordinates (student) honor senior members (faculty) by serving them food during special occasion. By rejecting the food offering, the faculty sent a message to the student that they did not approve or accept this student. The faculty advisor recommended that other committee members accept some food offered by all students.

The grad-student on the other hand experienced a form of disconfirmed expectancy. Disconfirmed expectancy is "a state whereby the expected result or response to an interaction is not what is actually experienced" (Brislin, Worthley, & Macnab, 2006, p. 48). The grad-student offered the food assuming that everyone would eat. During the journey to earn a Masters degree, it was reported that the student felt welcomed and was well liked. By offering food, the student reciprocated in the most honoring and welcoming way possible relevant to his culture. It was important for the student to understand that this rejection was not personal on the part of the faculty but rather a cultural nuance. The faculty interacted and behaved appropriately within their cultural norm by not eating if they were not hungry. If the student had continued to take this one event personally, he could have potentially limited his ability to interact effectively with others in the program (Brislin et al., 2006).

What the student gained from that experience was that in future similar situations he would offer bottled water rather than bringing food. The bottled

water could be consumed during or after a meeting fulfilling the behavioral need and cultural expectation of that student. All of the participants in this event recognized cultural differences and made appropriate compromises (Trompenaars & Woolliams, 2000).

The positive outcome for both the faculty and student belies the fact that they both had or could potentially increase their CQ. A critical skill for a person developing high CQ is to be able to identify and adjust to events and behaviors in a cross-cultural ecology that may not be immediately understood (Brislin et al., 2006). The skill to resist judging the situation right or wrong and to be willing to feel uncomfortable for a time in a state of not knowing is a CQ directive. By suspending judgment, one lowers stress levels during the communication and interaction process. One is more likely to calmly evaluate the situation or event increasing the potential to move toward recognition and respect for new stimuli or behavior from the perspective of the other's culture.

According to Earley and Ang (2003), the behavioral facet of CQ is tied to the cognitive and motivational facets of CQ. From a CQ cognitive perspective, correct behavior for subsequent processing and problem solving or reasoning are filed away. From a CQ motivational facet, one maintains sufficient control and composure to convey exactly what is intended in a behavioral response relevant to cultural interaction or communication norms. According to Earley and Ang, the interplay between the motivational and behavioral facet of CQ is similar to EI described by Gardner (1983).

CQ functions more effectively when one thinks before acting (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). Van Dyne and Ang (2005) argued that cultural intelligence is more than cognitive ability. Ang, Van Dyne, and Koh (2005) stated that behavioral CQ describes interpersonal skills and the capability to engage in high quality social interactions in cross-cultural encounters. The ability to assess the difference between client or counselor behavioral norms will most likely increase the counselor's ability and aptitude to adjust to match the behaviors of the client effectively (Brislin, Worthley, & Macnab, 2006).

If one does not possess these specific behaviors, he or she must have the capability and aptitude to acquire them. Awkwardness is often associated with the early stages of acquiring new communication and interaction behaviors (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). A first step in developing a new multicultural pedagogy is to have students acknowledge their disorientation and initial instinct to move away (Center, 2005). The ability to respond with CQ is often more difficult for those who are more closely aligned with a specific culture. An individual who is socially adept within their own culture often has more difficulty making sense of, or successfully interacting with, cultural strangers compared to a person who is more culturally detached (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). Earley and Ang suggested that people who possess a very strong and guarded sense of self would less likely adjust to new cultures. Individuals who are more culturally detached are more likely to be

observers and make conscious decision how best to fit in (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004).

CQ is operationalized when a counselor adjusts his or her communication and interaction behavior to mimic the client. For example in many Asian cultures, bowing displays a sign of respect. A high CQ counselor becomes informed when and how to reciprocate. The communication and interaction behavioral adjustment proves to an extent that the counselor has empathically entered into the world of the client (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). Empathy requires aptitude, ability, and skill.

Aptitude, ability, and skill are central to building a repertoire of behavioral responses to any situation or environment (Dunnette, 1976). Dunnette stated that aptitude refers to influences derived from life-experiences that accumulate over time. The influence of these daily life-experiences allows a person to increase a behavioral repertoire in order to make cognitive and behavioral adjustments relevant to new experiences.

Ability is aptitude in action (Earley & Ang, 2003). Ability is successfully achieving mental or physical content. For example, one learns a new language. The capability to acquire a new language is aptitude and mastery of that new language is ability. CQ reflects a person's capability to acquire new communication and interaction behaviors that reflect the norms of foreign cultures.

The behavioral repertoire of a high CQ person is flexible, broad, and easily adaptable. Role modeling contributes to behavioral CQ (Earley and Ang, 2003). Cues for appropriate behavior are gained by observing people from that culture. A person who possesses high CQ integrates and mimics those behavioral cues. Simply mimicking behavior is ineffective. A person must be able to integrate newly observed communication and interaction skills to interpret the motive and actions for specific behaviors in that culture.

Mindfulness

Cultural intelligence requires more than just having awareness that other cultures can be different. Difficulties identifying and integrating foreign cultural communication and interaction behaviors occur. This process can be confusing and frustrating. One must be able to discern that a behavior or emotive response is new or different from a similar behavior in her or his own culture. Thomas (2006) called this heightened awareness “mindfulness.”

Mindfulness is a “heightened awareness of and enhanced attention to current experiences or present reality” (Thomas, 2006, p. 84). For example, some non-Western cultures consider it rude to make direct eye contact. Making direct eye contact in most Western cultures is an expected norm. A high CQ counselor from either culture makes behavioral adjustments that accommodate the client’s interaction and communication norm. CQ requires a person to have

an available repertoire of behavioral responses to any given situation (Earley & Ang, 2003).

As a facet of CQ, mindfulness (at a highly developed level) means simultaneously (Thomas, 2006):

- Being aware of our own assumptions, ideas, and emotions; and of the selective
- Perception, attribution, and categorization that we and others adopt noticing what is apparent about the other person
- Tuning in to the other person's assumptions, words, and behavior
- Using all of the senses in perceiving situations, rather than just relying on, for example, hearing the words that the other person speaks
- Viewing the situation from several perspectives, that is, with an open mind
- Attending to the context to help to interpret what is happening
- Creating new mental maps of other peoples' personality and cultural background to assist us to respond appropriately to them
- Creating new categories, and recategorizing others into a more sophisticated category system
- Seeking out fresh information to confirm or disconfirm the mental maps using empathy

- The ability to mentally put ourselves in the other person's shoes as a means of understanding the situation and their feelings toward it, from the perspective of their cultural background rather than ours

CQ requires knowing what to do and how to do it (cognitive) as well as the capability to persevere and exert effort (motivation). The cognitive and motivational facets of CQ are also tied in with the behavioral facet. Assessing one's motivation, knowledge, and behavior by examining multiple cues, creates an environment where a counselor is less likely to make premature judgments or misattributions about a client's communication and interaction norms. A strong working alliance is more likely to occur because of assessing one's motivation, knowledge, and behavior before, during and after a counseling session.

In an effort to train counselor trainees Brislin et al. (2006) recommended a four-step conceptualization procedure to increase CQ:

- Consider what you know about the behaviors of others from this culture
- Introduce reasons for these behaviors as seen by people in the other culture
- Consider emotional implications and emotional associations that accompany the behavior

- Now that understanding has improved, use the new knowledge as a reference point about other behaviors and broader concepts that will improve cultural intelligence

The struggle to understand foreign cultural communication and interaction styles is ongoing. Studies have determined that declarative and procedural knowledge occurs during the learning process affecting behavior (Earley & Ang, 2003). Declarative and procedural knowledge are stored information derived from life experiences and accumulate over time. This accumulated stored information helps form general categories of identity-definitions as well as culture-specific identities that may possess communication and interaction norms that are unique. By accessing stored information, some counselors may inherently adjust to the communication and interaction norms of foreign cultures. Studies have determined that for most people this is not the case (Earley & Ang, 2003; Triandis, 1995a).

Extensive training is required for most counselor trainees to communicate fluently and interact in a cross-cultural ecology. Attaining high CQ is a developmental process (Thomas, 2006). Cross-cultural epistemology, pedagogy, and curricula must be reexamined and expanded to include CQ training. Learning to integrate information about self and other's cultural communication and interaction norms are vital outcomes and objectives for any program that hopes to instill high CQ as a component toward training

competent counselors. Thomas (2006) produced a model of CQ stage development. These stages are:

Stage 1: Reactivity to external stimuli: A starting point is mindlessly following one's own cultural rules and norms. This stage is typical of individuals with very little exposure to, or interest in other cultures. Parochial individuals do not even recognize that cultural differences exist. If they do, they consider them inconsequential. People at this stage of development can be heard to say things like "I don't see differences...and I treat everyone the same."

Stage 2: Recognition of other cultural norms and motivation to learn more about them: Experience and mindfulness produce a newfound awareness of the multicultural mosaic that surrounds us. A heightened sense of mindfulness presents a sometimes-overwhelming amount of new information. Curiosity is aroused, and the individual wants to learn more. People at this stage often search for simple rules of thumb to guide their behavior.

Stage 3: Accommodation of other cultural norms and rules in one's own mind: Reliance on absolutes disappears. A deeper understanding of cultural variation begins to develop. The cultural norms and rules of various societies begin to seem comprehensible and even reasonable in their context. The recognition of appropriate

behavioral responses to different cultural situations develops; however, only fairly obvious cues are attended to, and adaptive behaviors take a lot of effort and are often awkward. People at this stage know what to say and do in a variety of [foreign] cultural situations. However, they have to think about it, and adaptive behavior does not feel natural.

Stage 4: Assimilation of diverse cultural norms into alternative behaviors: At this stage, adjusting to different situations no longer requires much effort. Individuals develop a repertoire of behaviors from which they can choose depending on the specific cultural situation. They actively experiment with new behavior. They function in a number of different cultures almost effortlessly and with no more stress than if they were in their home culture.

Members of other cultures accept them as culturally knowledgeable and feel comfortable interacting with them. They feel at home, almost anywhere.

Stage 5: Proactivity in cultural behavior based on recognition of changing cues that others do not perceive: People who are culturally intelligent have the ability, through continuous sampling of internal states and external cues, to sense changes in cultural context, sometimes even before members of other cultures. They are so attuned to the nuances of intercultural interactions that they

almost automatically adjust their behavior to anticipate these changes and facilitate better intercultural interaction among others. They seem to intuitively know what behaviors are required and how to execute them effectively. Individuals at this stage of development may be quite rare.

Early CQ Assessment

CQ is the assessed ability to interact or communicate effectively with individuals from other cultures (Ang et al., in press; Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). Earley and Mosakowski developed the first assessment tool to measure CQ. Earley and Mosakowski stated that one could learn specific interaction and communication attributes (i.e., physical, cognitive, and emotive/motivational) by observing a client. Ang et al. (in press) followed Earley and Mosakowski's instrument with the "The 20 Item Four Factor Cultural Intelligence Scale" (CIS). The CIS added a Culturally Intelligent behavioral attribute (CQB).

Earley and Mosakowski (2004) pioneered the first psychometric assessment that attempted to combine cognition, the physical, and the emotional/motivational elements of intelligence (e.g., CQ) into one scale. Earley and Mosakowski's scale had three components (i.e., the cognitive, the physical, and the emotional/motivational). According to Earley and Mosakowski (2004), general conclusions can be drawn about the client's

culture by observation. Observing clues to a client's cultural norms and adjusting to any observed differences greatly increases the potential for developing a strong working alliance. By making necessary interaction and communication adjustments relevant to the client's cultural norms a counselor has provided concrete evidence that the client's culture is validated.

Assessing the relationship of CQ to other constructs is in its infancy. Current CQ data have provided the field with more exciting empirical questions than answers. Some researchers questioned the Diagnosing Your Cultural Intelligence (DYCQ) instrument (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). DYCQ was designed for business executives. This CQ instrument was designed to identify areas specific to strategy, knowledge, emotions, and behavior in order to enhance or assess one's CQ the DYCQ data discovered that many Western and foreign executives failed to interact and communicate successfully outside their cultural norms.

March (2005), an Australian corporate adviser, stated that Earley and Mosakowski's tool for diagnosing cultural intelligence and the CQ framework left much to be desired. Moore (2005) stated that many European societies have interacted and communicated with foreign cultures for centuries so that CQ evolved innately. March (2005) claimed that using only 12 items to measure three behavioral quotients trivialized Earley and Mosakowski's approach to cultural intelligence. March further stated that the "right" answers to the inventory are obvious, suggesting socially desirable response sets (i.e., a

subject in an experiment responds a certain way because that is how he or she thinks people will want him to respond) (Earley & Mosakowski, 2005). March (2005) chided that anyone who scored high on the Emotional/Motivational dimension (e.g., I am certain that I can befriend people whose cultural backgrounds are different than mine, see Appendix B) is, “likely to be arrogant and dogmatic, close to being culturally uneducable and prone to taking a fall rather than fitting into a new environment” (p. 141). March further claimed that there was no plausible connection between the three dimensions of the

Some scholars were quick to defend CQ. For example, Bailey (2005) argued that, “CQ is not offered as an innate, static determinant of one’s ability to navigate complex cultural situations. Rather, CQ is a basis by which the cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, and behavioral components of successful intercultural adaptation can be apprehended and consequently, taught.” (p. 99)

Ang et al. (in press) responded by developing the CIS in order to clarify certain attributes of the CQ construct. The CIS is an assessment tool that has the potential to lead counseling and other allied fields toward achieving higher levels of cultural competency (Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 2006). Ang et al. subjected the CIS to rigorous empirical testing. Most counseling programs embrace culture as an important attribute. Culture is a difficult construct to measure. Globalization and the growing diverse population being served by the counseling field require that we seek ways to connect. Very little

is known about CQ's relationship to other counseling constructs. Exploring, analyzing, and assessing CQ is a logical step. What is known, according to Earley and Ang (2003) and others, is that CQ is about interaction and communication. Interaction and communication learned behaviors are integrated throughout the counseling relationship and can be taught.

Individualist vs. Collectivist Identity Scale

Triandis (1995a) developed the Individualist vs. collectivist Identity Scale (ICIDS). The ICIDS is a standardized assessment tool that assessed I/C of a person or group. The ICIDS is an eight-page survey with 63 questions. It should be noted that only questions 33-63 (IND-COL) of the ICIDS were used in this study. The IND-COL, was scored as Triandis recommend. A participant was assessed an individualist if he or she responded to the IND-COL as an individualist 50% more often than as a collectivist. Triandis (1995a) believed in a "multimethod, multitrait approach" to I/C (p. 206). As such, the ICIDS contains two independent scales that have different approaches to assessing I/C. The IND-COL is congruent with the most common empirical method to assess I/C (Darwish & Huber, 2007; Li & Aksoy, 2007).

Triandis recommended that at the individual level, that one add the responses to the 8 items that are shown as measuring the HI, HC, VI, and VC to obtain 4 scores measuring these qualities (i.e., questions 1-32). questions

33-63 can be scored by taking into account the percent of time that the HI, HC, VI, and VC responses were ranked highest the most times. If a participant chose Individualist most often, he or she was ranked a 1. If collectivist was chosen by a participant the most often, he or she was ranked a 2.

Questions 1-33 elicited spontaneous responses without providing the context. For example, “I prefer to be direct and forthright when I talk with people.” A Likert scale from 1 to 6 assessed participants’ responses (e.g., 1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree). The social context of questions 1-32 of the ICIDS are not stated, therefore, it could be reasonably concluded that CQ is not involved in the response. It was required in questions 33-63 of the ICIDS that participants’ chose the most “right” response to a scenario using a hierarchical scale (1= most likely option, 2 = next best option, 3 = not likely option, and 4 = least likely option) (see Appendix D). For example:

You and your friends decided spontaneously to go out to dinner at a restaurant. What do you think is the best way to pay the bill?

- a. Split it equally without regard to who ordered what _____
- b. Each person decides how much to contribute to the total and if it does not cover the bill, each person is assessed inversely proportionally to what she/he has contributed _____
- c. The group leader pays the bill or decides how to split it _____

- d. Compute each person's charge according to what that person ordered _____

A low CQ person might do what he or she “has always done” in this situation without knowing what the other group members considered culturally appropriate in the context of this example. A high CQ-response would require that a person strategically determine a behavioral response using existing schemas or those of other members that are behaviorally congruent with the group of “friends.” Questions 33 through 63 elicited behavioral responses that included a strategic process that potentially interact with the CQ behavioral process (Ang et al., in press; Earley & Ang, 2003; Earley & Mosakowski, 2004; Triandis, 1995a).

Individualists and collectivists are often analyzed as two distinct cultural patterns that have opposing behavioral attributes (Triandis & Gelfand, 1996). According to Triandis (1990; 1995a), a person or group is not limited to either individualist or collectivist behaviors, depending on the context. Nevertheless, it is possible to empirically determine a percentage of individualist and collectivist group members of any given society (Chan, 1994; Triandis, 1995a).

INDCO-VERTCO

Many researchers have conducted extensive research on the measurement of the individualism vs. collectivism construct (Triandis, 1995a).

To distinguish individualist from collectivist in relationship to the view of the “self within a group” (a dimension he labeled Horizontal), Triandis (1995a) developed two scales that he labeled Horizontal Collectives (HC) and Horizontal Individualism (HI). For the purpose of this study, we labeled these scales INDCO (i.e., horizontal individualist, and horizontal collectivist) and VERTCO (i.e., vertical individualist and vertical collectivist). Triandis (1995a) was interested in power inequalities perspective as well as “self within the group” perspective. He labeled the power inequalities dimension “Vertical.” To distinguish Individualist from Collectivist in relationship to their view of power inequalities Triandis developed two scales that he labeled Vertical Collectives (VC) and Vertical Individualism (VI). For this study, in order to eliminate any influence of the power inequalities dimension, the vertical aspect of this construct were treated as a covariate and labeled “Vertco.”

Cultural Intelligence Scale

Earley and Ang (2003) developed the earliest published assessment of the CQ construct. Ang et al. (in press) standardized a more current tool that describes and assesses an interpersonal interaction and communication process (e.g., The 20 Item Four Factor Cultural Intelligence Scale). The CIS assessed CQ-Knowledge, Motivation, Strategy, and Behavior.

The CIS has twenty questions. The questionnaire is divided into four sections (five questions for each). The CIS assesses CQ-Strategy (i.e., I am

conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds); CQ-Knowledge (i.e., I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures); CQ-Motivation (i.e., I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures); and CQ-Behavior or CQB (i.e., I change my verbal behavior, e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it) attributes of CQ. A participant is asked to rate the response that best describes his or her capabilities using a Likert scale (e.g., Select the answer that BEST describes you AS YOU REALLY ARE; 1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree).

Van Dyne & Ang (2005) produced a four-factor model of CQ. They labeled these factors (a) Meta-Cognitive CQ, (b) Cognitive CQ, (c) Motivational CQ, and (d) Behavioral CQ. Ang et al.'s measure of cultural intelligence (i.e., CIS) contained four scales. The four-factor nature of this construct and the discriminant validity of the scales are well established. Ang et al.'s results also demonstrated differential relationships between specific personality characteristics and specific facets of CQ.

In Van Dyne and Ang's (2005) research with this measure, the individual scale scores rather than an overall means score are examined. For example, Van Dyne and Ang stated that CQ-Strategy and CQ-Behavior predict task performance. Those who have the capability to make sense of inter-cultural experiences (such as making judgments about their own thought processes and those of others) perform at higher levels in multi-cultural work

settings. One's performance is enhanced the higher their CQ-Strategy. Similarly, those who have the capability to adapt their verbal and nonverbal behavior to fit specific cultural settings have a flexible repertoire of behavioral CQ.

According to Van Dyne & Ang (2005), Behavioral CQ described interpersonal skills and the capability to engage in high quality social interactions in cross-cultural encounters. Behavioral CQ referred to an individual's flexibility in performing appropriate verbal and non-verbal actions when interacting with people who differ in their cultural backgrounds (Earley & Ang, 2003).

CQB

The focus of this study narrowed to assess behavior (Ang et al., in press; Thomas, 2006). The implementation and usage of the CIS employed the rational and protocol that the authors intended (Ang et al.). To analyze a CQ mean score of the whole instrument is not necessarily congruent with Ang et al. methodology. Given that the focus of this dissertation is the study of the interplay of variables of what a counselor might do in a therapeutic ecology, using just the Behavioral CQ scale (CQB) was appropriately used.

For example, Ang et al. (in press) hypothesized that agreeableness positively related to behavioral CQ. This is especially important to understand how this might play-out with counselors. There is certainly evidence out there

that justifies this approach. For example, Chao (2005) found that Color-blind racial attitudes (an unawareness of the racial dynamic, or that racism does not exist) occur for many people. Her study found that there was a strong correlation between higher ethnic identity and multicultural competence.

According to Ang et al. (in press), Behavioral CQ described interpersonal skills and the capability to engage in high quality social interactions in cross-cultural encounters. They go on to state: “Behavioral CQ refers to an individual’s flexibility in performing appropriate verbal and non-verbal actions when interacting with people who differ in their cultural backgrounds” (Earley & Ang, 2003, p. 11).

Behavioral norms vary across culture in three ways: (a) the specific range of behaviors that are enacted; (b) the display rules for when specific nonverbal expressions are required, preferred, permitted, or prohibited; and (c) the interpretations of particular nonverbal behaviors (Lustig & Koester, 1999). In effect, behavioral CQ describes interpersonal skills and the capability to engage in high quality social interactions in cross-cultural encounters.

The Behavioral CQ scale has 5 items (Ang et al., in press). They are:

BEH1 I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.

BEH2 I change my non-verbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it.

BEH3 I use pause and silence differently to suit different

cross-cultural situations.

BEH4 I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it.

BEH5 I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it.

CHAPTER III: METHOD

This study assessed graduate students in two Western U.S. CACREP accredited institutions in order to determine if a relationship existed between IND-COL and CQB.

Measures

The instruments used in this study were the ICIDS (Triandis, 1995a) and CIS (Ang et al., in press).

INDCO

ICIDS questions 33-63 (INDCO) were used as part of this study (see appendix D for an example question) (Triandis, 1995a). Results from those questions classify individual participant's as individualists or collectivists. Triandis, Leung, Marcelo, Villareal, and Clack (1985) conducted convergent and discriminate validation studies of Allocentric (collectivistic) vs. Idiocentric (Individualistic) tendencies with a multimethod questionnaire on Illinois undergraduates. Nine scales measuring different aspects of allocentrism were shown to have good reliability and to be intercorrelated, thus showing convergent validity. Factor analysis identified three aspects: subordination of personal to group goals (30% of the common variance), the in-group as extension of the self (15% of the common variance), and in-group identity

(13% of the common variance). The scales also had satisfactory discriminant validity. Those high on idiocentric tendencies used equity and those high in allocentric tendencies used equality and need in distributing rewards.

Triandis and Gelfand (1998) validated the horizontal (emphasizing equality) and vertical (emphasizing hierarchy) distinction of I/C in four separate studies. Triandis and Gelfand presented a theory regarding the horizontal and vertical distinction in all societies, whereas previous research suggested that the distinction was important only in the United States (Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995). They found that I/C existed in a non-Western context (e.g., Korea). Triandis and Gelfand used horizontal individualism (HI), vertical individualism (VI), horizontal collectivism (HC), and vertical collectivism (VC), as well, as the multitrait, multimethod matrices of the I/C constructs. To further test the viability of the distinction between horizontal and vertical I/C Triandis and Gelfand examined whether the constructs would relate to previous studies done on individualism (e.g., self-reliance, competition, emotional distance from in-groups, and hedonism) and collectivism (e.g., interdependence, family integrity, and sociability).

CQB

Behavioral CQ (CQB) was determined by use of the CQ-Behavior factor questions of the CIS. The CQ-Behavior factor (BEH) (see appendix D for a sample item) of the CIS contained five questions. Participant's selected

the answer that, “BEST describes you AS YOU REALLY ARE.” The sum total for all questions was used to assess a CQ score (i.e., 1 = strongly disagree; 6 = strongly agree). For example, BEH: 1 “I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it. _____.” Possible score selections ranged from 1 to 6. For example, Participant “A” chose 4. That score would then be added to other BEH scores to determine the raw score for participant “A.”

Ang et al. (in press) tested the predictive validity of the four CQ attributes on task performance and adjustment with hierarchical regression originally using 53 questions. The original questions were derived from literature along with interviews from eight executives who possessed extensive international experience. The 10 most qualified questions for each attribute were used in the Four-Factor Model of Cultural Intelligence. Overall, the four factors of cultural intelligence increase explained variance by 21% for task performance and by 31% for general adjustment.

Ang et al (in press) theorized that behavioral CQ would be related to performance and general adjustment. Results demonstrate significant beta coefficients for both outcomes: task performance ($\beta = .34, p < .01$) and general adjustment ($\beta = .48, p < .01$). In sum, the adjusted r^2 was 15% for task performance and 23% for general adjustment. Van Dyne & Ang (2005) theorized that behavioral intelligence focused on what individuals do (i.e., their overt actions) rather than what they think or feel (i.e., thoughts and emotions).

Data Coding

Dummy Codes were used for the nominal variables:

I/C	
Individualism	1
Collectivism	0

For this study, the horizontal attributes of individualism vs. collectivism (i.e., HI and HC) were used in the data analysis. The horizontal attributes reflect the relational aspect of individualism or collectivism. Horizontal individualism included the conception of an autonomous individual who emphasizes equality (Singelis et al., 1995). Horizontal collectivism stresses equality for each member of the group without being autonomous. HC includes perceiving the self as part of the collective, but seeing members of the collective as the same. Each ICIDS question included one of two possible responses, either individualist or collectivist. The low mean score determined how a participant was labeled. The lowest raw mean was converted to numeric scores and ranked either IND = 1 or COL = 0. For example, participant "A" reported mean scores for ICIDS questions 33-63 were, IND = 1.94, COL = 2.19. Therefore, participant A was ranked 1.

VERTCO	
VI	1
VC	0

In order to assess Vertco (i.e., VI and VC), participant's most "right" responses to questions 33-63 were used. Vertical individualism includes the conception of an autonomous individual and acceptance of inequality. Vertical collectivism includes perceiving at least an aspect of the self as part of the collective. VC individuals accept inequalities within the collective (Singelis et al., 1995). Each ICIDS question included one of two possible responses, VI or VC. The low mean score determined how a participant was assessed. The lowest raw mean was converted to numeric scores and ranked either VI = 1 or VC = 0. For example, participant "A" reported mean scores for ICIDS questions 33-63 were VI = 3.03, VC 2.84. HI, HC, VI and VC scores were converted to numeric scores and ranked VI = 1, VC = 0. Participant "A" would be assessed Vertco = 0.

Demographics

Demographics were asked on page three of the CIS (see Appendix C). Participants were asked to state the following (a) age, (b) gender and (c) race. It should be noted that some students reported that they felt minimized or confused, because they identified biracial. The nominal variables of race and gender were coded using dummy variables. This dummy coding was as follows:

Race	
White/European American	0
Non-White/Non-European American	1
Gender	
Male	0
Female	1

Participants

The participants in this study were graduate students from two CACREP accredited counseling programs in the Western United States. The rationale for using students at CACREP accredited programs as the participant pool for this study was threefold:

1. CACREP came into being in 1981 in order to set a high standard for counseling programs
2. CACREP is in the process of reestablishing a new set of standards for 2008
3. Counseling programs that earn CACREP certification must also undergo periodic program evaluations in order to maintain CACREP certification

The demographic (n = 96) profiles of this study follow: Participant mean age was 31.58-years. Participants were 87% female vs. 13% male. The participant sample was 78% White/European American (n = 75).

Procedures

The IND-COL and CQB were administered in the classroom. A total of 126 surveys were administered. Of the 126 surveys, 30 surveys were eliminated and not used for data analysis. The 30 eliminated surveys included multiple answers to a single question or had more than one unanswered question. The 96 remaining surveys were included in the data analysis.

Prior to data collection, a consent form was given to participants. Participants were instructed that, by reading the consent form, they had given permission to gather, analyze, and report data collected from this study. A brief description of the study immediately followed. Participants were also informed that they could stop any time, or answer any or all of the questions on the surveys. Participants were informed that as soon as they completed the surveys, they could exit the room. Any student or faculty associated with the study who requested the results of the survey were instructed to e-mail the investigators.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to discover the relationship between I/C and CQ after accounting for the influence of Vertco, race, gender, and age. To accomplish this stated goal, a partial correlation was conducted using subscales of the ICIDS (e.g., IND-COL) and CIS (e.g., CBQ) measures with Vertco,

race, gender, and age as control variables. Variables were coded and entered into SPSS 14.0 database for analysis (Norusis, 2000).

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

This study assessed the relationship between I/C and CQ. The analysis revealed no significant relationship between I/C and CQ.

IND (n = 96) scores were designated I (i.e., individualistic) or COL (i.e., collectivistic). IND-COL scores were sum totaled and used to assess whether a participant identifies more I/C. Participants (n = 96) identified themselves 56% Individualistic and 44% Collectivistic (see Table 1).

Table 1

Results of IND-COL Sample	
	IND = 54
	COL = 42

A standardized CQB score is currently unavailable. The CQB raw mean score was 24.48 out of a possible 35. The standard deviation was 6.59 (n = 96) (see Table 3).

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Continuous Variables			
Variable	Sample size	Mean	Standard deviation
CQB	96	24.48	6.59

A 2-tailed zero-order correlation between CQB and IND-COL, age, gender, race, and Vertco revealed no significance correlation related to the hypothesis of this study (see Table 4). The sole unrelated significant finding was between IND-COL and Vertco. However, both the correlation coefficient ($r = .25$) and the coefficient of determination ($r^2 = .06$) were low.

Table 3

Two-tailed Zero-order Correlation						
Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. CQB	---					
2. Age	.08	---				
3. Race	-.02	-.09	---			
4. IND-COL	.01	.01	-.00	---		
5. VERTCO	-.02	.23	-.15	.25*	---	
6. Gender	.08	.14	-.15	-.09	.03	---

* $p = >.05$

A partial correlation between CQB and IC (controlling for age, race, Vertco, and gender) shows no significant relationship (see Table 4).

Table 4

Correlation Matrix			
	IND-COL		
	p	df	r
CQB	.90	90	-.01

CHAPTER V: Discussion

Successful interaction and communication in a cross-cultural therapeutic ecology continues to pose problems for many counselors. It is the responsibility of the counselor to make the necessary cultural shifts in order to communicate successfully with the client. Some communication mishaps are likely to occur, because a counselor lacks the understanding or training to employ CQ behavior (Earley & Ang, 2003).

I/C influence interaction and communication behavioral norms (Triandis, 1995a). CQ assesses the ability and aptitude to interact and communicate in a cross-cultural ecology. Until this study, the relationship between I/C and CQ has not been examined. The purpose of this study was to discover if a relationship existed between I/C and CQ in counselor trainees at a CACREP accredited counseling program. To determine if a relationship existed between I/C and CQ, subscales of the ICIDS (i.e., IND-COL) and CIS (i.e., CQB) were correlated. The results of this study supported the H_0 . There is no relationship between IND-COL and CQB.

In the first part of this chapter, I will address possible explanations for the results of this study. Then I will discuss the implications of this study.

Explanations

Explanation 1: Constructs do not Covary

Applying Ockman's razor (Kelly, 2004), the most scientifically sound explanation for the results is that there is no relationship between I/C and CQ. Often logic supports things that research does not support. Why research does not support logical phenomenon is uncertain (Wirtz & Longabaugh, 2001). For example, a 32 million dollar study sanctioned by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services on alcohol treatment (Project MATCH) over a 10-year period failed to support a single hypothesis (Wirtz & Longabaugh, 2001).

Explanation 2: Different Path to the Same End

A second explanation is that it is possible that collectivists have a natural tendency toward CQ, because they are more likely to focus their behavior on meeting the needs of the group. Individualists, on the other hand, are likely to strive for CQB for individualistic reasons. As a result, both groups may have arrived at the same CQB for different reasons (Triandis, 1998).

Explanation 3: Social Desirability

Another possible explanation is that social desirability response bias suppressed the relationship between I/C and CQ. Social desirability may be especially significant for counselors who desire to see themselves as sensitive and empathic to others. March (2005) stated that the "right" answers to the CQ inventory are obvious, suggesting socially desirable response sets. Social desirability occurs when one projects favorable images of one's self during social interaction (Johnson & Fendrich, 2002).

For example, in a Church, Katigbak, Reyes, and Jensen (1999) study that assessed "Self-described traits, values, and moods associated with individualism and collectivism," the social desirability composite α scores ranged from .82 to .89. The effect sizes indicated that culture had a larger effect on the valuing (i.e., social desirability) of I/C-related traits than on self-descriptions of I/C-related traits. Grimm, Church, Katigbak, & Reyes (1999) study reported that 10 terms (in the list of 581 terms) with the highest mean social desirability ratings in the United States were to be honest, truthful, loving, trustworthy, dependable, trustful, kindhearted, loyal, lovable, and responsible. In this study, social desirability associated with Grimm et al.'s set of 10 items, likely occurred for some participants. For example, a participant in this study stated that, "I hope no one sees my answers, because they are going to think that I am very selfish."

That fact that the principle data gatherer was a person of color might have influenced some participants to report socially desirably bias. Counselors are often trained to interact and communicate more collectivistic than individualistic (e.g., client-centered). It should be noted, that after an extensive literature search, no data were discovered to determine whether or not the amount of time in a counseling program affected I/C or CQ. However, participants in this study included first, second, and third year masters students, therefore, it was difficult to assess collectively the effect partis pris (i.e., preconceived opinions, prejudices) had on how participants reported (Van De Vijver & Leung, 2000). It may seem more “counselor-like” to report more collectivistic than individualistic (Triandis, Chen, & Chan, 1998). To think of “self” individualistically may have been difficult to admit in a counseling classroom full of other counselors (Church, Katigbak, Alberio, & Reyes, 1999).

It is possible that some participants reported ideal professional-self vs. private-self’s learned interaction and communication behavioral norms (Katigbak et al., 2001). Professional learned behaviors, such as those taught in a CACREP accredited program, might not accurately assess an intrapersonal or private perspective. Therefore, “the most ‘right’ answers” may have not accurately described the intrapersonal communication and interaction norms but instead, reported to be more socially desirable.

Social desirability responses may have been exacerbated by the potential for interviewer and experimenter effects (Malpass, 1977). According to Triandis et al. (1998), when researching culture or related topics, participants may modify their responses depending on how they wish to present themselves to the experimenter. Adding a Crowne-Marlow Social Desirability Scale (CM) to future studies may be a next step to further I/C or CQ research. The CM has been used to identify persons who are likely to provide self-serving information on surveys (Johnson & Fendrich, 1996).

Explanation 4: Inherent Problems with the Culture Construct

Another possible explanation for the results of this study is the fact there remains a seemingly inherent inability to empirically define culture (Singelis et al., 1995). The fact that “culture” was assessed created an inherent limitation for some (Patterson, 2004; Weinrach & Thomas, 2002). Singelis et al. stated that there are major limitations when measuring culture at the individual level. When unique features of a particular culture are incorporated into theory, hypotheses, measurements, and analyses, generalizability across other cultures may be limited (Schaffer & Riordan, 2003). Patterson (2004) argued that identifying a “multicultural” client is difficult at best without having standards or specific training examples. He asserted that a strong therapeutic relationship is the same regardless of which group the client belongs. The concept of culture is diffuse and lacks explanatory power, unless

tied to specific “dimensions of culture” that mediate culture-personality relationships (Grimm et al., 1999).

Explanation 5: Inherent Problems with the I/C Construct

It is possible that I/C may not be a “self-identity” at all. According to Triandis (1995a), I/C could be a “new” personality test. To make research even more complex, as the societies become more pluralistic, acculturation may alter the development of identity (Bhugra, 2004). For example, most Native American populations are generally identified as collectivists (Pedersen, Draguns, & Trimble, 1996; Sue, Ivey, & Pedersen, 1996). The incursion of dollars from gaming casinos has caused some Native American populations to reexamine their preexisting education priorities. According to Vinje (1996), “education, as an indirect approach to economic development, appears to consistently be one of the more important priorities for tribal leaders...” (p. 427). Education or knowledge is not culturally neutral (Bowers, 2001). Becoming “educated” in order to navigate capitalism would move American Indians towards individualism. Using I/C self-identity as a construct to correlate with CQ may not be appropriate with some collectivistic populations.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of the study’s design may also explain the results of this study. These limitations included procedure, demographics, and the CIS.

Procedure

The procedure may have skewed the data. The instruments were administered onsite in a classroom. It is impossible to recreate an exact testing environment when the tests are given at different locations and at a different time of day. Most of the surveys were administered in the evening; however, one test was administered in the early afternoon. Even though purposeful instruction about no effect on grade outcome, anonymity, confidentiality and volunteerism were given to participants prior to taking the surveys, inconsistencies existed during test administration. During one session, several students asked questions for clarification that seemed to cause a distraction for at least one other participant.

Demographics

The results of this study are generalizable only to those graduate students ($n = 96$) from two Western CACREP-accredited institutions chosen for this study. Historically, studies attempting to determine a relationship between I/C and other constructs using culturally homogenous or monocultural groups consistently reported low reliability (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

The majority of the participants of this study identified White. However, one university in this study official WebPages purported to support a 53% non-White student population. The definition of “White vs. non-White”

used in this study may have led some participants with biological connections to Europe (i.e., Hispanics or Middle Easterners) to self-identify White rather than non-White.

Claiming that the population of this study was “monocultural” was congruent with how other studies categorized groups. For example, in order to test I/C theory, Grimm et al.(1999) categorized all US students “individualistic” and all Philippine students collectivistic.

CIS

Converting CQ, a defined business construct, into a counseling construct may not accurately assess a CQ relationship to other counseling constructs. Most current CQ research is limited to organizational psychology. The motivation behind an expected business outcome (e.g., profit) may not accurately assess an expected counseling outcome (e.g., TA).

The CIS attempted to quantify specific attributes that provided a model for a cross-cultural interaction and communication developmental process (Earley & Ang, 2003; Thomas, 2006). Ang et al. (in press) rightly stated that their version of the CIS assessed an interpersonal process. Simply assessing an interpersonal process (e.g., CQ as a business construct with business-oriented outcomes) may only assess a piece of the interaction and communication process from a culturally intelligent perspective (e.g. as a counseling construct with counseling-oriented outcomes). However, if culture is truly learned

behavior, one might logically speculate that culture may include interpersonal behaviors that are filtered through one's intrapersonal process.

Learning where one "belongs" is a developmental process. This knowledge can be acquired from parents, siblings, extended family, peers, and the media (Earley & Ang, 2003). How does this knowledge influence one's interaction and communication norms in a cross-cultural counseling ecology? By self-examining particular cultural interaction and communication norms one is more likely to understand his or her presence in all counseling relationships (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998).

Recommendations for Future Practice and Research

The results of this study suggested that I/C and CQ are not related. However, as independent empirically proven constructs, I/C and CQ potentially contain important implications for practice and research in counselor education. I will first address the research of potential implications of the I/C construct and then the CQ construct. Finally, I will address the research and practice implications of these constructs in relation to TA.

I/C

Interaction and communication norms are different for those who identify I/C (Triandis, 1995a). Training counselors to be aware of those differences has many implications. I/C are one of the primary dimensions that

differentiate cultures (Gelfand & Realo, 1999). Relationships between faculty, peers, and clients are directly affected by I/C. According to Van De Vijver and Leung (2000), “individual and cultural factors have not been frequently studied in terms of their interaction.” (p. 44)

Collectivists are more likely to be considered non-dominant members in American society (Triandis, 1995a). American high status members are more likely to establish group norms. Often individualistic norms encourage one to focus efforts on “self” apart from the group regardless of whether or not another member of the group is struggling (Triandis, 1995a). For example, Collectivistic students must learn how to navigate an individualistic culture when attempting to navigate American colleges without understanding or knowing how to “advocate” for self. It is usually left to the collectivistic faculty, student, or client to make necessary cultural shifts in order to interact and communicate effectively and efficiently with their individualistic counterparts or potentially face frustration, emotional harm or even expulsion.

Research has found that I/C cultural values have a direct effect on the level of cooperation and interactions (Deal, 2003). Receiving training that highlights I/C differences may enhance the potential for developing a stronger TA and relieve perceived cultural hegemony. Understanding the moderating effects of I/C may reduce misunderstandings. The end result could produce cultural and communication synergy (Deal, 2003).

CQ

There are two CQ assumptions (a) that culture is a learned behavior that requires certain personality traits (i.e., General Cognitive Ability or IQ), and (b) that culture answers the question: Where do I belong? The answer to the “culture” question could influence one’s personality state and could potentially impair the TA. One could logically assume that by teaching CQ, counselor trainees might better understand their intrapersonal process that produced their interpersonal interaction and communication norms. Understanding one’s intrapersonal process may lead to a deeper understanding of interpersonal process with persons from other cultures. CQ enables one to culturally-shift appropriately in order to interact and communicate in a cross-cultural ecology. Yet, some individuals are likely to never have high CQ or receive enough training to increase their CQ (Ang et al., in press).

What is known is that a CQ can be empirically assessed. Biology and environment represent the different facets of CQ. Teaching can increase CQ. Some have a greater potential to raise their CQ than others. Cultural intelligence can assess one’s ability to interact and communicate with others. According to Ang et al. (in press), it is more likely that one can form a closer relationship or TA when he or she attempts to communicate and interact within the cultural norms of the other person.

Discovering no relationship between I/C and CQ opens the door to exploring and assessing other constructs' relationship to CQ. There are many potential uses for the CQ construct in counseling research. It is too soon to make definitive assertions about when, where, or how CQ aligns with both historical counseling pedagogical approaches and research methods that address cultural competency.

Many counselor-training programs continue to promote “multiculturalism” as the way to increase the cultural competency of counselors. Empirically assessing or producing practical examples of multicultural counseling remains difficult (Patterson 2004; Weinrach & Thomas, 1998, 2004). A major complaint with “multicultural” counseling is that it is difficult to determine when multicultural counseling occurs. There does not seem to be an example readily available (Patterson, 2004; Weinrach, & Thomas, 2004).

CQ could provide a succinct process to address “culture” as it relates to interaction and communication in a cross-cultural ecology. The responsibility to make a cultural shift would transfer from the non-dominant member (i.e., client) to the dominant member (i.e., counselor). In order to train a counselor to recognize that a cultural shift has occurred, it would require a paradigm shift from simply teaching counselor trainees that cross-cultural clients may have different value and belief systems to a pedagogy that emphasizes a CQ process.

Lo and Fung (2003) stated that communication is the basis of therapeutic interventions. They asserted that the generic cultural competence (i.e., the knowledge and skill set needed in all cross-cultural encounters) required when working with clients from specific ethnocultural communities had two parts. Lo and Fung accurately stated that a client's life-experiences at the point of clinical contact, that will influence the eventual clinical outcome, "can be learned" (p. 162). They postulated that in order to avoid unjustified stereotypes therapists must learn to recognize the importance of appropriate inquiries into the client's culture.

There is little mention in Lo and Fung's (2003) study about specific training that might be needed to appropriately make a cultural shift. Lo and Fung searched for commonalities between the therapist and client, such as educational background in order to interact or communicate more effectively with the client. A high CQ counselor would seek to learn the interaction and communication norms of the client in order to interact and communicate within the client's cultural norms.

In present practice, it is still incumbent upon the non-dominant client to close any gaps in the communication norms. The communication or interaction norms of non-dominant cultures are rarely ever assessed for "commonalities" in order to better communicate with a dominant group member. This approach can lead clinicians to misattribute pathology to client's cultural interaction and communication norms (Chen et al., 1997).

Fortunately, emerging research places more emphasis on the aptitude of the clinician who is required to learn the “other’s” cultural interaction and communication norms (Earley & Ang, 2003).

TA

Discovering whether a relationship between CQ or I/C and TA existed would improve the field. After searching the literature, there were no articles found that discussed a relationship between CQ or I/C and TA. TA is a widely accepted counseling construct (Sarfan & Muran, 2006). Sarfan and Muran noted that the concept of alliance “highlights the fact that at a fundamental level the [client’s] ability to trust, hope, and have faith in the therapist’s ability to help always plays a central role in the change process” (p. 289). Few studies have focused on how the therapist’s culture affects interactive patterns that further TA (Hersoug, Høglend, Monsen, & Havik, 2001).

Most counselors endorse the “scientist practitioner” counseling model (Unbrit & Diane, 2003). The scientist practitioner model encourages sound research that produces data that can be applied. Accessing or referencing quality research needs to be a priority for counselor trainee development. Encouraging counselor trainees to better understand his or her “cultural-self” or learned interaction and communication behavioral norms may create opportunities to integrate culture into that process.

Conclusion

The results of this study determined that I/C is not a rich construct in reference to CQ. The results also showed that one does not have to shift a trainee's I/C in order to develop a more culturally intelligent counselor.

Acceptance of CQ as a useful counseling construct might potentially raise trainee awareness of “self” and “others.” It is imperative for further studies to determine a standardized scoring structure to determine standardized CQ scores. There are many ways that counselor educators might utilize CQ standardized scores. What is a pre-training baseline? Do emerging counselor trainees score higher in other types of assessments that measure empathy, therapeutic alliance, self-esteem, etc.? Do higher CQ individuals score higher on the Big-5 Personality, MMPI, or PF-16? Does the CQ correlate with any or all of the mentioned assessments or constructs? Future CQ correlations could include intrapersonal attributes such as social cognition.

CQ has a biological, experiential, and knowledge based etiology. Creating curriculum whose focus is CQ could potentially be integrated in a “multicultural” training model. According to Patterson (1996, 2004) mandatory curriculum that addresses multiculturalism only can produce racial stereotyping. By creating curriculum that includes training high CQ counselors, cultural competency could potentially reach new heights.

Bibliography

- Ackerman, P. L. (1996). A theory of adult intelligence development: Process, personality, interests, and knowledge. *Intelligence*, 22, 227-257.
- Ackerman, P. L. (2000). Domain-specific knowledge as 'dark matter' of adult intelligence: Gf/gc, personality, and interest correlates. *Journal of Gerontology*, 55, 64-68.
- Ackerman, P. L., & Heggestad, E. D. (1997). Intelligence, personality, and interests: Evidence for overlapping traits. *Psychology Bulletin*, 121(2), 219-245.
- Aiken, L. R. (1996). *Assessment of intellectual functioning* (2nd ed.). New York: Plenum Press.
- Alexander, J. C. (1980). Core solidarity, ethnic outgroup, and social differentiation: A multidimensional model of inclusion in modern societies. *National and Ethnic Movements*, 5-28.
- American Counseling Association (1992). *ACA Cross-Cultural Competencies and Objectives*. Retrieved December 5, 2005, from <http://www.counseling.org/Content/navigationMenu/RESOURCES/MULTICULTURALANDDIVERSITYISSUES/Competencies/Competencies.html>
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.

- Amiot C. E., & Bouris, R. Y. (2005). Discrimination between dominant and subordinate groups: The positive-negative asymmetry effect and normative process. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 44*, 289-308.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, C. (in press). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Groups and Organization Management*.
- Bailey, J. R. (2004). Navigating the cultural breach. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 3*(1), 99.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thoughts and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Benet-Martínez, V., & Karakitapoğlu-Aygün, Z. (2003). The interplay of cultural syndromes and personality in predicting life satisfaction: Comparing Asian Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34*(1), 38-60.
- Bernard, J. (1994). Multicultural supervision: A reaction to Leong, Wagner, and Cook. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 34*(2), 159-171.
- Bernard, J., & Goodyear, R. (1998). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Berry, J. W. (1994). Ecology and individualism and collectivism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kâğıtçıbaşı, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 77-84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bhugra, D. (2004). Cultural identities and cultural congruency: A new model for evaluating mental distress in immigrants. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 111*, 84-93.
- Boake, C. (2002). From Binet-Simon to the Wechsler-Bellevue: Tracing the history of intelligence testing. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology, 24*(3), 383-405.
- Bowers, C. A. (2001). Challenges in educating for ecologically sustainable communities. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 33*(2), 257-265.
- Bowker, R. R. (2004). Learning cultural dos and don'ts no longer effective in training global executives, managers. *Lifelong Learning Market Report, 22*, 2-4.
- Brewer, M. B., & Hewstone, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Self and Social Identity*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Brislin, R., Worthley, R., & Macnab, B. (2006). Cultural intelligence: Understanding behaviors that serve people's goals. *Group & Organization Management, 31*(1), 40-55.

- Caldwell-Harris, C. I., & Ayçiçeği, A. (2006). When personality and culture clash: The psychological distress of allocentrics an individualist culture and idiocentrics in a collectivist culture. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, 43(3), 331-361.
- Cayton, M. K., & Williams, P. W. (Eds.). (2001). *Ethnicity and race. Encyclopedia of American cultural and intellectual history*. New York: Scribner's Sons.
- Center, C. (2005). "Desperately looking for meaning:" Reading multiethnic texts. *Melus*, 30(2), 225-241.
- Chan, D. K. (1994). COLINDEX: A refinement of three collectivist measures. In U. K. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kâğıtçıbaşı, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 200-212). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chao, R. C-L. (2005) *Counselors' multicultural competencies: From gender and ethnicities perspectives*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Missouri Columbia.
- Chen, M., Froehle, T., & Morran, K. (1997). Deconstructing dispositions bias in clinical inferences: Two interventions. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 76, 74-81.
- Cherniss, C. (2000). *Emotional intelligence: What is it and why it matters*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA,

- Chu, Y., & Shaw, J. I. (2005). Causal chaining: Effects of behavioral domains and outcome valence on perceived causal structure. *Current Research in Social Psychology, 10*(14), 203-221.
- Church, T. A., Katigbak, M., Reyes, A. S., & Jensen, S. M. (1999). The structure of affect in a non-western culture: Evidence for cross-cultural comparability. *Journal of personality, (67)*3, 505-534.
- Churchill, W. (2004). The Crucible of American Indian Identity Native Tradition versus Colonial Imposition in Post conquest North America. Retrieved December 5, 2005, from http://www.multiworld.org/m_iversityhome.htm.
- Code of Federal Regulations (CFR, 25) (2004). Title 25, Indians, and 83.7, Washington DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Constantine, M. G., Wilton, L., & Caldwell, L. D. (2003). The role of social support in moderating the relationship between psychological distress and willingness to seek psychological help among Black and Latino college students. *Journal of College Counseling, 6*, 155-165.
- Cook, D. A. (1994). Racial identity in supervision. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 34*(2), 132-142.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Standards Education Programs. (2001). Retrieved November 24, 2005, from <http://www.cacrep.org/2001Standards.html>.

- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Standards Education Programs Directory of Accredited Programs (2006). Retrieved October 17, 2006, from <http://www.cacrep.org/CACREPDDirectory100506>.
- Darwish, A-F. F. & Huber, G. L. (2007). Individualism vs. collectivism in different cultures: A cross-cultural study. *Intercultural Education, 14*(1), 47-55.
- Deal, C. (2003). *Applications of the concepts of individualism and collectivism to intercultural training* (Report No. CS-511-401). Lanham MA: ERIC Processing and Reference Facility. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED-471-181).
- Dingman, S., Mrocza, M., & Brady, J. (1995). Predicting academic success for American Indian students. *Journal of American Indian Education, 34*, 10-17.
- Dunnette, M. D. (1976). Aptitudes, abilities, and skills. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 473-516). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Durkheim, E. (1933). *The division of labor in society*. (G. Simpson, Trans.). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press (Original work published 1887).
- Dykeman, C., & LaFleur, N. K. (1996). Counselors' adjective correlates of working alliance. *Psychological Reports, 78*, 563-570.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Earley, P. C., & Gibson, C. B. (1998). Taking stock in our progress on individualism-collectivism: 100 years of solidarity and community. *Journal of Management*, 24(3), 265-304.
- Earley, P. C., & Mosakowski, E. (2004). Best practice: Cultural intelligence, *Harvard Business Review*, 82, 139-146.
- Earley, P. C., & Mosakowski, E. (2005). Letters to the editor: Cultural intelligence. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(2), 140-141.
- Early, P. C., & Peterson, R. S. (2004). The elusive cultural chameleon: Cultural intelligence as a new approach to intercultural training for the global manger. *Academy of Management and Education*, 3(1), 100-115.
- Erdur, O., Rude, S., Barón, A., Daper, D., & Shankar, L. (2000). Working alliance and treatment outcome in ethnically similar and dissimilar client—therapist pairings. *Report Number 3, Research Reports of the Research Consortium of Counseling & Psychological Services in Higher Education*, 1, 1-14.
- Erez, M., & Earley, P. C. (1993). *Culture, identity, and work*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Estkell-Bloakland, M. L. (2005). Voice to the silent: An ecology of local knowledge in psychology. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from <http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd09142005080327/unrestricted/00front.pdf>.

- Fondiller, E. D., Rosage, L. J., & Neuhaus, B. E. (1990). Values influencing clinical reasoning in occupational therapy. *Occupational Therapy Journal of Research, 10*, 41-55.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gelfand, M. J., & Realo, A. (1999). Individualism-collectivism and accountability in intergroup negotiations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(5), 721-736.
- Graziano, W. G., Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Hair, E. C. (1996). Perceiving interpersonal conflict and reacting to it: The case for agreeableness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 820-835.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Pratkanis, A. R. (1984). The self. In R. S. Wyer & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (vol. 3, pp. 129-178). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Grimm, S. D., Church, A. T., Katigbak, M. S., & Reyes, J. S. (1999). Self-described traits, values, and mood associated with individualism and collectivism: Testing I-C theory in an individualistic (U.S.) and collectivist (Philippine) culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30*(4), 466-500.
- Guilford, J. P. (1967). *The nature of intelligence*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hampden-Turner, C., & Trompenaars, F. (2006). Cultural intelligence: Is such a capacity credible? *Group & Organization Management, 31*(1), 56-63.

- Hersoug, A. G., Høglend, P., Monsen, J. T., & Havik, O. E. (2001). Quality of working alliance in psychotherapy: Therapist variables and patient/therapist similarity as predictors. *The Journal of Psychotherapy Practice and Research, 10*, 205-216.
- Ho, D. Y. F., & Chui, C-Y. (1994). Component ideas of individualism, collectivism, and social organization: An application in the study of Chinese culture. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kâğıtçıbaşı, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 52-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Abridged ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holland, J. L. (1959). A theory of vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 6*, 35-45.
- Holland, J. L. (1973). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Huffman, T. (2003). A comparison of personal assessments of the college experience among reservation and non-reservation American Indian students. *Journal of American Indian Education, 42*, 1-16.
- Hui, C. H. (1988). Measurement of individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Research and Personality, 22*, 17-36.
- Ibarra, R. A. (2001). *Beyond affirmative action: Reframing the context of higher education*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS)*, (2005). White. Retrieved March, 10, 2006, from <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/glossary/index.asp?charindex=W>
- James, J. (2004). Cultural intelligence: Telling the new story. Retrieved November 20, 2005, from <http://www.jenniferjames.com/lectures/#telling>.
- James, W. (1890). *The principles of psychology* (Vols. 1-2). New York: Henry Holt & Co.
- Jetten, J., Postmes, T., & McAuliffe, B. J. (2002). We are all individuals': Group norms of individualism and collectivism, levels of identification and identity threat. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 32*, 189-207.
- Johnson, T. P., & Fendrich, M. (2002). A validation of the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, St Petersburg, Fl.

- Kâğıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1994). A critical appraisal of individualism and collectivism: Toward a new formulation. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kâğıtçıbaşı, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 52-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kâğıtçıbaşı, Ç., & Berry, J. W. (1989). Cross-cultural psychology: Current research and trends. *Annual Review of Psychology, 40*, 493-531.
- Kanter, R. M. (1968). Commitment and social organization: A study of commitment mechanisms in utopian communities. *American Sociological Review, 33*, 499-517.
- Kashima, Y., Siegel, M., Tanaka, K., & Kashima, E. S. (1992). Do people believe behaviors are consistent with attitudes? Toward a cultural psychology of attribution processes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 331*, 111-124.
- Kelly, K. T. (2004). Justification as truth-finding efficiency: How Ockham's razor works. *Minds and Machines, 14*, 485-505.
- Kihlstrom, J. F., & Cantor, N. (2000). Social Intelligence. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of intelligence* (2nd ed., pp. 359-379). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kihlstrom, J. F., Cantor, N., Albright, J. S., Chew, B. R., Klein, S. B., & Niedenthal, P. M. (1988). Information processing and the study of the self. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 21*, 145-178.

- Kim, U., Triandis, H. C., Kâğitçibaşı, Ç., Choi, S., & Yoon, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row Peterson.
- Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high-tech corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kunda, Z. (1987). Motivated inference: Self-serving generation and evaluation of causal theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(4), 636-647.
- Lane, H. W., DiStefano, J. J., & Maznevski, M. L. (2000). *International management behavior: Text, readings and cases*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Leary, M. R., & Tangney, J. P. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of self and identity*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Li, F., & Aksoy, L. (2007). Dimensionality of individualism-collectivism and measurement equivalence of Triandis and Gelfand's scale. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 42(3), 313-328.
- Li, Y., Cohen, A. S., & Ibarra, R. (2004). Characteristics of mathematics items associated with gender DIF. *International Journal of Testing*, 4(2), 115-136.

- Lo, H.-T., & Fung, K. P. (2003). Culturally competent psychotherapy. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 48*(3), 161-170.
- Lombroso, G. (1923). *The soul of woman*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.
- Lustig, M. W., & Koester, J. (1999). *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures* (3rd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Malpass, R. S. (1977). Theory and method in cross-cultural psychology. *American Psychologist, 32*, 1069-1079.
- March, R. M. (2005). Letters to the editor: Cultural intelligence. *Harvard Business Review, 83*(2), 140-141.
- Marcus, H., & Wurth, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 38*, 299-337.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*(2), 224-253.
- Markus, H. R., Kitayama, S., & Heiman, R. J. (1996). Culture and “basic” Psychological principles. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 857-913). New York: Basic Books.
- Mills, J., & Clark, M. S. (1982). Exchange and communal relationships. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 3*, 121-144.

- Moore, K. (2005). Letters to the editor: Cultural intelligence. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(2), 140-141.
- Moreland, R. L., & Levine, J. M. (1982). Socialization in small groups: Temporal changes in individual-group relations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 15, pp. 137-192). New York: Academic Press.
- Mulder, M. (1977). *The daily power game*. Leiden, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Nagayama-Hall, G. C. (2001). Psychotherapy research with ethnic minorities empirical, ethical, and conceptual issues. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 69, 502-510.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2005). Integrated postsecondary education data system (IPEDS) glossary. Washington DC: Department of Education.
- Ng, K.-Y., & Earley, P. C. (2006). Culture + intelligence: Old constructs, new frontiers. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 4-19.
- Niemonen, J. (1997). The race relations problematic in American sociology: A case study and critique. *The American Sociologist*, 28, 15-54.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14-37.
- Norusis, M. J. (2000). *SPSS 10.0: Guide to data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2003). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*(1), 3-72.
- Paige, R. M., & Martin, J. N. (1996). Ethics in intercultural training. In D. Landis & R. S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 35-60). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Parsons, T., & Shils, E. A. (Eds.) (1951). *Towards a general theory of action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Patterson, C. (1996). Multicultural counseling: From diversity to universality. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *74*, 227-231.
- Patterson, C. (2004). Do we need multicultural counseling competencies? *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, *26*, 67-73.
- Pedersen, P. B., Draguns, J., & Trimble, J. E. (Eds.). (1996). *Counseling across cultures* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peterson, B. (2004). *Cultural intelligence: A guide to working with people from other cultures*. Yarmouth, MA: Intercultural Press.
- Plucker, J. (2003). David Wechsler. Human Intelligence: Historical influences, current controversies, teaching resources. Retrieved February 28, 2006, from Indiana University, Web site:
<http://www.indiana.edu/~intell/wechsler.shtml>.
- Realo, A., Koido, K., Ceulemans, E., & Allik, J. (2002). Three components of individualism. *European Journal of Personality*, *16*, 163-184.

- Rhee, E., Uleman, J. S., & Lee, H. K. (1996). Variations in collectivism and individualism by in-group and culture: Confirmatory factor analyses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*(5), 1037-1054.
- Rolland, A. (1996). *Cultural pluralism and psychoanalysis*. New York: Routledge.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9*, 185-211.
- Salovey, P., Mayer, J. D., Goldman, S. L., Turvey, C., & Palfai, T. P. (1995). Emotional attention, clarity, and repair: Exploring emotional intelligence using the Trait Meta-Mood Scale. In J. W. Pennebaker (Ed.), *Emotion, disclosure, and health* (pp. 125-154). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (1994). *Intercultural communication* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Sarfan, J. D., & Muran, J. C. (2006). Has the concept of therapeutic alliance outlived its usefulness? *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 43*(3), 286-291.
- Schaffer, B. S., & Riordan, C. M. (2003). A review of cross-cultural methodologies for organizational research: A best-practices approach. *Organizational Research Methods, 6*(2), 169-215.

- Schoenfeld, A. H. (1987). What's all the fuss about metacognition? In A. H. Schoenfeld (Ed.), *Cognitive science and mathematics education* (pp. 1-31). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Shulruf, B., Hattie, J., & Dixon, R. (2003). Development of a new measure tool for individual and collectivism. Paper presented at the NZARE/AARE Joint Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Shweder, R., & Bourne, E. (1984). Does the concept of the person vary cross-culturally? In R. Shweder & R. LeVine (Eds), *Culture theory* (pp. 158-199). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, B. (2004). *Identity in modern society*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 29, 240-275.
- Sinha, D., & Tripathi, R. C. (1994). Individualism in a collectivist culture: A case of coexistence of opposites. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kâğıtçıbaşı, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 123-136). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stalinski, A. (2004). Organizational intelligence: A systems perspective. *Organization Development Journal*, 22(2), 55-62.

- Sternberg, R. J. (1988). *The triadic mind: A new theory of human intelligence*. New York: Viking.
- Sternberg, R. J., Conway, B. E., Ketron, J. L., & Bernstein, M. (1987). People's conceptions of intelligence. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 41*, 37-55.
- Stryker, S. (1987). Identity theory: Developments and extensions. In K. Yardley & T. Honess (Eds.), *Self and identity: Psychosocial perspectives* (pp. 89-103). London: John Wiley.
- Stryker, S., & Serpe, R. C. (1982). Commitment, identity, salience, and role behavior. In W. Ickes & E. S. Knowles (Eds.), *Personality, roles, and social behavior* (pp. 199-218). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 477-486.
- Sue, D. W., Ivey, A. E., & Pedersen, P. B. (Eds.). (1996). *A theory of multicultural counseling & therapy*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Swann, W. B., Jr. (1997). The trouble with change: Self-verification and allegiance to self. *Psychological Science, 8*(3), 177-180.
- Tafarondi, R. W., & Walters, P. (1999). Individualism-collectivism, life events and self-esteem: A test of two trade-offs. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29*, 797-814.

- Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2006). Motivational cultural intelligence, realistic job preview, realistic living conditions preview, and cross-cultural adjustment. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 154-173.
- Thales, (The Seven Sages) from *Diogenes Laertius, Lives of eminent philosophers Greek philosopher & scientist (635 BC - 543 BC)*.
- Thomas, D. C. (2006). Domain and development of cultural intelligence: The importance of mindfulness. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 78-99.
- Thomas, D. C., & Inkson, K. (2004). *Cultural intelligence*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its use. *Harper's Magazine*, 140, 227-235.
- Tönnies, F. (1957). *Community and association*. (Loomis, C. P. Trans.). New York: Harper Torchbooks. (Original work published 1887).
- Trafimow, D., & Finlay, K. (1996). The importance of subjective norms for a minority of people: Between-subjects and within-subjects analyses. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(8), 820-828.
- Trafimow, D., Triandis, H. C., & Goto, S. G. (1991). Some test of the distinction between the private and collective self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(5), 649-655.

- Triandis, H. C. (1989). Self and social behavior in differing social contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 269-289.
- Triandis, H. C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 41-133). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1993). Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 27, 155-180.
- Triandis, H. C. (1994). Theories and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kâğıtçıbaşı, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 41-51). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995a). *Individualism & collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995b). Motivation and achievement in collectivist and individualist cultures. In M. L. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement: Culture, motivation, and achievement* (pp. 1-30). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (2006). Cultural intelligence in organization. *Group & Organization Management*, 31(1), 20-26.

- Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Villareal, M. J., Asai, M., & Lucca, N. (1988). Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(2), 323-338.
- Triandis, H. C., Chen, X. P., & Chan, D. K. S. (1998). Scenarios for the measurement of collectivism and individualism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29(2), 275-289.
- Triandis, H. C., Chan, D. K.-S., Bhawuk, D. P. S., Iwao, S., & Sinha, J. B. P. (1995). Multimethod probes of allocentrism and idiocentrism. *International Journal of Psychology*, (30)4, 461-480.
- Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 118-128.
- Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., & Clack, F. L. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19, 395-415.
- Triandis, H. C., & Suh, E. M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 133-160.
- Triandis, H. C., & Trafimow, D. (2001). Cross-national prevalence of collectivism. In C. Sedikides & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), *Individual self, relational self, collective self* (pp. 259-276). Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

- Trompenaars, F., & Woolliams, P. (2000). *When two worlds collide*. Amsterdam: THT, Intercultural Management Consulting.
- Unbrit, G. A., & Diane, A. B. (2003). Professionalism's change to professional collective identity. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 81*(1), 3-8.
- Van De Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (2000). Methodological issues in psychological research on culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31*(1), 33-51.
- Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S., (2005). Cultural intelligence: an essential capability for individuals in contemporary organizations. *globalEdge*. Retrieved December 05, 2006 from <http://globalEdge.msu.edu>.
- Vinje, D. (1996). Native American economic development on selected reservations: A comparative analysis. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 55*(4), 427-442.
- Weber, M. (1930). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York: Routledge.
- Wechsler, D. (1940). Nonintellective factors in general intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin, 37*, 444-445.
- Wechsler, D. (1981). The psychometric tradition: Developing the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 6*, 82-85.

- Weinrach, S., & Thomas, K. (1996). The counseling profession's commitment to diversity-sensitive counseling: A cultural reassessment. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74*, 473-477.
- Weinrach, S., & Thomas, K. (1998). Diversity-sensitive counseling today: A postmodern clash of values. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 76*, 115-122.
- Weinrach, S., & Thomas, K. (2004). The AMCD multicultural competencies: A critically flawed initiative. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 26*, 81-93.
- Wirtz, P. W., & Longabaugh, R. (2001). Methodological assessment and critique. In R. Longabaugh & P. Wirtz (Eds.), *Project MATCH hypothesis: Results and Causal chain analysis* (pp. 296-304). Bethesda, MA: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.
- Wiseman, R. L. (Ed.). (1995). *Intercultural communication theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wyer, R. S., & Srull, T. K. (1989). *Memory and cognition in its social context*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Yamaguchi, S. (1994). Collectivism among the Japanese: A perspective from the self. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, Ç. Kâğıtçıbaşı, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 77-84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ziller, R. C. (1965). Toward a theory of open and closed groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 64, 164-182.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Diagnosing Your Cultural Intelligence

These statements reflect different facets of cultural intelligence. For each set, add up your scores and divide by four to produce an average. Our work with large groups of managers shows that for the purposes of your own development, it is most useful to think about your three scores in comparison to one another. Generally, an average of less than 3 would indicate an area calling for improvement, while an average of greater than 4.5 reflects a true CQ strength.

Rate the extent to which you agree with each statement, using the scale:

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree.

I have confidence that I can deal well with people from a different culture _____

I am certain that I can befriend people whose cultural backgrounds are different than mine _____

I can adapt to the lifestyle of a different culture with relative ease _____

I am confident that I can deal with a cultural situation that's unfamiliar _____

Total _____ ÷ 4 = _____ Emotional/Motivational CQ

Note. From: Earley, P.C., & Mosakowski, E. (2005). Cultural intelligence. *Harvard Business Review*, 82, P. 143.

Appendix B

The 20 Item Four Factor Cultural Intelligence Scale

Read each statement and select the response that best describes your capabilities. Select the answer that BEST describes you AS YOU REALLY ARE

(1=strongly disagree; 6=strongly agree)

CQ Questionnaire Items

Factor

CQ-Behavior:

- BEH1 I change my verbal behavior (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it. _____
- BEH2 I change my non-verbal behavior when a cross-cultural situation requires it. _____
- BEH3 I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations. _____
- BEH4 I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it. _____
- BEH5 I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it. _____

Note. Ang, S., Van Dyne, L. & Koh, C. (in press). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence, *Groups and Organization Management*. © Cultural Intelligence Center, 2004. Used by permission of the authors and the Cultural Intelligence Center.

Appendix C

Demographic Information

1. Age: _____
 2. Gender: Male _____ Female _____
 3. Nationality: American _____ Non-American _____
 4. Race: White _____ Non-White _____
-

Note.

White is a label associated with a person or group who claims a Caucasian European biological connection, and who claims origins to the original people groups of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa (IPEDS, 2005).

Non-White/Non-European Descent is a label associate with a person or group that is not White. A non-White person cannot claim a Caucasian European biological connection, and cannot claim origins to the original people groups of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa (NCES, 2005).

Appendix D

ICIDS

This questionnaire is anonymous, and there are no right or wrong answers. We want to know if you strongly agree or disagree with some statements. If you strongly agree, enter 6 in the blank space; if you strongly disagree, enter a 1 in that space

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 Strongly Agree

We now have a set of scenarios. Each scenario is followed by four options. Please place yourself mentally in that situation and rank the options by placing a 1 next to the option you consider the best or the most “right” or “appropriate”. Place a 2 next to the next best option and a 4 next to the least good option.

2. You and your friends decided spontaneously to go out to dinner at a restaurant. What do you think is the best way to pay the bill?
 - a. Split it equally without regard to who ordered what _____
 - b. Each person decides how much to contribute to the total and if it does not cover the bill, each person is assessed inversely proportionally to what she/he has contributed _____
 - c. The group leader pays the bill or decides how to split it _____
 - d. Compute each person’s charge according to what that person ordered _____
-