

Quantitative Study IV: What makes foreign students happy?

By Kristina Lindstedt & Melissa Veerman

Introduction

In a world where globalisation is making the availability of certain products and services more transparent, the demands have shifted to include the offerings of a more international market (Levitt, 1983). The academic world has not been left unfazed by this change. A market has emerged in higher education where universities compete with each other to enjoy the benefits of partnership. Such a partnership agreement may include exchange of research assets, technology and marketing new courses (Ayobi, 2013). This leads to an exchange of staff and students (*ibid.*). As a consequence, an increasing number of universities have widened the scope of their offerings to also include international opportunities for students (Harder et al., 2015). Certain studies have also found indications that employers have a tendency to be more likely to accept the applications of students who have had experience of studying abroad (Harder et al., 2015; Petzold, 2017), which is why students are also interested in going abroad for their higher education. Therefore, in order to stay competitive on the international market, universities need to tend to these new demands of students. Another element of competition can be found in the university brand, which is co-created with the students through internalisation of the university brand into students' personal brand (Holmberg & Strannegård, 2015). Since international exchanges of students are often organised through university partnerships, it is important that universities provide a positive

experience for students arriving from abroad. According to Lyubomirsky, King and Diener (2005), happiness is linked to success, and success is in turn linked to positive affect. Therefore, it may be deduced that positive experiences cause a person to be happy. Thus, universities should concern themselves with the happiness of foreign students.

The first problem that arises in the wake of this is how happiness should be understood. Here, an issue of terminology is illustrated through the usage of both happiness and satisfaction in the research. Are happiness and satisfaction related to each other, or is there a difference? Criticism of the use of happiness as a synonym for well-being is brought forward by Raibley (2011). Raibley (2011) further distinguishes between episodic happiness and happiness in the personal attribute sense. The episodic definition of happiness refers to a passing feeling related to hedonism. Episodic happiness is not a lasting feeling, while the personal attribute meaning of “happiness” refers to a lasting state. One could claim that a person’s well-being is determined by the total sum of that person’s episodic happiness. However, the basal state of an individual could be claimed to affect how the person is affected by the episodic happiness. For example, some things may be perceived as more positive when the person is already satisfied.

To conclude, happiness is a feeling that is not synonymous with well-being, or satisfaction. However, no consensus exists on this matter, which is why it should be a topic for investigation. We conclude that happiness extends beyond satisfaction, and it is not entirely contingent on well-being.

The first question that arises from this problem is: What affects the happiness of an individual? In order for universities to

know how they should maximise happiness in exchange students, they have to know what triggers happiness. According to Fave, Brdar, Freire, Vella-Brodrick and Wissing (2011) triggers for happiness include family, work, interpersonal relations, health, personal growth, standard of living, leisure and free time, community and society, life in general, education and spirituality or religion. The happiness of foreign exchange students may also be influenced by the process of adjusting to the new cultural context, referred to as *acculturative stress* (Constantine et al., 2005). Acculturative stress includes culture shock, confusion about role expectations, loss of social support, alienation, discrimination, and language barriers (Mori, 2000 and Sandhu & Asrabadi, 1994 in Constantine et al., 2005). Taken together, these results suggest that culture is a determinant of the happiness of foreign students. In light of the above, happiness can therefore be concluded to not only have one or two triggers, but several. Therefore, happiness can be described as a holistic concept where several triggers interact.

As illustrated through the factors derived from acculturative stress, some triggers can be claimed to touch upon the same overarching themes. It is evident from the results summarised by Constantine et al. (2005), and presented above, that culture is a trigger for happiness since the exclusion from it affects an individual in a negative manner. Community and society as presented by Fave et al. (2011) may also be claimed to fit into the category of cultural triggers. In sum, there is no consensus on which of the triggers presented by Fave et al. (2011) are central to happiness. Since exchange students constitute a special group who are exposed to a new cultural setting, we argue that cultural intelligence as defined by Earley and Mosakowski (2004) is a salient characteristic which may determine the happiness of exchange students.

Hypothesis development

Constantine et al. (2005) describe a phenomenon called acculturative stress, which refers to the phenomenon where an individual is alienated, discriminated or otherwise socially excluded due to language or discrepancies in other culturally contingent norms. In the light of this, one may claim that cultural aspects can influence the happiness of an individual negatively when there is an issue with them. Furthermore, triggers for happiness such as society and community (Fave et al., 2011), may be claimed to have a relation to culture. This is the case since society and community represent some of the forces which both teach and enforce cultural norms (Gampe & Daum, 2018). In light of the above, it may be the case that an individual who possesses the capabilities of reading into and adapting to the cultural behaviour of a certain group can avoid negative consequences of being culturally different. Such capabilities are referred to as *cultural intelligence* by Early and Mosakowski (2004).

Cultural intelligence is defined by Earley and Mosakowski (2004) as related to emotional intelligence. However, it extends beyond it to the point that a person with high cultural intelligence may discern what qualities are not universal, but culturally contingent (ibid.). Taken together, we conclude that an individual with high cultural intelligence will adapt with more ease to a new situation such as being in a foreign exchange situation. On the other hand, high cultural intelligence will negate negative effects, such as acculturative stress, since higher cultural intelligence results in higher adaptability, as stated previously. (Constantine et al., 2005). Finally, being in balance with the community and society will promote happiness (Fave et al., 2011). Through the collected evidence and our argumentation, we propose the following hypothesis:

H1: An increase in cultural intelligence will have a positive relation to the happiness of foreign exchange students.

Method

The aim of this paper is to investigate the potential relation existing between cultural intelligence and happiness in foreign students. Since this investigation concerns itself with establishing whether such a relationship exists, the research takes on a quantitative stance. Furthermore, the study approaches the issue with a deductive approach where conclusions are drawn, merging theory and empirical evidence together. One drawback of this method is that the researcher who draws the conclusion may influence the interpretations produced through conducting the research.

Research method and design

The empirical data for this research paper was collected in March of 2017 through a web-based survey constructed through using previously formulated survey questionnaires from different sources. The use of pre-established questions was chosen with the intention of increasing the reliability of the survey. However, the questionnaires were not fully utilised, but instead only certain questions, so some nuances originally captured may have been lost. Therefore, the reliability of the constructed survey may be brought into question. On the other hand, the use of a survey format facilitates replication of the research at another point in time (Bryman & Bell, 2011).

The data collection instrument used for the study was a web-based questionnaire published on SurveyMonkey. The methodological choice of web-based survey was made because it enabled collection of larger amounts of data from people who were assumed to be geographically spread across several countries,

possibly even continents (Bryman & Bell, 2011). However, the choice of web-based survey rather than quantitative interviews does however have its limitations. First, people vary in their affinity for using the internet, so certain people may be less inclined to reply to the survey (Bryman & Bell, 2011). In this study however, the survey was mainly sent to platforms and people who were assumed to be in their 20s-30s since they had had recent experience of studying abroad. This issue was therefore considered to be of little to no importance. Secondly, survey invitations may be seen as annoying by the people receiving them (ibid.). Thirdly, although the interviewer effect is eliminated by the method, the personal touch is lost (ibid.). Finally, some concerns may arise among the intended participants that the questionnaire may fall into the hands of people with malicious intent (ibid.). The survey was sent out accompanied by a short introductory letter which aimed to raise interest and motivate people to respond to the survey. The letter emphasised the confidentiality and also attempted to remedy the loss of a personal touch. The letter can be found in Appendix 1 - Letter.

Participants

The survey was sent out to the international offices of Kristianstad University and Linnaeus University and to Swedish alumni of Kristianstad University who had had foreign exchange experiences. Furthermore, five members of the research group put the request to participate in the study on their private Facebook pages, which was then shared five times. Finally, eight participants in the research group sent the survey to friends and acquaintances. As a consequence of this approach, the size of the population that the survey reached is unknown, so the response rate cannot be calculated. In total, 104 answers were collected through the survey, out of which 93 were complete.

However, 102 answers were used in the analysis, so some of them are incomplete. It is important to note that the survey was addressed to exchange students, not international students. The rationale behind this was that experiences of studying abroad may vary between foreign exchange students and international students. We base this on our experience that universities have a standardised way of treating exchange students coming from partner universities, while international students are treated in a different manner.

Most of the contact was taken through platforms related to Kristianstad University why most of the participants had had some kind of education there or had Kristianstad University as their home university. Therefore, the particular experience from this university may affect the data collected from this population.

Data analysis

The raw dataset generated by SurveyMonkey was exported to a spreadsheet in Excel where it was coded into a complete data set. Scales of negatives were inverted in order to make them compatible with the rest of the dataset (Pallant, 2013). The dataset was then imported to SPSS, which is the programme used for analysing the data. Several tests were then performed; those that will be presented in this study are Cronbach's alpha test, Spearman correlation, linear regression and descriptive statistics such as means, median, standard deviation etc. Spearman correlation was used since some variables were dummy variables, so a non-parametric test was suitable (Pallant, SPSS Survival Manual - A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS, 2013). A 95 % confidence level with a 5 % significance level was used for the analysis, but 10 % significance levels have also been flagged in the results to indicate weak relations between factors.

Operationalisation

Dependent Variable

Initially the concept of *Subjective happiness* was measured by using adjusted the Subjective Happiness Scale of Lyubomirsky and Lepper (1999). It contained four items rated on the seven-point Likert scale with Strongly disagree = 1 and Strongly agree = 7 as scale extremes. Modifications to the scales were made to capture subjective happiness experienced at one specific point of time (latest foreign exchange). This experience could have taken place in the past or could have been ongoing. The original scale is presented in the regular text while modified questions are in *italics*

1. In general, I consider myself a very happy person/*While on a foreign exchange I have considered/I consider myself to be a happy person*
2. Compared to most of my peers, I consider myself more happy/*While on a foreign exchange I have considered/I consider myself to be comparatively more happy person than my peers*
3. Some people are generally very happy. They enjoy life regardless of what is going on, getting the most out of everything. To what extent does this characterisation describe you? /*Some people are generally very happy. They enjoy life regardless of what is going on, getting the most out of everything. To what extent does this characterisation describe you while you were/are on a foreign exchange?*
4. Some people are generally not very happy. Although they are not depressed, they never seem as happy as they might be. To what extent does this characterisation describe you? /*Some people are generally not very happy. Although they are not depressed, they never seem*

as happy as they might be. To what extent does this characterisation describe you while you were/are on a foreign exchange?). Reverse-coded.

The reliability testing revealed that using all four questions in the instrument produced inadequate reliability ($\alpha = 0,575$) which we attribute to misunderstood reverse-coded question number 4. We have thus removed that question; reliability tests indicated that modified questions 1 to 3 outlined above had acceptable reliability ($\alpha = 0,744$) which is why the final measure of the concept was represented by an average of three questions 1-3. For this study, we have considered the reliability ideal of 0,7 provided by Pallant (2013) as well as the provided insight that scales with ten or fewer items generally provide low alpha values, which is why we have chosen to accept *Cronbach's* α -values between 0,65-0,7.

Independent Variables

The main independent variable in this research is defined as *cultural intelligence*. In order to measure this variable, a pre-constructed questionnaire developed by Earley and Mosakowski (2004) was used. These questions were left unmodified, since a reason to modify them could not be found. The questions should therefore be suitable also for this particular targeted group. The complete questionnaire itself consists of three parts measuring cognitive cultural, physical and emotional/motivational intelligence, with a total of 12 questions. For this survey, only the questions regarding *cognitive cultural intelligence* were utilised and the original five-graded Likert scale was expanded to a seven-graded Likert scale.

1. Before I interact with people from a new culture, I ask myself what I hope to achieve.

2. If I encounter something unexpected while working in a new culture, I use this experience to figure out new ways to approach other cultures in the future.
3. I plan how I'm going to relate to people from a different culture before I meet them.
4. When I come into a new cultural situation, I can immediately sense whether something is going well or if something is wrong.

In reliability-controlling these measures, the instrument showed sufficient reliability ($\alpha=0,683$), so all questions were included in the final analysis. The final statistical measure for cultural intelligence is therefore an average of questions 1-4 as displayed above.

Factual control variables

Gender – Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were Female=1/Male=0. Gender was used as a control because previous studies have indicated that there might be some differences between genders since women run greater risks of being depressed (Alavi, 2007).

Age – Respondents were asked to report the year of their birth, which we then subtracted from 2018 to determine their age. According to Hoggard (2005), older people tend to be satisfied with life and thus are happier compared to younger people.

Nationality region – Since the study was performed in Sweden, we controlled for Swedish =1 vs non-Swedish = 0 respondents as well as for EU = 1 vs non-EU=0 respondents, given that national and regional differences might have an influence on the perception of happiness (Ngoo et al., 2015).

Exchange region – We controlled for the country where the students gained their exchange experience, since previous studies

have indicated that foreign country experiences are related to people's emotional states (cf. Jose, 2008). Similar to Nationality region, we have coded the exchange region into Sweden =1 vs other country = 0 as well as for EU = 1 vs non-EU country=0.

Years since last exchange – Since individuals responding to the questions dealing with the past have been shown to differ from people reporting current experience (Grover and Lyberg, 2010) we controlled for the years that had passed since the respondent's foreign exchange experience. We did that by subtracting the year of exchange experience from the current year, 2018.

Exchange student – In line with the discussion on the years since last exchange we controlled whether the respondent was currently an exchange student =1 or had been a student in the past =0.

Prior study experience – We have controlled and asked the respondents for the number of years they had spent at the university prior to their exchange year. We controlled for this experience given that past studies have indicated that gained experiences allow for better coping with the new situations (Cohen and McKay, 1984) that foreign exchange students are exposed to during a student exchange.

Conceptual control variable

Personal growth was found by Fave (2011) to be a part of a person's happiness. Therefore, the concept of *Personal Growth* was measured through three questions through use of an adjusted scale produced by Kashdan, Rose and Fincham (2004). The three questions were asked and rated on the seven-point Likert scale, with Strongly disagree =1 and Strongly agree = 7 as scale extremes. Modifications to the scales were made to capture

how the students had perceived their personal growth at one specific point of time (latest foreign exchange). This experience could have taken place in the past or could have been ongoing. The original scale is presented in the regular text while modified questions are in italics.

1. I frequently find myself looking for new opportunities to grow as a person (e.g. information, people, resources...)/*I frequently find myself looking for new opportunities to grow as a person (e.g. information, people, resources...).*
2. I am not the type of person who probes deeply into new situations or things/*I am the type of person who probes deeply into new situations or things.*
3. Everywhere I go I am looking for new things or experiences/*Everywhere I go I am looking for new things or experiences.*

For this measure, reliability testing was also carried out which produced a *Cronbach's* $\alpha=0,849$. Therefore, the measure displayed adequate reliability, so the final measure consisted of an average of the three questions as displayed above.

Results and analysis

In this part of the paper, the results from the survey will be presented and discussed. A few variables were excluded from the analysis because they were very similar to or were the dummy counterparts of other variables. The excluded variables were *Swedish origin*, since its dummy counterpart was *European origin*, and *European exchange experience*, since its dummy counterpart was *Swedish exchange experience*. Finally, *Years since last exchange* was excluded since initial testing

showed that it correlated highly with age, so the inclusion of this variable might have brought multicollinearity to a regression model (Pallant, SPSS Survival Manual - A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS, 2013).

Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics of the sample can be found below in *Table 1 – Descriptive Statistics*. The investigated sample consisted of students and alumni aged between 18 to 52 years. The mean age of the participants was 25.9 years. Most of the participants (64 %) were female. What this distribution depended on is hard to explain, since no information about the sample was collected prior to distributing the surveys. Furthermore, 70 % of the participants were of European origin and 44 % had studied in Sweden during their exchange. Only 23 % of participants in the survey were currently exchange students and the average time they had been studying at a university before going abroad was 2.58 years. In sum, the survey participants seemed to be rather diverse, with some tendency towards more females, European origin, and not being exchange students currently.

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviator
1. Happiness	101	1,00	7,00	5,41	1,11
2. Cultural Intelligence	90	1,00	7,00	4,41	1,15
3. Personal Growth	95	1,00	7,00	5,82	1,14
4. Gender	101	0,00	1,00	0,64	0,48
5. Age	102	18,00	52,00	25,87	5,61
6. European origin	102	0,00	1,00	0,70	0,46
7. Exchange experience Sweden	99	0,00	1,00	0,44	0,50
8. Currently exchange student	99	0,00	1,00	0,23	0,42
9. University tenure before exchange	86	1,00	6,00	2,58	1,06

Table 6 - Descriptive Statistics

In general, the sample displayed a tendency to be on the happier side of the spectrum with a mean happiness score of 5.41 out of 7. The results for *Cultural Intelligence* were also higher than the middle of the scale, but only slightly, with an average of 4.41 out of 7. This indicated that the sample overall had a medium-high cultural intelligence. Finally, the score for *Personal Growth* displayed a very high average of 5.82 on the seven-item scale, which indicates that the participants on average sought personal growth in their experiences. Overall, the survey participants displayed a tendency of ranking items measured with a Likert scale at the higher end of the scale.

Bivariate correlations

As previously mentioned in 2.3, the survey measured some categorical variables with dummy variables, which prompted the use of a non-parametric test of bivariate correlation. The outcome of the Spearman correlation tests which were run in SPSS is displayed in *Table 2- Spearman correlation matrix*. However, a Pearson correlation test was initially carried out since some of the variables were parametric. Some correlations were revealed in the Pearson correlation matrix that did not appear in the Spearman correlation. However, these correlations did include the dummy variables, so we conclude that the Spearman non-parametric correlation test was more reliable for this particular dataset.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	-								
2	.113	-							
3	.481**	.253*	-						
4	.059	-.223*	.084	-					
5	-.088	-.052	-.275**	-.119	-				
6	.024	-.163	-.003	.104	-.060	-			
7	-.020	-.008	.073	.058	.164	-.139	-		
8	-.118	-.157	.021	.207*	-.403**	.196†	.238*	-	
9	-.167	-.261*	.025	.159	.100	.209†	.226*	.241*	-

Levels of significance: **<0.01, *<0.05, †<0.1

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Happiness | 6. European origin |
| 2. Cultural Intelligence | 7. Exchange experience Sweden |
| 3. Personal Growth | 8. Currently exchange student |
| 4. Gender | 9. University tenure before exchange |
| 5. Age | |

Table 7 - Spearman correlation matrix

As highlighted by the table above, we only identified one significant positive correlation between the dependent variable *Happiness* and the conceptual control variable, *Personal Growth*. This correlation was significant on a two-star level, indicating a strong correlation between the two. *Cultural intelligence* was found to positively correlate significantly with *Personal Growth*. Furthermore, *Cultural Intelligence* negatively correlated with *Gender*, which indicated that males were more likely to display higher levels of cultural intelligence than females. *Cultural Intelligence* also correlated negatively with *University tenure before exchange*. This indicated that a decrease in *Cultural Intelligence* could be found in individuals who had studied for longer before going abroad as exchange students. *Personal Growth* correlated positively with both *Happiness* and *Cultural Intelligence*. A negative correlation could however be identified between *Personal Growth* and *Age*, which indicated that older participants on average were less inclined to seek personal growth than their younger counterparts.

Regarding the control variables, they correlated in several instances. First, a positive correlation existed between *Currently exchange student* and *Gender*. This indicated that the participants who were currently exchange students were more likely to be female. Secondly, a negative correlation could be identified between *Age* and *Currently exchange student*. This indicated that those who were currently exchange students were more likely to be younger. There was also a weak positive correlation between being of European origin and being an exchange student. There was also a weak positive correlation between being of European origin and having longer university tenure before exchange studies. Finally, three positive intercorrelations existed among the factors *Currently exchange student*, *Exchange student Sweden* and *University tenure before exchange*.

Multiple regression

Linear multiple regression of the data was conducted in SPSS in order to find out if any set of the variables could explain the variance in happiness. In the initial regression model, all of the operationalised variables were used to attempt and explain the variance in happiness. Although this model displayed a positive significance for the entire regression, the dependent variable did not display any significance for the model. Several of the control variables did not display significance for the model as a whole either, so a decision was made to improve the model. Therefore, in Model 2, *Gender*, *Age* and *Currently exchange student* were removed since they did not display significance in Model 1. In model 2, the slight significance of *Exchange experience Sweden* disappeared. An *ad hoc* attempt to remove this variable decreased the Adj. R^2 while not improving the significance of the model. Therefore, an attempt to remove the variable *Cultural Intelligence* was made in Model 3.

Although Model 3 displayed a lower R^2 while maintaining a two-star significance level, the higher F-value illustrated that the fit of the model that excluded *Cultural Intelligence* was in fact more suitable for explaining *Happiness*. The p-value was also lowered from 0.02 to 0.00, indicating a slight increase in support for rejecting the null hypothesis (Pallant, SPSS Survival Manual - A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS, 2013). Furthermore, the variable *Cultural Intelligence* did not display any significance in the two preceding models, so it is plausible that this variable did not contribute to the regression. This opinion is further strengthened by the lack of correlation between *Cultural intelligence* and *Happiness* in the bivariate correlations. Furthermore, although the VIF values were acceptable for all models, a decrease was identified when *Cultural intelligence* was removed from the model. Since *Personal Growth* and *Cultural Intelligence* displayed a bivariate correlation, it may be the case that any contribution *Cultural Intelligence* made to the model was related to this correlation between *Personal Growth* and *Cultural Intelligence*.

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	All variables		Cultural Intelligence and Personal Growth		Only Personal Growth	
	Std. B	Std.E	Std. B	Std.E	Std. B	Std.E
2. Cultural Intelligence	-.139	.105	-.117	.100		
3. Personal growth	.383**	.110	.419**	.103	.454**	.098
4. Gender	-.006	.233				
5. Age	-.123	.029				
6. European Origin	.288*	.289	.273*	.275	.222*	.257
7. Exchange experience Sweden	.230†	.258	.169	.235	.104	.222
8. Currently exchange student	-.158	.282				
9. University tenure before exchange	-.272*	.117	-.308**	.111	-.209*	.101
Constant	4.364**		3.454**		2.733**	
F-value	3.785**		6.271**		7.327**	
Adj. R ²	.229		.258		.243	
VIF value, highest	1.515		1.306		1.203	

Levels of significance: **<0.01, *<0.05, †<0.1

Table 8 - Regression models

As displayed in the final model, the independent variable of *Cultural Intelligence* did not provide an explanation for the variance in *Happiness*. Therefore, the presented results do not provide support for the hypothesis that an increase in *Cultural intelligence* will have a positive relation to *Happiness* in foreign exchange students. This hypothesis must therefore be rejected. On the other hand, it seems that *Personal Growth*, *European Origin* and *University tenure before exchange* have significant relations to *Happiness* as measured in this research paper.

Discussion and conclusion

The final regression model verified that there was no support for hypothesis H1. Since there was certain theoretical support for that exchange students' happiness is in part affected by cultural factors, our opinion is that the results presented in this paper are not set in stone and should be interpreted carefully.

There may be reasons we were unable to identify such a correlation. First, the survey instrument used was a fragment of a larger survey where cognitive cultural intelligence was measured through not only the cognitive cultural intelligence (Earley & Mosakowski, 2004). Measuring only cognitive cultural intelligence implies that the respondents themselves are tasked with evaluating their own cultural intelligence. Thus, what we may capture through measuring cognitive cultural intelligence is the individuals' perceptions of their own cultural intelligence, not their actual cultural intelligence. Furthermore, cultural intelligence is measured by how the students and alumni evaluate their skills as of today. A large portion of students are not exchange students anymore; only 23 % of the participants stated that they were currently exchange students, which may have affected this result. Another reason may be that the measure for happiness was poor for the intended purpose. However, we do not have any indications that this was the case, so this notion is unsupported.

The three factors that showed significance in Model 3 were *Personal Growth*, *European origin* and *University tenure before exchange*. The final measure, exchange experience in Sweden, was not significant in the regression but contributed to the degree of explanation and did not reduce in significance. It was especially interesting that European origin affected exchange students positively. However, it is unclear whether these students had their experience within Europe, which may indicate that cultural likeness may affect happiness positively. *Personal growth* seemed to be the main factor affecting happiness in exchange students, which might be logical since students go abroad to develop. This is in line with the argumentation provided in the introduction of this paper, namely that students go abroad to gain advantages and develop. Interestingly, having

studied at university for longer before going abroad had a negative effect on happiness. This may be due to having certain expectations of universities, which may or may not be fulfilled in the country of exchange. This implies that expectation management could be integral for making students happy when going abroad.

We identified a negative correlation between the variables *Cultural Intelligence* and *University tenure before exchange*. This indicates that a decrease in cultural intelligence happens when you have longer experience of studying at university. Why this is the case may be hard to explain, but if there is some causality here, which is not certain since causality and correlation are different things, it may be the case that students develop a certain way of handling university settings in their home countries, which may inhibit the individual's adaptability in new settings.

Drawing from the reasoning above, cognitive cultural intelligence may not be the proper way to measure cultural aspects in relation to happiness. Therefore, we propose that future research should investigate culture and acculturative stress in a qualitative study to pinpoint what cultural aspects may in reality affect happiness.

References

Alavi, H. (2007). Correlatives of happiness in the university students of Iran (a religious approach). *Journal of Religion and Health*, 46(4), 480-499.

Ayoubi, R. M. (2013). A model of re-evaluating international partnerships in universities: a UK example. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 3(2), pp. 220-234.

Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2011). *Business Research Methods*, 3rd Edition. New York, United States: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, S., & McKay, G. (1984). Social support, stress and the buffering hypothesis: A theoretical analysis. *Handbook of psychology and health*, 4, 253-267.

Constantine, M. G., Anderson, G. M., Berkel, L. A., Caldwell, L. D., & Utsey, S. O. (2005). Examining the Cultural Adjustment Experiences of African International College Students: A Qualitative Analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(1), pp. 57-66.

Earley, P. C., & Mosakowski, E. (2004). Cultural Intelligence. *Harvard Business Review*, 1-9.

Fave, A. D., Brdar, I., Freire, T., Vella-Brodrick, D., & Wissing, M. P. (2011). The Eudaimonic and Hedonic Components of Happiness: Qualitative and Quantitative Findings. *Social Indicators Research*, 100, pp. 185-207.

Gampe, A., & Daum, M. M. (2018). How preschoolers react to norm violations is associated with culture. *Journal of experimental child psychology*, 165, 135-147.

Groves, R., & Lyberg, L. (2010). Total survey error: Past, present, and future. *Public opinion quarterly*, 74(5), 849-879.

Harder, A., Andenoro, A., Roberts, T., Stedman, N., Newberry III, M., Parker, S., & Rodriguez, M. (2015). Does Study Abroad Increase Employability? *NACTA Journal*, 59(1), pp. 41-48.

Hoggard, L. (2005). *How to be happy: Lessons from making Slough happy*. Random House.

Holmberg, I., & Strannegård, L. (2015). Students' Self-Branding in a Swedish Business School. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 45(2), pp. 180-192.

Jose, M. (2008). A phenomenological study of the lived experiences of foreign educated nurses working in the United States of America. Doctoral dissertation.

Kashdan, T. B., Rose, P., & Fincham, F. D. (2004). Curiosity and exploration: Facilitating positive subjective experiences and personal growth opportunities. *Journal of personality assessment*, 82(3), 291-305.

Levitt, T. (1983). The Globalization of Markets. *Harvard Business Review*, 2-20.

Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H. S. (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research*, 46(2), 137-155.

Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The Benefits of Frequent Positive Affect: Does Happiness Lead to Success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(6), pp. 808-855.

Ngoo, Y., Tey, N., & Tan, E. (2015). Determinants of life satisfaction in Asia. *Social Indicators Research*, 124(156), 141-156.

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS Survival Manual - A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS (5 ed.)*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.

Petzold, K. (2017). Studying Abroad as a Sorting Criterion in the Recruitment Process: A Field Experiment Among German Employers. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 21(5), pp. 412-430.

Raibley, J. R. (2012). Happiness is not Well-Being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 13(6), 1105-1129.

Wiers-Jenssen, J., Stensaker, B., & Grøgaard, J. B. (2002). Student Satisfaction: Towards an empirical deconstruction of the concept. *Quality in Higher Education*, 8(2), 183-195.