

Behavioral Competencies for Effective Cross-Cultural Leadership Practice

Richard Savior
The Citadel

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the complexity of leadership in a global context by exploring the ways in which various cultures' values and moral foundations affect how leadership is viewed and effectively practiced. The study focused on three groups of predictive variables of global leadership: characteristics of personality, attitude, and self; behavioral skills related to relationship building and cross-cultural connectivity; and cognitive and organizational acumen by region to identify any significant relationships between the variables. The study found that leadership practice and philosophy varied by region, based on competencies associated with personality, behavioral skills, morality and collective purpose, relationship building, social justice, and meritocracy.

Keywords: Behavioral, Competencies, Cross Cultural, Higher Education, Leadership, Organizational

J B
S B

Copyright statement: Authors retain the copyright to the manuscripts published in AABRI journals. Please see the AABRI Copyright Policy at <http://www.aabri.com/copyright.html>

INTRODUCTION

In his seminal work on leadership development, Gardner (1990) expressed the view that “The first step is not action: the first step is understanding” (p. xiv). An acknowledgement of this foundational principle appears to be missing in much of the applied research and practice regarding ways in which individuals and organizations can best prepare themselves for the complexities of global leadership. Too often, we find ourselves focused on the mechanics of designing global simulations, formulating international assignments, creating global task forces, and delivering language training, while giving short shrift to an understanding of what makes an effective global leader and why effective global leadership matters (Caligiuri & Dragoni, 2014). This paper is intended to encourage a thoughtful examination of complexity of leadership in a global context by exploring the ways in which various cultures’ values and moral foundations affect how leadership is viewed and effectively practiced.

To begin to understand the global context to leadership, one must acknowledge that this involves multiple elements, including the relationship between the leader and his/her followers, the goal that guides and provides purpose to that relationship, the environmental or organizational context where that relationship takes place, and finally the cultural influences that contextualize certain behaviors (McManus & Perruci, 2015). Assimilating the complexity, cultural nuances, and contextual applications of effective leadership practice can allow the individual to develop themselves and others while contributing to the greater good of one’s organization and broader society. In doing so, the individual leader has the potential to acquire the self-awareness and mindfulness essential to developing their whole selves.

The elements that begin to distinguish global-capable leaders include the ability to establish and build teams that encourage diversity of thought and leverage cultural differences and to insure that those cultural differences do not negatively influence the effectiveness of the team or larger organization (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004).

Having acknowledged the need for understanding the contextual aspects of applied leadership, it begs the question of how one defines effective leaders, a subject that has been extensively researched for quite some time. Bennis (1989, p. 259) wrote “Always, it seems, the concept of leadership eludes us or turns up in another form to taunt us again with its slipperiness and complexity. So we have invented an endless proliferation of terms to deal with it...and still the concept is not sufficiently defined.” Some years later, another of the twentieth-century’s leading scholars on the subject, stated that “Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth” (Burns, 1978, p.2).

What Makes an Effective Global Leader?

In general terms, effective global leadership requires an individual to possess certain attitudes, learned behaviors, and experience that can only be acquired through exposing oneself to different and oftentimes challenging situations. Global leaders must have a certain degree of intellectual intelligence involving both business acumen and the skills to be able to cognitively process complex and paradoxical problems, and emotional intelligence, which is comprised of cultural self-awareness, cross-cultural adaptability, and cross-cultural understanding and effectiveness (Rhinesmith, 2003). Together, these forms of intelligence equip global leaders with a high level of cognitive ability to process sometimes unfamiliar and frequently contradictory sources of information and make effective decisions.

Black & Gregersen (1999) approached the question of effectiveness from a qualitative perspective, identifying several personal characteristics that these leaders must possess. Global leaders need a strong sense of inquisitiveness as reflected by a love of learning, being intrigued by diversity, having a desire to seek out people different than oneself rather than those that make us feel comfortable, along with possessing a mindset that questions rather than confirms that which we think we already know. Another characteristic is the ability to embrace duality wherein uncertainty is viewed as invigorating and a natural dimension to global business, wherein one acts as opposed to hesitating when confronted with ambiguous, complex and rapidly changing situations.

Finally, global leaders must possess a strong character that enables the leader to connect emotionally with different cultures in establishing and reinforcing trustworthiness, by consistently demonstrating a high degree of personal integrity across a diversity of ethical conflicts (Caligiuri & Tarique, 2012). A strong and consistent reputation for acting with integrity can serve to help influence the views of followers, while those lacking in integrity will fail to earn the respect they require from stakeholders within and outside their organizations.

Global leaders must also find a balance between resilience and humility. Here we define resilience as that combination of optimism and persistence that is necessary to move forward despite adversity, coupled with the hardiness required to cope with the inevitable stresses inherent in global relationships. Humility, the antithesis of arrogance and ethnocentrism, is an equally important quality for global managers to possess if they are to allow themselves to be open to learning from other cultures (Pauleen, Rooney, & Holden, 2010).

A review of the empirical research conducted over the past two decades reveals over 160 separate and specific competencies associated with global leadership effectiveness (Grundling, Hogan, & Cvitkovich, 2011). These competencies can be grouped into three major categories: characteristics of personality, attitude, and self; behavioral skills related to relationship building and cross-cultural connectivity; and cognitive and organizational acumen.

With respect to characteristics of personality, attitude, and self, global leaders tend to be resilient, possess strong elements of character, are naturally inquisitive, flexible and pre-disposed towards having a more cosmopolitan mindset. Resilience speaks to the leader's ability to process complex challenges across different cultural, political and regulatory systems in a confident manner that minimizes stress, is resourceful, and naturally optimistic by nature (Jenkins, 2012).

Given the inherent ambiguity and stresses associated with global business, leaders in such an environment require a higher than average sense of self-identity and core values, integrity, and maturity in order to deal with a broad set of ethical decisions, as well as a healthy degree of inquisitiveness, manifested by innate curiosity, an openness to learning, and a confident humility that is not threatened by and is open to being taught by others (Black & Gregerson, 1999). Finally, global leaders must have an inherent interest in and knowledge of the broader world, coupled with the cognitive ability to approach highly contextualized cultural, social, and political environments effectively (Miska, Stahl, & Mendenhall, 2013).

The second major category of global competencies involves those behavioral skills related to relationship-building and cross-cultural connectivity, which is essentially the ability to manage people and interpersonal relationships. A critical element of this ability is a respect for, and understanding of people as individuals and for their differences. Implicit in creating and maintaining these relationships is an acknowledgement that they are fundamentally trust-based. Competency in interpersonal skills requires both emotional intelligence, which involves a

healthy sense of self awareness and sensitivity to others, and the ability to influence followers towards a goal. Finally, global leaders require a high degree of competency in cross-cultural communication, which draws on an awareness of the contextual, cultural and individual differences in the way messages are coded, transmitted and interpreted (Muenjohn, 2011).

The third and final core competency of effective global leadership speaks to organizational acumen, which is founded on possessing a practical understanding of one's internal and external environments, and using that knowledge to accomplish objectives efficiently and effectively. This entails the ability to assess the complexity of these environments in a way that balances the tactical and strategic aspects of any decision, inclusive of understanding their interdependencies (Bird & Osland, 2004).

Developing a globally-oriented strategic mindset requires leaders who possess, or acquire over time, the intellectual capital to grasp the complexities of global business and associated risks of having operations in different parts of the world, along with the cognitive capacity to connect complex elements in alignment to the organization's strategy. Global leaders further possess an interest in other cultures and socio-economic and political systems, and the mental flexibility, openness and respect for different and diverse perspectives and values. Finally, these leaders project the ability to build consensus and influence through authentic, trust-based interactions and are able to do so in a diplomatic manner (Javidan, Hough, & Bullough, 2010).

THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to examine the complexity of leadership in a global context by exploring the ways in which cultural values and moral foundations affect how leadership is viewed and effectively practiced. The study focused on three groups of predictive variables of global leadership: characteristics of personality, attitude, and self; behavioral skills related to relationship building and cross-cultural connectivity; and cognitive and organizational acumen, along with the demographics of the respondents, to identify any significant relationships between the variables. These were analyzed from the data derived from a survey that measured the relevance of these variables based upon the individual respondent's regional background.

The target population for this study was 192 senior higher education leaders operating in six major regions of the world (Asia, Europe, India, Latin America, the Middle East/Africa, and North America). These individuals were solicited based upon their positions within the major academic administration functions and were identified from country-specific college and university institutional databases.

FINDINGS

Of the 192 senior higher education leaders who received invitations to participate in the study, 92 (48%) responded. Responses were strongest from Europe at 27%, followed by India and Latin America at 16% each. The responses from North America (12%), Asia (11%), and the Middle East/Africa (10%) were roughly equal.

Functional affiliation was led by Academic Affairs at 33%, Student Affairs at 21%, Finance & Administration at 16%, Admissions & Financial Services at 12%, followed by Enrollment Management and Development and the years of experience the respondents had worked in their functional area was heavily weighted towards 16+ years.

The survey then asked about the most important challenges facing global higher education leaders, with a significant number of respondents (59%) citing managing change as the leading issue, followed by building coalitions (22%), and managing diversity (13%). Cross-cultural communication and defining roles within organizations were minimally reported.

The study measured three groups of predictive variables of global leadership by region of the world: characteristics of personality, attitude, and self; behavioral skills related to relationship building and cross-cultural connectivity; and cognitive and organizational acumen. The highest rated competencies in Asia, Europe, India and the Middle East/Africa were correlated to behavioral skills related to relationship building and cross-cultural connectivity. The respondents from Latin America and North America rated those competencies associated with personality, attitude, and self the highest. Cognitive and organizational acumen was the next highest rated competency group in the Middle East/Africa region, but was otherwise not given high priority throughout the other regions.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA), performed in order to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the means of the regions, found significance when comparing the means for the personality and cognitive related competencies between the six regions.

The study asked the respondents to then comment on the primary focus of leadership in their region of the world. Respondents in Asia emphasized that the primary focus of leadership is to motivate followers to higher levels of morality and collective purpose, and also stressed that leadership is most effective when it is subtle without appearing controlling. The European respondents gave high ratings to leadership that is guided by broader societal values and by their organization's strategic objectives.

Respondents from Latin America reported that effective leaders emphasize achieving results through charisma and by building personal relationships, while the Middle East/Africa respondents stated that the integral responsibility of every leader is to contribute to a more just society. Finally, the respondents from North America emphasized that the focus of leadership is more individually based and is derived from, and earned based upon a competitive meritocracy.

IMPLICATIONS

The study drew from the responses to a survey of senior higher education leaders drawn from six regions of the world, representing a diverse set of institutional affiliations. Of note, the level of experience of the respondents was extensive, theoretically contributing to a more well-informed understanding and assessment of critical leadership competencies.

One of the issues this research sought to examine pertained to what challenges senior higher education leaders were facing and how those issues might relate to regional or global influences. Managing change was rated the highest concern by 59% of the respondents, with building coalitions significant, but nevertheless a distant second at 22%, managing diversity cited by 13%, followed by cross-cultural communication (4.0%) and defining roles (2.0%).

Change management (59%) is a critical challenge for global leaders, given certain interpretations in the way different culture perceive and deal with change. Cultures with a preference for structure and order tend to be less comfortable with ambiguity and risk and may be more resistant to change, while other cultures may recognize change as an important cultural value to be accepted (Belias & Koustelios, 2014).

While certain cultures first focus on changing the attitudes of key stakeholders and then follow by realigning the organizational structure to fit the changed perceptions, others take the exact opposite approach by beginning with changes to the organizational structure in the hope that it will eventually encourage changes in the stakeholder's behavior and processes (Van Hove, 2012). In order to effectively manage change, global higher education leaders are well advised to develop visions with expectations that are clear and linked to organizational goals, communicate the change in a manner that is easily understood and reinforced, is founded on a previously established community of trust, and engage stakeholders at all levels of the organization to drive the initiative.

Global-capable leaders establish and build coalitions (22%) that are differentiated from their domestic counterparts in the diversity of their composition and in their distribution. The diversity of such teams can often bring the potential for higher levels of creativity, innovation, and overall performance. Managing diverse and distributed teams can be challenging, given cultural differences and expectations regarding roles, decision making processes, and communication (Nica, 2013).

Managing diversity (13%) reflects, in many respects, on the inherent complexity of the breadth of issues global leaders must address. These leaders must deal with a far greater degree of ambiguity in managing across cross-cultural norms and differences (Lane, Maznevski, Mendenhall, & McNett, 2004). Through these intercultural experiences, leaders' prior opinions and convictions are altered as they realize a lessening of what they previously believed to be certain and an acknowledgment of that which is yet to be discovered (Steers, Sanchez-Runde, & Nardon, 2012).

Intercultural competence involves a process that often starts from an ethnocentric perspective that is transformed over time by acquiring the ability to empathize with others, communicate across cultural boundaries, and adapt one's frame of reference in aligning to the behavior of others (Bennett, 2009). It involves the ability to establish interpersonal relationships, communicate effectively, and manage ambiguity in dealing with different social systems (Paige, 1993).

Another aspect of intercultural competence involves having a sense of mindfulness in thinking in new ways and being open to different perspectives. By being aware of, and considerate of, our internal assumptions and cognitions, global leaders not only better understand themselves, but are better able to see things through the eyes of others (Thomas, 2015). Intercultural competence does not develop overnight, but rather through a series of transformational experiences that allows one to internalize the values and perceptions of other cultures, and become imbedded through a strong personal motivation to learn and adapt (Hassanzadeh, Silong, Asmuni, & Wahat 2015).

Managing differences in cross-cultural communication (4.0%), and the manner in which conflicts are resolved, is another major challenge for global leaders (Nishii & Özbilgin, 2007). In Latin American culture, it is entirely acceptable for team members to express themselves, even at the same time as others, and with open expression while in Asian culture, doing so would be interpreted as disrespectful; the same can be said for most cultures, where expressions of excessive emotion or opinion are generally discouraged. More collective cultures tend to be more sensitive towards the affective influence of team members to each other than found in (more individualistic) Western culture.

With respect to conflict resolution, certain cultures demonstrate respect for each other by expressing disagreement indirectly, while in other cultures, the exact opposite values encourage direct conflict engagement as a normal behavior (Illies et al., 2007). Given these varying norms of acceptable team communication and conflict resolution, effective global leaders must be particularly sensitive to take these cross-cultural differences into consideration.

The definition of roles (2.0%) can differ depending on the hierarchical nature of a given culture. For example, Indian, Latin American, and elements of Asian cultures tend to be more hierarchical, and as such teams in those regions typically have a single leader with full decision-making authority. Other, more collective cultures within Asia tend to define roles with greater flexibility, with individuals contributing in different ways towards a more distributed form of team accountability.

Certain European segments of Western culture assume that the leadership of teams should be shared, with different individuals taking the lead based upon the tasks at hand, while the more individualistic American segment typically defines task-specific roles so as to identify individual areas of responsibility (Illies, Wagner, & Moregson, 2007).

This study sought to measure three groups of leadership competencies by region of the world: characteristics of personality, attitude, and self; behavioral skills related to relationship building and cross-cultural connectivity; and cognitive and organizational acumen. The highest rated competencies in Asia, Europe, India and the Middle East/Africa were correlated to behavioral skills related to relationship building and cross-cultural connectivity; respondents in Latin America and North America rated those competencies associated with personality, attitude, and self the highest.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) determined that there was a statistically significant difference between the personality and cognitive-related competencies' means between the regions. The inference is that while the manifestation of these leadership-related competencies differs around the world, those competencies associated with behavioral skills related to relationship building and cross-cultural connectivity appear to be more universal.

Respondents in Asia emphasized that leadership serves to motivate followers to higher levels of morality and collective purpose and stressed that leadership is most effective when it is subtle without appearing controlling. The European respondents gave high ratings to leadership that is guided by broader societal values and by organizational strategy. Respondents from Latin America emphasized the importance of achieving results through charisma and relationship building, while the Middle East/Africa respondents gave priority to the responsibility of leaders to contribute to a more just society. Finally, the respondents from North America emphasized that leadership is derived from and earned based upon a competitive meritocracy.

Leadership in Asian culture is challenging to capture in a single definition, given the significant cultural and political differences found throughout the region. Still, certain universal tenets of leadership philosophy are found throughout many Asian cultures. These include an understanding that every person in a society exists to function in a specific role, and that societal order is sought and valued. This perspective was reflected in the significant response (4.67) that leadership exists to motivate followers to higher levels of morality and collective purpose. Inherent in the underlying leader-follower relationships are a reverence for dignity, respect and humility, and an appreciation for the sagacity and wisdom one hopefully develops with age (Low, 2012).

Through experience, Asian leaders draw intuition on how to act through assessing the contextual environment. From a Western perspective, Asian leadership can appear to be subtle in that it strives to be effective without being overtly forceful or controlling, as reflected in the highest mean (4.67) for this variable of any of the regions in the survey. Finally, leaders are expected to place followers and the common good above their personal aspirations (Heller, 2012), as reflected in the rating (3.60) applied to behavioral skills related to relationship building and cross-cultural connectivity.

While challenging to define European leadership in one paragraph, given the various cultural influences that exist across the continent (size, degree of collectivism, socio-political system, east-west influence, etc.), most of these leaders are guided by broader societal values and an appreciation for the social contract that exists within the workplace. In addition, as a result of such constructs as the European Union, it is understandable that these leaders have adopted a greater sense for the interrelatedness of economies and cultures (Hofstede, 2001). These influences were reflected in the response to the importance of societal values and organizational strategy (4.00) and in the response (3.87) related to leadership competencies, with behavioral skills related to relationship building and cross-cultural connectivity.

India may hold the distinction of being the most diverse country in the world in terms of its social, economic, cultural, and linguistic dimensions. With respect to leadership philosophy, Indian leaders combine foreign ideas with historical values of interconnectedness, the leader as teacher and role model - as reflected in one of the higher means (4.00) for behavioral skills related to relationship building and cross-cultural connectivity - and an enlightened moral foundation (Cappelli, Singh, & Useem, 2014). Indian leaders place special emphasis on the broader mission of their organizations by focusing on social purpose, values, and strategic thinking. Driven by a desire to be creative in developing their organizations' value propositions, these leaders place priority on sustaining holistic employee development and in nurturing organizational culture (Wilson & Van Velsor, 2011).

Leadership in Latin American culture has been defined as *personalismo*, or the ability to persuade others through certain attributes and personal relationships. Leaders lead because they possess these qualities, most notably through a bold style combined with charisma. Followers are expected to recognize and respect their leaders through acts of loyalty and devotion and in that sense, the leader-follower relationship can be viewed as an extension of another foundational value in Latin America, that of family (Northouse, 2015). Latin American leaders ascend based upon personal qualities, achieve results through personal relationships, value order and hierarchy, inspire the loyalty and commitment of their followers, and define the moral dimensions of leadership as derived from a Judeo-Christian framework (Castano, de Luque, & Wernsing, 2015). These values were reflected in the highest mean of any region (4.50) when assessing the importance of charisma in building relationships, and for high ratings for leadership competencies related to personality, attitude, and self (3.95).

In Islamic culture, faith, politics, and society are inseparable. Whereas Western society views leadership as something to be pursued and attained in order to benefit one's self, Muslims generally hold that leadership exists to benefit the greater good. From this foundational principle, Islamic leaders are expected to follow the teachings of Islam, place value on the communities in which they lead, give priority to leading in a just manner, and to understand that they are entrusted to care for their followers in a reciprocal form of a leader-servant relationship (Ali, 2012). This trust is bestowed to the leader by his or her followers in order that they together may achieve a common goal.

In one sense, Islamic leadership philosophy is similar to secular transformational leadership theory except that the aspirational focus is to motivate the group to higher levels of morality and purpose, while encouraging each other to become better Muslims (Toor, 2008). In broader terms, the Islamic leader's responsibility is to help create a just society. This focus on the responsibility of leaders to contribute to a more just society was reflected in the highest mean (5.00) of any of the responses in the survey.

The study also asked the respondents to comment on the primary focus of leadership in their region of the world. Leadership in North American culture is noted for its focus on individualism and expression. The leader is viewed as an individual, a boss, and someone separated from his or her followers by rank or title. Leadership is earned based upon a competitive meritocracy, wherein followers are equated to subordinates and are thus deemed inferior to the leader. This perspective was reflected in the highest mean (4.00) for this variable of any of the regions in the survey. North American leaders are also given a fair degree of latitude and freedom of expression in the practice and projection of leadership philosophy (Chhokar, Brodbeck, & House, 2013).

These leaders see themselves as engaging in a social contract or transaction with their followers while motivating them expressly to accomplish a given task or goal. Success is measured by the leader's ability to utilize resources and people in order to accomplish those goals. This individual focus was reflected in the response related to leadership competencies, with characteristics of personality, attitude, and self, reflecting the highest mean (3.87). Finally, these leaders are ethically guided to do what is right, grounded by a Judeo-Christian perspective, based upon concepts of equity, justice, and fairness (Tubbs, 2005).

CONCLUSION: Why Effective Global Leadership Matters

Becoming an effective global leader embodies both the possibilities that global engagement can offer and the means by which an individual's personal development can be further shaped towards reaching his or her potential. In order to realize these outcomes, these leaders must pursue this development with purpose, well-grounded motivations, and self-discipline. Such a course is not a purely intellectual exercise, but requires a higher level of personal interest and engagement in seeking out new relationships with others quite different from themselves. By recognizing these challenges and opportunities, global leaders can seek out specific experiences that will allow them to learn and grow professionally (George, 2014).

Undergirding these experiences are the leader's inner values that guide the individual's behavior in deciding on moral or ethical matters. Globalization can, in turn, intensify certain differences in culturally-relative values as dissimilar peoples interact. Considering how one's personal and moral values may be different from one's follower's, and how the leader's behavior can affect their follower's mores, can stimulate a greater degree of openness, acceptance and humility as elements of a powerful personal learning experience (George, Sims, McLean, & Mayer, 2007).

Global leaders make a difference in the lives of their followers and in contributing to the greater good of their organizations and society. They foster the development of others through setting and inspiring a shared vision towards common goals, by setting an example through their values and ethical behavior, by taking risks and challenging the accepted, through collaboration and empowerment, and by encouraging their followers to aspire to greater things (Kouzes & Posner, 2008).

Effective global leaders recognize the concept that leadership can and should be seen as a social responsibility, wherein the leader's and follower's activities go beyond serving self-interests and seek to benefit the collective society. Acquiring a willingness to contribute to and build social capital requires connecting with, and bonding with other people who may hold different perspectives. Effective global leaders transcend parochial interests in establishing trust-based relationships with others who are often from different backgrounds, in order to contribute to a community's social capital (Putnum & Feldstein, 2003).

J B
S B

REFERENCES

- Ali, A. J., (2012). Leadership and Islam. In B. D. Metcalfe & F. Mimouni (Eds.), *Leadership development in the Middle East*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Belias, D., & Koustelios, A. (2014). The impact of leadership and change management strategy on organizational culture. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(7).
- Bennett, J. M. (2009). Cultivating intercultural competence: A process perspective. In D. Deardorff (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence* (121-140). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bird, A. & Osland, J. S. (2004). Global competencies: An introduction. In H. Lane, M. Maznevski, M. Mendenhall, & J. McNett (Eds.), *Handbook of global management* (57-80). Oxford, UK:
- Black, J. S., & Gregersen, H. B. (1999). The right way to manage expats. *Harvard Business Review*, 77(2), 52-62.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Caligiuri, P. M., & Dragoni, L. (2014). *Global leadership development*. The Routledge Companion to International Human Resource Management.
- Caligiuri, P., & Tarique, I. (2012). Dynamic cross-cultural competencies and global leadership effectiveness. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 612-622.
- Cappelli, P., Singh, H., & Useem, M. (2014). Indian business leadership: Broad mission and creative value. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26, 7-12.
- Castaño, N., de Luque, M.S., Wernsing, T., Ogliastri, E., Shemueli, R. G., Fuchs, R. M., & Robles-Flores, J. A. (2015). El Jefe: Differences in expected leadership behaviors across Latin American countries. *Journal of World Business*.
- Chhokar, J. S., Brodbeck, F. C., & House, R. J. (Eds.). (2013). *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. Routledge.
- Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- George, B. (2014). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- George, B., Sims, P., McLean, A. N., & Myer, D. (2007). Discovering your authentic leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(2), 129-138.

- Gundling, E., Hogan, T. & Cvitkovich, K. (2011). *What is global leadership: 10 key behaviors that define great global leaders*. Boston: Nicholas Brealey.
- Hassanzadeh, M., Silong, A. D., Asmuni, A., & Wahat, N. W. A. (2015). Global Leadership Competencies. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 5(2), 137.
- Heller, D. (2012). *Taoist lessons for educational leaders: Gentle pathways for resolving conflict*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.) (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Illies, R., Wagner, D. T., & Moregson, F. P. (2007). Explaining affective linkages in teams: Individual differences in susceptibility to contagion and individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 1140-1148.
- Javidan, M., Hough, L., & Bullough, A. (2010). *Conceptualizing and measuring global mindset: Development of the global mindset inventory*. Glendale, AZ: Thunderbird School of Global Management.
- Jenkins, D. (2012). Global critical leadership: Educating global leaders with critical leadership competencies. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(2), 95-101.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2008). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lane, H. W., Maznevski, M. L., Mendenhall, M. E., & McNett, J. (2004). *The Blackwell handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity*. London: Blackwell.
- Low, K. C. (2012). Asian leadership style and ways: the case of the leader being the boat, and his subjects the water. *Educational Research (ISSN: 2141-5161) Vol 3.12*, 933-941.
- McManus, R. M., & Perruci, G. (2015). *Understanding leadership: An arts and humanities perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Miska, C., Stahl, G. K., & Mendenhall, M. E. (2013). Intercultural competencies as antecedents of responsible global leadership. *European Journal of International Management*, 7(5), 550-569.
- Muenjohn, N. (2011). Global leadership competencies: cultural perceptions of leadership attributes and performance. In *The 4th Rikkyo University-Northeastern University International Business Studies Symposium* (pp. 1-11). Rikkyo University.

- Nica, E. (2013). Ethical challenges of integrating local leadership in the global mindset. *Journal of Self-Governance & Management Economics*, 1(3).
- Nishii, L. H., & Özbilgin, M. F. (2007). Global diversity management: towards a conceptual framework. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(11), 1883-1894.
- Northouse, P. G. (2015). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Sage publications.
- Paige, R. M. (Ed.) (1993). *Education in the intercultural experience*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Pauleen, D.J., Rooney, D.& Holden, N.J. (2010). Practical wisdom and the development of cross-cultural knowledge management: a global leadership perspective. *European Journal of International Management* 4(4), 382-395.
- Putnam, R. D., & Feldstein, L. M. (2003). *Better together: Restoring the American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rhinesmith, S. (2003). Basic components of a global mindset. In M. Goldsmith, V. Govindarajan, B. Kaye, & A. Vicere (Eds.) *The many facets of leadership* (177-195). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times/Prentice Hall.
- Steers, R. M., Sanchez-Runde, C., & Nardon, L. (2012). Leadership in a global context: New directions in research and theory development. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 479-482.
- Thomas, R. J. (2012). Global leadership teams: diagnosing three essential qualities. *Strategy & Leadership* 40(3), 25-29.
- Toor, S. (2008). Merging spirituality and religion: Developing an Islamic Leadership Theory. *IIUM Journal of Economics and Management*, 16(1), 15-46.
- Tubbs, S. L. (2005). *Keys to leadership: 101 steps to success*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Van Hove, N. (2012). Successful global S&OP: leadership, change management, behavior, & cross-cultural differences. *The Journal of Business Forecasting*, 31(3), 4.
- Wilson, M. S., & Van Velsor, E. (2011). A new terrain of leadership development: an Indian perspective. In S. Verma (Ed.) *Towards the Next Orbit: Corporate Odyssey*. New Delhi, India: Sage.

APPENDIX

Table 1

Geographic Distribution of Respondents (n=92)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Asia	11	12.0
Europe	27	29.0
India	16	17.0
Latin America	16	17.0
Middle East/Africa	10	12.0
North America	12	13.0

Table 2

Functional Affiliation of Respondents (n=92)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Academic Affairs	30	33.0
Admissions & Financial Services	11	12.0
Development	8	5.0
Enrollment Management	9	5.0
Finance & Administration	15	16.0
Student Affairs	19	21.0

Table 3

Years of Regional Experience of Respondents (n=92)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
0-5 Years	0	0.0
6-10 Years	8	9.0
11-15 Years	8	9.0
16-20 Years	20	22.0
20+ Years	56	60.0

Table 4

Global Leadership Challenges (n=92)

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Managing Change	54	59.0
Building Coalitions	20	22.0
Managing Diversity	12	13.0
Cross-cultural Communication	4	4.0
Defining Roles	2	2.0

Table 5

Leadership Competencies by Region

Region	Personality		Behavioral		Cognitive	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Asia	3.33	.30	3.60	.79	3.07	.80
Europe	3.71	.63	3.83	.61	3.63	.78
India	3.95	.60	3.95	.56	3.75	.78
Latin America	3.95	.69	3.90	.51	3.40	.54
Middle East/Africa	3.70	.53	4.10	.32	3.90	.11
North America	3.87	.56	3.67	.64	3.53	.77

Table 6

ANOVA of the Leadership Competencies by Region

Region	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>Sig</i>
Personality	7.91	5	1.58	4.12	.002
Behavioral	4.17	5	.83	1.17	.332
Cognitive	14.45	5	2.89	2.87	.019

Table 7
Primary Focus of Leadership (Mean/Standard Deviation)

Region/Focus	Asia	Europe	India	Latin America	Middle East Africa	North America
Morality & Collective Purpose	4.67 .49	4.00 .94	3.75 1.13	4.25 1.34	4.50 .53	3.67 1.30
Relationship Building	3.67 1.30	3.86 1.38	4.00 1.03	4.50 .52	3.50 1.60	3.67 1.30
Competitive Meritocracy	2.33 .49	3.00 .54	3.50 .89	3.75 1.13	2.50 .53	4.00 .85
Subtle Without Controlling	4.67 .49	3.57 1.07	2.50 .89	3.00 .73	2.50 1.60	2.67 .49
Societal Values & Strategy	3.00 1.48	4.00 .77	3.50 1.15	3.75 .86	3.50 .53	2.67 .49
Contribute to a Just Society	2.33 1.30	3.43 .92	3.00 1.26	3.75 .86	5.00 .00	2.00 .85