



International Leadership Association

[Membership](#)[Conferences](#)[Webinars](#)[Publications](#)[Public Resources](#)[Communities](#)[Awards](#)[Calendar](#)

Search Menu

[New Search](#)[Add New Program](#)[Edit Program](#)[Add Syllabus](#)

Questions or Comments?

Contact ILA at

ila@ila-net.org

Description Including Abstract(s) & Bio(s) (if available) for Concurrent Session# 76

CS1 Thursday, Oct. 25, 10:45 - 12:00 Room: Mineral B

Session Type: Panel Discussion **Accepted by Track(s):** Theme, Education **Time Allotted:** 75

THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS: DO WESTERN LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENTS WORK IN CROSS-CULTURAL CONTEXTS?

Description: This panel will examine the cross-cultural transferability of two widely used leadership assessment tools using research conducted in Ukraine on the Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) and the Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS), insights from the Ukrainian researchers who translated and administered the instruments, and follow-up interviews. Additionally, the researchers will discuss what to look for when selecting an instrument to use across cultures, how to examine word choice, and what to look for in an interview process to ensure understanding.

Abstract: 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.

The 21st century has provided and continues to provide a platform for new research across cultures. Technology has opened communication into many countries where access had been previously denied. Ukraine, a former Soviet-ruled country, is an interesting example of this trend. After the Soviet collapse, there was an influx of Western, particularly American business, religious and non-profit influence in Ukraine. Initially, there was a wide acceptance of these ideas about leadership, but now there is more skepticism. At the same time there is receptivity to gaining new knowledge about leadership and the role of cultural intelligence in preparing them to engage in new cross-cultural partnerships.

A part of research conducted in Ukraine set out to examine if the Leadership Practice Inventory (LPI) and Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) were transferable to the Ukrainian culture as it related to issues of translation, perception, and understanding. Results from interviews provided insight about the LPI and based on those insights, the researchers are now developing a parallel examination of the CQS. The initial study using the LPI set out to examine perspectives on leadership among two generational groups in the Ukraine. Each group has experienced very different kinds of leadership, across various aspects of society. The main question was whether these generational populations believed in different concepts of leadership.

Translation of the instrument was conducted in-country, followed by an assessment of the results. There were over 1200 Ukrainians who participated in the quantitative study. A representative sample of the populations was then interviewed, followed by a detailed analysis done by both the US and Ukrainian researchers. One of the outcomes of the interview process revealed an intriguing possibility that there appeared to be a lack of understanding of a number of concepts presented by the LPI. Additionally, some of the questions seemed to have embedded Western assumptions. As the LPI focuses on leadership practices, it was determined that cultural intelligence as important variable must also be considered. However, attention needs to be given to the same transferability issues for the CQS as were given to the LPI.

Although cultural intelligence (CQ) studies have been conducted in many countries, there are few studies which examine cultural intelligence and the transferability of its concepts in a former Soviet controlled country. 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). 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.

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. What appears to be a single culture, may, in fact, reflect different cultural nuances across geographical and/or generational lines. An important question is: Does this cross-cultural "fluidity" and these cultures within cultures lend themselves to adoption of Western leadership theory?

Nearly all prevailing theories of leadership and much of its empirical evidences have been based upon Anglo-American character, cultures and worldviews. These inherent biases reflect assumptions of rationality instead of aesthetics, superstition or religion, and they are also framed in individualistic contexts (House, et al., 2004). One of the ongoing challenges faced by Western (US) researchers and theorist is bridging the gap of applying the theoretical concepts to non-Western countries. The reliability and validity testing of most instruments does not take into consideration how other cultures interpret and view concepts and questions. This includes assessments that are forward/backward translated. 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.

Understanding the meaning of concepts, ideas, and words will lead to a better understanding of cross-cultural acceptance and worldviews. Goh (2009) suggested that concepts and theories are only transferable where cultural norms and values are similar. However, if the world is truly becoming flat, cultures are becoming more homogeneous and theories will need to use inclusive language that can be translated with clear understanding. 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.

All of the issues that are addressed in this research are critical to the future of the study of leadership because unless the instruments for the study of leadership cannot be used cross-culturally. If that is the case, then the many worldviews of other cultures cannot be effectively assessed. Therefore, conclusions drawn may well be one-dimensional and not explore other societies and leadership practices

around the world.

This panel presentation offers the attendees the opportunity to dialogue with Ukrainian and US scholars. The perspectives presented will not only include results of the study, but also provide additional insights from the Ukrainian researchers who translated and administered the instrument and conducted the interviews. This panel also provides a unique view that will bring both an American and Eastern European understanding of how language and worldviews can skew the meaning and outcomes of assessments. Additionally, the researchers will discuss what to look for when selecting an instrument to use across cultures, how to examine word choice, and what to look for in an interview process to ensure understanding.

Background: 10 minutes

Research Details: 25 minutes

Leadership Implications: 20 minutes

US/Ukrainian perspectives: 10 minutes

Question/Answer: 10 minutes

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.

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 Psychology*, 36(5), 628 - 630.

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.

Joanne Barnes, Indiana Wesleyan University

Bio: Dr. Joanne Barnes, Associate Professor of Organizational Leadership in Graduate Studies in Leadership at Indiana Wesleyan University (IWU), and has been involved in higher education since 1996. She was the first Affiliate Faculty for IWU'S College of Adult and Professional Studies where she not only facilitated adult learning, but also developed new faculty training. Joanne retired from Delphi Electronics & Safety in 2008, in Kokomo, Indiana after nearly 37 years of service, where she held various management and leadership positions. Her position upon retirement was the Global Quality Systems Manager for the entire enterprise. In this position, she was responsible for implementing global change and driving common quality practices throughout Europe, Asia, North and South America and leading global teams.

Dr. Barnes is certified in the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale and the Global Competency Inventory. She is currently working with universities and businesses in providing assessments and coaching to prepare students, faculty, administrators and business practitioners for expatriate and global assignments as well as multicultural experiences. Dr. Barnes currently teaches global leadership and theory, organizational behavior and theory, and human and organizational learning. Dr. Barnes earned her Ed.D in Organizational Leadership from Indiana Wesleyan University.

Boyd Johnson, Indiana Wesleyan University

Bio: Dr. Boyd Johnson is professor and Chair of the doctoral program in Organizational Leadership at Indiana Wesleyan University. He also teaches in this program, with a primary focus on research methods. In addition, he serves as an adjunct professor and teaches international business and social sciences. Dr. Johnson has a PhD in International Studies, MA degrees in Anthropology and Theology, and a BA in Anthropology. He has been involved in teaching and training for over 30 years, mainly while working in international development for 16 years. He has taught in higher education for over 15 years, from the associate to the doctoral level, and is the author of two books, the co-editor of three books, and the author of numerous articles. In his career he has done management, research work and consulting in over 50 countries, and lived in five nations while working in Asia and the South Pacific.

Svetlana Buko, Precedent Academics

Bio: Dr. Svitlana Buko has had over 10 years of experience with development work in Ukraine and has worked in business and with international NGOs. She has professional cross-cultural communication competence (in seven counties, including USA, Europe, NIS) and an international graduate level educational background. Dr. Buko holds a Liberal Arts degree from St. Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences (Russia, 2002), an MA-level research degree in Sociology from Personnel Management Academy (Kyiv, 2003), and a Ph.D. from the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, focused on the sociology of cross-cultural management (Kyiv, 2008). She has worked from 1999-2007 for several international organizations: Citizens Development Corps (CDC), American Councils (ACCELS), International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), and the United Nations (UNDP). Dr. Buko's teaching experience is closely connected to her Ph.D. research in cross-cultural management and business communication, in training mid-career professionals. She is registered as a Ukrainian entrepreneur/consultant since 2007 and currently is a senior analyst/associate at the Ukrainian branch of Precedent Academics.

Natalia Kostenko, Institute of Sociology, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

Bio: Dr. Natalia Kostenko graduated from the history department of the Belarusian State University, Minsk (1975), defended her PhD thesis (1984), PhD in Values and symbols in mass communication (1994). Since 1990 she has been working at the Institute of Sociology, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine as a researcher. Since 2007 - Head of the Department of Sociology of Culture and Mass Communication

Dr. Kostenko is author of special courses for students of Sociology: "Sociology of Mass Communication", "Analysis of texts in sociology." Her research interests include modern culture, media and communications.

This page was last updated on December 31, 2012.

[About](#) || [History](#) || [ILA Board](#) || [ILA Staff](#) || [Bylaws](#) || [Strategic Plan](#)



International Leadership Association, Inc.
1110 Bonifant Street, Suite #510, Silver Spring, MD 20910-3358, United States
email: membership@ila-net.org | conferences@ila-net.org | ila@ila-net.org
tel: +1 (202) 470-4818 | fax: +1 (202) 470-2724 or +1 (301) 588-1503



© 1998-2015 International Leadership Association | [Privacy Policy](#)