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THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF CROSS-CULTURAL LEADERSHIP

LISA P. GAYNIER

Abstract

A comprehensive literature review was conducted on the topic of the universality versus culture-specific nature of cross-cultural leadership. Additionally a small survey based upon the Global Leadership Competence model using a convenience sample was conducted in order to answer the question: What contributes to global leadership development? The results of the study were compared with existing research findings.
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"Be not afraid of greatness: some are born great,
some achieve greatness,
and some have greatness thrust upon them"

Shakespeare, Twelfth Night, Act 2, Scene V
CHAPTER I - RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY
Rationale for the Study

The purpose of this thesis is to explore cross-cultural leadership competencies. Specifically it will examine whether there are universally shared concepts of leadership. And if there are, whether cultural awareness informs the study of leadership and contributes to making a good cross-cultural leader?

To explore this question the study will include, first, a comprehensive literature review to define “cross-cultural leadership” and, second qualitative interviews with a small sample of business leaders with international experience, using a questionnaire based on the Global Leadership Competencies model developed by Chin, Gu, and Tubbs (2001). The interviews seek to apply the model by addressing a secondary question: What contributes to global leadership development?

Context

U. S. governmental and non-governmental organizations, as well as corporations, increasingly conclude that “diversity” is good business rather than simply the “right thing to do.” Leaders of these organizations have come to believe that having a diverse workforce constitutes a competitive advantage. The globalization of business, particularly American business, and the associated “globalization” of managers and leaders is also changing the landscape. Another reason to investigate global leadership competencies is that business and socio-political domains are converging. Business decisions increasingly impinge on national and international politics and vice versa. For example, a global leadership consultant states that the return by India and Pakistan to the negotiating table
in 2004 to resolve the dispute over Kashmir was largely due to pressure from multinational corporations, one of them being the consultant’s client. These multinational corporations were concerned about the safety of their investments in those countries if the region were allowed to destabilize.

In addition, the complexity of cross-national negotiations and mergers is driven to some extent by the differences between the national cultures involved, and organizational cultures are influenced by national cultures (Hofstede, 1980; Terpstra & David, 1991). Further, the greater the cultural distances, the greater the distance in organizational attributes and practices (Kogut & Singh, 1988; Datta & Puia, 1995; Javidan & House, 2001). Similarly, leaders require unique skills for successful functioning in “foreign” arenas (Adler, 1988; Lane, et al., 2004; Hartog, 2004; House, et al., 2004).

The best argument for studying cross cultural leadership is found when one considers real people in companies of the 21st century. “Titus Lokananta... is an Indonesian Cantonese [businessman] holding a German passport, managing a Mexican multinational corporation (MNC) producing Gummi bears in the Czech Republic... What management practices will he use, and for which subordinates, colleagues and supervisors?” (Scandura, et al., 2004, p. 289).

These global realities provide arguments for the need to understand the changing nature of leadership required for functioning effectively in a global landscape. Not only do organizations of the 21st century have diverse work populations, but in addition, they require cross-cultural competence on the part of their leaders.
Operational Definitions

This paper will utilize terms and concepts which may mean different things to different individuals. Therefore, it is important to define the terms that will be discussed in this paper. The next three sections will define terms that are the key topics of this research.

Diversity, Multi-cultural and Cross-cultural

Diversity, multiculturalism, and cross-cultural are three concepts that are often used interchangeably. These words, particularly, “diversity” are often catchall or umbrella terms under which many ideas, values and concepts are assembled. This writer believes the terms are overlapping points on a conceptual and contextual continuum.

A dictionary (Oxford English Dictionary, 1996) definition of diversity is that it is a noun meaning variety…, individuality…, heterogeneity. Diversity with a capital “D” implies something much bigger than simply demographics. For many organizations and people, Diversity is the politically correct term for affirmative action and for U.S. government Equal Employment Opportunity compliance. For others “Diversity” refers to the need to diversify human resources in order to reflect and better respond to diverse customers. Marketing departments in U.S. corporations were the first to realize the commercial significance of changing customer demographics. Computer technology has made tracking and triangulating huge sums of consumer data for targeted marketing to niche demographic groups, including minorities, possible in ways unimaginable in the past (O’Harrow, 2005). These demographics revealed the emergent buying power of minority populations. Hence, corporations have come to realize that “celebrating
diversity,” contributes to the bottom-line. Similarly, American corporations are increasingly functioning in global markets, which necessitate a different kind of cultural competence, beyond that associated with “Diversity” in the U.S.

Multiculturalism refers to racial/ethnic understanding. At its best, multiculturalism is cultural pluralism, and connotes the recognition of both nationality (e.g., American) and racial/ethnic heritage (e.g., white European).

While the terms diversity and multiculturalism tend to be associated with domestic issues, the term cross-culturalism refers to relations across international boundaries. For instance, U.S.-China interactions are cross-cultural, but relations between the many sub-cultures within the U.S. would be categorized as Diversity or multicultural.

Cross-cultural literacy and Diversity literacy are two ends of a spectrum which this researcher believes are converging due to the increasing globalization of the world. However, this paper will focus primarily on cross-cultural phenomena.

A Definition of Culture

Culture is a complex whole, encompassing knowledge, beliefs, art, morals, laws, customs, capabilities, and habits, all of which consist of explicit and implicit patterns as well as behaviors which are acquired and transmitted through symbols. Culture consists of traditional ideas and their attached values (Symington, Kroeber & Kluckhohn, in Adler, 1991, p. 14-15). Culture is shared by all or most members of a given social group, and is passed on from one generation to the next, and shapes not behavior, it actually structures an individual’s perception of the world (Carrol in Adler, 1991, p. 15).
Schein (1984) states the following in describing organizational culture, but it aids in understanding ethnic and national cultures as well:

To really understand a culture and to ascertain more completely a group’s values and overt behavior, it is imperative to delve into the underlying assumptions, which are typically unconscious, but which actually determine how group members perceive, think and feel... [A]s a value leads to a behavior, and as that behavior begins to solve the problem which prompted it in the first place, the value gradually is transformed into an underlying assumption about how things really are. As the assumption is increasingly taken for granted, it drops out of awareness (Schein, 1984, p. 446).

Globalization

It is no accident that, as awareness of Diversity and multiculturalism have gained ascendancy domestically, so has globalization. The study of global management and business, like the study of cross-cultural leadership is relatively new, but the need to develop global leaders and global mindsets is pressing (Mendenhall, 2001; Boyacigiller, et al., 2004). According to Gregerson (1998), who sampled Fortune 500 firms, 85% of firms reported that they did not have adequate numbers of globally competent leaders.

There are two major driving forces of globalization: commercial interdependence and the e-economy. Lane, Maznevski, and Mendenhall (2004) assert that globalization is more than simply trade across borders; globalization is a manifestation of exceptional complexity. They assert that complexity flows from three conditions which are all interrelated: multiplicity, interdependence, and ambiguity. Further, Bird and Osland
(2004) assert that many domestic managers and leaders work in a global context, even if they are not literally located abroad.

Summary

The world is shrinking and leaders functioning in the global arena are on the leading edge of this shrinkage, contributing to it and accelerating it. Diversity, multiculturalism and cross-culturalism are close cousins whose issues and solutions impinge on and overlap one another. Adler (1991) cogently addresses the importance of cultural competence:

Cultural norms, especially in North America, encourage managers to blind themselves to gender, race and ethnicity and see people only as individuals and to judge them according to their professional skills. This approach causes problems because it confuses recognition with judgment (italics added)... To ignore cultural differences is unproductive. … Choosing not to see cultural diversity limits our ability to manage it – that is, to minimize the problems it causes while maximizing the advantages it allows…. When we blind ourselves to cultural diversity, foreigners become mere projections of ourselves (Adler, p. 97).

In other words, it is the judging of cultural differences as good or bad that leads to prejudice, discrimination, offensive attitudes or behaviors. Recognizing differences can foster communication and mitigate misunderstanding. The tendency of U.S. managers to ignore differences is a phenomenon of American culture, not simply of organizational culture. Americans ignore differences at their own peril (Hofstede, 1988).
Further, culture dictates what we attend to (Triandis, 1993). Markus and Kitayama (1991) argue that culture greatly influences how the self is construed: the self is defined by the cultural context. This is important, because sensitivity and empathy to others, two key functions of effective leadership (Goleman, 2002), are "likely to drastically reduce the tendency toward the fundamental attribution error" (Ross, 1978, in Chemers, 1997).

Whether cultural differences are intra-national (involving diversity and multicultural issues) or global (involving trans-cultural issues), cultural competence is more relevant than ever. Given increasing globalization, the question of the universality of leadership seems all the more pressing. The thesis will show that there are universal concepts of leadership, and that they can be positive and negative. The thesis will also show that there are culturally contingent concepts of leadership and that the culturally competent leader has the capacity to distinguish which are which. And more importantly, to be able to apply them appropriately.

Secondly, this thesis will apply the Global Leadership Model, utilizing a small survey sample to explore a secondary question: what contributes to global leadership development?
CHAPTER II – REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

“The Jack Welch of the future cannot be me. I spent my entire career in the United States. The next head of General Electric will be somebody who spent time in Bombay, in Hong Kong, in Buenos Aires. We have to send our best and brightest overseas and make sure they have the training that will allow them to be the global leaders who will make GE flourish in the future.”

Jack Welch, former CEO of GE in a speech to employees.
The Study of Leadership – An Historical Perspective

The word lead comes from the Latin verb agere, which means to set into motion, and from the Anglo-Saxon laedere, meaning people on a journey (Adler, 2001). Even today the idea of leadership is of someone who sets ideas and people in motion. Leadership is one of the most studied topics in the history of humankind. In 1985, Bennis and Nanus concluded that decades of research had come up with more than 350 definitions. Twenty years later, it is no more clear. In fact, with globalization, leadership is as complex a concept as ever.

However, Chemers (1997) states that a definition of leadership that would be widely accepted is that “leadership is a process of social influence in which one person is able to enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task” (p. 1). Implicit in this definition is the idea that leadership is a group activity, based on social influence and revolving around a common task or tasks.

While much of the leadership literature is fragmented and contradictory, Chemers (1997) argues that there are two basic functions of leadership – what leaders do and how they integrate those activities to accomplish tasks (Chowdhury, 2003). Further, leaders must balance the conflicting activities of internal organizational maintenance (reliability, predictability and accountability) against external adaptability (sensitivity, flexibility and responsiveness to external forces) (Chowdhury, 2003).

Higgs (2003) outlines four eras of leadership discourse in the West, as adapted from Clemens and Meyers (1999). They are 1) the Classical era of the Greeks, who were concerned with dialog, society and democracy: 2) the Renaissance, characterized by Machiavelli, Chaucer and Shakespeare, who focused on ambition and the individual
(great man, not great event); 3) the Industrial era of Weber, Marx, and Durkheim, characterized by survival of the fittest, control and rationality; and 4) the Modern era of Freud, Skinner, and Jung, whose focus was psychological and behavioral. While seemingly linear, it is clear that there has not been a progression from one era to the other, with the thinking of previous eras replaced by that of subsequent eras, particularly the concept of the great man, which is still potent today, as evidenced in the pages of the business media.

Until recent years, far less attention has been given in the west to leadership from Asian or other points of view, but Asian teacher/philosophers such as Buddha and Confucius, fifth century, b. c. contemporaries of Socrates, and Lao Tsu (6th century) provide guidance and inspiration. Hegel lectured on Chinese philosophy in the 19th century and interest has been growing ever since (Dreher, 1996).

Much of early Western research was rooted in the search for the one best leadership method. Comparative research included an assumption that industrial systems were converging (Lane, 2004; Mendenhall, 2001). This was explicit in the research of the 1960s and 1970s, which focused on identifying the “one best way” within a technologically deterministic construct, and differences across national cultures were explained as reflecting different stages of development (Kerr, 1960; Rostow, 1960). In the 1980s, Peters, Waterman (1982) and their followers posited that there were universal rules for success based on excellence of service to internal and external customers. At the same time, researchers such as Hofstede (1980) had begun to compare business systems and leadership values across cultures to identify “universal” constructs.
Most recent research on globalization has also implied convergence toward a single way, although it has been centered on the increasingly shared pattern of diversity in nations within their own borders, rather than adherence to the earlier implied path of a common international model (Blyton, 2001).

Weick’s (1995) work on sense-making (in Higgs, 2003, p. 276) suggests an alternative way to study leadership. This “‘emerging theory’ school focuses on what leaders actually do and on the leader’s impact on followers and their subsequent ability to perform” (Higgs, p 277). Kotter (1990) and Kouzes and Posner (1998) represent this trend, although they base their work on implicit leadership theory: leadership as judged from the followers’ point of view – the implicit ideas and ideals that followers have of leadership. The GLOBE study uses implicit leadership theory as well. So, emerging theory views leadership as a combination of leadership personality and areas of competence.

House (1999) and his colleagues in the GLOBE project challenge convergence theories by explicitly asking the question, what is universal and what is culture-bound with respect to leadership practices? It is also important to note that until GLOBE, most studies of leadership have been conducted by Westerners, particularly Americans (Morrison, 2000; Shahin, 2004) studying American (predominantly male) leaders. In the 1980 and 1990s more cross cultural research was conducted (see Misumi, 1985; Arvey, et al, 1991; Khadra, 1990). Similarly, women’s leadership styles were being investigated (see Klenke, 1999; Adler, 2000; Rosener, 2000; Bajdo & Dickson, 2001; Applebaum, 2003; Eagly & Johannesen-Smith, 2003).
Leadership Models

Leadership research has been variously addressed by focusing on leaders, focusing on followers or on the organizational level of system. Weber was one of the first Westerners to build a model of leadership. His framework was characterized by three types of leaders, traditional (feudal), bureaucratic (transactional) and charismatic (transformational) leaders (1947). Building on Weber, Bass and his colleagues developed a “full range of leadership model” (Bass, 1985; Bass, 1997; Avolio & Atwater, 1996; Hater & Bass, 1998; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Yammarino, Spangler & Bass, 1993), which places transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership on an active-to-passive continuum, respectively, from most effective to least effective or ineffective. In the almost twenty years since Bass introduced his model, there has been much research demonstrating that transformational leadership is more effective than transactional leadership (see Weber, 1947; Bass, 1996, 1997; House & Shamir, 1994 for overviews). Almost all models of transformational leadership include leader charisma as a key quality. However, Bass and Steidlmeier (1998), argue that the most effective leadership is both (emphasis added) transformational and transactional.

Bass (in House, 2004, p. 65) also argues that the three components of transformational leadership (charisma, intellectual stimulation of followers and individualized consideration toward followers) are nearly universal. This view is also argued by Hartog and her colleagues (1999).

It is also significant that Eagly and Johannessen-Smith’s meta-analysis of 45 studies indicates that women leaders tended to be more transformational than their male counterparts.
Some researchers, while not ignoring Weber’s foundational construct, have focused on the character traits required of leaders such as personality, values and spirituality (Chin, et al., 2000; Judge, 2000; Fernandez, 2004). Still others have concerned themselves with competencies, skills and behaviors (Bass, 1985; Drucker, 1967; Bennis, 1985). Bass and Drucker argue that leadership is a set of behavioral skills which can be learned. In contrast, Chakraborty (1995) and Kaplan (1990) are deeply concerned about what they see as too much focus on skills; they argue that character is an important and neglected component of leadership and should be reinstated in leadership development programs.

It is fair to say, that for some time, there has been a tug of war of sorts – whether or not leadership research should focus on values, personality or behaviors (e.g., Hogan and Hogan, 2001; McCall et al., 1998; Higgs, 2003). There is a clear trend away from the rational/analytic logic of Weber to an emotional/intuitive logic of leadership and management (Harung, 1995; Higgs, 2003; Goleman, 2005).

Leadership domains have different possibilities in different parts of the world. Clearly leaders do not operate in a vacuum and the studies of leadership have approached the subject from various angles. Some utilize implicit leadership theory—beliefs others’ have about how leaders behave and what is expected of them. According to Hartog, et al., (1999) this attribution process provides the basis of social power and influence. Implicit leadership is also studied under other rubrics such as leader categorization theory (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, in GLOBE, p. 671), and social cognition theory as applied to leadership. Other scholars believe that leadership is situational. Pfeffer, in direct opposition to the great leader view, argues that leadership is solely situational: that people
dubbed as leaders are simply beneficiaries of favorable external conditions or key
variables that determine organizational performance or success (Pfeffer, 1998 in
Chowdhury, 2003). Whereas, contingency theory argues that leadership effectiveness is a
combination of leader personality and situation.

Others, such as Bass and Steidlemeier, (1998) focus on followership, asserting
that “modern western philosophy tacitly assumes that there is no morally valid leadership
without the consent of the led,” a belief shared by Fisher and Bibo (2003). For the
purposes of this paper, leadership will be examined at the individual level of system –
traits leaders possess or behaviors they manifest, rather than taking on the chicken and
egg question of which influences what – environment or person. In other words, while
attribution-based research data from leaders’ direct reports has played a critical role in
identifying leadership factors, it is those factors, not the process of arriving at them, that
are the focus of this paper.

To summarize, researchers have studied leadership from various perspectives and
at various levels of system, including leadership as influence, leadership as a pattern of
activities, leadership as an outcome of group process or situation, or simply as a product
of external circumstances.
Taxonomies of Leadership

Amazon.com lists over 14,000 books on leadership. A Google search yields 44,000,000 hits. This researcher accumulated 100 journal articles on the topic. The bulk of the writing is directed at the business community and written by leadership gurus such as Jack Welch, Deepak Chopra, and Steven Covey, each of whom can speak from his own experience, but none of whom have conducted a systematic, academically rigorous study of leadership. After a comprehensive review of the writing on leadership in general and cross-cultural leadership in particular, this researcher found that even the serious scholarship is limited (House, 2004; Yukl, 2002). Consequently, there is no common language for leadership and there is an undisciplined use of terms such as behaviors, characteristics, competencies, traits, dimensions, etc. to describe leadership.

In order to better understand all the ways leadership had been studied, the academic literature was organized into a hierarchy from higher-order functions to highly-detailed lower-order functions. To illustrate, at the top of the hierarchy are models such as the Global Leadership Competency Model developed by Chin, Gu and Tubbs (2001) or the GLOBE model developed by House and colleagues (2004). While naming their leadership variables “competencies,” Chin, et al. refer to a higher-order set of measures – ways of being, but do not provide any behavioral indicators. Their model is a developmental model, which articulates various states of competency through which leaders pass (from 1 at the lowest level and 6 at highest level):

6. Transformation
5. Acceptance/internalization
4. Appreciation
3. Understanding
2. Awareness
1. Ignorance

Descending from there is Goldsmith, Greenberg, et al.'s (2004) Emerging Characteristics of Global Leaders, which appears to mix ways of being with comparatively mundane activities, such as skill development. Their list (in no particular hierarchy) consists of:

- Thinking Globally
- Appreciating cultural diversity
- Developing technological savvy
- Building partnerships and alliances
- Sharing Leadership

Continuing with the organization of leadership approaches from higher to lower-order, the next level in the hierarchy are two examples, the Society for Human Resource Management’s Global Leadership Survey, which exemplifies a methodology utilizing descriptive “competencies,” which they call “dimensions,” performance, character, persistence, adaptability, and flexibility. Similarly, Kotter (2001) articulates what leaders do, but does not focus much on leadership competencies. His construct states that leaders:

- First and foremost, cope with change,
- Set direction,
- Motivate and inspire,
• Align people,

• Create cultures of leadership

Finally, there are very specific models as exemplified by Mendenhall and his colleagues (2001) who organize their research around competencies analogous to Spencer and Spencer’s (1993) job-competencies taxonomy. Mendenhall, et al., distinguish between interpersonal skills, business skill, personal traits and distinctive global leadership “competencies.”

1. Interpersonal Skills
   a. Establish close personal relationships
   b. Motivates employees
   c. Builds community
   d. Manages conflict
   e. Possesses negotiation skills

2. Business Skills
   a. Global Business Savvy
   b. Balances between global and local issues

3. Personal Traits
   a. Inquisitiveness
   b. Courage
   c. Vision
   d. Commitment
   e. Thinking Agility
f. Maturity

g. Improvisation

h. Entrepreneurial spirit

4. Distinctive Global Leadership Competencies (organizational structuring skills)

a. Managing uncertainty

b. Global organizational savvy

c. Stakeholder orientation

d. Creating Learning Systems

e. Change Agentry (Mendenhall, et al.'s term)
f. Managing Cross-cultural Ethical issues

To summarize, where Chin, et al., articulated high-level competencies, Mendenhall, et al., have drilled down to very specific job-task classifications. Between these two bookends are all sorts of approaches that researchers have used (Higgs, 2003). Yukl and his colleagues (2002) argued that it is difficult to integrate findings from five decades of research unless the many diverse leadership behaviors can be “integrated in a parsimonious and meaningful conceptual framework” (p. 15). He proposed an emerging solution, “a hierarchical taxonomy with three meta-categories (task, relations, and change behavior)” (p. 15).

Therefore, a classification of terms is in order. Spencer and Spencer (1993), summarized decades of research by McClelland and McBer on job competence
assessment. They developed a comprehensive taxonomy of job analysis and functional competence. They define “competence” thus,

“a competence is an underlying characteristic of an individual that is causally related to criterion-referenced effective and/or superior performance in a job or situation” (italics their own, p. 9).

They state further, “Underlying characteristic means that the competency is a fairly deep and enduring part of a person’s personality and can predict behavior in a wide variety of situations and job tasks. Causally related means that a competency causes or predicts behavior and performance. Criterion referenced means that the competency actually predicts who does something well or poorly, as measured on a specific criterion or standard” (p. 9). Examples of specific criterion would be volume of sales or number of clients who stay off drugs.

Upon establishing their terms, Spencer and Spencer worked backward from the criterion for superior or effective performance on the job to identify characteristics of people who perform at these levels. The result was that they identified five types of competency characteristics for which they later developed behavioral indicators. The competencies are paraphrased below:

- Motives - things a person consistently wants which causes action,
- Traits – physical characteristics and consistent responses to situations or information,
- Self-concept – a person’s attitudes, values, self-image,
- Knowledge – information a person has in specific content areas,
• Skill - ability to execute certain physical or mental tasks.

They then clustered the competencies:

• Achievement and action,
• Helping and Human service,
• Impact and influence, managerial,
• Cognitive,
• Personal effectiveness (p. 9-11).

As Spencer and Spencer demonstrate, there is a clear taxonomy that guides the examination of phenomena such as leadership. Therefore, for the purposes of this thesis, "competencies" are defined as higher-order phenomena which encompass knowledge, skills and abilities. "Dimensions" describe the behaviors of leaders, and attributes are qualities leaders possess either as in-born or learned.

Cross-cultural Leadership

The growing shift of business from the Atlantic to the Pacific has made the study of cultural differences, particularly East-West cultural differences, pressing (Adler, 1986). Because there are clearly differences in the cognitive and psychological processes of people from different cultures, any study of cross-cultural leadership must include these differences. Therefore, research into cross-cultural leadership has been intertwined with cultural research, psychology, sociology and anthropology. People possess assumptions and attitudes that are individually constructed, and which are so ingrained
they may not be consciously aware of them. Those assumptions drive their behavior and the judgments they make of others’ behavior (Kelly, 1973; Aronson, 2004).

Assumptions are also informed by culture. Hofstede and Bond (1988) claim that “we begin to acquire the mental programming we call culture the day we are born” (p. 7). Assumptions might be easy to ignore or may go unchallenged when we are functioning in our own societies, but they will be challenged when we interact with people of other cultures. Hofstede (1980) was one of the earliest to systematically study cultural differences and similarities. He identified five cultural dimensions affecting all cross-cultural interactions: power distance (degree of accepted social hierarchy), individualism (versus collectivism), masculinity (adherence to “traditional” male dominance), and uncertainty avoidance (adherence to the truth, extent of comfort with unstructured situations), and long-term orientation (devotion to a long-term commitment to traditional values). While his construct has been challenged, modified and added to, it is clearly the foundation from which subsequent researchers have worked.

Morrison (2000) articulated two approaches to subsequent global leadership models: 1) company-specific models (created internally), and 2) generalizable competency models developed by academic researchers. Cultural dimensions inform leader and follower behavior in all countries. For instance, in lower power distance societies such as the U.S., charismatic leaders are likely to use their power to enhance the self-efficacy of individuals reporting to them, while in China, the same charismatic behavior will be used to support the collective identity (Hofstede, 1988; Judge, 2001). Sarros and Santora (2001) demonstrated that the values orientations of leaders across
cultures positively correlated with transformative leadership styles even as they served culture-specific purposes.

Misumi (in Chemers, 1997, p. 128) believed there were “basic functions that are common to all leadership, even if they manifest themselves differently across specific situations.” The two functions he identified were performance (forming and reaching group goals) and maintenance (preserving group social stability).

But McKenna’s (1998) research suggests that there is little broad cross-cultural agreement on leadership dimensions and reminds the reader that most leadership dimensions are U.S.-centric. The implication is that there is a danger for U.S. multinational corporations (MNCs) to colonize so-called leadership dimensions. What is missing are truly ‘global’ behaviors. In fact, he asks, is there really a need for “global” behaviors? He argues that as long as things are getting done, why worry about the way they are getting done? Creating a “global organization behaviorally” (p. 111) is less important than reaching global markets.

House (2004) also recognized the weakness of earlier research. His response was to launch the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE), research program, the most comprehensive effort to date, and whose first stage of research was published in December, 2004. Beginning in 1994, House and a team of researchers from around the world studied culture and leadership in 62 countries. They define leadership as follows: “the ability to motivate, influence, and enable individuals to contribute to the objectives of organizations of which they are members” (p. xxii). Building on the work of past researchers, for instance, Kluckhorn and Strodtbeck’s (1961) work on the future and humane orientation, the performance orientation of
McClelland (1961) and Hofstede (1980), researchers in the GLOBE project developed additional cultural *dimensions*. They identified “21 first-order ‘primary leadership dimensions’ consolidated into six ‘second-order’ global leadership *behaviors.*” (p. 14), which, later in the text, are characterized as *dimensions* (p. 41). They are:

- Charismatic/value-based
- Team oriented
- Participative
- Humane orientation
- Autonomous
- Self protective

The first four contribute to outstanding leadership, the autonomous dimension can be either supportive or not depending on other circumstances, and “self-protective” generally impedes outstanding leadership. The GLOBE researchers further delineate attributes – such characteristics as trustworthiness, justness, honesty, etc., and each attribute is further broken down into “*sub-scales*” (House, et al., 2004, p. 14). Of these attributes, eight are universally endorsed as contributing to effective leadership and eight are universally endorsed as impediments to effective leadership. They have also identified 35 *attributes* which are considered contributors in some cultures and impediments in others. All the attributes tie to corresponding *dimensions*. The above terms are denoted in *italics* because they demonstrate even GLOBE’s tendency to interchange terms while designating different phenomena.
While most researchers focused on the positive dimensions of leadership, utilizing culturally endorsed implicit leadership theory, House and his colleagues in the GLOBE project examine both positive and negative. They also expanded Hofstede’s work on cultural dimensions (Hartog, 1999).

Summary

The literature reveals a rich, multi-perspective, yet haphazard approach to the study of leadership, in general, and cross-cultural or global leadership in particular. Are there universal and culture-specific leadership concepts? The answer is a resounding “yes.” There are also leadership qualities that are universally counterproductive to effective leadership (Hofstede, 1980; Adler, 1986; House, 2004).

As important, there are wide variances in the purposes these universal qualities serve. According to Hartog (1999) “universal endorsement of an attribute does not preclude cultural differences in the enactment of such an attribute” (p. 222). In other words, leadership is informed by the cultures from which it arises. Further, there are cultural differences with regard to the impact of universal leader behaviors on the social systems they inhabit (Selmer, 1979; Judge, 2000; Jung & Yammarino, 2001).

Similarly, despite the diversity of cultures, there are universal dimensions of culture (Hofstede, 1980; Adler, 1986; House, 2004) which have been cross-validated by using completely different questionnaires on different populations in different years in partly overlapping sets of countries (Hofstede, 1988; House, 2004).

To view cross-cultural leadership as either a universal or strictly culture-based phenomenon is misguided. Cross-cultural leadership is a “both-and” phenomenon. As
Fujisawa, co-founder of Honda Motor Corporation has said, "Japanese and American management is 95% the same and differs in all important respects." (in Adler, 1986, p. 295). Likewise, cross-cultural leadership must be addressed from both the personality and behavioral point of view. Certain competencies can be learned and behaviors adjusted accordingly. At the same time, personality is shaped by culture, and therefore has an impact on the developmental capacities and inclinations of leaders (Spencer & Spencer, 1998; Higgs, 2003).

As Chin, et al., (2001) argue, leader effectiveness is dictated by the effective assessment of situational factors and the application of appropriate combinations of behaviors. In other words, high-level cultural competence is akin to Goleman and his colleagues' (2002) approach to emotional intelligence: there is no one single recipe for cultural competence. Rather, it is infinite combinations of competencies appropriately applied in the right measure to a given situation.

In the next chapter, the secondary research question, "What contributes to cross-cultural leadership development?" will be addressed.
CHAPTER III – THE GLOBAL LEADERSHIP MODEL
The Global Leadership Model

This study now seeks to apply the model of Global Leadership Competencies (GLC) developed by Chin, Gu, and Tubbs (2001). The model is made up of hierarchical competency factors. They posit a developmental path of global leadership from least competent to an ideal high level of competence. The factors or levels of competence are as follows: a) ignorance, b) awareness, c) understanding, d) appreciation, e) acceptance/internalization, f) transformation (Figure 1). Chin (personal communication, January 14, 2005) has since modified the model, replacing transformation with adaptation, which is consistent with the work of Silverthorne (2000), whose own research indicates a strong link between adaptability and effective leadership across cultures.

The GLC model assumes that ascending to a higher level of global leadership function is not only desirable and attainable but, in fact, required for functional effectiveness in a global environment. It is important to note that the GLC model is not a leadership model as described above; rather, it focuses on the nature of cross-cultural competence or literacy required to be a high-functioning global leader. However, Chin and her colleagues acknowledge and draw from the work of Goleman (1997), Bergmann, et al. (1999), Tichy and Cohen (1997), (Chin, p. 2).
Figure 1. Global Leadership Competence Model

Global Leadership Competencies

- Transformation/Adaptation
- Acceptance & Internalization
- Appreciation
- Understanding
- Awareness
- Ignorance

Global Leadership Deficiencies
Source: Chin, Gu, and Tubbs, 2001
Chin, et al., challenge the application of western cultural idiosyncrasies such as individualism, which they believe are counterproductive in many cultural settings, particularly Asia. They are supported by the GLOBE findings.

Consistent with contingency theory, the GLC model assumes that as context changes, so must the behaviors of leaders (Chin, et al. p. 2) and, because global leaders are working abroad, the context is very different from the U.S.

Chin, et al., posit that their competencies follow Maslow’s need hierarchy. A more apt analogy might be the Emotional Intelligence construct (Goleman, 1995) or Kegan’s (1982) adult development model.

Emotional Intelligence

Being an effective leader requires a highly developed emotional intelligence, the basic elements of which are the capacity for self-awareness, self-management, social awareness and relationship management. Emotional intelligence is measured on a four-level scale with an identified target level of competence (Boyatzis, Goleman & Hay Group, 2002).

There are certain elements of emotional intelligence that are particularly relevant to the discussion of cross-cultural competence. They are paraphrased below:

- Emotional self-awareness – awareness of your own feelings and the ability to recognize and manage them,

- Emotional resilience – the ability to perform well and consistently in a range of situations and under pressure,
- Motivation – drive and energy which allows achievement, balancing of short and long term goals, and pursuit of goals despite challenge and rejection,

- Interpersonal sensitivity – awareness of others’ needs and feelings, and ability to use awareness effectively in interactions with others,

- Intuitiveness – ability to use insight and interactions to arrive at and implement decisions even when faced with ambiguous or incomplete information,

- Conscientiousness and integrity – ability to display commitment in the face of challenges, to act consistently and with integrity (Higgs, 2003).

These competencies, while important in a mono-cultural setting become even more critical in multi-cultural (within nation) and cross-cultural settings.

Kegan’s Adult Developmental Theory

Kegan’s stages of development, the basis of his Constructive Developmental Theory, are based on notions of human development which are very relevant to Chin and her colleagues’ concerns about developing cross-cultural literacy. The notions are as follows:

- “Development is evolutionary motion,

- Development focuses on changes in the way people differentiate between their sense of self and their environment—boundary issues,

- Development is a life-long process of differentiation and integration,
• Development is a movement toward making meanings, resolving discrepancies, preserving and enhancing personal integrity,

• Development is movement out of 'embeddedness,'

• Development is driven by responding to a complex world, particularly the task of encountering and resolving dis-equilibriums,

• Each stage of development is a theory of the previous stage,

• Development includes moving back and forth between inclusion and independence” (Litchfield, 1998).

Compare these with the GLC competencies. At the base of the pyramid, an individual is in a state of “global leadership deficiency” (Chin, p. 4), and with appropriate development assistance, moves out of what Kegan would characterize as embeddedness, rises up the pyramid, learning to respond to a complex world, with its inherent paradoxes and learning to manage dis-equilibrium as it is encountered. Kegan’s model describes a helix path (a couple steps forward and backward) of development rather than a simple linear path.

Kegan’s developmental model is not completely analogous to the GLC developmental model, as he begins with the earliest stages of human development whereas the Global Leadership model focuses on the adult. The models are similar in that neither assumes inevitable achievement of the higher developmental stages. Kegan equates his Levels 0 through 2 with physiological age. But subsequent to the teen years, unlike aging, continued development is not inevitable. People can, in fact often do, remain in one of the stages. Kegan later added a fifth level called inter-institutional to his
original model which he argues is an imperative of the post-modern age, but he believes most people are ill-equipped to achieve it (1994). One might argue that this fifth stage is similar to the transformational stage in the GLC model in that it is also an imperative of the modern age and that implies the capacity to integrate the self with other.

Kegan's model is analogous to the GLC model in other ways as well: A foreigner in a foreign land lacks language, may need assistance getting around, and is dependent on others in ways not experienced since infancy. As the individual gains exposure and is open to new ideas, s/he will move from the imperial self of Stage 2 to the self-in-relation to others of Stage 4 and so on. Table 1 provides a comparison of the two models.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Leadership Competencies and Kegan's Developmental 'Stages'</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kegan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ignorance Level -</strong> Each party assumes that their own way of doing things is the correct and proper way; “unconscious incompetence.”</td>
<td><strong>Impulsive Self (up to age 7)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | • Self is: Impulses and perceptions  
• Self has: Reflexes (seeing, moving)  
• Reflexes are embedded in what coordinates them--perceptions and impulses  
• Only understand objects as they are presently perceived  
• Impulses acted upon because there is not a "self" developed to coordinate and control them--no ambivalence |  |  |
| **Awareness Level -** The novice stage; with exposure come some impressions | **Imperial Self (ending around age 16)**                                                                                                                                 |  |
|  | • Self is: Needs, interests, wishes  
• Self has: Impulses and perceptions  
• "Imperial" because there is an absence of a shared reality with others  
• Awareness of a private life--people don't know what I'm thinking  
• Emergence of a self-concept, a consistent notion of "me"  
• I now have something to do with what happens in the world  
• Can't imagine the feelings of other's interior responses (empathy)  
• Only understand consequences of external behavior  
• What will happen if someone finds out  
• Others viewed in terms of meeting my needs, wishes, interests |  |  |
| **Understanding Level -** Individuals begin to exhibit some conscious effort to learn why people are the way they are and why people do what they do. They display interest and tolerance of those different from themselves. | **Mutuality: the Interpersonal Self**                                                                                                                                 |  |
|  | • Self is: Interpersonal, mutual with other people  
• Self has: Needs, interests, and wishes  
• Ability to negotiate my needs leads to mutuality  
• Enter into empathetic and reciprocal obligations  
• Person embodies many different voices |  |  |
| **Appreciation Level -** Individuals begin to take a "leap of faith" and experience a genuine tolerance of different points | **Interpersonal Self -**                                                                                                                                                  |  |
|  | • Self is: Interpersonal, mutual with other people  
• Self has: Needs, interests, and wishes  
• Ability to negotiate my needs leads to mutuality  
• Enter into empathetic and reciprocal obligations |  |  |
Table 1

*Global Leadership Competencies and Kegan's Developmental 'Stages*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceptance/ Internalization Level -</th>
<th>Institutional Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The possibility of interaction between cultures increases appreciably. People are more sophisticated both in terms of recognizing commonalities and in terms of effectively dealing with differences; This is a departure from the ethnocentric notion that “my way is the best way and the only way.” | - Self is: Identity, "psychic administration," ideology  
- Self has: Relationships with other people  
- Institutional as in regulating relationships; the self is an administrator of relations  
- Self-reflective of one's roles, norms, and self-concept  
- Ideological state--Truth depends on a faction/class/group  
- Defensive when chaos threatens order/structure of the self  
- Self in relation to other (as visiting another's world) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformational Level -</th>
<th>Inter-institutional Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Globalization becomes a way of life. It is internalized to the degree that it is out of one's own volition, thus becomes effortless, subconscious, and second nature. Appropriate words to describe this level are competent, fluent, balanced, broad-minded, and international. | - Self as transformative  
- Self as part of whole (holistic)  
- Self as trans-personal (of the other and they of self)  
- Self in relationship with other (as some aspect of other is also in self) |

Source: Litchfield, 1998 & Kegan, 1994

Simply put, highly effective leaders are more developmentally mature in the management of self and the self in relation to others, a distinct advantage when one is confronted with those who are very different from one's self.
Summary

Chin and her colleagues have added to the pantheon of required leader attributes, specifically challenging Western concepts of leadership which they believed over-emphasize western values such as individualism. Individuality is a culturally contingent phenomenon. Effective leaders must have the capacity to adapt to the culture in which they are functioning. In order to do that, they must have considerable cross-cultural literacy.

Having made this compelling argument, Chin, et al., did not provide a detailed taxonomy to support their competencies (see Appendix 4 for a full explication of Global Leadership Competencies by Chin, et al.). Bueno (2003) applied the GLC model and constructed a qualitative questionnaire instrument in order to address the following questions: 1) “how do effective leaders demonstrate a higher level of global leadership competencies than less effective leaders? 2) How do cultural sensitivity and global leadership skills contribute to leadership effectiveness?”

This thesis investigates whether there universally shared concepts of leadership. The research literature indicates that there are universally shared concepts of leadership and that there are culturally contingent concepts of leadership. The cross-culturally competent leader has the capacity to utilize both the universal and the culturally contingent and knows when and how to apply his/her leadership in a given cross-cultural situation.

In the next chapter, this thesis explores what contributes to global leadership development. The Global Leadership Competence model will be used to explore these questions.
CHAPTER IV - METHODS
Study Sample

A small sample of leaders was surveyed. The data were analyzed for themes then
coded according to a Likert scale of cross-cultural competence. Finally the data were
compared with other research on cross-cultural leadership to ascertain common patterns,
themes, and places of divergence.

The study utilized a convenience sample. Survey respondents were director-level
manager-leaders or above in a variety of companies, all with international work
experience. Five were professional contacts of the researcher and nine were referrals
identified through professional contacts. Referring persons made the introductory contact
on the researcher's behalf. The researcher then followed up with the prospective
respondent to explain the study and set up an appointment for the interviews.

Survey Process

The primary research was conducted through telephone interviews with all but
two respondents who were posted abroad. They responded by e-mail, answering the
survey in writing. The research data are qualitative, descriptive, and based on
respondents' self-reports, and as such may be subject to bias. However, the questionnaire
was conducted in a standardized fashion, meaning there was some probing for clarity but
the researcher did not deviate from the interview questions. Interviews typically averaged
35 minutes, with two extending to 60 minutes.
Limitations of the Study

The survey process was a modest endeavor designed to explore the subject of cross-cultural leadership competence. It does not provide a definitive statement on the subject. Therefore, these data are directional and may indicate correlations or causal links which would require extensive additional testing with a larger sample, more highly developed definitions of the levels of competence, and questions more appropriate to the factors of the GLC model. Bueno’s questionnaire was also selected for convenience, so that data sets could be compared.

Bueno mapped her questions to Chin et al.’s Leadership competencies. Bueno (2003) correlated her questions to specific factors of the GLC model (see Table 2 below). Early in the survey process, this researcher discovered that respondent answers did not fit the model as Bueno intended. In other words, there was no correlation of question responses to the model factors.

Additionally, problems were discovered in the wording of the questions. For example, the original questionnaire consisted of sixteen questions. Question number 15 (“What are the lessons and innovations to be learned around the world?”) was omitted after the first four interviews because the question lacked clarity. There will be more discussion of Bueno’s survey construction below. Therefore an alternative coding procedure was developed, which will be described below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Interview questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting of International</td>
<td>1. What countries have you visited?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>2. Approximately how long have you been in each of these countries?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. What was the nature of your visits? Business? Vacationing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. How many languages do you speak?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>5. To what do you attribute your personal leadership skill?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) work experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) natural ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) role models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) formal training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g) other (please specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance Level</td>
<td>6. What kinds of business challenges do/did you face in the global environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. How do you handle conflicts with an international partner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Level</td>
<td>8. What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from a different country/culture)? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Level</td>
<td>9. In what ways have you shown your curiosity about different aspects of history, languages, systems, and so on regarding an international customer/supplier?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Interview questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation Level</td>
<td>10. In what ways have you changed your point of view based on culture in a negotiation with an international supplier/customer? Please give examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance/ Internalization Level</td>
<td>11. How do you feel about the idea of having imported products in the market? What do you think about their quality? What imported products do you buy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. How do you feel about new concepts/trends? Do you like to follow them? (For example: palm pilot, digital camera, DVD player.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Level, Globalization, and Global Leadership Effectiveness</td>
<td>13. How comfortable are you negotiating with a foreign supplier/customer compared to a domestic one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. In what ways do you believe that leaders can use knowledge about cultural value differences to become more effective leaders? (For example, recognizing person's national values.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. What are the lessons and innovations to be learned around the world?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Is there anything else you would like to say about the lessons you have learned in your international experiences?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bueno, 2003
Sample Demographics

Interview questions 1 through 4 are demographic questions that establish work experience abroad. Question 5 asks respondents “To what do you attribute your personal leadership skill? Questions 11 and 12 ask about respondents’ attitudes concerning imported goods and adoption of new technologies and will be treated as demographic data.

All questions were analyzed to identify obvious themes in the interviews. The remaining questions (6-10, and 13-16; 15 was omitted) ask respondents to reflect on their experiences working abroad. These questions were coded using a Likert scale linked to the GLC model.

Tables 2 through 5 reflect the basic demographics of this study sample. Sixteen individuals were contacted. Fifteen respondents were interviewed. All but three were American-born.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>U.S. born</th>
<th>Foreign born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All but one were employed at American-owned companies with global operations. One respondent was an American employee of a foreign company with operations in the U.S. All but two respondents were at the Director and VP level. Five were in Human Resources functions, nine were in line functions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Countries Visited</th>
<th>Number of Leaders</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between 5 and 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 10 and 14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 15 and 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Trips Abroad</th>
<th>Number of Leaders</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacationing only</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed (business, vacation, and/or other such as study)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Months Abroad</th>
<th>Number of Leaders</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less or equal to 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 6 and 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 13 and 24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 25 and 48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All respondents indicated that their overseas trips were mostly for business. Vacations were added on the front and back end of business trips or were conducted while the respondent was posted abroad. Four respondents specifically referred to vacations taken abroad for their own sake. One respondent indicated no vacations abroad despite an accumulated five years of foreign travel for business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Languages Spoken By Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All nine respondents speaking one language were American-born. The respondents with two or more language capabilities were either foreign-born or had extensive foreign experience abroad from a young age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Leadership Skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Times Attributed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One respondent characterized natural ability as natural instinct: the ability to read others, to be tuned into the feelings and thinking of others. One respondent attributed religion in terms of it instilling a strong work ethic. Other sources of leadership skill reported were 1) teaching others, 2) birth order (respondent was the youngest of nine and the family peacemaker), 3) two respondents reported core values (not religiously based), and 4) one respondent said, “Hard work, drive, motivation, desire to achieve, fear of failure.”
Interview Themes

The next phase of data analysis identified common themes in the remaining interview questions. Two criteria were used for identifying themes: 1) if the theme appeared five or more times, 2) if the themes were relevant to the research question. Fifteen themes were identified. The interview themes are below. Each theme is followed by either 1) a verbatim an exemplary respondent quote, or 2) an explanatory statement.

1. Values: (appears 11 times in respondent answers):
   - Recognize lack of common values (4)
   - Recognize distinct cultural values of host country (5)

For instance, some respondents could recognize values differences, but saw them as something to be overcome or as means to an end, “It is important to study the culture to ensure that you have a basic understanding, learn some of the language and use it where possible as the people do appreciate this. Treat people fairly, conduct one-on-ones and town hall meetings to allow the employees to get to know you and to understand your vision and direction you are planning on taking the company.” (R2, Q6)

2. Inherent cultural and phenotypic diversity (appears 11 times in respondent answers):
   - Recognizes as a strategic asset
   - Understands there are multiple ways to accomplish a given goal (7)
• Recognizes that host country culture may have a more appropriate or even inherently (and objectively) better way to approach a challenge or a problem and displays willingness to allow this possibility (4)

For instance, “Having an open mind and finding value in the opinion or comments of others is a significant benefit. Understand that it is okay for people to think different [sic] than you do and their diversity can be the cornerstone to a successful business. Without them, you can not sustain a company or operation.” (R1, Q6) or “If you can manage cultural differences you ought to have a leg up dealing with big cultural differences, then you’ll be more effective with small differences in your own culture.” (R13, Q16)

3. Culture or Language understanding or competence – see value of (appears 55 times in respondent answers):

• Language/culture understanding (10)

• Actual language competence (4)

• Actual cultural competence? (5)

• Demonstrate cultural curiosity about others (14)

• Awareness of cultural differences in business operations (19)

• Gender issues (3)

Some respondents articulated cultural competence this way: “Be willing and flexible to change and let go. Be open to hearing other positions and smart enough to visualize that the two positions can be integrated. Integrate them into your position. If their position is
invalid, be willing to push back...there is a cost: Instilling in local culture a profit and
loss mentality is extremely difficult – that they can’t just keep an iron rice bowl. There is
still an undercurrent of that attitude. You need to handle it sensitively. Can’t just get
something tomorrow...They think the Germans and the Americans are only interested in
money.” (R10, Q10)

4. Comply with our point of view (appears 18 times in respondent answers):
   - Give them (local people) a chance to know my vision (2)
   - Our way, values (16)

Most respondents were concerned about gaining foreigners’ compliance with their
American company’s policies and procedures. Skills such as active listening were
mostly viewed as tactical activities in support of that end. Occasionally, a respondent
would hint at an accommodation of the ways of the foreign culture: “understanding of
ethics is one of our biggest issues: their interpretation vs. ours. Hard to get to see it
from our point of view. We need to keep an open-mind. Sometimes we may have to
compromise, within the law. They’re diligent --they stick to their guns. Body
language and passion in the voice.” (R11, Q7)

5. Probes/Questions – used as part of conflict management or technique of gaining
culture understanding (appears 24 times in respondent answers)

6. Listen (appears 29 times in respondent answers)

With regard to probing, questioning and listening, respondents recounted using probing,
questioning and listening as a tactic to enhance communication and negotiations.
7. Balance: know appropriate balance between dictating and gaining consensus

(appears seven times in respondent answers)

"Mostly elicit input, opinions thoughts, definitely diversity —from where you come, what makes you you? Assimilate the best response. One thing, you need to balance consensus with dictatorial.” (R14) “Perspective. My company has well established way of thinking/acting/being. It’s US centric and in upbringing. We balanced company way with Indian way. For instance, the company outsourced credit collection operations in India.” (R7)

8. Seeks third party assistance (appears eight times in respondent answers):

- To work through conflict (6)
- To understand local ways (2)

Some respondents sought third party assistance in understanding the ethnic/national and organizational cultural issues, someone who could advise them on the landscape. For instance: “Confidants would be helpful: help me read between the lines. I got advice. I found a confidant to coach me and act as go-between” (R5, Q8). Whereas, other respondents utilized third parties as arbiters of a dispute, or as a means to allow both sides to save face. For instance, “you resort to the typical chain-of-command and if that does not work, it is important to have a Governance Committee to assure resolution.” (R1, Q8)
9. **Formal training (appears five times in respondent answers):**

- *As available for preparing for overseas assignment* (2)
- *As available but not effective or as inadequate* (2)
- *As very necessary but not available* (1)

"My Pet Peeve is training (i.e., no training). At the CIA we had to (learn) to get into the heads of people. (Learn) to manage our ego and pride. (at this company) they put retiring people in a foreign assignment rather than high potentials (have them) grazing till retirement rather than as a strategic move." (R10, Q5). Or "human capital drives me as a leader. I’m committed to development. (R7, Q5)

10. **Saving face (appears three times in respondent answers):**

- *Understand face-saving as cultural more* (1)
- *Understand how to do it* (1)
- *Understand that it works both ways (i.e., the American can make use of face saving measures as well)* (1)

Most respondents seem to understand the concept, its importance and its use. For instance, “if I can’t resolve (a conflict), I move the goal to the next higher –broader, corporate context. It’s face saving for me; I can change my position if I need to and the same for them.” (R13, Q8). Other respondents referred to saving face as a lesson learned after an unpleasant interaction: “two company directors went to China. The Chinese were expecting VPs. The Chinese lost face because of how low-ranking the Americans were.” (R4, Q8) This quote is also an example of the differences in power distance between the
Americans and Chinese. Furthermore, the Chinese would read sending lower ranking people as a sign of disrespect therefore there would be no exchanges that would build relationship and trust.

11. Competition (appears 11 times in respondent answers):
   - See global competition as good thing (9)
   - See global competition as good, but believe it’s not a level playing field for U.S. companies (1)
   - Support local independent business (1)

12. Economic challenges (appears 11):
   - Exchange rates, (2)
   - Cost pressure (8)
   - Not level playing field (1)

13. Product Quality (appears 10 times in respondent answers):
   - As a function of purchasing decisions (2)
   - As a healthy product of a global economy (3)
   - As a business challenge (4)
   - As an issue to be balanced against loyalty to American made products (1)

R7's statement was generally representative of the mix of quality issues: “It’s almost transparent. Global partnering...what’s a global product anymore? If it’s a fair price, acceptable quality and those markets are open to us, I’m fine with it. I don’t want a
flood to the detriment of US jobs. I look for appropriate things. I don’t tend to specifically buy foreign except for foods. I recently wanted a BMW for the features and quality – it’s a brand thing.” R6: When at X company I wasn’t impressed with Asian products. But Honda is great. I don’t look at the location. Quality is what drives me. Competition is global. We have Kenmore, Toshiba, JVC. My husband researches it. R5: “I’m very high on it. It’s important for the global economy. Foreign products are better quality. I won’t buy a US car” or R3: “I’ve had them forever. For a car, I look for quality and value. Don’t care where it’s made.” Three quarters of respondents were also brand conscious, BMW and Sony was mentioned as representing the gold standard in high quality products. Other respondents referred to the challenge that some developing countries were having relative to quality. Thirteen respondents’ comments did not indicate a bias against foreign products. For example: R4: “I buy American when possible, but I’m not a flag waver. I shop locally, support local economy.”

14. Manufacturing capabilities (appears seven times in respondent answers)

Almost all the respondents discussed competition, economic challenges, and product quality as components of global competition or functions of their decisions to buy foreign goods. The pressure was strong to seek low cost countries, but there were challenges related to the manufacturing capabilities of those countries. R4: “As for quality, there have been relative shifts from China as a poor quality manufacturer.”

R1: “There are also differing standards of Quality and Manufacturing capability.”
Interview themes ranged from values and cultural issues to business challenges. They also reveal the outlines of the various levels of competence respondents demonstrated relative to the GLC model based on the ways in which respondents referenced themes and the contexts in which the themes arose. For instance, one respondent mentioned product quality as an issue to be balanced against loyalty to American-made products, while other respondents mentioned it as a healthy product of a global economy. These are two opposing ideas captured in the theme of product quality. The themes are further explored below in the Findings Section. The next step was an analysis of the questionnaire data.

Likert Scale

The data analysis was designed to answer the research question “What contributes to global leadership development? Since the GLC was a developmental model illustrating movement from low to high (global leadership) competence, a Likert-type scale was applied to the GLC Model’s six factors and respondents’ answers were analyzed and coded to the Scale.

The factors were coded as follows, with 1 representing global deficiency and 6 representing global leadership competence:

(a) ignorance = 1
(b) awareness = 2
(c) understanding = 3
(d) appreciation = 4  
(e) acceptance/internalization = 5  
(f) transformation/adaptation = 6

The Likert-type scaling was tested for inter-rater reliability. The data of four respondents were tested by a third party to assess the consistency of the rater. Thirty-two questions were cross-rated. Rater scores were the same for 12 questions, within one point for 15 questions, within two points for one question, and within three points on one question (two questions yielded responses that were not codable because the respondents did not answer the question posed). The divergences in rater scores were predominantly in the first two interviews; by the third and fourth interviews the scores were more consistent with the original set of ratings. Additionally, the rater scoring divergence occurred on questions with seemingly generic responses. In those cases, the divergence was probably due to two factors 1) the respondents and their companies and industries were known to the researcher, but were completely unknown to the second rater, 2) the second rater was not familiar with the topic of cross-cultural leadership.
CHAPTER V - FINDINGS
Survey Findings

The survey findings were arrived at using four levels of analysis. The first was to identify survey themes as discussed above (pp. 54-60); the second was to compare the demographic information from this study sample with Bueno’s hypotheses; the third was to assess cross-cultural competence, using a Likert-type scoring system. The fourth was an internal analysis of the interview data.

The interview data indicated three key findings, 1) 99% of the respondents were functioning at least at the awareness or understanding level on the GLC model, 2) contrary to Bueno’s hypothesis, answers to specific questions were not by themselves indicators of where a person might be in the GLC developmental model, 3) leaders who articulated both an openness (as measured by positive attitude/curiosity toward things foreign) and extensive foreign knowledge and/or exposure scored higher on the Likert scale for global leadership competency.

The respondents’ Likert scores and demographic information are summarized in Table 7. Most respondents demonstrated basic cross-cultural competence; the average score was 4.05, at the appreciative level, a capacity that includes sophisticated stereotyping, but there were no indications from the data of what Osland and Bird (2000) call sense-making in context. This capability goes beyond being expert regarding a list of cultural dos and don’ts (Mintzberg, 2004; Raelin, 2004).

While Bueno’s research findings (2003) implied a link between respondent demographics and global leadership competence, in this survey sample there were almost
no relationships. For example, three of the four highest scoring respondents had lived abroad for uninterrupted periods of years; so, living abroad may be one indicator of global leadership development; however, as a single data point there is no relationship with higher levels of global leadership competence. Further, there are no one-to-one relationships between respondent answers and any specific developmental level on the Global Leadership Competence model; this was particularly true for Questions 11 and 12, which Bueno equated with the acceptance/internalization level of the GLC model, (see Table 2).

There are also no direct relationships between the number of countries visited or amount of time spent abroad, and a higher level of development on the GLC scale. For example, one of the respondents reported a cumulative total of five years travel abroad, but had never actually lived abroad; he rarely spent more than two or three days in any country and scored low relative to his peers in this study. Therefore, it seems that it is not the quantity of travel, but the quality of time spent abroad (exposure to or immersion in foreign culture, effort made to learn about and understand the culture and language), combined with other factors, such as interest in foreign cultures, which linked to higher levels of GLC development.
The survey data point to a slight positive relationship between acceptance of imported products and advanced leadership skill, in that the lowest scoring respondent (R14) was also not very accepting of foreign goods. He indicated deep concern about the impact of foreign goods on American jobs and articulated a belief
that a level global economic playing field did not exist. However, his concern might have been born of something other than underdeveloped global leadership skill.

Furthermore, despite “Buy American” rhetoric, in a consumer society such as the U.S., the purchase of foreign goods and affinity for new gadgets has more to do with a history of domestic consumerism, than with an enlightened global mentality (United Nations Development Programme Report, 1998; Robbins, 2005).

Higher scorers actually advocated the benefits of developing countries taking part in the global economy, as exemplified by this quote:

“I honestly believe that global economics from open markets is a solution that would eventually make life on earth better for everyone. Imported products are part of the mechanism that can rebalance the wealth and health of many nations. The quality of the products will be decided by consumers and those companies that value their customers will find ways to integrate duality into their operations and products. I have purchased furniture from China, Italian leather, clothes from Thailand and Malaysia, snow skis from Germany, electronics from Japan and two motorcycles from Japan.”

(R1) Similarly, there appears to be no relationship between willingness to adopt new technologies (Q12) and the acceptance level of the GLC. Top scorers tended to be later adopters of technology. The one exception, R15, who characterized himself as a “gadget freak,” headed a Research and Development Division, so it is not surprising that he took the first unit to roll off his company’s production line.
Ninety-three percent of the respondents named work experience as a contributor to leadership skill, followed by role models (67%) and natural ability (60%). Respondents often associated age with work experience, both positively and negatively. On the positive side, experience comes with age and it is therefore difficult to isolate one from the other: “Now at 55, I’m wise because of my experience enabled by my youth” (R5, Q6). Age also brings mellowness: “I care about people, have more compassionate soft skills versus when I was younger and more goal, task, work driven.” (R6, Q6).

Conversely, two respondents said their age worked against them. One, in his mid-30’s, “I’m considered too young” (R9). Another, in his early 40’s, said, “I look younger than my years; it’s a hindrance. I look too youthful. It’s harder to garner respect” (R14). The latter two quotes are consistent with Americans’ experiences in high-distance cultures, where age and experience are valued and deferred to. Contrast that with Americans who tend to be more egalitarian and where it is not unusual for younger men to be managing their elders (House, 2004; Jung & Yammarino, 2001).
Three respondents rank ordered their responses.

* * characterized it as “natural instinct: the ability to read others, to be tuned into the feelings, thinking of others, emotional intelligence.”

* *** attributed religion to instilling a strong work ethic.

*1 “teaching others”

*2 “core values” (not religiously based)

*3 “exposure to and immersion in foreign cultures”

*4 “birth order” (respondent was the “youngest of nine and the family peacemaker”)

*5 “hard work, drive, motivation, desire to achieve, fear of failure”

Table 8  

| Likert Scores (from high to low) and Sources of Leadership Skills (respondent self reports) |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Respondent (M/F) | M15 | M8  | M13 | M10 | M7  | M1  | F11 | M12 | F5  | F6  | R9  | M3  | M4  | M2  | R14 | Total |
| Likert Score       | 5.13| 5.00| 5.00| 5.00| 4.63| 4.14| 4.00| 4.00| 3.86| 3.86| 3.63| 3.63| 3.13| 3.00| 2.75|
| Work Experience    | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 1   | •   | •   | 3   | •   | •   | 2   |     | 14  |
| Natural Ability    | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 1   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 1   |     | 9   |
| Role Models        | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 2   | •   | •   | 2   | •   | •   |     |     | 11  |
| Formal Training    | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   | 3   | •   | •   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 7   |
| Age                | •   | •   | •   | •   | 4   | •   | •   | •   | •   | •   |     |     |     | 2   | 6   |
| Religion           |     | •   | •   | •   | 5   | •   | •   | •   |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3   |
| Other              | •   | •   | •   | 1   | •   | •   | •   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5   |

Notes.

Three respondents rank ordered their responses.

* * characterized it as “natural instinct: the ability to read others, to be tuned into the feelings, thinking of others, emotional intelligence.”

* *** attributed religion to instilling a strong work ethic.

*1 “teaching others”

*2 “core values” (not religiously based)

*3 “exposure to and immersion in foreign cultures”

*4 “birth order” (respondent was the “youngest of nine and the family peacemaker”)

*5 “hard work, drive, motivation, desire to achieve, fear of failure”
Two of the four highest scoring respondents consistently listed work experience, natural ability and role models as contributing to their leadership and a third respondent later recounted a story in which he was influenced by a role model, so one might infer that a role model did have some impact on him.

The five highest scoring respondents shared a deep immersion in foreign cultures, coupled with intense curiosity, which some respondents characterized as natural ability: “World experience... a little natural ability in that you have to have a sense of adventure, curiosity, always want to learn, open to new experiences. You might be able to condition people for this but...” (R5, Q5) and “living overseas... [I] got to bridge the culture gap, recognize it, size it up, and [figure out] the best way to bridge it” (R10, Q5), and “work experience and natural instincts: being able to read others. I was at my last company (foreign-owned) for 13 years. I’m a good listener, [I’m] tuned to the feelings and thinking of others. I’m highly analytical in [an] Emotional Intelligence way, not in engineering type of analytical [way]” (R15, Q5).

Knowingly or not, one respondent demonstrated a capacity to transfer a transactional leadership quality (knowing what followers want and using it to provide incentives) (Hartog, et al., 1999): “Leaders need to take the time to understand who they’re dealing with, even domestically. If you take the time to understand, you get more results. Can’t cookie cut. People are motivated by different things. I had to figure out best reward. At [my] company there was an Indian and a Russian. The Indian was motivated by more time off for his family, the Russian by money because he wanted a new house.
I'm big on understanding my team. I take one-on-one time... I have to figure out how to motivate them and keep them happy” (R6).

Internal Analysis of the Survey Data

Following Spencer and Spencer’s methodology (1993), the responses of the highest scorers were analyzed for evidence of superior or effective functioning and compared with those of respondents who scored lower on the Likert scale.

The top five scoring respondents articulated the capacity for complex thinking beyond that expressed by the others. For instance, they responded to the question about global business challenges (Q7) from an economic domain and a leadership or management domain as well as demonstrating the ability to see and appreciate the Big (global) Picture (for instance, R10 & R15, Q7). Lower functioning respondents tended to be much more parochial in both their responses and their concerns (for instance, R3, Q7). Further, Respondent 15 articulated a capacity to recognize and respond to situational demands from a cross-cultural perspective, not simply a business or mono-cultural perspective: “Japan is different from France and Italy. We can yell at each other. In Japan, you can’t. In Japan, I had to talk about the good of the company, not my own needs; the approach is more quiet.” Respondent 13 demonstrated both Silverthorne’s (2000) argument that situational leadership lends itself to global applications, and Adler’s (1991) argument for the need for a capacity to think and act beyond one’s own culture when he said he could not apply a peanut butter approach to all situations: “[Need to] understand perspective and point of view. We take things for granted in our own culture.”
Similarly, the higher functioning respondents’ stories demonstrated their capacity to recognize the strategic value of cultural competence. For instance, Respondent 10: “Learn the language. Always try to learn the language. It’s a phenomenal benefit to forge relationships. In Asia they have to respect your ability. Language is a signal that you take this seriously. It really worked for me.” Respondent 15: “Try to learn enough history about the country to make the hosts feel comfortable. I have a natural curiosity and I ask a lot of questions. It always made people feel good. I’m a bit of an expert on Japanese history, so in Hiroshima I talked about the castle, etc. I demonstrated that I knew about it. That softened them up and helped in negotiations. In Japan, human relations are so important. If you don’t show this interest/sensitivity, they will negotiate very hard against you.”

Language competence is also an indicator of cross-cultural competence. The fact that English is the language of business tends to mask cultural differences because it is easy for Americans to assume that the English spoken by their foreign counterparts means the same thing (Schermerhorn, 1997). Most respondents recognized that language pitfalls exist. For instance, “it is important to be sure I’ve listened. Many have poor English skills; they often don’t say what they meant” (R9, Q6) or “Language, accents, idioms: the Queen’s English” (R7, Q7).

Other respondents clearly understood the value of language proficiency. For example, “I think it helps if you understand the language. [The] vast majority of my staff speaks English. Many times I let the meetings go in Spanish. [It’s
a] short coming in me...if you give me complex technological issue, I can handle it but from a language point of view my brain doesn’t work as well. Corporation doesn’t do as good a job as it should. They should send people to learn language before they give them an assignment.” Or R12 (Q16),

Or Respondent 1:

“We were in a training session on negotiating with Chinese partners. The leader of the Chinese delegation told us during the 2nd day of training about his secret advantage in the negotiations. He simply asked if we knew what he was doing while our comments were being translated from English into Chinese. His advantage was that he spoke excellent English and during the translation time, he could be developing his reply. The time advantage that gave him was significant, however, hearing the message twice – once in English and once in Chinese was even greater because it made the message much clearer. Understanding that a partner may possess advantages based on their culture is an awareness that is very valuable” (Q10)

However, measuring the degree to which respondents understand the implications of language fluency would require a more targeted survey question construction. This will be addressed further in the survey limitations discussion.

Respondents 8, 10, 13, and 15 also demonstrated an understanding of the cultural values and needs in Asia—the importance of competence and relationship together. Contrast them with Respondent 14, the lowest scoring, who dismissed cultural curiosity:

“I’m there to do business.” It is significant to note that this respondent has some
awareness that his lack of interest has hampered him, "It probably goes back to upbringing on the farm. No exposure to the outside world... I'm a rural, white boy; I struggle with it. It's limited my success."

While R14's comment, "I'm there to do business," was an obvious example of global leadership deficiency; the sentiment was not uncommon in the respondents scoring in the 3-4 range. Their responses indicated competence in leveraging basic sophisticated stereotyping to accomplish business goals, but they were always speaking from their own cultural reference points, as evidenced by their responses to the question, "In what ways have you changed your point of view based on culture in a negotiation with an international supplier/customer?" (Q10). American respondents spoke in terms of tactics: slowing down in order to give foreigners more time to come around, rather than actually experiencing their viewpoint being changed (R2, R7, & R14). Two respondents allowed that they had been "enlightened" (R4) or their "perspective [had been] altered" (R7).

The focus on accomplishing business goals highlights one of the most common cross-cultural frictions: the Western tendency to disregard the importance of relationships in the conduct of business abroad, particularly in Asia (R3, Q10). The concept of relationship is known in China as "guanxi." Chin, et al., used the concept of "guanxi" to demonstrate the lack of cultural competence Westerners exhibit when doing business with the Chinese (p. 29).

For Chinese people, establishing good relationships, which means not jumping right into the conduct of business, is an investment in the relationship for the long-term. By contrast, Americans want to get in and out, depending instead upon carefully worded contracts to protect their future interests, both of which insult Chinese people, thus
rendering them mistrustful of their American counterparts. Conversely, Americans often believe that the Chinese emphasis on relationship is inappropriate, bordering on nepotism. From the American point of view, “they cannot be trusted because they will help their friends” (Chin, p. 29). From the Chinese point of view, “they cannot be trusted because they would not even help a friend” (Chin, p. 29). This is the experience of R14. On the one hand, he sees himself as “just there to do business” on the other, he experiences the Chinese as not trustworthy: “They have a different viewpoint: they’re out to eat our lunch; they are not collaborative, they will sell their soul to get U.S. business.” That is to say, the Chinese are not behaving according to his concept of an appropriate business relationship. He barely realizes that his failure to attend to the needs of his counterparts to build a relationship on the front end, contributes to their subsequent behavior towards him.

By contrast, the highest scoring respondent, R15, demonstrated competence at the acceptance/internalization level of the GLC model in a comment he made about the Japanese: “Human relations are so important. If you don’t show this interest/sensitivity, they will negotiate very hard against you” (emphasis added). His is an example of an integration of cultural awareness and savvy beyond the sophisticated stereotyping that characterizes elementary level cross-cultural training. As leaders develop higher level competence they are able to recognize and decipher cultural paradoxes. They have the capacity to link schemas to varying cultural contexts (Osland & Bird, 2000). Schermerhorn (1997) describes it as a capacity to be a cultural relativist, fashioning meaning from the cultures with which one is engaged rather than depending upon North
American cultural mores to build a global leadership model. R15 exemplifies the capacity for situational leadership (Silverthorne, 2000; Chin, et al., 2001)

The above example also illustrates another point: the human tendency for cultural norms to go unexamined (Adler, 1991). Americans are low-power distance (Hofstede, 1980; House, 2004), and more egalitarian; they tend to label their experiences with guanxi as nepotism (Chin, 2001; Pye, 1995), but within American culture, equivalent phenomena are not always similarly labeled. Witness our current President’s access to Yale as a young man despite mediocre grades, or the current spate of Washington, D.C. beltway controversies involving Representative Tom DeLay. What makes DeLay’s activities acceptable, or not? When is leveraging relationships bad or good? Who is the arbiter and by what “objective” standards will any of these behaviors be judged? For that matter, how does one define “objectivity”?

Adler (1991) states that our own culture becomes the “self-reference criterion: since no other culture is identical to our own, we judge all other cultures as inferior” (p. 83). Chin, et al., quote DeGeorge (1995) who said, “It is arrogant to assume that American ways of acting are the only morally correct ways or permissible ways of conducting business” (p. 29). The culturally competent leader recognizes cultural dilemmas, understands the inherent paradoxes, and has the capacity to manage and lead accordingly (Schermerhorn, 1997).

Osland (2000) argues that it is a given of cross-border relations that expatriate leaders will be confronted with cultural paradoxes and moral dilemmas such as the above. The language capabilities, extended sojourns abroad, and willing immersion in other
cultures coupled with the curiosity about and knowledge of foreign cultures exhibited by the top-scoring respondents was a clear contrast to the lower-scoring respondents.

Conclusions

The GLC model is useful in conceptualizing cross-cultural competencies required of global leaders. Bueno’s survey, while well-intended, had serious methodological flaws. However, the Likert scale proved useful in addressing the question, “what contributes to global leadership?” The Likert scale generated data, which through primary and secondary analysis, indicated that a substantive combination of 1) attitude (positive disposition toward and curiosity about people and things that are difference from oneself, including the capacity to objectify one’s own experience as being one perspective among many, and 2) meaningful immersion or exposure to foreign cultures contributes to the development of cross-cultural competence among leaders.

Comparison of Survey Data with GLOBE Findings

Because the GLOBE study is the most comprehensive research to date on the topic of culture, leadership and organizations, it is important to compare these survey findings with that of GLOBE study. Respondent data were consistent with the GLOBE findings in several respects.

First, 80% of respondents were representative of the U.S., an individualistic, low-to-moderate power-distance culture. The tendency was to expect their foreign counterparts to have a team orientation coupled with respectfulness and responsiveness, which are characteristics of collectivist and high-power-distance followers, but which
differ from U.S. concepts of team orientation. Osland (2000) asserts that when two
cultural dimensions exist simultaneously, as they often do, one tends to trump the other:
the high-power-distance dimension will suppress participation, causing foreign workers
to remain silent and deferential.

The second consistency concerned communication. The GLOBE researchers
argued that because of the diversity of cultural dimensions global leaders must become
highly effective at cross-cultural communication. While all 15 respondents of this survey
articulated an understanding of the need for active listening and other basic
communication skills, U.S. cultural idiosyncrasies relative to what constitutes effective
communication were evident. For Americans, effective communication is direct, using
explicit language including facts, figures and rational thinking (Javidan & House, 2001).
Respondent R9 was indicative of this: “Repeat back. And I communicate in the common
language: financials” (emphasis added). In other words, R9 depended upon rather
elementary communications tactics and on numbers to work around language barriers.

Therefore American leaders who have had basic cross-cultural training and expect
to gather the opinions of their hosts will be confounded by the tendency toward silence,
particularly in public meetings. Schermerhorn (1997) concurs; “North American leaders
must understand that feedback in collectivist high power distance societies will be more
muted and indirect than they have been culturally conditioned to expect” (p. 8). The
study findings support this. For example, Respondent 2 recounts, “[the] lack of
transparency within the workforce and the ability for people to push back and express
themselves. They are of a culture to do whatever the boss says regardless of the
consequences. They also tell you what you want to hear as opposed to telling you the reality of the situation."

Similarly, Respondent 7 recognized that his foreign counterparts were less willing to share feedback with their superiors (high power distance): "the real challenge is when it's a company-wide position and non-negotiable. You have to be sensitive. For instance the company I'm with now... in Asia-Pacific, subordinates are uncomfortable giving feedback to bosses about the performance management system. [For example,] 'Sorry that won't work here.'"

The study data, while exploratory and directional are consistent with the GLOBE findings, particularly in illustrating the U.S. cultural construct of individuality, and the importance of communication in the process of cross-cultural understanding and competence.

Discussion

With their Global Leadership Competency model, Chin and her colleagues address cross-cultural leadership from the perspective of cross-cultural literacy. They argue that cross-cultural literacy is a necessary competence among other required leadership competences. The GLOBE research supports Chin, et al., by demonstrating that because cultural dimensions vary widely, cross-cultural literacy is required of global leaders today (Javidan & House, 2001).

Attributes of transformational leadership are universally endorsed across cultures as contributing to outstanding leadership (Hartog), but, because of cultural differences, their enactment will differ. For example, because cultural groups have different conceptions of
leadership, different leadership prototypes can be expected and the evaluation and meaning of leader behaviors and characteristics may vary widely. Further, the actual behaviors indicative of universally endorsed attributes will be different in different cultures, including serving different purposes (Hartog, et al., 1999).

Today more than ever technical skill is not sufficient for the global leader. It must be accompanied by the possession of some combination of universal leadership characteristics as well as the skilled application of culture-specific attributes. Cross-cultural leadership requires integration of complex factors such as appropriate transformational leadership dimensions, emotional intelligence and cultural literacy (Osland & Bird, 2000).

Chin, et al.'s focus was on the importance of cross-cultural literacy. The GLOBE study results support Chin and her colleague’s argument and go further by identifying the cultural dimensions required for that literacy. As Higgs contends, cross-cultural literacy has become a necessary “area of competence” (p. 277) for the global leader. Adler (1991), makes the case that the “capacity to anticipate future behavior depends on capacity to understand how others model the world” (p. 313).

The GLOBE researchers definitively demonstrated that there are universal and specific cultural dimensions; it is not either - or; it is both. Wise leaders follow the advice of the ancients’ – Buddha, Confucius, and Socrates – seek a middle way. Any virtue becomes a liability when overplayed. It is so with leadership: there is no single right way; there are no universal qualities which operate alone.
Limitations of the Current Research

The literature search was comprehensive and exhaustive. However, the survey portion of the study had a number of limitations. The sample was small and was not randomly selected. Furthermore, 60% were American-born and 80% were men. Clearly, a more diverse sample would have yielded more generalizable results; the data consisted of self-reports of survey respondents and as such, have inherent limitations, but are not in and of themselves unreliable. An existing questionnaire was employed so that results could be compared with those of previous studies. However, Bueno’s questionnaire proved problematic because each question was considered an indicator of a specific developmental level of the GLC model. Because of time constraints, the survey could not be discarded: thus, the creation of the Likert scale. Future testing of the GLC model would require construction of a new survey carefully tailored to measure the specific developmental levels in the model.

Question construction was also problematic. Several questions were awkwardly worded, particularly Question 15. It may be that Bueno was not a native speaker of English. Testing and cross-translation of the questions for clarity would be required prior to future use. The researcher erred in dropping the question mid-sample. Any further research would require careful question pre-testing and validation before use.

A third issue was that the survey questions were not constructed with a Likert scale methodology in mind, so they did “fit” as they would have had the questions been constructed around the scale. For instance, question 13, “How comfortable are you negotiating with a foreign supplier/customer compared with a domestic one?” is a closed ended question. It required much probing on the part of the interviewer to get data that
could be evaluated along the competence continuum. For example, does a respondent feel “very comfortable” negotiating with a foreign counterpart because they are a worldly global citizen or because they are too ignorant to discern the nuances of culture? The preferred solution would have been to rewrite the survey questions to more accurately reflect the researcher’s interests.

Further, eliciting the degree to which respondents understand the implications of factors such as language fluency would require a more targeted survey with open-ended questions and instructions for interviewers to probe. The subject of cross-cultural leadership is so complex that it requires quantitative methods and qualitative methods in order to generate a rich database of respondent stories.

Future testing of the GLC model would benefit from a qualitative approach combined with quantitative assessments of survey respondents by their direct reports to compare actual leader behaviors with self-reported data.

A final limitation of the survey is that it was not designed to control for other variables that might have an impact on leader competence.

Future Study Directions

The GLC model offers an interesting perspective worthy of further study, namely that cross-cultural literacy is necessary for effective global leadership. In addition, with their model, Chin and her colleagues have begun to delve deeper into the nature of cross-cultural literacy. Future research involving the GLC model would entail detailed analysis of the developmental levels of the model, including the identification of behavioral indicators.
A third area of study requiring an extensive empirical effort is to address the question, "Are leaders who display the culturally endorsed leadership qualities of their followers actually more effective?" and "by what standards or measures?"

A fourth area of study would be to examine selection criteria for desirable global literacy qualities. While there is probably sufficient research to support the efficacy of implementing some of the above training suggestions, more research is recommended, particularly with regard to the nature of the 21st century global corporation.

It is clear from the literature search that the topic of cross-cultural leadership is extremely complex. There are many factors that contribute to leadership success or failure. Further, human beings are difficult to study in a systematic way. This topic will require research from many perspectives and many levels of system.

Recommendations

The most important recommendations resulting from this research concern global human resource management. The globalization of business requires the globalization of the human resource function, quite possibly a complete overhaul of the concept of the human resources function. Effective and relevant global human resources functions require cross-culturally literate human resources leaders who are knowledgeable about global business operations, the cultures in which their companies operate and who are capable of examining "domestic" policies and procedures in the global context.

There are three levels of challenges. One is at the metaphysical level of strategy: what is the nature of the corporation itself in a flattening world economy? The second
level is more prosaic and concerns incremental approaches to a changing global economy. Examples of key questions to address would be:

- Does our corporation require a global mindset and if so what does that mean for this company?
- Is my company a U.S. company simply doing business abroad or are we truly a multinational corporation?
- If we are a multinational, what does that mean for our corporate culture? What does it mean for our workforce, foreign and domestic? What are appropriate policies and procedures?
- What degree of standardization is necessary to maintain corporate cultural coherence?
- To what extent is it appropriate for country culture to "trump" corporate culture and when is it necessary to "impose" corporate values?
- How do we learn to honor and incorporate a "foreign" way of doing things?
- What culture will predominate, if any? As McKenna (1998) provocatively queried, what if any standardization is required? If work is being accomplished, what does it matter how? How would fairness be evaluated across cultures given the diversity of needs, motivations and cultural morays?

The third is at the individual level of system. Coherent strategies for recruitment as well as training and development need to be developed given the global nature of business. The data suggest that recruitment strategies should include screening for people
who have already had substantive foreign exposure in their lifetimes, quite possibly from an early age so that they bring a global orientation and cross-cultural expertise to the job.

Cross-cultural training design needs to go beyond simple lists of “Dos and Don’ts” for the manager or leader going abroad. Instead, training programs need to be constructed as multi-dimensional maps and collages (Schermmerhorn, 1997; Osland, 2000) in which the intricacies of culture can be demonstrated as a mosaic and yet made meaningful by the use of examples.

For instance, Asians have a low tolerance for uncertainty compared to Americans, yet it is Americans who write lengthy and detailed contracts. How does the hapless expatriot leader make sense of this paradox? First, by understanding that knowledge is context specific; second, by accepting that culture is inherently paradoxical, including one’s own. Osland and Bird (2000) argue that once a leader accepts this notion, learning about another culture becomes dialectical – thesis, antithesis and synthesis. “Thesis entails a hypothesis involving a sophisticated stereotype; antithesis is the identification of an apparent oppositional cultural paradox. Synthesis involves making sense of contradictory behavior, for example, understanding why certain values are more important in certain contexts” (p. 73). Training design would benefit from the coherence of such an approach.

At a deeper level, training design, indeed public education, needs to integrate the latest research about diversity, emotional intelligence and adult development because the skill sets and knowledge bases required are converging and because the integrative nature of the subject requires long lead times for development to occur. Diversity and cross-cultural literacy should be introduced early in the careers of corporate managers, and be a
fully integrated aspect of any formal leadership development program. Country specific cross-cultural training might be a module in a larger development program.

Conclusion

Beyond the practical concerns of training and development this study raises a more profound question concerning the nature of global relations in the 21st century. Paradoxically, globalization is causing the world to flatten (Freidman, 2005). This is not the flat world theory of Christopher Columbus’ era, but it is just as seismic a paradigm shift. Friedman asserts that in this current era, individuals are globalizing, meaning they can and will collaborate horizontally. Global literacy will be an imperative. China and India now comprise fully one third of the world’s population and are becoming economic powerhouses in their own right. They are producing more engineers than is the U.S. while in this country there is a growing gap between our future needs and the numbers of engineers, scientists and technicians we produce (Jackson, 2002).

Leadership concepts are universal and culturally contingent. There will be more exchange across national and cultural boundaries than ever before. U.S. predominance is not a given, the sleeping giants of Indians and the Chinese are awake and their participation in the global scene will increasingly inform the nature and function of the world. Embracing cultural diversity, not as an intellectual exercise but as a way of life is crucial. As “developing” nations become “developed” nations, so to will the need for individual competence. As Friedman (2005) contends, we have gone from countries globalizing in the three centuries of colonialism to companies globalizing in the 20th
century to *individuals* globalizing in the 21st. Personal mastery will be required as never before.
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APPENDIX A – CONSENT FORM

Is Leadership Universal Across Cultures?

Dear ..., 

I would like to invite you to participate in my thesis research study. I am currently a student at Cleveland State University and am conducting my thesis research as part of the requirements for the Master's in Organizational Psychology.

The purpose of this thesis is to explore cross-cultural leadership competencies, specifically to ask the question what qualities, if any, are universal across cultures and which are situational or cultural-based? I am using the global leadership competencies (GLC) questionnaire developed by Chin, Gu and Tubbs, which was published in The Journal of Leadership Studies, Winter/Spring, (2001), p.20-31. This thesis is intended to advance the research knowledge on this subject.

In addition to a literature search, the primary source of new data will be information collected through interviews. The participants in the study will be individuals who have been active in international business. The interview consists of fifteen questions and it will gather information about your international experience. The interview will be conducted by phone and will take between 30-45 minutes. The information will be kept in a locked drawer in my house and computer files will be protected by password. There is no foreseeable risk in your participation.

The interview notes themselves will be erased/destroyed immediately after transcription or following completion of the study. This informed consent form, with your real name, will be matched with the data and your participation will be kept confidential. No information other than your answers aggregated with all the study respondents will be reported. Your name and corporation will be kept confidential, as well as the data collected through the interview. I will be the only person handling the data. The information may be published in a scholarly paper, but no names or affiliations will be used.

If you have read and understand this information and if you agree to take part in the study please sign and date after reading the following statement:

"It is my right to withdraw at any time from completion of the study without penalty. I have read all of the above information regarding this study. The procedures and requirements have been explained to me and I understand them. I freely and voluntarily consent to be a participant. For my records, I have been provided with a copy of this consent form."

Today's Date_________ Your
Signature___________________________
Thank you for your participation. If you have any concerns about your rights as a research subject, you can contact Cleveland State University’s Review Board at 216.687.3630. If you have any questions about this study, please contact Lisa Gaynier – 734.997.8806, email: lgaynier@creativechange.biz. If you have any questions regarding the consent agreement and research protocol approval procedures please contact Dr. Deborah Plummer at 216.687.2550.

If you would like to have a copy of the study results, please indicate by checking this line.

________________________

I appreciate your time and consideration.
APPENDIX B - SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. What countries have you visited?

2. Approximately how long have you been in each of these countries?

3. What was the nature of your visits? Business? Vacationing?

4. How many languages do you speak?

5. To what do you attribute your personal leadership skill?
   a. Work experience
   b. Natural ability
   c. Role Models
   d. Formal training
   e. Age
   f. Religion
   g. Other (please specify)

6. What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?

7. What kinds of business challenges do/did you face in the global environment?

8. How do you handle conflicts with an international partner?

9. In what ways have you shown your curiosity about different aspects of history, languages, systems, and so on regarding an international customer/supplier?

10. In what ways have you changed your point of view based on culture in a negotiation with an international supplier/customer? Please give examples.

11. How do you feel about the idea of having imported products in the market? What do you think about their quality? What imported products do you buy?

12. How do you feel about new concepts/trends? Do you like to follow them? (For example: palm pilot, digital camera, or DVD player.)

13. How comfortable are you negotiating with a foreign supplier/customer compared to a domestic one?

14. In what ways do you believe that leaders can use knowledge about cultural value differences to become more effective leaders? (For example, recognizing person’s national values.)

15. What are the lessons and innovations to be learned around the world?

16. Is there anything else you would like to say about the lessons you have learned in your international experiences?
APPENDIX C – TEXT OF GLC COMPETENCIES


Ignorance

As individuals begin to interact with those from another culture, impressions begin to form and, in many cases, bonds begin to develop. Institutions of learning, corporations and enterprises, both in the East and West seem to know the importance of international exchanges. They are also aware of the fact that most international activity now demands a cadre of personnel capable of operating easily with people from a variety of cultures, and that labor and management are both deficient in skills required of global business leadership. However, how many organizations have really invested in developing those competencies? Fewer than 8 percent of U.S. colleges and universities require knowledge of a foreign language for admission. Fewer than 5 percent of America's prospective teachers take any courses in international subjects as part of their professional training. While most Asian countries seem to fare better in regard to language requirements and international subjects compared to America, they are not making investments in seriously learning the American culture (the mindset, the philosophical underpinnings) of which the English language is only a part. Hardly any business delegations from Asia visiting the States attend cross-cultural training programs before departure. American businesses, however, do seem to be more willing to make that kind of investment. Sanchez, et. al., (2000) refer to building this level of awareness as the "Novice stage" when going to a foreign country. They write that, "Expatriates from individualistic societies should be
reminded that the lengthy social interactions observed in collectivistic cultures are not a waste of time, but a necessary conduit to doing business. Executives from collectivistic cultures transplanted to an individualistic one may make the opposite mistake." (p. 102). At this level there tends to be some recognition of superficial cultural differences such as "Asians are more formal," and "North Americans are more informal." Emphasis is on the basis of commonality in ethnocentric terms (i.e., everyone is essentially like us). It may also adopt the blame approach (we are underdeveloped, because we were once colonized). At this level of competence, individuals may be aware of different cultures, but may still experience a significant degree of unconscious denial as well as ethnocentrism. They may also experience a certain degree of discounting the value of the other culture. If their culture is so good, why do they have so much violence in the streets?

Understanding

At this level of competence, individuals begin to exhibit some conscious effort to learn why people are the way they are and why people do what they do. At this level people display interest in the history, psychology, and evolution of value systems, as well as in the environmental factors contributing to the makeup of a distinctive culture. Also at this level, individuals begin to develop some sense of the other culture and develop some tolerance of the new ways of doing things. Tolerance in this case means able to tolerate. There still exists a strong preference for one's own culture. Sanchez, et. al. (2000) refer to this as the "transition stage." We might add that this is the early transition stage.
Appreciation

At this level, individuals begin to take a "leap of faith" and experience a genuine tolerance of different points of view. Not just "putting up with" the other culture, but a genuine appreciation and, in some cases, preference for certain aspects of the new culture. There is no intent to denigrate or belittle the other culture. On the contrary, this stage sees alternative ways of living and alternative business practices and decision-making processes as viable. It is a mindset that allows individuals to see things from the other point of view. However, appreciation still tends to remain somewhat at a friendly distance (i.e., arms length). For example, "Look, these Asian farmers are engaged in back-breaking rice seedling transplantation. They are a hard working people. We are so fortunate to live in a highly mechanized society." We might refer to this as the middle transition stage in this developmental process.

Acceptance/Internalization

This is the later transition stage. At this level the possibility of interaction between cultures increases appreciably. People are more sophisticated both in terms of recognizing commonalities and in terms of effectively dealing with differences. At this level individuals begin to value and embrace their understanding of the new culture. This is a departure from the ethnocentric notion that "my way is the best way and the only way." It is the beginning of a realization that diversity, globalism, and competition from overseas are real. For example, it took about a decade for the U.S. auto industry to accept the idea that the Japanese quality systems sets an example to be emulated and that competition can have a positive impact. At this level, individuals having tried something
new need to reflect, to digest, to analyze and to evaluate. Internalization is the stage in which one's experience and learning is validated. It is a time to celebrate the true transformation that is taking place. Once people begin to appreciate other cultures, they may also begin to see that there are some universal values that apply to some degree across cultures:

- Universal Values
- Honesty
- Hard work
- Trust
- Integrity
- Persistence
- Courage
- Kindness
- Love
- Generosity
- Concern
- Patience
- Tolerance

Transformation

At this stage globalization becomes a way of life. It is internalized to the degree that it is out of one's own volition. The process having become more or less completed, one's behavior almost becomes effortless, subconscious, and second nature. Appropriate words to describe this level are competent, fluent, balanced, broadminded, and international. One can truly be himself or herself at this level. The use of empathy or frame of reference has shifted. There is no longer fear of things that are new and different. On the contrary, there is obvious interest in trying new and different things. There is an eagerness to solve problems in the true spirit of cooperation. There is an eagerness to learn and to continue
the adaptation process. There is a Chinese proverb that says, "Learning is a treasure that will follow its owner everywhere." Similarly, the late B.F. Skinner from Harvard University said that, "Education is what is left when everything that you have been taught is forgotten." In other words, you have become irrevocably transformed. Sanchez, et. al. (2000) refer to this level as the "mastery stage." They state that this stage is illustrated by the following. "Armed with the dual experience of having lived and worked both abroad and at home, expatriates are capable of seeing one culture through the eyes of the other. The ability to understand the cultural paradox that surrounds them, represents the pinnacle of ... executive transformation." (p. 103).

The world has become a marketplace of ideas without a clear-cut borderline (your culture vs. my culture, your product vs. my product); much in the same way the Internet operates. Total Quality Management has become a universal language. However, it is important to point out that globalization does not mean uniformity. True integration is highly selective. Asian countries will remain highly "affiliation-oriented," and Western nations will continue to stress the virtues of individualism. Differences are not seen as threats, but rather as strengths, hence the need to "localize" even as we talk about globalization.
APPENDIX D – LIKERT SCALE CODED RESPONSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Scale</th>
<th>Likert Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Note: Questions 1-4, 11, 12 are demographics questions so are not subject to the Likert Scale. Question 15 was pulled because respondents did not understand it. The scale covers Questions 6-10 and 13-16.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondent 1 Score: 29(7) = 4.14**

**Q6:** What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from a different country/culture)? How?

While in China we held cross-cultural training sessions and discovered that the Values we shared in-common became the basis for developing relationships with people from differing cultures. Having an open mind and finding value in the opinion or comments of others is a significant benefit. Understand that it is OK for people to think different than you do and their diversity can be the cornerstone to a successful business. Without them, you can not sustain a Company or Operation.

**Q7:** What kinds of business challenges do/did you face in the global
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8: How do you handle conflicts with an international partner?</td>
<td>R1: This is a much tougher question than you might imagine. Conflict resolution is first attempted on an individual level. If that is not possible, you resort to the typical chain-of-command and if that does not work, it is important to have a Governance Committee to assure resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9: In what ways have you shown your curiosity about different aspects of history, languages, systems, and so on regarding an international customer/supplier?</td>
<td>R1: One of the best ways to learn about any culture is through the Language and the food. By studying the language, you also learn about Customs and their background. It's amazing how many times you discover something significant about the people through understanding even a little of the Language. Another way to endear yourself to a...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
different society is to truly enjoy the Foods that they like and it gives you a lot to talk about!

Q10: In what ways have you changed your point of view based on culture in a negotiation with an international supplier/customer? Please give examples.

R1: We were in a Training session on Negotiating with Chinese Partners. The leader of the Chinese Delegation told us during the 2nd day of training about his secret advantage in the negotiations. He simply asked if we knew what he was doing while our comments were being translated from English into Chinese. His advantage was that he spoke excellent English and during the Translation time, he could be developing his reply. The time advantage that gave him was significant, however, hearing the message Twice – once in English and once in Chinese was even greater because it made the message much clearer. Understanding that a Partner may possess advantages based on their culture is an awareness that is very valuable.

Q13: How comfortable are you negotiating with a foreign supplier/customer compared to a domestic one?

R1: It is much easier to negotiate domestically because of common
language and similarities of customs that allow you to anticipate how the process will progress. With foreign negotiations, you always think you are missing something because the values are different. For that reason, there is uncertainty if you arrived with an equitable solution.

Q14: In what ways do you believe that leaders can use knowledge about cultural value differences to become more effective leaders? (For example, recognizing person’s national values.)

R1: The greatest value leaders can provide their business is the appreciation of diversity. Recognizing people from different cultures is only part of the sustainability needed to compete globally. A company that deeply understands the nature of a culture can appeal to their values in unique ways that can provide them with extraordinary satisfaction.

Q16: Is there anything else you would like to say about the lessons you have learned in your international experiences?

R1: The most valuable international experiences I've had were a direct result of working together with other people for a common goal. While the goal itself was the reason for our cooperation, it was the personal value of the interaction with each person using their creative skills and
talents to make a difference. The best feeling is when you make small successes and strive to achieve your common goals. I appreciate even more some of the difficulty endured by these individuals in their efforts to succeed.

Respondent 2: 21(7) = 3

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?

R2: It is important to study the culture to ensure that you have a basic understanding, learn some of the language and use it where possible; the people do appreciate this. Treat people fairly, conduct 1:1's and town hall meetings to allow the employees to get to know you and to understand your vision and direction you are planning on taking the company.

Q7: What kinds of business challenges do/did you face in the global environment?

R2: Lack of transparency within the workforce and the ability for people to push back and express themselves. They are of a culture to do
whatever the boss says regardless of the consequences. They also tell you what you want to hear as opposed to telling you the reality of the situation.

Q8: How do you handle conflicts with an international partner?

R2: Listening, reacting to their issues and gaining their confidence are important. Understanding the cultural sensitivities and how to handle conflict is important as it is different depending on the culture you are dealing with.

Q9:

R2: I utilize the local staff to provide me with sayings, local greetings, and areas of importance in advance of making presentations or meeting with individuals that I feel it may be important to realize. In many of the cultures I am dealing with saving face is of utmost importance. With this in mind I ensure that I openly treat people with the utmost respect regardless of the status of their position relative to mine.

Q10:

R2: I have found that negotiations are similar in the Asian culture to that of North America. Understand those that you will negotiate with, establish a trust and negotiate win / win scenarios with integrity. It is
also important to do the networking in advance to understand who you are dealing with and the hot points to be aware of. Particularly where there is history in the relationship, both good and bad.

Q13:
R2: I am very comfortable. (Note: Iwer had no opportunity to probe. This respondent responded in writing from overseas.)

Q14:
R2: It is important to understand your audience before you attempt to change them into what you are. They need to feel you are sensitive to their culture and I find it is important to communicate effectively the merit of change from what they are comfortable with and gain their support as a local nationals can be very disruptive if you do not gain their trust and co-operation.

Q16:
R2: Many foreign markets place a great deal of value and respect on leadership. You must never forget the esteem that is placed on leadership in many foreign markets vs. a traditional North American environment. You are very carefully watched and your leadership will be monitored very closely. Leadership skills must be positively
displayed by yourself and your leadership team in every thing you say and do.

Respondent 3 score: 29(8) = 3.63

Note: this respondent has extensive experience abroad both with the CIA and multinational corporations. He digressed and editorialized a lot. Was very critical of parochialism of American business.

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?

R3:
Getting individuals to continue to elaborate. Keep probing especially when response is negative – more in cross cultural situations. Listen more carefully. Speak more precisely.

Q7: What kinds of business challenges do/did you face in the global environment?

R3: Profit and competitiveness. Corp. Organization development’s role then was in a $1 billion business which was losing money. We had to turn it around. I laid the groundwork with the General Manager. Identified steps to reverse the trend and figured out how to align all levels of the organization to do and support. PROBE: Any Others?
our Global European operations there were separate profit centers. We moved to a shared service center (e.g., credit and billing paying to save money and get more efficient. The exact opposite occurred. On another: RE places where we had one business in individual markets, we had to decide whether to make them worldwide or leave them in their own regions. How global should we be? Should we have four marketing directors worldwide or one? As far as intercultural work: we had Belgium and America shared target setting. There were lots of cross-cultural issues.

Q8: How do you handle conflicts with an international partner?
R3: Same way as with anybody. Understand where they are coming from. Look for common ground. Re pricing discrepancies between countries, there was conflict between what’s right for the business units (parochial) versus what’s right for the corporation.

Q9:
R3: Not applicable to my job. PROBE: I interface with counterparts.
I’m a history major. Always probing to see what it’s like there. E.G., in E. Germany I talked with the East Blockers. People enjoy sharing their stories. I’ll try the local food & drink.

Q10:
R3: I've experience some resistance when I'm implementing new initiatives. The common expression is “typical American, didn’t listen, wanted people to do what he wanted.” So I listened -- what’s the right way to do it? What makes sense here? One size fits all doesn’t make sense. Now especially, the company uses involvement from all parts of the world. Some people still don’t get it. It takes more time (in other countries).

Q13:

R3: E.g., In Belgium they said, we’re better than U.S... My initial response was how do you know that? I was counseled not to say that. People with foreign experience have more balance: they can see that U.S. does this better, and Belgians do that better. Minds are opened up (from foreign experience).

Q14:

R3: Effective leaders need to understand followers’ more; more they understand cultural differences they can influence/direct them better. Meet the workers where they are. For example, if he’s Belgian or French: you barter or more are directive (depending on who you’re dealing with).
Q16:

R3: Most people in the U.S. could use international exposure.

Americans are narrow and un-accepting of others. They don’t care about ex-patriot experience. We are a narrow culture, quite parochial.

Bush – (started complaining about Bush).

Respondent 4 score: 25(8) = 3.13

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?

R4:

Formal program on leadership development (w/ the company) it was very influential. Focused on Asian cultures. Sent 18 to China for an action learning project. PROBE: anything else? Just travel. Backpacked alone through Europe. It forced me to meet people, stretch myself, teach them about me.

Q7: What kinds of business challenges do/did you face in the global environment?

R4: Basic business how-tos: (not) sticking foot in the mouth. Business cards, hand gestures, to integrity and ethics ($ gifts)
| Q8: | R4: One face saving. E.g., two company directors went to China. The Chinese were expecting VPs. They lost face b/c of how low-ranking the Americans were. (the meeting didn’t go well) I debriefed with subject matter experts (to understand what happened). |
| Q9: | R4: We had a licensing agreement with an Indian company. I had to go to assess their HR practices and share our Best Practices. I was there for 1 week. There were places in the plant for worship, no women. Even the administrative assistants were men. I chose language training in high school and college. I travel to other countries. |
| Q10: | R4: Enlightened me re Asian – Indian culture. There are things that don’t translate. I was stunned by the lack of technology. In Shanghai and Shujou, they’re still using an abacus and there are no phones. People come to work when there is no work and they still get paid. |
| Q13: | R4: Less comfortable with outside. I find myself rolling over. E.g., re an online system we were rolling out People soft worldwide. If I’m challenged by an IT expert in Germany, I don’t know the nuances, I
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14:</th>
<th>R4: Acknowledge differences publicly is helpful. Talk about how it impacts our work. Can learn about from differences. Kiss, Bow or Shake Hands (book). Give others an opportunity to … it takes more time than in the U.S. allow, especially in Asian countries.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16:</td>
<td>R4: I’m thankful for them, for the opportunity to travel. Most impactful [sic] business experience was abroad. E.g., India; I went when they had dengue fever. I took food and mosquito netting. It was embarrassing…. The wealth and the abject poverty. Beijing — dance. It’s helped me think more globally more strategically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondent 5 score: 27(7) = 3.86*

| Q6: | R5: Everything from bringing in a 3rd party to allowing myself to experience the difference. Acknowledge the differences and they can |
help me understand why the differences. Too many times we go
inward. Just say it out loud, open things up.

Q7:

R5: As a young female person (19-20) going abroad, there were lots of
challenges:

Gender – I couldn’t do certain things. People coming on to you. I
developed a way to respond – can’t as an American, You’re discounted
as a female, young American. R talked a lot somewhat digressive. Told
story of the Dutch white Santa w/ Black Face that dates back to the
Crusades. She had a visceral reaction found it personally abhorrent.

PROBE: business challenges? Things are more mellow, older now,
there are fewer challenges. Mostly clashes of mergers – business
cultures rather than cross cultural. E.g., in Switzerland, spouses
couldn’t work and had to adapt to the Blue Laws. Early store closings.
Westerners frustrated by work culture. People left at 4:30- 5. Felt like
we were doing the work, load and a half.

Q8:

R5: Not always successful. Sometimes they refused to work with me.

Confidants would be helpful: help me read between the lines. Got
advice. Found a confidant to coach me and act as go-between. When I
didn’t have that help, I’d try to go to discussing the “desired outcome”
R5: Company and Company both expects U.S. to go on sales calls. Social events give U.S. exposure. E.g. company bought a UK company. They were importing a cheese called “coon”. DIG. We had to tell them it would be very offensive in the U.S. market.

Q10:

R5: RE works Council. Euro/SA (Brazil) unions. In U.S., the contract spells out the terms. In (European) Work Council nothing is written. You don’t feel grounded. They are more vitriolic in Europe, but at 4:30 you stop and go out to the bar... It was hard for me. It was an accommodation.

Q13:

R5: It’s the same. I hate both. That’s why I’m in HR.

Q14:

R5: To drive innovation. B/c it’s broader, enhance perspective. Think out of the box. Have an outer view rather than an internal view: customer/supplier/product centric. When you have assignments outside your own playground, makes you better able to make connections (synapses).
R5: Not everyone is capable of “it” – can’t adapt to different culture. If as leaders we decide people must have international experience, we’ll compel some people to fail. Some cannot adapt. How can I encourage innovation so that person is adaptable? That’s why Tops get renamed so many times – more palatable.

Respondent 6 score: 27(7) = 3.86

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?

R6: Ask a lot of questions. I want to understand what I’m up against. Take time to understand. Get 1:1 time. Learn processes, cultures before jumping in.

Q7:

R6: In Brazil so slow. They do things when they get around to it (vs. 6 month time frame). I micro-manage the trades. In Sydney the biggest challenge was male chauvinism. They weren’t listening. It was their issue more than mine. I was patient.
R6: It depends. In Brazil/Venezuela, I lay down the law. Subs are easy to find. In Sydney need to take time to understand the problem get at underlying issues. I had no problems in N. Z.

Q9:
R6: Don’t think I did. Didn’t take the time. Focused on work only, not curious in other respects.

Q10:
R6: I’m more open-minded, sensitive about what up against and their culture. Can’t cookie cut overseas. Need to understand the different cultures.

Q13:
R6: Harder work. Negotiate what need to do. Keep culture in mind – think of them at the same time. Integrity and ethics are different. In Brazil payoffs are expected. It serves a purpose from their perspective, but it’s not ethical for my company. I’m not one to judge. That’s the way it’s done in their country.

Q14:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>R6: Leaders need to take the time to understand who they’re dealing with even domestically. If take the time to understand, you get more results. Can’t cookie cut. People are motivated by different things. Had to figure out best reward. At (my) company there was an Indian and a Russian. The Indian was motivated by more time off for his family, the Russian by money b/c he wanted a new house. I’m big on understanding my team. I take one on one time. I’ve only been here four months. I have to figure out how to motivate them and keep them happy. They grow the business.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Q16:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R6: Not really. R reiterated things she had said earlier in IW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondent 7 score: 37(8) = 4.63*

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?

R7: I try to get fundamental working perspective of country/region. Ask questions of people before I go abroad. I’m well read I think. I’m up on current events history was my minor. I taught social studies. Have a working world view. I look inside the organization. The
company has good support materials on India.

Q7:

R7: Perspective. My company has well established way of thinking/acting/being. It’s U.S. centric and in upbringing. We balanced company way with Indian way. EG company outsourced credit collection operations in India. The concept of credit is totally different in India. Social acceptance was a challenge. Language, accents, idioms. Queen’s English. Caste system is pervasive. In my company we don’t have people taking away your tea cup. Re Germany, --it’s very formal, very punctual. Have to balance social constraints and business environment.

Q8:

R7: Haven’t had many. But I spend time so that both sides are aware of what the issue is about. Active listening. Get it in the business context. Real challenge is when it’s a company-wide position and non-negotiable. Have to be sensitive. For instance the company I’m with now, in Asia-Pacific, maybe subordinates may be uncomfortable giving feedback to bosses re the performance management system – “sorry that won’t work here.” Need to figure out way to talk about how it can work.
| Q9: |  
|-----|---
| 4   | R7: Before I go, I prepare; when I’m there I go see historic places, temples, Taj Mahal, etc. Seek out locals. Seek invitations to their homes. They welcome us, make us feel at home. I try to find out what does work here, what messages should I take back. Ask questions. Language is important. They really appreciate when you make and effort to learn basic phrases. |

| Q10: |  
|-----|---
| 5   | R7: Anytime. Most of my energy is from here, but I try to slow done, think re what we’re doing and be cognizant of their position. Easier for us to implement here – what’s the infrastructure over there? Give them an ear and partner for a solution. PROBE: a learning or awareness about that region? RE Performance management: I changed my perspective in that we need not be so persistent –give them more time. Be patient and keep reminding them of global opportunities for Asians to work here for my company. They have a different framework and timing, but we haven’t changed a policy comprehensively due to input from foreign workforce. |
R7: Not any less or more. I know that international partners will have a different perspective. Need to heighten my own awareness and be more sensitive. If I’m dealing with a guy in NJ, it’s faster. I communicate differently with foreigners. My antenna goes up because I don’t do it as often.

Q14:

R7: Really demonstrate that they are appropriately aware of global diversity. It is the next great leadership capability that we need – collaborate globally. We defined our global strengths and capabilities from operating in Poland, developed our intellectual capacity. Now company leaders care why we should operate in Poland. It allows for different jobs here in the U.S. Leaders need to have capacity to communicate need for global expansion. Growth & acquisitions are happening oversees. Need to explain why and why it’s important to care. Need to plug into that emotional stuff. We’re getting beyond competencies to transformation.

Q16:

R7: No. Good question. It’s prompted me to think. Simply put, people are people. We have more common point of view than we think. My colleagues in Singapore want good jobs, good lives for families. Basic
desires and needs are similar. We don’t need to overcomplicate this.

*Respondent 8 score: 35(7) = 5*

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?

R8: LISTEN! I have an advantage b/c I’m a foreigner. I’ve interacted with other foreigners all the way back to college. Be in others’ shoes.

Q7:

R8: Good question. I try to understand the U.S. It’s especially different when you work for a U.S. company; my company’s culture is changing but not quickly enough. We’re an MNC but we operate as a U.S. company. Mexico has different regulations but we see it as an extension of the U.S. Mexico is quite bureaucratic. At the beginning U.S. had a hard time understanding the bureaucracies of China, Brazil and Argentine cultures. Values are different. Tomorrow is OK. Americans don’t understand that. There are other values than American.

Q8:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>R8: Goes back to listening on both sides. Eliminate clutter and personal. For benefit of both sides and between the two company employees -- find value in each.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>R8: It goes back to when I was 17-18. I didn’t want to go to college immediately. There was a dictator in my home country. I wanted to go away. So I went to London for a year. I was exposed to a lot of foreigners. It opened my eyes. Then I went to college in the U.S. — a state college. It was a melting pot. I learned about a lot of languages, re all kinds of Chinese languages. I keep it up. I’m very interested, more value to the person and to the company. I grab international assignments. It’s boring to do U.S. business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>R8: I’m more invisible inside company business; in foreign companies, I’m the middle man between U.S. and foreign managers without being dominant. I push back on the U.S. side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>R8: Comfortable as long as I have a base to prove my position. Personally foreigners are easier — they are more open to each other than to Americans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14:
R8: If leaders understand values of other peoples’ cultures they have a 100 to 120% advantage. They know how to position selves in negotiations. They understand you as a person – friend, business, everything. When you get to know people better (culture) business flows from that.

Q16:
R8: You’ve covered the main topics. No.

Respondent 9 score: 29(8) = 3.63

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?
R9: Most important to be sure I’ve listened. Many have poor English skills; they often don’t say what they meant. PROBE: how did you deal with it? Repeat back. Communicate in the common language: financials.

Q7:
R9: Fluctuating exchange rates. Union culture of Europe, mainly in Germany. Workers don’t see work the same way as in U.S. Changing economies – move production to low cost countries. Everything faster and more flexible.

Q8:

R9: No different than when here. They understand company’s rules of the road. Make sure that I understand the source of the conflict and take action to do the right thing. In business communication isn’t the issue. There are plenty of cultural differences, but because of contracts it is what it is.

Q9:

R9: Really enjoyable part of the job – want to hear and experience it. Establish where they eat, where they come from. Ask questions, specific ones re observations. Develop friendships with people. They are generally friendly. Make self approachable.

Q10:

R9: IWer had to PROBE. Unions. Cultural concepts re vacations in Europe. They knew deadlines well in advance… here when we can’t pull it off, people cancel their vacations, but not there. They’re
immovable. My approach next time is to accept that is what is.

Q13:

R9: No different. Only discomfort if don’t have common ground of communication, personally uncomfortable.

Q14:

R9: One thing – have the perspective of their followers. “If this happens they’ll do X.” You can have good intuition in your own culture, but may not have it foreign culture, into the way people will respond to different changes, etc. Harder to assimilate. It won’t be the same as where you came from.

Q16:

R9: Everywhere people are good. They’re proud. Leaders need to understand their perspective; harvest their energy to get things done.

*Respondent 10 score: 40(8) = 5*

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?
| 5 | R10: Listen... a lot. Understand where they are coming from & what they've done. I’ll have an idea re the production line, but they’ve got a line (their own). I’ll ask them to tell me more about their process, what they think of it. Then I go through mine. Hopefully, we agree on some modification of mine to get to the right situation. If I don’t do this, I’ll lose the legacy people. Then I can push them more later. I watch for negative, critical comments. Try not to be an ugly American. It’s still the same as when that book was written. Screaming idiots. |
| Q7: |
| 5 | R10: in 2000, we acquired Z Company. My job was to integrate them into the company in Asia. We have 10,000 in ten countries. Size and complexity all problems we talked about previously existed. American, German, GM they didn’t get OD couldn’t care less. It has to be a democratic way of doing it or it won’t work. It goes back to culture gap—it’s not just dinners, hello, talk, how to turn a screw in a production line. U.S. doesn’t have the best way. There are lots of countries that do as well as we do. |
| Q8: |
| 5 | R10: Dialog, facilitate a discussion. Bring in key people. Table key issues, debate them. Has to be an equal partnership. If were in a |
meeting with plant/general managers, we can’t let the expats (Germans and Americans) dominate. Locals lose face, feel angry.

Q9:

R10: Learn the language. Always try to learn the language. It’s a phenomenal benefit to forge relationships. In Asia they have to respect your ability. Language is a signal that you take this seriously. It really worked for me.

Q10:

R10: Turn around what I’ve said. Willing and flexible to change and let go. Be open to hearing other positions and smart enough to visualize that the two positions be integrated. Integrate them into your position. If their position is invalid, be willing to push back. Caveat: there is a cost: Instilling in local culture a P/L mentality is extremely difficult – that they can’t just keep an iron rice bowl. There is still an undercurrent of that attitude. You need to handle it sensitively. Can’t just get something tomorrow. Need to hear their story, strategy, and explain why 400 people are surplus. Need creative ideas: keep 100 as temps to ease the road. They think the Germans and the U.S. are only interested in money.
| Q13: | R10: That’s where culture gaps exist! If you video tape a German manager in Asia, that’s the best training in the world. Take people to dinner. Coach western team to prepare to listen & don’t force issues, pursue good arguments in a diplomatic way. They’ll acquiesce or buy-in. Can’t hurry it. They won’t make a deal if they don’t know you. |
| Q14: | R10: There’s a gazillion cross-cultural training programs out there. They need it! Eye contact, don’t squeeze hands…. By people who have real experience, not academics. |
| Q16: | Is there anything else you would like to say about the lessons you have learned in your international experiences? |
| R10: Spend time. Can’t parachute in and rocket out. Show dedication, commitment, to that local team. Live there. Visit a lot, build trust, and confidence and able to motivate. Do that and everything else is much easier. |

*Respondent 11 score: 28(7) = 4*
different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a
country/culture)? How?

R11: We have meeting with small groups of employees in that foreign
country, ask their opinions. Really use the GM and the HR manager to
draw on their strengths/experience. Mostly they are local people. They
respect your position. We need to be seen as caring and compassionate.

Q7:

R11: Ex: understanding of ethics is one of our biggest issues: their
interpretation vs. ours. Hard to get them to see it from our point of
view. PROBE: We need to keep an open-mind. Sometimes we may
have to compromise, within the law. Diligent --they stick to their guns.
Body language and passion in the voice.

Q8:

R11: One on one sit downs. Avoid email. We have an ethics outline
and ombudsman program. In Mexico we had a conflict between an
employee and their superior. I got a third party to mediate. It’s
important to go and listen, and present issues. Sometime they may
translate and interpret differently. Need to understand their point of
view and to keep talking. Sometimes you need to get other people
involved.
Q9:

4  R11: I haven’t been involved with suppliers but we have sister plants. I’m pretty outgoing and I ask a lot of questions. I’m not shy. I socialize with the locals.

Q10:

5  R11: E.g., in Mexico we listened to salary surveys. The leadership there convinced me to make a lot of adjustments. The data they gave me was credible and substantive.

Q13:

4  R11: I’m very comfortable. Mexico City has a union. I use a translator. It’s easier than here. Fewer union reps abroad than here. Employees follow their reps.

Q14:

5  R11: Makes you more sensitive to see other cultures interactions. I came away looking at things very differently. I have a different appreciation. I can’t treat everyone the same. I see the U.S. differently too. I have such an appreciation of the U.S. They may not appreciate the things we do –installed in door plumbing. PROBE RE gender. I’ve
had no problems.

Q16:
R11: None

Respondent 12 score: 32(8) = 4

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?

R12: Active listening. Have enough intuition and intelligence to know that even though they don’t speak English, it doesn’t mean they’re not as smart.

Q7:
R12: Know the culture and morays especially your direct reports. What works in one culture doesn’t work in another. There’s a fine line between imposing my culture on them, esp. in Spanish speaking –they say yes even when it’s impossible. Need to read between the lines.

Q8:
R12: Very open. 1:1 or in conference room it’s OK to scream but
outside we love each other. Try not to kill the messenger. Don’t want to be snake bitten.

Q9:

R12: I’m an avid reader. Read up on the local culture – 1-3 papers daily. Local papers. In Puerto Rico politics is the #1 sport. We’d converse. I’m interested in education systems in these countries. I’d talk with them about their kids. I’d offer $10.00 for As and Bs [grades].

Q10:

R12: Don’t do a lot. Most are subordinates reporting to me. Active listening, open mindset. U.S. is not the center of the world. When I view local programs/news, I learn different viewpoints. I listen, think and don’t respond in an emotional way.

Q11:

R12: It’s not my bailiwick. I’m a little hesitant with peers. I use active listening. I won’t lead. They know their markets and end customers. I don’t.

Q14:
R12: Learned the hard way that there are certain things that offend: learn when elevating the voice is appropriate and when it’s not. Re pace and industrial production, intensity: Latinos are better than in U.S.

Q16:

R12: I think it helps if you understand the language. Vast majority of my staff speaks English. Many times I let the meetings go in Spanish. It’s a short coming in me...if you give me something complex and technological, I can handle it but from language point of view my brain doesn’t work as well. Corporation doesn’t do as good a job as it should. They should send people to learn language before they give them an assignment. PROBE: Any Others? My pet peeve: Our tax prep people from ____ (named the company) do a horrible job. They just expect you to do the job. There’s no prep for the assignment. My last job in the ‘80s – ten minutes and I was gone overseas.

Respondent 13 score: 30(6) = 5

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?

R13: Understanding perspective and point of view. We take things for
Null

R13: Impact of the exchange rates. It's a key factor for my company. We're exposed to the strength of the dollar. That's different than in my past jobs with American products in American market.

Q8:

R13: using some. Same as answer for #6. Understanding and respecting positions. I repeat as tough I understand from the other side. If I can't resolve, I move the goal to the next higher–broader, corporate context. It's face saving for me, I can change my position if I need to and the same for them.

Q9:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>R13: _______ my (who is an American born from the company’s country) “go to guy.” He knows the protocol —giving, etc. For example: I expressed inconsistency to my admin. about the company policy concerning travel. One policy for Americans and one for natives. Company expects native, (his go to guy) to go coach, the American can go Business class. He always travels separately from the rest of us. I asked my admin why and it turns out he goes separately so that no one from the company sees him, that way he can go business class. Earlier in my career, I asked a lot of questions. Now I have to be careful not to ask too.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q10: R13: Use the example from #6. PROBE: TM. Open-minded. I believe in pareto principle in all aspects of life. 80% for the greater good and still achieve 80% of what I want to achieve. Some things I won’t concede – I leave bread crumbs along the way. It guides my answer to the appropriate point. More rewarding for the other person… I recently witnessed a discovery moment for another person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q13: R13: Negotiations with home office. I’ve had previous international experience. If understand differences in culture you can turn it into a real advantage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14:

R13: Great question. If you can manage cultural differences you ought to have a leg up. Dealing with big cultural differences, then you’ll be more effective with small differences in your own culture.

Q16:

R13: teasing IWER: You didn’t ask re: Finland in January – they took him out. It was dark. Drank vodka, sauna, then swim in a lake, roll in the snow and return to the sauna…….

Respondent 14 score: 22(8) = 2.75

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a country/culture)? How?

R14: Mostly elicit input, opinions thoughts, definitely diversity –from where you come, what makes you you? Assimilate the best response. One thing, you need to balance consensus with dictatorial.

Q7:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>R14: Universal language barrier. Communications rules aren’t the same for everyone. Our expectations are. You never know the playing field. There’s disparity between U.S. economy and others. They have a different viewpoint: they’re out to eat our lunch…not collaborative, e.g., China: they will sell soul to get U.S. business. Auto industry is cost challenged. I personally struggle with low cost countries.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>R14: Good question; communication failure. Expectations don’t translate. If all have same facts, etc. we’ll come to the same decision assuming integrity. Developing countries see, meet, it’s a single point of contact. They have one decision-maker. We have a difference with matrixed organization. Some of these countries don’t like email, voice mail, phone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9: In what ways have you shown your curiosity about different aspects of history, languages, systems, and so on regarding an international customer/supplier?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R14: Haven’t done much. Probably go back to upbringing on the farm. No exposure to the outside world. Not a desire; I’m there to do business.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10: In what ways have you changed your point of view based on culture in a negotiation with an international supplier/customer? Please give examples.

R14: It's a question of who has the leverage. In today's world the supplier has the leverage. We have to convince, coerce.... Far East.

Q13:

R14: Don't see it as a lot different. My style is more personal with foreigners.

Q14:

R14: AS you understand where folks are coming from, can be more successful. Lead by example.

Q16:

R14: We're not very different background. Need to understand those & utilize to your advantage. I was born rural white boy and I struggle with it. It's limited my success. Do more of it as you need to.

Respondent 15 score: $41(8) = 5.13$

Q6: What things have you tried in order to understand people who have different opinions (due to the fact they come from different a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>country/culture)? How?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R15: I pair them with good supervisors. Draw them out. Clear communication. I try to understand why people are doing what they are doing. I’m an extremely open manager. I praise a lot; I’m open when I’m disappointed. I share my feelings. I’m candid I tell people when the way they’re dressing or talking (aren’t being articulate) isn’t helping them. I give them specific examples. I model: I set a good example. I wouldn’t ask anyone to do what I wouldn’t do – hard work, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7:

|   | Unrelenting cost pressure. E.g. Wal-Mart was always pressuring us to sell to them for less than our costs. It’s a difficult labor situation in the U.S. We fled union states b/c of union rules & union costs. Product life cycles issues—it’s hard to recoup the R/D costs. Local content and minority issues. At my company when I started there were no women and minorities. I told them that was unacceptable. We worked on it. It’s a lot better now, but still not great. Quality issues. |
|   | |

Q8:

|   | Depends on who. Japan is different from France and Italy. We can yell at each other. In Japan, you can’t. In Japan, I had to talk about the |
good of the company, not my own needs, approach is more quiet. Also depended on who delivered the message. Half the time I spent worrying about company politics. PROBE: Japanese are worse than other companies? Yes, all Japanese companies are, but my company was unusual b/c the ___ family (company founder) interfered in detrimental ways. They had tons of stock. Founder’s grandson had come to U.S. and bought a company. We had three lines. The U.S. acquisition and one of the other lines were built on the same prod line. Only difference was name plate, but the U.S. acquisition didn’t have our rep so it had to sell for $50.00 less. It really ate into our profits but nobody was willing to go up against the old guy.

Q9:
R15: Try to learn enough history about the country to make the hosts feel comfortable. I have a natural curiosity and I ask a lot of Qs. It always made people feel good. I’m a bit of an expert on Japanese history, so in Hiroshima I talked about the castle, etc. I demonstrated that I knew about it. That softened them up and helped in negotiations. In Japan, human relations are so important. If you don’t show this interest/sensitivity, they will negotiate very hard against you.

Q10:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R15: Influenced by my mentors at my company. EG. We had 300,000 employees but we only needed 100,000 and making 1% profit. I asked my boss why we weren’t rationalizing the workforce. Boss said the purpose of the company was to employee people not so much to make money for shareholders (it is a publicly traded company). What American business man would think that way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q13: How comfortable are you negotiating with a foreign supplier/customer compared to a domestic one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R15: Very. It’s no harder. There are differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Q14: In what ways do you believe that leaders can use knowledge about cultural value differences to become more effective leaders? (For example, recognizing person’s national values.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>R15: Certainly understand and value differences. If Big 3 had understood the value the Japanese would place on quality, things would be very different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Q16:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R15: Economy is going very global. Don’t see how anyone who doesn’t pay attention to these things can rise to the top. It’s really necessary to know what trends are going on and make sure not to be left</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
n the dust. I have an 11 yr old. We’re trying to teach him two languages and about foreign currency rates and why it matters. We travel all over the world. If U.S. had understood Iraq we wouldn’t have been surprised that Iraqis didn’t throw flowers at U.S.