1-1-2018

PERCEIVED CULTURAL COMPETENCE AND SELF-AWARENESS IN DOCTORAL PSYCHOLOGY STUDENTS: DOES INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE MATTER?

Sarah K. Hatcher

PERCEIVED CULTURAL COMPETENCE AND SELF-AWARENESS
IN DOCTORAL PSYCHOLOGY STUDENTS:
DOES INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCE MATTER?

by

Sarah K. Hatcher

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Counseling Psychology

The University of Memphis

August 2018

Acknowledgments

Completion of my dissertation would not have been possible without the support of many people at The University of Memphis and in my personal life. First of all, I am grateful for the guidance of my dissertation committee: Dr. Elin Ovrebo, Dr. Douglas Strohmer, Dr. Chrisann Schiro-Geist, and Dr. Laura Marks. Their feedback enhanced my learning and the quality of the research. I want to extend a special thanks to my academic advisor and dissertation chair, Dr. Elin Ovrebo, for her advice and patient support during the dissertation process. Her assistance, even from the other side of the world, made it possible for me to complete the final stages of the dissertation in time to graduate on schedule. She also provided inspiration for the design and rationale of the research that helped me interpret the research in new and exciting ways.

Additionally, I appreciate the feedback I received on my dissertation proposal from Dr. Chloe Lancaster during her temporary appointment on my committee. I also do not want to leave out thanks to Dr. Owen Lightsey for his help in shaping the beginning stages of my dissertation during the CPSY 8203 dissertation proposal course as well as Dr. Michael Mackay for his consultation on the statistical analyses of the research.

I am also grateful to my PhD cohort for their support and friendship throughout our years in the Counseling Psychology program at The University of Memphis. Their encouraging words and sense of humor was never needed more than during the past few months as I worked to complete the dissertation in time to graduate in August.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their unwavering support, not only throughout the dissertation process, but also through six years of grad school. Without their encouragement (and willingness to let me vent) I would not have made it this far.

Abstract

The importance of cultural competence for psychologists and psychology students are discussed at length in theoretical psychology literature. Some authors have suggested that international experiences such as study and work abroad may promote cultural competence. However, few empirical studies explore whether such experiences actually promote intercultural and multicultural competence. The current study investigated whether international experience, defined as time spent outside the United States for the purposes of education, professional training or work, is associated with higher levels of perceived intercultural competence (IC), multicultural competence (MC), and self-awareness among doctoral students in psychology. Two hundred seventy-seven psychology doctorate students from APA accredited clinical and counseling graduate programs completed self-report surveys that measured their perceived cultural competence and self-awareness. Results of analysis of variance group comparisons suggested that there were several significant relationships between time spent abroad and IC, MC, and public self-awareness. International experiences of more than 180 days were related to higher levels of IC and lower levels of perceived public self-awareness, but differences in perceived MC as predicted by time spent abroad were only found between groups of less than 30 days and 30 – 90 days abroad. Correlation studies also revealed several significant, but weak relationships between perceived cultural competence, self-awareness, type of international experience and the number of graduate level multicultural courses taken by psychology doctorate students. Implications and recommendations were included for graduate psychology training and study abroad programs as well as the research and measurement of cultural competence and self-awareness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

In the past few decades, there has been an increase in psychologists from the United States who consult with international agencies or travel abroad to conduct research, provide counseling services, or engage in teaching activities (Christopher, Wendt, Marecek, & Goodman, 2014). Internationally oriented researchers have stated that participation in international activities such as study and living abroad are ways to increase the globalization of psychology (Leung, 2003). Scholars also discuss how engagement in international activities may increase intercultural (IC; Barden, Shannonhouse, & Mobley, 2015; Behrnd & Portzelt, 2012; Smith, Jennings, & Lakhan, 2014) and multicultural competence (MC; Anderson, Lawton, Rexeisen, & Hubbard, 2006, Christopher et al., 2014; Kwan & Gerstein, 2008; Smith et al., 2014). Furthermore, the general study abroad literature has suggested that studying abroad increases students' self-awareness and understanding of others (Bell & Anscombe, 2013; Diesel, Ercole, & Taliaferro, 2013; Lumkes, Jr., Hallett, & Vallade, 2012). The American Psychological Association (APA) also promotes awareness of personal attitudes and biases as well as systemic influences on cultural identity as competencies foundational to clinical and multicultural competence (APA, 2017). However, there are currently no known studies that measure if international experience contributes to mental health trainees' perceived intercultural and multicultural competence or self-awareness. The current study investigated if there is a relationship between international experience and the development of IC, MC, and self-awareness in psychology doctoral students. The study also began to explore what variables associated with international experience, such as time spent abroad and type of experience abroad, may contribute to perceived cultural competence and self-awareness.

The Globalization Movement in Psychology

In the last few decades, the field of psychology has heavily promoted the globalization of psychology (Kwan & Gerstein, 2008; Leung, 2003). Psychology professionals from a variety of specialties agree that ethnocentrism and cultural encapsulation are barriers to effective international psychology research and practice (Prilleltensky, 2012); however, there is little research on how to train psychologists to practice or do research competently with clients from foreign countries in domestic or international contexts. The American Psychological Association (APA, 2017) requires all accredited programs to follow guidelines for training graduate students to be multiculturally competent. However, competencies for psychological work in international contexts were not included in the APA multicultural guidelines until the most recent update in 2017. A set of guidelines for IC competencies helps ensure that psychologists have a framework for practice, research, teaching, or consultation that is sensitive to foreign cultures with the goal to prevent harm and improve mental health outcomes (APA, 2017).

Cultural Competence and Self-Awareness

Intercultural Competence

Intercultural Competence (IC) has been given many definitions across multiple disciplines. Broadly, the concept relates to behavioral interactions of effective communication, equality and inclusion with foreigners whether the individual is inside or outside of their own country (Behrend & Porzelt, 2012; Portalla & Chen, 2010). One definition states that IC requires an "ability of sensitive, reflective, and productive acting in situations of interaction with people from foreign cultures" (Behrnd & Porzelt, 2012, p. 214). Behrnd and Porzelt (2012) based their study on two models of IC by Gertsen (1990) and Bolten (2006, 2007; as cited in Behrnd & Porzelt, 2012). Gertsen (1990) developed a structural model of IC that distinguished between

cognitive, affective, and conative IC. Bolten's (2006, 2007; as cited in Behrnd & Porzelt, 2012) model conceptualized IC using the sub-domains of professional IC, individual IC, and social IC. Characterological traits of IC include willingness to learn, contact initiative, empathy, self-reflection, frustration tolerance, impulse control, optimism, tolerance of ambiguity, responsibility, and goal orientation (Behrnd & Porzelt, 2012).

Intercultural competence in psychology. Wilk (2014) stated that understanding clients' social contextual factors is vital to successful intercultural counseling. Additionally, she argued that intercultural communication is a core competency that psychologists need to develop in order to collaborate effectively with diverse clients. Lorelle et al. (2012) discussed globalization and its impact on the counseling field. The authors recommended that the competency guidelines required for graduate and professional training be expanded to include a more global perspective of counseling.

A few of the aspects of international experience that researchers believe promote IC are length of immersion, relationships with individuals in the host culture, knowledge of host culture, language proficiency, and situation-specific coping skills. Behrnd and Porzelt (2012) discussed several variables of IC extracted from previous empirical research such as willingness to learn, contact initiative, empathy, self-reflection, and tolerance of ambiguity. They hypothesized that IC can be trained and involves a component of comfort in interaction with people who are culturally different from themselves, "An interculturally competent person often has contact with foreigners, likes to have it, and fulfills tasks in foreign environments efficiently, without perceiving dealing with either the foreigners or the tasks abroad as stressful" (p. 214). Despite extensive theoretical and qualitative research on IC within the psychology field (Kwan & Gerstein, 2008; Heppner & Wang, 2014; Lorelle et al., 2012), there has been little focus on

quantitative measurement of IC or the development of instruments to measure levels of IC in mental health practitioners.

Multicultural Competence

Multicultural competence (MC) in psychology is the promotion of a treatment approach that is all-inclusive and sensitive to the needs of individuals of any race, ethnicity or minority group. It is also an ethical issue because professionals without training in MC are in danger of participating in harmful psychological practices (Sue, Arrendondo, & McDavis, 1992). In 1999, APA Divisions 17, Counseling Psychology, and 45, Society for the Psychological Study of Culture, Ethnicity and Race, endorsed the first set of multicultural competencies for best practices in the training and practice of multicultural psychology in the US (Pope-Davis, 2003). The MC framework identified three dimensions of multicultural competency as originally developed by Sue et al. (1992): 1) beliefs and attitudes, 2) knowledge, and 3) skills.

The multicultural guidelines were most recently updated in 2017 to focus on a broader ecological approach to cultural competency that "incorporates developmental and contextual antecedents of identity and how they can be acknowledged, addressed, and embraced to engender more effective models of professional engagement" (APA, 2017, p. 6). The new guidelines address intercultural competence through Guideline 7, which recommends that "Psychologists endeavor to examine the profession's assumptions and practices within an international context, whether domestically or internationally based, and consider how this globalization has an impact on the psychologist's self-definition, purpose, role, and function" (APA, 2017, p. 5). Psychology programs are encouraged to incorporate MC training into every psychology course and offer classes specifically related to multiculturalism and diversity. In addition to offering courses that promote MC, it is recommended that psychology programs

conduct research that is culture-centered and ethical in regard to racial, ethnic, and other minority groups.

Self-Awareness

Self-awareness and concepts related to awareness are frequently found in the literature on the globalization of psychology and cultural competency (Canfield, Low, & Hovestadt, 2009; Sue et al., 1992; Wilk, 2014). Sue et al. (1992) identified self-awareness as a vital piece of their model of MC. The first MC guideline Sue et al. recommended was "counselor awareness of own assumptions, values, and biases" (p. 70). In their literature review, Behrnd and Porzelt (2012) listed the variables of self-reflection, self-initiative, and self-assertion as traits of people who are interculturally competent. International experience has been promoted as one way students gain the skills of IC and MC as well as self-awareness (Heppner & Wang, 2014; Smith et al., 2014) or awareness of their own "assumptions, values, and biases" (Sue et al., 1992, p.481).

The Perception of Cultural Competence and Self-Awareness

Measures of cultural competence in the literature to date are primarily self-report using quantitative surveys or qualitative inquiry. Unfortunately, there is little discussion about the difference between perceived cultural competence and competence reported by someone who has observed a practicing clinician. The current literature that measures the difference between self-perceived and observed cultural competence is also limited to MC, but the issues discussed have implications for the study of IC and self-awareness. The studies that have been conducted raised questions about the interpretation of self-reported competencies. A 20-year content analysis of the empirical MC literature conducted by Worthington, Soth-McNett, and Moreno (2007) found self-reported levels of MC were not strongly correlated to MC levels reported in observational studies. Additionally, Cartwright, Daniels, and Zhang (2008) found that self-report

scores on competence measures were higher compared to independent observational ratings of MC. Factors such as social desirability and attitudinal biases may have contributed to inflated scores on competence measures. Self-report MC surveys may measure variables that do not reflect actual counseling behaviors, such as self-efficacy or confidence in an individual's knowledge about cultural competence (Worthington et al., 2007).

The difference between self-perceived and observed cultural competence is important to distinguish, but does not preclude the use of measures of self-perception. Self-report measures are valuable tools that can help gather information about an individual's self-perceived attitudes, knowledge, and skills. Caution is needed in the interpretation of self-report in competence studies and ideally comparison with observed ratings is recommended. However, for psychology graduate programs, self-report measures can be used to gage students' perceived self-efficacy with cultural competencies, which may help inform areas for improvement in training (Cartwright et al., 2008).

The Intersection of Cultural Competence and Self-Awareness

There appears to be many overlapping factors among and between the constructs of IC, MC and self-awareness, particularly between IC and MC. Some studies have even used instruments measuring MC to assess IC (Popescu, Borca, Fistis, & Draghici, 2014). However, some authors have argued that it is important to assess IC separate from MC as IC has certain specific components that MC does not have, such as a flexible worldview, greater awareness of ethnocentric beliefs, and empathy for the experience of being a "cultural outsider" (Heppner & Wang, 2014, p. 1180). It may be beneficial to investigate if there are differences between IC and MC among people who have studied or worked abroad. If MC is the same or highly correlated to IC, then based on the literature above, both should increase if individuals are exposed to people

6

from other countries, spend longer amounts of time abroad, or take one or several courses aimed at increasing multicultural competence.

International Experience

There is no explicit definition of international experience in the literature, or a pattern of research that points to exactly what types of international experience may lead to an increase in IC, MC, or self-awareness. The largest body of literature on the relationship between international experience and IC has focused on students who study abroad for short periods of time (Anderson et al., 2006; Bell & Anscombe, 2013; Diesel, et al., 2013; Lumkes, Jr., Hallett, & Vallade, 2012). A few studies have highlighted long term (6 months to 1 year) study abroad programs (Barden et al., 2015), but most studies have not compared differences between short term and long term study programs. The study abroad literature encompasses both undergraduate (Diesel, et al., 2013; Lumkes, Jr., et al., 2012; Watson, Siska, & Wolfel, 2013) and graduate students from many disciplines (Bell & Anscombe, 2013), including master level counseling (Barden et al., 2015). Only one study could be found on doctoral students exclusively in any specialty of psychology (Smith et al., 2014). Another included graduate psychology student participants from both master and doctoral levels (Heppner & Wang, 2014). Other research on international experience included expatriate workers and people who travel abroad for volunteer service (Gertsen, 1990; Lough, 2011). Expatriate studies are scarce and also inconsistent in how IC and MC are defined and measured. Despite the lack of a clear framework in the literature to design the current study, a review of the existing research was imperative to understand if there are common factors from international experience that point to an increase in IC, MC, and self-awareness.

Types of International Experience

Study Abroad. Study abroad is assumed to result in positive outcomes, including an increased ability to understand and communicate effectively with people of other cultures. Additionally, it is promoted as a vital educational tool to enhance the development of IC (Behrnd & Porzelt, 2012). Many types of study abroad programs are offered, and the length of stay often ranges from one week to two semesters. Despite the high number of programs, not many psychology study abroad programs are offered compared to the prevalence of programs in other disciplines (Earnest, Rosenbusch, Wallace-Williams, & Keim, 2016).

In research of study abroad outcomes, one question commonly asked is if time spent abroad affects cultural competency outcomes (Behrnd & Porzelt, 2012). Canfield et al. (2009) conducted a qualitative study of short-term study abroad programs ranging from 10 days to 6 weeks. The participants almost unanimously expressed that the study abroad program had a positive impact on their personal growth and intercultural competence. Behrnd and Porzelt (2012) found that more time spent abroad was positively associated with higher levels of IC. Students who spent 6 months or more abroad had better IC outcomes than students who spent less time in study abroad programs. Watson, et al. (2013) assessed student outcomes after semester long study abroad programs in 14 countries. Based on pre and post assessment, they found that the students' international experience was associated with gains in language proficiency, significant increases in cross-cultural competence and regional awareness. However, Behrnd & Porzelt (2012) was the only study found that compared the impact of short-term versus long-term study abroad programs using quantitative methods.

There is little distinction in the study abroad research between intercultural and multicultural competence. However, Heppner & Wang (2014) discussed IC and MC as separate

8

but overlapping components of cultural competency outcomes of study abroad. Additionally, a qualitative study by Smith et al. (2014) defined cultural competence based on the three primary components of Sue, et al.'s (1992) multicultural theory: the importance of awareness, knowledge, and skills "that professionals need to develop to become culturally competent psychologists" (Smith et al., 2014, p. 1189). Students reported that the study abroad program had improved their ability to "bring culture into counseling" because they gained increased knowledge of techniques and ways to question clients from diverse backgrounds that would benefit the therapeutic process. Greater flexibility, empathy, and less fear of working with culturally different clients was also reported (Smith et al., 2014).

Cultural Immersion. Pope-Davis and Coleman (1997) defined cultural immersion as "direct, prolonged, in vivo contact with a culture different from that of the counselor trainee" (p. 232). Most study abroad experience involves going on a short-term trip with other Americans, taking classes offered in English, or attending a so-called study abroad "island program" where American or other international students study or live in separate classrooms or dorms from students from the host country. A cultural immersion program requires students to adapt to the host country by going to school or living with students or families from the host country. The experience of cultural immersion has been linked to the development of IC and MC (Barden, et al., 2015; Canfield et al., 2009; Heppner & Wang, 2014). International cultural immersion, including study abroad immersion programs as well as paid and volunteer work, has been linked to increased levels of IC (Anderson et al., 2006; Gertsen, 1990; Lough, 2011). Further exploration of cultural immersion is needed to determine how it affects IC, MC, and self-awareness differently from other international experience.

9

Study Rationale and Purpose

Knowledge about if and how international experience contributes to IC, MC, and self-awareness is lacking despite the quickly growing number of theories that assumes international experience contributes to these competencies (Leung, 2003; Prilleltensky, 2012). Acknowledging the multicultural competency movement in healthcare (APA, 2006), the APA has worked to establish multicultural training competencies for psychology trainees, but competency guidelines for intercultural competency were only recently developed (APA, 2017). Training US psychology students in the cultural competencies needed when working with international clients, both inside and outside the US, is vital to protect clients from harm and to ensure that US psychologists are engaging in treatment that is appropriate for all populations (APA, 2017; APA, 2006).

The current exploratory study sought to fill a gap in the literature by investigating IC, MC, and self-awareness outcomes of international experience among psychology doctoral students. Group mean comparisons were used to explore the relationship between time spent abroad, IC, MC, and self-awareness. Number of multicultural courses completed were considered as variables that may explain some of the variance in the differences between time spent abroad, cultural competence, and self-awareness above and beyond participants' experiences abroad (Field, 2009). Finally, although research has indicated international experience contributes to IC, MC and self-awareness (Anderson et al., 2006; Barden et al., 2015; Smith et al., 2014), it has also indicated that self-awareness may contribute to greater IC and MC (Heppner & Wang, 2014; Lough, 2011). Therefore, the current study attempted to investigate if self-awareness contributes to IC and MC by measuring whether self-awareness functions as a co-variate of the relationship between perceived cultural competence and time spent abroad.

A cross-sectional survey design was used to investigate whether international experience, defined as time spent outside the United States related to education, professional training or work, is associated with increased perceived intercultural competence (IC), multicultural competence (MC), and self-awareness among trainees in psychology. The following six research questions were explored:

1. Are there any differences in perceived levels of IC, MC, or self-awareness between students with no experience abroad and students with international experience?

2. Are there any differences in students' perceived levels of IC, MC, or self-awareness for the amount of time spent abroad?

3. When controlling for MC coursework, are there any differences in perceived IC, MC or self-awareness between students who have spent less than 30 days abroad and students who have more international experience?

4. Between students with international experience, does the type of international experience and self-awareness predict the development of positive perceptions of IC and MC?

5. Does international experience, defined as travel outside the US for the purpose of education, professional training or work, contribute to the development of positive perceptions of IC, MC and self-awareness?

6. Do perceptions of IC, MC and self-awareness correlate and do their separate correlations to work abroad, study abroad and multicultural coursework indicate anything about the similarities or differences between the three constructs?

Method

Participants

Target participants were doctoral level graduate students from APA accredited clinical and counseling psychology (PhD and PsyD) programs. Inclusion criteria also included students at least 18 years old with US citizenship. One goal of the study was to explore how international experience may influence students from a similar cultural background (United States) on measures of cultural competence and self-awareness. Exclusion criteria were students from non-license eligible psychology graduate programs (i.e. school, developmental), master's level, and/or programs that were not APA accredited. To determine the appropriate number of participants needed for the study, a statistical power analysis was conducted, using G*Power 3.1 (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). In G*Power 3.1, an a priori power analysis was used with a medium effect size (f^2 =.15) based on the findings of small to medium effect sizes in similar studies (Watson, Siska, & Wolfel, 2013). Additionally, for the a priori analysis the standard α level of .05, and power of .8 was used with two groups, one predictor, and seven criterion variables. The test determined that a minimum of 103 participants would be needed per group - students who had spent time abroad related to education, professional training or work and students who had no experience abroad.

A total of 402 participants started the online survey process, but 123 participants were eliminated from the study either due to incomplete cultural competence or self-awareness questionnaires or because they did not meet inclusion criteria. Two hundred and seventy-nine participants were determined to be eligible and completed all measures of the study. Two additional participants were eliminated as multivariate outliers, which were evaluated using Mahalanobis distance with the critical chi square of $p = .001$ as the cutoff value (Tabachnick &

Fidell, 2013). Of the 277 remaining participants, 55 (19.9%) of the participants were male, 219 (79.1%) were female, two (0.7%) identified as "other", and one (0.4%) participant did not answer the question about gender on the demographic questionnaire. For a complete list of the demographic questions, please see Appendix A. All participants included in the final analysis were between 21 and 56 years of age (M=28.03; SD=4.83). Other key demographic characteristics of the sample included ethnicity (African = 1.1%, African-American (non-Hispanic) = 7.2%, Asian = 4.3%, Caucasian (non-Hispanic) = 75.1%, Hispanic or Latino = 5%, Native American or Alaskan Native = 0.4%, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander = 0.4%, Multiracial = 5.1% Other = 1.5%), and nationality (US citizen only = 98.2%, Dual US and other citizenship = 1.8%).

Measures

The Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES; Portalla & Chen, 2010) was used to measure IC. The IES is a 20-item Likert scale questionnaire. Responses to items range on a five-point scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" and higher scores on the instrument denote greater "intercultural effectiveness". A list of the IES questions can be found in Appendix B. The IES is based on the theoretical framework of intercultural communication competence, which has three dimensions: Intercultural awareness, sensitivity, and effectiveness. The IES was developed to measure six factors of intercultural effectiveness: Behavioral flexibility, interaction relaxation, interactant respect, message skills, identity maintenance, and interaction management. Sample IES items from each subscale include: Behavioral Flexibility – "I am afraid to express myself when interacting with people from different cultures"; Interaction Relaxation - "I find it is easy to talk with people from different cultures"; Interactant Respect – "I use appropriate eye contact when interacting with people from different cultures"; Message Skills – "I often miss

parts of what is going on when interacting with people from different cultures"; Identity Maintenance – "I find it is difficult to feel my culturally different counterparts are similar to me"; Interaction Management – "I am able to express my ideas clearly when interacting with people from different cultures". The psychometric properties of the IES indicate the inventory is a valid measure of intercultural effectiveness. Validity was tested using a correlation between IES and four other measures. Significant ($p < .01$) correlation coefficients were found ranging from -.71 to .74. The reliability coefficient of the scale scores was .85 (the authors did not specify the type of reliability). Internal consistency for the current study was measured using Cronbach's alpha resulting in a coefficient of .82.

The California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale (CBMCS; Gamst et al., 2004) was used to measure MC. The CBMCS is a 21 item self-report Likert questionnaire with responses on a four-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". A list of the CBMCS questions can be found in Appendix C. The CBMCS was designed to measure the multicultural competence of mental health service providers. The scale measures MC using four factors: Multicultural Knowledge (5 items), Awareness of Cultural Barriers (6 items), Sensitivity and Responsiveness to Consumers (3 items), and Socio-cultural Diversities (7 items). Higher scores indicate higher levels of multicultural competence. Examples of the questions for each subscale on the CBMCS include: Multicultural Knowledge - "I can discuss research regarding mental health issues and culturally different populations"; Awareness of Cultural Barriers – "I am aware that counselors frequently impose their own cultural values upon minority clients"; Sensitivity and Responsiveness to Consumers – "I am aware of how my own values might affect my client"; Socio-cultural Diversities – "I have an excellent ability to assess, accurately, the mental health needs of persons with disabilities." Results from the CBMCS development studies provided

adequate psychometric properties. Reliability for the entire 21-item scale, measured using Cronbach's alpha, was .89. Construct validity was assessed using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and the four-factor model of the CBMCS was shown to have high goodness of fit indices (> .97). For the current study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .83.

The Situational Self-Awareness Scale (SSAS; Govern & Marsch, 2001) was used to measure self-awareness. The SSAS is a 9 item, Likert scale questionnaire with responses that are rated on a seven-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". A list of the SSAS questions can be found in Appendix D. Development of the SSAS was based on the empirical framework of "human self-focus," a concept that has both public and private dimensions, which are theoretically recognized as aspects of self-awareness. Public self-focus is described as "attentiveness to those features of one's self that are presented to others (e.g. physical features and mannerisms)" (Govern & Marsch, 2001, p. 366). Private self-focus involves "attentiveness to the internal, personal aspects of one's self such as memories and feelings of physical pleasure or pain" (p. 366). Five studies were conducted to develop and validate the SSAS using independent samples of undergraduate college students, ranging in age from 18 to 53, in the US. The internal consistency for the "public," "private," and "immediate surroundings" factor scores were .82, .70, and .72, respectively. Based on previous research, Govern and Marsch (2001) determined that these levels are acceptable considering that each subscale has only three items. No known studies have attempted to use the SSAS as a full scale. Internal consistency for the current study was measured for each SSAS subscale resulting in Cronbach's alphas of .81 for Public Self-Awareness, .73 for Private Self-Awareness, and .79 for Self-Awareness of Immediate Surroundings. Examples of items for each subscale of the SSAS include, Private Self-Awareness - "Right now, I am conscious of my inner feelings", Public Self-

Awareness – "Right now, I am concerned about the way I present myself", and Immediate Surroundings – "Right now, I am keenly aware of everything in my environment." Higher scores on the instrument indicate greater self-awareness.

Procedure

Following IRB approval, graduate psychology students were recruited from across the US through online advertisement via social networking websites and email correspondence. Further recruitment occurred through email listservs of psychology graduate student programs and organizations in the United States as well as word of mouth and face-to-face inquiry from the primary investigator. All participants were invited to complete the surveys through an online website, esurveycreator.com.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Following a review of descriptive statistics to clean and screen the data for errors, missing data for the survey results were analyzed using Little's MCAR test $\chi^2 (945) = 905.691$, $p = .816$, which indicates that the data was missing completely at random (MCAR). Additionally, the overall percentage of missing data was .195%. A non-significant Little's MCAR test and a low percentage of missing data allows for flexibility in the handling of missing data. Therefore, the expectation maximization (EM) algorithm, a maximum-likelihood based method, was chosen to replace missing data because it is an efficient and unbiased method when data is MCAR (Dong & Peng, 2013). Use of the EM method allowed for the preservation of cases with missing data instead of deleting those cases from the sample.

Univariate outliers were analyzed by calculating the z-scores for each scale with outliers identified by a z-score of more than three standard deviations above or below the mean (Field,

2009). As recommended in Reifman and Keyton (2010), the Winsorize method was used to replace univariate outliers on total scale scores with the highest data point not considered to be an outlier.

Multivariate outliers were evaluated using Mahalanobis distance with the critical chi square of $p = .001$ as the cutoff value (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Two cases were identified as multivariate outliers and removed from the dataset reducing the total sample size from 279 to 277 for the final analysis. The total scores of the measures of cultural competence and self-awareness were analyzed for the assumption of normality using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test and visually using P-P plots and histograms. The total scores for IC - $D(277) = .067$, $p = .004$, MC - $D(277) = .063$, $p = .009$, Public Self-Awareness - $D(277) = .101$, $p < .001$, Private Self-Awareness - $D(277) = .135$, $p < .001$, and Awareness of Immediate Surroundings - $D(277) = .142$, $p < .001$ were all significantly non-normal. However, non-normal distributions are common in large sample sizes and is not a concern in sample sizes larger than 30. According to the central limit theorem, distributions tend to be normal as the sample size increases regardless of the population distribution (Field, 2009).

Primary Analyses

Time spent abroad vs. no international experience. Independent Samples *t*-tests were calculated to answer the first research question, which inquired if there were any differences between students with no experience abroad and students with international experience, defined as time spent outside the United States (US) related to education, professional training or work. The *t*-tests compared the mean scores of students with no international experience ($N = 79$) to students with at least one day of educational or professional international experience ($N = 198$) on levels of IC, MC, Public Self-Awareness, Private Self-Awareness, and Awareness of

Immediate Surroundings. The results of the t-tests found one statistical difference between students with no international experience ($M = 12.48$, $SD = 4.326$) and students with at least one day of international experience ($M = 10.76$, $SD = 4.713$; $t(275) = -2.81$, $p = .005$, two-tailed) on the measure of public self-awareness. The magnitude of the differences in the means for Public Self-Awareness was small ($d = 0.38$) but significant.

Differences in amount of time spent abroad. A one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to address the second research question, which was whether there were any differences in students' perceived levels of IC, MC, and self-awareness depending on the amount of time spent abroad. Students' reported time spent abroad for educational or professional reasons were divided into five categories: no experience abroad ($N = 79$), less than 30 days ($N = 94$), 30 – 90 days ($N = 34$), 90 - 180 days ($N = 38$), and 180+ days ($N = 32$). There was a statistically significant difference on the measures of perceived IC - $F(4, 272) = 5.38$ $p <$ .001, $\eta^2 = .073$ and Public Self-Awareness - Welch's $F(4, 104.49) = 15.18$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .099$. The Private and Immediate Surroundings subscales of self-awareness were not statistically significant on any groups of time spent abroad. After a Bonferroni correction at the .01 level, perceived MC was also not significant for the overall ANOVA, $F(4, 272) = 2.73$, $p = .03$.

Due to the use of ANOVA with an independent variable (time spent abroad) that is not truly categorical but is analyzed as ordinal categories (Field, 2009), a polynomial contrast analysis was conducted to determine if there was a significant linear trend between time spent abroad and perceived IC, MC, or self-awareness. For IC, there was a significant unweighted linear trend, $F(1, 272) = 9.35$, $p = .002$. For Public Self-Awareness, a significant unweighted linear trend was also found, $F(1, 272) = 22.94$, $p = < .001$.

Results of Tukey post-hoc analyses indicated several statistically significant differences for perceived levels of IC, MC and different time spent abroad groups. Games-Howell was selected for the post-hoc analyses of Public Self-Awareness due to its accuracy when the assumption of equal variances is violated (Field, 2009). The results of the ANOVA post-hoc analyses are listed in Table 1.

International experience and multicultural coursework. Spearman's rho correlations were used to address the third research question: When controlling for MC coursework, are there any differences in perceived IC, MC, or self-awareness between students who have spent less than 30 days abroad and students who have more international experience? Participants reported how many courses they had completed that focused on either intercultural (racial / cross-cultural, $N = 209$, 75.5%) or multicultural competency topics (individual differences, i.e. gender, disability, etc., $N = 166$, 59.9%). Results indicated that the number of multicultural courses taken by psychology graduate students did not have a strong relationship to perceived IC, MC, or self-awareness regardless of type of competency course or time spent abroad.

Type of international experience and self-awareness. The fourth research question was also addressed using Spearman's correlations to determine, between students with international experience, if the type of international experience and self-awareness predict the development of IC and MC. Two types of international experience, paid work and study abroad, were compared to measures of cultural competence and self-awareness. Spearman's rho correlations were also conducted to evaluate the relationship between IC, MC, and self-awareness. No strong relationships between the two types of international experience, work or study abroad, or self-awareness were found with perceived levels of cultural competence compared across time spent abroad for less than 30 days to 180+ days. Due to the weak relationships between coursework,

Table 1.

ANOVA Comparisons of Time Spent Abroad, Cultural Competence, and Self-Awareness

Group	n	Mean	SD	Tukey Comparisons (significant $p*$ values & Cohen's d)				
				No Experience Abroad	Less than 30 days	30 - 90 days	90 - 180 days	180+ days
Intercultural Competence								
No Experience Abroad	79	73.78	6.65					0.009
Less than 30 days	94	72.45	6.28					< .001
30 - 90 days	34	75.12	6.50					
90 - 180 days	38	72.58	7.52					0.003
180+ days	32	78.53	8.17	0.009 ($d = 0.64$)	< .001 ($d = 0.83$)		0.003 ($d = 0.76$)	
Total	277	73.88	7.04					
Multicultural Competence								
No Experience Abroad	79	66.49	6.26					
Less than 30 days	94	65.68	5.64			0.014 ($d = 0.68$)		
30 - 90 days	34	69.47	5.25		0.014 ($d = 0.69$)			
90 - 180 days	38	65.79	5.24					
180+ days	32	66.84	7.34					
Total	277	66.53	6.02					
Public Self-Awareness				Games-Howell Comparisons (significant $p*$ values & Cohen's d)				
No Experience Abroad	79	12.48	4.33					< .001
Less than 30 days	94	11.19	4.73					< .001
30 - 90 days	34	11.97	5.02					< .001
90 - 180 days	38	11.37	4.66					< .001
180+ days	32	7.47	2.74	< .001 ($d = 0.82$)	< .001 ($d = 0.59$)	< .001 ($d = 0.71$)	< .001 ($d = 0.63$)	
Total	277	11.25	4.66					

*p values are significant at the 0.05 level.

type of international experience, self-awareness, and cultural competence no further analyses were conducted for them as control variables. Several other variables collected in the demographic questionnaire were also explored: race/ethnicity, number of languages spoken fluently, type of psychology graduate program, and year in psychology program. No strong correlations were found between those variables and levels of IC, MC, or self-awareness. The correlation results for multicultural courses, type of international experience, and self-awareness are listed in Table 2.

International experience and the development of IC, MC, and self-awareness. Research question number five inquired if international experience, defined as travel outside the US for the purpose of education, professional training or work, contributes to the development of perceived IC, MC and self-awareness. To address this question, the statistical analyses used for research questions 1 - 4 were evaluated to determine if results from the current study provided evidence that international experience contributes significantly to higher levels of cultural competence and self-awareness. Significant differences found in the previously reported *t*-test and ANOVA group comparisons indicate several main effects for perceived cultural competence and Public Self-Awareness across five groups of time spent abroad.

Similarities and differences between IC, MC, and self-awareness. Although it is difficult to make inferences about the similarities and differences between the constructs of MC, IC, and the three types of self-awareness, research question number six was posed to explore possible connections between these variables. The measures of IC and MC used in the current study were significantly and positively correlated. The strength of the relationship was not strong ($\rho = .362$), but considered medium in strength for research in the behavioral sciences according to Cohen (1988). Correlations mirrored the ANOVA findings with a significant negative

Table 2.

Correlations of Multicultural Courses, Type of International Experience, and Self-Awareness with Cultural Competence

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Competence Variables										
1. Intercultural	1	.36**	-.12*	.15*	.25**	-.13*	.16**	-0.04	0.02	0.09
2. Multicultural	-	1	0.05	.24**	.25**	.16**	.12*	-0.10	-0.02	0.07
Awareness Variables										
3. Public Self-Awareness	-	-	1	.26**	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.07	-0.01	-.22**
4. Private Self-Awareness	-	-	-	1	.56**	0.03	0.08	0.00	0.05	-.01
5. Awareness of Surroundings	-	-	-	-	1	0.03	0.08	0.02	0.03	-.02
Multicultural Courses										
6. Cross-cultural focus	-	-	-	-	-	1	.50**	-0.10	-0.02	.08
7. Individual differences	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-0.04	0.04	-.05
Type of International Experience										
8. Work Abroad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	0.09	-.38**
9. Study Abroad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-.62**
10. Time Spent Abroad ***	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
*** Time Spent Abroad includes all participants ($N = 277$), students with no experience abroad to 180+ days of international experience

relationship found between IC and Public Self-Awareness (ρ = -.118). The magnitude of the relationship was small (Cohen, 1988), but the similar pattern of the correlation and ANOVA results may indicate that higher levels of IC influence levels of Public Self-Awareness or vice versa.

Discussion

In the current study, six research questions explored the relationships between perceived intercultural competence (IC), multicultural competence (MC), self-awareness, and international experience in psychology clinical and counseling doctoral students. The study investigated if there were any differences in perceived levels of IC, MC, or self-awareness between students with no experience abroad and students with international experience. Results indicated a small, but significant main effect in levels of Public Self-Awareness between students with no international experience compared to students with one to 180+ days of international experience. Due to the variation in the amount of time students spent abroad for education or work (1 – 180+ days), further analyses were performed, which inquired whether differences exist in students' perceived levels of IC, MC, or self-awareness for the amount of time spent abroad. Significant differences were found for IC, MC, and Public Self-Awareness across groups of different lengths of time spent abroad. Correlational analyses were used to investigate if multicultural courses, type of international experience, and self-awareness may predict perceived IC and MC as well as how the constructs may be related. No strong relationships were found between length of international experience and multicultural courses, type of international experience, and self-awareness. The constructs of perceived IC and MC appear to share some similarities, but may represent two distinct constructs. Public Self-Awareness and IC may share similarities in the development of knowledge and skills necessary for how an individual presents themselves to

23

others in different cultures. The following sections interpret the results in detail for each variable and research question.

Perceptions of Intercultural Competence

Levels of perceived IC were significantly higher for students with 180+ days of international experience compared to students with no experience abroad, less than 30 days abroad, and 90 - 180 days abroad. However, no difference was found for IC in the $30 - 90$ day group. A medium to large effect size was found for the overall comparison of levels of IC and time spent abroad and medium to large effect sizes were found for the differences between IC and 180+ days of international experience compared to students with no experience abroad, less than 30 days abroad, and 90 - 180 days abroad. The results indicate that the more time students spend abroad the more likely it is that students will score higher on the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES; Portalla & Chen, 2010), the measure of perceived IC used in the current study.

The findings for IC in the current study are consistent with the assertion in the literature that more time spent abroad is related to higher levels of perceived cultural competence. Behrnd & Porzelt (2012) surveyed a group of German university students from various fields of study, and found higher levels of perceived intercultural competence for students who spent longer periods of time abroad, particularly for stays of 6 months (approximately 180 days) or more. For the current study, it is unclear why there were no significant results for the 180+ days category compared to $30 - 90$ days for time spent abroad and perceived IC. However, if six months was a critical point in Behrnd & Porzelt's study then the lack of significant IC results for $30 - 90$ days in the current study might be explained by the absence of a difference between the time groups of six months or less. It may be that $30 - 60$ days of time spent abroad does not make much

difference on levels of IC when compared to less than 30 days or 90 – 180 days and 180+ days of time spent abroad.

Culture shock theories also offer insight into why students may not feel culturally competent during the 30 – 90 day period of time spent abroad. Length of cultural contact is one factor that facilitates the process of adjustment to a foreign culture (Zhou, Jindal-Snape, Topping, & Todman, 2008). The popular U-Curve theory of culture shock proposes that individuals experience stages of adjustment to a new culture over time starting with a "honeymoon" period, or period of excitement and optimism about being in a new culture. The honeymoon period is followed by a "stage of crisis" including feelings of depression and loneliness when the novelty of a foreign culture wears off and the difficulties of navigating the foreign culture becomes more salient. As more time passes, individuals tend to re-gain positive attitudes and levels of depression decrease as they acculturate (Bikos et al., 2007). Self-perception of high levels of IC might coincide with elated feelings associated with experiencing a new culture in the first month of travel, followed by a decrease in confidence in competence in the 30 – 90 day period. However, by 180+ days of time spent abroad self-perceived confidence in an individual's cultural competence may be restored.

Perceptions of Multicultural Competence

For perceived MC, significant differences in competence scores were found between students with less than 30 days of international experience and students who had spent time abroad for 30 – 90 days. A small to medium effect size was found for the overall comparison of levels of MC and time spent abroad and a medium effect size was found between the significant time spent abroad groups indicating that scores on the California Brief Multicultural Competence

Scale (CBMCS; Gamst et al., 2004) were most likely to be higher for students who spent 30 – 90 days abroad than students who spent less than 30 days abroad.

The relationship between perceived MC and time spent abroad was less consistent than perceived IC or Public Self-awareness, but showed significant differences between students with less than 30 days and 30 – 90 days abroad. There is little previous research on the impact of international experience on multicultural competence, but a couple of studies were found that addressed multicultural competence as a component of their research (Heppner & Wang, 2014; Smith et al., 2014). Most existing research on international experience appears to focus on variables related to intercultural competence.

The results for perceived MC in the current study support findings in the Smith et al. (2014) study that participants reported higher levels of perceived MC following a four week long study abroad experience. However, a theoretical precedent for the differences found in the current study between students with less than 30 days versus 30 – 90 days of international experience is elusive. It is uncertain why this pattern of results occurred, but there does appear to be an effect of time spent abroad on perceived levels of MC. Perhaps for students with international experience the perception of improved MC skills is most salient after travel of 30 – 90 days. International experience of less than 30 days may not be long enough to enhance perceived MC, but more than 180 days spent abroad may produce a ceiling affect in the perception of MC as described for IC in Behrnd & Porzelt (2012). In other words, scores on measures of MC may plateau for students after they spend a certain amount of time abroad, possibly due to limits in the surveys to measure increased levels of MC in long term expatriates or because the students have acquired a mastery of MC skills.

Perceptions of Self-Awareness

The results for comparisons of time spent abroad to levels of perceived Public Self-Awareness indicated significant differences between students who spent 180+ days abroad compared to all other categories of time spent abroad. A medium to large effect size was found for the overall comparison of levels of Public Self-Awareness and time spent abroad and medium to large effect sizes were found between 180+ days and the other four groups of time spent abroad, no experience abroad, less than 30 days, 30 – 90 days, and 90 – 180 days. The effect sizes indicated that students who spent more than 180+ days abroad were more likely to score lower on the measure of Public Self-Awareness than students who spent less time abroad. No difference was found in levels of Private Self-Awareness and Awareness of Immediate Surroundings across different groups of time spent abroad, which indicated that Public Self-Awareness may have a relationship with levels of cultural competence and time spent abroad that is not present for other types of self-awareness.

Public Self-Awareness. The relationship between perceptions of Public Self-Awareness and international experience was significant for all levels of time spent abroad when compared to 180+ days. This result pattern mirrored the results for IC, but time spent abroad appeared to be a stronger and more consistent predictor of students' levels of perceived public self-awareness. Additionally, levels of IC and MC *increased* as time spent abroad increases, but levels of Public Self-Awareness *decreased* as time spent abroad increased. A lack of quantitative research on the relationship between international experience and self-awareness makes it difficult to interpret the self-awareness results of the present study.

The theory behind the development of the Situational Self-Awareness Scale (SSAS; Govern & Marsch, 2001) may shed some light on the relationship between Public Self-

27

Awareness and international experience. Public Self-Awareness is related to attention focused on aspects of the self that are presented to others. It differs from Private and Immediate Surroundings because it impacts behavior more directly. When an individual perceives that they are being evaluated by others, they may become uncomfortable and change their behavior to conform to the standards of others (Govern & Marsch, 2001). During interactions with others in a foreign country, students may be more aware of how they present themselves publically and may modify their behavior to try to fit into their new environment and be accepted by people in a different culture. It may that the more time students spend abroad, the less heightened public self-awareness is needed due to increased knowledge, skills, and practice interacting with others in the foreign culture. The foreign culture becomes less "foreign" and the student becomes more comfortable as they acculturate.

Construct Differences and Similarities

How perceived MC is related to perceived IC is not entirely clear and the lack of the same pattern of results for MC across time spent abroad may indicate that international experience is not as strong of a predictor of increases in MC compared to IC and Public Self-Awareness. Therefore, MC may also overlap with IC, but could largely function as a separate construct with distinct differences in the knowledge and skills needed for competency. The pattern of decrease in levels of Public Self-Awareness as time spent abroad increased may represent an overlap with IC in the development of knowledge and skills necessary for how an individual presents themselves to others in different cultures. Govern and Marsch (2001) reported that people who are publically self-aware are more likely to behave according to the perceived expectations of others as opposed to people with high private self-awareness who behave according to their own internal standards. It would make sense that people with less

international experience might have higher levels of perceived Public Self-Awareness because of discomfort being in a culturally different environment. They might also have more awareness of how they are perceived by others than when in their native country. Therefore, as time spent abroad and comfort in the foreign environment increases, perceived public self-awareness decreases.

International Experience

In the current study, a pattern of significant differences was found between students with 180+ days of international experience and students who spent less time abroad for perceived IC and Public Self-Awareness. International Experience appears to be an inconsistent, but significant, predictor of higher levels of perceived cultural competence and lower levels of Public Self-Awareness in psychology graduate students.

Summary of the Research Questions

Exploration of research questions 1 and 2 for the present study indicated that more time spent abroad for professional work or education may be related to higher perceived levels of IC and 30 – 90 days of time spent abroad may be related to higher levels of perceived MC. More time spent abroad for work or educational reasons may be related to lower levels of perceived public self-awareness. Higher levels of IC have been associated with behavioral flexibility, the ability to adapt to unfamiliar situations as well as less anxiety and more sensitivity during interactions with people from different cultures (Portalla & Chen, 2010). Lower levels of public self-awareness are related to less discomfort and apprehension about negative evaluation from others, which may lead individuals to modify their behavior based on the perceived expectations of others. Such behavior may be inconsistent with the actual expectations of others as well as the individual's internal standards (Govern & Marsch, 2001).

Research questions 3 and 4 explored whether factors such as multicultural coursework, type of international experience, and self-awareness may predict perceived IC and MC. The number of multicultural classes taken by students, work abroad and study abroad were evaluated using correlation studies and the relationships between the variables were not strong enough to warrant follow-up analyses. Perceived self-awareness also does not appear to predict perceived IC or MC due to a lack of strong correlations between the measures of cultural competence and self-awareness. Although this finding may be surprising and contradictory to some research on international experience and cultural competence (Wilk, 2014), there is other previous research that supports a lack of a relationship between cultural competence, self-awareness, and international experience. Smith et al. (2014) referenced previous studies that found that traditional multicultural courses were not enough to reduce "affective prejudicial racial attitudes" (p. 1191), or attitudes students have about cultural differences related to events or situations that affect them personally. Additionally, Behrnd & Porzelt (2012) did not find any significant correlations between the number of visited countries, the number of foreign languages spoken, or the number of private stays abroad and measures of intercultural competence.

Research question 5 was a general inquiry into whether international experience, defined as travel outside the US for the purpose of education, professional training or work, contributes to the development of perceived IC, MC and self-awareness. The results for the current study indicate that international experience may be related to cultural competence and public self-awareness, but more research is needed to determine the extent or magnitude of the relationship between those variables. What is most clearly evident from the current study is a pattern of differences between students with 180+ days of international experience and students with less than 180 days on levels of perceived IC and Public Self-Awareness. This finding is congruent

with previous research indicating that 180 days is a cutoff point for sustained competency

learning outcomes (Behrnd & Porzelt, 2012).

Research question 6 explored the possible similarities and differences between the

constructs of perceived IC, MC, and the three subscales of self-awareness. IC and MC may share

some similarities, but as measured in the current study, it appeared they represent two distinct

constructs. Public Self-Awareness was the only subscale of self-awareness that showed

significant results when compared with IC or MC. The ANOVA indicated a consistent

significant pattern for IC and Public Self-Awareness between students who spent 180+ days

abroad compared to students who spent less time abroad. Correlations showed a significant

relationship between IC and Public Self-Awareness, but not MC, which may provide additional

support for the influence of Public Self-Awareness on IC or vice-versa. The nature of the

relationship between Public Self-Awareness and IC is not entirely clear but may represent some

overlapping factors in the process of learning to interact successfully with individuals from

different cultures.

Limitations

The present study had several limitations that must be considered. Self-report measures

of cultural competence may lack reliability due to some reported inconsistencies between

participant perception and observed measures of cultural competence (Gamst et al., 2004). Self-

report of competencies may reflect knowledge of cultural differences, self-efficacy in cross-

cultural interactions, and anticipated behavior in counseling with diverse clients (Worthington,

Mobley, Franks, & Tan, 2000). Understanding psychology students' perceptions of their own

ability to be competent mental health clinicians is important, but a fundamental limitation to the

current study was the absence of a measure of observed competence. Without a measure of

observed skills, it was difficult to know how self-perceived competence levels in the current sample might compare to actual behaviors in practice.

Other limitations involved sample demographics and issues in how the variables were defined and measured. First, the overall sample size met the recommended number for power as calculated in the a priori power analysis. However, for the groups of students who spent time abroad the samples were much smaller which may have reduced power for those analyses. Second, although the distribution of the participants' ages was fairly even, respondents were primarily female. The lack of male participants makes it difficult to generalize the results to male students in psychology doctoral programs. The race and ethnicity of the sample was also primarily Caucasian, which is a limitation to understanding the perception of cultural competence in minority students. Third, it is difficult to generalize the results outside of the measures and design of the current study due to a lack of ability to control for the overlap in the definitions and perceptions of IC, MC, and self-awareness. There is a lack of consistent definition of the study variables in the literature and few studies use the same questionnaires, type or number of participants, or lengths of time spent abroad to explore the perception of cultural competence or self-awareness.

Variations in the type of international experience and the content of multicultural courses may have also introduced unknown confounding variables into the current study. Where students spent time abroad and amount of cultural immersion may have influenced levels of perceived cultural competence and self-awareness as discussed in theories of cultural distance. Socio-cultural differences between countries such as values, language, and level of development make up a few of the aspects of cultural distance. The more cultural similarities that exist between an individual's home country and the host country, the less cultural adaptation that is required

(Froese & Peltokorpi, 2011). It is theorized that cultural immersion may increase cultural competence over time due to "psychological isolation and anxiety that encourages cultural learning" (Lough, 2011; p. 454). Finally, another limitation is the type of students who chose to participate in the study. Students with an interest in the factors of IC, MC, self-awareness, or international experience may have been more likely to complete the surveys. Students with little or no interest in the study topics may not have started or may have started but not finished the surveys. The lack of information from students who chose not to participate in the current study may mean that the results present an incomplete picture of the relationship between perceived cultural competence, self-awareness, and international experience.

Implications for Training and Future Research

Several implications for future research, training, and clinical practice can be identified from the current study. It may not be clear exactly how international experience, perceived cultural competence, and self-awareness are related, but it is evident that psychology trainees should be aware of the relationships between these variables when conducting research, diagnosing, and treating clients. Based on previous research and the current study results it is difficult to be confident in the use of multicultural courses, study abroad, or other types of cultural immersion as predictors of the development of cultural competence or self-awareness in psychology trainees. It may be optimistic to assume that psychology training programs can promote the growth of cultural competence using the current APA standards for coursework (APA, 2017), especially if there is not a strong relationship between coursework and the development of cultural competence. In the current study, higher numbers of multicultural courses were not strongly related to greater perceived cultural competence and the mean differences between students with little to no international experience and those who spent more

time abroad was small. Those findings appear to indicate that students may not have consistent perceptions of their own knowledge, awareness, or skills related to cultural competence. If so, an important implication for training is how to help students understand the limitations in their knowledge, awareness, and skills to engage in culturally effective psychological research and practice. Additionally, the pattern of higher perceived cultural competence and lower perceived Public Self-Awareness after 180 days of international experience may have implications for the length of time spent in multicultural courses. Further research is needed to determine if multicultural courses of at least 180 days would have a similar impact on levels of perceived cultural competence and self-awareness.

The current study also confirmed similarities as well as differences between perceived IC and MC. Because the current study only measured perception and not observed competence, it is vital to find better ways to measure whether psychology students demonstrate culturally competent knowledge and skills in psychology practice. A better understanding of the different types of cultural competence will help psychology programs design better training courses for students. Additionally, although MC has received a great deal of attention in APA training programs; little IC training is currently available to graduate students. Study abroad programs may offer a way to incorporate IC training, but study abroad is limited or not available in many APA programs.

Previous research (Behrnd & Porzelt, 2012, Barden, et al., 2015, Smith et al., 2014) and the current study indicate that longer periods of time spent abroad for education or work are more likely to promote perceived cultural competence than shorter periods of international experience. More time spent abroad may contribute to greater perceived cultural competence and lower perceived Public Self-Awareness due to specific knowledge, awareness, and skills that

may only develop after an individual has spent a significant amount of time (e.g. 180 days) living, working, or studying abroad. Experiences of cultural immersion, or intimate contact with people of the indigenous culture, are more likely during longer periods of international experience. Such experiences may decrease anxiety related to contact with unfamiliar people and environments as well as increase an individual's understanding and acceptance of other cultures (Lough, 2011). Therefore, psychology programs may enhance the development of perceived cultural competence in students by offering longer study abroad or cultural immersion experiences. However, the expense of study or work abroad programs may hinder many students from participating. The real question may be how to promote the growth of cultural competence with short term, cost effective cultural immersion programs in an international setting (Anderson et al., 2006; Heppner & Wang, 2014; Smith et al., 2014) combined with longer periods of multicultural coursework and cultural immersion in domestic settings as proposed by Canfield et al. (2009).

Cultural competence and self-awareness are complex factors with many possible influences on attitudes and behavior. If self-awareness is not highly related to cultural competence, as the current study results indicate, then education that promotes self-awareness may have little to no impact on how psychology students work with culturally different clients. Previous studies have claimed a relationship between self-awareness, cultural competence, and international experience, however, some claims appear to be purely theoretical and not based on empirical research (Wilk, 2014, Sue et al., 1992) or qualitative in nature (Heppner & Wang, 2014, Canfield et al., 2009). Quantitative studies related to cultural competence and self-awareness were not found and it is important to note that not only is the measure of self-

awareness needed in future studies, but attention to how self-awareness is measured is important considering the differences in the results of the subscales of self-awareness in the current study.

Additional research studies using multiple measures of competence, both perceived and observed, will be needed to fully explore the impact of international experience, multicultural education, and other factors that lead to the development of IC and MC for doctoral students in psychology. Future studies using more rigorous research methods, both quantitative and mixed methods designs, may be able to better parse out the complexity of these relationships, especially how one variable may predict another. The use of experimental randomized research designs such as pre-test and post-test studies with a control group, such as new graduate students who have no international experience or cultural competence training, would increase generalizability.

Future studies that use more objective methods to evaluate levels of cultural competence and self-awareness, such as standardized observations of students' counseling skills, would help determine if there is a difference between self-reported and observed skills. More research is needed to more fully understand how these variables inform the development of skills psychology students use to interact appropriately with culturally diverse clients. Cultural influences on mental health are complex, but research shows that culture plays a vital role in the symptomology and prognosis for individuals with mental illness and disability (Ryder et al., 2008). Therefore, it is vital to continue to study how cultural competence and self-awareness may help protect against prejudicial attitudes that could be harmful to clients.

References

American Psychological Association. (2006). APA task force on the assessment of competence

 in professional psychology: Final report. Retrieved from

 http://www.apa.org/ed/resources/competence-report.aspx

American Psychological Association. (2017). Multicultural Guidelines: An Ecological Approach

 to Context, Identity, and Intersectionality. Retrieved from:

 http://www.apa.org/about/policy/multicultural-guidelines.pdf

Anderson, P. H., Lawton, L., Rexeisen, R. J., & Hubbard, A. C. (2006). Short-term study abroad

 and intercultural sensitivity: A pilot study. *International Journal of Intercultural*

 Relations, *30*, 457-469. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.10.004

Barden, S. M., Shannonhouse, L., & Mobley, K. (2015). International cultural immersion:

 Assessing the influence of a group intervention on intercultural sensitivity for counselor

 trainees. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, *40*, 117-141.

 doi:10.1080/01933922.2014.992505

Behrnd, V., & Porzelt, S. (2012). Intercultural competence and training outcomes of students

 with experience abroad. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *36*, 213-223.

 doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.04.005

Bell, K., & Anscombe, A.W. (2013). International field experience in social work: Outcomes of

 a short-term study abroad programme in India. *Social Work Education, 32,* 1032-1047.

 doi: 10.1080/02615479.2012.730143

Bikos, L.H., Çiftçi, A., Güneri, O.Y., Demir, C.E., Sümer, Z.H., Danielson, S.,…Bilgen, W.A.

 (2007). A repeated measures investigation of the first-year adaptation experiences of the

female expatriate spouse living in Turkey. *Journal of Career Development, 34*(1), 5-27. doi: 10.1177/0894845307304063

Canfield, B. S., Low, L., & Hovestadt, A. (2009). Cultural immersion as a learning method for expanding intercultural competencies. *Family Journal*, *17*, 318-322. doi:10.1177/1066480709347359

Cartwright, B.Y., Daniels, J. & Zhang, S. (2008). Assessing multicultural competence: Perceived versus demonstrated performance. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 86,* 318-322.

Christopher, J.C., Wendt, D.C., Marecek, J., & Goodman, D.M. (2014). Critical cultural awareness: Contributions to a globalizing psychology. *American Psychologist, 69*, 645-655. doi: 0003-066X/14/S12.00

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences.* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Diesel, H. J., Ercole, P. M., & Taliaferro, D. L. (2013). Changing knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs via an immersion experience. *International Journal for Human Caring*, *17*, 71-78.

Dong, Y. & Peng, C-Y.J. (2013). Principled missing data methods for researchers. *SpringerPlus*, *2*(222). Retrieved from http://www.springerplus.com/content/2/1/222

Earnest, D. R., Rosenbusch, K., Wallace-Williams, D., & Keim, A. C. (2016). Study abroad in psychology: Increasing cultural competencies through experiential learning. *Teaching of Psychology*, *43*, 75-79. doi:10.1177/0098628315620889

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*, 175-191. doi:10.3758/BF03193146

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS.* (3rd Ed.). London, England: Sage

    Publications Ltd.

Froese, F.J. & Peltokorpi, V. (2011). Cultural distance and expatriate job satisfaction.

    International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35(1), 49-60. Retrieved from

    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.10.002

Gamst, G., Dana, R.H., Der-Karabetian, A., Aragon, M., Arellano, L., Morrow, G., &

    Martenson, L. (2004). Cultural competency revised: The California Brief Multicultural

    Competence Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 37*,

    163-183.

Gertsen, M.C. (1990). Intercultural competence and expatriates. *International Journal of Human*

    Resource Management, *1*, 341-362.

Govern, J.M. & Marsch, L.A. (2001). Development and validation of the Situational Self-

    Awareness Scale. *Consciousness and Cognition, 10*, 366–378. doi:

    10.1006/ccog.2001.0506

Heppner, P. P. & Wang, K. T. (2014). A cross-cultural immersion program: Promoting students'

    cultural journeys. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *42*, 1159-1187.

    doi:10.1177/0011000014548899

Keyser, V., Gamst, G., Meyers, L.S., Der-Karabetian, A., & Morrow, G. (2014). Predictors of

    self-perceived cultural competence among children's mental health providers. *Cultural*

    Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 20(3), 324–335.

Kwan, K-L.K., & Gerstein, L.H. (2008). Envisioning a counseling psychology of the world: The

    mission of the International Forum. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*, 182-187. doi:

    10.1177/0011000007313269

Leung, S.A. (2003). A journey worth traveling: Globalization of counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31,* 412-419. doi: 10.1177/0011000003031004004

Lorelle, S., Byrd, R., & Crockett, S. (2012). Globalization and counseling: Professional issues for counselors. *The Professional Counselor: Research and Practice, 12*, 115-123.

Lough, B.J. (2011). International volunteers' perceptions of intercultural competence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35,* 452-464. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2010.06.002

Lumkes, Jr., J.H., Hallett, S., & Vallade, L. (2012). Hearing versus experiencing: The impact of a short-term study abroad experience in China on students' perceptions regarding globalization and cultural awareness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 36,* 151-159. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.12.004

Pope-Davis, D. B., & Coleman, H. L. (1997). *Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education, and training, and supervision.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pope-Davis, D.B. (2003). *Handbook of multicultural competencies in counseling & psychology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Popescu, A-D., Borca, C., Fistis, G., & Draghici, A. (2014). Cultural diversity and differences in cross-cultural project teams. *Procedia Technology, 16*, 525-531.

Portalla, T. & Chen, G. (2010). The Development and validation of the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 19*, 21-37.

Prilleltensky, I. (2012). The what, why, who, and how of globalization: What is psychology to do? *Journal of Social Issues, 68*, 612-629.

Reifman, A. & Keyton, K. (2010). *Winsorize.* In N. J. Salkind (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Research Design (pp. 1636-1638). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ryder, A.G., Yang, J., Zhu, X., Yao, S.Y., Yi, J., Heine, S.J., & Bagby, R.M. (2008). The cultural shaping of depression: Somatic symptoms in China, psychological symptoms in North America? *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 117*(2), 300-313.

Smith, M. M., Jennings, L., & Lakhan, S. (2014). International education and service learning: Approaches toward cultural competency and social justice. *Counseling Psychologist, 42*, 1188-1214. doi: 10.1177/0011000014557499

Sue, D.W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R.J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 477-486.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. 6th ed. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education.

Watson, J.R., Siska, P., & Wolfel, R.L. (2013). Assessing gains in language proficiency, cross-cultural competence, and regional awareness during study abroad: A preliminary study. *Foreign Language Annals, 46*, 62-79. doi: 10.1111/flan.12016

Wilk, K. (2014). Using a pluralistic approach in counseling psychology and psychotherapy practice with diverse clients: Explorations into cultural and religious responsiveness within a Western paradigm. *Counselling Psychology Review, 29*, 16-28.

Worthington, R. L., Mobley, M., Franks, R. P., & Tan, J. A. (2000). Multicultural counseling competencies: Verbal content, counselor attributions, and social desirability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*(4), 460-468. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.47.4.460

Worthington, R.L., Soth-McNett, A.M. & Moreno, M.V. (2007). Multicultural counseling competencies research: A 20-year content analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*(4), 351–361. doi: 10.1037/0022-0167.54.4.351

Zhou, Y., Jindal-Snape, D., Topping, K., & Todman, J. (2008). Theoretical models of culture

shock and adaptation in international students in higher education. *Studies in Higher*

Education, *33*(1), 63-75. doi:10.1080/03075070701794833

Appendix A

Demographic Questions

What is your age?

How do you identify?
- Male
- Female
- Trans
- Other

Are you:
- Married
- Divorced
- Widowed
- Separated
- Never been married
- A member of an unmarried couple

To which racial or ethnic group(s) do
you *most* identify?
- African-American (non-Hispanic)
- African
- Arab
- Asian
- Caucasian (non-Hispanic)
- Latino or Hispanic
- Native American or Alaskan Native
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Multiracial
- Another race (please specify)

What is your nationality?
- United States Citizen
- Other
- Dual US and other nationality (please specify)

Were you born in the US?
- Yes
- No, not adopted
- No, adopted

Were either or both of your parents born outside of
the US (if adopted, refers to adoptive *not* biological
parents)?
- Yes
- No
- If *Yes*, please select all that apply
  - o Foreign born mother
  - o Foreign born father
  - o Both parents foreign born

What country do you primarily call "home"?

What type of psychology degree are you seeking?
- Counseling Ph.D.
- Clinical Ph.D.

- Psy.D.
- Other, please specify

What is your current status in the doctoral program?
- 1st year
- 2nd year
- 3rd year
- 4th year
- 5th + year
- On internship
- All but dissertation

How many multicultural courses have you taken in
graduate school that have primarily focused on racial
or cross-cultural differences?
(we recognize some programs include aspects of
multicultural training in every course; please only
include courses *primarily* focused on multicultural
issues)
- 0   • 3
- 1   • 4
- 2   •5+

How many multicultural courses have you taken in
graduate school that have primarily focused on other
individual differences (e.g. gender, disability, LGBT
issues, spirituality)? (we recognize some programs
include aspects of multicultural training in every
course; please only include courses *primarily* focused
on multicultural issues)
- 0   • 3
- 1   • 4
- 2   • 5+

What is the longest time you spent in a country other
than the US?
- 30 – 90 days
- 90 – 180 days
- 180 – 365 days
- 365+ days

How many languages other than English do you
speak fluently?
- 0   • 3
- 1   • 4
- 2   • 5+

How many languages other than English do you
speak moderately well?
- 0   • 3
- 1   • 4
- 2   • 5+

How many languages other than English do you speak at the beginner level?
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5+

What was the nature of your international experience, please mark all that apply:
- worked abroad
- study abroad
- attended a professional conference
- on the ground research
- other experience, please specify in the space below:

What was the length of your longest educational or professional international experience?
- Less than 30 days
- 30 – 90 days
- 90 – 180 days
- 180 – 365 days
- 365+ days
- If more than 365 days (1 year) please write in the approximate number of days below:

Regarding the experience in the previous question, did your study or work / professional experience abroad require you to take classes, teach, work, or present in a language other than English? (not including language learning classes or seminars)
- Yes
- No
- If *Yes*, please select all that apply
    o take classes
    o teach
    o work
    o present
    o other, please specify briefly below:

During your experience abroad, were you primarily communicating / interacting with American colleagues or students?
- Yes
- No

During your experience abroad, were you primarily communicating / interacting with people from the host country?
- Yes
- No

During your experience abroad, were you primarily working with foreigners who were not Americans or from the host country?
- Yes
- No

Have you had any experience with international / foreign populations inside the US?
- Yes
- No

If *yes,* please select all types of experience that apply:
- Teaching
- Research
- Educational / professional collaboration
- Paid work (other than teaching or research)
- Volunteer
- other, please specify briefly below:

If *yes*, please select each population you worked with:
- refugees
- immigrants
- international / exchange students
- foreign work colleagues
- other, please specify briefly below:

If *yes*, what was the duration of your work with international / foreign populations inside the US?
- Less than 30 days
- 30 – 90 days
- 90 – 180 days
- 180 – 365 days
- 365+ days
- If more than 365 days (1 year) please write in the approximate number of days below:

If *yes,* approximately how many international / foreign individuals did you work with during that time?

Appendix B

Items for the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES)

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.

Appendix C

Items for the California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale (CBMCS)

Below is a list of statements dealing with multicultural issues within a mental health context. Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each statement by circling the appropriate number.

Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4)

1. I am aware that being born a minority in this society brings with it certain challenges that White people do not have to face.
2. I am aware of how my own values might affect my client.
3. I have an excellent ability to assess, accurately, the mental health needs of persons with disabilities.
4. I am aware of institutional barriers that affect the client.
5. I have an excellent ability to assess, accurately, the mental health needs of lesbians.
6. I have an excellent ability to assess, accurately, the mental health needs of older adults.
7. I have an excellent ability to identify the strengths and weaknesses of psychological tests in terms of their use with persons from different cultural, racial and/or ethnic backgrounds.
8. I am aware that counselors frequently impose their own cultural values upon minority clients.
9. My communication skills are appropriate for my clients.
10. I am aware that being born a White person in this society carries with it certain advantages.
11. I am aware of how my cultural background and experiences have influenced my attitudes about psychological processes.
12. I have an excellent ability to critique multicultural research.
13. I have an excellent ability to assess, accurately, the mental health needs of men.
14. I am aware of institutional barriers that may inhibit minorities from using mental health services.
15. I can discuss, within a group, the differences among ethnic groups (e.g. low socioeconomic status (SES), Puerto Rican client vs. high SES Puerto Rican client).
16. I can identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about different ethnic groups.
17. I can discuss research regarding mental health issues and culturally different populations.
18. I have an excellent ability to assess, accurately, the mental health needs of gay men.
19. I am knowledgeable of acculturation models for various ethnic minority groups.
20. I have an excellent ability to assess, accurately, the mental health needs of women.
21. I have an excellent ability to assess, accurately, the mental health needs of persons who come from very poor socioeconomic backgrounds.

Appendix D

Items for the Situational Self-Awareness Scale (SSAS)

1. Right now, I am keenly aware of everything in my environment.
2. Right now, I am conscious of my inner feelings.
3. Right now, I am concerned about the way I present myself.
4. Right now, I am self-conscious about the way I look.
5. Right now, I am conscious of what is going on around me.
6. Right now, I am reflective about my life.
7. Right now, I am concerned about what other people think of me.
8. Right now, I am aware of my innermost thoughts.
9. Right now, I am conscious of all objects around me.