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Many talk of the business case for diversity to justify the importance of promoting diversity in an organization. It is simply good business to be responsive to diverse customers and diverse staff. As the population becomes increasingly diverse in many countries and institutions worldwide, it is also socially responsible for organizations and leaders to attend to diversity. This includes the theories and practices that we use to understand, exercise, and appraise leadership, especially when enacted by diverse leaders not typically in the ranks of leadership. The purpose of this book is to

- Expand the existing perspectives on leadership to be inclusive of diversity that is currently largely based on North American and Euro American male norms.
- Introduce other perspectives from international and minority groups in which different worldviews and cultural orientation values may prevail.
- Expect diverse responses. Leaders and potential leaders with privileged social identities may express surprise and hopefully be open to different perspectives and values as ways to expand their own exercise of leadership. Leaders and potential leaders with less privileged social identities may feel an affirmation for leadership styles and behaviors that do not fit that of the "prototypic" leader.

Together, new paradigms for diversity leadership will emerge, which will be relevant to a diverse and global society. While we underscore repeatedly the importance of context in this book, the focus is on how leaders lead, what influences the enactment of leadership and the interaction or exchange that occurs between members and leader. We hope to challenge the teaching/learning of leadership by addressing difference and the cultural competence of leaders, members, and organizations in the exercise of leadership. We recognize that there can be a dark side to leadership. In offering new perspectives, we offer them not as examples of ideal leadership; rather, we offer them as paradigms that recognize the changing demographics within organizations and societies and the increasing demand on leaders to lead a
diverse workforce (both locally and internationally) as well as the increasing entry of racial/ethnic minority groups and women into leadership roles.

This book is intended for leaders and potential leaders, graduate and undergraduate-level students in courses on diversity, leadership, management, and multiculturalism; and those interested in leadership and how it influences the lives of organizations. It is intended for those in fields of business, psychology, gender studies, and sociology to understand the role of leadership in advancing social and organizational outcomes.

The structure of the book is organized around introducing concepts of diversity and multiculturalism into the study of leadership. The first three chapters contextualize this goal as important to 21st century leadership and define the relevance of diversity concepts to leadership. We feel this is missing in the literature today. The next four chapters address leader identity, leadership style, societal, and organizational contexts as to how they shape the exercise of leadership and of leaders themselves. The last two chapters address the importance of leadership training and the need for new and alternative paradigms of leadership to be relevant to the 21st century.

The scope of the book focuses on diverse leaders and leadership within diverse contexts. It differs from diversity books that focus on promoting diversity as an organizational goal or those that focus on leadership without attention to issues of diversity. While we recognize there are many dimensions of diversity, this book is limited to race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation largely because these are visible dimensions that are salient in society according to privilege to one or more of its statuses. While religion, socioeconomic status (SES), and disability have also influenced our perceptions of leadership, there is little study of these dimensions vis-à-vis leadership. While we hope this diversity perspective will promote dialogue and organizational and societal change to incorporate diversity as a goal, the intent of the book is to promote awareness, skill development, and training of diverse leaders to effectively lead in the 21st century. We do this by identifying cross-cultural and cross-group differences in leadership styles and in understanding the importance of multiple and intersecting social identities on the exercise of leadership. We draw on empirical research where it exists but are mindful of using a grounded theory approach to identify phenomena that may not be found in existing theories.
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With Contributions From Roger Husbands and Beauregard Stubblefield-Tave

Notable Quotes on Minority Leadership

Mentorship: “In my mind and in my experience, mentorship for minority leaders is one of the most critical aspects for developing leadership muscles in the Western world.” (Black American female leader)

Leadership training: “Our training is intentional for minority leaders. It is about relationships and building a leadership pipeline. It is about mobilizing change and social responsibility. . . . It is not about filling a quota but is about blazing a trail.” (Alvin Alvarez, Founder of the Leader Development Institute of the Council of National Psychological Associations for the Advancement of Ethnic Minority Interests)

Vignette on Cultural Competence Awareness Training

“Well, you know all homosexuals are going straight to Hell, right? It says so right in the Bible.” When a workshop participant made this comment, I was stunned into silence. After a pause, I replied, “Well, you know there are Christians who don’t read the Bible the same way you do. Would you like to share your thoughts with your colleagues?” The participant looked at me as if I’d asked “Would you like to take a trip to Mars?” We were at a break, and it was clear he did not feel safe sharing his views with his colleagues. Was it in response to my listing sexual orientation as a core identity issue rather
than a sin (along with age, race/ethnicity, and sex/gender)? Was it that his colleagues had nodded in acknowledgment? I felt as though I had failed in my training objectives; however, it reminded me of two key points: (1) You can only take an individual, or a group, so far during any training session; (2) it would be difficult for others to be safe if he had shared his true feelings; and (3) he did feel safe enough with me to share his views when he knew I would disagree with them. This difficult dialogue is a type of experiential, “Aha!” learning, which is at the heart of cultural competence awareness training. (Beau Stubblefield-Tave, Cultural Imperative Trainer)

In identifying new paradigms and reframing existing theories toward a DLMOX paradigm for diversity leadership, we can look not only at the creation of new knowledge and research about an inclusive and culturally competent leadership framework as discussed in Chapter 3 but also to consider its application for leaders and organizations. Potential and existing leaders can become multiculturally or interculturally competent and culturally fluent regardless of their social identities; however, each group may have some different training needs as well as different lived experiences that they bring to their leadership. The application of principles in this book in promoting a DLMOX paradigm toward the development and training of diverse leaders is discussed in this chapter.

Purpose of Diversity Leadership Training

“Diversity leadership must become a core competency at all levels. . . . An effective leader promotes fairness and equity in the organization . . . and knows how to focus a broadly diverse group to use its members’ difference on ways to benefit the mission. . . . It is a learned skill. . . . Providing diversity leadership education is distinct from traditional forms of general diversity training. . . . This requires a fundamental shift in institutional thinking about diversity . . . and the personal and visible commitment of top leaders” (Military Leadership Diversity Commission, 2011). To have the United States support this position is profound within a culture known for its emphasis on conformity and command and control. It supports the implications of this book for developing leadership training that aligns with the principles of diversity. The underlying assumptions, goals and objectives, and training structure of a Diverse Leader-Member-Organizational Exchange Paradigm (DLMOX) proposed in this book are to train leaders to lead in a diverse and global environment. For this to happen, a focus on leadership development and leader self-awareness is first and foremost. Because leaders from minority, marginalized, and
underrepresented groups have a different experience, targeted training may be useful for these groups. Because organization cultures vary in their heterogeneity and as to whether or not their missions incorporate diversity as a goal, training needs for organizations may also be different.

We see training as an application of the principles discussed in this book to enable organizations to promote an inclusive, culturally competent culture and environment for all individuals to have access to and be effective in positions of leadership irrespective of the social groups from which they come and for all leaders to incorporate diversity objectives in their exercise of leadership.

Using a diversity leadership or DLMOX paradigm can be applied in very practical ways to build culturally sensitive workplace climates, design new employee orientation programs, conduct programs in relocation training, improve global team effectiveness, and facilitate multinational merger implementation. More inclusive and diverse leadership not only is responsive to growing diversity in the workplace but also promotes innovation and flexibility among work teams.

Understanding issues about diversity, difference, and culture are useful in several ways. First, it can help leaders understand their own cultural biases and preferences as the first step toward understanding that other people in other cultures have different preferences. Second, different cultures have different worldviews, perceptions, and expectations about what they want from their leaders and what it means to be a good leader. Understanding these differences can help leaders adapt their style to be more effective across different cultural settings or to manage the discrepancies that hinder them from being effective. Third, understanding different cultural orientation dimensions can promote more effective communication among diverse leaders across cultural and geographic boundaries. By understanding cultural differences, leaders can become more empathic and accurate in their communication with others.

### Training for Culturally Competent Leaders: KSA Model

Global leadership often focuses on cross-cultural relationships where the acknowledgment of difference between equal partners is presumed—that is, between countries, corporations, and businesses. Here, the differences between leaders based on their social identities are explicit. The term *global leadership* is often used when multinational companies send their managers to another country to manage its indigenous workforce. This use and perception of leadership is quite ethnocentric with the term indigenous reserved for the less privileged and “underdeveloped” countries to which managers
are sent. As a result, countless examples of cultural miscommunications under these circumstances illuminate the need to be aware that differences do matter and the influence of culture is real. Diversity training of managers under these circumstances has often emphasized learning the basic and more superficial rules and values of the culture.

The term *diverse*, on the other hand, differs from global in its focus on differences within a country, corporation, or group, which may or may not be acknowledged. Inequality between social identity subgroups within the organization also may or may not be acknowledged or may be invisible. When management strategies, viewed as “typical” or universal, are ineffective across these different subgroups, it is easily blamed on “the other” as incompetent, lazy, or unmotivated rather than on the method or process of leadership.

Research has shown consistent and significant differences between Western and Eastern points of view, both in the United States and globally. Many examples of culturally blind business practices lead to miscommunication when leaders impose a structure from their ethnocentric but differing view in cross-cultural and diverse settings. For example, Westerners often misunderstand the spontaneous behavior in Eastern cultures of one taking full responsibility for paying the bill in a restaurant. Easterners nurture the relationship and operate on the principle of unequal exchange as a demonstration of generosity and reciprocity, which evens out in the long term. Westerners, who operate on the principle of equal exchange in the short term, are often unable to understand this concept and end up viewing Easterners as foolish. Easterners, on the other hand, view Westerners who fail to reciprocate as callous and rude. If we contend that culture matters and provides the context for leadership, this could have important ramifications in business negotiations and management practices. In a business negotiation, this could lead to an inability to reach agreement or termination of the relationship. In managing a diverse workforce, this could result in lower productivity because workers feel unappreciated and exploited.

As cultural practices get transplanted through immigration or globalization, it is not uncommon for hybrid cultures to emerge. For example, shifting views of the McDonald’s chain restaurant have occurred as it expanded globally. While viewed as “fast food and cheap” in the United States, it is often viewed as “international and modern” in other countries. The reverse occurs in immigrant communities. As immigrants strive to retain their culture post migration, many retain and develop bicultural identities linking their cultures of origin with their acculturation to the new host culture. This dynamic often results in many immigrants viewing conformity to mainstream practices as “selling out” one’s identity. This idea of selling out or “acting White” in the United States by persons...
Applications—Training Culturally Competent and Diverse Leaders

of color has been described graphically using nicknames such as “apple” for those who are Native American Indian on the outside and White on the inside, “banana” or “Twinkie” for Asian Americans, “coconut” for Pacific Islander Americans, and “Oreo” for African Americans.

Toward this end, the training for culturally competent leaders would address challenges faced by leaders in dealing with a diverse workforce as well as training diverse leaders for the unique challenges faced as a result of their marginalized social identities. Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992) offer a Cross-Cultural Competencies model. Using multidimensional objectives to develop cultural competence based on a Knowledge, Skills, and Awareness model (KSA model) for the training of clinicians, this can be applied to the training of diverse leaders (Moodian, 2009; Connerley & Pedersen, 2005). **Knowledge** is the body of information needed to perform a task—that is, about cultural differences. It includes specific knowledge about racial and cultural heritage, and about how lived experiences affect leaders personally and as leaders. It is the acknowledgment of racist attitudes, beliefs, and feelings as well as the privileges one may have benefited from because of one’s social identities. **Skills** are the proficiencies to perform a certain task—that is, skills for cross-cultural communication. It includes seeking out training, development, and consultation experiences to improve understanding and effectiveness cross-culturally. **Awareness** is the sensitivity, affect, and attitudes toward difference and diversity. It includes valuing these differences and being aware of how they influence interaction and communication. It is the ability to recognize the limits of one’s competence.

Connerley and Pedersen (2005) expand this model to the training of leaders in a diverse and global multicultural environment. They use training exercises to address stages of intercultural sensitivity going from awareness to knowledge and skills to different challenges faced by diverse leaders.

**Developing Culturally Fluent Leaders: Training Applications**

Culturally Fluent Leadership is an emerging concept that builds on Cross, Bazron, Dennis, and Isaacs’s (1989) continuum of cultural competence, which is defined as “a set of congruent behaviors, attitudes, and policies that come together in a system, agency or among professionals and enables that system, agency, or those professionals to work effectively in cross-cultural situations” (p. iv). Stubblefield-Tave (personal communication, 2013) offers the following working definition: “Culturally fluent leaders use their awareness, skills and knowledge to earn the trust and loyalty of diverse followers in pursuing a shared vision, mission or goal.” “Cultural fluency is the ability to move comfortably among cultures from the family
culture of home and the ethnic culture of one’s community to the educational culture of school and the corporate culture of one’s workplace” (Center for Cultural Fluency, n.d.).

The concept is based, in part, on the work of Josefina Campinha-Bacote (2003), who developed the ASK model (Awareness, Skills, Knowledge) to describe a culturally competent clinician and to train clinicians’ cultural competence. While the ASK model involves the same terms as the KSA model described above, its varying emphases are different. Awareness includes cultural and self-awareness and the in-depth exploration of one’s own cultural background as well as that of others. Skills includes the cultural skills to perform a task, including cross-cultural communication and the skills to lead cross-cultural teams. Knowledge includes not only the acquisition of cultural knowledge but also a process of seeking and obtaining a sound educational foundation about diverse cultural groups.

The ASK model recognizes that no leader can have encyclopedic knowledge of all the cultural groups with whom they interact. The cultural knowledge process may involve “learning just enough of a culture . . . and being able to effectively put this knowledge to work through honed skills specific to the business tasks at hand” (Foster, 2010). Leadership involves the leader working with team members. The Center for Culturally Fluent Leadership (CCFL) (B. Stubblefield-Taye, personal communication, 2013) adds Behaviors to this model to become the BASK model and emphasizes the exchange of behaviors that takes place between leaders and members; it is consistent with the DLMOX paradigm proposed in this book. The concepts of culturally fluent leadership also reflect earlier leadership concepts of Drucker (2013), who emphasizes effective leadership as including (1) thinking through the organization’s mission, defining it, and establishing it clearly and visibly—that is, the goals; (2) seeing leadership as a responsibility rather than rank and privilege; and (3) earning the trust of members.

An example from sports illustrates the BASK model. Bill Russell, whose Boston Celtics teams won 11 National Basketball Championships in 13 years, identified 11 Russell Rules as skills-based behaviors of effective leaders (Russell & Falkner, 2001):

1. Commitment Begins with Curiosity
2. Ego = MC^2 (Team Ego Only)
3. Listening is Never Casual
4. Toughness or Tenderness: Creating Your Leadership Style
5. Invisible Man
6. Craftsmanship
7. Personal Integrity
8. Rebounding, or How to Change the Flow of the Game
9. Imagination, or Seeing the Unseeable
10. Discipline, Delegation, and Decision Making
11. Everyone Can Win

These rules became the foundation of CCFL’s leadership training program *Leading More Effective Teams: Leveraging the Power of Culturally Fluent Leadership* (B. Stubblefield-Tave, personal communication, 2013). The training asserts that a culturally fluent leader uses feedback loops in order to recognize and respond to cultural differences and shifts—illustrating the rule that *Listening is Never Casual*. According to Russell and Falkner (2001), “when a team is functioning on all cylinders, listening is an essential component of success. . . . Red (Auerbach)’s greatest talent was that he was a listener who translated what he heard into effective action. . . . The key to Red’s method was that when he asked a question or wanted to know if you could do something, he did it in such a way that you knew you had room to answer him without feeling threatened” (p. 63–64). In listening, Auerbach (Russell’s coach, mentor, and friend) got quality information and understood how to speak with each player to result in decisions and actions that would advance the team’s goals: winning games and NBA titles. Auerbach developed the ability to lead individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds and with widely varied personalities, reflecting his ability to live and communicate amidst diversity; he did not need to travel globally; the Celtics brought diversity to him. Accordingly, he used BASK type training exercises to address stages of intercultural competence among team members, including that of managing constructive conflict.

A very different example of culturally fluent leadership in the field of medicine involves the leadership of Lori Arviso Alvord, MD, the first Navajo woman surgeon (Alvord & Cohen Van Pelt, 2000). She describes her ideal operating room as follows:

“My ideal operating room would have a team of people who worked together smoothly and easily, with respect for one another and their patients. Each member, no matter what their rank, would be considered important and invaluable. (p. 128)

Dr. Alvord describes an Awareness of the value each member brings to the team. She brings her technical surgical skills and combines leadership Skills to listen and respond to changes in the patient and her team members. She acquires Knowledge of the cultural backgrounds of her patients and
staff on an ongoing basis in the context of completing successful surgery. Dr. Alvord’s behaviors in the operating room leads her team toward a common goal of improving the patient’s health. Lisa Arviso Alvord’s quote is often used in the CCFL training as an early step in developing culturally fluent leaders to exhibit cultural humility (Tervalon & Murray Garcia, 1998) and become lifelong learners. It emphasizes that leaders learn from their team members, from diverse written sources, from customers/patients, peers, mentors, coaches, and others. Culturally fluent leaders may exist in all types of organizations; what defines culturally fluent leaders, however, is their behavior in the context of the teams they lead.

Training Diverse Leaders

Leader Self-Awareness: Self-Assessment

Leader self-assessment is training at the Awareness level using the KSA model and is directed toward awareness of how one’s own cultural influences, social identities, and personal lived experiences interact with access to, exercise of, and effective leadership. While awareness of cultural differences and its implications for leadership is an initial step, it is unfortunate that most leadership training stop here as well. There are many components to leader self-awareness. They include the following:

- Assessing one’s strengths and weaknesses enables one to harness them to one’s advantage. This includes those weaknesses attributed to you based on stereotyped perceptions as well as real ones based on one’s core self or one’s cultural values, which may be disjunctive with the environment that you lead. How do you harness your strengths and compensate for your weaknesses? Do you recruit others to assist?
- Exploring one’s cultural and personal identity structures is vital. Taylor Cox (1993) developed a cultural identity exercise that enables participants to visually identify important elements of their cultural identity and the relative strength of those identity elements. Using a pie chart, individuals divide the elements of their cultural identity into slices according to their relative importance. Based on dozens of focus group discussions and hundreds of interviews with workshop participants, Cox concluded that most individuals have a relatively high awareness of the identity that most distinguishes them from the majority group in a particular setting, and considerably less awareness of their other identities. For example, of 50 one-on-one interviews at a large international company (B. Stubblefield-Tave, personal communication, 2013), 89% of White women focused exclusively on gender, 88% of expatriates focused on nationality, and 78% of non-White men focused on racial/ethnicity of their cultural identities as affecting workplace interactions.
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- It is not uncommon for race to account for a larger slice among African Americans while gender often accounts for a larger slice among European American women. Asian American women are likely to have both ethnicity and gender slices as large. Fifty percent of the non-White women in the above example addressed both racial/ethnic and gender issues in their identities speaking to the dominance of White males as the norm. Which of your identities do you bring to your leadership?
- Cultural identity also includes many elements beyond race, ethnicity, and gender, of course. These include employer, nationality, occupation, and religion and may vary with the context. How does your cultural identity structure affect your leadership? Is your pie chart—that is, how you see yourself—significantly different from how others see you?
- Racial/ethnic minorities often acquire a “victim culture” as part of their identities—a stance that often communicates that success is impossible because others are privileged. Stubblefield-Tave (2013) used Cox’s Identity Structure exercise to have leaders answer the question: “Who am I?” This is also translated as “What cultural groups do you identify with?” Participants can also be asked to elaborate the question “Who am I?” with personal as well as cultural characteristics: for example, “I am a leader,” “I am a father,” “I am an optimist,” or “I am a victim.” Hence, training in leader self-awareness with minority leaders might promote their ability to identify and counter “victim culture” in their organization and community.
- Awareness of opportunities and pitfalls—Identifying what one can or cannot do means taking the environment into consideration. This might include assessing sociocultural trends and the zeitgeist of the external environment. As one leader said, “It was being there at the right time!” It means continually taking stock of the organizational need and organizational culture. Who you are leading? What values and identities do they hold? What is the purpose of the organization and what is its typical means for getting there? How have individuals who share your cultural background fared within the organization? What can you learn from these experiences, directly or indirectly?
- Making a workable career trajectory plan—This means shaping one’s journey and having a plan. What are your leadership goals? How do you establish a plan, develop and monitor shared goals? This plan should align with interests and passion since commitment, motivation, and success follows. This may reflect a particular Western form of leadership development as Chin (2013) has noted that diverse leaders often tend to “fall into the role” or follow the urging of their community, role models, and mentors. For diverse leaders, the task may be how and when to consult with trusted leaders and mentors in the community, as well as how to instill the confidence of having someone believe in you.
- Learning from one’s lived experiences—Too often, the personal and relationship aspects of leadership development are overlooked in the interest of “objective” skills needed to become a leader. As emphasized throughout this book, diverse leaders often have different experiences and frequently need to grapple with stereotypic perceptions and expectations from others, which may be biased or unrealistic. It is important that self-awareness includes an assessment of these lived experiences of oppression, marginalized status, immigration, or invisibility.
Leader Skills: Developing Cultural Fluency

Cultural proficiency, the highest level of Terry Cross's continuum of cultural competence, can be defined as the ability to work with, and navigate between and across, diverse cultures fluidly, responsively, and organically. This emphasis on fluidity suggests an interactive and dynamic process. The development of skills and the emphasis on proficiency are consistent with the goals identified in the BASK model described above. A leader needs to understand and measure the organization’s ability and its members to work effectively in cross-cultural situations, and then to develop the skills to do so. These could include role-playing workplace scenarios involving individuals coming from diverse backgrounds and perspectives. It could involve identifying challenging dilemmas that occur when different perspectives come into play in decision-making situations, or when diverse work teams need to arrive at a common solution.

Leader Knowledge: Dimensions of Cultural Difference

The acquisition of knowledge of cultural difference is both a process and skill. Often the measurement of leadership style or personality style helps a leader know how to lead in different situations. There are a number of psychometric measures that examine personality style or interpersonal or communication styles, often along a two-dimensional axis, that are then correlated with how leaders should lead (see Fischer, 2009, pp. 191–201). Key questions that arise for diversity leadership are:

- Do you adapt your style to the expectation of the organization and its members or do you be yourself when there is a mismatch between the two?
- Through what lens do you assess the environmental or organizational context, yours or that of the organizational culture?
- What competencies are developed by virtue of belonging to a socially marginalized group (e.g., racial, ethnicity, women, LGBT, religion)?

Dimensions of Cultural Difference: Leader Skill Sets

Based on the concepts and perspectives presented in this book, especially in Chapter 2, a set of 14 cultural dimensions are identified that have shown cross-cultural cross-group variation and have been shown to influence patterns of leadership behavior. They are presented in no particular order and draw on the extensive cross-cultural literature (Hofstede, 2001; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). Hofstede (2001), in particular, has developed a set of national profiles characterizing different countries on a number of these...
dimensions. The GLOBE studies (House et al., 2004) have also identified leadership profiles across 62 different countries. These profiles and dimensions have not been applied to individual or subgroup analysis and can be valuable here for training in self-awareness and skills associated with each of the dimensions. However, one must caution against a simplistic use that might result in stereotypic characterizations of groups and countries. These dimensions overlap with one another and are not dichotomous; they often intersect with one another in complexity. Some are unidimensional while others are bipolar. Individuals, groups, or countries that are high on one end of a bipolar continuum do not imply nonexistence of its polar opposite. The dimensions are also relative in comparing one group to another, and manifestations will vary across different contexts.

The dimensions are useful here to focus on how leadership training can focus on awareness, skills, and knowledge of these dimensions; the dilemmas that arise when leaders with varying styles must interact within teams needing to solve a problem or make a decision; or when leader styles are disparate with member styles or expectations or how they influence the communication process. The dimensions highlight the importance of understanding alternative and multiple perspectives and how diversity leadership training can be important to avoid miscommunication, address power dynamics, and minimize pejorative or biased judgments of behavior.

**Power Distance**

Power distance (Hofstede, 2001; House et al., 2004) refers to whether individuals accept inequality in power. Low power distance individuals expect equality in power and do not accept a leader’s authority based on position. Malaysia, Spain, Japan, and Mexico are high power distance countries while the United States and Denmark are low power distance countries.

Hence, high power distance countries are more respectful based on age, education, and seniority. They use titles, follow protocol, avoid open disagreement with supervisors, and often use silence or not making eye contact to signal disapproval. They often view informality as disrespectful. Low power distance countries are more egalitarian; individuals will speak their mind or will interrupt one another. They often view those acting with formality as having nothing to contribute and unable to lead who are then passed over for leadership roles. This often plays out in the communication.

**Uncertainty Avoidance**

Uncertainty avoidance (Hofstede, 2001; House et al., 2004) refers to the feeling of comfort or discomfort associated with levels of ambiguity and
uncertainty. Low uncertainty avoidance individuals easily tolerate unstructured and unpredictable situations. The fundamental issue here is how a society deals with the fact that the future can never be known: Should we try to control the future or just let it happen? Countries exhibiting strong uncertainty avoidance maintain rigid codes of belief and behavior and are intolerant of unorthodox behavior and ideas. Weak uncertainty avoidance societies maintain a more relaxed attitude in which practice counts more than principles. In leadership situations where problem solving or decision making is needed, tension may arise among team members when there is variation in individual styles on this dimension.

**Individualism and Collectivism**

Individualism and collectivism (Hofstede, 2001; House et al., 2004) refer to the social frameworks in which individuals prioritize needs. Individualistic societies expect individuals to take care of themselves, while collectivistic societies expect individuals to look out for one another and organizations to protect their employees' interests. Individualism is high in many Western countries, while collectivism is high in many Eastern countries and among ethnic minorities in the United States.

Social interactions in individualistic cultures use a principle of equal exchange—that is, “do your own thing”—whereas social interactions in collectivistic cultures are marked by unequal exchange over a long period; there is a tendency to pursue group goals and pay attention to context and nonverbal cues.

**Gender Differentiation**

Also known as the masculinity and femininity dimension (Hofstede, 2001; House et al., 2004), this dimension refers to the emphasis of a culture on emotional and social roles and work goals. The masculinity side of this dimension represents a preference in society for achievement, heroism, assertiveness, and material reward for success. Society at large is more competitive. Its opposite, femininity, stands for a preference for cooperation, modesty, caring for the weak, and quality of life. Society at large is more consensus oriented.

This dimension has distinguished Western from Eastern cultures. Perceptions have historically favored the masculine dimension although there is an increasing sense that the feminine dimension is more necessary for 21st century leadership. As discussed earlier, definitions for assertiveness may vary cross-culturally. A feminine culture values relationships,
cooperation, and quality of life and may incorporate this into its definition of assertive behavior differently from masculine conceptualizations. Japan, the United States, and Mexico are masculine cultures, while Sweden, Norway, Netherlands, and Denmark are characterized by feminine cultures. This dimension is important to negotiation skills in leadership.

**Universalism and Particularism**

In universalistic cultures, rules are more important than relationships. Legal contracts are seen as trustworthy and to be honored. Much of business practice in Western countries operates on these principles in negotiations and making business deals. In particularistic cultures, whether a rule applies “depends” on the situation and relationships involved as is true in China and Islamic countries (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). In China, principles of Ren-Qing and Quanxi make for fluid rules and are often prevailed upon in negotiating a business deal.

**Neutral Versus Affective**

Individuals in neutral cultures hide their thoughts and feeling while maintaining a cool self-control, as in Asian countries, Germany, and England; individuals in affective cultures express their thoughts openly while using gestures and dramatic expression, often with much passion and touching, as in Latin American countries (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). Without an awareness of these different styles, miscommunication of intent or affect is likely to occur. An Asian or British individual may be viewed as unemotional while a Latino(a) may be viewed as too emotional.

**Specific Versus Diffuse**

Individuals are direct, clear, blunt, and to the point while examining the facts in specific cultures as in the United States. Individuals are more indirect and tactful in diffuse cultures; they are more able to tolerate ambiguity as in Asian countries (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). Americans, Germans, and Israelis tend to send clear messages; for example, “You can take my words to the bank.” Asians and Middle Easterners tend to send messages that include both verbal and nonverbal and direct and indirect components. This is considered more polite and enables someone to save face especially when the message is harsh or negative. They view direct messages as rude while Americans, Germans, and Israelis view indirect messages as evasive, dishonest, and misleading.
Achievement Versus Ascription

In achievement-oriented societies, there is little focus on titles unless they reflect competencies (e.g., Dr., Professor, or Professor Doctor). Leaders are judged on what they do and know. In ascribed status societies, titles are important; leaders with authority are usually older males; the boss is “the boss” (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). When this overlaps with a humane orientation, achievement may not always be considered in individualistic and egoistic terms, as it is in most Western cultures, but constitutes a strong social concern rather than a matter of individual striving and competition (Agarwal & Misra, 1986). The misunderstanding that may occur is when an individual from an achievement-oriented society denigrates a leader while an individual from an ascribed status society will accord the same leader respect by virtue of his or her status even when both may hold the same view of the leader’s competence.

Attitudes Toward Time Control

Whether one perceives his or her ability to control time is related to one’s time orientation about the past, present, or future (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998). It affects how a culture values time and believes it can control it. Americans are oriented toward the future. This is the result of many things, including the relatively short time the United States has been in existence and immigration patterns, which have made for short histories of different groups in the country. Indians are oriented toward the past. This causes India to be focused on traditions and long-term commitments. In business practices, Indians are less understanding of the Americans’ emphasis of being on time; they are likely to miss deadlines and be late for meetings. This affects the emphasis on speed in business whereby most large U.S. organizations maintain an absolute focus on quarterly profits. Most decisions are based on results rather than relationships. In cultures like India where relationships matter, longer term orientation abounds. Life is viewed as an ongoing cycle where influences from the past explain the current situation and the present is only a result of past action and cannot be controlled (Moore, 2006).

In cultures where time is fixed, time and structure are precise; schedules are maintained; meetings start and end on time. Those who are late are considered disrespectful, rude, and unprofessional. This is noted in American and German cultures. In cultures where time is fluid, time is loosely organized. People simply wait; they are willing to let a meeting run longer if business is not completed. They are more concerned about the relationship. They open meetings by getting to know people before starting business.
This is noted in Native American Indian and Latin cultures. They believe that those who have fixed time should relax.

**Internal Versus External Control**

Internal versus external control (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998) involves subjugation and domination in the sense of one being able to control what happens in the environment and whether one sees that control as coming from within oneself or external in the environment. It is also viewed as people’s relationship to nature. The Japanese culture’s relationship with nature is that of harmony with nature. The Japanese people respect nature and don’t attempt to manage or control nature. Instead, they feel a spiritual bond with nature evident in practices such as Japanese gardening and the simplicity of rock gardens, which date back to the beliefs of the ancient Shinto religion in Japan. This harmony with nature and the environment is similarly found in Native Hawaiian and Native American Indian cultures.

In contrast, the American culture does not live in harmony with nature but rather attempts to master nature. This is evident in how it responds to natural phenomena such as hurricanes; people try to manage and protect themselves and their belongings by boarding up their houses, taping windows, moving furniture, and evacuating. It is also reflected in its architectural planning of changing the landscape to accommodate man-made structures. This orientation leads to differences in how different groups accept certain projects in business planning and development.

**Assertiveness**

Assertiveness (House et al., 2004) refers to the extent a society encourages individuals to be tough, confrontational, assertive, and competitive compared to low assertive societies, which encourage individuals to be modest and tender. Germany and Austria are high assertive countries that value competition compared to New Zealand and Sweden, which value warm and cooperative relations and harmony. As discussed earlier, Asian American groups, often defined as low assertive, may maintain different rationale and definitions of assertiveness related to purpose and outcomes intended by their behaviors—that is, using indirect methods to maintain a relationship while achieving an assertive outcome. This dimension also leads to much miscommunication because of pejorative attributions to low assertive behaviors and negative appraisals of behaviors that do not fit in with characteristics of being confrontational and competitive. Cultures that value warm and cooperative relations and harmony often perceive this form
of assertiveness as rude and ruthless. Whereas women have been viewed to be less assertive than men, early assertiveness training focused on teaching them to behave like men; today’s assertiveness training would focus on how to make one’s point or achieve one’s goal without sacrificing the relationship or forcing one’s opponent to “lose face.”

Future Orientation

Future orientation (House et al., 2004) refers to the level of importance a society attaches to future-oriented behaviors such as planning, investing, and delaying gratification. A future orientation according to GLOBE findings is “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, Gupta, Mayfield, & Trevor-Roberts, 2004, p. 285). Singapore and Switzerland are high on future orientation signified by their propensity to save for the future and longer time horizon for decision making. Russia and Argentina have shorter time horizons for decisions and place more emphasis on immediate gratification. This is an important aspect of strategic planning for a leader or organization.

The long-term orientation dimension can also be interpreted as dealing with society’s search for virtue. Societies with a short-term orientation generally have a strong concern with establishing the absolute Truth. They are normative in their thinking. They exhibit great respect for traditions, a relatively small propensity to save for the future, and a focus on achieving quick results. In societies with a long-term orientation, people believe that truth depends very much on situation, context, and time. They show an ability to adapt traditions to changed conditions, a strong propensity to save and invest, thriftiness, and perseverance in achieving results (Hofstede, 2001).

Performance Orientation

Performance orientation (House et al., 2004) measures the degree to which a society encourages and rewards individuals for performance improvement and excellence. Singapore, Hong Kong, and the United States score high, reflecting the value of training, development, and initiative taking compared with Russia, Italy, and Argentina who score low, reflecting an emphasis on loyalty and belonging. In the latter, family background is more important than performance.
Humane Orientation

Humane orientation (House et al., 2004) measures the extent to which a society encourages and rewards people for being fair, caring, generous, altruistic, and kind. The Philippines, Ireland, Malaysia, and Egypt scored highest on this dimension reflecting a focus on sympathy and support for the weak. Spain, France, and former West Germany scored lowest on this dimension reflecting the importance given to power, material possessions, and self-enhancement. This orientation, in particular, contrasts with charismatic and transformational orientations in which a leader draws on the prominence of his or her personality to influence and motivate people to change. A humane orientation aligns with social justice goals, self-sacrificing behavior, and role modeling as ways to motivate members to change. Increasingly, this orientation is important to 21st century leadership. A question might be whether this is a skill that can be learned, or is it an orientation one must have?

Targeted Training Models

The specific challenges and needs of subgroups, minority groups, or outgroups that have historically faced biases or disadvantages in accessing leadership roles may call for targeted training. Several examples below demonstrate how an emphasis on the challenges faced by women, racial/ethnic minorities, and Asian Americans can be empowering in developing pipelines to leadership and enabling leaders to become more effective. They arose out of the felt need for targeted training, and that existing leadership training institutes omitted a dimension central to their experience. The process and structure of these training institutes enable specific groups to address challenges that arise out of microaggressions, bias, ignorance, or a lack of commitment to diversity, and to negotiate their leadership from a position of strength, to avoid miscommunications, to develop awareness of stereotyped perceptions and expectations, and to learn leadership skills in a safe and trusted environment.

Leadership Institute for Women in Psychology (LIWP): Training Women Leaders

“When the baby boomer exodus does ramp up, more female executives will necessarily have to backfill those positions. Proper experience and training must be ensured, but thus far many programs are focused on fixing women to play the man’s game,” as stated in “Taking Gender Into Account: Theory and Design for Women’s Leadership Development Program” (Cooke, 2013). The article noted research that found, among
graduates of top business schools, women’s career trajectory was not on par with the men’s, and females’ advancement in their careers has even slowed in recent years. Rather than jamming a round peg in a square hole, the article suggests “providing tools for leaders to do what the author called the ‘identity work’ to become leaders by internalizing that identity and developing an elevated sense of purpose. . . . Twice as many women than men launch startups. They’re looking to carve out their own destiny and want to be in charge. Korn/Ferry International surveyed women who left careers to strike out on their own and found that 40% cited lack of advancement and 43% stated lack of recognition were key factors. Another 48% said they were turned off by the corporate politicking” (Cooke, 2013).

The Leadership Institute for Women in Psychology (LIWP) sponsored by the American Psychological Association’s Women’s Office has as its mission to prepare, support, and empower women psychologists as leaders to promote positive changes in institutional, organizational, and practice settings as well as APA and SPTA (State, Provincial and Territorial Psychological Associations) governance, and increase the diversity, number, and effectiveness of women psychologists as leaders. A major focus of the Institute is to ensure that leadership training opportunities are available for mid-career and senior women psychologists in all their diversities. Institute objectives include (1) ensuring that mid-career and senior women in psychology have the knowledge and skills necessary to compete for leadership/senior management positions, (2) enhancing the number and effectiveness of women psychologists holding leadership positions, (3) increasing the diversity of women psychologists in leadership positions, (4) creating networks of women psychologists in leadership/senior management positions, and (5) documenting the career movement, professional advancement of LIWP participants (APA, n.d.).

The education and training component of LIWP is represented by highly interactive case-based workshops held twice a year and by the Webinars held bimonthly on leadership development topics. A research component includes surveying the leadership training needs of LIWP participants. Specific topics include strategic planning, negotiation skills and strategies, leadership goal setting, mentoring, and self-care. Activities that make the institute unique and relevant to women leaders are: self-assessment using the FIRO-B with opportunities for networking, small group discussion drawing on the lived experiences of the faculty of women leaders, and developing an elevator speech.

**CNPAAEMI Leadership Development Institute: Training Racial and Ethnic Minority Leaders**

The Council of National Psychology Associations for the Advancement of Ethnic Minority (CNPAAEMI) Leadership Development Institute (LDI)
developed out of a coalition of national professional psychological associations for Asian Americans, Black Americans, Latino Americans, and Native American Indians who saw the need for targeted leadership training for psychologists of color. Few existing theories of leadership delve meaningfully into the effects of culture, worldview, out-group perspectives, or other such factors important to leaders of color. The LDI, therefore, aims to identify and attract racially and ethnically diverse psychologists and mental health professionals to foster and support culturally grounded leadership skills that are transferable to multiple settings (e.g., families, work settings, professional organizations, neighborhoods, communities) and to establish networking and sustainable coaching and mentoring opportunities to nurture ongoing leadership development.

Begun in 2012, a cohort of eight Fellows was identified to be matched with a primary mentor for a yearlong training experience. This included two hours of mentoring per month for one year, working with a primary mentor from one’s home CNPAAME. Its organization and a secondary mentor from another CNPAAME organization, bimonthly facilitated discussions with other Fellows throughout the year led by one of the mentors, and monthly conversations among the Fellows on their leadership project. Fellow responsibilities include developing a personal leadership plan for a project, addressing a current leadership issue in the host organization, peer mentoring, and producing a final report.

Training topics include the following:

- Strategies for Using Mentoring Successfully
- Defining the Role of a Mentor Cross-Culturally
- Establishing Professional Goals
- Making a Workable Career Trajectory Plan
- Early Career Development
- Negotiating Institutional/Political Systems
- Self-care for Healthcare Professionals
- Successful Bids for Leadership Positions
- Upward Mobility Time Management Strategies
- Developing Your Leadership Niche in the Field
- Networking and Developing Collaborative Partnerships
- Paying it Forward: Mentoring Others

These topics and the initial orientation focused on models of leadership competencies relevant to leaders of color. A central feature of the LDI rests on the relationship between Fellows and their Mentors. Their monthly meetings were critical in exposing the Fellow to a leader within the field and the process of leadership as a person of color as well as exposing the Fellow to organizational cultures and leadership opportunities within the field. The Leadership project is intended to develop a culturally grounded model of leadership.
competencies. One project involved interviewing leaders to provide grounded research and case studies about diversity leadership. Another important objective of the LDI is to foster coalition building across ethnic minority psychological associations and to provide Fellows with insights into various models of organizational leadership. For this purpose, Fellows met with a secondary mentor outside of their home organization on a regular basis.

LEAP: Training Asian American Leaders

In 1982, Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics, Inc. (LEAP) was established to address the lack of API leadership representation across the private, public, and nonprofit sectors. Through LEAP, its founders hoped to create an environment where APIs could develop leadership skills, realize their full leadership potential, and assume visible leadership roles that would impact the larger society. LEAP embarked on a plan both to increase the number of API leaders as well as to train those leaders to be more effective in their work (Atsutakawa, 2013).

LEAP’s original programming began with awareness and skills building workshops and symposia featuring prominent API civic and community leaders. While the initial intent of LEAP’s founders was to expand the pool of community leaders, they were surprised to find that their leadership training was attracting not only API nonprofit staff and community volunteers but also large numbers of APIs in corporate, government, and higher education jobs who were frustrated with the lack of advancement and leadership opportunities. Repeated stories and experiences of the “glass ceiling” or “bamboo ceiling” effect led LEAP to expand its training and definition of “community” when it realized that the model minority myth, combined with cultural misunderstanding, racism, and ignorance severely hobbled Asian Americans in the mainstream and prevented them from fuller economic, social, and political participation (U.S. Department of Labor, 1991). The “bamboo ceiling” refers to the barriers that serve to exclude Asians and Asian Americans from executive positions based on biased and stereotypic perceptions of “lack of leadership potential” and “lack of communication skills” that cannot actually be explained by job performance or qualifications. It is a derivative of the term “glass ceiling,” which refers to the more gendered metaphor used to describe invisible barriers through which women and minorities can see managerial positions but cannot reach them. By the mid-1980s, LEAP had expanded its focus to encompass API advancement in all sectors—public, private, nonprofit—and across interest areas such as education, civic and government, youth and students, first in Southern California and, by the end of the 1980s, had expanded across the country.
Through the creation of culturally relevant workshops and programs, more than 125,000 people from colleges and universities, community and student organizations, federal and state government agencies, and Fortune 1000 companies across North America and Asia have participated in over 2,500 leadership development programs, organizational development workshops, career management, and diversity trainings. LEAP found it essential to create programming in which Asian American participants can speak freely without fear of being judged, where they can build self-awareness and confidence, while learning new skills. LEAP strives to create an atmosphere that allows participants to feel confident about asking honest questions, sharing experiences, and giving opinions without feeling like they must constantly be explaining, defending, or justifying themselves. In other words, effective Asian American leadership development demands that we release participants from the burden of constantly having to perform cultural translation. With the leadership philosophy “Keep your values. Develop new skills™”, LEAP focuses on trying to show Asian American would-be leaders that they can retain their culture, identity, and values while, at the same time, developing skills necessary to become effective leaders within their organizations, communities, and broader society.

Multicultural and Global Leader Dilemmas

Using the cultural dimensions identified above, we might examine how they influence common leadership competencies and dilemmas. Training leaders to lead in a diverse multicultural and global environment is aligned with broad social goals of valuing diversity as not only good for business but also promoting a harmonious diverse and global society. Is is aligned with diversity principles of inclusion, including both in-group and out-group members, privileged and oppressed groups, majority and minority groups to ensure that leaders are interculturally fluent. Targeted training for diverse leaders and historical “out-groups” has as an additional goal the ability to address the challenges of incongruities between one’s lived experiences and that of their members’ identities, or the incongruities between one’s social identities and “typical” leader prototypes.

Self-Awareness: Identity

The dilemma of deciding “Who am I?” or one’s self-identity can be challenging when leaders need to decide when and how to conform to organizational and member perceptions and expectations. Exercises and activities asking leaders to define: “Who are you?” address this dimension. They are
intended to promote awareness of social identities and how they influence leader behaviors and member perceptions. Leaders need to decide in what situations and contexts must they adapt or conform to organizational and member values to be effective, and at what cost. This raises the added dilemma of how leaders use a moral compass to ensure that they maintain their authenticity and conduct themselves ethically as leaders. It is a process of continuous development.

**Image Management**

While managing one’s image can appear superficial and disingenuous, it is a dilemma to decide when and if one needs to do so. Competency at this level starts with an awareness of how social identities can constrain leadership behavior or bias appraisals of leader effectiveness and competence. Leaders need to decide when to align the image one communicates with what members expect. Contrary to popular belief, these are specific skills that can be taught by identifying concrete ways of dress and self presentation. Often, this is more important for first impressions when one’s competence is usually unknown. It is also important to recognize how and what physical presentations (within one’s control) align with attributions of leader power, influence, status, and legitimacy held by members. Image management intersects with social identities, which can be a distraction in communicating one’s leadership. How a leader manages the benefits of using one’s privilege or disadvantage to overcome stereotypic expectations can be useful.

Proper attire, tone of voice, and pitch of voice are important conveyers of image. While seemingly superficial, these visible images often convey the first impressions of a leader’s credibility and competence. Attention to one’s image enables one to make a choice about when to display one’s ethnic and cultural ways. For example, should one wear ethnic garb and ornaments? Is it “to make a statement” or is it simply “who I am”? Will it “distract from one’s competence as a leader” by invoking stereotypic perceptions and expectations or will it convey a distinct sense of self?

Business etiquette is generally governed by social rules of decorum that differ cross-culturally. These include such rituals as greetings on meeting one another, which range from a bow to a handshake. Religious sensitivities may also dictate different rituals for addressing women. The exchange of business cards is another ritual that is much more formal in Asian countries; proper decorum and respect is accorded in presenting cards with both hands and having the words facing the receiver; the receiver is expected to do this in return and to read the card before putting it away. The accepting or refusing of refreshments also follows cultural rules of etiquette that
include initial refusal by a guest and insistence by the host as a form of politeness in Asian and Middle Eastern cultures. Hostess gifts, which may involve food, is considered a necessity and often expected in Asian cultures. In learning and observing these rules of etiquette, the biggest challenge is how to present an authentic self while managing one’s image in a way to project a leaderful image.

**Negotiation**

Negotiation is one of the necessary tasks of leadership and helps people achieve goals and resolve problems. It is a process involving two parties or groups to resolve matters of dispute by holding discussions and coming to a mutual agreement between the parties. This can involve a course of action, a bargaining position, or a desired outcome. Often, negotiation involves winning and losing, competition and cooperation, aggressive and passive behavior, direct and indirect behaviors (both verbal and nonverbal). Every negotiation takes places within the context of a relationship, in which each party has something of value to offer.

Two common negotiation styles are cooperation and competition; the latter is more common in Western cultures while the former is more common in Eastern cultures. While legal contracts are often the outcome of negotiation in Western cultures to represent what is mutually agreed to, leaders from Eastern cultures often approach negotiation and international trading based not on legal contracts but on trust and family ties. This dynamic also plays out in the employer-employee relationships in the workplace, where employees from Eastern cultures often expect their bosses and leaders to have their interests in hand and may be less likely to ask for accommodations, promotions, and raises.

Women are found to negotiate less often based on their tendency toward cooperation. They are more likely to ask for less particularly on salary and promotion, to set lower targets, and to settle for less than what they want. Women find negotiation more appealing when it becomes more collaborative. They need to capitalize on this as strengths of their emotional intelligence, listening skills, and tendency toward cooperation. They need to aim higher and be more specific in what they want. Men, on the other hand, tend to assert their needs more often, are more oriented toward affirming their status, and are more comfortable negotiating such issues as salary and promotion.

Several key negotiation strategies include the following: Avoidance, Compromise, Accommodate, Competing to win, and Collaborating to problem solve. Successful negotiation involves being clear about: What do you really want to get out of the negotiation? It involves a focus on the
goals versus the bottom line and an assessment of what you think the other party wants out of the negotiation. Westerners and Easterners often differ in their response to these questions. In negotiation, Westerners often view “It’s not personal; it’s business” while Easterners often view that “The relationship is what matters.” Hence, there is value in exploring diverse perspectives and cultural dimensions when negotiating to solve complex problems. A keen awareness of cultural differences will avoid potential misunderstandings.

**Communication**

Leadership is a process of influence and communication. There are both formal and informal ways in which communication occurs. British rely mostly on formal communication while Chinese rely on face to face or are more relationship oriented. Japanese styles are also noted to be formal and follow more strict protocols. Often, underlying cultural value dimensions dictate these modes of communication and can result in misunderstanding. Communication has three goals: instrumental goals (performing tasks), relational goals (negotiating conflict), and identity management (self-image). Whereas different cultures may place varying emphasis on each of these dimensions, cross-cultural communication and miscommunication can be challenging when original intent of a person is different from the meaning received by another person. Nonverbal communication, including the use of facial expression and posture, is known to communicate meaning and to vary cross-culturally. The use of physical structure has been used to communicate power and status in different cultures. For example, King Arthur and the knights of the round table were designed to signal equality while the Chinese Temple of Heaven and Imperial palace in Beijing used concentric circles of importance with the highest ranking leader seated facing the main entrance in a round table with descending order on his or her right or left.

**Decision Making**

The main finding of decision-making style in eight countries with widely differing orientations as to level of subordinate participation in decision making was that 75% of managers used “consultative-participative” means to reach their decisions—that is, in consultation or jointly with their subordinates. While differences existed, they were not statistically different except for the extremes; Swedish managers were low while Israeli managers were high on centralized, authoritarian decision making. When the context was competitive within a similar worldwide task environment where organizational characteristics (of size and technology) and sociocultural
backgrounds of industrial countries were relatively similar, there tended to be more homogeneity and convergence of leadership styles on decision making (Kao, Sinha, & Wilpert, 1999). Hence, decision making is dependent on an optimal fit between managerial style and organizational and sociocultural environments.

In the United States, women leaders are found to use a more collaborative style of decision making in line with their emphasis on relationships and consensus building. However, within masculinized contexts, this decision-making style has been viewed as weak and indecisive. Hence, it may explain why many women tend toward more androgynous styles of leadership.

**Problem Solving and Managing Conflict**

Conflict is any situation where incompatible goals, attitudes, emotions, or behaviors lead to disagreement or opposition between two members. In multicultural organizations, cultural differences add to the potential for conflict. While conflict can lead to innovation, stimulate creativity, and solutions to problems, conflict can also divert energy from work, waste resources, create a negative climate, affect productivity, and lead to hostility and aggressive behavior (Nelson & Campbell Quick, 2003). Thomas (1976) uses five conflict-handling orientations according to an individual’s desire to satisfy his or her own or other’s concerns; he orders these along a continuum of assertiveness and intersecting continuum of cooperation. Competing styles are characterized by assertive and uncooperative behavior and collaborating strategies as win-win for both assertive and cooperative behavior. Avoiding and accommodating styles are both unassertive but uncooperative and cooperative, respectively. Compromising is in between.

It was noteworthy that Asians preferred the avoiding and accommodating styles while expatriates from the United States and Canada preferred the competing, collaborating, and compromising styles (McKenna, 1995). A qualitative follow up suggested that Asian participants felt Americans would often “shout first and ask questions later,” which they saw as arrogant; Americans, on the other hand, felt Asians were timid and unassertive while their goal was to “get things out in the open.” The example points to the bias inherent in Thomas’s model, which is based on a view from individualistic cultures. Individuals from collectivistic cultures such as China also value preserving the relationship and are more likely to avoid conflicts; or they may be more inclined to compromise and accommodate as a way of showing concern for the outcome of others in their problem solving styles. Hence, they view the American respondents as selfish and only interested in their own outcomes (Connerley & Pedersen, 2005, pp. 131–132). This example calls for complexity in evaluating responses in the context of culture.
Work Culture

Japanese management styles were notable after the rapid rise of Japan to become one of the most industrially advanced countries in the world post WWII. Without abandoning its traditional social values and cultural characteristics, work attitudes and values rooted in Confucian social philosophy became embedded in Japanese management styles and work culture (Kao, Sinha, & Wilpert, 1999). This included a synergistic blend of traditional indigenous roots and modern techniques as Japan sought to catch up with the rest of the world. The emphasis on groupism and on “li” or propriety of the social rules and obligations that bound the relationships between worker and manager or leader and follower characterized the work culture as important offshoots of Confucian philosophy.

Japanese bushido, or spirit, defined as refinement toward enlightenment, included Zen principles of realizing one’s own potential, and Buddhist principles emphasizing self-reliance, self-discipline, and self-perfection leading to a calm trust in fate, submission to the inevitable, and stoic endurance and composure in the face of danger—a concept embodied in the Samurai warrior. It is shaped by feudal values of group loyalty, commitment to duty, honor, and group harmony. Japanese employees have to be loyal to their companies and bosses for the sake of the business and to safeguard their jobs. In return, they expect their employers to be paternalistic in protecting them and offer a sense of belonging, guaranteeing lifelong employment.

This contrasts with the American emphasis on rugged individualism, first coined by President Herbert Hoover in 1928. It is the practice of individualism in social and economic relations emphasizing personal liberty and independence free from government intervention, self-reliance, resourcefulness, self-direction of the individual, and free competition in enterprise.

While both concepts focus on the individual, Japanese bushido has, as its goal, reaching enlightenment and group harmony while American rugged individualism has, as its goal, free competition with others. The concepts capture the different work culture characteristics, respectively. In the United States, people typically work from 9:00 to 5:00 for a total of 8 hours. This is not true in Japan and other countries where a typical workday might be 9:00 to 9:00 for a total of 12 hours, although this is beginning to change as the social factors contributing to their existence change. While Japanese bushido led to a work ethic in Japan that was once praised for digging Japan out of the post WWII rubble to a world superpower, it is now blamed for destroying employees’ lives.

The examples provide a context for how work cultures may be shaped by the cultural values held by members within the organization, the organization’s values and mission, or the sociopolitical trends shaping
the organizational context. Hence in the 21st century, emphasis on workfamily balance is now prominent, especially as more women enter the workforce. The overworked males of the past working long hours striving for career advancement and leadership positions are replaced by dual couple careers who share the burden of child care, homemaking, and caretaker as well as bringing in the family income. Hence, the emphasis on work cultures is now toward family friendly environments with flexible work schedule options, work-sponsored day care, and more generous family life benefits. Emphasis is now greater on self-care.

**Team Building: Leading Global Teams**

Diversity brings innovation to a team. Diverse thinkers help a team think out of the box and bring in different perspectives for more creative solutions. At the same time, diversity can create conflict as teams negotiate their differences. Team building is a process and goes through stages involving group dynamics. With diverse teams, the leader or facilitator might often have to address underlying hostilities and prejudices associated with different social identities, orientations, and styles; these often are unconscious or taboo.

In leading or building global teams, self-awareness and cultural competence becomes paramount. When organizations focus on expanding market and opportunities globally, they need focus on how to incorporate culture and customs when trying to market to a local population that is not their own. Leaders must learn about communication styles, attitudes toward meetings and deadlines, even the very notion of what makes a good leader in a given culture before entering into business negotiations cross culturally or within minority communities.

**Summary**

In identifying new paradigms and reframing existing theories toward a DLMOX paradigm for diversity leadership, we can consider its application for training leaders. Using a KSA model to train leaders, we emphasize diversity, difference, and culture. It is a process for leaders to understand their own cultural biases, to adapt their leadership styles to be more effective across different contexts, and to learn more effective means of communicating across cultures and subgroups—that is, to train culturally fluent leaders. Central features of diversity training include Awareness—for leaders and organizations to understand the influences of culture, social identities,
and lived experiences on leadership, and to recognize opportunities and pitfalls; *Skills*—for leaders to develop cultural fluency to navigate between and across cultures fluidly and responsively; and *Knowledge*, which might include psychometric measures to examine and identify personality styles and strengths and weaknesses for effective leadership. The fourteen cultural orientation value dimensions identified can be useful as the content of leadership training as leaders need to negotiate with those holding different cultural orientation values. Potential incongruities between a leaders’ social identities and leader identities raise additional dilemmas. Targeted training, such as those focused on women or minorities, to address specific challenges and needs of these subgroups, or designing training to address the eight multicultural and global dilemmas that are identified addresses this. Racial minority leaders may face greater challenges with image management given how social identities can constrain leadership behavior or bias appraisal of leader effectiveness and competence. Leaders with differing cultural values regarding cooperation and competition may face greater challenges with negotiation processes and conflict management. Gender differences in preferred modes of communication may create misunderstanding and conflict.

**Discussion Questions: Applications to Training Diverse Leaders and Practicing DLMOX Leadership**

1. Using the 14 dimensions of cultural difference, identify some scenarios where you and someone else are approaching a problem or decision from opposite perspectives. How might you reconcile this?

2. Should a leader adapt his or her leadership style to conform to the organizational context? Is this possible or should a leader leave the organization?

3. Identify some of the differences and similarities between training targeting all leaders and those targeting racial/ethnic minority leaders. Develop a list of skills that you would include in a targeted training.

4. Using the multicultural and global dilemmas, identify a dilemma you may have faced in your organization. Have a group discussion on developing some solutions to managing these dilemmas.

5. Identify several characteristics of vertical and horizontal collectivism. Then identify some culturally based values that might be aligned with one or the other dimensions. Can the same discussion be applied to vertical and horizontal aspects of individualism, and if so how?

6. Discuss the *national character* concept. Is it useful to capture common characteristics of a group or does it simply result in stereotypes? Does it have at least some practical validity?
7. U.S. culture is commonly associated with individualism. What percentage of the population would fit this description? In deriving your estimate, factor the following considerations: Most people in the United States enjoy individual freedom; there are more individualist than collectivist features in the U.S. culture; individualists influence the level of power distance; and individualists influence the level of uncertainty avoidance. Provide brief descriptions for each factor and provide a rationale for your description and response.

8. Consider the following list of considerations. In most traditional cultures social roles are prescribed individuals, there is a clear distinction between good and evil in behavior, individuals' choices are restricted to the boundaries of social perceptions, and truth is revealed through the competition of ideas. Is it possible that all or some of these considerations are truly applicable to traditional societies? Justify your answer and in so doing provide examples based on your knowledge of such cultures.

9. Discuss why some people in nondemocratic countries believe that authoritarian leaders are “good” for these countries?

10. As discussed in this chapter, considerable attention has been given to describing cultures on the basis of a collective-individual continuum. In considering the extreme poles of the continuum, is it possible that there are cultures that truly fit the extremes? In your reply, provide illustrations of how that might be possible and what the characteristics might be.