International mobility is a prevalent life event that particularly affects university students. The aim of this longitudinal study was twofold: First, we examined the impact of international mobility on personality (Big Five) change, separating self-selection effects from socialization processes. Second, we extended prior analyses on the association between life events and personality development by investigating the mechanisms that account for socialization processes. In particular, we assessed whether individual differences in the fluctuation of support relationships serve as an explanatory link. We used a prospective control group design with 3 measurement occasions. A sample of university students, containing both short-term (i.e., 1 semester) and long-term (i.e., 1 academic year) sojourners \((N = 527)\) along with control students \((N = 607)\), was tracked over the course of an academic year. Multivariate latent models revealed 3 main findings: First, initial (pre-departure) levels of Extraversion and Conscientiousness predicted short-term sojourning, and Extraversion and Openness predicted long-term sojourning. Second, both forms of sojourning were associated with increases in Openness and Agreeableness and a decrease in Neuroticism above and beyond the observed self-selection. Third, the acquisition of new international support relationships largely accounted for the sojourn effects on personality change. These findings help to fill the missing link between life events and personality development by establishing social relationship fluctuation as an important mediating mechanism.

**Keywords:** personality development, international mobility, social relationships, young adulthood

Internationalization has wide ranging effects on various fields of contemporary living, including academic education and professional life. As a consequence, the number of student sojourners (i.e., university students who pursue some of their academic education on campuses abroad) increased from a few hundred sojourners per year in the 1980s to about 25% of Germany’s enrolled students in the 2010s (Heublein, Schreiber, & Hutzsch, 2011). Recent publications on the psychological conditions and consequences of students’ international sojourn experiences characterized them as major life events and showed that the effects of sojourning went far beyond academic benefits and had long-term personal and social consequences (Andrews, Page, & Neilson, 1993; Leong & Ward, 2000; Searle & Ward, 1990; Ying, 2002).

Against the background of these findings, international mobility qualifies as an optimal setting to extend previous research on personality-environment transactions. With the longitudinal study “PEDES—Personality Development of Sojourners,” we assessed sojourn effects on personality development. The implementation of a prospective control group design with three measurement occasions allowed us to separate the effects of personality determined self-selection from socialization processes. In addition, we extended previous research on the dynamic interplay between life events and personality development by examining the fluctuation of support relationships as a mechanism which accounts for socialization processes.

**Always on the Road? International Mobility of Young Academics**

We argue that international mobility is a relevant life event for the personality development of young adults. First, international sojourns have become increasingly important as both European educational boards and employers have strong expectations regarding young academics’ international experiences and their subsequent readiness for global job mobility (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 2009; Council of the European Union, 2009; Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, 2011). Second, conceptual commonalities between international mobility and other life transitions (Roberts & Wood, 2006; Roberts, Wood, & Smith, 2005) become obvious once we consider the particular role of social relationships. It has been argued that social relationships are the most important sources of environmental continuity and change (Casp, 2000)—so much so that “[l]ife transitions reflect, first and foremost, relationship transitions” (Neyer & Lehnart, 2007, p. 536). From this perspective, the most important transitions of young adulthood, such as leaving the parental home, entering the world of work, engaging in romantic relationships, or becoming a parent, may be understood as changes in social relationships.

---

This article was published Online First June 17, 2013.


We thank Matthias Warken for the technical support concerning the implementation of the online questionnaires.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Julia Zimmermann, Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena, Institut für Psychologie, Humboldstr. 11, D-07743 Jena, Germany. E-mail: zimmermann.julia@uni-jena.de
Accordingly, recent studies on residential mobility experiences have provided evidence for their causal effect on social relationships and the self (Lun, Oishi, & Tenney, 2012; Oishi et al., 2007) and have suggested that the residential mobility effects on the self are mediated in large parts by the changes in social networks (Oishi, 2010; Oishi & Talhelm, 2012). Even though temporary international sojourn experiences differ from permanent residential moves, we contend that these experiences likewise promote fundamental changes of social relationships.

In particular, the large spatial distance from familiar acquaintances and the changed living conditions while studying abroad are likely to put a strain on sojourners’ preexisting relationships. Simultaneously, sojourning individuals are confronted with the challenge to establish and maintain new social relationships within a foreign and intercultural context. Bochner, McLeod, and Lin (2007) observed that international sojourns promote, primarily, the international diversity of support relationships. For example, sojourners turn to fellow international students or host country students for companionship or help with academic matters. Surprisingly, despite the tremendous increase of student sojourners over the last decades, the changes and challenges of sojourners’ social relationships have not yet been systematically researched.

Summarizing, we suggest that international mobility as an important event in numerous students’ lives is best characterized in terms of the associated relationship dynamics. On the one hand, it shares common ground with age-related transitions, such as leaving the parental home or starting a romantic relationship, and with residential mobility experiences in general. All these transitions and experiences involve social relationship changes (Neyer & Lehnart, 2007; Oishi, 2010; Oishi & Talhelm, 2012), which provide the social contingencies for personality development (Caspi & Roberts, 1999; Roberts & Wood, 2006). On the other hand, international mobility experiences differ from most life transitions as they do not only expose sojourners to a new but, first of all, internationally diverse social environment. Consequently, we hypothesize that international sojourns affect personality development and that these socialization effects are best explained by social relationship changes that refer to new international relationships (Bochner et al., 1977; Oishi, 2010; Oishi & Talhelm, 2012).

**Stability or Change? Personality Traits in Young Adulthood**

The last decades of research on personality development have been dominated by a controversy on both the general changeability of the Big Five traits (Costa & McCrae, 1988; Srivastava, John, Gosling, & Potter, 2003) and the age limit that constrains personality development (Costa & McCrae, 2006; Roberts, Walton, & Viechtbauer, 2006). In the meantime, several meta-analyses and large-scale studies have shown that both rank-order dynamics and mean-level changes extend far into old age (Lucas & Donnellan, 2011; Roberts & DelVecchio, 2000; Roberts et al., 2006; Specht, Egloff, & Schmukle, 2011) and have identified young adulthood as the most dynamic period of personality development (Roberts et al., 2006; Robins, Fraley, Roberts, & Trzesniewski, 2001). The universal mean-level trends during this developmental time-span illustrate that most individuals become more conscientious, agreeable, and emotionally stable during the passage from adolescence to adulthood.

The trends observed for Openness and Extraversion are diverse. All recent studies have reported some form of mean-level change in Openness; however, results are contradictory since they advocate either trends of decrease (Lucas & Donnellan, 2011; Specht et al., 2011) or increase (Roberts et al., 2006; Robins et al., 2001). With respect to Extraversion, there is evidence that the developmental trajectories differ depending on the facet under study (Roberts et al., 2006).

There is a consensus that the mechanisms accounting for these Big Five mean-level changes can be traced back to both genetic and environmental influences (Bleidorn, Kandler, Riemann, Angleitner, & Spinath, 2009; Kandler, Bleidorn, Riemann, Angleitner, & Spinath, 2012; Roberts, Caspi, & Moffitt, 2003), and the decisive role of age-graded life transitions is broadly acknowledged (Roberts & Wood, 2006; Roberts, Wood, & Caspi, 2008). According to the Social Investment Principle, the course of these developmental trajectories is primarily explained in terms of age-graded social investments, that is to say, commitments to social roles which are typically adopted in young adulthood (Lodi-Smith & Roberts, 2007; Roberts & Wood, 2006).

However, besides these mean-level patterns of personality development, many studies of young adults have documented individual deviations from these trajectories and showed that some individuals may show an increase pertaining to a certain personality trait, while others decrease (Donnellan, Conger, & Burzette, 2007; Lüdtke, Trautwein, & Husemann, 2009; Vaidya, Gray, Haig, & Watson, 2002). These individual deviations have been discussed in terms of interindividual differences in the accomplishment of age-graded life transitions (Hudson, Roberts, & Lodi-Smith, 2012; Lehnart, Neyer, & Eccles, 2010; Neyer & Lehnart, 2007; Roberts & Caspi, 2003; Roberts et al., 2003) or consequences of rather non-normative life events (Löckenhoff, Terracciano, Patriciu, Eaton, & Costa, 2009; Lüdtke, Roberts, Trautwein, & Nagy, 2011; Mroczek & Spiro, 2003).

**What Makes the Difference? Life Events and Individual Differences in Change**

Life events open up contexts of individual differences in personality development and were for a long time understood as randomly arising incidents (Sarason, Johnson, & Siegel, 1978). However, there is growing evidence for systematic interindividual differences in the occurrence of these events, and that these differences are linked to personality traits (Jokela, 2009; Lüdtke et al., 2011; Specht et al., 2011). This mechanism is also referred to as “self-selection.” Based on previous findings pertaining to personality traits and mobility within one’s own country (Jokela, 2009; Jokela, Elovaario, Kivimäki, & Keltikangas-Järvinen, 2008), we expected to find sustainable self-selection effects for Extraversion. However, some previous studies have found that increased levels of Openness (Jokela, 2009; Lüdtke et al., 2011) and either reduced or elevated levels of Agreeableness (Jokela, 2009; Lüdtke et al., 2011) and Neuroticism (Jokela et al., 2008; Lüdtke et al., 2011; Silventoinen et al., 2008) predict mobility experiences. Hence, we were particularly interested in clarifying the contribution of these three trait domains to self-selection effects.

Above and beyond self-selection effects, the occurrence of life events is related to distinct patterns of subsequent personality development, which are referred to as “socialization” (Löckenhoff...
et al., 2009; Mroczek & Spiro, 2003). Earlier studies (Lüdtke et al., 2011; Ying, 2002) identified sojourn effects on the trajectories of Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. Apart from that, the Corresponsive Principle suggests that selection and socialization are not independent of each other, rather “the most likely effect of life experience on personality development is to deepen the characteristics that lead people to those experiences” (Roberts et al., 2003, p. 583). As only a few studies have embarked upon a systematic empirical examination of such corresponsive developmental patterns, we endeavored to investigate whether the Corresponsive Principle holds in the context of international mobility experiences. This would require the exclusive identification of socialization processes which match the pattern of self-selection effects.

Likewise, the mechanisms that account for socialization processes as well as the time it takes for these processes to unfold have not yet been thoroughly investigated. For the case of international mobility, we propose the mechanisms of relationship fluctuation as being particularly relevant. Caspi and Roberts (1999) suggested that the role of relationships in personality development can be conceived of as learning from relevant others by either modeling their behaviors or by incorporating their feedback. Accordingly, personality change may occur in response to qualitative changes in established relationships, or as a consequence of quantitative changes such as relationship fluctuation, that is the replacement of established relationships by new ones (Feld, Siut, & Hoenig, 2007; Sturaro, Denissen, van Aaken, & Asendorf, 2008).

Individuals who move to another country are particularly faced with relationship fluctuation (Degemme & Lebeaux, 2005; Lübers et al., 2010). Social relationships that provide emotional support, instrumental support or companionship are particularly important for people on the move (Bochner et al., 1977; de Miguel Luken & Tranmer, 2010). Staying abroad offers plenty of opportunities to engage in new social relationships with either other sojourners from the country of origin (national relationships) or members of the host country and other international sojourners (international relationships) (Bochner et al., 1977). The available support relationships will thus be partly replaced by new and most likely international relationships. Therefore, we suggest that international relationship gains constitute an important mediator in explaining possible sojourn effects on personality development.

Regarding the timing of sojourn effects, recent studies on psychological and sociocultural adaptation suggest that adjustment difficulties are greatest during the early phases of the foray into the new culture, but then decrease until they reach a stable level (Furukawa & Shibayama, 1993, 1994; Ward, Okura, Kennedy, & Kojima, 1998). It seems to take sojourners about 4–6 months to overcome any mood disturbances related to their entrance into a new cultural context (psychological adaptation) and to settle down and get along with everyday matters of work, life, and social communication (sociocultural adaptation). Based on this observation, we assume that sustainable sojourn effects on personality development might at earliest be identified once these initial adaptation stages have been accomplished. We thus implemented a first follow-up measurement approximately 5 months after sojourners’ arrival in their host countries (T2) and scheduled another occasion of data collection by the end of the academic year (T3). With these measurement intervals we were further able to compare socialization trajectories of sojourners who stayed abroad for one academic term of about 5 months (i.e., short-term sojourners) and sojourners who spent the full academic year of about 8 months (i.e., long-term sojourners) abroad.

The Present Study

A sample of $N = 1,134$ students (containing $N = 527$ sojourners and $N = 607$ control students) was tracked over the course of an academic year. Participants were approached several weeks before the academic year started and presented with an introductory questionnaire, which asked them about their future international mobility plans and accordingly assigned them to either the control or the sojourner groups. Waves of data collection included an initial assessment at the beginning of the academic year, a second approximately 5 months later, and a third around 8 months after that. Members of the control group were approached on pre-arranged dates, but, for the sojourner groups, we established regular intervals between the times of data collection by coordinating all further measurements based on their proposed dates of departure and return.

As outlined above, we investigated three research questions. First, we aspired to identify contingencies between (pre-departure) personality traits and the self-selection into international mobility experiences (selection hypothesis).

Second, we addressed sojourn effects on personality development (socialization hypothesis) and assessed incidents of corresponsive personality development in the context of international mobility experiences. We further aimed to clarify if (a) the intended time to stay abroad or (b) the actual duration of the sojourn experience had any effects on patterns of trait development. To investigate the effects of the intended time to stay abroad, we first compared socialization patterns of short-term (i.e., one semester) and long-term (i.e., one academic year) sojourners during the measurement interval of the first five months (T1–T2), where both groups lived abroad. Second, to learn about the impact of the actual sojourn duration, we compared socialization patterns of long-term sojourners across two measurement intervals: their first five months abroad (T1–T2) or the full observation period of an academic year (T1–T3).

Third, we set out to clarify the mechanisms that account for the socializing effects of life experiences (mediation hypothesis). To meet this challenge, we examined indicators of relationship fluctuation (i.e., the respective numbers of lost and new national and international support relationships) as mediators of socialization effects. We supposed international mobility experiences as promoting a general increase in relationship fluctuation, but in particular to bring about new international contacts and thus increase the international diversity of sojourners’ support networks. As a consequence, we expected international relationship gains to play a major role in the explanation of sojourn effects. However, we were eager to assess all particular effects of losses and gains with respect to both national and international support relationships.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants of the PEDES (Personality Development of Sojourners) longitudinal study were recruited nationwide using var-
ious strategies, for example postings via the mailing lists of facilities and university clubs or on target group relevant online social network sites. Additionally, the international offices of all German universities (of applied sciences) and art academies were requested to forward our invitation e-mail to students registered for international exchange programs starting in the winter term of 2009. Participants from approximately 200 different institutions of higher education accepted our invitation.

We implemented an online study with a personalized research design that prevented multiple registrations by the same individual. As a feature of this design, participants could interrupt and continue the completion of the online questionnaires at their convenience. Furthermore, it allowed us to track participants’ progress in completing the questionnaires and enabled us to remind them of any outstanding questions whenever necessary. The personalized design was used throughout the study (i.e., for the introductory questionnaire and the three subsequent occasions of data collection).

In the introductory questionnaire, participants provided some basic demographic information and declared their international mobility plans with regard to any possible trips abroad lasting more than two months that were expected to happen within the next 12 months. Participants who did not indicate any international mobility intentions were assigned to the control group; sojourners with concrete international mobility plans were asked to specify their destination and date of departure. The declared date of departure was used to plan regular measurement intervals for all three following measurement occasions. More specifically, all sojourners received an e-mail with their personalized link to their questionnaire before their departure (T2), the second one 20 weeks (T2) after the transition abroad. The timing of the third occasion of data collection was further dependent upon the individual duration of stay as recorded at T2. Sojourners who indicated they would further stay abroad for more than two months that were expected to happen within the near future (short-term sojourners) or cease their experience abroad in the near future (long-term sojourners) were excluded from the regular measurement circle, as they would either have moved back to Germany within the next 12 weeks (short-term sojourners) or had already returned to Germany at the second occasion of data collection (visitors) were classified in different groups and separated from the regular measurement circle, as they would either cease their experience abroad in the near future (short-term sojourners) or had already left their foreign destination (visitors).

Measurement occasions for participants of the control group were established at intervals comparable to the long-term sojourners, more precisely about 20 weeks (April 6, 2010) and about 32 weeks (July 12, 2010) after the first occasion of data collection at the beginning of the academic year 2009/2010 (October 26, 2009).

To prevent any untimely completion, all questionnaires were only available for participants’ input once the respective invitation e-mail had been sent out. Participants were only invited to subsequent waves of data collection when they had completed the preceding questionnaire on time. Participation in the study was voluntary and not financially remunerated. However, interested individuals were offered to participate in a lottery game with a non-cash prize and to receive individual feedback after the completion of the longitudinal study as a reward for their services.

From the individuals who initially registered for participation in the study (N = 3,427), N = 3,427 completed the first measurement, and a panel sample of N = 1,836 provided Big Five personality data at all measurement occasions.1 According to Rubin’s (1976) missing data typology, missing values can be completely at random (MCAR), missing at random (MAR) or missing not at random (MNAR), with MCAR and MAR being considered to constitute ignorable non-response. Little’s MCAR test assesses the assumption that MCAR can be assumed instead of MAR which means that missing values are independent of observed values in a defined set of other variables. First, we conducted MCAR tests as implemented in SPSS Version 20.0 (IBM Corporation, 2011) using the data of all participants who accomplished the first measurement (N = 3,427), and we found no indication that participants’ age, sex, initial Big Five trait levels, or the home university would predict panel attrition, χ²(5) = 1.69, p = .890. Second, we repeated the MCAR tests with the data of all sojourners and were able to rule out host country effects on panel attrition, χ²(5) = 0.27, p = .998.

Additionally, to ensure optimal data quality and to enable a strict test of our hypotheses, we precluded several data sets from the main analyses based on the following reasons. First, to obtain a strictly defined internationally inexperienced control group, we did not consider the data of N = 331 control students who had either indicated previous experiences of more than 2 months spent abroad or spontaneous mobility plans that coincided with the study period. Secondly, we excluded participants from the sojourner sample who either had not fully completed the first (pre-departure) questionnaire before their departure (N = 108), or numbered more than one country of residence for the succeeding months abroad (N = 7). This was necessary to both ensure stable baseline measures, since assessments in the aftermath of a transition abroad may have already been affected by the event’s experience, and comparable nonrecurring transition experiences. Third, we would enhance the comparability of the international mobility experiences by restricting our analyses to sojourners who spent at least 5 months (one semester) abroad (i.e., short-term sojourners [N = 230] and long-term sojourners [N = 297]). The data sets of visitors (N = 256) who had already moved back to Germany before the second assessment had taken place, were not taken into account for the current analyses. Repeated MCAR tests revealed that the cleansing procedures did not produce any systematic sample bias, χ²(5) = 1.74, p = .884.

The overall analysis sample (N = 1,134) comprised 21.8% male participants, almost equally distributed across the three groups (21.7% male short-term sojourners, 25.3% male long-term sojourners, and 20.1% male control students). Similarly, the mean age was largely comparable (22.8 years [SD = 1.9], 22.6 years [SD = 1.9], and 22.5 years [SD = 3.0]).

Comparing initial Big Five trait scores to those of a representationally selected sample of young German adults (N = 160, mean age = 30.7 years, SD = 5.7) compiled by Lang, Lüdtke, and Asendorpf (2001), we found that our sample was to a large extent
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1 We only included data sets with a maximum of 20% missing data per scale (Downey & King, 1998). However, as the online questionnaire was based, for the most part, on forced choice items, only scattered missings occurred.
comparable to the representative sample, as differences in Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Agreeableness reached only negligible to small effect sizes. However, our sample was characterized by a higher level of Neuroticism (Cohen’s $d = 0.47$). Against the background of a known consistent and substantial decrease in Neuroticism across the years of young adulthood (Roberts et al., 2006; Robins et al., 2001; Specht et al., 2011), these differences are likely to be explained by the fact that our participants were on average about 8 years younger than the representative sample.

The vast majority of sojourners (82%) spent their year abroad on EU-European campuses, which further contributed to the comparability of mobility experiences. Almost all sojourners indicated the intention to study in their host countries (94%). Only a handful of participants intended to use their sojourn to do an internship (4%) or had some other unspecified plans (2%). On average, sojourners were quite confident in their ability to manage everyday encounters regarding their host countries’ languages, the average self-rating about pre-departure language competence on a 7-point Likert scale was $M = 4.5$ ($SD = 1.9$).

In both the short-term and long-term groups, Spain was the most popular country of destination (33% and 19%), followed by France (18% and 17%), and the United Kingdom (11% and 15%). In other words, 62% of short-term sojourners and 51% of long-term sojourners went to one of the three most favored countries. These numbers are in line with the national averages among all German students who moved abroad on EU-sponsored ERASMUS grants during the academic year 2009/2010. According to official statistics, about 52% of all 28.854 German ERASMUS-Outgoings moved to Spain (20.4%), France (17.3%), or the United Kingdom (13.8%) (European Commission, 2013). In terms of travel destinations, the present sojourn groups compare well to the national average.

We assessed possible influences of the host countries by the inspection of intraclass correlation coefficients for the Big Five (T1, T2, and T3) and relationship measures (i.e., number of support relationships at T1, numbers of lost and gained relationships). The majority of coefficients were small to negligible (Hox, 2010), which points to the irrelevance of country-level differences with respect to the sojourners’ trait constellations.

Social relationship measures. We developed a research design that allowed for the precise quantification of support relationship gains and losses. These requirements were met by the utilization of a personal network approach (Milardo, 1992) with three different name eliciting questions, referred to in the literature as name generators (Burt, 1984; Campbell & Lee, 1991). Short characteristic descriptions of support needs with respect to either emotional, instrumental, or companionship matters (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959) were used to direct the naming of each and every relevant support relationship (van der Poel, 1993).

The three name eliciting questions were presented on three successive pages of the online questionnaire, with relationship entries being automatically transmitted from one page to the following. Thus, all relationships named in reply to former questions were listed at the top of the subsequent page and could be reused as answers to the present question by clicking. This design feature was implemented to prevent the same relationship partner’s repeated denomination with different spellings or name references (e.g., Maximillian M. or Max M.), which would prevent clear identification and thus distort the relationship data (Fung, Yeung, Li, & Lang, 2009). Participants were required to identify their support relationships with full first names, surnames’ initials, age, sex, and role relationship to guarantee unambiguous recognition on the next occasion of data collection. Once participants had worked through all three name generating questions, they were presented with the full list of their support relationships along with the request to check for possible unintentional repetitions, missing information or misspellings and edit their entries if necessary. Once the lists were shown to be unambiguous and valid, they were stored online and saved as recognition stimuli for the next wave of data collection. In the next step, participants moved on to the interpreters’ section (Burt, 1984; Campbell & Lee, 1991), where the relationship list was used to gather further qualifying information on the respective relationship partners’ nationalities.

As a feature of the recognition design we used (Marsden, 1990; Neyer, 1997; Sudman, 1985), all subsequent waves of relationship data collection endorsed the same name eliciting questions. However, from the second data collection on, participants were no longer required to start their listings from scratch, but were presented with the complete support relationship list of the previous measurement occasion as an aide memoire and point of reference. A new use of former entries was achieved by clicking on the respective name to activate it as a response to the currently presented generator. In this way, we were able to keep track of each and every formerly named relationship and to confirm whether it was still relevant. At the same time, participants still had the possibility to add any new contacts to the established support relationship list.

Measures

Big Five trait measures. The German version of the Big Five Inventory (BFI; Lang et al., 2001) was employed at all three measurement occasions to assess personality traits. The 42 items were rated on 5-point scales (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Coefficient alpha reliabilities at the three measurement occasions were .83, .83, and .84 for Openness; .83, .83, and .83 for Conscientiousness; .88, .89, and .90 for Extraversion; .73, .72, and .74 for Agreeableness; and .82, .84, and .84 for Neuroticism, respectively.
items to the respective parcels. All latent analyses were carried out simultaneously. Age and gender were controlled in all analyses. We used Bayesian estimators as they have been proven to outperform standard maximum likelihood parameter estimates and a mean-adjusted chi-square, which are robust to violations of normality (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2010). Missing values in the relationship indices were treated using the FIML procedure as implemented in Mplus Version 6 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2010).

Selection effects. To assess self-selection effects, we implemented multivariate probit regressions with the Big Five personality factors as latent predictors and the sojourn status as dependent dummy coded variables (0 = control group, 1 = sojourner). To illustrate differences between univariate and multivariate designs, we subsequently performed univariate analyses for all Big Five personality traits, and a multivariate model considering all traits simultaneously. Age and gender were controlled in all analyses. We used Bayesian estimators as they have been proven to outperform the commonly implemented WLSMV estimators in structural equation models with categorical outcome variables in many incidences (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2010).

Socialization effects and mediation analyses. To assess initial levels and to measure changes in the latent personality constructs over time, we used latent change models (McArdle, 1988; McArdle & Nesselroade, 1994; Steyer, Eid, & Schwenkmezger, 1997; Steyer, Partchev, & Shanahan, 2000), which are also frequently referred to as true change models (Geiser, 2010). In these models, latent change variables are used to represent the change between two measurement occasions which is uncontaminated by random measurement error. More precisely, time specific latent factors that represent a construct at each time point are defined. The crucial idea is that the latent measure for the second time point can be decomposed into the initial intercept, and a latent change factor representing growth or decline from one time point to the other (Reuter et al., 2010; Steyer et al., 1997, 2000). The variance of the latent change factor points to interindividual differences in change. To confirm the reliability of change, it is crucial to ensure that changes are not due to modifications in the relation between manifest indicators and their latent counterparts (Bollen & Curran, 2006; Horn & McArdle, 1992; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000). Thus, the specified models implied strict factorial invariance by constraining factor loadings, measurement intercepts, and error variances to be equal across time (Meredith, 1993). We allowed for correlations between residuals of the same indicators across time to account for residual effects that cannot be ascribed to the latent factors under study (Brown, 2006; Marsh & Hau, 1996). If strict factorial invariance is established, changes in average indicator scores unequivocally reflect changes in the latent variables (Geiser, 2010; Lüdtke et al., 2011).

A further advantage of latent change models is their flexible extensibility, due to the fact that the latent change variables can serve as both endogenous and exogenous variables that can be related to other constructs (Steyer et al., 2000). In the present study, we took advantage of these possibilities with respect to three analytical features. First, we estimated all latent change models as multivariate models (Reuter et al., 2010; Steyer et al., 2000), which simultaneously endorsed all five personality traits. In the context of the present study, this was particularly important as only the simultaneous incorporation of all initial trait levels allowed for a differentiation between selection and socialization effects since initial trait level differences (selection effects) were controlled. Importantly, the five latent change variables were restricted so as not to correlate with each other.

Second, treating latent change factors as endogenous variables enabled us to assess the extent to which their variances were explained by sojourn effects. To perform these analyses, the uncorrelated change variables were regressed on dummy variables that indicated the participants’ sojourn status. We analyzed change patterns in two distinct but analogous models with respect to two measurement intervals: the first five months interval (T1–T2) and the full observation period of an academic year (T1–T3). Given the multivariate control of selection effects, significant effects of sojourn status on trait change variables can be interpreted as socialization effects above and beyond the impact of initial trait constellations.

Third, in order to assess the mechanisms that account for the sojourn effects on personality change, we also extended the latent change models by incorporating relationship fluctuation indices as mediators into the models and tested for the significance of these mediation effects (see Figure 1). The outcome variables and mediators were controlled for age, gender, initial trait constellations, and the respective numbers of national and international support relationships at T1. To account for non-normality of item distributions, we estimated all latent change models using the Satorra–Bentler method for model estimations. This approach provides maximum likelihood parameter estimates and a mean-adjusted chi-square, which are robust to violations of normality (Muthén & Muthén, 2004). Missing values in the relationship indices were treated using the FIML procedure as implemented in Mplus Version 6 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2010).
Results

To begin, we present results on self-selection, and then turn to the results of multivariate latent change models to seize socialization effects. Here, we first investigated direct sojourn effects on personality trait change across T1–T2 and T1–T3 in two separate models (path c, Figure 1). Next, we extended each of these two latent change models by including indices of relationship fluctuation as mediators. We present the results from these two latent change mediation models in three steps. First, we report on sojourn effects on uncorrelated latent trait change variables. For reasons of parsimony and comprehensibility, this illustration is restricted to exemplary univariate latent trait and change variables.

Self-Selection Hypothesis: Personality Traits as Predictors of International Mobility

Self-selection effects were examined separately for short-term and long-term sojourners using probit regression analyses as described above. The inspection of univariate and multivariate probit coefficients revealed substantial differences between both forms of analyses (see Table 1). In the univariate analyses for short-term sojourners, all Big Five traits were identified as predictors of sojourning; similarly, all the traits apart from Agreeableness predicted long-term sojourning. In contrast, the multivariate models showed a different pattern. While Extraversion was consistently classified as a positive predictor for short-term ($\beta = .23, p = .002$) and long-term ($\beta = .26, p = .000$) sojourning above and beyond the impact of all other traits, higher initial Conscientiousness predicted short-term ($\beta = .38, p = .001$) and higher Openness long-term sojourning ($\beta = .24, p = .003$). Proportions of explained variance were $R^2 = .12, p = .000$, in the multivariate analyses of short-term sojourners, and $R^2 = .09, p = .000$, in the multivariate analyses of long-term sojourners. Direct sojourn group comparisons substantiated the group differences between self-selection effects.

Socialization Hypothesis: Direct Sojourn Effects on Personality Trait Change

We first specified two multivariate latent change models referring to the two measurement intervals of one academic term (T1–T2) and the full academic year (T1–T3). In each model, we regressed the five uncorrelated latent trait change variables on dummy-coded sojourn status variables to distinguish between effects for control students, short-term, and long-term sojourners. Both models obtained a good fit to the data, with comparative fit indexes (CFIs) $>.95$, root-mean-square error of approximations (RMSEAs) $<.07$, and standardized root-mean-square residuals (SRMRs) $<.06$. As can be seen in the first two columns of Table 2, the first model revealed a comparable pattern of results for T1–T2 across both sojourning groups. Although some of the effects were only substantiated as a tendency, effect comparisons using Cohen’s $d$s suggested genuine sojourn effects on developmental trajectories of Openness ($d_{short} = 0.23, d_{long} = 0.12$), Agreeableness ($d_{short} = 0.10, d_{long} = 0.13$), and Neuroticism ($d_{short} = −0.13, d_{long} = −0.16$). Indeed, a Wald test confirmed that there were no significant differences between socialization effects for control students, short-term, and long-term sojourners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality and Self-Selection: Prediction of Sojourn Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personality Trait</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* $T1 =$ Time 1; Short-term $=$ short-term sojourners; Long-term $=$ long-term sojourners; Controls $=$ control students.

* Unstandardized probit coefficients.
patterns of short-term and long-term sojourners, $\chi^2(5) = 6.43, p = .266$. In order to reduce model complexity, we repeated the analysis with the pooled sojourner sample (the third column in Table 2). The socialization pattern for the pooled sample across T1–T2 substantiated the sojourn effects on personality change in the domains of Openness, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism.

The same pattern of results was identified in the second model addressing socialization effects across T1–T3 (fourth column in Table 2). We compared the effect sizes (Cohen’s $d$) obtained for the long-term sojourners across T1–T2 and T1–T3 to evaluate how the duration of stay affected socialization patterns. Effect sizes for Openness ($d_{12} = 0.12, d_{13} = 0.14$) and Agreeableness ($d_{12} = 0.13, d_{13} = 0.18$) were comparable across both intervals, indicating that sojourn effects on Openness and Agreeableness development were relatively independent of the time spent abroad. A considerable increase in effects on Neuroticism ($d_{12} = 0.16, d_{13} = 0.27$) suggests that the sojourn duration played an influencing role for this domain.

Figure 2 summarizes the results by exemplarily illustrating the multivariate selection and socialization effects obtained for the long-term sojourners for the full measurement period (T1–T3). As can be seen, the sojourn effect on Openness change translates in differential developmental trends for sojourners and control students. While the sojourners’ change patterns are characterized by an increasing tendency, the contrary trend is observed in the control group. With respect to Agreeableness, the sojourn effect on trait change is shown by sojourners’ more pronounced increases. The impact of international mobility on Neuroticism change is consistently demonstrated by the sojourners’ steeper Neuroticism decline. It is worth noting that sojourning did not directly relate to changes in Conscientiousness and Extraversion in any of the models, hence there are no significant differences between sojourners and controls with respect to the change patterns of these traits.

Mediation Hypothesis: Relationship Fluctuation as Mechanism of Personality Development

In the next step, we extended the two latent change models (T1–T2, T1–T3) for mediation analyses by including fluctuation indices of national and international relationship losses and gains as mediators to explain sojourn effects on trait change (see Figure 1). For the T1–T2 interval, we started with a model that distinguished between the indirect paths for the short-term and long-term sojourners. As the pattern of results was comparable for short-term and long-term sojourners, we next tested a model with all indirect paths set equal across both sojourn groups. As the result of a Wald test confirming that there were no significant differences between the indirect paths of short-term and long-term sojourners, $\chi^2(20) = 2.82, p = 1.000$, we pooled the indirect paths for the two sojourn groups.

Sojourn effects on relationship fluctuation (a paths). To begin, we introduce descriptive findings to illustrate the dynamic pattern of change in support relationships (see Table 3). The first three columns show the total numbers of relationships reported at each measurement occasion and the numbers of lost and gained relationships across T1–T2 and T1–T3, respectively. At each measurement occasion, participants of both sojourn groups reported comparable numbers of relationship partners which were greater than those reported by control students. In addition, short-term and long-term sojourners reported more relationship losses and gains compared to the control students. All in all, the pattern of relationship fluctuation was comparable between both sojourn groups, though long-term sojourners tended to lose more supportive relationships than the short-term sojourners from T1 to T2.

The overall numbers of reported international support relationships including gains and losses are also reported in Table 3, both in numbers and percentages. Both sojourn groups were involved in more international relationships at each measurement occasion, and added about 10 times more international relationships than control students. The composition of international relationships was nominally the same in both sojourn groups; that is, around one third of these relationship partners were host country natives, and about two thirds were other international sojourners.

This descriptive pattern of relationship fluctuation was confirmed by the tests of a paths of the latent change mediation models. For the T1–T2 interval, we observed substantial sojourn effects on losses of both national ($\beta = 2.02, p = .000$) and international ($\beta = 0.52, p = .022$) relationships, as well sojourn effects on international relationship gains ($\beta = 2.46, p = .000$). This indicates that sojourners lost more national and international relationships, while at the same time gaining many more new

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality trait</th>
<th>Model for T1–T2</th>
<th>Model for T1–T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short-term sojourners</td>
<td>Long-term sojourners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Openness</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Extraversion</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Agreeableness</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Neuroticism</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Coefficients are the unstandardized effects of sojourn status on trait change (i.e., c paths in Figure 1). T1–T3 = Time 1–Time 3.
Figure 2. Multivariate self-selection and socialization effects for control students and long-term sojourners (T1–T3). To illustrate multivariate selection effects, standardized probit coefficients derived from the multivariate self-selection analyses were used to illustrate intercept differences between control students and long-term sojourners. Coefficients for both groups’ Big Five trait change over time—that is, socialization effects—were deferred from the latent change model and, for illustrative purposes, were standardized relative to the first measurement.
international relationships than control students during the same time interval.

Regarding the T1–T3 interval, effects of long-term sojourns on relationship fluctuation were shown to be significant with respect to national relationships losses ($\beta = 2.15, p = .000$) and international relationship gains ($\beta = 2.91, p = .000$). Therefore it can be seen that long-term sojourn led to both higher rates of nationally associated relationships losses and international relationship gains. Importantly, all these effects were independent of initial network constellations as the respective numbers of national and international relationships at the first measurement occasion were controlled.

**Effects of relationship fluctuation on Big Five trait change (b paths).** Table 4 summarizes the results of the b paths for the latent change mediation models. As the direct effects of sojourn status were controlled ($c'$ paths), the coefficients reflect the effects of relationship fluctuation on trait change above and beyond any sojourn effects.

Notably, all relationship effects on trait change across both T1–T2 and T1–T3 referred to relationship gains. With the exception of a negative effect of national relationship gains on Agreeableness change which only manifested across T1–T3, all relationship effects on trait change variables were replicated across both measurement intervals. Both gains of national and international contacts affected Openness change. By contrast, only international relationship gains had substantial impact on change in Neuroticism and Extraversion.

**Relationship fluctuations as mechanisms of trait change.** We completed the mediation analyses by examining the significance of the total indirect effects, and their power to explain the socialization effects that had been substantiated for Openness, Neuroticism, and Agreeableness. With respect to Openness, only the indirect effect of international relationship gains was significant for T1–T2 ($\beta_{\text{international}} = .04, p = .000; \beta_{\text{national}} = .00, p = .380$) and T1–T3 ($\beta_{\text{international}} = .05, p = .008; \beta_{\text{national}} = .00, p = .126$). In both cases, the direct sojourn effect on Openness change was no longer sustained ($c'_{12} = .02, p = .343; c'_{13} = .00, p = .921$). The indirect effect explained about 65% (T1–T2) and 94% (T1–T3) of the direct effect’s variance.

Regarding Neuroticism, only the indirect effect of international relationship gains was significant for both T1–T2 ($\beta_{\text{international}} = -.05, p = .002; \beta_{\text{national}} = .00, p = .527$) and T1–T3 ($\beta_{\text{international}} = -.05, p = .028; \beta_{\text{national}} = .00, p = .650$). The direct sojourn effects on Neuroticism became insignificant once mediation terms

### Table 4


Note. Coefficients are the unstandardized b paths from latent change mediation models. T1–T3 = Time 1–Time 3.
were included ($c'_{12} = -.03, p = .382; c'_{13} = -.07, p = .068$), which accounted for 69% (T1–T2) and 39% (T1–T3) of the direct effect.

For Agreeableness, none of the indirect effects were significant for T1–T2 ($\beta_{\text{international}} = .02, p = .275; \beta_{\text{national}} = -.00, p = .451$) or T1–T3 ($\beta_{\text{international}} = .03, p = .059; \beta_{\text{national}} = .00, p = .169$). As the insignificance of b paths had already indicated (see Table 4), there were no substantial effects for relationship losses, imputing that overall relationship losses did not account for any sojourn effects on trait change.

To sum up, these results illustrate that both the sojourn effect on change in Openness and Neuroticism can be explained in terms of sojourners’ more extensive international relationship gains.

### Discussion

The aim of the present study was to investigate self-selection and socialization processes in the context of international mobility experiences, and to explore the mediating mechanisms that account for socialization effects. We based our classification of international mobility as a life event with the potential to influence personality development on two grounds: first, its increasing importance in young adults’ lives, and, second, the idea that sojourning compares to other life events in facilitating relationship dynamics as a social framework for personality development (Caspi, 2000; Lang, Reschke, & Neyer, 2006; Roberts & Wood, 2006). The pattern of self-selection and socialization effects speaks notably in favor of international mobility’s classification as a life event that catalyzes personality development (Roberts et al., 2005). Furthermore, the establishment of relationship gains as a mechanism that accounts in large parts for the sojourn effects on personality development validated our assumption of a strong theoretical explanation for personality change.

### Self-Selection: Personality Traits as Predictors of International Mobility

As expected, we observed substantial self-selection effects in both univariate and multivariate analyses. However, there were substantial differences between the two analyses strategies. While univariate analyses revealed all Big Five traits as determinants of short-term sojourning, and all traits but Agreeableness as being predictors of long-term stays abroad, multivariate analyses restricted the pattern to substantial effects for Extraversion (short-term and long-term sojourning), Openness (long-term sojourning), and Conscientiousness (short-term sojourning). While higher levels of Extraversion and Openness had already been related to both intra- and international mobility experiences in recent studies (Camperio Ciani, Capiluppi, Veronese, & Sartori, 2007; Jokela, 2009; Jokela et al., 2008; Lüdtke et al., 2011; Silventoinen et al., 2008), the effect of Conscientiousness on sojourning was unexpected. Additionally, the Openness effect was substantiated for long-term sojourners only and did not generalize across both study abroad schemes.

Our conclusions on self-selection are threefold. First, the divergent pattern of univariate and multivariate results demonstrates the pitfalls of univariate self-selection analyses, as these are likely to suggest extensive selection effects that are, on closer (multivariate) inspection, carried by traits’ covariances, while lacking unique predictive value. Second, with the impact of the Big Five traits on young adults’ international mobility engagement, we complemented the existing knowledge on the relevance of traits with respect to life events in general, and provided insights into the psychological prerequisites that foster one of the most important forms of current geographical mobility (King & Ruiz-Gelices, 2003). Third, the fact that self-selection effects differed between short-term and long-term sojourns suggests that these two study abroad schemes represent different points of focus. The engagement in short-term sojourns may rather reflect an aspiration to accumulate career relevant experiences that are valued by many employees (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 2009), which would explain the unexpected Conscientiousness effect. In contrast, long-term sojourns may rather respond to a desire for more extensive experiences with a foreign culture, which is reflected in the Openness effect. However, few studies have investigated the motives and the goals that are pursued by students when they decide to spend some of their academic education abroad, which prompts the presented findings toward interesting perspectives for future research. These differences in self-selection notwithstanding, it is all the more noteworthy that the patterns of socialization were indeed comparable between short-term and long-term sojourners.

### Socialization: Direct Sojourn Effects on Personality Trait Change

Latent change analyses on trait socialization confirmed a coherent pattern of substantial differences between sojourners and control students with respect to change in Agreeableness, Neuroticism, and Openness. Notably, the overall socialization pattern was consistently identified for both short-term and long-term sojourners, which highlights that sojourn effects on personality development were independent of the intended time to stay abroad, whether the experience was for one semester or for a full year.

In particular, sojourners exhibited an accentuated increase of Agreeableness and a steeper decline of Neuroticism. Against the background of the mean-level trends toward higher Agreeableness and Emotional Stability across the life span (Lucas & Donellan, 2011; Roberts et al., 2006; Roberts & Wood, 2006; Robins et al., 2001; Specht et al., 2011), these socialization patterns corroborate the conceptualization of international mobility experiences as a life event that expedites personality maturation in young adulthood.

As only few previous studies have revealed substantial contingencies between life experiences and Openness trajectories (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998; Neyer & Asendorpf, 2001), we regard the identified sojourn effect on Openness change as an important achievement. If we consider both socialization and self-selection effects obtained for that domain, the claim of the Corresponsive Principle that “the most likely effect of life experience on personality development is to deepen the characteristics that lead people to those experiences” (Roberts et al., 2003, p. 583) would seem to be validated for the case of long-term sojourning. In this regard, the present study extended the Corresponsive Principle to fields other than professional experiences.

Other than the socialization effects observed for Openness and Agreeableness, the sojourn effect on Neuroticism increased over time. Several studies have shown that the first four to six months abroad are frequently associated with adaptation hassles, which
validity of the results. The replication of socialization effects on personality maturation. The replication of socialization effects on level (Roberts et al., 2006). However, one can only speculate that sojourning has an effect on Extraversion. Earlier studies indicated that developmental patterns of Extraversion strongly depend upon the facet under study, and that antagonistic tendencies of different facets might neutralize each other attrait level (Roberts et al., 2006). However, one can only speculate concerning such effects when considering the present study.

Nevertheless, the observed socialization processes genuinely validated international sojourns as a life event which catalyzes personality maturation. The replication of socialization effects on Openness, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism across different sojourn groups and time intervals provided a strong case for the validity of the results.

Relationship Fluctuations as Mechanism of Personality Development

Both control and sojourner students reported having considerable numbers of concrete relationships; people who responded to their needs for emotional support, instrumental support, and companionship. These numbers, ranging from about 10 to 12 support relationships, were thoroughly in line with earlier findings on personal support networks of young adults (Wurzus, Hänel, Wagner, & Neyer, 2013) and sojourners (Domínguez & Maya-Jariego, 2008). With respect to relationship fluctuation over time, we identified the expected accentuation in the social network dynamics of sojourners that was most apparent in their more than tenfold increased international relationship gains. Importantly, the aim of the present study was not to compare the general effects of national and international relationship fluctuation. We rather aspired to precisely describe the particular pattern of relationship fluctuation that occurs in the context of international sojourns, and investigate its role in socialization processes.

Latent change mediation models revealed international relationship gains as a powerful mediator to explain sojourn effects on Openness change. This finding agrees with the assumption of the culture learning framework, that international sojourns facilitate behavior change by intercultural relationship experiences which offer first-hand experiences of cultural differences (Furnham & Bochner, 1982; Ward & Kennedy, 1993). That way, the cultural learning framework corresponds with the Sociogenomic Model, which would assume that such relationship experiences result in concrete behavior changes, which, in turn, promote trait development by bottom-up processes (Roberts & Jackson, 2008).

In line with our expectations, the quantity of new support relationships with international partners also provided a powerful explanatory link for sojourn effects on decline in Neuroticism. As mentioned above, earlier studies suggested that the successful handling of acculturative stressors may set in motion declines in trait anxiety (Andrews et al., 1993). In addition, several studies characterized the successful handling of multicultural social encounters as a major challenge of international sojourners (Eshel & Rosenthal-Sokolov, 2000; Gong & Fan, 2006; Ward & Kennedy, 1999). The successful integration of international relationships can therefore be considered to be an important step in mastering acculturation challenges, leading to reduced stress and anxiety, which finally translates into change in Neuroticism.

Further research is needed to understand sojourn effects on Agreeableness change. None of the assessed indirect effects were significant; however, the indirect effect via international relationship gains appeared as a tendency across T1–T3. We can only speculate that change in Agreeableness was related to other social experiences not captured by the mechanism of relationship fluctuation. For example, it was empirically shown that continuous experiences of specific relationship qualities, such as closeness or security, are associated with personality change (Neyer & Lehnart, 2007; Parker, Lüdtke, Trautwein, & Roberts, 2012; Sturaro et al., 2008). Agreeableness may rather be sensitive to such qualitative relationship changes during sojourn experiences.

It is worth remarking that mediation analyses did not substantiate any effects for lost support relationships. The reason may be that lost relationships are of minor importance to the individual person. Given the advanced communication and travel facilities in today’s world, it seems unlikely that social relationships are broken up for no reason other than increased geographical distances. Hence, relationship losses may rather pertain to the least relevant social relationships, where termination does not profoundly affect individuals, and therefore has minor consequences with respect to personality development.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study has limitations. First, as in most non-experimental research, it cannot be precluded that other unknown variables account for the observed effects. However, we contend that, with the implementation of a prospective control group design, we were able to control for trait-determined self-selection effects in our analyses of trait development. We believe that this approach supports our interpretation of the socialization effects obtained.

Second, the sustainability of observed developmental tendencies cannot be assessed with the available data, as they pertain only to the limited observation period of one academic year and do not allow for the extrapolation of trait development after return to the home country.

However, the Cumulative Continuity Principle (Roberts et al., 2008) underlines the importance of intermediate changes in trait development, as they were observed in the present study. Such intermediate changes characterize the flux and flow of self-selection and socialization processes as the most crucial mechanism behind the cumulative pattern of personality development over the life course. George, Helson, and John (2011), for exam-
ple, showed that the effects of professional experience on trait development may accumulate over several decades.

With respect to the particular case of international sojourning, the clear delineation of sustainable sojourn effects is particularly challenging, given that the experience of moving and living abroad is closely linked to another event, the return to the country of origin. There is broad agreement that the return to the country of origin constitutes a challenging life event on its own that should not be confounded with the preceding experiences of departure and living abroad (Martin, 1986; Rogers & Ward, 1993). Such effects were beyond the scope of the present study. A research design that is powerful enough to disentangle the effects of sojourn and return would require an observation period of at least three years, including fine-grained measurement occasions timed with reference to individual dates of return. We consider this to be an interesting challenge for future research.

Third, the sample in our study has two limitations. On the one hand, most sojourners moved to European destinations, thus limiting the ability to generalize the observed selection and socialization effects. We cannot rule out that moving to non-European destinations may be associated with different selection and socialization patterns. On the other hand, we concentrated on the very particular case of international student mobility, and as such, the question of whether or not our conclusions can be generalized into other groups subjected to inter- and intra-national mobility challenges remains open. Validating our results by studying international mobility experiences in foreign environments of variant cultural distances (Suanet & Van De Vijver, 2009; Ward & Chang, 1997; Ward, Leong, & Low, 2004) makes an appealing objective for future research.

Fourth, despite the successful approval of the Corresponsive Principle with respect to the coherent selection and socialization patterns in the trait domain of Openness, further trait domains miss corresponsive result patterns. However, it is important to bear in mind that we applied multivariate self-selection analyses, and thus implemented stricter tests of corresponsive patterns than previous studies, which may explain the discrepancy between favorable findings on the Corresponsive Principle (e.g., Roberts et al., 2003) and our results.

Finally, the theoretical and empirical substantiation of idiosyncratic trait change in response to rather non-normative life experiences, like international mobility, merits further consideration. With respect to normative age-graded life transitions, trait changes are assumed to be driven by unique reward contingencies bound to normatively defined social roles (Roberts & Wood, 2006). However, as non-normative events are less likely to be furnished with predefined normative expectations, they allow for more flexible individual accomplishments. The pattern of trait changes may then depend more on the concrete social environment, such as the context-specific rewards that are communicated in social relationships, in the form of behavior feedback or role models for example. Further research is required however, to clarify the concrete mechanisms that occur during social interactions with (new) relationship partners in order to thoroughly unravel how the new relationships work upon individuals.

To conclude, with the present study we showed that hitting the road has substantial effects on who we are. The difference is made by the international people we meet on that road and with whom we form new relationships. We hope that future research will continue to explore this road of personality–relationship transaction.
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