
11 Minoritized multiculturals and the development of intercultural competence

Angela-MinhTu D. Nguyen, Kimberly Avila, Brittnie A. Ferguson, and Verónica Benet-Martínez

Intercultural competence has garnered and continues to garner theoretical, research, and applied interest across many disciplines. Its popularity is fully warranted given that it relates to greater physical health, psychological well-being, and more diverse social networks for those living, studying, or working internationally or in diverse environments domestically (Leung et al., 2014). Intercultural competence, also known as cross-cultural competence, refers to the knowledge, skills, and awareness or attitudes necessary to function effectively in culturally diverse settings or with culturally different others (Leung et al., 2014; Matsumoto & Hwang, 2013). It consists of three domains: intercultural traits (e.g., multicultural personality; van der Zee & van Oudenhoven 2000), intercultural attitudes and worldviews (e.g., intercultural sensitivity; Bennett, 1986), and intercultural capabilities (e.g., cultural intelligence or CQ; Earley & Ang, 2003; Thomas et al., 2008). In this chapter, we focus on the latter two domains of intercultural competence because they are the more malleable and developmental domains of intercultural competence (Bhawuk et al., 2008). Specifically, we begin by reviewing research on intercultural competence for multicultural individuals in general, and multicultural individuals from minoritized groups in particular. Next, we present new findings from three studies on minoritized multicultural undergraduate students, including those who studied abroad. We end by proposing the Intercultural Competence Developmental Model for Multiculturals (ICDM4M), a developmental model of intercultural competence especially for minoritized multiculturals.

Multicultural individuals are those who have internalized two or more cultures (Benet-Martínez et al., 2002; Hong et al., 2000), understand and accept those cultures, and identify with their cultural groups (Pekerti & Thomas, 2016; Vora et al., 2019). This category can broadly encompass immigrants, refugees, sojourners (expatriates and international students), indigenous people, racial/ethnic minorities (REMs), those in inter-ethnic relationships, and mixed-ethnic individuals (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2007). In this chapter, we focus on multicultural individuals with a double-consciousness (Du Bois, 1903), where biculturalism (or multiculturalism) is intertwined with oppression. That is, we center the experiences of multicultural individuals who hold minority statuses in their home country as well as in the global community, such as Aboriginal people in Australia, Turkish people in Germany, Chinese people in Canada, and Black and African American people in the United States. In doing so, we respond to calls for considering power, status, inequality, and oppression as they relate to intercultural competence (Berry et al., 2022; Deardoff, 2009; Foronda et al., 2016; Lieberman & Gamst, 2015).

INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE

Intercultural Sensitivity

The most widespread model of intercultural attitudes and worldviews is the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS; Bennett, 1986). Intercultural sensitivity is a worldview that accommodates cultural differences, and meta-analytic results indicate that intercultural sensitivity predicts successful expatriate job performance (Mol et al., 2005). Intercultural sensitivity develops in stages, from not seeing culture or recognizing cultural differences (ethnocentrism) to embracing cultural differences and having the ability to navigate across cultures (ethnorelativism). Individuals progress – with the possibility of regressing – through six stages in their development: denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration. Individuals in the denial stage have had little exposure to other cultures and do not believe that cultural differences exist. They might even isolate themselves and build barriers as to not experience different cultures. Individuals in the defense stage feel that their worldview is threatened. In response, they might denigrate other cultures and tout their own culture as superior. Individuals in the minimization stage emphasize the importance and significance of cultural similarities over differences. They might do this by using biology (e.g., we are one race: the human race) or philosophy (e.g., we are all god’s children). Individuals in the acceptance stage develop an understanding and appreciation of cultural differences, including differences in behaviors and values. Individuals in the adaptation stage develop skills necessary for intercultural relations, such as empathy. Finally, individuals in the integration stage create a new reality from their internalized cultures. From this new reality, they become citizens of the world, transcending cultural boundaries and allowing themselves to mediate cultural conflicts.

Considering this last (integration) stage, it is evident that the DMIS was developed with White Westerners, particularly White men, in mind. That is, the integration stage is characterized as “the lack of any absolute cultural identification” (Bennett, 1986, p. 186); however, marginality and detachment are the antithesis of women’s and REMs’ conceptualizations of intercultural sensitivity (Sparrow, 2000). For them, the latter stages of intercultural sensitivity must include connection to and relationships with others. Furthermore, according to Bennett, the goal is to transcend cultural boundaries, which is neither desirable nor possible for women and REMs (Sparrow, 2000). Women and REMs strive for belonging and rootedness in their communities, and due to their status and sociopolitical realities, they do not have the privilege or luxury of shedding their cultures and constructing an unbounded individual identity. For example, in the United States, non-White Americans, such as Asian Americans and Latinxs, are treated as foreigners (i.e., not allowed to adopt an American identity) even when their families have lived in the United States for generations (Devos & Banaji, 2005; Huynh, Devos, & Smalarz, 2011). It is uncertain whether other DMIS stages are relevant and applicable to minoritized multiculturals.

Nevertheless, Bhawuk et al. (2006) draw parallels between the DMIS stages and Berry’s (1997) acculturation strategies, such that the denial stage corresponds to the marginalization and separation strategies, the defense stage also corresponds to the separation strategy, the minimization stage corresponds to the assimilation strategy, the acceptance and adaptation stages correspond to movement towards the integration strategy, and the integration stage and strategy correspond to each other. In short, they propose that the integration strategy (bicultur-

alism), compared to other acculturation strategies, relates to the highest levels of intercultural sensitivity.

Cultural Intelligence (CQ)

CQ, which is the ability to adapt to new cultural environments (Earley & Ang, 2003; Thomas et al., 2008), has dominated research on intercultural capabilities. Thomas and colleagues (2008) define CQ as consisting of knowledge, skills, and metacognition. These components are like the CQ dimensions that Ang and colleagues (2007) specify: cognitive CQ, behavioral CQ, and metacognitive CQ, respectively. Ang and colleagues' model also has a motivational dimension that is not present in Thomas and colleagues' model. Cognitive CQ concerns explicit and tacit, and declarative and procedural knowledge of cultures. Behavioral CQ concerns culturally adaptive skills and behavioral flexibility involving both verbal and nonverbal actions. Metacognitive CQ concerns the mental ability to acquire, understand, and monitor cultural knowledge. Motivational CQ concerns the desire and drive to be interculturally competent.

According to a review of 142 empirical articles from 2002 to 2018, global CQ and its dimensions relate to greater cross-cultural adjustment, which in turn relates to better performance (Fang et al., 2018). Moreover, according to a meta-analysis of 199 samples from 2003 to 2017, metacognitive CQ and cognitive CQ relate to better intercultural judgment and decision-making, metacognitive CQ and behavioral CQ relate to better task performance, and motivational CQ relates to better intercultural adaptation (Rockstuhl & Van Dyne, 2018). Although these CQ dimensions have distinct nomological networks, they are indicators of a single, latent CQ construct (Rockstuhl & Van Dyne, 2018) with dimensions that interact and influence each other (Thomas et al., 2008). However, remaining questions are whether CQ is developed in stages like the development of intercultural sensitivity (Fang et al., 2018) and, specifically, how it develops for minoritized multiculturals.

MULTICULTURALISM, MINORITY STATUS, AND INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE

In this section, we review empirical findings on multiculturalism and intercultural competence, followed by more theoretical literature on why multicultural individuals (in general) might have higher intercultural competence than monocultural individuals. We then focus specifically on minoritized multiculturals' intercultural competence.

Findings on Multiculturalism and Intercultural Competence

There is a growing literature on multiculturalism and intercultural competence. For example, biculturally identified European managers (e.g., those who identified with both their home and host cultures) display more culturally appropriate behaviors and engage in more effective communication during their international assignments than those who only identified with one (home *or* host) culture (Lee, 2010). Similarly, among international students with a low global identity studying in European business schools, those who identified with two cultures have higher global CQ than those who identified with only one culture (Lee et al., 2018). In addition, self-identified bicultural undergraduate students in the United States have more

empathy and cultural metacognition than their monocultural peers (Thomas et al., 2010). Relatedly, multicultural undergraduate students in the United States have higher global CQ than their monocultural counterparts both before and after studying abroad (Nguyen et al., 2018). Likewise, bicultural identity relates to greater global CQ across two samples: one of Latinx employees in the United States and one of Asian American and Latinx undergraduate students (Wagstaff et al., 2020).

In these previous studies, participants were multicultural through identification, but people may also be multicultural through context, such as migration and minority status (Vora et al., 2019). Among German adolescents, multicultural students (i.e., those from an immigrant background) report higher latent CQ than those from a non-immigrant background (Schwarzenthal et al., 2019). Among international students in the United States, those with more minority statuses (regarding religion, race, native language, national origin, gender, age, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and class) in their home country adapt more quickly to the host country than those with fewer minority statuses (Volpone et al., 2018). Among U.S. employees, multicultural (REM) expatriates have lower turnover intentions and higher interaction adjustment compared to monocultural (White) expatriates (Pattie & Parks, 2011). Furthermore, biculturalism (as operationalized with acculturation measures) relates to greater intercultural sensitivity in a community sample of Latinx adults (Christmas & Barker, 2014). Among 4–6-year-old children, multiculturalism (as operationalized as multilingual fluency or exposure) relates to greater perspective-taking (Fan et al., 2015). These findings suggest that being multicultural may facilitate the development of intercultural competence, or perhaps that the development of intercultural competence may be different for multicultural individuals.

Rationale for the Link between Multiculturalism and Intercultural Competence

Life as a multicultural person (minoritized or not) necessitates knowledge, skills, and awareness associated with greater intercultural competence and affords many opportunities for developing them. Intercultural competence is primarily developed through social experiences, such as those that multicultural individuals encounter in daily life (Brannen et al., 2009; Pattie & Parks, 2011; West et al., 2017). Because multicultural individuals have been through the process of learning at least two cultures, they may have a better understanding of a third (or more) culture than monocultural individuals might have of a second culture (Bell & Harrison, 1996; Friedman & Liu, 2009; Pattie & Parks, 2011). This familiarity with the cultural learning process provides multicultural individuals with the prerequisites for intercultural competence, including awareness of their cultural identities, cultural differences, and culture itself (Chen & Padilla, 2019; Fisher-Borne et al., 2015). Multicultural individuals may also have a complex representation of their multiple cultures (Benet-Martinez et al., 2006), and this social identity complexity relates to greater openness, universalism, and tolerance for contact with outgroup members (Roccas & Brewer, 2002).

Through the process of cultural learning, multicultural individuals are likely to have acquired and developed intercultural skills, such as behavioral, cognitive, and emotional flexibility (Bell & Harrison, 1996; Chen & Padilla, 2019; Friedman & Liu, 2009). Multicultural individuals' adaptive or action skills include a broad behavioral repertoire and cultural frame switching (Hong et al., 2000; LaFromboise et al., 1993). That is, multicultural individuals may have verbal and nonverbal intercultural communication skills and the ability to perform behaviors appropriate to the cultural situation (LaFromboise et al., 1993). This adaptability

may include code-switching or alternating between languages within one situation, conversation, or sentence (Chen & Padilla, 2019), cross-cultural code-switching or alternating languages and behaviors (Molinsky, 2007), or cultural frame-switching or alternating between two or more cultural meaning systems (including languages and behaviors) in response to environmental cues (Hong et al., 2000; West et al., 2017). Multicultural individuals are not explicitly trained for switching between cultures; it is a skill that they acquire through life experience. Furthermore, for multicultural individuals, switching can be either a deliberate choice (Molinsky, 2007) or an automatic process (Hong et al., 2000).

Multicultural individuals' analytical skills include cognitive complexity and cultural metacognition (Tadmor et al., 2009; Thomas et al., 2010). Multicultural individuals may have more complex cultural schemas, developed through constant detection, processing, and accessing of cultural cues, which may help them better understand and learn about their own and other cultures (Benet-Martínez et al., 2006). Their integratively complex cognitions allow them to recognize that different perspectives can be interconnected and equally valid (Tadmor et al., 2009). Thus, the cultural metacognition dimension of CQ is a characteristic of multicultural individuals due to their experience of cultural learning (Brannen et al., 2009; Thomas et al., 2010). In other words, multicultural individuals have the cognitive and perceptual skills required for intercultural competence.

Multicultural individuals' flexibility extends to emotional and psychosocial domains also (Chen & Padilla, 2019; Friedman & Liu, 2009). For example, multicultural individuals may have the emotional skills to help them manage how they elicit, experience, express, and regulate emotions across cultural settings (Friedman & Liu, 2009). These emotional skills may help multicultural individuals establish, maintain, and foster intercultural interpersonal relationships, and this social connectedness facilitates multicultural individuals' psychological growth and well-being (Chen & Padilla, 2019).

The considerable overlap between multiculturalism and intercultural competence is expected due to parallels between bicultural (or multicultural) competence and intercultural competence (Bell & Harrison, 1996). Hong (2010) asserts that "bicultural competence is a unique construction of biculturals' cultural intelligence" (p. 94). According to LaFromboise et al. (1993), there are six dimensions of bicultural competence: knowledge of cultural beliefs and values; positive attitudes toward both groups; bicultural efficacy; communication ability; role repertoire; and groundedness. These dimensions also apply to intercultural situations and aptly describe intercultural competence, including knowledge of other cultures, positive affect toward other cultures, knowing how to learn another culture, fluency in multiple verbal and nonverbal communication systems, behavioral adaptability, and intercultural interpersonal relationships (Bell & Harrison, 1996).

Minoritized Multiculturals' Intercultural Competence

Many multicultural individuals experience life as a minority, which develops their intercultural competence and prepares them for intercultural effectiveness (Bell & Harrison, 1996). For example, bicultural Black women in the United States frequently switch between their White work community and their Black non-work community (Bell, 1990). In U.S. educational institutions, Black students adopt a White frame of reference at school – where acting White is necessary for academic success – but switch to a Black frame of reference in other settings (Ogbu, 2004). Compared to majority group members, minority group members must

be more attuned to intergroup differences and must engage in more intergroup contact (Bell & Harrison, 1996; Christensen, 1989). As a result, minoritized multiculturals may be more aware of cultural differences and more efficacious in intercultural interactions because of their extensive experience navigating between cultures (i.e., social situations with majority vs. minority group members; Volpone et al., 2018).

Furthermore, whereas majority group members may have to adjust to the stress of being an outsider abroad, minority group members – especially visible minorities – have existing strategies and resources to cope with alienation and isolation due to their experience as a minority in their home country (Nguyen et al., 2018; Pattie & Parks, 2011). Thus, minority status – not limited to race/ethnicity, but including sexual orientation, religion, ability, or class – operates as a resource for minoritized multiculturals. In short, minoritized multiculturals – through their life experience as a multicultural person *and* a minority group member – may already be interculturally competent to some extent and thus, may engage in a unique and early process of developing intercultural competence.

AN ILLUSTRATION WITH THREE STUDIES OF MINORITIZED MULTICULTURALS

To the best of our knowledge, there has only been one study (Nguyen et al., 2018) that has deliberately examined the intercultural competence (namely, CQ) of multicultural individuals who also hold a minority status (in terms of their race/ethnicity) and compared the intercultural competence of this group to that of their monocultural peers. Contributing to this area of study, we present new findings from three studies on the intercultural competence of minoritized multiculturals (e.g., multiculturally identified REMs).

Study 1: Minoritized Multicultural Undergraduate Students

In the first study (from a larger project by the first author that also includes data from Lieng et al., 2022), participants were 900 undergraduate students from the psychology department's subject pool at a large, public university in a diverse metropolitan area of the United States. The sample was 85.78% U.S.-born with a mean age of 19.14 years ($SD = 1.71$). In terms of gender, the sample was 55.54% female, 44.34% male, and 0.11% "other." Regarding racial/ethnic background, the sample was 47.78% Asian Pacific Islander South Asian American, 31.67% Latinx, 31.33% White/European American, 8.00% Black/African American, 4.89% Southwest Asian and North African, and 4.00% American Indian. These numbers add up to more than 100% because participants were able to select more than one race/ethnicity.

For this study, we operationalized minoritized multiculturals as REMs who had above mid-point identification with at least two cultures ($n = 718$). Compared to monoculturally identified participants ($n = 182$), minoritized multiculturals had significantly higher global CQ scores (as measured by the 20-item Cultural Intelligence Scale; CQS; Ang et al., 2007; $\alpha = .92$), $t(894) = 3.29, p = .001, d = .27$ (see Table 11.1 for M s and SD s). Regarding specific CQ dimensions, minoritized multiculturals had significantly higher cognitive CQ [$t(894) = 3.37, p = .0008, d = .28$], motivational CQ [$t(894) = 2.41, p = .02, d = .20$], and behavioral CQ [$t(894) = 2.14, p = .03, d = .18$], and marginally higher metacognitive CQ [$t(894) = 1.78, p = .08, d = .15$] than monoculturally identified participants. Therefore, these findings corroborate

Table 11.1 *Descriptive statistics for multicultural vs. monocultural participants*

	Multiculturals			Monoculturals	
	Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Study 1					
Global CQ	1–7	4.65	0.84	4.41	0.91
Cognitive CQ	1–7	4.07	1.16	3.74	1.15
Motivational CQ	1–7	5.14	1.03	4.93	1.14
Behavioral CQ	1–7	4.49	1.14	4.28	1.27
Metacognitive CQ	1–7	5.09	1.09	4.92	1.17
Study 2					
Time 1: Global CQ	1–7	5.23	0.79	5.39	0.78
Time 1: Cognitive CQ	1–7	4.24	1.28	4.28	1.18
Time 1: Motivational CQ	1–7	5.84	0.92	6.07	0.83
Time 1: Behavioral CQ	1–7	5.35	1.03	5.56	0.90
Time 1: Metacognitive CQ	1–7	5.77	0.87	5.96	0.88
Time 3: Global CQ	1–7	5.59	0.74	5.64	0.64
Time 3: Cognitive CQ	1–7	4.86	1.07	4.79	0.92
Time 3: Motivational CQ	1–7	6.06	0.88	6.30	0.77
Time 3: Behavioral CQ	1–7	5.63	0.99	5.75	0.86
Time 3: Metacognitive CQ	1–7	6.04	0.65	5.97	0.72
Time 3 – Time 1: Global CQ	-6–6	0.41	0.76	0.36	0.52
Time 3 – Time 1: Cognitive CQ	-6–6	0.62	1.20	0.55	0.79
Time 3 – Time 1: Motivational CQ	-6–6	0.20	0.95	0.38	0.62
Time 3 – Time 1: Behavioral CQ	-6–6	0.44	0.86	0.29	0.96
Time 3 – Time 1: Metacognitive CQ	-6–6	0.32	0.94	0.13	0.73
Time 2: Psychological Adjustment	1–6	4.85	0.59	4.32	0.77
Study 3					
Intercultural Competence	1–5	4.38	0.63	4.10	0.66

previous findings comparing multicultural vs. monocultural participants on CQ. This study contributes to the literature by focusing on participants who are multicultural through identification *and* minority status.

Study 2: Minoritized Multicultural Study-Abroad Students

In the second study (by the first author and from which Nguyen, 2010 is a subset), participants ($N = 160$) were study-abroad undergraduate students at two large, public universities in a diverse metropolitan area of the United States. They were recruited through their respective university's study-abroad offices and were enrolled in an education abroad program in Germany ($n = 31$), Greece ($n = 18$), China ($n = 17$), the United Kingdom ($n = 13$), Brazil ($n = 12$), France ($n = 12$), Spain ($n = 10$), Thailand ($n = 8$), Italy ($n = 7$), South Korea ($n = 6$), Argentina ($n = 4$), Japan ($n = 4$), Australia ($n = 2$), Canada ($n = 2$), Hong Kong ($n = 2$), Austria ($n = 1$), Chile ($n = 1$), Costa Rica ($n = 1$), India ($n = 1$), Norway ($n = 1$), Sweden ($n = 1$), Switzerland ($n = 1$), or "other" (e.g., semester at sea; $n = 5$). The sample was 86.88% U.S.-born, and 65.00% female and 35.00% male with a mean age of 21.55 years ($SD = 2.60$). Regarding racial/ethnic background, the sample was 48.53% White/European American, 44.03% Asian Pacific Islander South Asian American, 34.78% Latinx, 5.65% American Indian, 4.13% African American, and 3.31% Southwest Asian and North African. These numbers add up to more than 100% because participants were able to select more than race.

As in the first study, we operationalized minoritized multiculturals as REMs who had above mid-point identification with at least two cultures ($n = 105$). Unlike in the first study, in this second study, minoritized multiculturals did not have higher global CQ scores (as measured by the 20-item Cultural Intelligence Scale; Ang et al., 2007; $\alpha_{\text{Time1}} = .92$; $\alpha_{\text{Time3}} = .92$) than monoculturally identified participants ($n = 55$). There were no significant group differences on global CQ either at Time 1 [before studying abroad; $t(158) = 1.23, p = .22, d = .20$] or Time 3 [after studying abroad; $t(85) = 0.32, p = .75, d = .07$]. Moreover, there were no significant group differences on the change in global CQ scores (Time 3 – Time 1), $t(85) = -0.35, p = .73, d = .08$. We also found the same non-significant pattern of results for specific CQ dimensions at both timepoints (see Table 11.1 for *Ms* and *SDs*). Therefore, contrary to what we expected, multicultural individuals and monocultural individuals had comparable levels of CQ. Study-abroad students – like the participants in this study – may be different from the general student population – like those in the first study – in that they are likely to be more interculturally competent, at least in terms of their awareness and motivation. Indeed, Table 11.1 indicates that the mean scores for global CQ and its dimensions are higher for both minoritized multiculturals and monocultural students in Study 2 (study-abroad participants) than in Study 1 (general student population).

Interestingly, however, minoritized multiculturals had significantly higher psychological adjustment (as measured by an adapted version of 12-item Job-Related Anxiety-Comfort and Depression-Enthusiasm Scale; Warr, 1990; $\alpha = .90$) while abroad (Time 2; at the midpoint of the education abroad program) than monoculturally identified participants, $t(47) = 2.48, p = .02, d = .85$. Despite having similar levels of CQ, multicultural individuals were better adjusted psychologically than monocultural individuals during their time studying abroad.

Study 3: Minoritized Multicultural Study-Abroad Alumni

The third study (Nguyen, 2013) was a 3–5-year follow-up study with former study-abroad students ($N = 187$) at a large, public university in a diverse metropolitan area of the United States. The sample was 68.45% female and 31.55% male. Regarding racial/ethnic background, the sample was 43.85% White/European American, 22.46% Latinx, 19.79% Asian Pacific Islander South Asian American, 9.09% multiracial, 3.74% Black/African American, and 1.07% American Indian. In this study, we operationalized multiculturalism as minority status, where REMs are considered multicultural ($n = 105$) and White participants are considered monocultural ($n = 82$).

Participants completed a 5-item intercultural competence scale developed for this study ($\alpha = .75$), with items measuring comfort with people from different cultures, engagement in culturally diverse activities, openness to diverse perspectives, and appreciation of cultural differences. As expected, minoritized multiculturals had significantly higher intercultural competence scores than their monocultural peers, $t(185) = 2.96, p = .004, d = .44$ (see Table 11.1 for *Ms* and *SDs*). That is, years after studying abroad, minoritized multiculturals are more interculturally competent than monocultural individuals. International experience – such as from study-abroad programs – is a theorized and empirically supported predictor of intercultural competence (Raver & Van Dyne, 2017; Terzuolo, 2018; Wolff & Borzиковsky, 2018), but the current findings suggest that the development of intercultural competence may differ between multicultural and monocultural individuals.

MINORITIZED MULTICULTURALS' DEVELOPMENT OF INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE

Regardless of whether minoritized multiculturals have higher levels of intercultural competence than monocultural individuals (as illustrated in the previous studies), theoretical and empirical literature suggests that the *process* of intercultural competence development differs for these two groups. For minoritized multiculturals, the process of developing intercultural competence and preparing for intercultural effectiveness may be expedited because they have a different starting point from their monocultural peers. For minoritized multiculturals, daily life requires some degree of intercultural competence (Christensen, 1989). From their real-life experiences, they have acquired tacit, procedural knowledge and valuable skills associated with intercultural competence, such as cultural frame-switching and cultural metacognition (Bell & Harrison, 1996; West et al., 2017). Further development of intercultural competence for minoritized multiculturals (e.g., via cross-cultural training) may only need to focus on culture-specific content knowledge rather than on both content and process knowledge (Bell & Harrison, 1996). For example, this training may cover the norms and values (e.g., communication styles, personal space) of the specific culture of expatriation without having to also teach about intercultural sensitivity, cultural frame-switching, and metacognitive skills. Moreover, interviews with minoritized multiculturals suggest that they have a different trajectory for intercultural competence development than monocultural majority-group members because they were already accustomed to the ostracism and lack of belonging that their monocultural peers might be experiencing for the first time when abroad (Nguyen et al., 2018).

Additionally, minoritized multiculturals may have a different end-stage for intercultural competence. (Note that there is no endpoint for the development of intercultural competence; it is a lifelong process [Deardoff, 2015].) For the DMIS, the last stage (the integration stage) involves transcending cultural boundaries (Bennett, 1986), which is only available to those with power and status, namely members of the global ruling class (Langinier & Gyger Gaspoz, 2015): those who are White and Western (and male). That is, “only members of dominant paradigms can have the luxurious illusion of objectivity or of a self which is free of social realities” (Sparrow, 2000, p. 181). Racially minoritized multiculturals do not have this White privilege; they often do not have status or respect within the international community, nor are they allowed to have a cosmopolitan identity or be a citizen of the world (Langinier & Gyger Gaspoz, 2015) due to their lack of power and visible minority status as non-White individuals. It is essential to acknowledge the role of colonialism and imperialism in granting White Westerners unearned power and status and withholding those same benefits from non-Whites and non-Westerners (Deardoff, 2009; Langinier & Gyger Gaspoz, 2015; Sparrow, 2000). Even if minoritized multiculturals could transcend cultures, it is uncertain whether they would choose to do so. Non-Westerners' definition of intercultural competence emphasizes relationships and interconnectedness, and being rooted in their cultures (Deardoff, 2009; Langinier & Gyger Gaspoz, 2015; Sparrow, 2000).

Instead of cultural transcendence, minoritized multiculturals' last stage of intercultural competence may be characterized by cultural humility (Hook et al., 2013). From not having power and privilege, minoritized multiculturals may be predisposed to possessing attributes of cultural humility, such as critical self-reflection and an awareness of power imbalances (Fisher-Borne et al., 2015; Foronda et al., 2016). In the helping professions, cultural humility has replaced traditional views of multicultural competence, where multiculturally competent

individuals may feel an inflated sense of mastery and view other cultures as static, essentialized, and homogenous (Chao et al., 2011; Fisher-Borne et al., 2015). In contrast, cultural humility emphasizes lifelong learning – including acknowledging one’s limitations – and an understanding that cultures are dynamic (Fisher-Borne et al., 2015), constantly evolving and interacting (see also polyculturalism [Rosenthal & Levy, 2010] and interculturalism [Yogeeswaran et al., 2021]). Furthermore, cultural humility means being other-oriented, egoless, and open to others’ beliefs, values, and worldviews to mitigate power imbalances (Hook et al., 2013).

Intercultural Competence Developmental Model for Multiculturals (ICDM4M)

With these considerations in mind, we propose a culturally appropriate and relevant model of intercultural competence development for minoritized multiculturals. In doing so, we address issues of power, status, inequality, and oppression that existing intercultural competence models neglect (see critiques by Christensen, 1989; Deardoff, 2009; Lieberman & Gamst, 2015). We developed the ICDM4M especially for multicultural individuals who (a) have a minority status at home and abroad and (b) grew up with more than one culture. As minority group members, these multiculturals may experience power imbalances, discrimination, and pressure to adopt the majority culture (Berry et al., 2022); therefore, they had no choice but to acknowledge the existence of different cultural systems early on. Relatedly, with their multicultural upbringing, these multiculturals experienced early immersive culture mixing (Martin & Shao, 2016) and developed an awareness of multiple cultures at an early age. Examples of such multicultural individuals are second-generation REMs and individuals with parents of different racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds. Our ICDM4M is an acknowledgement of the existence of this understudied group (I see them [minoritized multiculturals] for them) as well as an affirmation of the cultural humility aspect (with its other orientation) of the last ICDM4M stage (I see them [others] for them).

To develop the ICDM4M, we reviewed literature from management and human resources, intercultural communication and training, counseling and social work, healthcare and nursing, and developmental and social psychology. We synthesized research on bicultural competence, multicultural competence (which concerns cultural differences and other types of differences within a country), and intercultural competence (which concerns cultural differences across countries). For our ICDM4M, we focus on and integrate the two malleable and trainable domains of intercultural competence: intercultural attitudes and intercultural capabilities (Bhawuk et al., 2008).

Based on Leung et al.’s (2014) propositions, we too propose that intercultural attitudes and worldviews precede intercultural capabilities. For the domain of intercultural attitudes and worldviews, we modified the DMIS (Bennett, 1986) based on critiques by Sparrow (2000) and others. As for the domain of intercultural capabilities, we used Ang and colleagues’ conceptualization of CQ (e.g., Ang et al., 2007; Earley & Ang, 2003) as an example. Previous studies found that ethnocentrism (or low intercultural sensitivity) relates more strongly to lower motivational CQ and lower metacognitive CQ than behavioral CQ or cognitive CQ (Li, 2020; Young et al., 2017). Based on these findings and because motivational CQ is most related to intercultural attitudes and worldviews, we proposed that motivational CQ is the first of the CQ dimensions to develop. On the other end, with cultural humility in mind (where learning about other cultures is a lifelong process), we proposed that cognitive CQ is the last CQ dimension

to develop. Supporting this, mean levels of cognitive CQ from Studies 1 and 2 tend to be lower than mean levels of other CQ dimensions (see Table 11.1). Because behavioral CQ concerns intentional flexibility and switching, we proposed that it comes after metacognitive CQ, where cultural knowledge is monitored so that it can be translated into behaviors.

Integrating various theories and empirical findings on intercultural competence and related constructs, we propose the following five As of ICDM4M: limited Awareness; motivated Awakening; respectful Acceptance; flexible Adaptation; and critical Accountability. It is important to note that these stages are not linear because individuals can progress as well as regress, or they may concurrently occupy two or more stages. In addition, these stages are continuous and blended (with soft boundaries) rather than discrete or mutually exclusive; characteristics of some stages may be present in other stages. Furthermore, the stages and their elements are interactive and reciprocal, such that cognitive CQ may reinforce metacognitive CQ and vice versa (Thomas et al., 2008).

Stage 1: Limited Awareness

Stage 1 (Limited Awareness) is characterized by a *cluelessness* of the profound role of culture in people's lives. Unlike in DMIS's denial and defense stages, where individuals do not believe that there are cultural differences or that different cultures are equally valid, minoritized multiculturalists start their development of intercultural competence with the realization that different cultures exist and that there is not one right culture. This realization comes from being reared with multiple cultures and living as a minoritized person in a society where their cultures and identities may not be valued. However, these individuals have not given much conscious thought to culture. They may be aware of external, explicit, or surface-level cultural differences and similarities (e.g., skin color, language) but do not have a complex understanding of deeper, psychologically based cultural differences and similarities. Due to their minimal awareness of cultures, multiculturalists in this stage have not yet developed the motivation to learn about cultures, including their own.

Stage 2: Motivated Awakening

Stage 2 (Motivated Awakening) is characterized by a *curiosity* about culture. To manage the multitude of cultural differences, minoritized multiculturalists in this stage may be drawn to and focused on cultural similarities rather than differences. This focus on cultural similarities may be a cursory way of dealing with power imbalances across cultures; similarities may act as a validating feature of minority cultures. Our Stage 2 is like the DMIS's minimization stage, and minoritized multiculturalists' curiosity translates to the development of motivation to learn about other cultures (e.g., motivational CQ). In addition, they start to acquire knowledge of other cultures (e.g., cognitive CQ start to develop).

Stage 3: Respectful Acceptance

Stage 3 (Respectful Acceptance) is characterized by a *consideration* for cultures. As in the DMIS's acceptance stage, minoritized multiculturalists in this stage accept and embrace differences as well as similarities across cultures. They recognize value and power in these cultural differences; they take a strengths-based (vs. deficit-based) perspective on minority cultures. As they are continuing to acquire cultural knowledge (e.g., cognitive CQ), they are also engaging in more abstract thinking about cultures and are developing high-level cognitive skills, such as metacognition (e.g., metacognitive CQ).

Stage 4: Conscious Adaptation

Stage 4 (Conscious Adaptation) is characterized by *competence* across cultures. Minoritized multiculturals in this stage celebrate cultures and can use metacognition (metacognitive CQ) to translate their cultural knowledge (cognitive CQ) into culturally appropriate behaviors (behavioral CQ). That is, multiculturals in this stage are behaviorally competent in different cultures and have the skills to function effectively in various cultural settings (like the adaptation stage of the DMIS). This competence may be a manifestation of their social justice orientation, and they may begin to leverage their competence to reconcile social inequalities.

Stage 5: Critical Accountability

Stage 5 (Critical Accountability) is characterized by *cultural humility*. Minoritized multiculturals in this stage engage in continuous self-reflection and critique. They are focused on others and their connections to others. As such, they hold themselves accountable for mitigating power imbalances and social inequalities within and across cultures. Minoritized multiculturals in this stage also recognize that the development of intercultural competence is a lifelong process and that they have much to learn about other cultures, which are continually interacting and changing. Their cultural knowledge (cognitive CQ) continues to develop, but without an endpoint where intercultural competence can be fully achieved. This stage is in stark contrast to the DMIS's integration stage.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future directions based on the ICDM4M

We propose the ICDM4M based on a comprehensive, interdisciplinary review of research regarding intercultural competence; however, empirical data are needed to test the validity of this model for minoritized multiculturals. For example, researchers can conduct phenomenological interviews with minoritized multiculturals to understand how they develop intercultural competence. Researchers can then compare interview results to see how they map onto the ICDM4M, DMIS, and other developmental models. Furthermore, they can use those same interview results to generate items and develop a scale assessing the development of intercultural competence for minoritized multiculturals. Next, they can administer this yet-to-be-developed ICDM4M scale, the Intercultural Development Inventory (Hammer et al., 2003) measuring the DMIS, and the CQS (Ang et al., 2007) to a sample of minoritized multiculturals to collect evidence of the ICDM4M's validity.

A model and a measure of minoritized minorities' intercultural competence development are only the first steps. To translate research into practice, researchers and practitioners need to collaborate to design culturally appropriate cross-cultural training for minoritized multiculturals (Bell & Harrison, 1996). The needs of minoritized multicultural trainees may be different, thus requiring specialized training content and perhaps even different training delivery methods, from those used with monocultural trainees. For example, would cross-cultural training focused on only culture-specific content (as proposed by Bell & Harrison, 1996) – rather than in combination with culture-general processes – be effective in preparing minoritized multiculturals for expatriation? For example, it is plausible that minoritized multicultural expatriates who participate in only culture-specific training (which includes knowledge such as indirect communication, saving face, and the use of honorifics in Viet language) would fare equally well working in Viet Nam as those who participate in a cross-cultural training with

both culture-specific content knowledge (see previous example) and culture-general process knowledge (which includes intercultural awareness, cognitive and behavioral skills, and other cultural learning processes).

Developing intercultural competence vs. cultural and ethnic/racial identity (ERI)

Researchers have emphasized the overlap between the negotiation of cultures within oneself (e.g., ERI development, bicultural identity) and the negotiation of one's own cultures with other cultures (e.g., intercultural competence) (Nguyen & Benet-Martínez, 2013). For example, Lee et al. (2018) propose: "if we consider the development of CQ as a transformation of self rather than the mere acquisition of knowledge and skills, one's cultural identities and their configuration certainly matter in such a process" (p. 194). Despite these propositions, there are very few studies examining the association between cultural identity or ERI and intercultural competence. One study found that ethnic identity exploration relates to all four CQ dimensions for adolescents – many of whom were of Turkish descent – in Germany (Schwarzenthal et al., 2017). Rather than investigating intercultural competence, most studies have investigated the association between ERI and multicultural competence. For example, among graduate students (most of whom were White/European American) in counseling, more advanced development of racial identity relates to greater multicultural competence (Munley et al., 2004; Vinson & Neimeyer, 2000).

Given the overlap between the development of intercultural competence and the development of ERI, the dearth of research linking these two constructs and their developmental processes is surprising. For example, in their Emerging Stages of Ethnicity model, Banks (1976) describes individuals in the last stage of ERI development as those who can function in diverse cultural environments and engage with multiple cultures. Similarly, in their People of Color Racial Identity model, Helms (1995) describes individuals with the most developed ERI as those with an integrative awareness, where they value their own identities, and empathize and collaborate with those from other groups. In their Optimal Theory Applied to Identity Development model, Myers et al. (1991) describe the last stage as marked by an interrelatedness and a sense of community and unity among all peoples, which corresponds to cultural humility and the Critical Accountability stage of the ICDM4M. From these descriptions, those with developed ERI are also likely to be interculturally competent; however, future research is needed to empirically evaluate this claim. When doing so, researchers may want to use Christensen's (1989) Cross-Cultural Awareness Development Model for minority group members as the basis for their studies. Their proposed model is a combination of racial identity development and the development of intercultural attitudes and worldviews.

It may also be fruitful to explore how the development of a multicultural identity corresponds to the development of intercultural competence (e.g., as described by the ICDM4M); but first, further research on the development of a multicultural identity is needed (Meca et al., 2019). For example, researchers can build on the Cognitive-Developmental Model of Social Identity Integration (Amiot et al., 2007), where individuals with multiple identities progress from anticipatory categorization to categorization to compartmentalization and end at integration. They can also expand on daily fluctuations in biculturalism (Schwartz et al., 2019) to examine the long-term development of individual differences in one's perceptions of one's biculturalism (i.e., bicultural identity integration; Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005) along with the long-term development of one's multiple identity negotiation strategies (i.e., hybrid and alternating identity styles; Ward et al., 2018). To complement this emphasis on the person,

it is crucial to highlight the example of the role of context in the development of a multicultural identity (Huynh, Nguyen, & Benet-Martínez, 2011; Meca et al., 2019). For example, it would be important to investigate the effects of early multicultural experiences – giving rise to different types of multiculturals (e.g., innate vs. achieved multiculturals; Martin & Shao, 2016) – on multicultural identity development. After these questions are answered, researchers can explore parallels and divergences between the development of a multicultural identity and the development of intercultural competence.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we center the experiences of multicultural individuals with at least one minority status in their home country and abroad – a group that has been largely neglected in intercultural competence research – and we consider issues of power, status, inequality, and oppression in the development of intercultural competence for this group. Based on a review of theoretical and empirical literature suggesting that multicultural individuals have greater intercultural competence and develop it earlier than their monocultural peers, and after presenting new findings from three studies on the intercultural competence of minoritized multiculturals, we propose the ICDM4M as a developmental model of intercultural competence for minoritized multiculturals. This model prioritizes cultural humility instead of cultural mastery or transcendence, acknowledging that many minoritized multiculturals have neither the desire nor the privilege of transcending cultures; instead, they prefer being connected to others, and they must operate within the sociopolitical constraints imposed upon them as minoritized individuals, that is, as those who are not White men (i.e., without power and status globally). To the best of our knowledge, the ICDM4M is the first proposed developmental model of intercultural capabilities and the first to integrate the two malleable domains of intercultural competence: intercultural attitudes and worldviews, and intercultural capabilities. It presents exciting possibilities for the assessment and training of intercultural competence for minoritized multiculturals. Furthermore, it sparks promising future research directions on the parallels between intercultural competence development and the development of ERI and a multicultural identity for minoritized multiculturals.

REFERENCES

- Amiot, C. E., de la Sablonnière, R., Terry, D. J., & Smith, J. R. (2007). Integration of social identities in the self: Toward a cognitive-developmental model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11(4), 364–388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868307304091>
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3), 335–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x>
- Banks, J. (1976). The emerging stages of ethnicity: Implications for staff development. *Educational Leadership*, 34, 190–193.
- Bell, E. L. (1990). The bicultural life experience of career-oriented Black women. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(6), 459–477. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030110607>

- Bell, M. P., & Harrison, D. A. (1996). Using intra-national diversity for international assignments: A model of bicultural competence and expatriate adjustment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 6(1), 47–74. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(96\)90004-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(96)90004-2)
- Benet-Martínez, V., & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural identity integration (BII): Components and psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality*, 73(4), 1015–1050. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00337.x>
- Benet-Martínez, V., Lee, F., & Leu, J. (2006). Biculturalism and cognitive complexity: Expertise in cultural representations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37(4), 386–407. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022106288476>
- Benet-Martínez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F., & Morris, M. W. (2002). Negotiating biculturalism: Cultural frame switching in biculturals with oppositional versus compatible cultural identities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(5), 492–516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033005005>
- Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10(2), 179–196. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767\(86\)90005-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0147-1767(86)90005-2)
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46(1), 5–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026999497378467>
- Berry, J. W., Lepshokova, Z., MIRIPS Collaboration, & Grigoryev, D. (2022). How shall we all live together? Meta-analytical review of the mutual intercultural relations in plural societies project. *Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 1014–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12332>
- Bhawuk, D. P. S., Landis, D., & Lo, K. D. (2006). Intercultural training. In D. L. Sam & J. W. Berry (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of acculturation psychology* (pp. 504–524). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511489891>
- Bhawuk, D. P. S., Sakuda, K. H., & Munusamy, V. P. (2008). Intercultural competence development and triple-loop cultural learning: Toward a theory of intercultural sensitivity. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications* (pp. 342–355). M.E. Sharpe.
- Brannen, M. Y., Garcia, D., & Thomas, D. C. (2009). Biculturals as natural bridges for intercultural communication and collaboration. *IWIC '09*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1499224.1499257>
- Chao, M. M., Okazaki, S., & Hong, Y.-y. (2011). The quest for multicultural competence: Challenges and lessons learned from clinical and organizational research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(5), 263–274. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2011.00350.x>
- Chen, X., & Padilla, A. M. (2019). Role of bilingualism and biculturalism as assets in positive psychology: Conceptual dynamic GEAR model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, Article 2122. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02122>
- Christensen, C. P. (1989). Cross-cultural awareness development: A conceptual model. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 28, 270–289.
- Christmas, C. N., & Barker, G. G. (2014). The immigrant experience: Differences in acculturation, intercultural sensitivity, and cognitive flexibility between the first and second generation of Latino immigrants. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 7(3), 238–257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2014.929202>
- Deardoff, D. K. (2009). Synthesizing conceptualizations of intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardoff (Ed.), *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence* (pp. 264–269). SAGE.
- Deardoff, D. K. (2015). Intercultural competence: Mapping the future research agenda. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 48, 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.03.002>
- Devos, T., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). American = White? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 447–466. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.447>
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of black folk: Essays and sketches*. McClurg.
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford University Press.
- Fan, S. P., Liberman, Z., Keysar, B., & Kinzler, K. D. (2015). The exposure advantage: Early exposure to a multilingual environment promotes effective communication. *Psychological Science*, 26(7), 1090–1097. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615574699>
- Fang, F., Schei, V., & Selart, M. (2018). Hype or hope? A new look at the research on cultural intelligence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 66, 148–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.04.002>

- Fisher-Borne, M., Cain, J. M., & Martin, S. L. (2015). From mastery to accountability: Cultural humility as an alternative to cultural competence. *Social Work Education, 34*(2), 165–181. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2014.977244>
- Foronda, C., Baptiste, D.-L., Reinholdt, M. M., & Ousman, K. (2016). Cultural humility: A concept analysis. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 27*(3), 210–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1043659615592677>
- Friedman, R., & Liu, W. (2009). Biculturalism in management: Leveraging the benefits of intrapersonal diversity. In R. S. Wyer, C.-y. Chiu, & Y.-y. Hong (Eds.), *Understanding culture: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 343–360). Psychology Press.
- Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*(4), 421–443. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(03\)00032-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00032-4)
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181–198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hong, H.-J. (2010). Bicultural competence and its impact on team effectiveness. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 10*(1), 93–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595809359582>
- Hong, Y.-y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C.-y., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist, 55*(7), 709–720. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.7.709>
- Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Owen, J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Utsey, S. O. (2013). Cultural humility: Measuring openness to culturally diverse clients. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*(3), 353–366. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032595>
- Huynh, Q.-L., Devos, T., & Smalarz, L. (2011). Perpetual foreigner in one's own land: Potential implications for identity and psychological adjustment. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 30*(2), 133–162. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2011.30.2.133>
- Huynh, Q.-L., Nguyen, A.-M. D., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2011). Bicultural identity integration. In S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx, & V. L. Vignoles (Eds.), *Handbook of identity theory and research* (pp. 827–842). New York, NY: Springer.
- LaFromboise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin, 114*(3), 395–412. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.114.3.395>
- Langinier, H., & Gyger Gaspoz, D. (2015). Expatriates' and teenagers' nomadic identities: An intersectional analysis. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 34*(4), 308–324. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-09-2012-0078>
- Lee, Y.-T. (2010). Home versus host – identifying with either, both, or neither? The relationship between dual cultural identities and intercultural effectiveness. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 10*(1), 55–76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595809359583>
- Lee, Y.-T., Masuda, A. D., Fu, X., & Reiche, B. S. (2018). Navigating between home, host, and global: Consequences of multicultural team members' identity configurations. *Academy of Management Discoveries, 4*(2), 180–201. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amd.2016.0063>
- Leung, K., Ang, S., & Tan, M. L. (2014). Intercultural competence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1*, 489–519. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091229>
- Li, M. (2020). An examination of two major constructs of cross-cultural competence: Cultural intelligence and intercultural competence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 164*, Article 110105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110105>
- Lieberman, D. A., & Gamsit, G. (2015). Intercultural communication competence revisited: Linking the intercultural and multicultural fields. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 48*, 17–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.03.007>
- Liang, N., Chang, R., Nguyen, A.-M. D., & Huynh, Q.-L. (2022). Different but not at odds: Dialectical thinking moderates the association between bicultural compartmentalization and adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 90*, 11–20.
- Martin, L., & Shao, B. (2016). Early immersive culture mixing: The key to understanding cognitive and identity differences among multiculturals. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 47*(10), 1409–1429. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116639391>

- Matsumoto, D., & Hwang, H. C. (2013). Assessing cross-cultural competence: A review of available tests. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 44*(6), 849–873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113492891>
- Meca, A., Eichas, K., Schwartz, S. J., & Davis, R. J. (2019). Biculturalism and bicultural identity: A relational model of bicultural systems. In P. F. Titzmann & P. Jugert (Eds.), *Youth in superdiverse societies: Growing up with globalization, diversity, and acculturation*. Routledge/Psychology Press.
- Mol, S. T., Born, M. P., Willemssen, M. E., & Van Der Molen, H. T. (2005). Predicting expatriate job performance for selection purposes: A quantitative review. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 36*(5), 590–620. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022105278544>
- Molinsky, A. (2007). Cross-cultural code switching: The psychological challenges of adapting behavior in foreign cultural interactions. *The Academy of Management Review, 32*(2), 622–640. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159318>
- Munley, P. H., Lidderdale, M. A., Thiagarajan, M., & Null, U. (2004). Identity development and multicultural competency. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*, 283–295.
- Myers, L. J., Speight, S. L., Highlen, P. S., Cox, C. I., Reynolds, A. L., Adams, E. M., & Hanley, C. P. (1991). Identity development and worldview toward an optimal conceptualization. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*(1), 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1991.tb01561.x>
- Nguyen, A.-M. D. (2010). *Expatriate effectiveness and cultural intelligence among multiculturals and monoculturals abroad* [Publication No. 3412803] [Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Riverside]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Nguyen, A.-M. D. (2013, June). *Intention to study abroad, studying abroad, and 5 years after: A comparison of multicultural vs. monocultural individuals*. Poster session presented at the regional conference of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, Los Angeles, CA.
- Nguyen, A.-M. D., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2007). Biculturalism unpacked: Components, measurement, individual differences, and outcomes. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 1*(1), 101–114. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00029.x>
- Nguyen, A.-M. D., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2013). Biculturalism and adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 44*(1), 122–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022111435097>
- Nguyen, A.-M. D., Jefferies, J., & Rojas, B. (2018). Short term, big impact? Changes in self-efficacy and cultural intelligence, and the adjustment of multicultural and monocultural students abroad. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 66*, 119–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.08.001>
- Ogbu, J. U. (2004). Collective identity and the burden of “acting White” in Black history, community, and education. *The Urban Review, 36*(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:URRE.0000042734.83194.f6>
- Pattie, M., & Parks, L. (2011). Adjustment, turnover, and performance: The deployment of minority expatriates. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 22*(10), 2262–2280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2011.580195>
- Pekerti, A., & Thomas, D. (2016). n-Culturals: modeling the multicultural identity. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management, 23*(1), 101–127. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCSM-06-2014-0063>
- Raver, J. L., & Van Dyne, L. (2017). Developing cultural intelligence. In K. G. Brown (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of workplace training and employee development* (pp. 407–440). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316091067.020>
- Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 6*(2), 88–106. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0602_01
- Rockstuhl, T., & Van Dyne, L. (2018). A bi-factor theory of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence: Meta-analysis and theoretical extensions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 148*, 124–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2018.07.005>
- Rosenthal, L., & Levy, S. R. (2010). The colorblind, multicultural, and polycultural ideological approaches to improving intergroup attitudes and relations. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 4*(1), 215–246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-2409.2010.01022.x>
- Schwartz, S. J., Meca, A., Ward, C., Szabó, Á., Benet-Martínez, V., Lorenzo-Blanco, E. I., Sznitman, G. A., Cobb, C. L., Szapocznik, J., Unger, J. B., Cano, M. Á., Stuart, J., & Zamboanga, B. L. (2019). Biculturalism dynamics: A daily diary study of bicultural identity and psychosocial functioning. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 62*, 26–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2018.12.007>

- Schwarzenthal, M., Juang, L. P., Schachner, M. K., & van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2019). A multi-modal measure of cultural intelligence for adolescents growing up in culturally diverse societies. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *72*, 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2019.07.007>
- Schwarzenthal, M., Juang, L. P., Schachner, M. K., van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Handrick, A. (2017). From tolerance to understanding: Exploring the development of intercultural competence in multiethnic contexts from early to late adolescence. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *27*(5), 388–399.
- Sparrow, L. M. (2000). Beyond multicultural man: Complexities of identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *24*(2), 173–201. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767\(99\)00031-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(99)00031-0)
- Tadmor, C. T., Tetlock, P. E., & Peng, K. (2009). Acculturation strategies and integrative complexity: The cognitive implications of biculturalism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *40*(1), 105–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022108326279>
- Terzuolo, E. R. (2018). Intercultural development in study abroad: Influence of student and program characteristics. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *65*, 86–95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.05.001>
- Thomas, D. C., Brannen, M., & Garcia, D. (2010). Bicultural individuals and intercultural effectiveness. *European Journal of Cross-Cultural Competence and Management*, *1*(4), 315–333. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ejccm.2010.037640>
- Thomas, D. C., Elron, E., Stahl, G., Ekelund, B. Z., Ravlin, E. C., Cerdin, J.-L., Poelmans, S., Brislin, R., Pekerti, A., Aycan, Z., Maznevski, M., Au, K., & Lazarova, M. B. (2008). Cultural intelligence: Domain and assessment. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *8*(2), 123–143. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595808091787>
- van der Zee, K. I., & van Oudenhoven, J. P. (2000). The Multicultural Personality Questionnaire: A multidimensional instrument of multicultural effectiveness. *European Journal of Personality*, *14*(4), 291–309. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0984\(200007/08\)14:4<291::AID-PER377>3.0.CO;2-6](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-0984(200007/08)14:4<291::AID-PER377>3.0.CO;2-6)
- Vinson, T. S., & Neimeyer, G. J. (2000). The relationship between racial identity development and multicultural counseling competency. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *28*(3), 177–192.
- Volpone, S. D., Marquardt, D. J., Casper, W. J., & Avery, D. R. (2018). Minimizing cross-cultural maladaptation: How minority status facilitates change in international acculturation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *103*(3), 249–269. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000273>
- Vora, D., Martin, L., Fitzsimmons, S. R., Pekerti, A. A., Lakshman, C., & Raheem, S. (2019). Multiculturalism within individuals: A review, critique, and agenda for future research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *50*, 499–524. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-018-0191-3>
- Wagstaff, M. F., Kim, S. H., Jiménez Arévalo, F. R., Al-Riyami, S., & Huerta, E. (2020). Individual bicultural identity and cultural intelligence. *Management Research: Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management*, *18*, 29–45. <https://doi.org/10.1108/mrjiam-06-2019-0931>
- Ward, C., Ng Tseung-Wong, C., Szabo, A., Qumseya, T., & Bhowon, U. (2018). Hybrid and alternating identity styles as strategies for managing multicultural identities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *49*(9), 1402–1439. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022118782641>
- Warr, P. (1990). The measurement of well-being and other aspects of mental health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, *63*(3), 193–210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00521.x>
- West, A. L., Zhang, R., Yampolsky, M., & Sasaki, J. Y. (2017). More than the sum of its parts: A transformative theory of biculturalism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *48*, 963–990. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022117709533>
- Wolff, F., & Borzиковsky, C. (2018). Intercultural competence by international experiences? An investigation of the impact of educational stays abroad on intercultural competence and its facets. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *49*(3), 488–514. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022118754721>
- Yogeeswaran, K., Gale, J., & Verkuyten, M. (2021). Interculturalism as a strategy to manage diversity: Moving psychological research beyond colorblindness and multiculturalism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, e12640. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12640>
- Young, C. A., Haffeejee, B., & Corsun, D. L. (2017). The relationship between ethnocentrism and cultural intelligence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *58*, 31–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.04.001>