

# ADJUSTMENT OF CHINESE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC: THE ROLE OF CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE AND ETHNOCENTRISM

<sup>a</sup>MIROSLAV JURÁSEK, <sup>b</sup>PETR WAWROSZ

*University of Finance and Administration, Estonská 500,  
Prague, Czech Republic*

*email: <sup>a</sup>jurasek.miroslav@mail.vsf.cz, <sup>b</sup>wawrosz.petr@mail.vsf.cz*

Acknowledgments: The result was created in solving the student project No. 7427/2020/06 "Intercultural communication: the research on the concept of cultural intelligence (CQ)" using objective oriented support for specific university research of the University of Finance and Administration".

**Abstract:** The article deals with two factors that affect the process of cross-cultural adaptation of foreigners in the Czech Republic in opposite directions: cultural intelligence (CQ) and ethnocentrism (ETN). Three hypotheses were tested: 1) cultural intelligence and its subdimensions (metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, behavioral) are positively related to intercultural adaptation, 2) ethnocentrism affects adaptation negatively, 3) the positive relationship between CQ and adaptation is weakened by ethnocentrism. The first two hypotheses were confirmed using a PLS-SEM statistical technique on a sample of 84 Chinese students studying at several Czech universities, and the third was rejected. In addition, the latent CQ construct was validated as a hierarchical component model. Means for easier adaptation of students/workers during a long-term stay in a culturally foreign environment are briefly also discussed.

**Keywords:** cultural intelligence, intercultural adaptation, ethnocentrism, Chinese students, PLS-SEM, hierarchical component model

## 1 Introduction

Applications for obtaining a temporary stay in the Czech Republic vary. Most often ask Americans for family reasons. Ukrainians, Vietnamese and Moldovans ask because of employment and business. Kazakhstan and Belarusians ask for their studies (Marešová 2016). According to the statistics of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports in the school year 2021/2022 (at 31<sup>st</sup> December 2021), 52,109 foreigners studied at Czech universities (public and private), of which 320 were students from China. Of the total number of foreign students, 50% studied in the given school year in the bachelor's study program, 17% in the master's study program, 24% in the follow-up master's study program and 9% in the doctoral study program. Quick adaptation to local conditions, way of life, different practices (often completely different from one's own), customs, etc. is important for every newcomer from the point of view of their life satisfaction and well-being (Sousa & Gonçalves 2017) or work performance. As he can cope with the effects of culture shock more quickly and get used to a new culture, he can focus more on fulfilling work (or study) tasks (Chen, Lin & Sawangpattanakul 2011). Therefore, it is important to examine the factors that facilitate intercultural (or also cross-cultural) adaptation and, conversely, those that make it difficult.

It is relatively well known that cultural intelligence (CQ) expresses an individual's ability to operate effectively in a culturally different environment and be successful there (Ang et al. 2007). A number of studies have confirmed that cultural intelligence has a positive effect on the level of adaptation (ADJ) (Chao, Takeuch & Farh 2017; Guðmundsdóttir 2015; Shu, McAbee & Ayman 2017). However, there is no consensus among researchers on how the individual components of CQ (metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, behavioral) contribute to this adaptation. It is also relatively well known that ethnocentrism (ETN) acts as a brake on effective intercultural communication and impairs the process of adaptation (Michailova, Piekkari, Storgaard & Tienari 2017; Thomas 1996; Wu, Bodigerel, & Koehler 2013). However, the relationship between cultural intelligence and adaptability is not too much studied.

In this study, ethnocentrism acts as a moderator of the direct relationship between CQ (= independent variable) and ADJ (= output variable) and is understood as a certain contextual variable (relatively constant over time) that characterizes individuals. It is reasonable to assume that a person with ethnocentric views and a worldview will be less able to adapt to a culture (country) that he considers significantly inferior to his

own. Long-term stay abroad (Triandis 2006) usually develops intercultural competences (expressed by CQ), but it can also happen that based on one's own (perhaps even negative) experience and observation, one realizes the value of one's culture and its ethnocentric tendencies. The current (and mutual) role of cultural intelligence and ethnocentrism as two opposing forces in the mechanism of intercultural adaptation is not yet sufficiently clarified.

The aim of this study is to understand the process of adaptation of foreigners in the Czech Republic in the context of differences between two cultural environments: own and foreign. The more demanding and complex the two cultures are, the more difficult and complex the adaptation will be. This makes the significance of both variables (CQ, ETN) in the adaptation process better. The mechanism of adaptation in a culturally foreign environment is being investigated in Chinese university students. According to Hofstede's cultural dimensions, (e.g., Hofstede 2003) the Czech Republic and China are culturally dissimilar countries, which differ in at least three dimensions: distance, individualism vs. collectivism and avoiding insecurity. Data for this study were collected at several Czech universities among mostly foreign students; however, the research (ETN) of the moderated direct relationship between CQ and ADJ was conducted only on an ethnically homogeneous group of Chinese students. As CQ (motivational component) has been found to be related to general intercultural adaptation regardless of age and gender (Ang, Van Dyne, Koh & Ng 2007), the results obtained may not necessarily apply to academia alone, but are likely to be generalized to all foreigners (working or studying) residing abroad for a long time (in culturally different regions).

The paper is organized as follows. Individual constructs such as cultural intelligence (incl. individual components of CQ), adaptation, and ethnocentrism are firstly defined and described. Furthermore, three hypotheses are formulated in support of the existing literature and logical connections: 1. positive relationship between CQ and ADJ, 2. negative relationship between ETN and ADJ, 3. moderation (weakening) of the direct relationship CQ-ADJ due to ethnocentric thinking. Subsequently, the methodological part (data collection, respondents, analytical procedure) is described and the results are presented. Finally, some suggestions on how to mitigate the effects of the ethnocentric worldview are briefly discussed.

## 2 Literature review

### 2.1 Cultural intelligence

The construct of cultural intelligence (CQ) arose from the growing interest in non-academic forms of intelligence. The conceptualization of CQ was motivated by the practical reality of globalization (Mahembe & Engelbrecht 2014). The CQ construct was developed by Ang et al. and is defined as "the ability of an individual to function effectively to function in a culturally diverse environment and to cope with related situations" (Ang - Van Dyne 2015) involving contact with people from culturally diverse backgrounds in terms of race, ethnicity, nationality. This construct is based on intelligence theory: it consists of four components (metacognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral) that integrate different personality types (Crowne 2013). It is consistent with Gardner's perspective of intelligence (Gardner 2011), i.e. as certain abilities to adapt and adapt in a new (unknown) environment; a clear overlap that distinguishes it from other types of intelligence clearly exists here, as it relates exclusively to phenomena characterized by cultural diversity and diversity. Cultural intelligence is a unique approach to understanding situations where intercultural interactions occur; it is an expression of the different intellectual ability of an individual who is in a certain intercultural environment (Starčević, Petrović & Komnenić 2017).

The first component of CQ is metacognitive CQ, which refers to the processes used by individuals to acquire and understand a certain (cultural) knowledge. An individual with a developed CQ component determines a certain strategy of contact with foreigners in advance. In this sense, he carefully prepares and considers the short-term (or long-term) goals of his work in a culturally new environment. In addition, it plans (and intuitively correctly anticipates) certain measures that must be taken to succeed in dealing with foreigners within the set strategy. The plan focuses on three aspects: oneself, the stranger, and a specific environment. The individual is able to project himself into the feelings of his culturally different partner and look at the world through his eyes. In direct contact with foreigners, he is fully (in real time) aware of (or perceives in detail) this intercultural situation, i.e. how this interaction affects himself and his partner. Aware of the differences, he can refrain from premature and hasty conclusions about the course of the meeting until he has enough information (Van Dyne et al. 2012). After the first two phases, i.e. setting the strategy and drawing up the plan, comes the third phase: control. An individual with a high metacognitive CQ thinks about the end of the encounter (and new experiences), compares the set plan with reality, and adjusts his mental map (settings) if the reality differs from his expectations. The experience gained is processed and evaluated.

The second component is cognitive CQ. It concerns the knowledge and knowledge that an individual has about cultural institutions, standards, practices and conventions from different cultural backgrounds. Cultural knowledge is twofold: objective and subjective. In the first case, there are artifacts and cultural practices observable and visible to the naked eye, such as knowledge of economics (capitalism vs. socialism), law (continental vs. common law), political system (monarchy vs. democracy), traditional cultures (matriarchy vs. patriarchy, norms of social interaction (e.g. guanxi concept), religion, typical gender roles, socio-linguistic theories (incl. dialects and relevant vocabulary), nonverbal behavior (proximity, gesticulation, etc.), or Subjective cultural knowledge means a less visible (observable) psychology of culture: values, norms, beliefs and basic assumptions from which society draws its spiritual legacy (masculinity vs. femininity, individualism vs. collectivism, avoidance of insecurity, or power inequality in society.) Thanks to knowledge of a cultural nature, an individual with a high cognitive CQ better understands the influences that shape behavior and actions in different cultural environments and it is easier to imagine how different cultures differ from each other (or in what they resemble). Based on the acquired cultural knowledge, this individual is able to apply different cultural concepts to specific countries (e.g. in distinguishing high and low contextual cultures knows that the Japanese communicate indirectly, based on a certain context, Brazilians openly express their emotions, Indians have respectful respect for authorities etc.); they are well acquainted with cultural differences depending on certain professional groups (diplomats, managers, teachers) or demographic characteristics (by age, gender, education).

The third subdimension of CQ is motivational. It refers to an individual's ability to direct his or her strength, attention, and energy toward learning and functioning effectively in situations characterized by cultural otherness. The source of inspiration for the formation of motivational CQ are motivational theories such as expected value models, social cognitive theories, self-determination theories (Van Dyne et al. 2012: 303), which explain not only immediate (rather than permanent) differences between individuals, but also certain contextual variables beyond the control of the individual. The three components of motivational CQ are internal interest, external interest and belief in their ability to successfully adapt in a new cultural environment. A person has an inner interest if he evaluates a certain cultural diversity on his own (or for himself), because he has a feeling of inner satisfaction. Contact with people from different cultures, elements of novelty in intercultural interactions brings this individual pleasure, (often quiet) joy and personal fulfillment, which comes only from his inner (and inner setting) and are not dependent on other circumstances and

contextual factors. On the contrary, external interest is defined as the effort to achieve tangible personal gain (eg, thanks to foreign experience, to have better prospects of getting a better job, to increase one's reputation, to be promoted, to get higher responsibility). Self-confidence (as a third feature of motivational CQ) refers to one's own belief in being able to succeed in performing various tasks (activities) in an intercultural context. The individual feels that he or she can adapt to the new cultural environment and will be able to cope with the stress that these situations bring. Motivational CQ is associated with the belief that the individual will be able to communicate with people (local, co-workers) who come from other cultures. An important concept related to motivational CQ is self-efficacy, which is seldom translated into Czech. Its author is the Canadian-American psychologist Albert Bandura (Bandura 1977).

The fourth dimension of cultural intelligence is behavioral CQ. It concerns the ability of an individual to adapt a wide repertoire of verbal and nonverbal expressions to a specific intercultural situation. Thanks to this component, people control and regulate their social behavior in intercultural communication so as to prevent misperceptions and interpretations of their message from the other side and to avoid communication misunderstandings. Three types of communication behavior have been identified (Van Dyne et al. 2012): a) verbal (different accents, change of voice tone, melody, adjustment of speed, speech volume and style of expression, appropriate insertion of pauses and pauses), b) nonverbal (gestures, facial expressions, proxemics, eye and physical contact, e.g. during health), c) specific speech acts (words and phrases used to express a certain message; form of request, apology, expression of gratitude, disagreement, which is always governed by certain local standards). The means of communication used in one cultural environment may not be appropriate and appropriate in another. Therefore, people need to flexibly change their expressions and means of communication depending on the environment in which they find themselves, in order to avoid certain cultural faux pas.

## 2.1 Intercultural adjustment

Intercultural adjustment is defined as "the degree of psychological comfort and familiarity that an individual has in his or her new environment" (Templer, Tay & Chandrasekar 2006). According to another definition (Akhil & Liu 2019), it is a process in which it behaves and reacts to its surroundings in order to comply with it or not deviate from normal. Support for the organization (employer), support for the social community in the new environment, networking, previous training in cultural skills, knowledge of the language of the host country and special personality traits (Akhil & Liu 2019) help to better adapt.

Intercultural adjustment is a complex, multi-layered concept. It covers three main areas: a) at a general level, i.e. adjustment to the culture of the host country and local living conditions, b) at the social level, i.e. the smooth establishment of interpersonal relationships with members of the local community (ethnicity, culture), c) at the level of work / study, i.e. acceptance and identification with organizational culture, work habits, human resources management, company management, etc.; this area also concerns study in terms of differences in education systems, teacher attitudes, classroom climate, etc. The three-dimensional model working with different types of obstacles and difficulties that an individual has to deal with and deal with abroad has been confirmed by a number of previous studies (Fitzpatrick 2017). Successful intercultural adjustment in the new culture reduces stress and psychological pressure, which results in increased work performance (Mehra & Tung 2017). However, the adjustment is not automatic. Conversely, many people who go (or are sent) to work abroad find it not easy to adapt culturally; he therefore often returns home prematurely (Akhil & Liu 2019).

## 2.2 Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism is one of the important concepts of the social sciences today. It is an important component of modern

nationalism and is associated with the formation of prejudices. Accompanying features of ethnocentrism are adverse effects on harmonious relationships between groups. This phenomenon is explained by a number of theories of social psychology: the theory of authoritarian personality, the theory of agreement of beliefs, the theory of realistic conflict and the theory of social identity. William Graham Sumner is widely regarded as a pioneer in the study of ethnocentrism. Sumner defined this concept in terms of the self-centeredness of one's own ethnic group and a negative understanding of all external groups (Bizumic et al. 2009).

Ethnocentrism is an example of cultural relativism. It is a tendency to evaluate and interpret the surrounding world only from the perspective of one's own culture (Prücha 2004). In intercultural oriented managerial literature, ethnocentrism expresses a certain attitude towards the categorization of cultural groups (Thomas & Peterson 2017). Ethnocentrism is an obstacle to communication (Browaey & Price 2015). Defining the other (s) occurs through self-perception, and in the case of ethnocentrism, the frame of reference is primarily one's own culture. Members of a certain culture relate to other people only through the prism of their own culture. Ethnocentrism inextricably defines belonging to a particular socio-cultural, ethnic or ethnic group.

Human beings are essentially ethnocentric (Miele & Nguyen 2019); Many people tend to think that their cultural norms are commonly accepted outside of their own social environment. Many researchers (Lee, Crawford, Weber & Dennison 2018) consider ethnocentrism to be a universal tendency among people that manifests itself in all cultures; in general, ethnocentrism is considered a negative trait that leads to negative phenomena, especially during intercultural interactions. A high level of ethnocentrism is dysfunctional because it creates obstacles to communication with foreigners or understanding of various intercultural situations; leads to misperceptions and subsequent misinterpretation of the behavior of people from other cultures, to whom it is given a different meaning than it has.

### 3 Materials and methods

#### 3.1 Hypothesis about relation between cultural intelligence and intercultural adjustment

There is a clear link between cultural intelligence and cross-cultural adaptation, although these are still different constructs. Cross-cultural adaptation captures the daily experience of well-being and peace during a temporary stay abroad, while CQ refers to a sense of competence to adapt and work effectively in an environment where intercultural contacts and interactions take place (Chao, Takeuchi & Farh 2017). CQ and rapid adjustment have a positive effect on an employee's work performance. For CQ's personal disposition to be reflected in performance (positive), an environment with certain multicultural features is needed (Moon 2013). If this condition is met, CQ plays an important role in the quality of interpersonal relationships, which shows very well, for example, in international business activities (Charoensukmongkol 2015). Thanks to the developed CQ, the individual quickly adapts to a new (culturally unknown) environment, does not shy away from the team, is not afraid to explore original ideas, approaches work tasks and problems creatively (Darvishmotevali, Altinay & De Vita 2018) and more willingly shares his ideas, experiences, and knowledge for the benefit of the whole multinational corporation (Jiang, Le & Gollan 2018). This is because CQ helps to overcome cultural barriers, reduce stress; in addition, it facilitates intercultural contact and interaction. Metacognitive and cognitive CQs are a positive predictor of the employee's personal goals with the goals of the organization. As employees can adapt to the new (intercultural) work environment thanks to their high CQ, they are more involved in the work processes and actions that take place within the organization (Chen 2015). Although certain personality traits such as extraversion, diligence, and openness to new experiences are important for intercultural adaptation, it also depends to a large extent on how CQ is developed. Virtually the

whole construct (in all its components) is important for adaptation in everyday matters (general adaptation), social and work (academic) adaptation (Guðmundsdóttir 2015; Shu, McAbee & Ayman 2017). E.g., it was found that due to the high behavioral CQ score, individuals respond more flexibly to unusual cultural situations (Ang & Van Dyne 2015). If the right motivation is lacking, the relationship between CQ and intercultural adjustment in general applies regardless of gender, age and nationality (Ang et al. 2004). Without a developed CQ (especially cognitive, behavioral and motivational components), previous work experience abroad will not help to better adapt (in all respects) (Lee & Sukoco 2010). It is not even enough to live in a certain country to become an expert in the local culture. According to contact theory, occasional contact with local culture does not necessarily increase cultural knowledge. It is necessary to be proactive, to look for different situations of a cultural nature, to participate in various local practices and rituals; take for granted and regularly practice local, live the typical life of a local citizen. Getting to know the local culture and customs promotes quality (not cursory, superficial) contact with the locals (Chao, Takeuchi & Farh 2017).

Based on previous research and the characteristics of both constructs, we hypothesize that cultural intelligence positively affects intercultural adaptation. H1: Cultural intelligence positively predicts intercultural adaptation.

#### 3.2 Hypothesis about relation between ethnocentrism and intercultural adjustment

An obstacle to adjustment and a successful stay abroad can be if one has an ethnocentric worldview while working abroad and comes into contact (not only working) with people who are culturally different from him (Thomas 1996). This may be the case, in particular, when he comes from an economically developed world and is posted to more lagging countries, i.e., his country enjoys a certain privileged position from which the inhabitants benefit practically from birth without deserving to do so. Foreigners are less able to adapt at work if they perceive the ethnocentric thinking of their surroundings. In addition to other stressors felt by all employees, this thinking will have an additional negative effect on them; in this case, he does not have to work for the organization with determination and full commitment (Florkowski & Fogel 1999). Even a foreign manager will get used to his new job and adapt to change worse if his subordinates (coming from this country) have ethnocentric attitudes and opinions towards him. These either exist a priori (before the arrival of a superior - a foreigner), or they develop in response to the inability to live well with their job requirements and demands (Templer 2010). Ethnocentrism is an obstacle to competent intercultural communication, damages relationships with local people and worsens interaction adaptation (Wu – Bodigerel & Koehler 2013). Based on logical reasoning supported by previous research (Michailova et al. 2017), it can be stated that an ethnocentrist-minded person will have a harder time getting used (professionally and generally) to a new relationship with another culture outside their country (will be less flexible in their responses to change). It is also harder to socialize with its culturally different colleagues and people from its new (temporary) residence abroad because it can look at them with a certain ethnic superiority, hidden ridicule and contempt. These feelings (perhaps hidden, but still felt) can prevent you from establishing closer (friendly) relationships with your new environment.

H2: Ethnocentrism is negatively related to adaptation.

#### 3.3 Impact of ethnocentrism on the relationship between CQ and intercultural adjustment

The discussion about the relationship between CQ and ethnocentrism has started relatively recently, but the evidence presented is far from clear (Young, Haffeejee & Corsun 2017). Ethnocentrism can be both a predictor (Ang et al. 2007) and an output variable in relation to CQ (Triandis 2006). Harrison (2012) confirmed the presumed negative relationship between

the two constructs, but no longer addressed the question of which quantity predicts the other. Further research (Barbuto, Beenen & Tran 2015) supported the findings of the study by Ang et al. (2007); it has been shown that motivational CQ is influenced by ethnocentrism. CQ has a dampening effect on ethnocentrism (Triandis 2006). An inverse relationship applies to both constructs: higher CQ is associated with lower ethnocentrism (Young, Haffeejee & Corsun 2017). However, in the light of other research (Bernardo & Presbitero 2017), this conclusion is no longer so clear-cut; international experience (one of the CQ antecedents) may raise the need to defend one's own culture (= a certain form of ethnocentrism) and lead to a tendency to exaggerate cultural differences between cultures, i.e. to think more rigidly about cross-cultural differences. It is also strange (and interesting) that the negative relationship found between ethnocentrism and CQ does not apply to the preference of domestic goods over foreign ones (measured by consumer ethnocentrism). This has been explained by consumer theory: while at national level national interests are at stake and preferential behavior, the consumer pursues his own interests and satisfaction, which is why ethnocentric consumers unexpectedly show a higher CQ (Pratono & Arli 2020).

There are several overlapping and interrelated variables between CQ and ethnocentrism. Therefore, despite the lack of studies that would directly confirm this relationship, it can be inferred indirectly. E.g. polyculturalism, i.e. the belief that there are more interacting cultures in the world or also multiculturalism, i.e. respect for other cultures, acts against ethnocentrism and at the same time polyculturalism was found to be related to CQ (Bernardo & Presbitero 2017). Another circumstantial evidence for the existence of a relationship between ethnocentrism and CQ is the theory of social dominance. This theory explains, *inter alia*, ethnocentrism (Bizumic et al. 2009). At the same time, it has been shown that there is a negative relationship between the orientation towards social dominance and the development of CQ; social dominance is the obvious link between the two constructs (Alexandra 2018). Another link is personality traits. Openness to new experiences and friendliness (tendency to cooperate, kindness, generosity and trustworthiness) are negatively related to prejudices (Ekehammar, Akrami, Gylje & Zakrisson 2004). In addition, flexibility, open mind and empathy are associated with motivational CQ (Ward - Fischer 2008). There is a clear sense of ethnocentrism in all of these output variables. The negative relationship between CQ and ethnocentrism can be indirectly deduced from another study (Korzilius, Bücker & Beerlage 2017). If multiculturalism (as the opposite of ethnocentrism) has a positive effect on CQ, then ethnocentrism must be negatively related to CQ.

In several studies, ethnocentrism has moderated CQ's relationship to other variables, such as foreign language skills, intercultural skills training at university, regular daily contact with people from other cultures, and experiences from traveling abroad. The authors of one study (Lee et al. 2018) hypothesized (and in part demonstrated) that these relationships are stronger for a group of students with lower levels of ethnocentrism than for a group of students who are more ethnocentric. The ethnocentric worldview is also created (and maintained) based on inherent individual dispositions. Long-term intercultural experience may reinforce certain stereotypes (such as ethnocentrism), which may affect, for example, the willingness to work abroad or negatively affect otherwise desirable outcomes associated with CQ (Livermore 2008; Priest, Dischinger, Rasmussen & Brown 2006). Another moderator between CQ (motivational component) and ethnocentrism is cultural identity (Peng, Van Dyne & Oh 2015). Cultural identity expresses the degree to which an individual perceives his own connection with members of the culture from which he comes (in the sense of sharing values with this culture). People with a strong cultural identity are less adaptable. They may even exhibit certain ethnocentric reactions to cultural otherness because they are unable to switch flexibly between cultural symbols and characters. Because they do not understand people who are "other", they express various negative judgments about them, and therefore these (ethnocentric) individuals are less effective

in an intercultural environment. Based on the above research and logic conclusions, the following hypothesis is formulated:

H3: Ethnocentrism weakens the positive effect of cultural intelligence on adaptation.

### 3.4 Data collection and sample

The online questionnaire was created in English. The link to the questionnaire was sent by university e-mail during the winter semester of the academic year 2021/22 or distributed via chat of certain platforms (such as MS Teams), in which online teaching took place at some universities. A Chinese student also helped collect the data, distributing the link via social networks to Chinese students studying at Czech universities. Students at several Czech universities (private and public) were addressed: VŠFS, Metropolitan University in Prague, VŠE (Prague), Charles University, CTU, Czech University of Life Sciences in Prague and others. A total of 194 respondents completed the questionnaire. Subsequently, only a group of Chinese students worked. 53 (63.1%) female students participated in the research, 31 (36.9%) students most often under the age of 24 (63 students; 75%). 46 (54.8%) respondents studied in a bachelor's degree program, 32 (38.1%) in a master's degree program and 6 (7.1%) in a doctoral degree program. 44 (52.4%) respondents had experience of a stay abroad (study, work or other) lasting 1 - 3 years, 15 (17.9%) lasting 3 - 5 years. 14 (13.1%) respondents declared sporadic contact with foreigners (local residents), 32 (38.1%) have occasional contact, 34 (40.5%) frequent and only 4 (4.8%) respondents were in permanent residence. contact with foreigners. 29 (34.5%) respondents rated their knowledge of English as excellent, 43 (51.2%) as candidates, 11 (13.1%) respondents described their knowledge of English as poor, 1 (1.2%) respondent did not speak this language at all. 24 (28.6%) respondents do not speak Czech at all, 41 (48.8%) respondents know the basics of Czech, 8 (9.5%) of them speak this language at a sufficient level and only 11 (13.1%) respondents' knowledges of Czech as excellent.

### 3.5 Measurement scales

Cultural intelligence was measured using the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS), known and often used in intercultural research (Ang et al. 2007), which measures human proficiency in cultural diversity situations on a seven-point Likert scale (Kaleramna, Saharan, and Singh 2019). It is a second-order reflective construct, which consists of four factors (components, dimensions): metacognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral first-order reflective constructs (Costers, Vaerenbergh & Van den Broeck 2019). Several studies (e.g. Ang et al., 2007) have confirmed that Cronbach's alpha CQS is high and satisfactory (Starčević, Petrović & Komnenić 2017). The 4-factor structure of the CQ construct and discriminant validity have also been demonstrated (Ang et al., 2007). A high CQ score indicates a better understanding of the new culture and local customs, which results in effective and appropriate behavior and leads to adaptation in an unfamiliar environment. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha for total CQ is very high (0.950), suggesting a problem with multicollinearity. To solve this problem, the CQ variable was investigated as a hierarchical component model (HCM).

Intercultural adaptation was measured on a 5-point scale using one of the most researched (most reliable) scales (Black & Stephens 1989). The measurement used consists of three dimensions (general, social and work / study) numbering 14 items. In this study, the third dimension was adapted to the university environment (Chao, Takeuchi, and Farh 2017). Respondents were asked to decide on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = zero adjustment to, 5 = very good adjustment or accustomed to) to what extent they adapted (or did not adapt) to various aspects of their stay in the Czech Republic. Cronbach's alpha equals 0.807 for general adaptation, 0.943 for adaptation in interaction with local ones; third dimension (academic adaptation) Cronbach's alpha showed a very value (0.941), resp. 0.955 for overall adjustment. Due to certain problems in scale

measurement, the subdimension was academic adaptation, and following the example of another study (Sharma & Hussain 2019), the target variable was a tailored construct composed of two dimensions: general and interaction.

Neuliep (2002) created and validated several questionnaires to measure ethnocentrism. He performed the first validation of his scale in the USA. The measurement of ethnocentrism in general (GENE) contains 21 items, 11 of these statements are formulated positively (Neuliep referred to as factor 1), 10 statements are formulated negatively (referred to as factor 2). The individual items have been created to reflect the concept of ethnocentrism that can be experienced by anyone, regardless of the culture they come from. Several adjustments were made in the following versions of the questionnaire: a) the word "country" was replaced by "culture", b) several items were reworded for clarity, c) several items from the original version were deleted, d) several new items were added. The answers were recorded on a five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Neuliep's scale of measuring ethnocentrism was also used in cultural intelligence research (Young, Haffeejee & Corsun 2017), although in this case the original GENE questionnaire was largely modified to 7 items; The purpose of this questionnaire was to find out individual perceptions of ethnicity, assimilation and attitudes towards multiculturalism. In our study, the revised GENE questionnaire was used in the English version, numbering 22 items. 7 of these items have only a balancing function: it balances the number of positively and negatively formulated questions (Neuliep 2002). Three items have been recoded. Cronbach's alpha for this construct showed a very high value (0.936).

#### 4 Results

The collected data were subjected to further analysis using IBM SPSS 19 and SmartPLS programs (v.3.3.2). Although PLS-SEM works efficiently with small samples and complex models and requires virtually no basic data assumptions (it is essentially nonparametric), Hair et al. (Hair Jr, Hult, Ringle & Sarstedt 2016) recommend evaluating whether or not the data is normally distributed. As the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test showed, the data are normally only distributed for the CQ variable (Pallant 2020). Extreme values were also checked in the data set, which are usually eliminated from the analysis (they can significantly affect the final results), if there is no explanation for them. However, the data did not show an anomaly in this regard. The structure of the data and the individual responses of the respondents were also examined in detail to reveal certain biases. In several cases (for some variables), cases with a very low standard deviation were found, which means that the respondent answers questions and statements in a monotonous manner and probably does not seem to be very interested in research. However, after considering several facts (sample size and extent of these "doubtful" cases), no answers were therefore excluded from the analysis. Based on the recommendations (Hair Jr et al. 2016), incomplete answers were replaced by the average values of individual indicators, as they were missing less than 5% per indicator.

Since the construct of cultural intelligence consists of four factors, a hierarchical component model or higher order model was created to test the proposed theoretical model. This often happens due to the reduction of the complexity of the relationships in the model and in the interest of stronger parsimony of the model, or in an effort to avoid collinearity problems (Hair Jr et al. 2016). In this sense, the recommendations of Rockstuhl & Van Dyne (2018) are followed, who conceptualized CQ as a two-factor theoretical model: latent CQ factor (explains the shared variance between all CQ items) and four specific CQ factors, i.e. metacognitive, cognitive, motivational, behavioral, which explain the variance of specific factors in CQ items. The total CQ is an aggregated multidimensional construct that is constructed as a linear combination of five factors in a two-factor model. Using the PLS-SEM method, it is possible to observe each CQ dimension independently through a higher order construct, which by

definition HCM is a full mediator (Hair Jr et al. 2016) in the process of indirect relationship between each CQ component and adaptation. PLS-SEM allows each dimension of CQ to be analyzed separately with the possibility to present different theoretical explanations for each factor separately (Ott & Mikhail 2018).

There are four main types of hierarchical component models (Hair Jr et al. 2016). Although CQ can be modeled in the reflective-formative mode of the hierarchical component model (Vlajicic, Caputo, Marzi & Dabic 2019), in accordance with a number of other studies (Charoensukmongkol 2015; Gabel, Shemueli, Westman, Chen & Bahamonde 2019; Thomas 2015) the CQ construct was modeled in reflective - reflective mode in this study. Schlögel & Sarstedt (2016) performed a confirmatory four-factor analysis in PLS-SEM, which supported the original version of the reflective CQ model, although they believe that some dimensions of CQ (especially cognitive) should be designed more formatively than reflectively. For the reflective model, 1) indicators (i.e., observed variables of each of the dimensions) are highly correlated and interchangeable, 2) components (factors, dimensions) are not the result of a linear combination of indicators (or observed variables) and 3) each of the indicators represents effects of individual dimensions (Frias, Jamilena, Sabiote, Ortiz, Martín-Santana, Beerli & Palacio 2018).

Based on the literature, our CQ model is defined in a reflective-reflective mode as a latent second-order construct composed of four dimensions: metacognitive, cognitive, motivational and behavioral. The hierarchical component model was validated using a consistent PLS algorithm using a confirmatory factor analysis test using the repeated indicator approach. The charges of all twenty indicators of the CQ construct in its four dimensions range from 0.725 to 0.916, respectively. 0.570 - 0.787 for repetitive indicators for the latent variable, which fully meets the minimum criterion (= 0.5) for the reliability of the indicators, and therefore none of them had to be eliminated (Hair Jr et al. 2016). Then, a consistent PLS bootstrapping technique was performed and found that for all dimensions of CQ, t values are significantly greater than 2, i.e. statistically significant, and CQ as a second-order construct was thus validated. Subsequently, the scores of the latent variable CQ were calculated using the PLS algorithm.

The charges, validity and reliability of the other variables forming the conceptual model, i.e., ethnocentrism (ETN) and adaptation (ADJ), were also checked. The three items at the construct were recoded. Items with a charge of less than 0.7 (with two exceptions) were eliminated from the questionnaire. Other items were eliminated from the questionnaire in an effort to improve measurement indicators and avoid collinearity problems. In terms of achieving convergent validity, charge indicators were monitored (values should be greater than 0.70), AVE (> 0.50), in terms of reliability of internal consistency, it is an indicator of compound reliability (expected values: 0.60 - 0.90) and Cronbach's alpha (expected values: 0.60 - 0.90), in terms of discriminatory validity, the HTMT confidence interval should not contain 1, which was met. The following values were obtained: for adaptation (AVE = 0.698, CR = 0.941, Cronbach's alpha = 0.926), for ethnocentrism (AVE = 0.657, CR = 0.945, Cronbach's alpha = 0.936). The resulting values are quite high for both constructs (except for the AVE indicator), however, they are not greater than 0.950, which would be very undesirable, because then the items measure the same phenomenon (i.e., they are semantically redundant).

Furthermore, the scores of latent variables for all constructs were calculated, ie ethnocentrism (independent variable) and adaptation (dependent variable). The dependent variable (intercultural adaptation) was first examined for a three-factor construct, which was validated in SmartPLS as a higher-order construct for three dimensions (as well as the latent variable CQ). As a preliminary analysis showed that the independent variable (ethnocentrism) was not significant for the school subdimension, in the next analysis this dimension was

completely omitted from the construct following the example of another study (Sharma-Hussain 2019) conducted among university students. The results were obtained using PLS Algorithm and PLS bootstrapping tests. Hypothesis H3 (moderating the influence of ethnocentrism on the relationship between CQ and intercultural adaptation) was investigated in PLS using the two-stage approach technique recommended by Hair et al. (Hair Jr et al. 2016) if the constructs are not (as in our case) modeled formatively and the goal of bootstrapping is to reveal the significance of the moderating effect.

Tab. 1: Results of bootstrapping analysis

Hypothesis	Relationship	$\beta$	SD	t-value	Decision	LL CI 2.5%	UL CI 97.5%
H1	CQ->ADJ	0.769	0.061	12.628***	ANO	0.631	0.871
	ETN->ADJ(3)	-0.122	0.065	1.840	NE	-0.256	0.003
H2	ETN->ADJ	-0.218	0.079	2.789***	ANO	-0.372	-0.059
H3	CQ*ETN->ADJ	0.097	0.070	1.526	NE	-0.036	0.237

$\beta$  = correlation coefficients between variables, SD = standard deviation, (LL CI) = lower confidence interval limit, (UL CI) = upper confidence interval limit, CQ = cultural intelligence (CQ), ADJ = adaptation, ETN= ethnocentrism as a moderator of the relationship between CQ (independent variable) and ADJ (dependent variable), \*\*\* (p < 0.01)

Table 1 shows the results of the bootstrapping analysis. Hypothesis H1 predicted a positive relationship between cultural intelligence and intercultural adaptation. Our data confirmed this hypothesis; the result is also statistically significant ( $\beta = 0.769$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). H1 is accepted. Hypothesis H2 predicted that there was a negative relationship between ethnocentrism and intercultural adaptation. The data confirmed this hypothesis ( $\beta = -0.218$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). Hypothesis H2 is accepted, but only for two subdimensions of intercultural adaptation: general and interaction (not for adaptation at school). Ethnocentrism does not exert its influence on academia, only in the general level of the adaptation process and in its interaction with local people. Nor can it be argued that this variable moderates the relationship between cultural intelligence and intercultural adaptation ( $\beta = 0.097$ ;  $p > 0.05$ ). The result is not statistically significant. Hypothesis H3 is thus rejected.

## 5 Discussion and conclusion

This empirical study deals with the mechanism of adaptation in a culturally unknown environment to the population of foreigners who apply for a temporary stay in the Czech Republic to study. The target group was Chinese students studying at Czech universities. The data were collected in the form of an online questionnaire at several Czech universities. The ability to adapt quickly and begin to function effectively in a new cultural environment has been linked to two variables: cultural intelligence and ethnocentrism. The first is a personal disposition to succeed in a culturally foreign environment and quickly deal with the negative phenomena that come to an unknown country usually brings, such as cultural shock, anxiety and stress (Sozibilir & Yesil 2016). This construct reflects (and indirectly includes) a number of factors that facilitate stays abroad and improve adaptability to local customs and practices such as individual personality traits (extraversion, openness to new experiences) (Presbitero 2018), language skills (Shannon - Begley 2008), previous international experience in the form of intercultural travel (Crowne 2008), work experience from culturally different countries (Takeuchi, Tesluk, Yun & Lepak 2005), life (residence) in different cultural environments (Tarique & Takeuchi 2008) or quality, frequency of intercultural social contacts in the form of diversity of social contacts of everyday life (Wang, Heppner, Wang & Zhu 2015), work with foreigners, i.e. routine interactions with them (Koo Moon, Kwon Choi & Shik Jung 2013). The second variable, ethnocentrism, expresses a distinctive understanding and definition of one's own ethnicity (culture, country) in relation to other ethnic groups

(cultures, countries). While the first variable (CQ) helps individuals to adapt in a culturally new environment, the second (ETN) works in the opposite direction and complicates adaptation.

The results of this study can contribute to the current understanding of the positive impact of cultural intelligence on an individual's ability to better adapt to a culturally new environment (Guðmundsdóttir 2015; Shu-McAbee-Ayman 2017), as the complex CQ construct was model in relation to adaptation. The analysis shows that all components of CQ are involved in adaptation. Although the adaptation construct was modeled in this study only for the general dimension (adaptation to a different standard of living, habits, etc.) and the social dimension (concerning contact with local people), ie the third dimension of work (study) adaptation as the main reason for staying abroad was deleted from the construct due to unconvincing measurement results of this subdimension, it can be assumed that well-being (satisfaction) from the easier course of adaptation in one area will be transferred (extended) to other spheres of life (Sambasivan, Sadoughi & Esmaeilzadeh 2017). The transfer of positive emotions, attitudes, moods and behaviors from work to private life (and vice versa) is explained by spillover theory.

Ethnocentrism is to some extent related to cultural identity (Peng, Van Dyne & Oh 2015). If a person is strongly connected with his country (culture), he will probably have difficulty getting used to and quickly adapting to change. While cultural identity in terms of the degree of connection with one's own culture is not limited to other cultures (countries), this is not the case for ethnocentrism: an ethnocentric person is also proud of his country (culture), but at the same time elevates it above others whom he despises. This attitude of life worsens the possibilities of adaptation in a foreign culture, as this study has shown. Thomas (1996) recommended blunting ethnocentrism in individuals potentially planning long-term stays abroad, thorough preparation before departure, for example, by increasing the frequency of cross-cultural contacts at home (and later abroad) or by training cultural skills. Thomas (1996) also recommended taking an active interest in life experiences and strategies in bicultural minorities. This could help them develop a bicultural or multicultural identity.

A study of the literature has shown that ethnocentrism moderates relationships between other variables (Lee et al. 2018). Although we assumed, based on the literature and logical reasoning, that ethnocentrism would set a certain context in the CQ-adaptation relationship and act as a weakening moderator of this relationship, our data did not confirm this hypothesis. In this respect, a larger sample would probably lead to more accurate results, although it is not very small (respondents made up about a tenth of the total population of Chinese students in the Czech Republic) and the SmartPLS program used can work with small files, i.e., it provides reliable outputs in these cases (Hair Jr et al., 2016). In addition to increasing the size of the sample, the research design can be improved in other ways, such as a modified measurement technique (instead of self-evaluation, the data would come from other entities, classmates, teachers). This study, following the example of others (Ang et al. 2007), showed that CQ is a predictor of ethnocentrism, but a longitudinal experimental study would be needed to definitively confirm this causality. In the future, it is also possible to include in the questionnaire survey the measurement of another variable, social desirability in order to avoid various distortive effects caused, for example, by the respondents' efforts to answer in terms of what is socially desirable and appropriate.

The proposed model introduced a new contextual (and relatively stable) variable into the study of the direct relationship CQ - ADJ: ethnocentrism. But it is also possible to suggest in the future that a certain dynamic of this relationship be taken into account and to examine how another moderator will have to adapt: a culture shock. In addition, the latent variable CQ does not necessarily have to be modeled in the reflective - reflective

mode as in this study, but in accordance with the literature also in another mode (reflective - formative).

### Literature:

1. Akhal, K., Liu, S. (2019): Cultural intelligence effects on expatriates' adjustment and turnover intentions in Mainland China. *Management Research Review: MRN; Patrington*, Vol. 42, No. 7, pp. 818–836.
2. Alexandra, V. (2018): Predicting Cq Development in the Context of Experiential Cross-Cultural Training: The Role of Social Dominance Orientation and the Propensity to Change Stereotypes. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, Vol. 17, No. 1.
3. Ang, S., Van Dyne, L. (2015): Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness, and nomological network. *Handbook of cultural intelligence*. Routledge, pp. 21–33.
4. Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C. – Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007): Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and organization review*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 335–371.
5. Bandura, A. (1977): Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, Vol. 84, No. 2, pp. 191.
6. Barbuto, J. E., Beenen, G., Tran, H. (2015): The role of core self-evaluation, ethnocentrism, and cultural intelligence in study abroad success. *The International Journal of Management Education*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 268–277.
7. Bernardo, A., Presbitero, A. (2017): Belief in polyculturalism and cultural intelligence: Individual- and country-level differences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 119, pp. 307–310.
8. Bizumić, B. (2012): Theories of ethnocentrism and their implications for peacebuilding. *Peace Psychology in the Balkans*. Springer, pp. 35–56.
9. Bizumić, B., Duckitt, J., Popadić, D., Dru, V., Krauss, S. (2009): A cross-cultural investigation into a reconceptualization of ethnocentrism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 39, No. 6, pp. 871–899.
10. Black, J. S., Stephens, G. K. (1989): The influence of the spouse on American expatriate adjustment and intent to stay in Pacific Rim overseas assignments. *Journal of management*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 529–544.
11. Browaeys, M.-J. Price, R. (2015): *Understanding Cross-Cultural Management 3rd Edn* (Vol. Third edition). Harlow: Pearson.
12. Chao, M. M., Takeuchi, R., Farh, J.-L. (2017): Enhancing Cultural Intelligence: The Roles of Implicit Culture Beliefs and Adjustment. *Personnel Psychology; Durham*, Vol. 70, No. 1, pp. 257–292.
13. Charoensukmongkol, P. (2015): Cultural intelligence of entrepreneurs and international network ties The case of small and medium manufacturing firms in Thailand. *Management Research Review*, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 421–436.
14. Chen, A., S. (2015): CQ at work and the impact of intercultural training: An empirical test among foreign laborers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 47, pp. 101–112.
15. Chen, A., S., Lin, Y., Sawangpattanakul, A. (2011): The relationship between cultural intelligence and performance with the mediating effect of culture shock: A case from Philippine laborers in Taiwan. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 246–258.
16. Costers, A., Vaerenbergh, Y., Van den Broeck, A. (2019): How to boost frontline employee service recovery performance: the role of cultural intelligence. *Service Business*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 581–602.
17. Crowne, K. A. (2008): What leads to cultural intelligence? *Business Horizons*, Vol. 51, No. 5, pp. 391–399.
18. Crowne, K. A. (2013): An Empirical Analysis of Three Intelligences. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, Vol. 45, No. 2, pp. 105.
19. Darvishmotevali, M., Altinay, L., De Vita, G. (2018): Emotional intelligence and creative performance: Looking through the lens of environmental uncertainty and cultural intelligence. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 73, pp. 44–54.
20. Ekehammar, B., Akrami, Nazar – Gylje, Magnus – Zakrisson, Ingrid (2004): What matters most to prejudice: Big five personality, social dominance orientation, or right-wing authoritarianism? *European journal of Personality*, Vol. 18, No. 6, pp. 463–482.
21. Fitzpatrick, F. (2017): Taking the “culture” out of “culture shock” –a critical review of literature on cross-cultural adjustment in international relocation. *critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 278–296.
22. Florkowski, G. W., Fogel, D. S. (1999): Expatriate adjustment and commitment: The role of host-unit treatment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 783–807.
23. Frías-Jamilena, D. M., Sabiote-Ortiz, C. M., Martín-Santana, J. D., Beerli-Palacio, Asunción (2018): Antecedents and consequences of cultural intelligence in tourism. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, Vol. 8, pp. 350–358.
24. Gabel-Shemueli, R., Westman, M., Chen, S., Bahamonde, D. (2019): Does cultural intelligence increase work engagement? The role of idiocentrism-allocentrism and organizational culture in MNCs. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management; Bingley*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 46–66.
25. Gardner, H. (2011): *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Hachette Uk.
26. Gozzoli, C., Gazzaroli, D. (2018): The Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS): A Contribution to the Italian Validation. *Frontiers in psychology*, Vol. 9, p. 1183.
27. Guðmundsdóttir, S. (2015): Nordic expatriates in the US: The relationship between cultural intelligence and adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 47, pp. 175–186.
28. Hair Jr, Joseph F – Hult, G Tomas M – Ringle, Christian – Sarstedt, Marko (2016): *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Sage publications.
29. Harrison, N. (2012): Investigating the impact of personality and early life experiences on intercultural interaction in internationalised universities. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 224–237.
30. Hofstede, G. (2003): *Culture's Consequences, Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*. Sage Publications.
31. Jiang, Z., Le, H., Gollan, P.J. (2018): Cultural intelligence and voice behavior among migrant workers: the mediating role of leader-member exchange. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 29, No. 5, pp. 1082–1112.
32. Kaleramna, N., Saharan, T., Singh, U. (2019): Cultural Intelligence Stimulating Professional Adjustment. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research; Arden*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 1–7.
33. Koo Moon, H., Kwon Choi, B., Shik Jung, J. (2013): Comprehensive examination on antecedents of cultural intelligence: case of South Korea. *Personnel Review*, Vol. 42, No. 4, pp. 440–465.
34. Korzilius, H., Bückner, J., Beerlage, S. (2017): Multiculturalism and innovative work behavior: The mediating role of cultural intelligence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 56, pp. 13–24.
35. Lee, J.J., Crawford, A., Weber, M.R., Dennison, D. (2018): Antecedents of Cultural Intelligence Among American Hospitality Students: Moderating Effect of Ethnocentrism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 167–183.
36. Lee, L.-Y., Sukoco, B. (2010): The effects of cultural intelligence on expatriate performance: the moderating effects of international experience. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 21, No. 7, pp. 963–981.
37. Livermore, D. (2008): Cultural intelligence and short-term missions. *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement and application*, pp. 271–285.
38. Mahembe, B., Engelbrecht, A. S. (2014): A preliminary study to assess the construct validity of a cultural intelligence measure on a South African sample. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 1–8.

39. Mehra, N., Tung, N. S. (2017): Role of Adjustment as a Mediator Variable between Cultural Intelligence and Well-Being. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology; Chennai*, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 286–295.
40. Michailova, S., Piekkari, R., Storgaard, M., Tienari, J. (2017): Rethinking ethnocentrism in international business research. *Global strategy journal*, Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 335–353.
41. Miele, J., Nguyen, V. H. (2019): On par with the rest: first-generation college students and cultural intelligence. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, pp. 1–9.
42. Moon, T. (2013): The effects of cultural intelligence on performance in multicultural teams. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol. 43, No. 12, pp. 2414–2425.
43. Neuliep, J. W. (2002): Assessing the reliability and validity of the generalized ethnocentrism scale. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 201–215.
44. Ott, D. L., Michailova, S. (2018): Cultural Intelligence: A Review and New Research Avenues. *International Journal of Management Reviews; Oxford*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 99–119.
45. Pallant, J. (2020): *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. Routledge.
46. Peng, A. C. – Van Dyne, Linn – Oh, Kyoungjo (2015): The Influence of Motivational Cultural Intelligence on Cultural Effectiveness Based on Study Abroad: The Moderating Role of Participant's Cultural Identity. *Journal of Management Education; Thousand Oaks*, Vol. 39, No. 5.
47. Pratoño, A.H., Arli, D. (2020): Linking global consumer culture and ethnocentric consumerism to global citizenship: exploring the mediating effect of cultural intelligence. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, Vol. 40, No. 7/8, pp. 659–675.
48. Presbitero, A. (2018): Extraversion, Openness to Experience, and Global Career Intention: The Mediating Role of Cultural Intelligence. *Journal of Employment Counseling; Alexandria*, Vol. 55, No. 3, pp. 104–114.
49. Priest, R. J., Dischinger, T., Rasmussen, S., Brown, C. M. (2006): Researching the short-term mission movement. *Missiology*, Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 431–450.
50. Průcha, Jan (2004): *Interkulturní psychologie*. Portál.
51. Rockstuhl, T., Van Dyne, L. (2018): A bi-factor theory of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence: Meta-analysis and theoretical extensions. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, Vol. 148, pp. 124–144.
52. Sambasivan, M., Sadoughi, M., Esmaeilzadeh, P. (2017): Investigating the factors influencing cultural adjustment and expatriate performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management; Bradford*, Vol. 66, No. 8, pp. 1002–1019.
53. Schlägel, C., Sarstedt, M. (2016): Assessing the measurement invariance of the four-dimensional cultural intelligence scale across countries: A composite model approach. *European Management Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 6, pp. 633–649.
54. Shannon, L. M., Begley, T. M. (2008): Antecedents of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications*, pp. 41–55.
55. Sharma, N., Hussain, D. (2019): Role of Cultural Intelligence in Acculturation: Explorations on a Physiognomic Minority Diaspora in India. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, Vol. 48, No. 3, pp. 274–291.
56. Shu, F., McAbee, S. T., Ayman, R. (2017): The HEXACO personality traits, cultural intelligence, and international student adjustment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 106, pp. 21–25.
57. Sousa, C., Gonçalves, G. (2017): Expatriates and Non-Expatriates: Effects of Cultural Intelligence and Multicultural Personality on Passion for Work and Satisfaction With Life. *Psychological Thought; Trier*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 90–108.
58. Sozbilir, F., Yesil, S. (2016): The impact of cultural intelligence (CQ) on cross-cultural job satisfaction (CCJS) and international related performance (IRP). *Journal of Human Sciences*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 2277–2294.
59. Starčević, J., Petrović, D., Komnenić, D. (2017): Validation of the cultural intelligence scale on a Serbian sample. *Primenjena Psihologija*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 165–184.
60. Takeuchi, R., Tesluk, P. E., Yun, S., Lepak, D. P. (2005): An integrative view of international experience. *Academy of management Journal*, Vol. 48, No. 1, pp. 85–100.
61. Tarique, I., Takeuchi, R. (2008): Developing cultural intelligence: The roles of international nonwork experiences. *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications*, pp. 56–70.
62. Templer, K. J. (2010): Personal attributes of expatriate managers, subordinate ethnocentrism, and expatriate success: A host-country perspective. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 21, No. 10, pp. 1754–1768.
63. 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*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 154–173.
64. Thomas, D. C. (2015): Cultural intelligence. *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management*, pp. 1–3.
65. Thomas, D. C., Peterson, M. F. (2017): *Cross-cultural management: Essential concepts*. Sage Publications.
66. Thomas, K. M. (1996): Psychological privilege and ethnocentrism as barriers to cross-cultural adjustment and effective intercultural interactions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No. 7, pp. 215–228.
67. Triandis, H. C. (2006): Cultural intelligence in organizations. *Group & Organization Management*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 20–26.
68. Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., Ng, K. Y., Rockstuhl, T., Tan, M. L., Koh, C. (2012): Sub-dimensions of the four factor model of cultural intelligence: Expanding the conceptualization and measurement of cultural intelligence. *Social and personality psychology compass*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 295–313.
69. Vljacic, D., Caputo, A., Marzi, G., Dabic, M. (2019): Expatriates managers' cultural intelligence as promoter of knowledge transfer in multinational companies. *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 94, pp. 367–377.
70. Wang, K. T., Heppner, P. P., Wang, L., Zhu, F. (2015): Cultural intelligence trajectories in new international students: Implications for the development of cross-cultural competence. *International Perspectives in Psychology: Research, Practice, Consultation*, Vol. 4, No. 1, p. 51.
71. Ward, C., Fischer, R. (2008): Personality, cultural intelligence, and cross-cultural adaptation. *Handbook of cultural intelligence (Ed SLVD Ang)*, pp. 159–73.
72. Ward, C., Fischer, R., Lam, F. S. Z., Hall, L. (2009): The Convergent, Discriminant, and Incremental Validity of Scores on a Self-Report Measure of Cultural Intelligence. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 69, No. 1, pp. 85–105.
73. Wu, W.-Y., Bodigerel-Koehler, M. (2013): The mediating effects of cross-cultural dynamic competencies on the relationship between multicultural personality and cross-cultural adjustment. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 24, No. 21, pp. 4026–4045.
74. Young, C. A., Haffeejee, B., Corsun, D. L. (2017): The relationship between ethnocentrism and cultural intelligence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol. 58, p. 31–41.
75. Zhang, Y., Oczkowski, E. (2016): Exploring the potential effects of expatriate adjustment direction. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 158–183.

#### Primary Paper Section: A

#### Secondary Paper Section: AE, AH