CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE SCALE (CQS): TESTING CROSS-CULTURAL TRANSFERABILITY OF CQS IN UKRAINE

© **Dr. R. Boyd Johnson**, Chair of the doctoral program in Organizational Leadership, Department of Organizational Leadership, Graduate Studies in Leadership, Indiana Wesleyan University 1900 W. 50th Street Marion, IN 46256 USA
email: boyd.johnson@indwes.edu

© **Svitlana Buko**, PhD. Research Director, Precedent Academics 9465 Counselor's Row, Suite 200 Indianapolis, IN 46240, email: sbuko@precac.com

The article examines the cross-cultural transferability of widely accepted cross-cultural assessment tool using research conducted in Ukraine - the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS), insights from the American and Ukrainian researchers who translated and adapted the instrument in Ukraine. Within the qualitative focus group study researchers look at the peculiarities of CQS perceptions by the Ukrainian audience sample and identify barriers of these perceptions, peculiarities of perceptions of citizens of Ukraine regarding cross-cultural interaction.

Key words: *cultural intelligence, cross-cultural communication, cross-cultural interaction, transferability.*

Introduction

Many researchers assume that the use of instruments can be used cross-culturally, regardless of where they are developed. Even instruments that have been validated in multiple countries are used outside of the validated study region and often transferability to these other regions is not considered. In reviewing the literature,

many cross-cultural studies assume a static reality. This includes Hofstede's values dimensions. However, other literature asserts that cultures are dynamic, fluid and ever-changing.

Goh (2009) suggested that concepts and theories are only transferable where cultural norms and values are similar. Understanding the meaning of concepts, ideas, and words will lead to a better understanding of cross-cultural acceptance and worldviews. To narrow the gap of Western assessments being used in Eastern cultures, this study is seeking through qualitative and quantitative research to determine what language must be used to ensure these (Barnes J., Buko S., Johnson B., Kostenko N, 2012).

Cultural intelligence was first introduced in 2003 and is defined as "an individual's capability to function and manage effectively in culturally diverse settings" (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008, p. 3). The CQS was developed to test and validate Earley and Ang's (2003) conceptualization of cultural intelligence, which is based upon Sternberg's multiple loci of intelligences. The CQS measures four primary factors which represent distinct CQ capabilities: CQ-Drive, CQ-Knowledge, CQ-Strategy, and CQ-Action. It is a 20-item, Four Factor Scale.

Ang et al. (2007) asserted CQ examines particular spheres in intercultural settings. This multidimensional construct includes four dimensions of cultural intelligence: (a) cognitive – "an individual's cultural knowledge of norms, practices, and conventions in different cultural settings" (Van Dyne et al., 2008, p. 16), (b) metacognitive – "an individual's cultural consciousness and awareness during interactions with those from different cultural backgrounds" (Van Dyne et al., 2008, p. 16), (c) motivational – "an individual's capability to direct attention and energy toward cultural differences" (Van Dyne, et al., 2008, p. 16), and (d) behavioral – "an individual's capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions when interacting with people from different cultural backgrounds" (Van Dyne, et al., 2008, p. 16).

Earley and Ang (2003) posited the construct cultural intelligence goes beyond the single dimension of cognition, even though cognition is considered the dominant view, to include metacognitive, motivational and behavioral dimensions. Additionally, Van Dyne et al., (2008), focusing on the early research of Earley and Ang, suggested there are "three loci of individual intelligence with direct relevance to human interaction: mental (metacognition and cognition), motivational, behavioral" (pp. 16-17). In their early studies, Earley and Ang proffered the foundation to understanding

the constructs of cultural intelligence; one must also understand what is meant by culture and society (Early, et al., 2006).

Cultural intelligence is vital for any individual interacting with a diverse population. Cultural intelligence "is needed to manage the stress of culture shock and the consequent frustration and confusion that typically result from clashes of cultural differences" (Joo-seng, 2004, p. 19).

Delving further into existing literature and research, at this point the researchers have found no literature as it relates to the transferability of the CQS across cultures. According to Van Dyne, Ang, and Koh (2008), the CQS was tested across two cultures, the US and Singapore; however, there has been no testing to date to determine if the CQS is transferable to countries in Eastern Europe. As former Soviet-ruled countries have opened their borders to Asia, Western Europe, and the US, assessments used to prepare in-country nationals and expatriates must be transferable across cultures.

Ukrainian CQS adaptation research project started in summer 2012 as joint US-Ukraine Project of Dr Boyd Johnson and Dr Joanne Barnes of Department of Organizational Leadership at Indiana Wesleyan University (Indiana, USA) and Institute of Sociology, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Kyiv, Ukraine). It was the first time that cultural intelligence scale (CQS) was used in the sociological research in Ukraine (Kostenko, Skokova, 2012). Research consisted of several phases: Phase I - Translation and adaptation of the scale to Ukrainian audience using two focus groups (17 respondents) was conducted by Dr. Tetyana Nikitina, and analyzed by Dr. Natalia Kostenko and Dr. Lyudmyla Skokova. Ukrainian sociologists followed up with the pilot test results with Phase II (fall 2012/winter 2013) - using translated scale for 300 students (Prof. Evheniy Golovakha, Dr. Andriy Gorbatchyk, Prof. Olexander Stegniy, Dr. Tetyana Nikitina, and Dr. Kateryna Ivashchenko-Stadnik) to test cultural intelligence scale for larger audiences in Ukraine. Article focuses on the phase I of the research. Research phase I focused on examining if the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) was transferable to the Ukrainian culture as it related to issues of translation, perception, and understanding.

Cross-cultural interaction and processes were basically not reflected and analyzed in Ukraine through the lenses, terms and definitions of «cultural intelligence». At the same time «cultural competence» concept which is understood as a derivative of «cultural education/awareness» and «cultural sensitivity», is widely used by Ukrainians sociologists (Ruchka, Kostenko, 2002, 2008, 2010).

Methodology

The purpose of the qualitative phase (focus groups) of the research is to identify content validity of cultural intelligence scale (CQS) and adapt it for Ukraine.

Research objectives:

1) To describe general scale perception based on participants' reaction to questionnaire and further discussion within Ukrainian audience sample.

2) To identify understanding and perception barriers of the scale questions of Ukrainian participants; detect characteristics of their attitudes towards cross-cultural interaction.

3) To define the interpretation limits/boarders for separate questions; to specify appropriate approaches for translations of separate questions and wordings

Method: focus groups discussions.

The research method appropriates is justified by the number of reasons:

1) discussion helps define participants' understanding of cross-cultural interaction issues as well as their interpretations of CQS Scale questions,

2) within the group participants based their answers on their personal assessments as well as dominant culture's standards and patterns,

3) discussion itself partially «shapes» the flow of cross-cultural interaction since participants are people of different sex, age, educational background, income and ethnicity (Ukrainians, Russians). Focus groups were conducted on the 05 July 2012 in Kyiv, Ukraine.

Relevance: Due to the issues of polysemantics of the «cultural intelligence» concept, ambiguity of it's translation into Ukrainian and Russian, as well as specifics of Ukrainian citizens' perception of other cultures and their attitudes towards cross-cultural interaction, adaptation was appropriate and necessary step. Instrument (CQS) adaptation was instrumental for further use of this scale in the representative surveys. Therefore qualitative sociological research was conducted in Kyiv in summer/fall 2013.

Samples and procedures

Two different focus groups were conducted. Participants were members of the «General public» representatives (GP – 8 respondents) and «leaders» (L – 9 respondents), who work in different non-governmental organizations. The group of «leaders» could be considered a «control group» since CQS initially implies leadership assessment. Respondents were contacted by sociologists of ISNANU from the pool of Sociological Monitoring database for Kyiv, Ukraine.

Structure of the groups:

Table 1 **"General public" FG demographics composition**

№	Person, age	Sex	age group	education	Income	was abroad
GP1	Zhanna, 28	Female	18–40	university degree	average	yes
GP2	Dmytro, 18	Male	18–40	high school	lower than average	yes
GP3	Natalia, 55	Female	55+	high school	average	no
GP4	Malika, 19	Female	18–40	high school	lower than average	no
GP5	Anatoliy, 44	Male	41–54	University degree	average	yes
GP6	Igor, 37	Male	18–40	high school	average	yes
GP7	Aleksandr, 46	Male	41–54	University degree	lower than average	yes
GP8	Svetlana, 43	Female	41–54	Community college	average	yes

"Leaders" FG demographics composition

№	Person, age	Sex	age group	education	Income	was abroad
L1	Tatyana, 54	Female	41–54	Universitydegree	lower than average	yes
L2	Larysa, 53	female	41–54	Universitydegree	average	yes
L3	Alexandr, 19	Male	18–40	Universitydegree	lower than average	yes
L4	Elena, 27	Female	18–40	Universitydegree	lower than average	yes
L5	Dmytro, 56	Male	55+	Universitydegree	average	yes
L6	Tanya, 62	female	55+	Universitydegree	lower than average	yes
L7	Olesya, 33	female	18–40	Universitydegree	higher than average	yes
L8	Yuriy, 31	Male	18–40	Universitydegree	higher than average	yes
L9	Alexey, 38	Male	18–40	Universitydegree	higher than average	yes

Participants were asked to fill in the cultural intelligence questionnaire before the main goals of the research were explained to them and focus groups were started. This was done in order to capture their spontaneous reactions to the CQS survey. Since two languages are spoken in the country - two precisely translated versions of the questionnaire were offered to the participants – in Ukrainian and Russian languages.

Discussion started with moderator's request to justify the importance of cross-cultural communication and describe its benefits. Participants returned to exchanging views on this topic in the following discussion later. Their observations and answers helped us highlight argumentation, justifications, attitudes which served as a basis for the following questionnaire wording adjustments/adaptation. In order to make these items easier to comprehend we will present them in form of dichotomies or special measuring axis that show the ambivalence of respondents' attitudes towards "other cultures". This ambivalence changed depending on the situation and intercultural interaction context.

Results

General evaluation of the CQS questionnaire

Participants' general impression of CQS survey after its completion was mostly negative. They obviously recognized the importance and relevance of cross-cultural interaction issues, but they faced difficulties understanding questions as well as with the format of questionnaire.

Questions content: most of the participants were surprised by a large number of questions. They felt questions were repetitive, their context duplicates which results in tautology, complexity and incomprehensibility. This kind of resentment can be explained by few factors of psychological, cognitive and axiological nature.

METACOGNITIVE UNIT

The perception of questions wording

MC1 I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds.

MC2 I adjust my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from a culture that is unfamiliar to me.

MC3 I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions.

MC4 I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures.

Metacognitive CQ unit turned out to be the hardest to understand since self-reflections on individual cross-cultural interaction knowledge and practices were not common for most of the respondents (according to what they stated). However, when they describe their real life experience, they often refer to reflections.

Discussion started with moderator's request to justify the importance of cross-cultural communication and describe its benefits. Participants returned to exchanging views on this topic in the following discussion later. Their observations and answers helped us highlight argumentation, justifications, attitudes which served as a basis for the following questionnaire wording adjustments/adaptation. In order to make these items easier to comprehend we will present them in form of dichotomies or special measuring axis that show the ambivalence of respondents' attitudes towards "other cultures". This ambivalence changed depending on the situation and intercultural interaction context.

The following words and phrases prompted additional discussion:

a) Respondents were confused by reflective actions statements «I am conscious», «I adjust», «I check», since, as they suppose, if that kind of actions take place, this is rather automatic or subconscious. Rationalization of this kind of actions as some separate procedures is considered vague, strange and unnecessary. Instrumental context of this kind of intercultural communication is also considered by participants unacceptable. Most of the participants think that cross-cultural communication should be «based on the free will» and with «mutual openness» (« It feels like we're talking about computers [not humans] » (L4, f., 27).

b) Many participants did not like the «cultural knowledge» expression as it sounds unfamiliar for the locals. Respondents noted that it would be better to say «knowledge of culture», «knowledge about the culture» or «culture peculiarities knowledge». Expression «your cultural knowledge» was usually seen as related to other cultures and countries. At the same time, it can be understood as «general cultural reserve/supply» which is based on internalized images of «personal», «native» culture (One of the respondents told a story on how typical Ukrainian traits – good cooking skills, hard work and friendliness helped her mother win her employer's respect while she was working in Poland).

c) Phrase «different cultures» was perceived as too broad and vague. In most cases it was interpreted by participants as reference to other country's, nation's culture (foreigners, foreign guests/citizens of other countries which we visit as tourists, guests). Participants lacked some general specification to help them understand which culture the questionnaire was referring to (European, Asian, etc.). They suppose that with this kind of clarification they would be more confident in their answers. At the same time some of the respondents associated expression «different cultures» with cultural differences inside the country or society. They mentioned ethnic minorities, regional cultures, subcultures, and cultures of different generations, professional cultures, although they did not think that questionnaire was suitable for researching those cultures.

d) «Cross-cultural interaction» phrase was perceived as too formal, official, not grasping the specifics of human communication.

COGNITIVE UNIT

Perception of the wording of the questions

COG1 I know the legal and economic systems of other cultures

COG2 I know the rules (e.g., vocabulary, grammar) of other languages

COG3 I know the cultural values and religious beliefs of other cultures

COG4 I know the marriage systems of other cultures

COG5 I know the arts and crafts of other cultures

COG6 I know the rules for expressing non-verbal behaviours in other cultures

The following phrases prompted discussion in this unit:

a) the majority of respondents are not ready to state in their answers openly and firmly "I know", when different aspects of other cultures are discussed. Respondents do not think that this is overall possible. They stated that more passive phrasing like "I am aware", "I am familiar with", "I have heard", "I have an idea" are more applicable to these questions.

b) in the context of law, language, economic systems, «different cultures» are perceived by respondents as «different countries»

c) identification of the subject of knowledge through «rules» or «systems» of different cultural institutions perceived by majority of respondents as too general, formal, official, which required explanations and more details. Based on their opinion, it would be more relevant to ask people about «peculiarities of legal and economic systems», «peculiarities of marriage systems», («marriage systems», «marriage traditions»).

d) similar situation is identified within perceptions of respondents regarding language proficiency. Respondent believe that it is important to specify language type (Romano-Germanic, Asian etc), and discuss in the questionnaire not the knowledge rules of other languages including grammar and vocabulary (where respondents also commented that vocabulary is not actually related to language rules), but rather to focus on "ability to speak foreign languages." Questions about rules of "nonverbal communication" should be expanded with more details in the parenthesis (i.e. gestures, facial expressions) or the wording should be changed to "knowledge of gestures, accepted in different cultures".

THE MOTIVATIONAL UNIT

Perception of the wording of the questions

MOT1 I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures

MOT2 I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me

MOT3 I am sure I can deal with the stresses of adjusting to a culture that is new to me

MOT4 I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me

MOT5 I am confident that I can get accustomed to the shopping conditions in a different culture

The following phrases prompted discussion in this unit:

a) the affirmation «I am confident» (MOT2, MOT3, MOT5) pushed away the respondents due to its categorical tone (it is not clear, what is the basis of such a confidence, especially if the person does not have such an experience). More adequately, according to their opinion, is the use of the subjunctive form ("I could" socialize, get accustomed, deal with) or subjective estimations ("I think that I can socialize", "I consider that I can socialize").

b) the expression "socialize with locals" (MOT2) is seen by some participants in a pejorative light, the similarity with the concept of "aborigine", "indigenous people" that are associated with colonialism, with stories about primitive populations and cultures. It was proposed to change the wording and talk about socializing with "people from the local culture" or changing the statements to "I am ready to socialize with the inhabitants of a unfamiliar country".

c) the statement MOT3 formulated "general public" looks as "I think that I can deal with stress in a foreign cultural environment".

d) the expression "I enjoy living" (MOT4) is more adequate in the subjunctive form ("I would like to live") or it requires changing the verb "live" with the verb "reside", as the verb "live" is associated with emigration, moving to another country for a permanent residence: "Five days or a week or the entire life – these are different things" (GP8, f., 43).

e) if it is inquired about the specificities of shopping conditions, then it is more appropriate to talk about "another country" and not about "a different culture"(MOT5)

BEHAVIORAL UNIT

Perception of the formulation of questions

BEH1 I change my verbal behaviour (e.g., accent, tone) when a cross-cultural interaction requires it

BEH2 I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situation

BEH3 I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it

BEH4 I change my non-verbal behaviour when a cross-cultural situation requires it

BEH5 I alter my facial expressions when a cross-cultural interaction requires it

The following phrases prompted discussion in this unit:

a) The respondents are not convinced, if all the details of the direct interaction, listed in the questions of this unit, have a fundamental meaning in intercultural interactions; in any case, not more than in any other interaction (with close people, representatives of the same culture). The face, for example, "changes in any interaction, regardless of whom you are in contact with, let's say with a sibling". The speed of the speech depends on the psychological and age characteristics of the individual ("the temper of the person is important, the age"). Therefore, such detailed questions were not always clear to them.

b) Some respondents found it hard to split their behavior in the process of interaction into parts. It was very difficult for the group "general public" to identify the situation when "pauses" and "silence" was required within cross-cultural interaction. The majority agrees that it would be more appropriate to merge some questions, regarding verbal and non verbal behavior. To merge:

- ✓ *questions BEH2 and BEH3 about verbal behavior (regulating pauses/quietness and the speed of the speech). "I can communicate faster, slower, pause, keep silence when it is required for better understanding within communication with representative of other culture" (L8, m., 31).*

- ✓ *Questions BEH4 and BEH5 about non verbal behavior (mimics / gestures and facial expressions, as "facial expressions – this is also non verbal behavior". However here it is mandatory to decode/explain " non-verbal behavior" as mimics and gestures.*

c) some participants suggested to replace the expression "verbal behavior" with a clearer word "speech" or generally remove this from the questionnaire ("I can change intonation, accent when it is necessary for understanding of the representative of another culture" - L8, m., 31), and "non verbal behavior" replace with the "language of gestures", but this was not supported by the majority.

d) for the respondents it is more comfortable to perceive the questions of this unit in the subjunctive form and conditional mode (not "I change my verbal behavior", but "I could change", "I hope I could change").

e) the expression "cross-cultural situation" requires, according to the participants, a more flexible application, within some questions it can be modified to "the situation of interacting with people from other cultures/countries/nationalities"

Implications for Research and Practice

The results are rather illustrative due to a small number of the respondents in the groups. On the other hand these results demonstrate CQS's differential capacity when applied to Ukrainian audience sample; they can be used to formulate hypothesis within representative survey.

Further testing of translated/adapted instrument for Ukrainian audience is scheduled by researchers. Phase II: Pilot testing of the translated scale with 300 respondents in Kyiv (Students of Shevchenko state University) Quantitative. Phase III: Integration of the CQS into the Ukraine-wide Monitoring (1800 respondents), data collection in all the regions of Ukraine. Quantitative.

Limitations

Researchers did not distort measurement instruments, but took consideration feedback and comments of respondents related to the perception of the questions, and peculiarities of translations from English language to Russian language. Researchers offer adapted version of the scale for Ukrainian audience.

The settings in which focus groups were held were special in two respects, both immediately related to cross-cultural interaction. Firstly, European soccer championship (Euro 2012) that took place

in Kyiv has just finished. That's the reason why cross-cultural interaction concept became even more relevant for the participants. Secondly, so called «language law» became a hot topic in the Ukrainian Parliament at that period of time. Discussion of the language law caused noticeable reaction both from it's supporters and opponents, which in turn effected «leaders» group mood. They were quite emotional in their contradictory statements on the FG topic right before the discussion started.

Conclusion

The respondents in both groups have more often identified the guidelines for intercultural interaction in terms of understanding, tolerance, personal development; the "leaders" have emphasized more often the role of knowledge and interaction, "the general public" – respect toward other cultures". Both groups consider the important aspect of intercultural interaction the mutual spiritual enrichment. The majority of respondents converge on the acceptability knowledge and skills in the intercultural interaction as "cultural awareness/conscience", taking into consideration the cognitive and emotional aspects of it, regulating the intercultural practices.

The term "cultural intelligence" was never evident in this relationship. Sharing their opinions about the concept, the participants, asked by the moderator, emphasized the low relevancy of the term as "intellect/intelligence" refers to a very high level of knowledge, to a rational understating of actions that represents only a very small part of the cultural interactions. According to the participants, it is not mandatory to be an intellectual if one is a culturally sensitive [aware] person.

Summary:

1. Respondents' perception of the initial version of CQS scale, is influenced by a set of political, ideological, social, cultural, psychological, gnoseological, factors; these factors form drivers and barriers for active participation in this research, and for further demonstration of cultural practices and predispositions. Factors have impact on multiple levels: could set specific value dichotomies, form settings that serve as orientations within cross-cultural interactions; and unconventionally impact configurations of intellectual ranges articulated by separate units of CQS.

2. Barriers to the loyal perception of the survey have mixed nature, based on the psychological, cognitive and cultural reactions. Key rejection/resistance aspects are:

- coercion to the rational activity, forms internal resistance of respondents due to lack of clear and meaningful reflection experience linked to their own behavior in the cross-cultural interactions; cognitive dissonance, formed based on the implied requirement of the CQS (megacognitive and cognitive unit) to track personal reactions and actions during communication with people. At the same time description shared by respondents related t their cross-cultural interaction experience indicates, that they actively use different metacognitive practices, which are commonly not discussed outlined.

- Suppressing natural reactions is something perceived by respondents as a part of CQS image of intercultural interaction (especially behavioral unit). This image contradicts general perception of respondents about prevalence of automatic aspects in the interaction of people. The overall idea of controlling verbal and nonverbal behavior perceived by the Ukrainian audience as something of manipulative nature. This leads to dissociation with declared traditional believes about the leading role of human characteristics (such as friendliness, openness, sincerity) during the contact with representatives of different cultures.

- In addition to psychological rejection of "techologism" during cross-cultural interaction, another set of barriers are supported by widely declared values of humanism, understanding, true communication, which lead to mutual

spiritual enrichment; as an antipode to a different type of pragmatic orientations, which are based on the usefulness of intercultural communication, rational planning of the strategy and tactics of interaction, geared towards achievement of specific effects, usage of the contact to reach specific goals.

- Need for Critical self-evaluation of personal knowledge about other cultures, fear to feel intellectual vulnerability due to inability to reach the level of knowledge, assumed as a maximum for the scale of the cognitive unit ("obsolete knowledge of al rules of all the cultures". This is also related to the megacognitive and motivational units, where compete agreement with survey statements would have indicated obsolete confidence regarding knowledge of diverse list of different cultures. A fear to show arrogance or ignorance, unwillingness to be responsible to setting any type of "objective" criteria, or skills stimulates respondents to use passive language structures ("I am aware" instead of "I know"), subjunctive mood ("I would have liked" instead of "I like), possibility of modality judgments ("I could have changed it" instead of "I am changing").

- Terminological pressure, dense saturation of the CQS questionnaire with generalizing concepts ("cross-cultural interaction", "cross-cultural situation", "other cultures"), which do not always make sense for respondents, required to be restructured by participants to make them more precise, add more details. This pressure results in inadequate understanding of the questions, especially by the elder group of respondents with lower level of education.

  Due to complicated terminology of the survey, respondents often do not understand what level of cross-cultural communication is discussed – interaction of counties, nations or direct human contact.

The analysis of the focus group discussions enables researchers to draw the following conclusions and state listed above results regarding peculiarities of CQS perceptions by the Ukrainian audience sample; identify barriers of these perceptions, peculiarities of perceptions of citizens of Ukraine regarding cross-cultural interaction. Importance and relevance of the research topic is acknowledged by all research participants.

References

Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008). Conceptualization of cultural intelligence: Definition, distinctiveness, and nomological network. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and application (pp. 3 - 15). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008b). Development and validation of the CQS: The cultural intelligence scale. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and application (pp. 16 - 38). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K.Y., Templer, K.J., Tay, C. & Chandrasekar, N. A., (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. Management and Organization Review, 3(3), 335-371. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x

Deardorff, D. K. (2009). Synthesizing conceptualizations of intercultural competence. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), The Sage handbook of intercultural competence (pp. 264-269). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Barnes J., Buko S., Johnson B., Kostenko N. (2012, October) Through the looking glass: Do Western Leadership Assessments work in cross-cultural contexts. Paper presented at the 14th Annual International Leadership Association Global Conference "Leadership Across the Great Divides: Bridging Cultures, Contexts, and Complexities," Denver, Colorado, USA.
Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures. Stanford, CA: Stanford Business Books.

Goh, J. (2009). 'Parallel leadership in an "unparallel" world'—cultural constraints on the transferability of Western educational leadership theories across cultures.' International Journal of Leadership in Education. 12(4), 319-345. doi: 10.1080/13603120902980796

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psycology, 36(5), 628 – 630.
Joo-seng, T. (2004). Cultural intelligence and the global economy. Leadership in Action, 24(5), 19-21.

Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Koh, C. (2008). Development and validation of the CQS: The cultural intelligence scale. In S. Ang & L. Van Dyne (Eds.), Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and application (pp. 16 - 38). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Koh, C. K. S. (2009). Cultural intelligence: Measurement and scale development. In M.A. Moodian (Ed.), Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations (pp. 233-254). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Костенко Н., Скокова Л., Тестирование шкалы культурной компетентности (CQS): украинская аудитория // Социология: теория, методы, маркетинг. - 2012. - №4. - С.159-184