

A Global Leadership Quotient—GLQ: Measuring, Assessing, and Developing

Robert W. Service, David Loudon
Samford University, Birmingham, AL USA

Nothing is more mysterious than another person's worldview. Each of us has one or more. Each of us believes our worldview expresses reality. And, indeed nothing determines success in leading across cultures more than one's worldview. Remember that your choice is not between no framework and having one in mind, but between a considered framework and a framework that is unknown to you. The first step in improving potential as a global leader is to understand one's own worldview and the probable worldviews of those ones expect to lead. This research addresses the following research questions: (1) How can one measure global leadership potential? And (2) What are developmental areas of concern when preparing individuals for global leadership? These important research questions are being addressed by a global leader quotient (GLQ) that can serve as the beginning benchmark for assessment, strategic development, and continuous learning.

Keywords: global leadership, leadership, cultural adaptation

Introduction

The literature is thoroughly consistent that international experience has become a must for those desirings to lead in today's globally interrelated world (Bisoux, 2011; Phan, 2011). "Integration of technologies, industries, nations, cultures, relationships, and interests continue to characterize the twenty-first century workplace" (Potoker, 2011, p. 12). Most researchers and practitioners are now saying that "[t]he leader of tomorrow is someone who can jump across boundaries and disciplines and analyze cultural and global differences" (Shinn, 2011, p. 37). Mathis and Jackson (2013) added:

It is becoming more important for individuals in top management positions to have international experience... Effective selection and development processes are needed to ensure that the right individuals are chosen... Leading across cultures requires specific skills, and organizations should provide formal training along with expatriate assignments to develop leaders who can achieve results in this demanding environment. (p. 15)

Moreover, the required road to leadership understanding and improvement in a "flat" open world remains all too contradictory and unforgiving (Friedman, 2005, 2008; Tracy, 2010). These pronouncements indicate that few executives will succeed without worldly contextual adaptability skills and few organizations will succeed without global leaders (Mintzberg, 2009; Service, 2006). To address global leadership realities, contextually adaptive people who can lead must be developed.

Robert W. Service, Ph.D., Professor of Management and Leadership, Brock School of Business, Samford University.
David Loudon, Ph.D., Professor of Marketing, Brock School of Business, Samford University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Robert W. Service, Brock School of Business, Samford University, 800 Lakeshore Drive, Birmingham, AL 35229 U.S.A.. E-mail: rwservic@samford.edu.

Initial Research Questions

Leadership in any form is a matter of the attitudes and experiences that shape our worldviews (Gundling, 2003; Mendenhall, Osland, Bird, Oddou, & Maznevski, 2008). Most negative issues in global ventures arise because of attitudes and lack of the appropriate interpersonal relational knowledge, skill, and ability (KSA). Desired KSAs revolve around self-awareness and relating “with” people from different cultures and countries on their terms (Klopf & McCroskey, 2007). Yet, the complexity of emergent systems makes effectively handling major contextual changes such as cultural adaptation tough at best. This article begins to codify complexity into useful precepts. Here a precept is defined as knowledge, skill, ability, attitude, awareness, theory, or abstraction that can be a useful conceptualization directed toward understanding how to improve as a leader in any context. The first precept is that leadership occurs in any context; that is, moving people into places that they would not go the places without the leader’s influence. Our answer that will not be simple for simplicity normally fails in complex problems. “What is important is that researches findings do not oversimplify phenomena, but rather capture some of the complexity... conditions/consequences do not exist in a vacuum (p. 91)... [and,] the primary purpose of doing qualitative research is discovery, not hypothesis testing... not trying to control variables, but to discover them” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 317).

The research question is: What precepts can be used in identifying where one is and where one needs to be in order to strategically “mind the gaps” in global leadership effectiveness?

The authors’ answer revolves around a proposed global leadership quotient (GLQ) which denotes a category of intelligence akin to IQ, EQ, and LQ. Any GLQ formula needs to classify the variables for empirical testing. And naturally, some GLQ precepts presented here might prove to be mediating, moderating, or directly causal variables. However, the intent here is not to categorize variables, but to establish a composite of variables that influence GLQ no matter what the influencing variable of the category is.

Overview and Needs

For the past one hundred plus years, academicians have been endeavoring to develop a metric for measuring and improving leadership. In 2005, Service published research and related theory to evolve the notion of a Leadership Quotient (2005a, 2005b, 2005c). Then in 2006, Service and Arnott introduced their complete Leadership Quotient as the copyrighted LQ^{\circledR} . The LQ^{\circledR} as proposed is a wide-ranging model for measuring and improving one’s ability as a leader and for furthering the understanding of leadership. This LQ^{\circledR} formula is a research-based formula, yet practical as a guide for leadership measurement and improvement. And, because the LQ^{\circledR} is measurable and malleable, it provides clear advice to help everyone reach their leadership potential. The LQ^{\circledR} acknowledges differences between leaders and followers, and offers everyone a useful metric that can be tailored to anyone and their followers under wide-ranging contexts. The LQ^{\circledR} concepts have been successfully used to teach leadership at undergraduate, graduate, and executive levels.

The 2006 LQ^{\circledR} concept was extended in 2009 (Service, 2009a, 2009b) and in 2012 (Service & Dance, 2012). Then in 2012, Service extended LQ^{\circledR} to leading across cultures and in differing contexts. Also Service and White’s “rest-of-us” leadership model was proposed in 2011 as a more complete and far-reaching leadership model. This current article further extends the crossing cultures LQ^{\circledR} and the rest-of-us leadership model by introducing the foundations of a comprehensive GLQ.

Many “organizations... accumulating foreign markets... face the challenges of selection [and], management of the most appropriate individuals” (Lee, 2005, p. 273). Additionally, “Globalization and

changing demographic patterns are making it more important for leaders to understand how to influence and manage people with different values, beliefs, and expectations” (Yukl, 2013, p. 360). To meet these pressing needs, GLQ depicts a worldview that guides developing proven tools for measuring and improving individuals in their knowledge, skills, and abilities to lead in diverse contexts.

“Virtually all of our thoughts, convictions and values exist and have meaning—whether or not we are conscious of it—within models of the world that have been developed over the course of intellectual history” (Rosen, 2011, p. A11). “The world we live in does influence what we do with ourselves on a day-to-day basis and can largely shape our ultimate destiny... ” [Therefore] “we must recognize the importance of what we are and how we think about things” (Neck & Manz, 2013, p. 9). While *doing, thinking and being*, humans evolved into building institutions, religions, academic disciplines, technological wonders, families, and politically divergent groups that underpin the multifaceted frameworks of civilizations. These resulting interactions establish norms of behavior and expectations that are defined through cultures. Discovering the make-up of cultures in order to exercise a level of influence in the form of leadership within varied societies is not easy. Providing some order to the complexity of leading across cultures is a primary purpose of this research. “The wisest of insights that can be gained by any man or woman is the realization that our world is not so much what it is but what we choose it to be” (Neck & Manz, 2013, p. 8).

An extensive and broad range extant literature was integrated with questionnaire responses to form a foundational CIQ—contextual intelligence measures model reported in Service, 2012. Supporting the use of research and writing from all fields of study and sources, Porter (1990) said:

Researchers in many fields of study are just beginning to recognize that traditional boundaries between fields are limiting. It should be possible to cut across disciplines and examine more variables in order to understand how complex and evolving systems work. (pp. 29-30)

Academic research and theory, science, history, psychology, religion, editorial opinion, fiction, and more can be useful if it helps clear preconceived notions. Indeed, “When perceiving the world without prejudice... our minds judge the world quite differently than when accessing it in the context of belief or expectation” (Chopra & Mlodinow, 2011, p. 132). Let us bring together diverse thoughts, concepts, and theories from many varied sources and attempt to clear our minds in order to think anew. Academicians must tear down traditional mired-in-the-past silos and move to become more innovatively open. Everyone must incessantly fine-tune their worldview to match the world as it changes, or be left in the dust bin of history.

“No one can ignore the question of how to perceive the world” (Chopra & Mlodinow, 2011, p. 19). Psychology Professor Pinker (2011) added:

The expansion of people’s... worlds through literacy, mobility, education, science, history, journalism, and mass media... can prompt people to take the perspectives of people unlike themselves and to expand their circle of sympathy to embrace them. (p. C2)

Ridley (2011, p. A15) added: “Collaboration is necessary for society to work... Human progress waxes and wanes according to how much people connect and exchange”. Chopra, Mlodinow, Pinker, and Ridley are joined by many others in describing human progress which increasingly depends on mutuality because individuals are incapable of producing and surviving alone. Individuals who learn to more effectively and innovatively handle major contextual changes are essential to cross cultural leadership successes (Kouzes & Posner, 2010). It starts with the need to understand your mindsets and related knowledge, skills, and abilities

for “firms will not ultimately succeed unless they... [hold] a realistic understanding of their national environment” (Porter, 1990, p. 30).

Literature Review—Culture and Context

In fairness this section must start by acknowledging the 2008 book, *Global Leadership: Research, Practice and Development*, by Mendenhall and others. Although this book was not reviewed until this paper was near completion, it proved to be the most complete research review source we have found in the past 25 years. It would indeed be a fine text or reference guide for anyone who needing a summary of relevant global leadership literature or anyone who wanting to improve in that area. Its most significant contributions, besides those cited directly in this paper, related to the validation of the need for and the possibility of producing more effective leaders capable of crossing cultures and handling major contextual changes. Furthermore, it validated the separately-derived GLQ mindset precepts shown later in this paper. It also supported the notion that only the inquisitive person has capable of handling much perplexity, paradox, ambiguity, and uncertainty who should attempt to lead across significant cultural barriers-barriers guided by multifaceted, passionately different worldviews.

The literature, academic and otherwise, are super clear in a few areas: First, it rightly says that there is an urgent need to build people with the right mix of knowledge, skills, and abilities that are willing to work to succeed in global leadership; Second, people with the correct balance of KSAs are rare and difficult to find or develop, they can be imitated to a degree and that is a key concept of GLQ; Third, a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach to studying effective global leadership is required; Lastly, in our age of globalization, leaders truly do exist in a world where variety, complex interaction patterns among various subunits, host governments, customers, pressures for change and stability, and the need to re-assert individual identity in a complex web of organizational relationship are the norm. This world is beset with ambiguity and stress. Facts, emotions, anxieties, power and dependence, competition and collaboration, individual and team efforts are present (Mendenhall et al., 2008, p. 11).

All forms of leadership development and adaptability require some level of self discovery. Yet, “we must admit that everyone else probably understands us better than we do ourselves” (Jung, 1933, p. 77). There are numerous self-defining models, frames, metaphors, and filters that everyone uses to make sense of “our” world. Additionally, effective leadership and cultural awareness are about *commitment and necessity* directed toward accomplishment:

[A] common series of... processes seems required... sensing needs, amplifying understanding, building awareness, creating credibility, legitimizing viewpoints, generating partial solutions, broadening support, identifying zones of opposition and indifference, changing perceived risks, structuring needed flexibilities, putting forward trial concepts, creating pockets of commitment, eliminating undesired options, crystallizing focus and consensus, managing coalitions. (Quinn, 1980, p. 146)

Success with these wide ranging adjustments goes beyond seeing, observing, and immersing.

[Fi]gure out what sort of environment [you need to succeed] in and carve mental maps that would help navigate it... [These are the] sophisticated models, which are then used to anticipate, interpret, and navigate through life (p. 46)... [T]houghts are profoundly molded by this long historic flow, and none of us exists, self-made, in isolation from (p. 32)... the essential feature of a human being, a culture, or a society (Brooks, 2011, pp. 108-109).

Developing a more comprehensive model is helpful for leaders to improve Bourdieu's call for using "cultural capital"—the tastes, opinions, cultural references, and conversational styles that will enable you to rise in polite society (Brooks, 2011, p. 146)... We absorb ethnic cultures, institutional cultures, regional cultures, which do most of our thinking for us (p. 149)... society is a layering of networks... bound by trust... Trust reduces friction and lowers transaction costs (p. 155).

Ideas from Klopff and McCroskey (2007) can also help in this GLQ pursuit:

Ignorance of another's culture is a major factor causing intercultural miscommunications (p. 9)... All cultures are characterized by distinctive attributes... [1] pervasiveness, [2] learned behavior, [3] shared behavior, [4] adaptability, [5] explicit/implicit behavior, [6] change, and [7] ethnocentricity (p. 26).

These seven common cultural characteristics are accounted for in GLQ. Additionally,

Major findings in the research on how current cultural values are related to leadership beliefs, leadership behavior, and leadership development practices [show the need to include the following] six value dimensions:... (1) power distance, (2) uncertainty avoidance, (3) individualism versus collectivism, (4) gender egalitarianism, (5) performance orientation, and (6) humane orientation. (Yukl, 2013, p. 365)

Finally, Americans, in particular, need to realize the extent and impact of our wealth and military compared to the small percent of world population (Rue & Byars, 2005). Regardless, "Americans might be less quick to impose their values on others if they understood the cultural values of others" (Sternberg, 2003, p. 167)

In *The Art of Crossing Cultures*, Storti (2001) said:

Cultural effectiveness comes at the cost of vigilance and sustained effort (p. 106)... [Y]ou either open yourself up to the experience and are greatly enriched by it, or you turn away—and are greatly diminished (p. 115)... If there is one thing nearly everyone who lives and works abroad has to get right, it is this: they must be able to get along with the local people (p. 15)... [If one depends on luck] chances of having a really satisfying experience living abroad would be about one in seven (p. 16)... Becoming culturally effective does not mean becoming a local; it means trying to see the world the way locals do and trying to imagine how they see you [and]... know[ing] when to give way and when not to (p. 96)... [Moreover,] the better you understand the local culture, the harder it is for the locals to hide behind it (p. 107)... The ability to see situations, problems, practices—the way we do things—from multiple perspectives... is a tremendous benefit to you and to your company... [C]onvictions and certainties are too often the concomitants of ignorance (p. 111).

Modern social scientist says that culture is transmitted through symbols representing patterns of behavior. Experience and research suggest that when attempting to test more Western theories on non-Western cultures, erroneous conclusions about conditions or capabilities often occur (Sternberg, 2003). "A major issue is the extent to which leadership theories developed and tested in one culture can be generalized to different cultures" (Yukl, 2013, p. 360). Though it cannot be totally worked out in this research, personal experiences, backed up by much anecdotal evidence, indicate that American people tend to value speed whereas Eastern cultures view speed suspiciously. The American value of creative thinking and disagreeing with professors shows up in many American classes; but experience with Chinese students shows that creativity is not a goal and disagreeing with a professor is a "no-no" in China. Additionally, Chinese students have often said to a current author, "I cannot believe students ask you and you said, 'I do not know!'" The patterns here are not inclusive or subtle: differences abound. The current authors have found that testing creativity and measuring in-class dialogue are

tough with many Eastern-born students. And, surely the act of testing changes the dynamics of relationships and distorts measures.

In *The Logic of FAILURE* (1996), Dorner said:

Studying the consequences of our measures gives us excellent opportunities for correcting our incorrect behavioral tendencies and assumptions... If our measures yield unexpected consequences, there must be reasons. By analyzing those reasons, we can learn what we should do better or differently in the future. (p. 177)

Yes, social scientist and those that use anything from this article need to analyze what works for them and what does not; and then you must attend to the differences between our prescripts predictions and your actual results.

In a dynamic and challenging account American Lieutenant Fiske Handley II experienced a cultural lesson in March of 1945 after being captured by the Japanese. Admittedly Handley knew a little of the Japanese. Luckily for Handley a Japanese doctor warned him: “It is a death offense for a barbarian to mention the Emperor’s name. All non-Japanese are barbarians’... I heeded the doctor’s advice religiously and warned other prisoners” (Hanley, 1997, p. 94). In the related and more well-known story of Olympian Louis Zamperini and his years of torture as a Japanese WWII prisoner of war, we can see other reasons for survival.

It remains a mystery why these three young men, veterans of the same training and the same crash, differed so radically in their perception of their plight. Maybe the difference was biological; some men may be wired for optimism, others for doubt... Perhaps the men’s histories had given them opposing convictions about their capacity to overcome adversity. (Hillenbrand, 2010, p. 147)

One of the individuals quickly gave up and died. Of the two who survived, one was deeply religious, and the other not so much so. But, the survivors both had humor, hope, and rebellion with truly resilient minds, bodies and spirits that kept survival in the forefront of their minds.

Victor Frankl in a classic on the human condition (1992) described how as a holocaust survivor he had to adapt to the most dehumanizing treatment. His advice was that when you cannot change your circumstances, you have to realize you can change your reactions to them. Frankl showed that when faced with unbelievable circumstances, some men act like saints while others react as swine. Much can be learned about fitting to new and very trying circumstances from such accounts. Perhaps these lessons can be summarized by the Stockdale Paradox: they confronted the brutal facts, but believed they would prevail in the end (in Collins, 2001; and reinforced throughout Collins & Hansen, 2011).

Difficult—Yes; Impossible—No

“Draw a different frame around the same set of circumstances and new pathways come into view (p. 1)... much more is possible than people ordinarily think” (p. 2). All of us seek confirming evidence based on limited assumptions and frames and seldom really listen to or see dissenting views. Thinking about what Picasso said about why he did not paint people “as they really are: show me a picture of her. Is not she rather small and flat?” (R. S. Zander & B. Zander, 2000, p. 11). Or consider words from a *Business Week* book of the year to help in understanding more about why all should study difficult concepts like culture and influence (leadership):

All people have untapped leadership potential... There are clear differences due to nature and nurture, that is, genes and development, as to how much untapped potential there may be. But no matter what level of... leadership performance a person currently exhibits, he or she can make quantum improvements. Not everyone can be the CEO of a multibillion-dollar corporation... [But] leadership is there in you. (Tichy, 2002, p. 8)

Leading edge science gives lessons for a GLQ. First, relationships rule; Second, time is only relative related to change; Third, “measuring” changes the measured; Fourth, cultures are never static; Fifth, cultures like clouds cannot simply be broken down to understand as clocks can; and Sixth, to address the complexity of a useful GLQ this research has to cross disciplines and views. Indeed, with these six pronouncements it may seem that we are adding too much complexity to the GLQ. However, such complex conceptualizations as GLQ can only be simplified to a certain level or they become too simple to work.

BizEd authors stressed that MBA skills and knowledge of globalization, leadership development, innovation and creativity, critical thinking and all forms of self-presentation and communication need to be the focus.

Personal reflection and crossing cultures are key concepts in these articles (“Best Practices”, 2011; Phan, 2011; Bisoux, 2011; Shinn, 2011). These authors, like the current authors, suggested that when you experience a major contextual change, start by going with the flow, but do not get stuck in what you know and do not know; or in correcting others involved. Most of us will figure out when it simply becomes a necessity.

Most people are sent abroad because they are at the top of their game and show much potential to succeed in cross cultural assignments. But, that changes when they get there for,

[y]ou have to be able to sustain reversals, upsets, accidents (p. 21)... get beyond the temptation to withdraw from the local culture (p. 63)... People from different cultures can fail to get along with each other for any number of reasons (p. 45)... The capacity of the average person to fully conceive of the “other” has always been greatly exaggerated (p. 70)... [Too often] expectation, not... behaviour, is the real sticking point (p. 75)... Become aware of your... reactions (p. 77)... [for] responses are influenced by the individual’s expectations (Storti, 2001, p. 82).

Storti went on to say that “to do” and “not to do” cannot cover all the contingencies and they generally oversimplify the difficulty of cross-cultural effectiveness (p. 87). Our GLQ shows the appropriate fit of complexity and is useful in developing mind-sets needed for success in crossing cultures or facing other major contextual changes.

We are born into a society and nurtured by that society in a process of socialization. Individuals are familiarized with it from their infancy, custom has rendered it habitual to them, and they are very apt to regard it as, what is called, the way of the world... (Smith, 1976, p. 201)

And, “As individuals we make judgments but the judgments we make are based in part on the social norms which have evolved through time. These judgments also impact the evolution of future norms” (Marshall, 2011, p. 8). For as long as social scientists have been studying societal customs, they have witnessed humans using customs to shape their views. And, existing customs of society frame the evolution of new customs. However, reminding that when mores is sufficient, you do not need laws; but when mores is insufficient, laws cannot be enforced (Covey, 1991, 2004).

Much value can be found in the “business” expatriate literature. Articles from Andreason (2008), Baker and Roberts (2006), Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, and Luk (2005), Harrison, Shaffer, and Bhaskar-Schriivas (2004), Kleinschmidt (2009), Kupka and Cathro (2007), Lee and Sukoco (2008), Shen and Hall (2009), Takeuchi (2010), and Takeuchi, Seakhwa Yun, and Tesluk (2002) all got into the realms of technical and simple humanistic aspects that supported the need for varying views to build a useful GLQ. However, because of article space requirements, a more comprehensive review is difficult and will not be

recounted here. Clearly it can be seen that influence and leadership, global or otherwise, are characterized by interrelated, ambiguously-complex relationships, values, communications, motivations, missions, and visions (Service & Arnott, 2006; Service & White, 2011). Further, this is even more complex when there are many varied constituents commanding attention with all too often mutually exclusive stresses. For our model and quotient to be of use, its user must make much of its second nature and react at a more sub-conscious level for:

Unconscious processes are better when everything is ambiguous (p. 243)... [Acquire] a set of practical skills that enable [you] to anticipate change (p. 249)... being wise is the art of knowing what to overlook (p. 264)... Behavior does not exhibit what the researchers call “cross-situational stability”. Rather, it seems to be powerfully influenced by context (p. 282)... [Learn about yourself] How pathetically scant my self-knowledge is (Brooks, 2011, p. 371).

Competing in a Global Context

The “must have” international experience deserves a book of its own; but in this article the current authors can start by stating that international leadership-management-influence is tough but it is more a matter of attitude than of experience. Additionally, the literature shows clearly another main reason for failures is the lack of leaders with appropriate skills to relate to people from different cultures. Management-leadership interpersonal skills are helpful to effectiveness in international situations:

- (1) Establishing credibility with actions that back up words—not appearing boastful or arrogant;
- (2) Taking care in giving and receiving feedback—level of directness—err on the side of humility;
- (3) Obtaining information—do not equate perceptions with facts; other’s perceptions = their realities;
- (4) Learning to evaluate people without offending—asking versus telling is always a good start;
- (5) When working on a global team, watch your tendency to defend national interest;
- (6) Handling training and development—realizing that trainers must train differently in many cultures;
- (7) When selling is a goal, learn to speak their language: learn to introduce yourself, say thank you;
- (8) When negotiating seek a native to help you—confidentiality differs from culture to culture;
- (9) Getting native support for strategic planning—strategic mindsets are different from culture to culture;
- (10) Remembering when transferring knowledge—accepting what host country experts give you and use it;
- (11) Being innovative wherever you are—setting up systems that encourage differences in differing cultures;
- (12) Managing change—requiring tremendous momentum-go slow (Gundling, 2003);
- (13) Learning to listen;
- (14) Using social media for good and strategy.

The use or need for speed and consensus differs in most cultures. The more “Americanized” cultures move quickly when accomplishing change; whereas Eastern cultural mindsets require a change maker to wait for nearly total consensus before even mentioning change.

In an unknown culture, start by “knowing what you do not know”, and then read, study, ask, and recognize to learn and use (non-judgmentally) what you have learned. As Steven Covey has preached for years, seek first to understand before seeking to be understood (supported by Peters, 2003; Porter, 1990; Service, 2006).

As one’s management and leadership grow and as one develops a better GLQ, one moves from unconscious incompetence to conscious incompetence, then to conscious competence before arriving at the

ultimate destination of unconscious competence. To aid in moving toward the betterment of GLQ and correct level of unconscious competence let us review foundations for models of global leadership.

Successful Intelligence as a Guide for GLQ's Foundation

In his classic work, Gardner (1993) demonstrated that intelligence is not one thing but many. In a similar fashion, Sternberg (1996) asked if intelligence is one thing or many. Sternberg's answer was that intelligence is clearly many things and intelligence cannot be limited to one classic definition or measure. Any would-be global leader must realize that there is a distinctive intelligence, a malleable intelligence that can guide one to work successfully across varying cultures and contexts in our shrinking world. Our following GLQ worldview-mindset model is designed to describe that intellect for measurement and development.

The traditional IQ as researches have come to know is important. But it does not take genius-level intelligence to have high intellect in other areas. In our chosen fields of leadership and management, the literature contains many theories promoting IQ, EQ, or both as predictors of leadership success. On the other hand, more have found, as Drucker said: "There seems to be little correlation between a man's effectiveness and intelligence... Brilliant men are often strikingly ineffectual; they fail to realize that the brilliant insight is not by itself achievement" (Henninger, 2002, p. A16). Moreover, most major leadership theories—behavioral, trait, situational, contextual, or contingent approaches, do not fully answer the needs of contextual intelligence as a definable, teachable, measurable, and improvable component of crossing cultures.

A need exists to extend understandings of the IQ of old in order to build success in crossing cultures (contexts) at an ever increasing pace. Brooks (2011), Hall (2011), and Sternberg (1996, 2003) are among many authors that reduce the importance of traditional IQ and replace it with something coming to be known as "successful intelligence". These authors said successful intelligence is the kind of matters in reaching life's important goals. Here the current authors want to extend that into a contextual intelligence (GLQ) that can insure cross cultural and different contextual fit effectiveness.

Successful intelligence is not an accident; but it can be nurtured and developed... It is my contention that successful intelligence should be taught, because it is the kind of intelligence that will be the most valuable and rewarding in the real world after school (p. 269)... [It] involves analytical, creative, and practical aspects (p. 47)... is primarily an issue not of amount but balance, of knowing when and how to use analytic, creative, and practical abilities... Successfully intelligent people figure out their strengths and their weaknesses, and then find ways to capitalize on their strengths (Sternberg, 1996, pp. 47-49).

Two quotes should help us with the GLQ's concept: (1) "One of the most enduring lessons of social psychology is that behavior change often precedes changes in attitude and feelings" (p. 129). And (2) "He ignored arguments that did not fit his mental framework" (Brooks, p. 163). These quotes provide different approaches that one should recall when attempting to change attitudes and expand understandings.

[IQ] is surprisingly malleable (p. 164)... IQ predicts only about 4 percent of variance in job performance (p. 165)... Wisdom does not consist of knowing specific facts or possessing knowledge... It consists of knowing how to treat knowledge: being confident but not too confident; adventurous but grounded. It is a willingness to confront counterevidence and to have a feel for the vast spaces beyond what is known (pp. 168-169)... people who succeed tend to find one goal in the distant future and then chase it through thick and thin (Brooks, 2011, p. 177).

Sternberg listed common characteristics and attributes found among successfully intelligent people. Those

that are of use in the GLQ show that successfully intelligent people: (1) learn to control their impulses, persevere and make the most of their abilities; (2) do not procrastinate—translating thought into action—initiating and completing tasks; (3) are not afraid to risk failure-accepting fair blame and rejecting pity; (4) independently surmount personal difficulties; (5) see the forest and the trees, not spreading themselves too thin nor too thick; (6) have reasonable levels of self-confidence; and (7) balance analytical, creative, and practical thinking (Sternberg, 1996, Chapter 8). “Successfully intelligent people... eventually, come to lead it (p. 189)... Thus, the true measure of your intelligence is not in a test score; it is in your willingness to develop your own talents (1996, p. 150)”.

The literature is filled with accounts of leaders who have improved their own successful intelligence by identifying shortcomings and working to improve them. George W. Bush, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Edison, Condoleezza Rice, Woodrow Wilson, Mother Teresa, and Teddy Roosevelt are historical exemplars of formally educated and uneducated leaders who improved their intelligence in ways that indicate successful intelligence. This brief overview of IQ and successful intelligence provide a beginning platform for a useful GLQ.

The GLQ

The GLQ precepts came from the models and literature reviewed in this research, and extended by adding the results of interpretive analysis to 50 preliminary questionnaires (Service, 2012). Using methods clearly described in Chopra and Mlodinow (2011), Corbin and Strauss (2008), Eisenhardt (1989), Mendenhall et al (2008), and Ropo and Hunt (1991), the GLQ precepts shown below were developed—coded from the questionnaire narratives in light of the research and writings shown in this paper. It was difficult to code varied statements into meaningful concepts that could be defined and researched. The “coding” as precepts-labels is subject to normal human biases and knowledge.

Encouragingly, the range of nationalities and situations represented in the completed questionnaires (shown in Service, 2012) was broad. It included people with experiences in America that are from Germany, Vietnam, China, South Africa, Sweden, Cuba, and Spain; and American who have worked or lived in many countries. A next step will involve a larger and more randomly inclusive sample to be analyzed with several experts in a predefined and uniform fashion.

Appendix A is the resulting proposed initial guide to developing a GLQ capable of being further refined and then empirically tested. Personally you can use Appendix A to identify what you need to improve related to your GLQ. Then those seeking improvement can follow Appendix B in planning and realizing a new and improved GLQ.

Reviewing many researches and popular press accounts, and discussion with hundreds of whom have experienced cross cultural leadership situations, it is clear that a wide range of approaches can help one be more successful in leading across cultures. However, following best practices should be avoided and instead replaced by a broad understanding of complex and competing principles. GLQ strengths do require a high level of psychological fitness coupled with extensive abilities to consider, build and use a multiplicity of people, perspectives, and contextual comprehensions. Also, a top GLQ requires self-awareness without self-centeredness coupled with an ambitious sincerity and sensitivity folded into a questioning willfulness that seems impossible in a human. “[Reject] this displacement of the human oneself from the center of validity, and insist that [your] own experience must be the starting point for [your] understanding of the world” (Wertheim, 2011, p. 50). Moreover, it should go without saying that confidence, desire, focus, and attention to detail must

be coupled with hard work for a superior GLQ. However, the desire, attention, and focus are quite different for GLQ than many other metrics. GLQ's desire must be more adventurous and its attention and focus must be more "other-situation" centric than in many other areas. Additionally, the literacy, resilience, energy, flexibility, openness, and overall street savvy required for superior GLQ are daunting. But, GLQ's precepts are very malleable. In fact, recent studies have shown that traditional IQs and EQs once thought to be relatively fixed are also very changeable (Goleman, 1995, 2000; Goleman, et al., 2001, 2002; Hall, 2011; Service, 2005b, 2005c, 2009a, 2009b; Sternberg, 1996, 2003).

Successfully intelligent people are flexible in adapting to the roles they need to fulfill. They recognize that they will have to change the way they work to fit the task and situation at hand, and then they analyze what these changes will have to be and make them (p. 153)... All of us know people who succeed in school but fail in their careers (Sternberg, 1996, p. 220).

This quote defines what must be included for any GLQ to be useful as a guide to self-assessment, teaching, growth, and learning how to improve cross cultural effectiveness.

There is much in this model that needs explaining, but the purpose here is not to totally explain, but to forward a testable model. Four areas to contemplate are: First, for anyone familiar with the so called big five in personality (Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Amiability, and Narcissism), you will notice portions of those factors; Second, for those that study cultures, ethnocentricity (the degree of belief in the superiority of one's ethnic group), dispassionate views of humanness and the power distance factor (close in more open societies and far in more closed societies) are generally present; Third, locus of control, where an internal locus indicates a feeling of self-control and external one indicates the opposite; and Lastly, one can see the need to know one's own frames, mindsets, views, and tendencies in order to improve GLQ.

The key is going to be world views; that is the mind-sets one has and can develop. World views that indicate flexibility and openness to one's limits and the values and values of others are a must. World views that revolve around complexity and understand the equifinality—many ways to the same end, and that are known and considered will win out in crossing cultures. A love for different views and learning from any and all sources is a must as the abilities to form and hold relationships based on mutual trust and competency. Being wary of those that cannot accept differences or biding those that express themselves in any ways you are yet to encounter. Interdependence and independence must be tolerated and used without social or emotional laziness or disdain. Do not seek to confirm your own world views but seek to understand those of others.

Notice that this research has said nothing about gender, for indeed, your sex is what it is. However, in certain cultures, gender does make a difference. "Gender egalitarianism [is of concern and it] is the extent to which men and women receive equal treatment, and both masculine and feminine attributes are considered important and desirable" (Yukl, 2013, p. 366). You must realize, as do the current authors, these views of gender may not be fair or right, but they are all too often facts. Additionally, this research will not address gender orientations, beyond saying that it is a consideration. Finally, humane orientation, the concern for the welfare of others, is often a consideration because altruism, benevolence, compassion, kindness, friendliness and so on, are not universally thought or valued in the same way. Some see them as weaknesses versus desirable attributes.

The precepts shown in the GLQ are not "either or" precepts, but the precepts exist on a continuum and, consequently most do have to be changed much to be improved. The intent is for one seeking improvement to study the GLQ and discovering their strengths and weaknesses. Then use our max-min principle, depicted in

Appendix B, which says to maximize strengths and hone or deflect weaknesses as possible. The key management and education rule is: “measure it and it will improve”. Just be sure what “it” is: GLQ is an intellect that directs one to correctly read situations, discover important knowledge, and identify skills and abilities useful in handling new and different situations.

Do not be put off by lack of GLQ knowledge, skills, or abilities; practice the Max-Min principles and develop an improvement plan using Appendix B as a guide.

It is noted that those items listed as natural are precepts that are established early in life and unlikely to change when one reaches mid-to-early teenage years. In most cases, someone is born with a tendency toward a certain type of behavior and that is amplified early in life. For example, you hear someone say of their first female child, “She is so sensitive”. Consequently the child is treated as being sensitive and therefore, a trait that appeared early in life is solidified and often embedded in personality.

In a recent conference a current author was discussing the topic of crossing cultures with a psychologist who consulted with large international organizations. In this capacity the consultant evaluated candidates for expatriate assignments. The psychologist said the key factor that predicted success in her experience over the years was curiosity (Saba, 2011). Additionally, in a recent paper on adaptation in expatriate situations identified both psychological hardiness and cultural distance as key factors predicting expatriate success (White, Absher, & Huggins, 2011). These factors, though not discovered for our preliminary testing, are worthy of consideration. Our expectation is that curiosity and psychological hardiness would be mediating variables between the GLQ precepts shown above as independent variables (IV) and the dependent variable (DV) of success in cross cultural assignments. That is, curiosity and psychological hardiness could both be shown to be necessary catalysts in a regression equation where the DV expatriate success is a function of the restated IVs from the GLQ model shown above.

This is a very brief overview of how one might evaluate oneself and work toward improvement in the ability to adapt to cultural or major contextual changes. Please do not be put off by this brevity of the description of this GLQ model, just get on with knowing yourself better and developing a “wisdom” improvement plan. Hall (2011) in his discussion of wisdom from views of philosophy to neuroscience stressed a key point that relates back to the global leadership model. That point is that wisdom only occurs when one can deal effectively with uncertainty and complexity under their known values and judgments.

Each individual has the potential to improve themselves as a global leader though enhancing their GLQ. This article is designed to help you do so. Go beyond media hype of feeling good, self-help articles and books to truly evaluate you, then develop a plan and do it! Understand where you are in each precept and where you need to be and then mind your gaps. Remember that, categorization must never win out over understanding.

Clearly simplistic classifications do not work (p. 9)... The world is very complex. There is no simple explanation for things. Rather, events are the result of multiple factors coming together and interacting in complex and often unanticipated ways. ... it is important to capture as much of this complexity... as possible... Obtain multiple perspectives (p. 8)... something occurs when doing analysis that is beyond the ability of a person to articulate or explain... Interpretation is an art that cannot be formalized (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p. 9).

Conclusions

For one wishing to improve as a global leader of the GLQ is not the end, simply the end of a new

beginning. The GLQ is not the final work for the current authors realize it is limited. However, do not be deterred by limitations; use the amalgamation of wisdom and linking of concepts and ideas to improve your GLQ. For anyone that is willing to work and study, successful intelligence in the form of a GLQ is useful in crossing cultures and contexts. It is no doubt that the world is becoming more open and change is the new norm. A new worldview based on GLQ assessment and improvement is possible if you just get on with it. Do not be deterred by your or our shortcomings or by other obstacles, for “Few of us will walk this earth and not be touched in some way by tragedy, but there’s an old saying that adversity has a way of introducing you to yourself” (George W. Bush in Nantz and Spielman, 2008, p. 8).

References

- Andreason, A. W. (2008). Expatriate adjustment of spouses and expatriate managers: An integrative research review. *International Journal of Management*, 25(2), 382-395.
- Baker, W. M., & Roberts, F. D. (2006). Managing the costs of expatriation. *Strategic Finance*, 87(11), 35-41.
- Bate, P., & Child, J. (1987). Paradigms and understanding in comparative organizational research. In J. Child & P. Bate (Eds.), *Organization of innovation East-West perspective* (pp. 19-49). New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- “Best Practices in Curriculum Redesign”. (2011, September/October). *BizEd* (pp. 48-50).
- Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P., Harrison, D., Shaffer, M., & Luk, D. M. (2005). Input-based and time-based models of international adjustment: Meta-analytic evidence and theoretical extensions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(2), 257-281.
- Bisoux, T. (2011, September/October). Re-envisioning the MBA. *BizEd* (pp. 22-30).
- Brooks, D. (2011). *The social animal: The hidden sources of love, character, and achievement*. New York: Random House.
- Caligiuri, P. M., Hyland, M. M., Joshi, A., & Bross, A. S. (1998). Testing a theoretical model for examining the relationship between family adjustment and expatriates’ work adjustment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(4), 598-614.
- Chopra, D., & Mlodinow, L. (2011). *War of worldviews*. New York: Harmony Books.
- Churchill, W. S. (1949). *The second world war* (Vol. 6). London: Cassell & Co. Ltd..
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap... and others do not*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc..
- Collins, J. C., & Hansen, M. T. (2011). *Great by choice*. New York: Harper-Collins Publishers.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (3th ed.). Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage.
- Corsini, M. A. (2006). *Do what you do better*. Birmingham, A. L.: Do What You Do Better Publishing.
- Covey, S. (1991). *Principle centered leadership*. New York: Summit Books.
- Covey, S. (2004). *The 8th habit*. New York: Free Press.
- Dorner, D. (1996). *The logic of FAILURE: Why things go wrong and what we can do to make them right* (German version) . New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Fischlmayr, I. C., & Kollinger, I. (2010). Work-life balance—A neglected issue among austrian female expatriates. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(4), 455-487.
- Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Friedman, T. L. (2008). *Hot, flat and crowded*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Friedman, T. L., & Mandelbaum, M. (2011). *That used to be us*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Gladwell, M. (2002). *The tipping point: How little things make a big difference*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Gladwell, M. (2008). *Outliers: The story of success*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Goleman, D. (2000). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2001, December). Primal leadership: The hidden driver of great performance. *Harvard Business Review* (pp. 42-51).
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

- Gundling, E. (2003). *Working globesmart*. Palo Alto, C.A.: Davies-Black.
- Hall, S. S. (2011). *Wisdom: From philosophy to neuroscience*. New York: Vintage.
- Hanley, F. II. (1997). *Accused American war criminal: "Special prisoner" of the Japanese 1945*. Austin, T.X.: Eakin Press.
- Harari, O. (2002). *The leadership secrets of Colin Powell*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Harrison, D. A., Shaffer, M. A., & Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P. (2004). Going places: Roads more and less travelled in research on expatriate experiences. In J. J. Martocchio (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 23, 199-247.
- Hillenbrand, L. (2010). *Unbroken: A World War II story of survival, resilience, and redemption*. New York: Random House.
- Heninger, D. (2002). There must be a real reason for Bush's success. *The Wall Street Journal* (p. A16).
- Isaacson, W. (2007). *Einstein: His life and universe*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Jung, C. G. (1933). *Modern man in search of a soul*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Kahn, R. L. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York: Wiley.
- Kleinschmidt, J. (2009). Cross-company knowledge sharing: How enterprise social networking transforms the workplace. *Information Management*, 19, 56.
- Klopf, D. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (2007). *Intercultural communication encounters*. Boston, M.A.: Pearson Education, Inc..
- Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2010). *The truth about leadership: The no-fads, heart-of-the-matter facts you need to know*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Kupka, B., & Cathro, V. (2007). Desperate housewives—Social and professional isolation of german expatriated spouses. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(6), 951-968.
- Lee, H. W. (2005). The factors influencing expatriates. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 6(2), 273-278.
- Lee, H. W. (2007). Factors that influence expatriate failure: An interview study. *International Journal of Management*, 24(3), 403-413.
- Lee, L., & Sukoco, B. M. (2008). The mediating effects of expatriate adjustment and operational capability on the success of expatriation. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 36(9), 1191-1204.
- Lee, R. (2009). Social capital and business and management: Setting a research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 11(3), 247-273.
- Li, C. (2010). *Open leadership: How social technology can transform the way your lead*. New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Madjar, N., Oldham, G. R., & Pratt, M. G. (2002). There is no place like home. The contributions of work and nonwork creativity support to employees' creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 757-767.
- Marshall, J. B. (2011). Adam Smith explained it, however we fail to teach—That the ethical maturity of the citizenry is a necessary condition for economic growth. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Economics and Finance in Jacksonville, FL.
- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2013 forthcoming). *Human resource management: Essential perspectives* (6th ed.). Mason, O. H.: South Western.
- McIntosh, F. (2011). *The relational leader: A revolutionary framework to engage your team*. Boston M. A.: Course Technology.
- Mendenhall, M. E., Osland, J. S., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R., & Maznevski, M. L. (2008). *Global leadership: Research, practice and development*. New York: Routledge.
- Mintzberg, H. (2009). *Managing*. U. K.: Pearson Education.
- Monarath, H. (2010). *Executive presence*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nantz, J., & Spielman, E. (2008). *Always by my side*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. (2013 forthcoming). *Mastering self-leadership* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Peters, T. J. (2003). *Re-imagine!* New York: Dorling Kindersley.
- Phan, P. (2011, September/October). Building the 21st century curriculum. *BizEd* (pp. 38-45).
- Pinker, S. (2002). *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature*. New York: Viking.
- Pinker, S. (2011). Violence vanquished. *The Wall Street Journal* (pp. C1-C2).
- Porter, M. E. (1990). *The competitive advantage of nations*. New York: Macmillan.
- Potoker, E. S. (2011). *International human resource development: A leadership perspective*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Quinn, J. B. (1980). *Strategies for change: Logical incrementalism*. Homewood, I. L.: Richard D. Irwin.
- Ridley, M. (2003). *The agile gene: How nature turns on nurture*. Great Britain: Fourth Estate.
- Ridley, M. (2011). From phoenecia to hayek to the "cloud". *The Wall Street Journal* (p. A15).
- Ropo, A., & Hunt, J. G. (1991, December). A dynamic case study perspective for management and organizational research (An unpublished report from Professor J. G. Hunt Institute for Management and Leadership Research, College of Business Administration Texas Tech University, Lubbock, Texas).

- Rosen, G. (2011). How to think about how to live (Review of Luc Ferry's *A brief history of thought*). *The Wall Street Journal* (p. A11).
- Saba, A. S. (2011). Roll the Dice: Are we gambling with global employee selection? A reassessment of competitive alternatives. Proceedings of *The International Academy of Business and Public Administration Disciplines* (p. 388) (abstract only published). Memphis, T. N..
- Service, R. W. (2005a). CQ: The communications quotient for IS professionals. *Journal of Information Science*, 31(2), 99-113.
- Service, R. W. (2005b). Measuring and teaching for success: Intelligence versus IQ. *The International College Teaching Methods & Styles Journal*, 1(1), 5-24.
- Service, R. W. (2005c). SQ versus IQ: Successful intelligence matters. *The International Journal of Business Disciplines*, 16(1), 81-96.
- Service, R. W. (2006). The development of strategic intelligence: A managerial perspective. *International Journal of Management*, 23(1), 61-77.
- Service, R. W. (2009a). The leadership quotient: Measuring toward improve. *Business Renaissance Quarterly*, 4(1), 125-158.
- Service, R. W. (2009b). Leadership quotient[®]'s thought experiment: A framework for leadership and management. *International Journal of Business and Public Administration*, 6(3), 74-90.
- Service, R. W. (2012 forthcoming). Leadership and Innovation across cultures: CIQ-contextual effectiveness as a skill. *Southern Business Review*. 32nd Annual International Industrial and Human Relations Conference best paper award.
- Service, B., & Arnott, D. (2006). *The leadership quotient: 12 dimensions for measuring and improving leadership*. New York: iUniverse.
- Service, R. W., & Dance, J. W. (2012 forthcoming). IAM quotient for impression management: A guide to appearance and behavior for young professionals. *American Journal of Business Research*. Previously published in an earlier form in Proceedings of *American Institute of Higher Education*. April: Charleston, SC.
- Service, R. W., & White, D. (2011). Leadership effectiveness for the rest-of-us. Accepted for Presentation and Proceeding Publication at the Academy of Business and Public Administration Disciplines in Memphis, T. N., October 27.
- Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., & Gilley, K. M. (1999). Dimensions, determinants, and differences in the expatriate adjustment process. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 30(3), 557-581.
- Shen, Y., & Hall, D. T. (2009). When expatriates explore other options: Retaining talent through greater job embeddedness and repatriation adjustment. *Human Resource Management*, 48(5), 793-816.
- Shinn, S. (2011, September/October). The customizable curriculum. *BizEd* (pp. 32-37).
- Smith, A. (1976). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. In P. H. Campbell & A. S. Skinner (Eds.), Indianapolis, I. A.: Liberty Classics.
- Smolin, L. (2001). *Three roads to quantum gravity*. New York: Basic Books
- Sternberg, R. J. (1996). *Successful intelligence: How practical and creative intelligence determine success in life*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2003). *Wisdom, intelligence, and creativity synthesized*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stidder, N. (2011). *Experience of the region becomes a vital asset*. Retrieved October 2011, from <http://www.ft.com>
- Storti, C. (2001). *Art of crossing cultures* (2nd ed.). Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.
- Swaim, B (2011, September). An Englishman lights out [Review of J Raban's *Driving Home*]. *The Wall Street Journal*, 17-18, C6.
- Takeuchi, R. (2010). A critical review of expatriate adjustment research through a multiple stakeholder view: Progress, emerging trends, and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 36(4), 1040-1064.
- Takeuchi, R., Seakhwa Yun, R., & Tesluk, P. E. (2002). An examination of crossover and spillover effects of spousal and expatriate cross-cultural adjustment on expatriate outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 655-666.
- Tichy, N. M. (2002). *The leadership engine*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Tichy, N. M., & Bennis, W. G. (2007). *Judgment: How winning leaders make great calls*. New York: Portfolio.
- Tracy, B. (2010). *How the best leaders lead*. New York: AMACOM.
- Tudor, A. (2011, December). Chain's rarest bankers. *The Wall Street Journal*, 6, C1.
- Tyson, N. deGrasse, (2007). *Death by black hole: And other cosmic quandaries*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Varner, I. I., & Palmer, T. M. (2002). Successful expatriation and organizational strategies. *Review of Business*, 23(2), 8-11.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory: Foundations, development, application*. New York: Braziller.
- Wertheim, M. (2011). *Physics on the fringe*. New York: Walker & Company.

- White, D. W., Absher, R. K., & Huggins, K. A. (2011). The effects of hardiness and cultural distance on sociocultural adaptation an expatriate sales manager population. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 31*(3), 325-337.
- White, D. W., & Lean, E. (2008). The impact of perceived leader integrity on subordinates in a work team environment. *Journal of Business Ethics, 81*, 765-778.
- Wooden, J., & Jamison, S. (2007). *The essential wooden: A lifetime of lessons*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wren, D. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (2009). *The evolution of management thought* (6th ed.). Hoboken, N. J.: John Wiley & Sons.
- Yukl, G. (2013 forthcoming). *Leading in organizations* (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Zander, R. S., & Zander, B. (2000). *The art of possibility: Transforming professional and personal life*. New York: Penguin.

Appendix A: GLQ “Required Worldview” Strengths and Weaknesses

1. Strengths—advantages that are enablers in contextual adaptive development

A. Natural—more uncontrollable “good” traits-key abilities and attitudes

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| (1) Flexible-openness: equifinality | (2) Dispassionate |
| (3) Gender and gender orientations | (4) Internal locus of control |
| (5) Abilities under psychological hardiness | (6) Attitudes & awareness-curiosity |

B. Nurtured—more controllable “good” traits-key knowledge and skills

- | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| (1) Known “open” mindsets | (2) High social/cultural intellect |
| (3) Weak ethnocentricity | (4) Observant |
| (5) Knowledge/job skills/tasks | (6) High EQ |

2. Weaknesses—disadvantages and detailers to leadership development

A. Natural—more uncontrollable “bad” traits-key self-centered

- | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| (1) Strong national affiliation | (2) Narcissistic |
| (3) Change avoidance | (4) Large power distance |
| (5) Cognitive simplicity | (6) Psychological immaturity |

B. Nurtured—more controllable “bad” traits-key avoidance

- | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| (1) Disdaining other views | (2) Confirming mindset |
| (3) Learned behavior pervasiveness | (4) Un-accepting of differences |
| (5) Low EQ | (6) Relationship challenged |

Appendix B: Improvement Planning Guide

1. Clearly & honestly assess vs. precepts.
2. Set doable goals as SMART objectives & measure—Express as events & behaviors.
3. Make goals under your control.
4. Develop a strategy that insures you accomplish objectives.
5. Establish support group.
6. Create rewards & punishments for results.

Take care in indentifying what is under your control and what is not. In the Appendix A (the GLQ model), “natural” strengths and weaknesses are not normally very changeable. On the other hand, “nurtured” strengths and weakness are more under

your control. Work hard to hone your ability to correctly identify your skills and try to limit distractions from the reality of what your GLQ might become. Identifying, studying, learning, relearning, internalizing and using your GLQ will serve you well.

1. List & acknowledge all GLQ shortcomings.
2. Describe how you will improve on the shortcomings.
3. Establish measures of progress.
4. ID & use people in your change support group.