Research Article

Mediating Effect of Cultural Intelligence on Personality Traits and Intercultural Effectiveness Among Senior High School Students

Jessilda A. Salas[1], Jherwin P. Hermosa[2]

[1]Department of Education – San Pablo City, San Vicente Integrated High School, Brgy. San Vicente, San Pablo City, Laguna, Philippines, 4000
[2]Laguna State Polytechnic University – San Pablo City Campus, San Pablo City, Philippines 4000

ABSTRACT

This study examined the mediating role of Cultural Intelligence (CQ) in the relationship between personality traits and intercultural effectiveness among Senior High School students. In an increasingly globalized world, developing intercultural competence is essential for students to navigate diverse cultural environments effectively.

The study employed a quantitative approach, gathering information from 100 Senior High School students in San Vicente Integrated High School through a survey method. The Big Five Personality Traits questionnaire, the Cultural Intelligence Scale, and the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale were among the tools used in the survey.

Mean and Standard Deviation were used to describe the responses of the respondents in their perceptions of Personality Traits, Intercultural Effectiveness, and Cultural Intelligence. Also, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship between Personality Traits and Intercultural Effectiveness. PROCESS Macro was used in Mediation Analyses.

The findings show a positive correlation between higher levels of intercultural effectiveness and specific personality traits, namely conscientiousness and openness to new experiences. Moreover, cultural intelligence significantly mediates this relationship, showing that students with higher Cultural Intelligence (CQ) are better able to leverage their personality traits to enhance their intercultural effectiveness.

The results show how crucial it is to develop cultural intelligence in learning environments to get students ready for cross-cultural interactions. The development of focused interventions and instructional strategies that raise students' CQ and improve their capacity to perform well in a variety of cultural contexts are examples of practical results.

Keywords: Cultural Intelligence, Mediating Effect, Personality Traits, Intercultural Effectiveness, Cross-cultural Competence

Introduction

As the world becomes more interconnected, individuals must navigate diverse cultural landscapes. Successful cross-cultural interactions require an in-depth awareness of how individual characteristics, particularly personality traits. A person's persistent thought, feeling, and behavior patterns are their personality traits. They are imaginative, inquisitive, and tolerant. Some are disciplined, goal-oriented, trustworthy, and well-organized. Some are quiet and prefer small gatherings, but some are gregarious and lively. They are resilient, compassionate, kind, and adept at handling stress. These characteristics help make an individual stand out from the crowd and behave consistently in various contexts. It affects one's ability to adapt and thrive in intercultural environments.

People with different personality traits may approach cross-cultural settings differently, and these traits can influence how successfully they navigate and engage with people from other cultures. Furthermore, the role of cultural intelligence as a potential mediator in this dynamic relationship is receiving increasing attention. Cultural intelligence is the ability to relate to others and interact effectively across cultures and it goes beyond existing notions of cultural sensitivity and awareness. According to Ang and Van Dyne (2008), the ability to handle cultural diversity well is known as cultural intelligence. Culturally intelligent people can manage cultural diversity

The world is changing and the need to interact effectively with culturally diverse individuals, either face-to-face or through electronic media, is critical. Intercultural effectiveness can be defined as the ability to interact and collaborate with people from diverse cultural backgrounds to enhance beneficial outcomes (Simkhovych, 2009). It is about understanding and being knowledgeable about one's own culture as well as those of others. the ability to communicate effectively across cultural barriers. being conscious of and sensitive to the cultural norms, values, and practices of others. Additionally, the capacity to adapt one's behavior and speech pattern to the cultural context. identifying and respecting the feelings, opinions, and experiences of others. Effective cross-cultural communication requires a broad range of skills, including awareness, adaptability, communication skills, and a respectful attitude toward cultural diversity. It takes time, self-reflection, constant learning, and a willingness to engage with people from diverse backgrounds to be an effective intercultural communicator.

Background

In today's globalized world, the significance of Cultural Intelligence has been increased. In a world where businesses, communication, and collaborations span across borders, individuals encounter diverse cultures regularly. Cultural intelligence enables effective engagement in this interconnected global environment. Workplaces are becoming more culturally diverse. Employees from different cultural backgrounds bring unique perspectives, skills, and approaches. Cultural intelligence is essential for fostering a positive and inclusive work environment. Global business transactions require individuals to navigate diverse cultural norms, practices, and communication styles. Cultural intelligence is a key competency for professionals involved in international trade, negotiations, and business operations. Cultural intelligence helps individuals understand and adapt their communication styles to be more inclusive and considerate of cultural nuances, reducing the likelihood of misunderstandings. Leaders and managers dealing with multicultural teams need cultural intelligence to motivate and lead effectively. This includes understanding the values and expectations of team members from different cultural backgrounds. Cultural intelligence enables individuals to navigate and resolve conflicts arising from cultural misunderstandings, fostering positive relationships. Academic and research environments often involve collaboration with individuals from around the world. Cultural intelligence is crucial for researchers and students to work effectively in diverse academic settings. Cultural intelligence allows individuals to approach challenges with a broader mindset, leading to innovative and effective solutions. Cultural intelligence promotes respect and appreciation for different cultural norms and values. It helps individuals avoid cultural

insensitivity, stereotyping, or unintentional offenses in their interactions.

As individuals increasingly identify as global citizens, the ability to adapt to different cultures becomes a vital aspect of global citizenship. Cultural intelligence contributes to a sense of interconnectedness and shared humanity.

The increasing importance of intercultural effectiveness is evident in various domains, reflecting the growing interconnectedness of our world. Intercultural effectiveness is crucial for establishing successful international partnerships, attracting a global customer base, and navigating cross-cultural negotiations. Intercultural effectiveness is essential for fostering a positive work environment, promoting inclusion, and leveraging the strengths of a diverse team. Intercultural competence facilitates effective communication, collaboration, and relationship-building in these cross-border interactions. Whether in business, education, or international relations, individuals and organizations that prioritize intercultural competence are better positioned to thrive in our diverse and interconnected world.

To adjust more successfully to a new cultural environment where people think and act differently, individuals must increase their cultural intelligence (CQ) (Kim, E. j., et al., 2015, Ward, C., et al., 2011). According to Earley and Ang (2003), cultural quotient (CQ) is defined as a form of intelligence that indicates a person's capacity to interact with people from diverse cultural backgrounds. Since CQ is a special kind of intelligence that allows people to adapt to different cultural contexts, it helps us to understand why some people perform better than others in culturally diverse settings (Thomas et al., 2015).

The Philippines is a culturally diverse country. Composed of people who are different from one another. Scott, W. H. (1994). The Philippines is home to numerous indigenous ethnic groups, often referred to as "Lumad" in Mindanao, "Igorot" in the Cordillera region, and other distinct communities throughout the archipelago. Rubrico, J. A. (2005) The Philippines is known for its linguistic diversity, with over 170 languages and dialects spoken. Filipino, based on Tagalog, is the official language, while English is widely used in education, government, and business. Agoncillo, T. A., & Guerrero, M. (1977) The Philippines is predominantly Christian, with a significant majority being Roman Catholic. However, there are also Muslim communities, particularly in Mindanao, as well as indigenous belief systems. Mojares, R. B. (1999). Festivals showcase the cultural diversity of the Philippines. Examples include the Sinulog Festival in Cebu, the Ati-Atihan Festival in Aklan, and Dinagyang Festival in Iloilo, each with its unique cultural and religious significance. Barretto, M. (2015) Filipino cuisine reflects a fusion of indigenous, Spanish, Chinese, and American influences. Each region has its specialties, contributing to the country's diverse food culture.

Sometimes, due to a lack of knowledge of the cultures, misunderstanding arises. In our school, San Vicente Integrated High School, the Senior High School Department is composed of 200 students with different backgrounds and cultures.

Due to this scenario, the researcher came up with this research paper that aims to determine the mediating effect of cultural intelligence to the personality traits and intercultural effectiveness of Senior High School students in San Vicente Integrated High School.

Methods

The study employed the descriptive method of research in determining the mediating effect of cultural intelligence on personality traits and intercultural effectiveness among Senior High School students of San Vicente Integrated High School. The goal of descriptive study design is to gather data methodically to characterize a population, circumstance, or phenomenon. More precisely, it assists in providing answers to the research problem's what, when, where, and how inquiries as opposed to its why. This study was directed at San Vicente Integrated High School, located at Brgy. San Vicente, San Pablo City. The respondents are one hundred (100) Senior High School Students. It is half of the total population of Senior High School students in San Vicente Integrated High School. As I have observed, they have

limited aptitude for cultural intelligence and would like to be of great help through this research. Also, these people can answer the questions that the researcher has carefully constructed.

Result and Discussion

Table 1. Perception of Personality Traits in Terms of Openness

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I have a vivid imagination.	3.75	.892	Evident
2. I have excellent ideas.	3.60	.711	Evident
3. I am quick to understand things.	3.56	.868	Evident
4. I spend time reflecting on things.	3.70	.882	Evident
5. I like to learn new things.	4.60	.725	Very Evident
Overall	3.84	.549	Evident

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Strongly Disagree/Not evident); 1.50-2.49 (Disagree/less evident); 2.50-3.49 (Moderately Agree/Moderately evident); 3.50-4.49 (Agree/evident); 4.50-5.0 (Strongly Agree/very evident).

Based on the findings, it shows that they enjoy and are eager to learn and experience new things and they are curious about the world, two qualities that are essential to the openness trait (McCrae & Costa, 1997).

It is also evident in the respondents that they understand things quickly, according to the lowest mean score of 3.56, but this agreement is not as strong as it is for other indicators. The comparatively higher standard deviation (0.868) indicates that there may be greater variation in the way students judge their comprehension speed. Understanding speed is frequently linked to cognitive aptitude and the ability to pick up new ideas quickly. Although this is a part of openness, not everyone who scores highly on openness to experience will have it as developed. Silvia et al. (2008) posit that openness is associated with divergent thinking and creativity, although there may not always be a direct correlation between openness and speedy comprehension of linear or structured information. This variation shows that although students love to study and explore, their assessments of how well they understand new material change rapidly.

Table 2. Perception of Personality Traits in Terms of Conscientiousness

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I am always prepared for any task.	3.70	.916	Evident
2. I pay attention to details.	3.73	.886	Evident
3. I follow my schedule.	3.98	.887	Evident
4. I get chores done right away.	3.56	.891	Evident
5. I try to do it again if I don't succeed at something for the first time.	4.30	.893	Evident
Overall	3.85	.643	Evident

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Strongly Disagree/Not evident); 1.50-2.49 (Disagree/less evident); 2.50-3.49 (Moderately Agree/Moderately evident); 3.50-4.49 (Agree/evident); 4.50-5.0 (Strongly Agree/very evident).

Based on the findings, it is evident that respondents want to try it again if they don't succeed the first time. It shows that respondents have a propensity for diligence and perseverance, they also have fortitude in the face of difficulties. Self-control, caution, and tenacity in the face of difficulty are characteristics of conscientious people (Costa & McCrae, 1992). This quality is known as "grit," according to Duckworth, Peterson, Matthews, and Kelly (2007). It entails maintaining interest and effort over extended periods despite setbacks and difficulties. This quality is crucial for success in both the classroom and the workplace because it enables people to bounce back from setbacks and keep working toward their goals. With a mean score of 3.56, it is evident the least among all the indicators that they finish their

chores promptly. Even though most people concur, they might not always put finishing tasks first. This might point to differences in how conscientious people prioritize their tasks or manage their time. Even though they might still finish things efficiently, they might not always finish them right away. Even those who are generally diligent sometimes struggle with procrastination. This shows that even though students try to be diligent, there may be sporadic errors in immediate task completion because of a variety of reasons, including workload, distractions, or problems with motivation.

Table 3. Perception of Personality Traits in Terms of Extraversion

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I feel comfortable around people.	3.44	1.157	Moderately Evident
2. I like to start conversations.	3.15	1.104	Moderately Evident
3. I don't mind being the center of attention.	2.75	1.132	Moderately Evident
4. I have a wide social circle of friends and acquaintances.	3.79	1.217	Evident
5. I feel energized and surrounded by other people.	3.43	1.241	Moderately Evident
Overall	3.31	.858	Moderately Evident

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Strongly Disagree/Not evident); 1.50-2.49 (Disagree/less evident); 2.50-3.49 (Moderately Agree/Moderately evident); 3.50-4.49 (Agree/evident); 4.50-5.0 (Strongly Agree/very evident).

Based on the findings, it is evident that respondents have a large social network of friends and acquaintances. It shows that respondents believe that they are socially connected. As it reveals in the study of Eysenck (1967), extroverts, who get their energy from interacting with people and thrive on social engagement, are known to have a wide social circle. Extraverts are more likely to seek out and maintain larger networks of friends and acquaintances, which enhances their social support and opportunities for social interaction, according to Asendorpf and Wilpers (1998). Assertiveness, sociability, and a high degree of social interaction are traits associated with extraversion (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

In comparison to other extroverted traits, respondents appear to be less at ease with being the center of attention, as indicated by their lowest mean score of 2.75. Extraverts frequently enjoy being the center of attention and actively seek out social validation and visibility (Watson & Clark, 1997).

The moderate agreement in this domain, however, indicates that not all extroverted students feel at ease in a high-profile setting. These results are consistent with research conducted by Cain (2012) in "Quiet: The Power of Introverts in a World That Can't Stop Talking," which emphasizes that even extraverted people can occasionally feel uncomfortable under intense social scrutiny or prefer social interactions in more intimate, controlled environments.

Table 4. Perception of Personality Traits in Terms of Agreeableness

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I sympathize with others' feelings.	4.11	.952	Evident
2. I put people at ease.	4.05	.892	Evident
3. I make time for other people.	3.79	1.038	Evident
4. I enjoy helping and contributing to the happiness of other people.	4.41	.866	Evident
5. I value close relationships in my life.	4.59	.818	Very Evident
Overall	4.19	.690	Evident

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Strongly Disagree/Not evident); 1.50-2.49 (Disagree/less evident); 2.50-3.49 (Moderately Agree/Moderately evident); 3.50-4.49 (Agree/evident); 4.50-5.0 (Strongly Agree/very evident).

Based on the findings, it is very evident that the respondents place a high value on close relationships. It shows that they create deep and intimate bonds. It is revealed in the study of Nettle (2007); and Gwern (2007), that one of the main characteristics of agreeableness is that they value close relationships, which supports the notion that agreeable people believe that strong personal ties are vital to their well-being. Their focus on intimate relationships is probably a reflection of their need for social support and bonds, which are essential for psychological well-being and contentment with life (Nettle, 2007; Gwern, 2007). They are better able to establish and preserve intimate, encouraging relationships because of their propensity for empathy and prosocial behavior (Gwern; Academic Oxford University Press).

Although there is still agreement with the indicator "I make time for other people," which has the lowest mean score (3.79), there is comparatively less agreement than with other indicators. Even though agreeable people tend to be empathetic and helpful, they may find it difficult to consistently make time for others due to time constraints or other obligations. This shows that while some people find it easy to make time for others, others may find it more difficult, perhaps as a result of different priorities or life circumstances. According to research, there is variability in how consistently people can make time for others. While agreeableness generally encourages interpersonal engagement, contextual factors like work demands, personal responsibilities, and individual differences can affect this (John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008).

Table 5. Perception of Personality Traits in Terms of Neuroticism

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I experience a lot of stress.	3.47	1.132	Moderately Evident
2. I worry about many different things.	3.71	1.131	Evident
3. I get upset easily.	3.61	1.333	Evident
4. I feel anxious.	3.34	1.121	Moderately Evident
5. I struggle to bounce back after stressful events	3.21	1.200	Moderately Evident
Overall	3.47	.903	Moderately Evident

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Strongly Disagree/Not evident); 1.50-2.49 (Disagree/less evident); 2.50-3.49 (Moderately Agree/Moderately evident); 3.50-4.49 (Agree/evident); 4.50-5.0 (Strongly Agree/very evident).

Based on the findings, it is evident that respondents worry about many different things and get upset easily.

As it revealed in the study of Costa & McCrae (1980), this is consistent with the idea of neuroticism, which is the tendency for some people to feel bad emotions more often and intensely than others, such as worry, anxiety, and fear. Excessive worry can affect many facets of life, such as making decisions, interacting with others, and feeling good overall.

The lowest mean shows that although people are generally in agreement, they are not as likely to have a substantial amount of difficulty recovering from stressful situations. Resilience is the ability to adjust to new circumstances, overcome setbacks, and preserve mental health and well-being in the face of adversity (Connor & Davidson, 2003). The difference between the highest and lowest means indicates how neurotic people can be, with people displaying different levels of susceptibility to stress and misfortune in addition to variations in coping mechanisms and resilience.

Table 6. Perception of Intercultural Effectiveness in Terms of Behavioral Flexibility

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I am afraid to express myself when interacting with people from different cultures.	3.37	.991	Moderate Extent
2. I am who I am when I interact with people from different cultures.	3.85	.892	Great Extent
3. I often act like a very different person when interacting with people from different cultures.	3.31	1.042	Moderate Extent
4. I find the best way to act is to be myself when interacting with people from different cultures.	4.05	.796	Great Extent
5. I often adapt to people from different cultures.	3.92	.884	Great Extent
Overall	3.70	.499	Great Extent

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Strongly Disagree/Not at all); 1.50-2.49 (Disagree/Some extent); 2.50-3.49 (Moderately Agree/Moderate extent); 3.50-4.49 (Agree/great extent); 4.50-5.0 (Strongly Agree/very great extent).

Based on the findings, it is in Great extent that they find the best way to act is to be themselves when interacting with people from different cultures. It shows that respondents strongly agree with the importance of upholding authenticity in cross-cultural interactions and that they are secure in their identity and that they think sincere behavior improves cross-cultural communication. According to Ting-Toomey (1999), effective intercultural communication requires being true to oneself and authentic while acknowledging cultural differences, building trust and minimizing miscommunications are essential for cross-cultural interactions, and this strategy aids in both of these areas. Brislin (1981) also highlights that, although flexibility is necessary, preserving one's basic identity can result in more fulfilling and long-lasting relationships in cross-cultural settings.

The statement "I often act like a very different person when interacting with people from different cultures" has the lowest mean score (3.31), indicating moderate extent. This shows that some respondents feel the need to significantly change their behavior in intercultural settings.

Bennett (1993) asserts that individuals can display varying degrees of behavioral flexibility depending on where they are positioned on the spectrum of intercultural sensitivity. This is something that can be accomplished. As op-

posed to those who are in later stages of development and are more at ease blending their own identities with new cultural surroundings, those who are in earlier stages of development may experience feelings of pressure to make significant behavioral adjustments to conform to the norms of the group. This is in contrast to those who are in later stages of development. Furthermore, Earley and Ang's (2003)

presentation of the concept of cultural intelligence (CQ) highlights the fact that individuals who possess a higher CQ are better able to adjust their conduct in a manner that is suitable without feeling the need to change who they are. This is because individuals with a higher CQ are better able to adapt their behavior to the culture in which they are immersed.

Table 7. Perception on Intercultural Effectiveness in terms of Message Skills

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I have problems with grammar when interacting with people from different cultures.	3.68	.942	Great Extent
2. I often miss parts of what is going on when interacting with people from different cultures.	3.37	.895	Moderate Extent
3. I have problems distinguishing between informative and persuasive messages when interacting with people from different cultures.	3.33	.805	Moderate Extent
4. I have problems in communicating intentions, ideas, and feelings openly and directly to other cultures.	3.30	.870	Moderate Extent
5. I often encourage an open exchange of ideas and different points of view with people from different cultures.	3.34	.890	Moderate Extent
Overall	3.40	.548	Moderate Extent

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Strongly Disagree/Not at all); 1.50-2.49 (Disagree/Some extent); 2.50-3.49 (Moderately Agree/Moderate extent); 3.50-4.49 (Agree/great extent); 4.50-5.0 (Strongly Agree/very great extent).

Based on the findings, it is in Great extent that respondents have problems with grammar when interacting with people from different cultures. As it is revealed in the study of T. Gudykunst and Kim (2003) state that one of the main obstacles to intercultural communication is language barriers. It is essential to be proficient in interactional language in order to accurately convey messages and comprehend responses. Furthermore, as Chen and Starosta (1998) point out, proficiency in language, particularly grammar, is necessary to achieve clarity and lessen anxiety in cross-cultural communication

The statement, "I have difficulties in communicating intentions, ideas, and feelings openly and directly to other cultures," has the

lowest mean score of 3.30, indicating moderate extent. This shows that although some students have difficulty with this area, it is not as common as grammatical problems. Due to cultural differences in communication styles, it can be difficult to communicate intentions, ideas, and feelings openly and directly in intercultural contexts. According to Hall (1976), there are two types of cultures: those with high contexts depend more on implicit communication, while those with low contexts favor explicit communication. Students from high-context cultures may struggle to adapt to low-context cultures' directness, and vice versa. Ting-Toomey (1999) also adds that some cultures see direct communication as aggressive, making it hard for people to speak honestly.

Table 8. Perception of Intercultural Effectiveness in Terms of Interaction Management

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I find it easy to talk with people from different cultures	3.18	1.009	Moderate Extent
2. I can express my ideas clearly when interacting with people from different cultures.	3.28	.854	Moderate Extent
3. I am a good listener when interacting with people from different cultures	3.99	.980	Great Extent
4. I can express my ideas clearly when interacting with people from different cultures.	3.43	.756	Moderate Extent
5. I can answer questions effectively when interacting with people from different cultures.	3.40	.876	Moderate Extent
Overall	3.46	.605	Moderate Extent

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Strongly Disagree/Not at all); 1.50-2.49 (Disagree/Some extent); 2.50-3.49 (Moderately Agree/Moderate extent); 3.50-4.49 (Agree/great extent); 4.50-5.0 (Strongly Agree/very great extent).

Based on the findings, it was to a great extent that respondents are good listeners when interacting with people from different cultures. Active listening, which is crucial in cross-cultural interactions, is comprehending the speaker's message, interpreting their intent, and reacting correctly, according to Rogers and Farson (1987). According to Ting-Toomey and Chung (2012), effective listening techniques contribute to the bridging of cultural gaps by exhibiting respect and understanding, both of which are essential for developing rapport and trust. Furthermore, as noted by Gudykunst (2005), attentive listeners are more adept at navigating cultural quirks and attending to their interlocutors' needs, which improves communication effectiveness.

The statement "I find it easy to talk with people from different cultures" has the lowest mean score (3.18), indicating moderate extent and indicating that students find it somewhat challenging to start and carry on conversations in cross-cultural settings. Communication style differences between cultures, language barriers, and fear of misunderstandings are some of the reasons why conversing with people from different backgrounds can be challenging.

Gudykunst and Kim (2003) state that fear and doubt are typical in cross-cultural relationships and frequently result in nervousness during communication. Furthermore, Hofstede (2001) emphasizes how cultural factors that influence conversational dynamics include individualism versus collectivism and high versus low context communication.

Table 9. Perception of the level of Cultural Intelligence of the Respondents

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I talk about my own culture with others.	3.82	.869	High
2. I have changed my behavior to adapt to other cultures.	3.57	1.094	High
3. I have found that some things matter to me that I will not compromise on.	3.69	.940	High
4. I am known to have friends from many different cultures.	3.02	1.146	Moderate

5. I am confident during conversations with people from a different culture from me.	3.28	1.026	Moderate
1. I do not avoid people who don't speak my language fluently.	3.57	1.066	High
2. I do not avoid situations when I find myself in a minority.	3.37	.895	Moderate
3. I am ashamed of myself for not standing up when I witness cultural intolerance.	3.42	.976	Moderate
9. I make an effort to learn about the cultural norms and customs of different countries or regions.	3.81	.940	High
10. I am attentive to their cultural preferences and behavior when interacting with people from different cultural backgrounds.	3.74	.860	High
Overall	3.58	.628	High

Legend: 1.0-1.49 (Strongly Disagree/Very low); 1.50-2.49 (Disagree/low); 2.50-3.49 (Moderately Agree/Moderate); 3.50-4.49 (Agree/High); 4.50-5.0 (Strongly Agree/Very High).

Based on the findings, the level of Cultural Intelligence of the respondents is High in their talk about their culture with others. It shows that most respondents feel at ease talking to others about their cultural background. This conduct is a good sign of communication openness and cultural awareness. Talking about one's own culture is associated with higher levels of cultural intelligence (CQ), especially in terms of motivation and behavior. Actively sharing one's cultural heritage shows a person is not only conscious of their own cultural identity but also open to engaging with the perspectives of others, both of which are essential for successful cross-cultural relationships. Increased communication skills and a deeper understanding of other cultures can result from this openness. Talking about one's own culture can help people respect and understand one another, which are crucial elements of intercultural competency, according to Thomas and Inkson (2009). This behavior also fits with the findings of Triandis (2006), who hypothesizes that because culturally intelligent people recognize and value cultural differences, they are more adaptive and productive in a variety of settings. The respondents' social circles are not as diverse as other facets of their cultural intelligence, despite having some friends from different cultures, according to the lowest mean score of 3.02. Because it exposes people to a variety of cultural norms and viewpoints, having a diverse network of friends is frequently linked to higher levels of cultural intelligence (Van Dyne & Ang, 2004). Social networks with members from various cultural backgrounds give people the chance to hone their intercultural competencies and skills.

Intercultural friendships improve cultural intelligence by exposing people to a wider range of cultural practices and perspectives, according to research by West et al. (2014). The development of empathy and cognitive flexibility—two qualities necessary for successfully navigating multicultural environments—is aided by this exposure.

The lower mean score in this area shows room for improvement, though. The promotion of intercultural friendships has the potential to increase the cultural intelligence of participants by expanding their comprehension and admiration of diverse cultures. The results of Ward, Fischer, Zaid Lam, and Hall (2009), who highlight the value of cross-cultural interaction in fostering intercultural competence and lessening ethnocentric prejudices, are consistent with this.

Table 10. Test of Significant Relationship between personality traits and Intercultural Effectiveness of the Respondents

Personality Traits	Intercultural Effectiveness		
	Behavioral Flexibility	Message Skills	Interaction Management
Openness	.223**	.139	.330**
Conscientiousness	.342**	.110	.471**
Extraversion	-.003	-.125	.332**
Agreeableness	.322**	.024	.366**
Neuroticism	.108	.358**	-.022

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). Verbal Interpretation of r-value: +1.0 Perfect positive +/- association +0.8 to +1.0 Very strong +/- association +0.6 to +0.8 Strong +/- association +0.4 to +0.6 Moderate +/- association +0.2 to +0.4 Weak +/- association 0.0 to +0.2 Very weak +/- or no association

Table 10 shows that there is a correlation at the 2-tailed 0.01 significance level. Regarding behavioral flexibility in Conscientiousness (.342), people who are well-organized, accountable, and conscientious tend to exhibit greater behavioral flexibility in cross-cultural interactions, according to this weak to moderately positive correlation. Planning and completing tasks on time are important components of conscientiousness, and they can aid in behavior adaptation in various cultural contexts (Barrick & Mount, 1991).

In Agreeableness (.322), This weakly positive correlation indicates that cooperative, kind, and amiable people have more adaptable behavior. In a variety of cultural contexts, agreeableness promotes more fluid interactions and adaptability (Graziano & Tobin, 2002) Openness (.223), this weakly positive correlation suggests that people with higher levels of imagination and openness to new experiences have more flexible behavior. For intercultural effectiveness to be effective, openness entails being flexible and willing to try new things (McCrae, 1996).

In Message Skills, neuroticism (.358), this weak positive correlation implies that people who feel more negative emotions may be better at communicating in cross-cultural contexts. Perhaps more cautious and thoughtful communication results from the increased self-awareness and caution that come with neuroticism (Lazarus, 1991).

In Interaction Management, conscientiousness, (.471), this moderately positive correlation shows that conscientiousness and skillful interaction management are closely related. Conscientious people are likely to organize their interactions well, run them smoothly, and make sure that everyone is communicating clearly (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Agreeableness (.366), this positive, weak to moderate correlation indicates that agreeable people are adept at handling social situations. Their collaborative character probably makes cross-cultural communication easier and more successful (John & Srivastava, 1999). Extraversion (.332), this weak to moderately positive correlation indicates that extraverted people are good at handling cross-cultural situations. Extraverts are typically outgoing and confident, which makes them good at navigating cross-cultural relationships (Watson & Clark, 1997) Openness (.330), this weak to moderately positive correlation suggests that those with an open personality are good at handling cross-cultural interactions. Their openness to new experiences and inquisitiveness probably make them better at navigating interactions across cultural boundaries (McCrae & Costa, 1997).

Generally, behavioral flexibility is positively correlated with agreeableness, openness, and conscientiousness. These characteristics facilitate behavior adaptation to fit various cultural contexts. Message Skills correlate positively with neuroticism, indicating that cautious and potentially nervous communication styles could improve message skills in cross-cultural exchanges. Interaction Management positively correlated with conscientiousness,

agreeableness, extraversion, and openness. Through preparation, collaboration, sociability, and adaptability, these qualities support the e

fficient management of cross-cultural interactions.

Table 11. Mediation Analyses of Cultural Intelligence between Personality Traits and Intercultural Effectiveness

Indirect Effects	Effect	SE	LLCI	ULCI
PT→CI→IE	.1671	.0514	.0779	.2794
Completely Standardized Indirect Effects				
PT→CI→IE	.2060	.0597	.0985	.3309

Legend: PT (Personality Traits); CI (Cultural Intelligence); IE (Intercultural Effectiveness).

Utilizing PROCESS Macro v4.1, mediation analyses were started by Hayes' (2022) protocol. The results showed that theories of cultural intelligence could account for the differences in personality types and cross-cultural performance. Based on 5,000 samples from the lower and upper limit class interval, a biased-corrected build confidence interval shows that these indirect effects are statistically different from zero. The outcome suggests that personality traits can have an impact on overall cultural intelligence, which boosts intercultural effectiveness. Furthermore, it is notable that the highest mediating effect of personality traits to intercultural effectiveness was shown by overall cultural intelligence (TP=.1671). This indirect effect means that respondents who differ by one unit in their reported personality traits are estimated to vary by 20.6% units on intercultural effectiveness.

Table 11 shows that the confidence intervals for both the indirect effects and the completely standardized indirect effects do not contain zero, indicating that the mediating effect of cultural intelligence on the relationship between personality traits and intercultural effectiveness is statistically significant.

The indirect effect size of .1671 shows a moderate mediation effect, meaning that a portion of the influence of personality traits on intercultural effectiveness is transmitted through cultural intelligence. It shows that while personality traits play a significant role in intercultural effectiveness, part of their impact is mediated by an individual's level of cultural intelligence.

The completely standardized indirect effect size of .2060 further supports the mediation, showing a standardized measure of the mediation effect.

According to Ang et al. (2007), personality traits and a range of intercultural outcomes can be mediated by cultural intelligence. This study supports the idea that people who possess higher levels of cultural intelligence are better able to use their personality traits to their advantage when interacting with people from different cultural backgrounds. According to research by Van Dyne, Ang, and Koh (2008), intercultural effectiveness can be predicted by personality traits like conscientiousness and openness. They suggest that to improve the application of these personality traits in cross-cultural settings, cultural intelligence serves as a crucial middleman. According to Rockstuhl et al. (2011), cultural intelligence improves a person's capacity to decipher cultural cues and react appropriately to them, which makes it easier to translate personality traits into productive cross-cultural relationships. This process explains how personality traits and intercultural effectiveness are mediated by cultural intelligence.

The results of the analysis demonstrate that cultural intelligence significantly mediates the relationship between personality traits and intercultural effectiveness. The significance of cultivating cultural intelligence to increase the influence of inherent personality traits on intercultural effectiveness is shown by this mediation effect. The results align with previous research that emphasizes the critical function of

cultural intelligence in thriving in culturally diverse settings.

Acknowledgements

The researcher would like to express her deepest gratitude to all those who provided her the possibility to complete this thesis.

First, she would like to express her gratitude to Dr. Mario R. Briones, the esteemed President of Laguna State Polytechnic University, for his unwavering support throughout the journey of completing this thesis.

To Dr. Edilberto Z. Andal, Dean of the College of Teacher Education, I extend my heartfelt appreciation for your invaluable guidance, mentorship, and encouragement.

Gratitude is also extended to her panelists: Mrs. Rona Almazan, Mrs. Remedios Almanza,

and Mr. Chester Derequito, for their insightful recommendations and counsel, which significantly improved the flow of her thesis.

She would like to express sincere gratitude to her thesis adviser, Dr. Jherwin P. Hermosa, for all of his insightful comments, ongoing support, and priceless advice. His unwavering belief in her potential has been her foundation to complete this thesis.

Also, she is grateful as well to Laguna State Polytechnic University which became her home for 3 years. Moreover, to the LSPU Statistics Center, and to validators whose contributions are very significant to this study;

She would especially like to thank San Vicente Integrated High School for providing the tools and setting that she needed to carry out this research.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that:

The hypotheses that there is no significant relationship between the level of cultural intelligence and intercultural effectiveness and that there is no significant relationship between personality traits and intercultural effectiveness are rejected. Cultural intelligence significantly mediates the relationship between personality traits and intercultural effectiveness. The significance of cultivating cultural intelligence to increase the influence of inherent personality traits on intercultural effectiveness is

shown by this mediation effect. Moreover, Behavioural Flexibility is positively correlated with agreeableness, openness, and conscientiousness, showing that these traits enhance behavioural adaptation in various cultural contexts. Message Skills correlate positively with neuroticism, indicating that cautious and thoughtful communication styles can improve cross-cultural exchanges. Interaction Management is positively correlated with conscientiousness, agreeableness, extraversion, and openness, emphasizing hat preparation, collaboration, sociability, and adaptability are crucial for effective cross-cultural interactions.

References

Ang, S., & Dyne, L. V. (2008). Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness, and nomological network. In S. Ang & L. V. Dyne (Eds.), Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications (pp. 3-403). Routledge.

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.

Asendorpf, J. B., & Wilpers, S. (1998). Personality effects on social relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74(6), 1531-1544.

Cain, S. (2012). Quiet: The power of introverts in a world that can't stop talking. Crown Publishing Group.

Chen, G. M. (2009). Intercultural effectiveness. In L. A. Samovar, R. E. Porter, & E. R.

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

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual. Psychological Assessment Resources.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. Personality and Individual Differences, 13(6), 653-665.

Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures. Stanford University Press.

Eysenck, H. J. (1967). The biological basis of personality. Charles C. Thomas.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (2003). Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication. McGraw-Hill.

Hall, E. T. (1976). Beyond culture. Doubleday.

Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1997). Conceptions and correlates of openness to experience. In R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), Handbook of personality psychology (pp. 825-847). Academic Press.

Rogers, C. R., & Farson, R. E. (1987). Active listening. In R. G. Newman, M. A. Danzinger, & M. Cohen (Eds.), Communicating in business today. D. C. Heath and Company.

Silvia, P. J., Winterstein, B. P., Willse, J. T., Barona, C. M., Cram, J. T., Hess, K. I., Martinez, J. L., & Richard, C. A. H. (2008). Assessing creativity with divergent thinking tasks: Exploring the reliability and validity of new subjective scoring methods. Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 2(2), 68-85.

Simkhovych, D. (2009). The relationship between intercultural effectiveness and perceived project team performance in the context of international development. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33, 383-390.

Thomas, D. C., & Inkson, K. (2009). Cultural intelligence: Living and working globally. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Chung, L. C. (2012). Understanding intercultural communication. Oxford University Press.

Triandis, H. C. (2006). Cultural intelligence in organizations. Group & Organization Management, 31(1), 20-26.

Van Dyne, L., & Ang, S. (2004). Cultural intelligence: An essential capability for individuals in contemporary organizations. Presented at the Academy of Management Symposium, New Orleans.