Masthead Logo

2010

The Development and Validation of the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale

Tamra Portalla

Guo-Ming Chen
University of Rhode Island, gmchen@uri.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/com_facpubs

The Development and Validation of the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale

Tamra Portalla & Guo-Ming Chen
University of Rhode Island

The present study developed and assessed reliability and validity of a new instrument, the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES). Based on a review of the literature, 76 items important for intercultural effectiveness were generated. A total of 653 college students rated these items in two separate stages and generated a 20-item final version of the instrument which contains six factors. An assessment of concurrent and predictive validity from 246 participants in the final stage indicates that the IES was significantly correlated with other related scales. Implications and limitations of the study are discussed as well.

The importance of the study of intercultural communication competence has been increasing because of the impact of globalization on human society. However, the study also continues to be plagued with problems of conceptual ambiguity and the lack of valid instruments for measuring the concept. Although more and more scholars have made an effort to reduce this confusion (e.g., Chen & Starosta, 1996; Deardorff, 2009), more research is still needed.

Intercultural communication competence (ICC) can be conceptualized as an individual's ability to achieve their communication goal while effectively and appropriately utilizing communication behaviors to negotiate between the different identities present within a culturally diverse environment. ICC is comprised of three dimensions, including intercultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity, and intercultural effectiveness (Chen & Starosta, 1996).

Intercultural awareness represents the cognitive process by which a person comes to know about their own and others' cultures. Intercultural sensitivity is the affective aspect which not only represents the ability of an individual to distinguish between the different behaviors, perceptions, and feelings of a culturally different counterpart, but also the ability to appreciate and respect them as well (Chen & Starosta, 1997). Intercultural effectiveness dictates the behavioral aspect of ICC, which refers to the ability to attain communication goals in intercultural interactions. Scholars from different disciplines have tried to conceptualize intercultural awareness and intercultural sensitivity and develop measuring instruments for the two concepts (e.g., Bennett, 1986; Chen & Starosta, 1998; Hanvey, 1987; Turner, 1968). There remains a lack of research on the concept of intercultural effectiveness. It was then the purpose of this study to focus on intercultural effectiveness by developing and validating a measuring instrument of the concept.

Conceptualization of Intercultural Effectiveness

Intercultural effectiveness and intercultural communication competence are often used indistinctly by scholars, which not only reflects the problem of conceptual ambiguity, but also causes confusion in research (Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1978; Ruben 1976; Wiseman 2003). In order to avoid the problems of ambiguity and confusion, Chen and Starosta (1996) argued that intercultural effectiveness should only refer to "intercultural

adroitness" or the behavioral aspect of intercultural communication competence. In other words, intercultural effectiveness corresponds to communication skills, including both verbal and nonverbal behaviors, which enable individuals to attain their communication goals in intercultural interaction through an appropriate and effective performance.

Scholars have identified various components to account for interculturally effective behaviors, which can be organized into five categories: message skills, interaction management, behavioral flexibility, identity management, and relationship cultivation (Chen, 1989, 2005; Martin & Hammer, 1989; Ruben, 1977; Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009).

Message Skills

Message skills refer to the ability to use the language of a culture other than one's own, and in doing so the individual must "exercise one's counterpart's verbal and nonverbal behaviors" (Chen, 2007, p. 102). According to Rubin (1982), those verbal and nonverbal behaviors of message skills comprise four components: (1) communication codes—the appropriate use of words, pronunciation, grammar, and nonverbal signals as well as the ability to listen; (2) oral message evaluation—the ability to identify main ideas, distinguish fact from opinions, differentiate informative and persuasive messages, and take notice when another does not understand the message; (3) basic speech communication skills—the ability to express ideas clearly and concisely, defend a point of view, organize messages so they can be understood, effectively ask and answer questions, give concise directions, and summarize messages; and (4) human relations—the ability to describe another's point of view, explain differences in opinion, express feelings to others, and perform social rituals.

Message skills are dictated by the process of self-disclosure (Bochner & Kelly, 1974; Duran, 1983; Wheeless & Grotz, 1976), which "must be regulated by the principle of appropriateness in order to reach a successful outcome" (Chen, 2007, p. 102). Therefore, the self-disclosure must demonstrate the ability to use the expected messages and the understanding of the expectation for acceptable behaviors in intercultural interaction (Wiseman, 2003). In other words, what makes behaviors acceptable or effective will fluctuate depending on the specific cultural constraints and situations.

Interaction Management

Interaction management is "displayed through taking turns in discussion, and initiating and terminating interaction based on an accurate assessment of the needs and desires of others" (Ruben & Kealey, 1979, p. 18). Interaction management has been found to be an important element of intercultural communication competence (Koester & Olebe, 1988; Martin & Hammer, 1989; Ruben, 1976). Interaction management is primarily concerned with the procedural aspects that sustain an interaction, and competency is directly related to an individual's ability to handle those procedural aspects (Wiemann, 1977). In addition to initiating and terminating interaction, Spitzberg (1997) pointed out that there should be a smooth exchange of speaking turns, and "the more a person actually knows how to perform the mannerisms and behavioral routines in a cultural milieu, the more knowledgeable this person is likely to be in communicating generally with others in this culture" (p. 384).

The cultivation of interaction management skills is dependent on the continuous concern for the interests and orientations of others within an interaction (Chen, 2009). Five components of interaction management confined by culturally sanctioned rules have been outlined by Wiemann (1977): "(1) interruptions of the speaker are not permitted; (2) one person talks at a time; (3) speaker turns must interchange; (4) frequent and lengthy pauses should be avoided; and (5) an interactant must be perceived as devoting full attention to the encounter" (p. 199). Moreover, genuine responsiveness and attentiveness, as well as perceptiveness, play a crucial role in showing involvement and commitment to the other person in the process of interaction management (Cegala, Savage, Brunner, & Conrad, 1982).

Behavioral Flexibility

Behavioral flexibility refers to the ability to observe an interaction, distinguish and make use of the appropriate behaviors, and adapt to the specific situational context (Bochner & Kelly, 1974). Duran (1983) indicated that while individuals must appropriately choose their behaviors, they must also adjust their goals within that interaction to better strategize and adapt to the situation. Therefore, individuals with the ability of behavioral flexibility are "accurate and adaptable when attending to information, and are able to perform different behavioral strategies in order to achieve communication goals" (Chen & Starosta, 1996, p. 368). Behavioral flexibility was considered to be an important element of intercultural effectiveness (Imahori & Lanigan, 1989; Martin & Hammer, 1989; Ruben, 1977; Wiseman, 2003). According to Chen (2007), behaviorally flexible persons can integrate various communication demands in different contexts. Behavioral flexibility can be accomplished by the use of verbal intimacy cues, face saving devices, and the choices of relational messages in interaction (Wiemann, 1977).

In order to be adaptable when combining the different attitudes, values, and beliefs of a culture together with an infinite number of possible communication interactions, individuals must be aware of their own physical and social environment (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984). Moreover, in addition to understanding one's own familiar surroundings as a basis for comparison, "the development of behavioral flexibility is dependent on the cognitive awareness of cultural variations and the affective ability in self-monitoring" (Chen, 2007, p. 105).

Identity Management

An individual's identity is shaped and influenced largely in the process of interaction by internalizing one's experiences (Wood, 2008). Whether this communication is with a family member, peer, or random member of society, each interactant plays a role in defining the individual's identity. Intercultural communication poses additional complexity in the management of an individual's identity because each person has a significant and separate cultural identity that needs to be negotiated, maintained, and supported by both individuals involved. In other words, identity management allows an individual to maintain their counterpart's identity, which is formed through the verbal and nonverbal interaction. Identity management as well was identified as an important element of communicating effectively in intercultural context (Chen, 2007; Collier, 2005; Kim, 2009; Martin, 1993).

As Collier (1989) indicated, intercultural communication competence is demonstrated as an individual's ability to effectively and appropriately advance the other's cultural identity, which is not only avowed and confirmed by each individual, but also reiterates the many different identities that are salient within the interaction. Ting-Toomey (2005) further pointed out that the management of cultural identities is a form of facework which competent intercultural communicators must be able to reconcile.

Relationship Cultivation

Relationship cultivation refers to "the ability to establish a certain degree of relationship with one's partner in order to satisfy each others needs and reach a positive outcome of interaction" (Chen, 2007, p. 106). Hammer, Gudykunst, and Wiseman (1978) found that the ability to establish an interpersonal relationship is vital in the nourishment of intercultural effectiveness. An individual can take on or play different roles in various situations. Although individuals may vary in the amount of effort they contribute toward these situations, relational roles taken on by individuals can build a supportive environment in groups where all members can come together (Ruben, 1976). Ruben also found that through the use of nonverbal and verbal behavior the group can achieve such positive outcomes as conflict resolution, group consensus, and the creation of a group dynamic.

According to Imahori and Cupach (2005), one of the indispensable components of relational competence is the recognition of the reciprocal and interdependent nature of interaction. This indicates that relationship cultivation is other oriented and, to be competent in the ability to attain goals, individuals must effectively collaborate with others (Bochner & Kelly, 1974). The intended goals of the other take precedence when individuals engage in a communication interaction that is both appropriate and effective.

The conceptualization of intercultural effectiveness above formed the basis of developing and validating an instrument for the measurement of the concept.

Development and Validation of the Instrument

In order to reach the goal of this study, a survey method was used to collect necessary data in three consecutive stages. The first stage aimed to reduce the number of the original items; the second stage aimed to generate the instrument; and the last stage aimed to test the validity of the instrument.

STAGE 1

The objective in the initial stage of the test was to reduce the number of original items in the instrument of intercultural effectiveness. The 76 original items of the instrument represent the empirical indicators of the five dimensions for intercultural effectiveness discussed previously.

Method

Participants. Participants in this stage were undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory communication course, which has an average of 70 sections per semester, in a mid-sized college in the Northeastern United States. A total of 204 students (M = 74, F = 130) were used for the data collection. The average age of the participants was 19.21.

Instrument and Procedure. After reading and signing the consent form for participation, the participants completed the original 76 items of the instrument. A five-point Likert scale was used in this study to respond to each item of the survey. The average time for the students to complete the survey was about 12-15 minutes.

Results

Factor analysis was used to sort the data and 42 items with > .45 loading were used for the purpose of instrument construction in the second stage. Appendix A shows the 42 items.

STAGE 2

The objective of the second stage of the study was to determine the factor structure of the 42-item version of the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale.

Method

Participants. Participants in this stage consisted of 449 students who did not appear in the first stage of the test. Among them, 187 were males and 262 were females. The average age of the participants was 19.46.

Instrument and Procedure. After reading and signing the consent form for participation, participants completed the 42-item version of the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale during the regular class meeting time. The average time for the students to complete the survey was about 10-12 minutes.

Results

Factor analysis was performed to generate the factors of intercultural effectiveness. Appendix B shows the factors and items extracted from the results of the principal axis factor analysis. Six factors with an eigenvalue of 1.00 or higher were extracted from the 42 items of intercultural effectiveness. These factors accounted for 42% of the variance. Twenty items having loadings of at least .50 with secondary loadings no higher than .30 were included in the scale.

The first factor accounted for 22.4% of the common variance and had an eigenvalue of 9.40. Four items, which include items 20, 28, 38, and 39, were clustered in this factor. These items refer to the ability of a participant to distinguish between appropriate behaviors and adapt to specific situations. This factor was labeled Behavioral Flexibility.

The second factor accounted for 5.7% of the common variance and had an eigenvalue of 2.38. Items 1, 3, 15, 19, and 40 were included in this factor. These items refer to the ease at which the participant feels while conversing, specifically referring to their approachability, openness, and overall comfort level during the interaction. This factor was labeled Interaction Relaxation.

The third factor accounted for 4.5% of the common variance and had an eigenvalue of 1.89. The three items included in this factor were 11, 23, and 31. These items refer to the level of value the participant places on their culturally different counterpart during the interaction. This factor was labeled Interactant Respect.

The fourth factor accounted for 3.3% of the common variance and had an eigenvalue of 1.39. The three items that fell into this factor were 12, 16, and 26. These items refer to the ability of the participant to use the language of a culture other than their own by utilizing verbal and nonverbal behaviors within an interaction. This factor was labeled Message Skills.

The fifth factor accounted for 3.2% of the common variance and had an eigenvalue of 1.35. The three items clustered in this factor were 36, 41, and 42. These items refer to the capability of the participant to maintain the unique identity of their culturally different counterpart while also maintaining their own separate identity during the interaction. This factor was labeled Identity Maintenance.

The last factor accounted for 2.9% of the common variance and had an eigenvalue of 1.21. The two items in this factor were 5 and 9. These items refer to the ability of the participant to express ideas and answer questions during the interaction. This factor was labeled Interaction Management.

STAGE 3

The objective of the third stage of the study was to evaluate the validity of the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES) with related instruments. All 20 items extracted from the analysis, after the order of items were rearranged (see Appendix C), were treated together as a measure for the validity test, because they represent the empirical indicators of the concept of intercultural effectiveness. Appendix C shows the complete instrument used in this stage.

Method

Participants. Participants in this stage consisted of 246 students, who did not appear in the first two stages of the test. Among them, 116 were males and 130 were females. The average age of the participants was 18.82.

Instrument and Procedure. As done in previous stages, a five-point Likert scale was used in this study to respond to each item of the survey. The first part of the survey is the 20-item version of the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES). Higher scores of this measure refer to being more interculturally effective. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of this instrument was .85.

In order to test the validity of IES, participants were asked to complete four additional measures: a 24-item Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen & Starosta, 2000), a revised 13-item

Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1978), a revised 6-item Intercultural Willingness to Communicate Scale (Kassing, 1997), and a 14-item Intercultural Communication Apprehension Scale (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997). The revised 13-item Intercultural Effectiveness Scale was used to evaluate the concurrent validity of IES, and the other three scales were used to test the predictive validity of IES.

The Intercultural Sensitivity Scale was developed to measure intercultural sensitivity, which is the affective dimension of intercultural communication competence. The scale can help individuals distinguish how their culturally different counterparts vary in behaviors, perceptions, and feelings so that they may be conscious and respectful within their interaction (Chen & Starosta, 2000). Given that intercultural effectiveness represents the behavioral aspect of intercultural communication competence, it can be predicted that an individual with high intercultural sensitivity will better recognize which behaviors are most appropriate while in an intercultural interaction. Therefore, a positive correlation between the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale and the IES was expected. The reliability coefficient of the scale in this study was .82.

 The 12-item Intercultural Effectiveness Scale was derived from the questionnaire developed by Hammer, Gudykunst, and Wiseman (1978). Only those with a >.50 factor loading were included in the present scale. This scale was used to determine an individual's ability to acclimate and function in another culture. It concerns an individual's ability to deal with psychological stress, to effectively communicate, and lastly, to create and maintain interpersonal relationships. It was predicted that those scoring high in this scale would also achieve a high score in IES in this study. The reliability coefficient of the scale in this study was .87.

The Intercultural Willingness to Communicate Scale was developed to measure an individual's willingness to initiate communication with members of another culture when they are free from any obligation to do so (Kassing, 1997). A person's willingness to communicate with an individual from a culture other than their own would suggest that they are open to elicit the appropriate behaviors necessary to effectively communicate and establish a relationship. It was predicted that individuals scoring high on the Intercultural Willingness to Communicate Scale would also yield a high score on IES. The scale was converted to the 5-point Likert scale for the purpose of this study. The reliability coefficient of the scale in this study was .89.

Finally, the Intercultural Communication Apprehension Scale measures an individual's fear and anxiety when interacting with members of another culture. An individual with a high degree of anxiety and apprehension tends to avoid communicating, be less interculturally sensitive, and be hesitant or inhibited with members of another culture (Chen, 2010; Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997). It was predicted that an individual with high apprehension would not be responsive, attentive, or perceptive during an interaction with a member of a different culture and therefore score low on IES. The reliability coefficient of the scale in this study was .91.

Results

Pearson product–moment correlations were completed to find out the correlations between the IES and the four related measures. Appendix D shows the results of the analysis.

It was found that a significant correlation exists between IES and all of the four measures at the p < .01 level, with correlation coefficients from -.71 to .74.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to develop and validate a scale to measure an individual's behavioral ability, that is to say, intercultural effectiveness, in intercultural interaction. The factor analysis yielded a 20-item Intercultural Effectiveness Scale with six factors, including Behavioral Flexibility, Interaction Relaxation, Interactant Respect, Message Skills, Identity Maintenance, and Interaction Management. The reliability coefficient of the scale was .85.

As predicted, the moderate correlations between IES and the other related measures provided support for the validity of the inventory. The results indicated that individuals who scored high in the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale were behaviorally flexible and able to distinguish between appropriate behaviors and adapt to specific situations. More specifically, the results indicated that individuals who scored high in IES tend to demonstrate the following characteristics as well.

First, they are more sensitive to an intercultural interaction. As Snyder (1974) pointed out, individuals who can appropriately self-monitor their behaviors are able to exhibit self-control over their emotional expressions. Because of this, they are ultimately able to learn what is appropriate in a given situation. With these skills they are more able to create the impression they want in the interaction.

Second, they are less anxious in intercultural interaction. People scoring high in the IES are not likely to experience difficulties with identifying with their culturally different counterparts, nor will they find it hard to participate in the interaction. In other words, they are less characterized by an unpleasant emotional state, feelings of tension, or apprehension and worry, which are hesitant, inhibited, and disrupted behaviors toward the perceived interaction with another individual (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997).

Third, they know how to show respect to their counterparts in intercultural interaction. Respect is generally regarded as the result of admiration and approbation, combined with deference. It could also refer to an individual's ability to put another person's interests first. Interculturally effective individuals will generally use appropriate behaviors to show that they are listening and agreeing with their counterparts' opinions through eye contact or other verbal or nonverbal cues. Spitzberg and Cupach (1984) stated that one of the indispensable components of relational competence is the recognition of the reciprocal and interdependent nature of interaction. This indicates that respect in an interaction is other oriented, as was also assumed of relationship cultivation. Consequently, to be other orientated implies that an individual is considered competent to the extent that the others involved within the interaction are attended to appropriately (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009). Therefore, individuals who exhibit respect to their counterparts are able to attend to the specific interaction and establish a mutual relationship.

Fourth, they are able to display message skills in intercultural interaction. Individuals with the ability of intercultural effectiveness are able to understand, distinguish, and execute the messages during the interaction as well as respond appropriately. In other words, as Chen (2009) indicated, intercultural effectiveness refers to the ability to use verbal and nonverbal languages, or message skills, of one's counterpart.

Fifth, they know how to maintain their counterparts' identity in intercultural interaction. Individuals with the ability of intercultural effectiveness can demonstrate effective and appropriate behaviors to promote the other's cultural identity. The identity of both parties is confirmed by each individual, and an interculturally effective person can also reiterate that there are many different identities present within the interaction (Collier 1989). Those identities, which are recognized, nurtured, and respected, are initially formed through the verbal and nonverbal interaction in which participants achieve mutual understanding (Chen, 2009).

Lastly, they know how to manage the process of the intercultural interaction. Interculturally effective persons possess the ability to sustain an interaction through the display of communication skills that are dependent on the continuous concern for the interests and orientations of others within an interaction (Chen, 2007). Hence, they are able to handle the more procedural aspects of the interaction, which include initiating and terminating interaction, balancing speaking turns, performing the unique mannerisms and behavioral routines within the culture, and emote responsiveness, attentiveness, and perceptiveness while answering questions, and expressing ideas (Spitzberg, 1997; Wiemann, 1977).

The findings can contribute to our further understanding of the concept of intercultural effectiveness. The results also demonstrate the complex nature of intercultural communication competence and the various factors that influence an individual's behavioral strategies.

Limitations and Future Directions

A few limitations of the study may provide opportunities for further studies in this line of research in the future. One limitation is the sample used. College students may provide different results compared to the general population. The relative homogeneous enrollment of the college may also play a role, as the college has a predominant Caucasian population. Many students might have very limited interaction with individuals from a different culture. For future research, a more random sample from a variety of locations with subjects of varying age, gender, religion, race, and education level can be used to strengthen the outcome of the study.

The self-report process of the survey is another potential limitation for this kind of study. As Chen and Starosta (1996) indicated, the difficult question to be asked is: Who is better suited to evaluate an interaction where an individual's ability to be competent in intercultural effectiveness is judged? Should it be the other individual involved in the interaction or an observer? Furthermore, results may be different if a qualitative study was conducted where both parties answered questions immediately following the interaction. Future research can utilize different methods for data collection in order to compare results to measure consistency.

In addition, Wiseman (2003) outlined the importance of negotiating mutually acceptable identities during an interaction. Within that interaction, competent intercultural communicators must be able to navigate through the perceptions of face, facework, and dialectical orientations which are always changing. It is important for future research to consider the multiple identities individuals sustain in the various facets of life. In other words, moving beyond situational constraints, what different types of behaviors would an individual

utilize while assuming a specific role or identity such as that of a salesperson, a business associate, a consumer, or that of a parent? Moreover, because intercultural effectiveness only represents one of the dimensions of intercultural communication competence, it is necessary for future research to examine the relationships between intercultural effectiveness and other dimensions such as intercultural sensitivity and intercultural awareness, and provide a more holistic view of the concept of intercultural communication competence.

Finally, further research also can examine the IES from a culture-specific perspective to see if cultural differences play a significant role in developing a valid instrument. With an in-depth study into various cultures, contexts, and situations, an Intercultural Effectiveness Scale may be duplicated to produce a universal inventory of behavioral skills in intercultural interaction.

References

Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *10*, 179-196.

Bochner, A. P., & Kelly, C. W. (1974). Interpersonal competence: Rational, philosophy, and implementation of a conceptual framework. *Speech Teacher*, *23*, 279-301.

Cegala, D. J., Savage, G. T., Brunner, C. C., & Conrad, A. B. (1982). An elaboration of the meaning of interaction involvement: Toward the development of a theoretical concept. *Communication Monographs*, *46*, 229-248.

Chen, G. M (1989). Relationships of the dimensions of intercultural communication competence. *Communication Quarterly*, *37*, 118-133.

Chen, G. M. (2005). A model of global communication competence. *China Media Research*, *1*, 13-11.

Chen, G. M. (2007). A review of the concept of intercultural effectiveness. In M. Hinner (Ed.), *The influence of culture in the world of business* (pp. 95-116). Berlin, Germany: Peter Lang.

Chen, G. M. (2009). Intercultural effectiveness. In L. A. Samovar, R. E. Porter, & E. R. McDaniel (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 393-401). Boston, MA: Wadsworth.

Chen, G. M. (2010). The impact of intercultural sensitivity on ethnocentrism and intercultural communication apprehension. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, *19*(1), 1-9.

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1996). Intercultural communication competence: A synthesis. *Communication Yearbook*, *19*, 353-384.

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1997). A review of the concept of intercultural sensitivity. *Human Communication*, *1*, 1-16.

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). A review of the concept of intercultural awareness. *Human Communication*, *2,* 27-54.

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (2000). The development and validation of the intercultural communication sensitivity scale. *Human Communication*, *3*, 1-15.

Collier, M. J. (1989). Cultural and intercultural communication competence: Current approaches and directions for future research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *13*, 287-302.

Collier, M. J. (2005). Theorizing cultural identification. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 235-256). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Duran, R. L. (1983). Communicative adaptability: A measure of social communicative competence. *Communication Quarterly*, *31*, 320-326.

Deardorff, D. K. (Ed.). (2009). *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hammer, M. R., Gudykunst, W. B., & Wiseman, R. L. (1978). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *2*, 382-392.

Hanvey, R. G. (1987). Cross-culture awareness. In L. F. Luce & E. C. Smith (Eds.), *Toward internationalism* (pp. 13-23). Cambridge, MA: Newbury.

Imahori, T. T., & Cupach, W. R. (2005). Identity management theory: Facework in intercultural relationships. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp.195-210). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Imahori, T. T., & Lanigan, M. L. (1989). Relational model of intercultural communication competence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *13*, 269-286.

Kassing, J. W. (1997). Development of the intercultural willingness to communicate scale. *Communication Research Reports*, *14,* 399-407.

Kim, Y. Y. (2009). The identity factor in intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural communication* (pp. 53-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Koester, J., & Olebe, M. (1988). The behavioral assessment scale for intercultural communication effectiveness. *Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *12,* 233-246.

Martin, J. N. (1993). Intercultural communication competence: A review. In R. L. Wiseman & J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural communication competence* (pp. 16-29). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Martin, J. N., & Hammer, M. R. (1989). Behavioral categories of intercultural communication competence: Everyday communicators' perceptions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *13*, 303-332.

Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The development of the intercultural and interethnic communication apprehension scales. *Communication Research Reports*, *14,* 145-156.

Ruben, B. D. (1976). Assessing communication competency for intercultural adaptation. *Group & Organization Studies*, *1*, 334-354.

Ruben, B. D. (1977). Guidelines for cross-cultural communication effectiveness. *Group & Organization Studies*, *2*, 470-479.

Ruben, B. D., & Kealey, D. J. (1979). Behavioral assessment of communication competency and the prediction of cross-cultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *3*, 15-47.

Rubin, R. B. (1982). Assessing speaking and listening competence at college level: The Communication Competency Assessment Instrument. *Communication Education*, *31,* 19-32.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *30*, 528.

Spitzberg, B. H. (1997). A model of intercultural communication competence. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 379-391). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural communication* (pp. 2-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1984). *Interpersonal communication competence*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). Identity negotiation theory. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 211-234). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Turner, C. V. (1968). The Sinasina "big man" complex: A central cultural theme. *Practical Anthropology*, *15,* 16-22.

Wheeless, E. W., & Grotz, J. (1976). Conceptualization and measurement of reported self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research*, *2*, 238-346.

Wiemann, J. M. (1977). Explication and test of model of communication competence. *Human Communication Research*, *3*, 195-213.

Wiseman, R. L. (2003). Intercultural communication competence. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Cross-cultural and intercultural communication* (pp. 191-208). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wood, J. T. (2008). *Communication in our lives*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Appendix A. Items for Intercultural Effectiveness Measure.

_____ 1. I find it is easy to talk with people from different cultures.
_____ 2. I always feel constrained when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 3. I find it is easy to get along with people from different cultures.
_____ 4. I always feel nervous when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 5. I am able to express my ideas clearly when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 6. I feel bored when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 7. I use appropriate tone of voice when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 8. I find my mind often wanders when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 9. I am able to answer questions effectively when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____10. I have problems expressing my opinions concisely when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____11. I use appropriate eye contact when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____12. I have problems distinguishing between informative and persuasive messages when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 13. I am a good listener when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 14. I find it is difficult to respond appropriately to the needs of my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.
_____ 15. I always know how to initiate a conversation when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 16. I often miss parts of what is going on when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 17. I always pretend to be having a good time, even if I am not, when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 18. I often get confused when it is my turn to speak when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 19. I feel relaxed when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 20. I am afraid to express myself when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 21. I use appropriate facial expressions when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 22. I find it is difficult to concentrate on what my culturally different counterparts are saying during our interaction.
_____ 23. I always show respect for my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.
_____ 24. I often feel disappointed in myself after interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 25. I often express empathy to my culturally different counterparts to let them feel that I care about them.
_____ 26. I have problems with grammar when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 27. I have no problem changing my opinions in order to please my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.
_____ 28. I often act like a very different person when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 29. I always adjust my behavior to make my culturally different counterparts feel comfortable during our interaction.
_____ 30. I often have problems changing my behaviors to suit the situation when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 31. I always show respect for the opinions of my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.
_____ 32. I often try to control the conversation when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 33. I change my approach when I find the look of disapproval in the eyes of my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.
_____ 34. I am often uncertain of my role in conversations with people from different cultures.

_____ 35. I find it is difficult to maintain satisfying relationships with my culturally different
counterparts during our interaction.

_____ 36. I find I have a lot in common with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

_____ 37. I find it is difficult to enter into meaningful conversation when interacting with people from
different cultures.

_____ 38. I find the best way to act is to be myself when interacting with people from different cultures.

_____ 39. I am not always the person I appear to be when interacting with people from different cultures.

_____ 40. I find it is easy to identify with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.

_____ 41. I find it is difficult to feel my culturally different counterparts are similar to me.

_____ 42. I always feel a sense of distance with my culturally different counterparts during our
interaction.

Appendix B. Items with Factor Loading for the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale

Items   *Factor
Loading*

Factor I - Behavioral Flexibility (22.4%)

39. I am not always the person I appear to be when interacting with people from different cultures.	.68
28. I often act like a very different person when interacting with people from different cultures.	.65
38. I find the best way to act is to be myself when interacting with people from different cultures.	.65
20. I am afraid to express myself when interacting with people from different cultures.	.65

Factor II - Interaction Relaxation (5.7%)

1. I find it is easy to talk with people from different cultures.	.69
15. I always know how to initiate a conversation when interacting with people from different cultures.	.57
40. I find it is easy to identify with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.	.61
3. I find it is easy to get along with people from different cultures.	.53
19. I feel relaxed when interacting with people from different cultures.	.53

Factor III - Interactant Respect (4.5%)

23. I always show respect for my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.	.76
31. I always show respect for the opinions of my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.	.65
11. I use appropriate eye contact when interacting with people from different cultures.	.55

Items   *Factor*
Loading

Factor IV - Message Skills (3.3%)

26. I have problems with grammar when interacting with people from   .69
    different cultures.
16. I often miss parts of what is going on when interacting with people from   .62
    different cultures.
12. I have problems distinguishing between informative and persuasive   .55
    messages when interacting with people from different cultures.

Factor V - Identity Maintenance (3.2%)

36. I find I have a lot in common with my culturally different counterparts   .74
    during our interaction.
41. I find it is difficult to feel my culturally different counterparts are similar .70
    to me.
42. I always feel a sense of distance with my culturally different counterparts .62
    during our interaction.

Factor VI - Interaction Management (2.9%)

 5. I am able to express my ideas clearly when interacting with people from   .67
    different cultures.
 9. I am able to answer questions effectively when interacting with people   .61
    from different cultures.

Appendix C. The Complete Version of the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale

Direction: Below is a series of statements concerning intercultural communication. There are no right or wrong answers. Please work quickly and record your first impression by indicating the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statement. Thank you for your cooperation.

5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = uncertain   Please put the number corresponding to your answer in the
2 = disagree   blank before the statement
1 = strongly disagree

_____ 1. I find it is easy to talk with people from different cultures.
_____ 2. I am afraid to express myself when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 3. I find it is easy to get along with people from different cultures.
_____ 4. I am not always the person I appear to be when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 5. I am able to express my ideas clearly when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 6. I have problems with grammar when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 7. I am able to answer questions effectively when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 8. I find it is difficult to feel my culturally different counterparts are similar to me.
_____ 9. I use appropriate eye contact when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 10. I have problems distinguishing between informative and persuasive messages when interacting
          with people from different cultures.
_____ 11. I always know how to initiate a conversation when interacting with people from different
          cultures.
_____ 12. I often miss parts of what is going on when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 13. I feel relaxed when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 14. I often act like a very different person when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 15. I always show respect for my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.
_____ 16. I always feel a sense of distance with my culturally different counterparts during our
          interaction.
_____ 17. I find I have a lot in common with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.
_____ 18. I find the best way to act is to be myself when interacting with people from different cultures.
_____ 19. I find it is easy to identify with my culturally different counterparts during our interaction.
_____ 20. I always show respect for the opinions of my culturally different counterparts during our
          interaction.

Note. Items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 18 are reverse-coded before summing the 20 items. Behavioral Flexibility items are 2, 4, 14, and 18; Interaction Relaxation items are 1, 3, 11, 13, and 19; Interactant Respect items are 9, 15, and 20; Message Skills items are 6, 10, and 12; Identity Maintenance items are 8, 16, and 17; Interaction Management items are 5 and 7.

Appendix D. Correlations of Intercultural Effectiveness with Other Measures

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Scale                                                             r
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Intercultural Sensitivity Scale                                  .74*
Intercultural Effectiveness Scale                                .60*
Intercultural Willingness to Communicate Scale                   .48*
Intercultural Communication Apprehension Scale                   -.71*
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
```
*p<.01.