Chapter 3
Servant-Leadership with Cultural Dimensions in Cross-Cultural Settings

David Whitfield
Union Institute and University, USA

ABSTRACT

This chapter demonstrates how the power of servant-leadership characteristics and nine cultural dimensions offer intercultural leaders increased capacity in cross-cultural workplaces. Servant-leadership characteristics are paired with cultural dimensions based on their corresponding commonalities to provide intercultural leaders potential tools and strategies to successfully ameliorate cultural barriers, to productively navigate cultural differences, and to build an organizational culture of inclusion, collaboration, and participation. The main objective of the chapter is to increase intercultural leader capacity to lead in culturally mixed organizations, be they domestic or international, resulting in minimizing or avoiding institutional or organizational failure.

INTRODUCTION

This chapter explores servant-leadership characteristics in the context of cross-cultural workplaces. By linking the characteristics to the nine cultural dimensions provided by the GLOBE study (Chhokar, et al., 2008), intercultural leaders will be better equipped to lead cross-culturally, specifically to navigate cultural differences. Wibbeke (2009) states that leaders need to adjust to cultural differences and understand how culture affects leadership. "The first step for business leaders is to learn to understand how cultural differences affect leadership and life within and across organizations" (p. 28). The objective of this chapter is to improve intercultural leader capacity by embracing both servant-leadership characteristics and the cultural dimensions, resulting in plausible strategies for intercultural leaders to navigate cross-culturally.

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-4666-5840-0.ch003

BACKGROUND

To navigate cultural differences effectively, intercultural leaders need both cultural intelligence and intercultural competence. Intercultural competence as defined by Bennett and Bennett (2004) is "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts" (p. 149). For clarity regarding cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills, Bennett and Bennett synthesized *mindset, skillset*, and *heartset* to clarify the meaning of cultural competence. Mindset or the cognitive aspect is about knowledge of culture-general frameworks. Namely, what one knows about cultures in general; skillset is the behavioral part including the ability to collect proper information, to empathize, listen, build relationships, and adapt, leading to skills to navigate cultural differences. Finally, heartset is the affective part, meaning, one's attitudes toward cultural differences, curiosity, risk taking, open-mindedness, and tolerance of ambiguity, or how one's feels about cultural differences.

Moodian (2009) supports Bennett and Bennett's definition by adding four aspects of intercultural competency. Moodian's first aspect of the four is *recognition*: how competent leaders are in recognizing cultural differences around them. The second aspect is *respect*: how leaders respect those cultural differences. Third aspect is *reconciliation:* how leaders reconcile those cultural differences; finally *realization*: how competent are leaders to realize the actions necessary to implement the reconciliation of cultural differences (p. 166). Given the foregoing definitions of intercultural competence, leaders do not become interculturally competent without hard work and tenacity. However, being interculturally competent may not be sufficient to navigate cross-cultural differences.

Navigating cross-cultural work setting also requires cultural intelligence. Cultural intelligence is about what happens when we meet people who think and act differently; it is defined as one's ability to participate successfully in diverse cultural settings or environments (Earley & Eng, 2003). According to Engle and Nehrt (2012), environments may range "from expatriate assignments in a foreign country to those who will need to function in multicultural teams, or even teams of a relatively homogeneous cultural make up that are working on project with multicultural implications" (p. 35). A blatant example of a lack of cultural intelligence that could have been easily avoided is discussed by Ottavi (2009), where a British manager attempted to run a Japanese company and experienced conflict from the Japanese workforce which seemed out of place because Japanese are usually polite. According to Ottavi, the British manager was not taken seriously because of her gender; thus, she was unable to participate successfully as cultural intelligence demands. Apparently she didn't know how women are viewed in Japan.

The scenario below demonstrates another example of lacking cultural intelligence and cultural competency that caused embarrassment, stress, and decrease in work performance. Some workers decided to remain home until the issue was resolved.

While working in Frankfurt, Germany, I became familiar with associates working for a Fortune 100 company headquartered in Frankfurt. The American leadership issued and attempted to implement a policy that German women as its employees would not be allowed to wear pants to work. This caused much protracted embarrassment for the American company. Because once the German Works Council (a very strong, highly respected, and often feared group of German lawyers who work for the employee) was notified, the German newspapers were relentless in telling how an American company, working in Germany, telling their women how to dress. Whitfield (as cited in Sudhakar & Reddy, 2008, pp.130-131)

Would the American leadership have demanded the same from American women had they been on American soil? Not wearing pants to work had nothing to do with safety or any other

reason. The leaders lacked cultural intelligence: ability to behave and participate successfully in a different culture; one's ability to adapt effectively in new cultural contexts (Earley & Eng, 2003). And they lacked intercultural competence that required: "a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts" (Bennett & Bennett, 2004, p. 149). The American leaders, one could argue, did not know German cultural norms such as communication styles, physical space, decision making, and dress or attire—aspects of cultural intelligence. Perhaps the German Works Council would not have demanded the American company explain itself had they known and respected those cultural norms. The Works Council saw arrogance and ignorance in the leaders' behavior.

According to Polak-Weldon, et al. (2012), "Cultural intelligence (CQ) is the key competence of the twenty-first century" (p. 2). These authors add more depth to its definition and meaning; specifically, cultural intelligence is multi-dimensional, including a *metacognitive* component that refers to the control and monitoring of cognition, the process of knowledge acquisition and comprehension, active thinking about people and situations in cross-cultural situations. The *cognitive* component includes the norms, values, religious beliefs, artistic values and language rules, etc. Of central importance to problem solving is the *motivational* component; this includes the ability to view cross-cultural situations in different ways, making efforts to gain new experiences from culturally different others. Finally, the *behavioral* component facilitates what one does rather than what one thinks or feels; it is essential to sustaining cross-cultural relationship (p. 2).

Thus far we have briefly discussed the ingredients of cultural competency and cultural intelligence, plus the potential consequences of their absence in cross-cultural settings. Given the power of those two constructs and their possible outcomes, they may not be sufficient to lead successfully in the cross-cultural workplace. And that's because many organizations are competing in a global atmosphere and are pressured to attract and retain high-performing employees (Han, Kakabadse, & Kakabadse, 2010, p. 4). These authors contend that servant-leadership is fundamental in acquiring, maintaining, and motivating a high performing workforce. That it is a leader's obligation to create a balance between workers' spiritual world and their working roles (p. 5). That servant-leadership is potentially an effective approach to bring this to fruition.

AN OVERVIEW OF SERVANT-LEADERSHIP

Exigencies for intercultural leaders are high and rising (Black, Morrison & Gregersen, 1999). Servant-leadership potentially offers plausible concepts, ways of thinking, and means to facilitate engagement and navigation of cultural differences in cross-cultural work settings. As a teacher, trainer, and coach in multicultural settings for more than 20 years, I believe the servant-leadership characteristics (Greenleaf, 2002) paired with the nine cultural dimensions (Chhokar, Brodbeck, & House, 2008) are potential strategies to accommodate the demand for intercultural leaders to lead in cross-cultural settings.

Not only is there a high demand for intercultural leaders, there is also a call for ethical leaders as posited by Shekari, Taft, Yazd, and Nikooparvar Mahmood (2012), "The world is crying out for ethical and effective leadership that serves others, invest in their development and fulfill a shared vision" (p. 1). Servant leadership, they add, "is best for the ideals embodied in the human factor" (p. 1). So, leading as usual with traditional tyrannical styles is not only anachronistic it is also potentially dysfunctional, given the fast pace of globalization, the complexity of transnational corporations, the addition of global educational entities, and the demographical changes in the workplace. These

changes require culturally intelligent, interculturally competent, sensitive, and insightful leaders with a worldview that is inclusive and respectful of all culturally and ethnically different others. These changes require leaders who are keen on serving others, regardless of others' origin. In this context, leadership requires adaptability in thinking, attitudes, behavior, and structure, especially in cross-cultural settings. Shekari, Taft, Yazd, and Nikooparvar Mahmood (2012) explain:

Servant-leadership cannot prevail, however, unless there is a fundamental change in organizational attitudes, behavior, and structure. In this new organizational structure, the leader becomes the soft glue that holds the organization together as a virtual community working together. This glue is made up of a sense of common identity, linked to a common purpose and fed by an infectious energy and urgency. That is the task for a leader who is taking his or her institution into the twenty-first century. Critical to their success will be the creation of healthy and productive relations between the CEO and the employees, between the pastor and the congregation, between the president, the faculty, and students. (2012, p. 55)

Finally, new forms of organizing are becoming a necessity (Sanchez-Runde, Whittington, & Quintanilla, 2000). Based on my years of experience, living and working in different cultures, consulting, coaching, teaching, and training, I believe intercultural competency and cultural intelligence linked to *servant leadership* can significantly change the landscape of a cross-cultural workplace, potentially resulting in a culture of inclusion, synergy, and high performance. And that is because on the one hand "Servant-leaders must be value- and character-driven people who are performance and process oriented" (Shekari, Taft, & Nikooparvar Mahmood, 2012, p. 54). On the other, cultural intelligence and intercultural competence provide leaders skills to experience cultural differences and similarities in ways that lead to clarity in communication and avoid misunderstanding (Bennett, 2001).

However, to bring this to fruition, I believe intercultural leaders also need detail knowledge and understanding of the servant leadership characteristics (Greenleaf, 2002), allied with the nine cultural dimensions (Chhokar, et al., 2008). Just what is servant-leadership?

What is Servant-Leadership?

For the purpose of this chapter, servant-leadership is defined as leading with "servant first" at the fore, a quest to serve the needs of others before leading them, resulting in those served becoming servant themselves. Spears (2005) supports Greenleaf's notion that a different approach to leadership is needed. Consequently, he posited that the servant-leader, "puts serving others—including employees, customers, and community—as the number one priority. Servant-leadership emphasizes increased service to others, a holistic approach to work, promoting a sense of community, and the sharing of power in decision making" (Spears, 2005, p. 2). Shekari, Taft, and Nikooparvar Mahmood (2012) believe Servant-leadership includes principles of empowerment, team building, and the ethic of service (p. 54).

Greenleaf (2002, p. 27) asks: "Who is the Servant-Leader?" Note that he doesn't address leadership first. He says "[T]he servant-leader *is* servant first," adding that "It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve *first*" (p. 27). And then the choice to lead follows. Meaning, the one who chooses to serve first, "is sharply different from one who is *leader* first." Finally, he affirms, "The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types" (p. 27). The servant-first leader takes care "to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being

served" (p. 27). He advocated a test of sorts, distinguishing between the leader who decides to lead first and the one who decides to serve first. Thusly,

The best test, and difficult to administer is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, *while being served,* become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely

Themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society? Will they benefit or at least not be further deprived. (p. 27)

Leaders who subscribe to the servant-leadership approach according to Northouse (2010, p. 385), "focus on the need of followers and helps them to become more knowledgeable, more free, more autonomous, and more like servant themselves. These leaders, Northouse notes, "enrich others by their presence" (p. 385). Their presence is fed by servant-leadership characteristics.

Servant-Leadership Characteristics

First, the imperative in embracing these characteristics can mean the difference between success and failure in many organizational settings. Nevertheless, as an introduction to this part of the chapter, I feel compelled to offer at least one caveat regarding the acceptability and potential efficacy or lack of efficacy of servant-leadership. Though it offers potentially powerful characteristics, ideas, and sources of thought for leaders in various settings, Irving and McIntosh (2010) discusses servant leadership in very constructive ways, indicating positive opinions, for example by Peruvian religious leaders who stated how well they follow servant-leadership principles. However, these authors posited that because of cultural difficulties, servant-leadership may be academically accepted but not practiced. That when it comes to Latin America in general and Peru in particular where power is aggregated at the top, it becomes very difficult if not impossible to follow the tenants of servant-leadership. Irving and McIntosh established that power distance is high in Latin American cultures, and thus, will not support servant-leadership principles. Though Peru is only one country, one may conclude that those countries where power distance is high, or where power is shared at the top only, servant-leadership may not be embraced. Despite this caveat, potentially, servant-leadership has much to offer leaders. Respect and understanding are crucial for researchers conducting servant-leadership research in different cultures.

Second, on becoming a servant-leader in organizational settings in general and cross-cultural organizations in particular, I believe a key question leaders should ask themselves, is: is my desire to serve first greater than my desire to lead first? With that question at the fore, the intercultural leader should be ready to embrace the following servant-leadership characteristics (Greenleaf, 2002):

1. **Listening:** Listening first
2. **Self-Awareness:** A disturber and an awakener
3. **Foresight:** The central ethic of leadership
4. **Empathy:** Acceptance is receiving what is offered
5. **Conceptualization:** The prime leadership talent
6. **Healing Relationships:** For one's own healing
7. **Persuasion:** Sometimes one person at a time
8. **Commitment to growth of others:** Meeting needs of those served
9. **Building Community:** Essential for health

Greenleaf (2002) cites *Listening* first among the characteristics of a servant-leader, along with understanding. Per Henman (2009), "the number one weakness direct reports identify in their leaders is a failure to listen" (p. 4). Larry Spears (2005) of the Greenleaf Center for Servant leadership, summarizes the listening characteristics, thusly,

Listening: Leaders have traditionally been valued for their communication and decision-making skills. While these are also important skills for the servant-leader, they need to be reinforced by a deep commitment to listening intently to others. The servant-leader seeks to identify the will of a group and helps clarify that will. He or she seeks to listen receptively to what is being said (and not said!). Listening also encompasses getting in touch with one's own inner voice and seeking to understand what one's body, spirit, and mind are communicating. Listening, coupled with regular periods of reflection, is essential to the growth of the servant-leader. (Spears, 2005, p. 3)

In *Global Explorers*, Black, Morrison and Gregersen (1999), caution that listening can be sabotaged. "Despite the best intentions, cultural and language barriers can severely restrict your ability to listen effectively" (p. 119). These authors assert that "it takes great effort and patience to understand the heart and soul of people" (p. 119). In leadership situations in general and cross-cultural leadership positions in particular, servant-leadership is an excellent approach to understand the heart and soul of people by listening and reflecting. And that's because to serve first requires intimate knowledge of those being served which includes people's heart and soul. Being servant first requires a level of emotional connection, as Black et al. (1999) affirm, "Emotionally connecting with people requires more than sincere interest and skillful listening" (p. 121). Since the inability is potentially a serious weakness, it can also become a derailer of leaders. Listening is about leading the self and may not be easily done (Rowe & Guerrero, 2011).

"Why is it so hard to lead yourself?" The answer, in my experience, lies in the differences between your idealized self and your real self. The key to being able to develop yourself as a leader is to narrow that gap by developing a deep self-awareness. (Rowe & Guerrero, 2011, p. 284)

To navigate cultural differences in cross-cultural work settings, listening and self-awareness are essential; self-awareness is about knowing who you are, what you stand for, and what you value. "Self-awareness means being tuned into one's own cognitive and emotional states, core values and beliefs, personal preferences and biases" (Wibbeke, 2009, p. 100); otherwise leader performance may suffer. In her *Global Business Leadership*, Wibbeke says "…the quality and level of a leader's awareness largely determines his or her performance" (p. 99); she also asserts that "a leader arrives in a new cultural situation as ignorant but then should move into a novice stage of awareness and should continue to evolve in knowledge through building awareness" (p.99). According to George, et al. (2007) "When the 75 members of Stanford Graduate School of Business's Advisory Council were asked to recommend the most important capability for leaders to develop, their answer was nearly unanimous: self-awareness" (2007, p .3).

When it comes to listening in a cross-cultural setting, Moseley 2009) suggest leaders engage in active listening as opposed to simply listening with the ears; that to improve communication skills across cultures, leaders should teach active listening to their workers. He asserts that "focus should be on listening to understand not to judge" (p. 6). Moseley adds that active listening engenders cross-cultural interpersonal sensitivity: "the ability to hear what people from a foreign culture are really saying or meaning, and an ability to predict how they will react" (p. 6). That active listening is a key to closing cultural gaps.

Had the leaders of the American company in Frankfurt, Germany been more self-aware, it would not have been necessary for them to explain

to a platoon of lawyers about demanding how German women should dress in the workplace. Perhaps self-awareness would have avoided the embarrassment.

Awareness: General awareness, and especially self-awareness, strengthens the servant-leader. Making a commitment to foster awareness can be scary—you never know what you may discover. Awareness also aids one in understanding issues involving ethics and values. It lends itself to being able to view most situations from a more integrated, holistic position. (Spears & Lawrence, 2004, p. 14)

Leading in cross-cultural workplaces requires leaders to be keenly aware of who they are, what they value, and how they relate to culturally different others. As Greenleaf observed: "Awareness is not a giver of solace—it is just the opposite. It is a disturber and an awakener. Able leaders are usually sharply awake and reasonably disturbed. They are not seekers after solace. They have their inner serenity" (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 41). Servant-leaders' inner serenity is crucial in exercising foresight, especially when it comes to decision making.

"Fores*ight* is the "lead" that the leader has. Once leaders lose this lead and events start to force their hand, they are leaders in name only" (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 40). According to Spears and Lawrence (2004), foresight connotes the ability to foresee expected outcomes; it "is a characteristic that enables servant-leaders to understand the lesson from the past, the realities of the present, and the likely consequence of a decision for the future" (p. 4). This has implications for intercultural leaders especially when it comes to decision making in multicultural settings. If intercultural leaders are able to foresee the consequences of their decision, examine the past and presence, they increase the probability of being successful. On the other hand, if they make decisions willy-nilly, the outcomes could be potentially costly.

Very little research is available regarding foresight and cross-cultural leadership. However, Havas, Schartinger, and Weber (2010) looked at the potential of foresight as it relates to decision making, policy formulation, and a new culture of future-oriented thinking. They conducted foresight exercises in four different cultures: Hungary, Malta, Sweden, and the UK. They concluded that "Foresight stresses the possibility of different futures (or future states) to emerge, as opposed to the assumption that there is an already given, predetermined future and hence highlights the opportunity of shaping our future" (p. 2). They used foresight to collect future intelligence and build long-term visions, aimed at influencing present day decisions and other actions.

Empathy: Woolman and Grundtvig exercised both acceptance and empathy for the slaves and peasants respectively; servant-leaders "strive to understand and empathize with others" (Spears & Lawrence, 2004, p. 13). Greenleaf asserts, "The servant always accepts and empathizes, never rejects" (2002, p. 33). We need to be accepted and recognized for our special and unique spirits (Spears & Lawrence, 2004). Even if we reject their behavior and performance, we assume good intentions and not reject them as people. These authors add, "The most successful servant-leaders are those who have become skilled empathetic listeners" (p. 13). In a cross-cultural organization empathy is imperative.

What makes empathy imperative in cross-cultural settings? Miyashiro (2011) says "Empathy engenders trust, insight, and understanding important for both internal and cross-cultural communication" (p. 24). Goleman (2000) indicates that there is a rising importance of empathy for business leaders because of globalization. He asserts, "Cross-cultural dialogue can easily lead to miscues and misunderstandings. Empathy is an antidote. People who have it are attuned to subtleties in body language; they can hear the

message beneath the words being spoken" (p. 9). With empathy, Goleman adds for those in cross-cultural settings "have a deep understanding of both the existence and the importance of cultural and ethnic differences" (p. 9).

Conceptualization is another dominant characteristic of servant-leadership. Whereas staff members need to be primarily operational, boards and trustees "need to be mostly conceptual in their orientation" (Spears & Lawrence, 2004, pp. 14-15). These authors state that "Servant-leaders seek to nurture their abilities to "dream great dreams" (p.14). Greenleaf (2002) casts conceptualizing as "the prime leadership talent" (p. 45). He discusses how Nikolai Frederik Severin Grundtvig, who, during the nineteenth century, conceptualized and became the Father of the Danish Folk High Schools for the peasants. That Denmark "was predominantly agricultural with a large peasant population of serfs who were attached to manors" (p. 46). Grundtvig concentrated on the masses rather than the cultured who "thought him to be a confused visionary and contemptuously turned their backs on him" (p. 46).

As a result of his conceptualization, Grundtvig caused the peasants to "raise themselves into *the* Danish national culture" (p. 47). Consequently Denmark went from a corn-only market to that of a "butter and bacon" market. "All of this, truly remarkable social, political, and economic transformation, stemmed from one individual's conceptual leadership" (p. 47). Imagine finding CEOs as intercultural leaders such as Grundtvig and Woolman in today's cross-cultural work setting*s*.

When it comes to conceptualization in cross-cultural settings, there is a paucity of research available as evinced by my reviewing more than 150 journal articles on servant-leadership in cross-cultural settings. However, in her phenomenological study, Driscoll Chavez (2012) ask how "in a society where high power distance and low trust cultural dimensions predominated everyday life in very real oppression and distrust, could it really be possible that servant leadership could be effective?" Through Dr. Scheflen's persuasion, she influenced non-schooled elementary-age children in a remote jungle area in Bolivia. "Again, as the classes grew, the elementary school eventually expanded into one high school, then another, then a Bible school, and finally led to the foundation of the first private evangelical university in Bolivia" (p. 5).

Healing and serving is how Greenleaf (2002) addresses this characteristic, adding that Alcoholic Anonymous was founded on this principle. For healing and serving, Greenleaf says, "Whether professional or amateur, the motive for the healing is the same: for one's own healing" (2002, p. 50). Spears and Lawrence (2004) posit that "One of the great strengths of servant-leadership is the potential for healing one's self and others," and that "learning to heal is a powerful force for transformation and integration" (p. 13). It's about making one whole. "There is something subtle communicated to one who is being served and led if, implicit in the compact between servant-leaders and led, is the understanding that the search for wholeness is something they share" (pp. 13-14). What better way for intercultural leaders to engage commitment to the growth of others after learning to heal the self?

When it comes to healing in cross-cultural settings, there is very little research. After searching and reviewing more than 150 refereed journal articles related to servant-leadership research in cross-cultural organizations, I found Kenny's "Consciousness and Healing: Integral Approaches to Mind-Body Medicine." Kenny's meaning of healing is consistent with Greenleaf's (2002) in that it is about repairing one's broken spirit or making one whole. Working with teams in a Fortune 50 global aerospace company, he was able to change team members from sarcasm, angry e-mails, and unresponsiveness to listening, collaboration, participation, and helping one another.

Team members reported working with a greater sense of integrity and purpose. Many spoke about

healing that had occurred in their team. Despite a work environment characterized by extreme time pressure and scarce resources, they had increased their collaboration and creative problem solving, deepened their mutual trust and support, and improved their communication skills. (n. d. p. 3)

Kenny indicated that wholeness and healing require engaged, loving, and caring relationships; that "True healers represent the community and life itself, conveying healing energy in sacred acts of service" (p.1). The above healing exercises were done through reflective practices (Kenny, n. d.). Reflective practices involve: "…journaling; dialogue, creative problem-solving through exploratory role play and imaginative visualizations; contemplation and meditation; visioning retreats; shared affirmation; goal setting and strategy… reflective walks and sitting in Nature…active listening; values clarification;…clarifying one's life purpose…" (p. 2).

Persuasion: Greenleaf (2002, pp. 42-44) discuses John Woolman, an American Quaker who led by this very characteristic. During the eighteenth century, Woolman rode up and down the east coast persuading Quakers to free their slaves; that he "almost singlehandedly rid the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) of slaves" (p. 43). John Woolman demonstrated persuasion effectively. "By 1770, nearly 100 years before the Civil War, no Quakers held slaves" (p. 43). Woolman didn't rant and rave about Quakers owning slaves; he didn't affect a protest movement; "His method was one of gentle but clear and persistent persuasion" (p. 43). Greenleaf believed that had there been a few more Woolmans, perhaps we could have avoided 600,000 casualties as a result of the Civil War. "Leadership by persuasion has the virtue of change by convincement rather than coercion. Its advantages are obvious" (p. 44). Persuasion in cross-cultural work settings is relevant in working with organizational members who choose to minimize cultural differences; minimizing cultural differences can cause disharmony and animosity among culturally different organizational members.

An excellent example of applying servant leadership in general and persuasion in particular in a cross-cultural setting is demonstrated in the phenomenological study conducted by Driscoll Chavez (2012). This study was based on the work of Dr. M. Scheflen who founded a large educational cooperative in Santa Cruz, Bolivia that included an elementary school, a high school, plus the first and only evangelical university in Bolivia. She accomplished this by applying servant-leadership and overcoming "at least four basic cultural dimensions that should have been working against her" (p. 8). The four cultural dimensions were a low-trust society, collectivistic, high power distance, and male-dominated. "Dr. Scheflen, according to Driscoll Chavez, "was an unassuming Christian leader who changed the educational systems of Bolivia on all levels" (p. 5) through persuasion.

Commitment to the growth of people is linked to the original definition of servant-leadership; it is allied to meeting the needs of those being served, leading to their becoming servants themselves. The leaders who meet workers' needs say they are more than what they bring to the workplace. "Servant-leaders believe that people have an intrinsic value beyond their tangible contributions as workers" (Spears & Lawrence, 2004, p. 15). Servant-leaders should be aware of "the tremendous responsibility to do everything possible to nurture the personal, professional, and spiritual growth of employees" (p. 15). These authors assert that "providing means of professional development, listening to their suggestions, involving them in decision making, and if they are laid-off, assistance should be provided for them" (p. 16).

Dr. Scheflen demonstrated her commitment to the growth of people by entrusting them with responsibility; she convinced them that she believed in them and trusted them (Driscoll Chavez, 2012). She encouraged followers by assisting them in overcoming obstacles, and to believe in themselves; she fed their growth and development by having "a keen understanding of individual abilities and interests. This was particularly true regarding teachers and the level of their participa-

tion in the school activities" (p. 22). Please note that Dr. Scheflen "was a woman in a male-dominated machismo culture; and a highly trusted individual in a low-trust society" (p. 11).

Building Community for Greenleaf (2002) was equal to an imperative he felt the ones served should be loved which requires community; as such, all for one should be unlimited which requires trust and respect. "Trust and respect are highest in this circumstance, and an accepted ethic that gives strength to all is reinforced" (p. 52). Specifically, he adds, "Where community doesn't exist, trust, respect, and ethical behavior are difficult for the young to learn and for the old to maintain" (p. 52).

When it comes to building community in a cross-cultural setting, apparently, Dr. Scheflen's efforts in persuasion and conceptualization left a lasting impact on the Bolivian school systems.

She conceptualized a completely different school system for Bolivia, and persuaded members of a male-dominated, high power distance culture to think differently about educating Bolivians. She left a "lasting impact of servant leadership behaviors on two educational organizations in Bolivia" (Driscoll Chavez, 2012, p. 6) that has lasted some 50 years and are still functioning. In her study, Driscoll Chavez addressed whether it was possible that servant-leadership could be effective, permeating an organization by making a lasting change over a long period of time, especially in a Latin American culture where power distance and low trust cultural dimensions predominate. Driscoll Chavez was impressed by the results regarding the community; namely, that community members are still active in the school system to include their children, grand-children (who are students), teachers, and directors; that the community is close-knit; there is a high level of integrity, unlike the general Bolivian culture (p. 18).

The most noteworthy works in intercultural leadership in recent times acknowledge that culture influences leadership styles and perception (Abdalla & Al-Homoud 2001). Intercultural leadership requires cultural intelligence and an intercultural mindset that facilitates attainment of cultural competency. Imagine intercultural leaders with an intercultural mindset, an intercultural skillset, and intercultural sensitivity (Bennett, 2009). These attributes too, are essential to navigating cultural differences in cross-cultural work settings. Bennett (2009) says, contact alone in a cross-cultural workplace is not enough to attain cultural competency. Cultural competency demands that Leaders adapt a learn-to-learn philosophy among their followers; meaning that followers understand the importance of learning with a desire to embrace strategies to learn how to learn, especially to become culturally intelligent and culturally competent.

Cultural competency as defined by Gardenswartz, et al. (2003) is "the ability to understand cultural difference, and the ability to leverage it…" (p. 43). Synonymous with cultural competency is cultural literacy as defined by Rosen et al. (2000, p. 50), "knowing about and leveraging cultural differences..." will be an advantage for intercultural leaders. As we can see, understanding and leveraging cultural differences will potentially result in intercultural leader success, especially in cross-cultural work places.

Part II of this chapter addresses the servant-leadership characteristics, culture, and the nine cultural dimensions as articulated by the GLOBE study.

CULTURAL DIMENSIONS AND SERVANT-LEADERSHIP

I believe culture is the most powerful variable in any entity; be it a corporation, a church, a family, a university, or a group, its power is compelling and ubiquitous. The two quotes above are persuasive because if a strategy or policy is implemented and culture is disrespected, ignored, or in any way, diminished by leaders, it is to their peril. Edgar Schein's definition of culture is too, persuasive: it is "the way we do things around here" (1999,

p. 24). He adds, it is "the learned, shared, tacit assumptions on which people base their daily behavior" (p. 24). Authors of the GLOBE Study define culture as, "shared motives, values, beliefs, identities, and interpretations or meanings of significant events that result from common experiences of members of collectives that are transmitted across generations" (House, et al., 2004, p. 15).

Note that we have two definitions of culture: one from U. S. America by Edgar Schein and one from the GLOBE study (House, et al., 2004) which is based on a sample size of 17,300 middle managers from across 62 countries, their respective societies and cultures. I believe culture is to an organization as oxygen is to life. As briefly discussed in the first part of this chapter, by not considering culture, leader failure is almost a given.

Not only should leaders understand their own culture, they should understand the cultures in their workplace and have the skills to navigate cultural differences. Failure to understand cultural differences can be costly for corporations in general and international corporations in particular as pointed out by Beitler (2005, p. 1) who asserts that "Nearly one-third of U. S. managers sent abroad do not perform up to the expectations of their superiors." His research findings showed, "Up to 20 percent of all U. S. managers sent abroad return early because of job dissatisfaction or difficulties in adjusting to a foreign country" (p. 1). One of the main reasons for failure is a lack of cultural competence, not being able to adjust to host cultural differences (Wibbeke, 2009).

Why link servant-leadership characteristics to cultural dimensions? I believe the servant-leadership characteristics are potentially owned by the individual; they are analogous to personal traits, located within the leader. The cultural dimensions are learned; this may mean that intercultural leaders should create a learning environment, change behavior, and structure. As (Shekari, et al., 2012) state "Servant-leadership cannot prevail, however, unless there is a fundamental change in organizational attitudes, behavior, and structure" (p. 2). This would potentially increase intercultural leader success in applying the servant-leadership characteristics with the cultural dimensions as defined in the GLOBE Study (Chhokar, et at., 2008). The majority of these cultural dimensions can conceivably assist intercultural leaders in navigating cultural differences, guiding the way to work successfully through cultural barriers. Cultural barriers are present in most if not, all diverse organization; here, diversity includes different cultures, ethnicities, ages, gender, sexual orientations, nationalities, belief systems, ways of thinking, and more. "The greatest challenge facing leaders in this era of globalization is working effectively through cultural barriers to achieve business goals and objectives" (Wibbeke, 2009, p. xvii).

Leaders in general and intercultural leaders in particular should build a culture of inclusion and acceptance. And that's because "Global leadership competencies are in increasing demand. Navigating multinational, multicultural working relationships requires a new set of KSAOs (knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics—i.e., competencies) that are vast in number and complex in depth" (Skoll, 2011, p. 142). Regarding the linkage of leadership development to cross-cultural understanding, (Wibbeke (2009, p. 1) argues that there has been a failure, "especially as it relates to globalization." She asserts that when it comes to intercultural differences, "The conservative estimate is that fully 70% of global business ventures worldwide fail due to the mismanagement of intercultural differences" (p. 1). Mismanagement of intercultural difference can be costly (Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2009, p. 2). Per these authors, some organizations estimate the cost of a failed executive was $500,000 to $1,500,000 per senior manager. Hogan et al. stated that in another study "the cost of a failed executive to be as much as $2.7 million" (p. 2). This is about management practices; however, management practices that work in some organizations may not work in

others. When it comes to cross-cultural application of servant-leadership vis-a-vis the cultural dimensions:

A management practice that works quite effectively in the United States might have disastrous results in a plant in Singapore and vice versa. Similarly, the increasingly diverse nature of our workforce within our own borders compels us to examine the challenges we face from multiculturalism in the workforce. (Hannay, 2009, p. 5)

I believe the cultural dimensions and the servant-leadership characteristics will help ameliorate the challenges Hannay discusses, and accommodate those new competencies (Skoll, 2011) by demonstrating the degree to which the cultural dimensions (Chhokar, et al., 2008) will enhance the servant-leadership characteristics. Plus, linking the cultural dimensions and the servant-leadership characteristics potentially avoids failures such as: SBC and Pacific Bell. Senn's (2008) research noted: "that most of the failure was due to a clash in cultures and the absence of any attempt to bring the cultures together" (p. 3). Intercultural leaders are potentially more capable to navigate cultural differences in multinational firms when equipped with the cultural dimensions, though this may require new competencies.

New competencies potentially involve understanding the cultural dimensions indicated below:

1. Future Orientation
2. Assertiveness
3. Gender Egalitarianism
4. Human Orientation
5. In-Group Collectivism—individuals, families, loyalty, pride, cohesion
6. Institutional Collectivism—institutional reward for being collectivistic
7. Performance Orientation
8. Power Distance
9. Uncertainty Avoidance

These cultural dimensions emanate from the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) Research Project. This study is robust in that its empirical findings are based on samples from cross-cultural populations: 17,370 middle managers from 951 corporations, across 62 societies or countries; the sampling came from 62 societal cultures (House, et al., 2004, p. 97). To link the servant-leadership characteristics to the cultural dimensions, I grouped them into pairs based on their closeness in meaning, though some are closer in meaning or congruency than others, as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1. Servant-leadership characteristics paired with cultural dimensions

Servant Leadership Characteristics	*GLOBE Cultural Dimensions*
Foresight	Future orientation
Empathy	Gender Egalitarianism
Persuasion	Human Orientation
Commitment to growth of others	Performance Orientation
Building Community	Institutional Collectivism
Conceptualization	Uncertainty Avoidance
Self-Awareness	Power Distance
Listening	Assertiveness
Healing	In-Group Collectivism

Note: This table was created and contributed by Natalie A. Mattson, May 17, 2013

The first cultural dimension is *Future Orientation*, defined as "the degrees to which individuals in organizations or societies engage in future-oriented behaviors such as planning, investing in the future, and delaying individual or collective gratification" (Chhokar, et al., 2008, p. 3). Ashkanasy, et al. included a bit more in defining future orientation, specifically relevant parties looked at how their current actions would affect their future with a focus on investment in their future. When it comes to defining future orientation, these authors state:

the extent to which members of a society or an organization believe that their current actions will influence their future, focus on investment in their future, believe that they will have a future that matters, believe in planning for developing their future, and look far into the future for assessing the effects of their current actions. (Ashkanasy et al., p. 285, 2004)

As we can see this cultural dimension, *Future Orientation,* is consistent with addressing the needs of others, especially as related to their future. *Foresight* too, deals with others' future. This first pair is relevant to intercultural leaders' planning for staff development; it may be applied within a corporate merger to minimize failure by focusing on future of the merger and not just the finances.

Future orientation and foresight share commonalities; on one hand, *future orientation* informs current actions, future planning, investing in the future and delaying gratification. *Foresight* on the other hand, looks at "events of the instant moment and constantly comparing those events with a series of projections made in the past and at the same time projecting future events—with diminishing certainty as projected time runs out into the indefinite future" (Greenleaf, p. 39, 2002). Thus, the servant-leadership characteristic *foresight* and the cultural dimension *future orientations* share similar considerations for future orientations for those being served. Intercultural leaders may embrace both while navigating cultural differences in domestic diverse leadership work settings and international ones as well. *Future orientation* and *foresight* could play a key role in strategic planning, budget forecasting, brand development, succession planning, training, and staff development. The second pair, *gender egalitarianism* and *empathy* potentially play a major part in building a culture of inclusiveness and engagement.

Gender Egalitarianism and Empathy may work conjointly in a variety of diverse workplaces. *Gender egalitarianism* is about minimizing gender differences (Chhokar, et al., 2008). "[I]t is the extent to which an organization or a society minimizes gender role differences while promoting gender equity and the equality of genders" (p. 3). *Empathy* on the other hand is linked to acceptance (Greenleaf, 2002). "The servant always accepts and empathizes, never rejects" (p. 33). According to Greenleaf, reject is the opposite of both empathy and acceptance; he defines reject as "to refuse to hear or receive—to throw out" (p. 33). Since servant-leaders empathize, the practice of *gender egalitarianism* is consistent with *empathy* because both play a role in understanding experiences of another and acceptance when it comes to gender. It means in a sense to treat women and men with equal dignity; to understand each one's relationship to culture, it says treat them equitably, such as equal pay for equal work, creating a culture of inclusiveness which affects a person's engagement in the workplace. Empathy is a means of understanding and getting to gender egalitarianism. "Empathy engenders trust, insight, and understanding important for both internal and cross-cultural communication" (Miyashiro, 2011, p. 24). Garner says it best: "Tough empathy means giving people what they need and not what they want" (2009, p. 86). Empathy and gender egalitarianism were demonstrated by the President when he signed the Paycheck Fairness Act:

On average, women in the U.S. still make 77 cents for every dollar that men make in the same job, said senior administration officials on the call. The rate drops even lower for minorities, to 64 cents for African-American women and to 56 cents for Latinas. (Bendery, 2013, Huffington Post)

Gender egalitarianism and empathy are necessary in diverse workplaces, especially where men and women differ ethnically, culturally, etc., yet doing the same or similar work. And Garner's (2009) notion that empathy is giving people what they need. However, intercultural leaders may need to consider how genders are seen in different cultures to fuse gender egalitarianism with empathy, or giving women what they need. And will the organization's culture mirror the countries culture and if not how will this be addressed by the intercultural leader? This is related to equitable inclusion of both genders which leads to the next pair: *human orientation* and *persuasion*.

Human Orientation and Persuasion: Human orientation as defined by (Chhokar, et al., 2008) "is the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies encourage and reward individuals for being fair, altruistic, friendly, generous, caring, kind to others, and exhibiting and promoting altruistic ideals" (p. 3). *Persuasion* according to Greenleaf "has the virtue of change by convincement rather than coercion" (p. 44). When it comes to leadership, Greenleaf believes *persuasion's* advantages are obvious (p. 44). With a mindset of *human orientation* and *persuasion*, an intercultural leader is able to co-create or design and implement environments in which individuals are creatively fulfilling norms of fairness and caring, establishing social structures that foster inclusion of those who differ culturally, ethnically, religiously, etc. A mindset as such is essential for navigating cultural differences, facilitating the growth of others, supporting their professional development, leading to a higher performance orientation. These two are somewhat aligned because leadership by persuasion can significantly influence human orientation.

Performance Orientation and *Commitment to growth of others*: *Performance orientation* "refers to the extent to which high level members of organizations and societies encourage and reward group members of performance improvement and excellence" (Chhokar, et al., 2008, p. 4). And when it comes to *commitment to the growth of others*, intercultural leaders can mirror servant-leaders who believe that people have an intrinsic value beyond their tangible contributions as workers. (the definition of performance orientation as stated above does not include or endorse the notion of intrinsic value, thus the two do not equate) In practice, this may include (but is not limited to) concrete actions such as "making funds available for personal and professional development, taking a personal interest in the ideas and suggestions from everyone, encouraging worker involvement in decision-making, and actively assisting laid-off employees to find other positions" (Spears, 2010, p. 5). According to Spears, servant-leaders are devoted deeply to the growth of organizational members; that servant-leaders believe in personal and professional development of staff members; this belief informs intercultural leaders for their continued development and growth.

The servant-leader is deeply committed to the growth of each and every individual within his or her organization. The servant-leader recognizes the tremendous responsibility to do everything in his or her power to nurture the personal and professional growth of employees and colleagues. (Spears, 2010, p. 5) Thus, recognizing cultural variation adds a layer of complexity to the workplace and deepens intercultural leaders' commitment to growth and performance.

Given that *performance orientation* as a cultural dimension and *commitment to the growth of others* as a servant-leadership characteristic, both potentially result in rewards for growth and performance; both can work concurrently in most cross-cultural workplaces. If handled strategically, differences create curiosity, exploration, and synergistic based performance orientations,

rather than competitive ones. I believe organizations and employees win when people are working at their optimum; and intercultural leaders demonstrating cultural awareness are prepared to create an environment in which this occurs. In the end, com*mitment to the growth of others* and *performance orientation* are slightly correlated, creating a potential recipe for feeding institutional collectivism and building an inclusive community.

Institutional Collectivism and *Building Community: Institutional collectivism*, also known as Collectivism I, as a cultural dimension, "reflects the degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective actions" (Chhokar, et al., 2008, p. 3). In support of the foregoing, research by House, et al. (2004, p. 447) indicates that when it comes to *institutional collectivism*, organizational members have a high regards toward their community and feel obligations toward others within that community (p. 447). Support for group needs is evident, indicating a tendency toward collective actions for all, leading to a community of higher participation, collaboration, productivity. Gardenswartz et al. (2008), add to this concept, Social Architecting which "is about being an engineer or an architect who designs spaces intentionally to produce a climate of energy and productivity" (p.129).

Spears and Lawrence (2004) say servant-leadership is an institutional model and "advocates a group-oriented approach to analysis and decision making as a means of strengthening institutions and improving society" (p. 17). That servant-leadership "emphasizes the power of persuasion and seeking consensus over the old top-down form of leadership" (p.17). To reinforce the strength of *institutional collectivism* and *building community*, Spears and Lawrence add, "Servant-leadership holds that the primary purpose of a business should be to create a positive impact on its employees and community, rather than using profit as the sole motive" (2004, p. 17). Both *institutional collectivism* and *building community* are mutually supporting in that the former rewards collective distribution of resources; the latter is about collective efficacy and capability. The two together result in building capacity by sharing resources. This concept can add cultural synergy to the workplace.

Uncertainty Avoidance and Conceptualization: On the surface, the cultural dimension, *uncertainty avoidance* appears to be inconsistent with the servant-leadership characteristic, *conceptualization. Uncertainty avoidance* per the GLOBE study is about "relying on established social norms, rituals, and bureaucratic practices to decrease the probability of unpredictable future events that can adversely affect the operation of an organization or society" (Chhokar, et al., 2008, p. 4). Its potential lies in its relationship with organizational uncertainty avoidance (House, et al., 2004); that is GLOBE's analysis "found a strong relationship between societal uncertainty avoidance and organizational uncertainty" (p. 641).

The data suggest that societies with high scores for GLOBE uncertainty avoidance practices tend to have a higher level of economic prosperity and enjoy more civil liberties, a higher level of competitiveness in the global market, greater security, higher life expectancy, and greater general satisfaction. (House, et al., p. 645)

The practice of *conceptualization* by its makeup potentially supports *uncertainty avoidance* because it involves a form of seeing into the future: prescience. Greenleaf's (2002, p. 45) example how *uncertainty avoidance* was overcome by Denmark's Nikolai Frederik Severin Grundtvig who conceptualized a high school for the peasants; he conceptualized a new form of education, leading to the Folk High School, achieving a transformation thought impossible at the time. Greenleaf (p. 46) added, "cultured" (those who were of the elite class) thought he was a confused visionary. Grundtvig's conceptualization resulted in the peasants raising "themselves into the Danish national culture" (p. 46).

Conceptualizing is being a visionary for an organization or institution; plus, the leader thinks beyond the day-to-day (Spears & Lawrence, 2004). Thus, an intercultural leader who leads in a cross-cultural or multicultural workplace containing staff members who support *uncertainty avoidance* should be able to, through conceptualizing, modify their thinking about *uncertainty avoidance*, or unpredictable events; he or she, being a visionary for the organization, is able to think beyond the day-to-day. Intercultural leaders' behavior as such, will aid in ameliorating the power distance where necessary, and especially when they are acutely self-aware of who they are and what they stand for. These two are moderately aligned because conceptualization is about looking beyond; thus, the leader is more able to potentially ameliorate uncertainty avoidance.

Power Distance and Self-Awareness: In the Globe study (Chhokar, et al., 2008) the definition of *power distance* can be misleading. The authors define it as: "the degree to which members of an organization and society encourage and reward unequal distribution of power with greater power at higher levels" (p. 4). Given that unequal distribution of power is encouraged, if intercultural leaders are keenly self-aware of who they are, what they value, and how they relate to culturally different others, they are better prepared to be disturbed and awakened (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 41). Not being "seekers after solace," leaders should be able to lead from "their inner serenity" (p. 41). Being fully self-aware, intercultural leaders are poised to decrease the *power distance,* lead from within or from the heart, engage cultural differences in ways perhaps unknown to other type leaders. Though power distance is a relationship between leader and follower, self-awareness of both leader and follower can play a vital role in their relationship; thus, these two are somewhat aligned.

Assertiveness and Listening: Assertiveness as defined by (Chhokar, et al., 2008, p. 3) "is the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies are assertive, confrontational, and aggressive in social relationships." Bertsch has a slightly different definition: It "relates to adaptation, survivability, and integration of a cultural group and these are consistent with Schein's (1992, 2004) concepts of cultural dimensions" (Bertsch, 2012, p. 12). Even if some organizational members subscribe to the first definition: assertive, confrontational, and aggressive and other members subscribe to the second definition: adaptation, survivability, and integration, we must adhere to the GLOBE's definition. Comparing assertiveness, as used in the GLOBE study, with listening as defined here, the two are marginally equatable.

In-Group Collectivism and Healing: This is the last pair of the cultural dimension and servant-leadership characteristics. *In-Group Collectivism* is also known as Collectivism II, reflecting "the degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations, families, circle of close friends, or other such small groups" (Chhokar, et al., 2008, p. 3). Its companions, *Healing, a* servant-leadership characteristic means "to make whole" (Greenleaf, 2002, p. 50). According to Carol Smith (2005) "The servant-leader recognizes the shared human desire to find wholeness in one's self, and support it in others" (p. 5). The phrase "to make whole" refers to working with "those who have broken spirits and have suffered from a variety of emotional hurt" (Spears & Lawrence, 2004, p.13); however, as Greenleaf says, leaders should work with themselves first. From the meaning of *In-Group Collectivism,* that individuals are proud, loyal and cohesive in their settings, be it their organizations, families, and friends, and that *Healing* is about sharing a desire to find wholeness in self and others; this provides excellent vehicles for intercultural leaders to bring the culture to the fore by: practicing listening, conceptualizing, building community, committing to the growth of others, persuasion, empathy, foresight, self-awareness, healing and building relationships, plus creating a comprehen-

sive culture that embraces these characteristics. Of course, this equation would be incomplete without adding the cultural dimensions, requiring deep levels of cultural acumen, stretching every characteristic the intercultural leader has developed. This blend in my view could result in an organizational culture like no other. To link healing and in-group collectivism would require reflective practices as cited above in the Fortune 50 global aerospace company (Kenny, n. d.).

Cautionary Summary

A cautionary summary is necessary regarding the servant-leadership characteristics and the cultural dimensions, especially when it comes to conducting research. Let's take the cultural dimensions first. Hofstede (2010) warns that they should not be reified; that they are not tangible, not observable directly but only from verbal statements, they are inferable from verbal statements (p. 6); that we have defined them into existence (p. 7). Brewer and Venaik (2012) also warn "that dimensions of national culture do not apply to individuals," or used to predict behavior of a single individual (p. 2) but rather to groups and cultures as a whole. One may conclude that applying the cultural dimensions in different cultures, researching them, and drawing conclusions should be done with caution. What about servant-leadership?

Servant-leadership too, is not a panacea in all cultures. Irving and McIntosh (2010) concluded for example countries having a high power distance (powered shared by a few) such as many Latin American cultures will not support Servant leadership principles. Humphreys (2005) did a study, stating that both servant leadership and transformational leadership theories are contingent; that both are appropriate depending on the cultural setting. So, regardless to how closely servant-leadership characteristics are aligned or not aligned with the cultural dimensions from the GLOBE study, they may or may not be appropriate in certain cultures. One may conclude that the two theories are ripe for rigorous research for years to come.

BRINGING IT TOGETHER

The first part of this chapter defines servant-leadership followed by it characteristics. The second part attempted to integrate the nine cultural dimensions (Chhokar, et al., 2008) with the servant-leadership characteristics (Greenleaf, 2002); some dimensions are not as equatable as others. The goal is to build intercultural leader capacity to effectively navigate cross-cultural differences, overcome cultural barriers, and build an organizational culture that is inclusive, collaborative, and participative, avoiding organizational failure. Building capacity in this context also implies working with the servant-leadership characteristics and the cultural dimensions simultaneously.

The content of this chapter responds to the exigencies for intercultural leadership noted in the beginning. Linking the cultural dimensions and the servant-leadership characteristics may offer improved ways of communicating, building inclusive cultures, and leading more globally and interculturally, potentially avoiding failure, depending on the type of culture. However, if we define institutional success as serving the larger public interest, providing goods and services for all, not just the wealthy, rich, privileged, and powerful, then Dee Hock's quote about failure has merit. In the "Afterword" of Greenleaf's *Servant Leadership* (2002), Peter Senge quotes Dee Hock: "In an era of massive institutional failure, the ideas in *Servant Leadership* point toward a possible path forward, and will continue to do so" (p. 345). By intercultural leaders internalizing and embracing the content of servant-leadership and the cultural

dimensions, they will potentially have a stronger capacity to play major roles in minimizing or avoiding institutional failure.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

There is a large gap in research on servant-leadership in cross-cultural settings. I was quite disappointed after reviewing more than 150 refereed journal articles without finding substantive research regarding servant-leadership in cross-cultural settings. Much of the research in servant-leadership in different cultures is void of substance. Seemingly, most researchers simply repeat what other researchers have done with minor variations. And when it comes to the servant-leadership characteristics, there is even less research—a gap needing to be closed.

Given the changes in demographics, globalization, and technology, the first potential research endeavor comes to mind is a design comparing the servant-leadership approach with other leadership approaches in multicultural organizations. This may take the form of a mix-method: quantitative and qualitative data in concert with phenomenological research looking at leader effectiveness in cross-cultural settings.

Another research enterprise may compare differences in performance outcomes of those organizations applying the cultural dimensions concomitantly with servant-leadership characteristics and those that do not. What are the differences in goal attainment and mission accomplishment of intercultural leaders and other type leaders in transnational settings?

Merger failures too, could be researched by comparing performance outcomes of leaders who are culturally competent, culturally intelligent, and apply servant-leadership approach vs. leaders who do not possess these attributes.

Finally, when we look at the magnitude of the GLOBE study, the sample size of 17,300 middle managers generalize middle managers from 950 organizations, across 62 countries/cultures, the 21 leadership dimensions could be researched to see how they fit within a servant-leadership environment, again, depending on the culture

CONCLUSION

This chapter's objective was to provide a different way of thinking regarding servant-leadership and ideas from the GLOBE study, especially the cultural dimensions. It promoted the importance and strength of the Servant-leadership characteristics working in pairs with cultural dimensions, though some pairs were not as strongly linked or equated as anticipated. The thrust of the chapter was to provide the wherewithal to build intercultural leader capacity to effectively navigate cultural differences, overcome cultural barriers, and create cultures that are inclusive, collaborative, participative, and highly effective.

REFERENCES

Addalla, I. A., & Alhomoud, M. A. (2001). Exploring the implicit leadership theory in the Arabian gulf states. *Applied Psychology*, *4*, 506–531. doi:10.1111/1464-0597.00071

Ashkanasy, N., Gupta, V., Mayfield, M., & Trevor-Roberts, E. (2004). Future orientation. In R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman, & W. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 282–342). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Aulet, B. (2013). *Culture a primal force*. MIT Entrepreneur Development Program 2013. Retrieved May 4, 2013 from http://www.valueatwork.se/how-to-design-and-shape-workplace-culture/

Beitler, M. (2005). *Expatriate training & support*. Retrieved May 20, 2013 From www.mikebeitler.com

Bendery, J. (2013, April 7). *Obama presses senate to act on equal pay for women*. Huffington Post. Retrieved April 7, 2013 from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/06/04/obama-equal-pay-women_n_1568255.html

Bennett, J. M. (2001, June). Intercultural competence for global leadership. In *An intercultural mindset and skillset for global leadership*. Paper presented at Leadership Without Borders: Developing Global Leaders. Adelphi, MD.

Bennett, J. M. (2009). Transforming training: Designing programs for culture learning. In *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations* (pp. 95–110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. doi:10.4135/9781452274942.n8

Bertsch, A. M. (2012). Validating GLOBE's societal values scales: A test in the U.S.A. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *3*, 8.

Black, J. S., Morrison, A. J., & Gregersen, H. B. (1999). *Global explorers: The next generation of leaders*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Chhokar, J. S., Brodbeck, F. C., & House, R. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Culture and leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Driscoll Chavez, E. G. (2012). *Servant leadership in Bolivia: A phenomenological study of long-term effect of a servant leader in missions*. Retrieved September 14, 2013 from http://www.edsmither.com/uploads/5/6/4/6/564614/chavez_ems_2012.pdf

Earley, P. C., & Eng, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Engle, R. L., & Nehrt, C. C. (2012). Antecedents of cultural intelligence: The role of risk, control, and openness in France and the United States. *Journal of Management*, *13*(5), 35.

Gardenwartz, L., Cherbosque, J., & Rowe, A. (2008). *Emotional intelligence for managing results in a diverse world: The hard truth about soft skills in the workplace*. Mountain View, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.

Gardwnswartz, L., Rowe, A., Digh, P., & Bennett, M. F. (2003). *The global diversity desk reference: Managing an international workforce*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Garner, H. C. (2009, November-December). Empathy: A true leader skill. *Military Review*.

George, B., Sims, P., McLean, A. N., & Mayer, D. (2007). Discovering your authentic leadership. *Harvard Business Review*. Retrieved April 30, 2013 from http://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~leaders/articles/DiscoveringAuthenticLeadership.pdf

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence.*

Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). Servant leadership: A journey in to the nature of legitimate power & greatness (25th Anniversary Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Han, Y., Kakabadse, N. K., & Kakabadse, A. (2010). Servant leadership in the People's Republic of China: A case study of the public sector. *Journal of Management Development*, *29*(3), 265–281. doi:10.1108/02621711011025786

Hannay, M. (2009). The cross-cultural leader: The application of servant leadership theory in the international context. *Journal of International Business and Cultural Studies*. Retrieved March 6, 2013 from http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/08108.pdf

Havas, A., Schartinger, D., & Weber, M. (2010). The impact of foresight on innovation policy-making: Recent experiences and future perspectives. *Research Evaluation*, *19*(2), 91–104. doi:10.3152/095820210X510133

Henman, L. (2009). *Executive deraliers: Mistakes that interfere with success*. Retrieved March, 21, 2013 from http://www.henmanperformancegroup.com/articles/Executive-Derailer.pdf

Hofstede, G. (2010). The GLOBE debate: Back to relevance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *41*, 1339–1346. doi:10.1057/jibs.2010.31

Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2009). *Management derailment: Personality assessment and mitigation*. Retrieved May 20, 2013 from http://www.hoganassessments.com/_hoganWeb/documents/Management_Derailment.pdf

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Humphreys, J. H. (2005). Contextual implications for transformational and servant leadership: A historical investigation. *Management Decision*, *43*(10), 1410–1431. doi:10.1108/00251740510634949

Irving, J. A., & McIntosh, T. A. (2010). Investigating the value of and hindrances to servant leadership in the Latin American context: Initial findings from Peruvian leaders. *Journal of International Business and Cultural Studies,* (2), 1-16.

Kenny, R. (n.d.). *Consciousness and healing: Integral approaches to mind-body medicine*. The Institute of Noetic Sciences. Retrieved September 20, 2013 from http://media.noetic.org/uploads/files/Kenny.pdf

Landis, D., Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miyashiro, M. R. (2011). *The empathy factor: Your competitive advantage for personal, team and business success*. Encinitas, CA: Puddle Dancer Press.

Moodian, M. A. (Ed.). (2009). *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Moseley, A. (2009). Improving cross-cultural communication skills: Ask-seek-knock. *Leadership Advance Online, 17*.

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Ottavi, L. (2009). *Cultural intelligence in the globalized work environment*. Retrieved September 20, 2013 from http://leslie.ottavi.com/about/CI_GWE.pdf

Polak-Weldon, R., Balogh, A., Bogdany, E., & Cizmadia, T. (2012). *The challenges of globalization: The changing role of cultural intelligence in the 21st century*. Management, Knowledge and Learning—Conference 2012. Retrieved September 23, 2013 from: http://www.issbs.si/press/ISBN/978-961-6813-10-5/papers/ML12_081.pdf

Rosen, R., Digh, P., Singer, M., & Phillips, C. (2000). *Global literacies: Lessons on business leadership and national cultures*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Rowe, W. G., & Guerrero, L. (2011). *Cases in leadership* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Sanchez-Runde, C., Whittington, R., & Quintanilla, J. (2000). *Human resource management implications of new forms of organizing*. Retrieved May 21, 2013 from http://www.iese.edu/research/pdfs/DI-0409-E.pdf

Schein, E. H. (1999). *The corporate culture survival guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: Its origin, development, and application in organization. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *9*(2). doi:10.1177/107179190200900205

Senge, P. (2002). Afterword. In R. K. Greenleaf (Ed.), *Servant leadership* (pp. 343–359). Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Senn, L. (2008). *Cultural clash in mergers and acquisitions*. Retrieved May 25, 2013 from http://knowledge.senndelaney.com/docs//thought_papers/pdf/new_cultureclash_UK_final.pdf

Shekari, H., Taft, Yazd, I. R., & Nikooparvar Mahmood, Z. (2012). Promoting leadership effectiveness in organizations: A case study on the involved factors of servant leadership. *International Journal of Business Administration*, *3*(1), 54–65. doi:10.5430/ijba.v3n1p54

Skoll, S. (2011). *The relationship between GLOBE's future orientation cultural dimension and servant leadership endorsement*. Retrieved March 24, 2013, from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/elj/vol4iss1/Sokoll_V4I1_pp141-153.pdf

Smith, C. (2005). *Servant leadership: The leadership theory of Robert Greenleaf.* The Greenleaf Centre for Servant-Leadership UK.

Spears, L. C. (2005). *The understanding and practice of servant leadership*. Retrieved May 23, 2013 from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/sl_proceedings/2005/spears_practice.pdf

Spears, L. C. (2010). Character and servant leadership: Ten characteristics of effective, caring leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, *1*, 25–30.

Spears, L. C., & Lawrence, M. (2004). *Practicing servant leadership: Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Venaik, S., & Brewer, P. (2012). *Critical issues in the Hofstede and GLOBE national culture models*. Retrieved September 20, 2013 from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=17093012

Whitfield, D. (2008). Global leadership. In *The global manager* (pp. 129–137). Hyderabad, India: The Icfai University Press.

Wibbeke, E. S. (2009). Global business leadership. New York, NY: Butterworth-Heinemann (Elsevier).

ADDITIONAL READING

Augsburger, D. W. (1992). *Conflict mediation across cultures*. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press.

Baruth, L. G., & Manning, M. L. (1992). *Multicultural education of children and adolescents*. Needam Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, J. M., & Bennett, M. J. (2004). Developing intercultural sensitivity: An integrative approach to global and domestic diversity. In D. Landis, J. M. Bennett, & M. J. Bennett (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (3rd ed., pp. 147–165). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. doi:10.4135/9781452231129.n6

Bennett, M. J. (1998). *Basic concepts of intercultural communication*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bhagwati, J. (2004). *In defense of globalization*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Black, J. S., Morrison, A. J., & Gregersen, H. B. (1999). *Global explorers: The next generation of leaders*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Fernandez, J. P. (1991). *Managing a diverse work force: Regaining the competitive edge*. New York: Lexington Books.

Fowler, S. M., & Mumford, M. G. (1999). *Intercultural Sourcebook: Cross-cultural training methods* (Vol. 2). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Gardenswartz, L., Cherbosque, J., & Rowe, A. (2008). *Emotional intelligence for managing results in a diverse world*. Mountain View, CA: Davies-Black Publishing.

Gardenswartz, L., Rowe, A., Digh, P., & Bennett, M. F. (2003). *The global diversity desk reference: Managing an international workforce*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.

Garner, H. C. (2009). Empathy: A true leader skill. *Military Review*, (November-December): 2009.

Goldsmith, M., Greenberg, C. L., Robertson, A., & Hu-Chan, M. (2003). *Global leadership: The next generation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. New York: Random House.

Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1987). *Understanding cultural differences: Germans, French, and Americans*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moodian, M. A. (Ed.). (2009). *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Moseley, A. (2009). Leadership advance online – *Issue XVII, Summer 2009*. Retrieved September 17, 2013 from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/lao/home.htm.

Multicultural Women Attorneys Network. (1994). *The burdens of both, the privileges of neither*. Chicago, IL: American Bar Association.

Pusch, M. D. (1979). *Multicultural education: A cross-cultural training approach*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., & McDaniel, E. R. (2009). *Intercultural communication: A reader*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Seelye, H. N. (1996). *Experiential activities for intercultural learning*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Seelye, H. N. (1997). *Teaching culture: Strategies for intercultural communication*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Simon, G. (1989). *Working together: How to become more effective in a multicultural organization*. Los Altos, CA: Crisp Publications, Inc.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press. [Note: There may be a new Ed.]

Whitfield, D. (1994). Toward an integrated approach to improving multicultural counselor education. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *22*, 239–252. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.1994.tb00257.x

Whitfield, D. (2011). Leadership and foresight in a changing and challenging world: A call for servant leadership. *The International Journal of Servant-Leadership.*, *7*, 123–139.

Wibbeke, E. S. (2009). *Global business leadership*. New York, NY: Elsevier.

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Cultural Dimensions: To me, these are attributes or independent variables (causal variables) that when applied in intercultural workplaces will result in a potentially desired outcome (caused outcome).

Cultural Intelligence: Knowing how to behave in different cultural settings; knowing how to embrace ambiguity, how to deal with the unknown when it comes to culturally different others.

Culture: To me culture is a picture of behavioral patterns observed throughout an organization daily. The best way to know an organization is to know its culture.

Culture Competency: Is the fitness and capability to scan, understand, and navigate cultural differences appropriately enough to get work done through organizational members.

Heartset: Is about our attitude toward cultural differences; how we feel about and toward culturally different others.

Intercultural Leadership: A process with the capacity to successfully navigate across different cultures with the skill to *leverage* cultural differences; this may be internal or external to an organization or entity.

Intercultural Workplace/Setting: A space or spaces where culturally different individuals are working, playing, or somehow socially engaged; this may include differences such as: ethnic, racial, religious, sexual, etc.

Mindset: Includes our knowledge about culturally different others; what we know about different cultures in general and their norms in particular; our perceptions, our cognitive orientation toward differences.

Skillset: Involves our abilities to work with cultural differences; how we gather information and facts; how we listen in culturally different settings; how we build relationships, and how we adapt.