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Using the Global Competency Inventory to Consider How Personality Influences Cross-Cultural Adaptability in Expatriate Leaders (Case Study)
Research Question: Do any relationships exist between relatively static (unchanging) personality traits and cross-cultural adaptability (that can be developed) of American expatriate leaders?

Two Assessments Used:
- the Global Competencies Inventory
- the Keirsey Temperament Sorter
Sample Population Tested:

- 57 volunteers identified through snowball sampling technique
- Criteria included:
  - U.S. National
  - Served as expatriate leader for minimum of 12 months
  - Corporate, government or military expatriate experience
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*Descriptive Statistics*

- **Gender:** Male 72%, Female 28%
- **Age Range:**
  - 30-39 8%
  - 40-49 46%
  - 50-59 46%
- **Highest Educational Level**
  - Undergraduate coursework 3%
  - Undergraduate degree 30%
  - Graduate coursework 18%
  - Graduate degree 39%
  - Terminal degree 10%
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- Keirsey Temperament Sorter (KTS)

- Introspective
  - NT, NF
    - Martians
      - Pragmatic
        - NTJ, NTP
          - Rationals
            - Informative
              - ENTP, INTP
                - Engineers
            - Directive
              - ENTJ, INTJ
                - Coordinators
      - Cooperative
        - NFJ, NFP
          - Idealists
            - Informative
              - ENFP, INFP
                - Advocates
            - Directive
              - ENFJ, INFJ
                - Mentors
  - Observant
    - SJ, SP
      - Earthlings
        - Cooperative
          - STJ, SFJ
            - Guardians
              - Directive
                - ESTJ, ISTJ
                  - Administrators
              - Informative
                - ESFJ, ISFJ
                  - Conservators
        - Pragmatic
          - STP, SFP
            - Artisans
              - Directive
                - ESTP, ISTP
                  - Operators
              - Informative
                - ESFP, ISFP
                  - Entertainers
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- Global Competencies Inventory (GCI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Perception Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Nonjudgmentalness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inquisitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of Ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cosmopolitanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interest Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Relationship Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Relationship Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Interpersonal Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Emotional Sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Self-Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Self-Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Optimism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Self-Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Self-Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Emotional Resilience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Non-Stress Tendency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Stress Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Global Competency Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Statistically Significant Findings:

- A significant relationship was found between the four KTS personality clusters and the GCI Perception Management’s subscale of Interest Flexibility
  
  \( p\text{-value} = .03 \)

- A highly significant relationship was found between the four KTS personality clusters and the GCI Relationship Management subscale of Social Flexibility
  
  \( p\text{-value} = .008 \)
Statistically Significant Findings:

◊ A significant relationship was found between the SJ personality clusters and the GCI category of Relationship Management AND the GCI subscale of Relationship Interest (p-values = .02)
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❖ Statistically Significant Findings:

◊ A significant relationship was found between the SJ personality clusters and the GCI subscale of Interpersonal Engagement ($p$-value = .01)

◊ A highly significant relationship was found between the SJ personality clusters and the GCI subscale of Social Flexibility ($p$-value = .006)
Implications of the Findings:

- Personality may influence the expat leader’s ability to adapt to physical, mental and emotional change inherent in cross-cultural contexts.
- Personality type should no longer be ignored when selecting and mobilizing expatriate leaders.
Implications of the Findings:

◊ This study revealed significant insights about expat leaders within the SJ personality type
  - Social Status (impression management)
  - Self-Identity
  - Typically NOT well equipped for long term relationship building and maintenance
Using the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale to Prepare Leaders In Higher Education (Case Study)
Overview of the Study

• Study was conducted at a private Christian university in the Midwest
• University recently began expanding online programs and developing a footprint in Asia
• All administrative functions were being lead at the university
• Participants included:
  – 27% Administrators
  – 52% Faculty
  – 21% Staff
Problem Statement:
Universities are now finding ways to stay competitive by expanding their borders. Some institutions are partnering with universities abroad, while others are opening virtual universities (with little to no brick and mortar presence). The latter institutions are using their current administrators and staff to support these endeavors without recognizing if these individuals will be interculturally competent or effective working with diverse cultures.
# Measurements of IES: Why It Was Selected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuous Learning</th>
<th>Interpersonal Engagement</th>
<th>Hardiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>Global Mindset</td>
<td>Positive Regard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td>Relationship Interest</td>
<td>Resilience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interesting Observations

- Majority of administrative leaders and staff had no intercultural training
- Intercultural experiences were limited to short term mission trips and/or being a missionary kid (MK)
- Less than 3 percent spoke another language other than English
- Average age: 47.3
## SAMPLE OF RESULTS

### Results from Group 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Learning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Engagement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Mindset</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Interest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardiness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Regard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Resilience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall IES Score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRATEGIES IMPLEMENTED

• Implemented intense training program

• Implemented language training program

• Implemented cultural mentor

• Leadership evaluation of progress

• Quarterly culture discussions

• Revised web-site to be culturally-inclusive
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Top Ten Questions to Ask When Selecting an Intercultural Assessment
Top 10 Questions to ask when selecting an intercultural assessment

#1

Is it “reliable”? Does the measure give you scores that are free from *random error*?
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Is it “valid”? Does the measure give you scores that are free from systematic, built in error?

Several ways to think of measures being valid:

- Is it **Content** valid?
- Is it **Predictive** valid?
- Is it **Convergent** (triangulation) valid?
- Is it **Face** valid?
- Is it **Differential** (or cross-cultural) valid?
#2

Is it Content valid?

Does it actually measure the targeted “content domain” of interest?

- Example: Think of all the competencies someone would most likely need in order to be an outstanding futbol player. What would be on that list?

- Does it “tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?”
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#3

Is it Predictive valid?
Do the measure’s scores help you “predict” other things of interest?
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#4

Is it Convergent valid?

Does the measure give you scores that are consistent in expected ways with other measures of the same thing?
Convergent Correlations between GCI & NEO PI-R Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neuroticism</strong></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extroversion</strong></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Openness</strong></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreeableness</strong></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conscientiousness</strong></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: based on \( n = 305 \) subjects; highlighted yellow cells are predicted convergences between NEO PI-R and GCI scales; black font in yellow cell indicates statistically significance values (red font was not) at \( p < .05 \).
#5

Is it Face valid?

That is, does the measure, taken at “face value,” look appropriate for what it’s supposed to measure (and how it will be used)?

But beware! Face validity is more about marketing and perception than it is about the measure’s “true” validity.
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#6
Is it Differentially (or Cross-Culturally) valid?

Does it measure the intended trait or attribute in a way that is free from culture or other demographic biases?

What would that look like?
For example, what would ethnic bias look like in a measure (if it existed)?

If **ethnic bias** existed, it might look something like this:

- **Anglos**
- **Asians**
Whereas Differential validity (or freedom from ethnic bias) would look like this:

If NO ethnic bias existed, it would look like this:
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#7

Is it transparent (or “game-able”)?

- In some situations, “transparent” items may be subject to response biases when people are motivated to get a particular score.
- Along with transparency, this also depends on the motivation and gaming skills of respondents.
- While less transparency lowers gaming, it usually also means trading away face validity.
- One strategy: Look for “Social Desirability” scales built into the measure.
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#8

What is its intended use?

- Staffing decisions
- Executive coaching
- Student assessment
- Research
#9

Is it easy and practical to get and use?

• What does it cost?
• Is there specialized training or qualification processes?
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#10

What sort of administrative options are available?

• Online?
• Paper-and-pencil?
• Preparation and delivery of reports?

No, wait! I have one more question!

#11: Will it also do my laundry?

(Lesson: Beware if the developers claim the assessment will do more than should be reasonably expected!)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory</th>
<th>Global Competencies Aptitude</th>
<th>Intercultural Development Inventory</th>
<th>Global Competencies Inventory</th>
<th>Intercultural Effectiveness Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>CCAI</td>
<td>GCAA</td>
<td>IDI</td>
<td>GCI</td>
<td>IES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predictive</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convergent</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>face</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differential bias</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$6-12</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability</td>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>Moderately complex</td>
<td>Moderately complex</td>
<td>Moderately complex</td>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifying Seminars</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Not required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Audience</td>
<td>Originally for expatriate coaching, and predeparture training, etc.</td>
<td>Education and business settings</td>
<td>Education, business, government, NGOs and non-profits</td>
<td>Intercultural settings or cross cultural encounters</td>
<td>Any intercultural setting or cross cultural encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Requirements</td>
<td>~15 min.</td>
<td>~20 min.</td>
<td>~30 min.</td>
<td>~45 min.</td>
<td>~15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Method</td>
<td>Online or Paper &amp; Pencil</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Online or Paper &amp; Pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages Options</td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>English only</td>
<td>Currently available in 12 languages</td>
<td>English, Chinese, French, German, Japanese, Spanish</td>
<td>English, French, German, Japanese, Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>