



The Role of Affect in Cross-Cultural Competence

Elizabeth Culhane, Ph.D., JHT
William Gabrenya, Ph.D., Florida Institute of Technology





Outline

- Why this topic is important
- Constructs of interest
- Methodology
- Hypotheses and results
- Limitations
- Future research
- Implications





Why this Topic is Important

- Expatriate workers
 - Differences in adaptability and adjustment
- Globalization
 - Impact on managers
 - Multiple factors
- U.S. military
 - Occupation of Iraq
 - Lack of training





Goals of this Study

- Affective component
- Trainability
- Measures
 - Implicit versus explicit





Cultural Competence

- “Cultural competence can be defined as a set of cultural behaviors and attitudes integrated into the practice methods of a system, agency or its professionals, that enables them to work effectively in cross cultural situations” (National Center for Cultural Competence, p. 9).
- Cross-cultural competence can also be referred to as “the knowledge, skill, and affect/motivation that enable individuals to adapt effectively in cross-cultural environments” (Abbe et al., 2008, p. 2).





Constructs of Interest

- Emotion regulation
 - Gross (1998) defined emotion regulation as being able to manage and modify emotional reactions while achieving goal-directed outcomes.
- Disgust
 - Core disgust can be defined as revulsion at the prospect of (oral) incorporation of an offensive object (Rozin et al., 2000).
- Big five and prior experience





Methodology

- Participants
 - Multiple samples:
 - Undergraduate students (50 classes)
 - Extra credit
 - Volunteers
 - Military personnel
- Experimental procedure
 - Pre-post design
 - Distributed training technique





Training Content

- Emotion regulation
 - Defining emotion regulation
 - Attentional deployment (consensual model)
 - Examples
- Cognitive (knowledge based)
 - Concept of disgust
 - Diverse foods
 - “Omnivore’s dilemma”
- Control
 - Traveling tips





Methodology: Measures

- Demographics
- Emotion regulation
- Personality
- Disgust sensitivity
- Stimuli
- Affective (food and safety)
- Implicit association test





	Min.	Max	Mean	SD	Alpha
Emotion regulation	1.00	6.60	4.70	.81	.74
Reappraisal	1.00	7.00	5.25	1.04	.88
Suppression	1.00	7.00	1.18	1.18	.66
Openness	2.00	4.80	3.60	.50	.81
Conscientiousness	2.22	5.00	3.96	.58	.83
Agreeableness	2.33	5.00	3.85	.55	.78
Neuroticism	1.00	4.50	2.65	.66	.81
Disgust	1.04	4.56	2.58	.70	.89
Food Affect (pre)	1.00	5.00	3.10	.70	.91
Food Affect (post)	1.00	5.00	3.22	1.00	.95
Food Safety (pre)	1.57	5.00	3.35	.82	
Food Safety (post)	1.67	4.67	3.43	.71	





Hypotheses and Results

- *Hypothesis 1a:* Participants who receive the emotion regulation training will have more positive affective responses than those participants who receive the traditional cognitive training.
 - Not supported
 - *Hypothesis 1b:* Participants who receive the traditional cognitive training will have more positive affective responses than participants who are in the no training control group.
 - Not supported for explicit
 - Supported for implicit
-
- Explicit measure: controlled for gender and history of military
 - Implicit: no variables were controlled for
 - Looked at affect in terms of food affect and food safety




Hypotheses and Results (cont.)

- *Hypothesis 2a**: Disgust sensitivity will be inversely related to positive affective response across all conditions of the experiment.
 - Supported
 - Both explicit and implicit
- *Hypothesis 2b**: Participants low in disgust sensitivity will benefit more from the emotion regulation training than those participants who are high in disgust sensitivity.
 - Not supported for explicit

*2a: controlled for age, travel experience, and gender

*2b: controlled for gender, age, and military participation







Hypotheses and Results (cont.)

- *Hypothesis 3**: Participants high in emotion regulation skill will experience higher positive affective response than participants low in emotion regulation skill in all conditions of the experiment.
 - Partially supported for explicit
 - Not supported for implicit

* No variables were controlled





Hypotheses and Results (cont.)

- *Hypothesis 4a:* Participants high in openness to experience will benefit more from the emotion regulation training than participants low in openness to experience.
 - Not supported
- *Hypothesis 4b:* Participants high in openness to experience will benefit more from the traditional cognitive training than participants low in openness to experience.
 - Not supported
- *Hypothesis 4c:* Openness to experience will be positively related to affective response across all conditions of the experiment.
 - Not supported





Hypotheses and Results (cont.)

- *Hypothesis 5**: Participants high in conscientiousness will benefit more from emotional regulation and cognitive training than participants low in conscientiousness.
 - Partially supported for explicit
 - Not supported for implicit

* Explicit controlled for: gender, education, religion, parents' education





Hypotheses and Results (cont.)

- *Hypothesis 6**: Extraversion will be positively related to affective responses across all conditions of the experiment.
 - Not supported
- *Hypothesis 7*: Neuroticism will be negatively related to affective response across all conditions of the experiment.
 - Supported for explicit

* Hypothesis 6 controlled for gender; Hypothesis 7 controlled for emotion regulation skill and disgust sensitivity





Debriefing and Manipulation Check

- 69.6% liked the study
- 99% understood the material
- 80% felt comfortable
 - 18% somewhat or very uncomfortable
 - “I was disgusted by some of the foods, made me nervous”
 - “every food presented was disgusting except the banana, chocolate, and the frozen veggie bars. This is totally biased because it does not consider vegetarians, which is the only food humans are supposed to eat.”
- Manipulation check
 - 90% chose the training that they had been assigned



Why didn't it work?

- Theory
- Method
 - Delivery
 - Length
 - Content
 - Audio-visual
- Online training
- Validity of affect measure





Limitations

- Sample
- Military versus Civilian
- Duration
- Combining the training
- Web





Future Research & Implications

- Extended amount of time
- Performance data
- Different trainings
- Pilot testing
- Different emotions

- Adjustment
 - Expatriates
 - Military personnel
- Affective outcomes
- Adaptability
 - Neuroticism





THANK YOU!!





Implicit vs. Explicit

- Food Affect, $r(96)=-.20$, $p=.05$
- Food Safety, $r(96)=-.13$, n.s.
- Disgust Sensitivity, $r(96)=-.16$, n.s.

- Contamination, $r(96)=-.24$, $p<.05$
- Core Disgust, $r(96)=-.20$, $p=.05$

