

# ПСИХОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

---

## PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES

DOI: 10.12731/2658-4034-2024-15-4-545  
UDC 159.9.072



Original article | General Psychology, Personality Psychology, History of Psychology

### COMPARATIVE STUDY ON CULTURAL INTELLIGENCE LEVEL AMONG EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES IN RUSSIA AND CHINA

*Z. Li, L.V. Tokarskaya*

**Background.** *As inclusive education and social participatory parity continue to develop, more and more professional-trained people with disabilities are seeking opportunities for integration into the workplace. However, they face various of challenges in the current work environment. From the perspective of the cultural model of disability, employees with disabilities vary from their able-bodied colleagues in terms of cognition or behavioral patterns. As a result, newer concept such as the disability cultural competence has emerged. In order to adapt and function well in diverse and inclusive work teams, the cultural intelligence of employees with disabilities has become vital yet to be deeply explored in Russia.*

**Purpose.** *This paper attempts to reveal the cultural intelligence level of Russian employees with disabilities and to compare cultural intelligence between employees with disabilities from Russia and China.*

**Materials and methods.** *Cultural intelligence has been measured through the Russia and Chinese adaptation Cultural Intelligence Scale among 25 Russian and 23 Chinese employees with disabilities. Then, SPSS 26.0 was used to carry out the descriptive analysis, normality test and mean comparison analysis.*

**Results.** *Both Russian and Chinese employees' cultural intelligence are at average level. And Russian employees with disabilities have higher cultural intelligence level than the Chinese ones. Besides, this study underlined that there is no significant difference in cultural intelligence by ethnic, gender or type of disability while there is significant difference in cultural intelligence depending on the participants' age.*

**Keywords:** *cultural intelligence; employees with disabilities; Russia; China; mean comparison analysis*

**For citation.** *Li Z., Tokarskaya L.V. Comparative Study on Cultural Intelligence Level among Employees with Disabilities in Russia and China. Russian Journal of Education and Psychology, 2024, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 339-361. DOI: 10.12731/2658-4034-2024-15-4-545*

Научная статья | Общая психология, психология личности, история психологии

## СРАВНИТЕЛЬНОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ УРОВНЯ КУЛЬТУРНОГО ИНТЕЛЛЕКТА СОТРУДНИКОВ С ОГРАНИЧЕННЫМИ ВОЗМОЖНОСТЯМИ В РОССИИ И КИТАЕ

*Ц. Ли, Л.В. Токарская*

**Обоснование.** *По мере того, как инклюзивное образование и социальное равенство продолжают развиваться, все больше и больше людей с ограниченными возможностями с профессиональной подготовкой ищут возможности для интеграции на рабочем месте. Однако в нынешней рабочей среде они сталкиваются с различными проблемами. С точки зрения культурной модели, сотрудники с ограниченными возможностями отличаются от своих трудоспособных коллег когнитивными способностями или моделями поведения. В результате появилась новая концепция, такая как культурная компетентность людей с ограниченными возможностями. Для того чтобы адаптироваться и хорошо функционировать в инклюзивных рабочих коллективах, культурный интеллект сотрудников с огра-*

ниченными возможностями стал жизненно важным, но его еще предстоит глубоко изучить в России.

**Цель.** В статье предпринята попытка выявить уровень культурного интеллекта российских сотрудников с ограниченными возможностями и сравнить культурный интеллект сотрудников с ограниченными возможностями из России и Китая.

**Материалы и методы.** Культурный интеллект был измерен с помощью адаптированной для России и Китая шкалы культурного интеллекта среди 25 российских и 23 китайских сотрудников с ограниченными возможностями. Затем мы использовали SPSS 26.0 для проведения описательного анализа, тест на нормальность и анализ сравнения средних значений.

**Результаты.** Уровень культурного интеллекта как российских, так и китайских сотрудников находится на среднем уровне. Российские сотрудники с ограниченными возможностями имеют более высокий уровень культурного интеллекта, чем китайские сотрудники с ограниченными возможностями. Кроме того, это исследование подчеркнуло, что не существует существенной разницы в культурном интеллекте в зависимости от этнической принадлежности, пола или типа инвалидности, в то время как существует значительная разница в культурном интеллекте в зависимости от возраста участников.

**Ключевые слова:** культурный интеллект; сотрудники с ограниченными возможностями; Россия; Китай; сравнительный анализ средних значений

**Для цитирования.** Ли Ц., Токарская Л.В. Сравнительное исследование уровня культурного интеллекта сотрудников с ограниченными возможностями в России и Китае // Russian Journal of Education and Psychology. 2024. Т. 15, № 4. С. 339-361. DOI: 10.12731/2658-4034-2024-15-4-545

## Introduction

In 2022, in the interview, Bérubé pointed out that psychological disability complicates the pure social model of disability and employment of the disabled became the toughest challenge [36]. As it also has been

identified by Garland-Thomson, cultural competence of person with disability values, especially for the disabled employees and cultural disability has been increasingly discussed [16]. Cultural competence could bridge the borders and equip individuals to operate inclusively and globally. Thereby, research into cultural competence of person with disabilities comes to the fore. Nevertheless, cultural competence of employees with disabilities in Russia is in vogue still. To fill the gap, this paper measures cultural intelligence of employees with disabilities.

From 1900s, various of intelligences began to be involved and investigated. In specific, social intelligence (SI), emotional intelligence (EI), and cultural intelligence (CQ) have gained much popularity. It is Thorndike who initially proposed the concept of SI [32]. In the beginning, it simply referred to the ability to interact with the surroundings. Later, SI has been defined SI as two personal intelligences, including interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences, that is, it involves knowledge about both oneself and others [15, 26, 35]. SI evolves the capability for relationships and interpersonal tasks.

Afterwards, other related intelligences emerged. Emotional intelligence (EI) refers to the capability to consider one's own and others' emotions, discriminating between them and using it to master own and others' thoughts and actions [26], and at the outset, EI was considered as subset of SI. Different ideas about EI continuously enriches its conceptualization system. It has been thought to be involving recognition of emotion, reasoning with emotions and emotion-related information, and processing emotional information, mood regulation, impulse control and delayed gratification, perception, expression, understanding, managing emotions accurately, personality trait [29], and tenacity, strong interpersonal skills and self-management [22].

CQ is the recent construct which has been noticed in the last decade. It has been proposed [3, 4, 11] building on the contemporary theories of intelligence [30]. It refers to an individual's ability to adapt and function productively in culturally diverse contexts and to interact with people from distinct cultures [12]. As a multidimensional construct, CQ consists of four elements such as metacognitive CQ (mindfulness and con-

trol of cognition), cognitive CQ (cultural knowledge), motivational CQ (inherent interest in learning cultural differences and experiencing other cultures) and behavioral CQ (suitable non-verbal and verbal interactive behaviors with individuals from other cultures) [20,28].

With the establishment of these three notions of intelligence, scholars increasingly discuss their similarities, differences and relations. On the one hand, SI, EI and CQ are specific facets of multiple intelligence theory [26]. They together build the more complete intelligence framework. On the other hand, intelligences are not isolated but rather they relate with each other. For instance, EI has been considered as a subset of SI [26] and has acknowledged that it is grounded in SI but evolved [9, 26, 35]. As well, as it covers a set of capabilities rather than preferred way of behaving, CQ has been found similarities to other types of intelligence such as general cognitive ability (IQ), EI or SI [4]. However, CQ is conceptually differentiated from these other intelligences because it concentrates on culturally relevant capabilities and especially the behaviors in the culturally diverse situations [11, 18].

Regarding the measurement of CQ, Ang, Van Dyne and colleagues developed and validated the 20-item standard Cultural Intelligence Scale in Singapore and U.S. [3, 4, 5] and this scale has been most commonly used to measure CQ with good construct validity by far [21]. In the original 4-dimensional Cultural Intelligence Scale, metacognitive CQ consisting of 4 items, such as “I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I apply to cross-cultural interactions”; cognitive CQ consisting of 6 items, such as “I know the cultural values and religious beliefs of other cultures”; motivational CQ consisting of 5 items, such as “I am confident that I can socialize with locals in a culture that is unfamiliar to me” and behavioral CQ consisting of 5 items, such as “I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires it.”

The original 4-factor Cultural Intelligence Scale has been translated from English to other languages and validated well among different ethnics, including Turkish [25], Chinese [27], French [14, 27], German [14, 24, 27], Indian [14], Korean, Portuguese, and Vietnamese. Furthermore, numerous studies have applied the scale to com-

pare CQ's effects across countries or cultures [8, 13], or have used it on pooled samples comprising individuals with different cultural backgrounds [17, 19].

In Russia, the history of measuring cultural intelligence goes back last decade. Belovol, Shkvarilo and Khvorova in 2012 firstly translated the original 4-facet 20-item Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) [1, 4, 33] and assessed the content validity of the adaptive Russian scale by a panel of psychological experts. Later the adaptation version of scale was conducted in 7-dimensional Likert Scale firstly among 90 Russian subjects and second round among 87 Russian subjects. The reliability of scale was supported (Cronbach's alpha = 0.877). Furthermore, through factor analysis, the construct validity was as well supported. Thus, this adaptative scale has become the most recognized and popular measurement for CQ in Russia. Furthermore, Belovol and colleagues demonstrated the additivity of cultural intelligence in their research and provided an evaluation system. The cultural intelligence scores observed in subsequent studies can be calculated and the total score of cultural intelligence can be compared with the evaluation system to obtain the cultural intelligence level. The scoring evaluation system is shown below.

- from 0 to 55 - very low cultural intelligence,
- from 55 to 71 - low cultural intelligence,
- from 71 to 103 - average cultural intelligence,
- from 103 to 119 - high cultural intelligence,
- from 119 and above - very high cultural intelligence.

Later, several evidence followed the Russian adaptive 4-factor Cultural Intelligence Scale (R-CQS) [1] and further demonstrated that the scale can be used as a valid psychological tool for measuring cultural intelligence in Russia. Especially, psychologists from Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN) used R-CQS and investigated the intercultural ability and intellectual potential of foreign students and student mobility. Chkhikvadze, Pilishvili, Karabuschenko and Mago-medova (2019) inherited the R-CQS among 172 RUDN University foreign students, who from China, Mongolia, South Korea and Vietnam

[10]. Karabuschenko, Pilishvili, Chkhikvadze, and Sungurova in 2020 as well applied R-CQS and measured cultural intelligence of total 242 RUDN students (70 Russian, 44 Chinese, 48 Mongolian, 40 South Korean, and 40 Vietnamese) [2]. Moreover, in 2020, Baranova, Kobicheva and Tokareva followed the adaptive four-facet Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQS) [1] with 5-point Likert scale in their study about university 123 Russian 4-year bachelor students' cultural intelligence development through X-culture project [6]. And in their study, scale's reliability was approved because of Cronbach's alpha above 0.7, which is consistent with Belovol and colleagues' results. This study redemonstrated the applicability of the original cultural intelligence scales to a Russian sample. Boštjančič, Ismagilova and Milijašević (2022) as well followed and employed the adaptation four-facet Cultural intelligence Scale (CQS) to measure and compare cultural intelligence of 114 Russian, 115 Slovenian and 331 Croatian employees with a 7-point Likert Scale (1- "strongly disagree", 7- "strongly agree") [7]. And reliability of scale was approved via Cronbach's alpha of all cases above 0.7.

With the globalization, scholars started to touch the latest topic of disability in a global context [23]. Comparative study of disability is already on the agenda. But research on disability globally or comparative study on disability are still quite limited.

Followingly, this paper is interested to compare CQ of Russia and Chinese employees with disabilities. In China, Wang, Tang and Meng conducted the traditional four-factor, 20-item Cultural Intelligence Scale questionnaire survey on 351 Chinese university students in 2008 [34]. After follow-up exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, they found that the four-factor cultural intelligence model is consistent and credible across cultures. And it is an effective psychological assessment tool that is related but independent of emotional intelligence standard scale [34]. As well, Tang, Zheng, Zhang and Fu applied four-factor Cultural Intelligence Scale to measure CQ among 334 managers with overseas working experiences and their study results supported the validity of questionnaire through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis [31].

### **Aim and research questions of the study**

This paper aims to investigate the CQ levels of employees with disabilities from Russian disability-inclusive organizations and to compare CQ levels between Russian with Chinese employees with disabilities. Moreover, the present study also tries to unearth whether the CQ levels of employees with disabilities are associated with their gender, age, type of disability. Towards these goals, we will seek answers to the following research questions.

1. How is the CQ level of Russian and Chinese employees with disabilities?
2. Are the CQ levels of the Russian participants significantly different from the Chinese participants?
3. Are the CQ levels of female participants higher than males?
4. Is there a significant difference between the CQ levels of the participants in terms of their ages?
5. Is there a significant difference between the CQ levels of the participants in terms of their disability types?

### **Research methods**

#### *1) Sample*

In total, 25 Russian employees with disabilities (12 females; 13 males) and 23 Chinese employees with disabilities (5 females; 18 males) participated in this study. These participants all work in disability-inclusive organizations and have more than 3 years working experience. Their age ranges from 21 to 66 years old (Mean = 44.38, Median = 43.5, Mode = 39, Std. Deviation = 11.041). Number of participants according to their disability types was 19 employees with blindness (14 Russian; 5 Chinese), 29 employees with mobility impairments (11 Russian; 18 Chinese). And more detailed demographics were presented in Table 1.

#### *2) Materials*

The questionnaire includes of demography questions and standard Cultural Intelligence Scale. The respondents were told to select the degree of agreement with the 20 statements given in the questionnaire based on their actual situation. In addition, demography information of the re-



spondents was also collected, including age, gender, type of disability, ethnic. The participants were informed that survey responses would be kept confidential and used only for by scientific research. Forms among Russian employees were filled out either on paper or via Google Form. While Chinese participants filled out forms either on paper or via “Wen Juan Xing” online survey platform.

Russian adaption 20-items Cultural Intelligence Scale [5] with 7-dimensional Likert form (1=strongly disagree; 7=strongly agree) was used among Russian participants. For instance, the first statement was “Для обогащения своих культурных знаний я специально больше общаюсь с представителями других культур” (“I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds”). The reliability of scale was well supported (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.909).

While Chinese adaptive 20-items Cultural Intelligence Scale [34] was used among Chinese participants in the 7-dimensional Likert form (1=strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). For instance, the first statement was “当我与不同文化背景的人交往时，我会注意我所使用的文化知识” (“I am conscious of the cultural knowledge I use when interacting with people with different cultural backgrounds”). The reliability of scale was well supported (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.940).

Table 1.

**Demographics of Sample**

Construct	Item	Frequency			Percentage (100%)		
		Russian (N=25)	Chinese (N=23)	Total (N=48)	Russian (N=25)	Chinese (N=23)	Total (N=48)
Gender	Female	12	5	17	48.00	21.74	35.42
	Male	13	18	31	52.00	78.26	64.58
Age	20-30 y.o.	4	1	5	16.00	4.35	10.42
	30-40 y.o.	7	5	12	28.00	21.74	25.00
	40-50 y.o.	10	4	14	40.00	17.39	29.17
	50-60 y.o.	4	9	13	16.00	39.13	27.08
	> 60 y.o.	-	4	4	-	17.39	8.33
Disability type	Blindness	14	5	19	56.00	21.74	39.58
	Mobility	11	18	29	44.00	78.26	60.42

Source: compiled by the author

## Results

After data collection and analysis via SPSS 26.0, the cultural intelligence scores of Russian and Chinese disabled employees were obtained (see Table 2).

Table 2.

**Descriptive statistic of variables**

Variables	Mean	Median	Deviation	Mean	Median	Deviation	Mean	Median	Deviation
Ethnic	Russian (N=25)			Chinese (N=23)			Total (N=48)		
CQMC1	5.48	6.00	1.005	4.91	5.00	1.535	5.21	6.00	1.304
CQMC2	5.12	5.00	1.092	4.96	5.00	1.331	5.04	5.00	1.202
CQMC3	5.52	6.00	0.872	5.09	5.00	1.345	5.31	5.00	1.133
CQMC4	5.08	5.00	1.038	4.78	5.00	1.347	4.94	5.00	1.192
CQK1	4.92	5.00	1.256	4.96	6.00	2.383	4.94	6.00	1.861
CQK2	5.48	6.00	1.388	4.26	4.00	1.839	4.90	5.00	1.716
CQK3	4.96	5.00	1.207	4.48	5.00	2.086	4.73	5.00	1.685
CQK4	5.44	6.00	1.261	4.74	5.00	1.864	5.10	6.00	1.601
CQK5	5.08	6.00	1.222	4.83	6.00	2.188	4.96	6.00	1.738
CQK6	5.60	6.00	1.354	4.61	5.00	1.777	5.13	5.00	1.632
CQM1	5.04	5.00	1.428	4.52	4.00	1.620	4.79	5.00	1.529
CQM2	3.92	4.00	1.656	4.74	5.00	1.912	4.31	4.00	1.812
CQM3	5.80	6.00	1.225	5.39	6.00	1.559	5.60	6.00	1.395
CQM4	4.68	4.00	1.314	4.87	5.00	1.424	4.77	5.00	1.356
CQM5	4.64	5.00	0.995	4.96	5.00	1.397	4.79	5.00	1.202
CQB1	5.84	6.00	1.344	4.52	5.00	2.108	5.21	6.00	1.856
CQB2	4.36	5.00	1.705	4.74	6.00	2.027	4.54	5.00	1.856
CQB3	5.16	5.00	1.700	5.00	5.00	1.834	5.08	5.00	1.748
CQB4	5.76	6.00	1.091	5.30	6.00	1.690	5.54	6.00	1.414
CQB5	4.60	5.00	2.000	5.26	6.00	1.322	4.92	5.00	1.724
CQ	102.48	101.00	16.187	96.91	98.00	24.032	99.81	100.00	20.298

Note: CQMC = metacognitive cultural intelligence, CQK = cognitive cultural intelligence, CQM = motivational cultural intelligence, CQB = behavioral cultural intelligence, CQ = cultural intelligence

Source: compiled by the author

In our study, both observed Russian participants and Chinese participants are characterized by having average cultural intelligence according to the scoring evaluation system by Belovol, Shkvarilo and Khvorova in 2012 [1]. And the mean of Russian participants' CQ (102.48) is higher than Chinese participants' CQ (96.91). As well, there are various of

differences between Russian participants and Chinese participants in four CQ facets.

In order to further examine our research questions, this study first conducted a normality test on the questionnaire data. Firstly, we present the skewness and kurtosis values of the sample data, and calculate the Z-score of the skewness and kurtosis based on their respective standard errors (see Table 3). The standard error of skewness is 0.343, while the standard error of kurtosis is 0.674.

Table 3.

**Descriptive statistic of cultural intelligence**

Item	Mean	Median	D	Skewness	Z-score	Kurtosis	Z-score	P-value	Remark
CQMC	20.50	20.00	4.548	-0.425	-1.239	-0.416	-0.617	0.056	Yes
CQK	29.75	32.00	9.749	-0.716	-2.087	-0.461	-0.684	0.002	No
CQM	24.27	24.50	5.671	-0.317	-0.924	0.427	0.634	0.334	Yes
CQB	25.29	25.00	5.820	-0.471	-1.373	-0.312	-0.463	0.209	Yes
CQ	99.81	100.0	20.30	-0.330	-0.962	-0.360	-0.534	0.505	Yes

Note: CQMC = metacognitive cultural intelligence, CQK =cognitive cultural intelligence, CQM =motivational cultural intelligence, CQB = behavioral cultural intelligence, CQ = comprehensive cultural intelligence, D = standard deviation, Std. error of skewness = 0.343, Std. error of kurtosis = 0.674, Z-score of Skewness equals to Skewness/Std. error of skewness, Z-score of Kurtosis equals to Kurtosis/Std. error of kurtosis, P-value = Shapiro-Wilk significance.

Source: compiled by the author

At the test level of  $\alpha=0.05$ , if the Z-score is between  $\pm 1.96$ , the data can be considered to be normally distributed. In this study, the Z-score of metacognitive CQ, motivational CQ and behavioral CQ are in this range, while cognitive CQ is not. In the meanwhile, this study conducted Shapiro-Wilk test to examine the distribution. P-value of metacognitive, motivational and behavioral CQ are above 0.05, while P-value of cognition CQ displays lower than 0.05, thereby, metacognitive, motivational and behavioral CQ are in accordance with normal distribution, while cognitive CQ is not in line with normal distribution.

Therefore, regarding cognitive CQ, this study in turn advanced non-parametric test with the variance of ethnic, gender, age and disability type. In specific, we conducted Mann-Whitney U test with the variance of

ethnic, gender and type of disability, additionally we did Kruskal-Wails test in terms of age (see Table 4).

Table 4.

**Results of Mann-Whitney U test and Kruskal-Wails test**

Items	Ethnic		Gender		Age		Type of disability	
	Mann-Whitney U	Sig.	Mann-Whitney U	Sig.	Kruskal-Wails	Sig.	Mann-Whitney U	Sig.
CQK	240.0	0.325	255.0	0.854	6.858	0.144	191.0	0.124

Source: compiled by the author

According to the results, there is no significant difference highlighted between Russian and Chinese participants’ cognitive CQ. Moreover, no significant difference has been found between male and female participants’ cognitive CQ. No noticeable difference has been detected in cognitive CQ among different age group or different disability group of participants.

Regarding metacognitive CQ, motivational CQ and behavioral CQ, we executed independent samples T-test to investigate the mean variance in term of ethnic, gender, disability type (T-test results see Table 5).

Table 5.

**T-test for difference by ethnic, gender and type of disability**

Variables	F-value	Sig.	T-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
Factor 1: ethnic				
CQMC	2.120	0.152	1.115	0.271
CQM	0.688	0.411	-0.241	0.811
CQB	1.791	0.187	0.528	0.600
CQ	3.579	0.065	0.948	0.348
Factor 2: gender				
CQMC	0.775	0.383	-0.164	0.870
CQM	2.679	0.108	-1.432	0.159
CQB	0.129	0.721	-0.772	0.444
CQ	0.009	0.923	-0.336	0.738
Factor 3: type of disability				
CQMC	2.222	0.143	0.794	0.431
CQM	2.201	0.145	-1.002	0.322
CQB	1.375	0.247	1.226	0.227
CQ	1.759	0.191	0.979	0.333

Source: compiled by the author

From Levene’s test for equality of variances, all significances were above 0.05, thereby the variance of each group of samples is the same. Our results presented no significant difference between Russian and Chinese participants in metacognitive CQ, motivational CQ and behavioral CQ. Furthermore, no parent difference has been observed between female and male participants’ metacognitive CQ, motivational CQ and behavioral CQ. There are no obvious variances between employees with blindness and employees with mobility impairment either. Combined with the results of non-parametric tests of cognitive CQ, our results demonstrated that there exists no significant difference in CQ by ethnic, gender or type of disability.

Additionally, in order to inquire the difference in metacognition CQ, motivational CQ and behavioral CQ among different age group of participants, this study applied one-way ANOVA to assess the variance (see Table 6).

Table 6.

One-way ANOVA for difference by age

Variable	Age					ANOVA(F)	Sig.
	20-30 y. (mean)	30-40 y. (mean)	40-50 y. (mean)	50-60 y. (mean)	>60 y. (mean)		
CQMC	20.00	23.50	21.29	18.15	17.00	3.494	0.015*
CQM	23.20	26.92	24.21	22.23	24.50	1.133	0.354
CQB	28.00	28.17	26.29	21.46	22.25	3.341	0.018*
CQ	99.60	112.67	103.00	89.38	84.25	3.261	0.020*

Note: \*  $p \leq 0.05$

Source: compiled by the author

Accordingly, this study unveiled the significant level in metacognitive CQ, behavioral CQ and comprehensive CQ among respondents of different age groups ( $P < 0.05$ ). Generally, participants in younger age group such as 20-30 years of age, 30-40 years of age, 40-50 years of age tend to be with higher metacognitive, motivational and behavioral CQ than elder age group such as 50-60 years of age, or over 60 years of age. In particular, the subjects at 30-40 years of age are with the highest metacognitive, motivational and behavioral CQ than other age groups.

The aim of this study was to answer the research questions about the cultural intelligence level of Russian and Chinese employees with disabilities and differences in cultural intelligence by those factors (ethnic, gender, age, type of disability). Through the investigation among 48 employees with blindness or mobility impairments from Russia and China, this study mainly drew the findings as follows.

- 1) Russian and Chinese employees with disabilities both have average and even higher cultural intelligence level. Russian disabled employees have higher cultural intelligence scores than the Chinese group. However, there exist no significant differences between Russian and Chinese groups.
- 2) No apparent differences in cultural intelligence by gender or type of disability has been highlighted.
- 3) Employees with disabilities of different ages show significant differences in metacognitive, motivational, behavioral and comprehensive cultural intelligence (at the 0.05 significance level). Subjects at 30-40 years of age and 40-50 years of age have high level of cultural intelligence, while subjects from other groups are at average cultural intelligence level. 30-40 year-old employees with disabilities are with the most advanced cultural intelligence in comparison with other groups.

### **Conclusion**

Theoretically, this paper started to discuss the cultural intelligence of employees with disabilities in the workplace. It originally compared the four-dimensional cultural intelligence between disabled subjects with different cultural backgrounds. The findings revealed that Russian and Chinese employees with disabilities developed ready cultural competence for globalization and diversity in the work environment. Moreover, this study underscored that employees with disabilities failed to develop significantly variant cultural intelligence in spite of their ethnic, gender and disability type. This paper enriches theoretical directions in the topic of cultural intelligence and persons with disability in workplace.

Besides, it provides new insights into the necessity of cultural intelligence developing projects and educational courses for people with disabilities. The finding that Russian subjects possessed higher cultural intelligence than the Chinese suggests more attention should be paid to cultural intelligence developing projects or educational courses for people with disabilities in China. More advanced cultural intelligence level of employees with disabilities, who are under 50 years of age, partly indicates the benefits from the revolution of inclusive education in Russia and China since the past decades. And higher cultural intelligence scores of employees at middle age than employees at 20-30 years of age highlighted certain advantages from their inclusive work teams.

This paper has concentrated on differences in cultural intelligence by those factors (ethnic, gender, age) that are commonly believed but in a new labour context. Findings not only once again underlined the influence of age on individuals' cultural intelligence, but also inspired a further prospect for research into cultural competence of disabled individuals in a larger and more culturally-diverse sample.

### *References*

1. Belovol E. V., Shkvarilo K. A., Khvorova E. M. Adaptatsiya oprosnika «Shkala kul'turnogo intellekta» K. Erli i S. Anga na russkoyazychnoy vyborke [Russian-Language Verification of PC Earley and S. Ang's "Cultural Intelligence Scale"]. *Vestnik Rossiyskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Psikhologiya i pedagogika* [RUDN Journal of Psychology and Pedagogics], 2012, no. 4, pp. 5-14.
2. Karabuschenko N. B., Pilishvili T. S., Chkhikvadze T. V., Sungurova N. L. Osobennosti sotsial'nogo, emotsional'nogo i kul'turnogo intellekta i raspoznavaniya emotsiy u predstaviteley Rossii i stran Azii [Features of social, emotional and cultural intelligence and recognition of emotions by Russian and Asian students]. *Vestnik Rossiyskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Sotsiologiya* [RUDN Journal of Sociology], 2020, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 394-404. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2272-2020-20-2-394-404>

3. Ang S., Van Dyne L., Koh C. Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group & organization management*, 2006, vol. 31, no. 1, pp.100-123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275267>
4. Ang S., Van Dyne L., Koh C., Ng K. Y., Templer K. J., Tay C., Chandrasekar N. A. Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance. *Management and organization review*, 2007, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 335-371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x>
5. Ang S., Van Dyne L. *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications*. New York: Routledge, 2015, 414 p.
6. Baranova T., Kobicheva A., Tokareva E. The impact of an online intercultural project on students' cultural intelligence development. In International Conference on Professional Culture of the Specialist of the Future. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 219-229. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65857-1\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65857-1_19)
7. Boštjančič E., Ismagilova F. S., Milijašević S. P. The Role of Managers' Cultural Intelligence and Demographic Variables in Building Trust in Business Relations. *Changing Societies & Personalities*, 2022, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 927-944. <https://doi.org/10.15826/csp.2022.6.4.210>
8. Bücken J., Furrer O., Peeters W. T. Measuring cultural intelligence across cultures: Testing cross-cultural equivalence of the CQ scale. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2012, no. 1, pp. 14401. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2012.14401abstract>
9. Cartwright S., Pappas, C. Emotional intelligence, its measurement and implications for the workplace. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2008, vol.10, no. 2, pp. 149-171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00220.x>
10. Chkhikvadze T., Pilishvili T., Karabuschenko N., Magomedova E. Cultural and Emotional Intelligence among Asian Students in Russia. *NORDSCI International Conference*, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.32008/NORDSCI2019/B1/V2/03>
11. Earley P. C., Ang S. *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003, 379 p.



12. Earley P. C., Mosakowski, E. Cultural intelligence. *Harvard business review*, 2004, vol. 82, no. 10, pp. 139-146.
13. Engle R. L., Nehrt C. C. Antecedents of cultural intelligence: The role of risk, control, and openness in France and the United States. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 2012, vol.13, no.5, pp. 35-47.
14. Fischer N. *Cultural Intelligence-A key competence in intercultural sales? A study across three cultural contexts (France, India & England)*. PhD dissertation. Montpellier, Université de Montpellier, 2022, 489 p.
15. Gardner H. *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books, 1983, 529 p.
16. Garland-Thomson R., Iezzoni L. I. Disability cultural competence for all as a model. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 2021, vol. 21, no. 9, pp. 26-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2021.1958652>
17. Huff K. C., Song P., Gresch E. B. Cultural intelligence, personality, and cross-cultural adjustment: A study of expatriates in Japan. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 2014, vol.38, pp. 151-157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.08.005>
18. Kiznyte J., Ciutiene R., Dechange A. Applying cultural intelligence in international project management. *PM World Journal*, 2015, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 1-16.
19. Lin Y. C., Chen A. S. Y., Song Y. C. Does your intelligence help to survive in a foreign jungle? The effects of cultural intelligence and emotional intelligence on cross-cultural adjustment. *International Journal of intercultural relations*, 2012, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 541-552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2012.03.001>
20. Livermore D., Van Dyne L., Ang S. Cultural intelligence: Why every leader needs it. *Intercultural Management Quarterly*, 2012, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 18-21.
21. Matsumoto D., Hwang H. C. Assessing cross-cultural competence: A review of available tests. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 2013, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 849-873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113492891>
22. Mayer J. D., Geher G. Emotional intelligence and the identification of emotion. *Intelligence*, 1996, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 89-113. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-2896\(96\)90011-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-2896(96)90011-2)

23. Puar J. K. *The right to maim: Debility, capacity, disability*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017, 296 p.
24. Remhof S., Gunkel M., Schlägel C. Working in the “global village”: The influence of cultural intelligence on the intention to work abroad. *German Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2013, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 224-250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/239700221302700304>
25. Şahin F., Gurbuz S., Köksal O. Cultural intelligence (CQ) in action: The effects of personality and international assignment on the development of CQ. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 2014, vol. 39, pp. 152-163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.11.002>
26. Salovey P., Mayer J.D. Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 1990, vol. 9, pp. 185-211. <https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG>
27. Schlägel C., Sarstedt M. Assessing the measurement invariance of the four-dimensional cultural intelligence scale across countries: A composite model approach. *European Management Journal*, 2016, vol. 34, no. 6, pp. 633-649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.06.002>
28. Şenel M. Investigation of the Cultural Intelligence Levels of the Turkish University Students at Foreign Language Departments. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2020, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 361-377.
29. Smith L., Ciarrochi J., Heaven P. C. The stability and change of trait emotional intelligence, conflict communication patterns, and relationship satisfaction: A one-year longitudinal study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 2008, vol. 45, no. 8, pp. 738-743. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.07.023>
30. Sternberg R. J. Intelligence, wisdom, and creativity: Three is better than one. *Educational Psychologist*, 1986, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 175-190. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2103\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2103_2)
31. Tang N.Y., Zheng X.S., Zhang J.S., Fu J. Research on the construct and criterion-related validity of cultural intelligence. *Psychological Science*, 2010, vol. 2, p. 5.
32. Thorndike R. L., Stein S. An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological bulletin*, 1937, vol. 34, no. 5, p. 275. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0053850>

33. Van Dyne L., Ang S., Ng K. Y., Rockstuhl T., Tan M. L., Koh C. Sub-dimensions of the four factor model of cultural intelligence: Expanding the conceptualization and measurement of cultural intelligence. *Social and personality psychology compass*, 2012, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 295-313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2012.00429.x>
34. Wang Q. Q., Tang N. Y., Meng H. Construct validity of Cultural Intelligence Questionnaire in Chinese college students. *Chinese Mental Health Journal*, 2008, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 654-657.
35. Wong C. S., Law K. S. Wong and law emotional intelligence scale. *The leadership quarterly*, 2002. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t07398-000>
36. Yang Y., Bérubé M. Disability Studies, Literature, and Humanities: An Interview with Michael Bérubé. *Foreign Literature Studies*, 2022, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 1-16.

#### Список литературы

1. Беловол Е.В., Шкварило К.А., Хворова Е.М. Адаптация опросника «Шкала культурного интеллекта» К. Эрли и С. Анга на русскоязычной выборке // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Психология и педагогика. 2012. № 4. С. 5-14.
2. Карабущенко Н.Б., Пилишвили Т.С., Чхиквадзе Т.В., Сунгурова Н.Л. Особенности социального, эмоционального и культурного интеллекта и распознавания эмоций у представителей России и стран Азии // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Социология. 2020. Т. 20, № 2. С. 394-404. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2272-2020-20-2-394-404>
3. Ang S., Van Dyne L., Koh C. Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence // *Group & organization management*. 2006. Vol. 31, No. 1. P.100-123. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601105275267>
4. Ang S., Van Dyne L., Koh C., Ng K. Y., Templer K. J., Tay C., Chandrasekar N. A. Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance // *Management and organization review*. 2007. Vol. 3, No. 3. P. 335-371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2007.00082.x>
5. Ang S., Van Dyne L. *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications*. New York: Routledge, 2015, 414 p.

6. Baranova T., Kobicheva A., Tokareva E. The impact of an online intercultural project on students' cultural intelligence development // In International Conference on Professional Culture of the Specialist of the Future. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 219-229. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65857-1\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65857-1_19)
7. Boštjančič E., Ismagilova F. S., Milijašević S. P. The Role of Managers' Cultural Intelligence and Demographic Variables in Building Trust in Business Relations // *Changing Societies & Personalities*. 2022. Vol. 6, No. 4. P. 927-944. <https://doi.org/10.15826/csp.2022.6.4.210>
8. Bücker J., Furrer O., Peeters W. T. Measuring cultural intelligence across cultures: Testing cross-cultural equivalence of the CQ scale // *Academy of Management Proceedings*. 2012. No. 1. P. 14401. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2012.14401abstract>
9. Cartwright S., Pappas C. Emotional intelligence, its measurement and implications for the workplace // *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 2008. Vol. 10, No. 2. P. 149-171. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2007.00220.x>
10. Chkhikvadze T., Pilishvili T., Karabuschenko N., Magomedova E. Cultural and Emotional Intelligence among Asian Students in Russia // *NORDSCI International Conference*. 2019. <https://doi.org/10.32008/NORDSCI2019/B1/V2/03>
11. Earley P. C., Ang S. *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003, 379 p.
12. Earley P. C., Mosakowski E. *Cultural intelligence* // *Harvard business review*. 2004. Vol. 82, No. 10. P. 139-146.
13. Engle R. L., Nehrt C. C. Antecedents of cultural intelligence: The role of risk, control, and openness in France and the United States // *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*. 2012. Vol. 13, No. 5. P. 35-47.
14. Fischer N. *Cultural Intelligence-A key competence in intercultural sales? A study across three cultural contexts (France, India & England)*. Doctoral dissertation. Montpellier, Université de Montpellier, 2022, 489 p.
15. Gardner H. *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books, 1983, 529 p.

16. Garland-Thomson R., Iezzoni L. I. Disability cultural competence for all as a model // *The American Journal of Bioethics*. 2021. Vol. 21, No. 9. P. 26-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2021.1958652>
17. Huff K. C., Song P., Gresch E. B. Cultural intelligence, personality, and cross-cultural adjustment: A study of expatriates in Japan // *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2014. Vol. 38. P. 151-157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.08.005>
18. Kiznyte J., Ciutiene R., Dechange A. Applying cultural intelligence in international project management // *PM World Journal*. 2015. Vol. 4, No. 6. P. 1-16.
19. Lin Y. C., Chen A. S. Y., Song Y. C. Does your intelligence help to survive in a foreign jungle? The effects of cultural intelligence and emotional intelligence on cross-cultural adjustment // *International Journal of intercultural relations*. 2012. Vol. 36, No. 4. P. 541-552. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2012.03.001>
20. Livermore D., Van Dyne L., Ang S. Cultural intelligence: Why every leader needs it // *Intercultural Management Quarterly*. 2012. Vol. 13, No. 2. P. 18-21.
21. Matsumoto D., Hwang H. C. Assessing cross-cultural competence: A review of available tests // *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*. 2013. Vol. 44, No. 6. P. 849-873. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113492891>
22. Mayer J. D., Geher G. Emotional intelligence and the identification of emotion // *Intelligence*. 1996. Vol. 22, No. 2. P. 89-113. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-2896\(96\)90011-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-2896(96)90011-2)
23. Puar J. K. *The right to maim: Debility, capacity, disability*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017, 296 p.
24. Remhof S., Gunkel M., Schlägel C. Working in the “global village”: The influence of cultural intelligence on the intention to work abroad // *German Journal of Human Resource Management*. 2013. Vol. 27, No. 3. P. 224-250. <https://doi.org/10.1177/239700221302700304>
25. Şahin F., Gurbuz S., Köksal O. Cultural intelligence (CQ) in action: The effects of personality and international assignment on the development of CQ // *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2014. Vol. 39. P. 152-163. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2013.11.002>
26. Salovey P., Mayer J.D. Emotional intelligence // *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*. 1990. Vol. 9. P. 185-211. <https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG>

27. Schlägel C., Sarstedt M. Assessing the measurement invariance of the four-dimensional cultural intelligence scale across countries: A composite model approach // *European Management Journal*. 2016. Vol. 34, No. 6. P. 633-649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.06.002>
28. Şenel M. Investigation of the Cultural Intelligence Levels of the Turkish University Students at Foreign Language Departments // *International Journal of Language Education*. 2020. Vol. 4, No.3. P. 361-377.
29. Smith L., Ciarrochi J., Heaven P. C. The stability and change of trait emotional intelligence, conflict communication patterns, and relationship satisfaction: A one-year longitudinal study // *Personality and Individual Differences*. 2008. Vol. 45, No. 8. P. 738-743. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.07.023>
30. Sternberg R. J. Intelligence, wisdom, and creativity: Three is better than one // *Educational Psychologist*. 1986. Vol. 21, No. 3. P. 175-190. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2103\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2103_2)
31. Tang N.Y., Zheng X.S., Zhang J.S., Fu J. Research on the construct and criterion-related validity of cultural intelligence // *Psychological Science*. 2010. Vol. 2. P. 5.
32. Thorndike R. L., Stein S. An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence // *Psychological bulletin*. 1937. Vol. 34, No. 5. P. 275. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0053850>
33. Van Dyne L., Ang S., Ng K. Y., Rockstuhl T., Tan M. L., Koh C. Sub-dimensions of the four factor model of cultural intelligence: Expanding the conceptualization and measurement of cultural intelligence // *Social and personality psychology compass*. 2012. Vol. 6, No. 4. P. 295-313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2012.00429.x>
34. Wang Q. Q., Tang N. Y., Meng H. Construct validity of Cultural Intelligence Questionnaire in Chinese college students // *Chinese Mental Health Journal*. 2008 Vol. 22, No. 9. P. 654-657.
35. Wong C. S., Law K. S. Wong and law emotional intelligence scale // *The leadership quarterly*. 2002. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t07398-000>
36. Yang Y., Bérubé M. Disability Studies, Literature, and Humanities: An Interview with Michael Bérubé // *Foreign Literature Studies*. 2022. Vol. 44, No. 2. P. 1-16.

### DATA ABOUT THE AUTHORS

**Zijun Li**, PhD student in Psychology, Research Engineer of Center for Population Research, Department of Psychology  
*Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia  
B. N. Yeltsin*  
51, Lenin Str., Yekaterinburg, 620002, Russian Federation  
[tszytsziun.li@urfu.ru](mailto:tszytsziun.li@urfu.ru)  
Researcher ID: ACL-6721-2022

**Lyudmila V. Tokarskaya**, Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Pedagogy and Educational Psychology  
*Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia  
B. N. Yeltsin*  
51, Lenin Str., Yekaterinburg, 620002, Russian Federation  
[l.v.tokarskaia@urfu.ru](mailto:l.v.tokarskaia@urfu.ru)  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2385-9227>

### ДАНИЕ ОБ АВТОРАХ

**Ли Цзыцзюнь**, аспирант психологии, инженер-исследователь Центра демографических исследований кафедры психологии  
*ФГАОУ ВО «Уральский федеральный университет им. Б.Н. Ельцина»*  
ул. Ленина, 51, г. Екатеринбург, 620002, Российская Федерация  
[tszytsziun.li@urfu.ru](mailto:tszytsziun.li@urfu.ru)

**Токарская Людмила Валерьевна**, кандидат психологических наук, доцент кафедра педагогики и психологии образования  
*ФГАОУ ВО «Уральский федеральный университет им. Б.Н. Ельцина»*  
ул. Ленина, 51, г. Екатеринбург, 620002, Российская Федерация  
[l.v.tokarskaia@urfu.ru](mailto:l.v.tokarskaia@urfu.ru)

Поступила 06.06.2024  
После рецензирования 27.06.2024  
Принята 30.06.2024

Received 06.06.2024  
Revised 27.06.2024  
Accepted 30.06.2024