

Characteristics and Practices Essential to Leading Global Organizations in the 21st Century

**Bryan Forsyth
Colorado Technical University**

This paper analyzes the argument that global leaders are not only essential in most all businesses going forward but that there is a large gap in current methods and approaches to developing these leaders. The argument is that more and more businesses are going global so do businesses need global leaders, absolutely and without question. If you are working on the World Wide Web, you are essentially global. You could have customers from around the world quite easily. It could be even easier to be smug and arrogant in those situations because you are not sitting face to face with the client and most likely never will. If you are serious about your business, then you should take global leadership seriously whether or not you are traveling around the world. A gap in the literature is addressed in this paper.

ELEVEN CHARACTERISTICS

Clawson (2014) posited that there are 11 characteristics that global leaders need to exhibit to succeed. The following paragraph headings are the ones that Clawson used, all the content under the headings are original writing.

Overseas Experience

It is said that there is no substitution for actual experience overseas. Is that not the case in most situations? Having experience is usually the best teacher. It is hard to learn from a book or case studies all of the subtle nuances that might come into play working overseas. Like any other learning, making mistakes and learning from them also would matter a lot one would think.

Deep Self-Awareness

How do your beliefs differ from others and is that acceptable to you. There are many people that are so steeped in their belief system that everything is black and white to them. It is either right or wrong based on my understanding of the world and perhaps the doctrine I was raised with. Are you willing to invite a Buddhist person over for dinner if you are a staunch Christian? Can you relate to them on any level? This is the kind of deep self-awareness that must be thought about and potential hurdles overcome in order to succeed in other cultures.

Sensitivity to Cultural Diversity

Along the same lines of self-awareness how much are you willing to engage in other cultures and perhaps some of their rituals? If you are invited out to eat lunch with some potential business clients and they are eating monkey brains and would be offended if you did not partake in this delicious delicacy, how would that impact the relationship? Are you willing to eat scorpions or raw fish for example? If not, how will you deal with that odd cultural situation?

Humility

As Americans with huge egos and often a sense of self-superiority, this can be very crucial. When this author was working overseas, we were warned not to look or act like “ugly Americans”. When you go downtown you do not wear your ten gallon hat and cowboy boots. You are humble and respect the culture you are working in. After all, when in Rome do as the Romans do is probably good advice in this situation. Most Americans can use a good dose of humility both here and abroad. It will certainly take you places that any other egotistical behavior would or could not.

Lifelong Curiosity

Lifelong learning is a commonly used term these days. If one is not willing to learn, change and adapt to the environment as it is shifting and morphing around them, they are not likely to survive very long internationally. It is one thing to say you are a lifelong learner and it is quite another when you are being forced to change your ways and adapt on a regular basis.

Cautious Honesty

What is honesty? What is truth, good and bad, etc. when you are in a foreign country? You must be aware that some cultures have languages where the words we use do not even exist let alone having the same understanding that we have of the same word. So when you are using any term that could possibly be ambiguous, be sure to use caution until you know what you are doing for sure.

Global Strategic Thinking

How attuned are you to the global situation? Do you keep current with the latest economic trends and perhaps the politics of the countries you are dealing with? Let’s say you are working in Iraq and they put a new government in place, how does that affect your strategy as it relates to that country? What about the people involved, do you truly invite differing people from differing cultures who might have the necessary knowledge, skills and ability to do the work that needs to be done? How about the strategy, what changes about your strategy when in a global marketplace? More questions than answers here right now but I would consider them important in thinking about global strategy.

Patiently Impatient

When you are doing business in Japan, how does that culture treat time and relationships in business? In our country we tend to want to “close the deal” as soon as possible to meet our quarterly results. Is that the way the rest of the world works? Often times, not so much. If you are in Japan for instance and you try to rush the relationship, come across as a phony or push the deal to a close, you will bring up resentment and likely destroy the deal because you were not patient enough to work with the client where they are at culturally. So does that mean we do not assert ourselves at all and just go on forever without closing a deal? No, it is just like so many things in life, you must find, achieve and maintain balance.

Well-Spoken

Well-spoken in this context also means that you try at least to understand and speak the language of the country you are working in. Typically, the locals like it when you make that effort and you do not expect everyone to speak English. Also, if you have interpreters, are you comfortable with that? It is odd when you have someone speaking the words you are speaking right after you speak them. Be prepared and try. Most people in most cultures will recognize that you are trying and award you more points in the process and ultimate outcome. Trying is better than not caring about them or their culture.

Good Negotiator

Along the same theme as we have had all along in this paper, how well do you understand the culture you are in and how they negotiate? If you think speaking through an interpreter is tough, try doing that and negotiating at the same time. Is there a possibility that the words and expressions could get jumbled up and lead to issues with the final negotiation? Of course, there must be follow up and further analysis before final deals are made to ensure that it is truly what both parties agreed to.

Presence

How do you present yourself? Is it in alignment with your audience? The old saying is that you should dress one level above the audience you are dealing with. Does that wisdom truly apply in all situations around the globe? Maybe it could get you in trouble in some situations so again, prepare and study your audience and their culture. How about charisma and charm, do you have it and is it appropriate for the situation? I will close this part of the posting with a direct quote from Clawson that sums it up nicely. "As a global business leader, you must respect the identities and affiliations of others. Some people can do that; many or most cannot. Do you have what it takes to become a global business leader?" (Clawson, 2014, para. 15).

LEADING TEAMS

Ganesh (2012) examined the challenges that global leaders have in creating the optimal organization in terms of effectiveness and efficiency along with required skills to be successful as a global leader. Ganesh (2012) further identified key opportunities for improvement and change in the interests of this optimization. Specifically team optimization was mentioned as a necessity to keep global teams moving in the right direction and toward the desired end game.

Team Working: Optimization is likely to break many silos previously existing in the organisation. Employees may be expected to pool their respective efforts to jointly create value for the stakeholders. Assumptions around team working may need to be clarified to create team accountabilities, rather than individual accountabilities. Leadership has a very critical role to play with respect to building the culture of optimization. Firstly, the leaders may have to lead by example by demonstrating what they preach. Secondly, the leaders may have to create practices/frameworks within the organization that may encourage employees to whole heartedly embrace the above mentioned cultural attributes. For example, one of the ways this is done is by setting specific behavioral goals and providing associated rewards for employees who demonstrate such goals (Ganesh, 2012. para. 12).

HANDLING CONFLICT

As the CEO of a multi-national organization, I would first need awareness and reliable data and information as to what this means and how it should be approached. This CEO would need trusted advisors as well as a desire to learn about other cultures and their goals, values, needs and so on. This cannot be done using a software program such as Rosetta Stone. This takes work and dedication and a knowing that doing this is crucial to the success of the organization.

Najafbagy (2008) discussed co-orientation as a possible solution to cross-cultural conflict resolution and stated that

Co-orientation refers to any effort that may be necessary to familiarize and train an individual in the life, work, social and political relations, norms, values, traditions, religion and other aspects of one's own culture and those of other concerned nations. (Najafbagy, 2008, p. 146)

According to Najafbagy (2008), the following principles could clarify the kind of co-orientation needed for conflict resolution.

To increase our awareness and understanding of our own rights;

To increase our awareness and understanding of our own culture;

To become more cognizant of our attitudes and feelings towards people of another country or community and vice versa;

To better understand the social, political and economic environments of other cultures and their impact on personal behavior;

To gain better awareness and appreciation of the similarities and differences between the different cultures; and,

To be flexible and realistic to an extent that could contribute to resolving conflicts (p. 146).

An increase in self-awareness is mentioned more than once and is stated in the first paragraph of this posting as essential for any type of success with conflict in a multinational environment. If we understand our own rights and own culture then we are better prepared to work with any differences that are discovered between two or more parties. So self-awareness and knowing what we stand for and believe in and what we will be willing to sacrifice in negotiations and what we will not is a good place to start for this CEO. One way to really be effective is immersion in another culture speaking their language, eating their food and getting a real feel for the culture and way of life. As the CEO however, is that possible? Likely it is not so plausible unless the company happens to be headquartered in another country. So having trusted advisors that can go to the countries in question and have that immersion might be preferred. How important is this to your organization and your future success? That determination will be a major factor in gaining understanding as to how far you go with this.

The other side of this is the willingness of each party to engage and stay engaged looking for mutual benefit and trying to meet the needs of the other while not giving up all of your positions. None of this works if both parties are not willing participants. An example is the conflict between the people of Gaza and the Israelis at this time. When you watch the spokesperson for both sides you get a sense that they are so deeply embroiled in their situations and their stand on the issues that there might never be a peaceful solution. This author has observed and studied many a spokesperson for the certain countries during these periods of unrest and has gotten the impression that these countries and their leaders feel and project a sense of superiority; that there way is the right way leaving little to no room for negotiations. If one party comes to the table with a pre-conceived outcome and little to no room for give and take, this will ultimately lead to an undesirable outcome.

Leaders have tried for many decades to come up with solutions that both sides could agree on when they do not seem to be able to come up with their own. This brings up the variable of having an outside entity trying to negotiate for the two sides. Do the people offering ideas truly understand the needs of both sides and are they considering all the possibilities for a peaceful outcome. One would think the answer is yes but apparently the answer is no because it has not happened yet. This might indicate that the necessary preparation has not been done in accordance with the content of this paper or other similar approaches.

How does all of this matter to the CEO of a multinational company who wants to do well at working through conflicts with their clients and internal employees, etc.? Many leaders read philosophical works such as “The Art of War” by Sun Tzu and try to gain insight and wisdom from those works that might translate into practical application for their leadership and decision making styles. This is good but does the application translate as readily as might be needed to handle a changing world and the changing needs of a population that is enriched by technology and has been brought closer together into a more global community than ever before? That is a question worth pursuing. Perhaps the title of a book called “Making the Art of War Work in Today’s World” might be an appropriate part of the equation. A practical application manual of sorts where philosophy and technique intertwine into the potential for solving some of the deeply embedded problems of the twenty first century whether it be the CEO of a multinational company or a leader of a country. People are people and the more you know going into these conflicts, the better you are armed to prevail with kindness, understanding and a position where all needs will be met to the furthest extent possible. As was discussed in the beginning of this paper, how important is all of this to the multinational companies and the world as a whole and how much time and energy should be invested in making something like this happen? This author would say it is critical for the long-term health of the companies and the world and we had better begin immediately.

DEALING WITH DIVERSITY

Diversity has been defined in many ways over the years and it has added many categories as far as the human resources community is concerned. Moving beyond simple demographics, we have sexual orientation, religious affiliations and other similar situations related to race and ethnic orientation and background that have not been traditionally considered in the equation. Many companies may be engaged with the whole diversity issue to a point where it is too much and perhaps even distracts from the business at hand. However, others do not even have a definition they follow according to Whitelaw. “Only 30

percent of human resources professionals say that their company even has an official definition of diversity, according to a 2007 survey by the Society for Human Resource Management” (Whitelaw, 2010, para.1). So what is appropriate? How far do we go with the whole diversity issue? It is experience of this author that many companies that truly care will have programs for all kinds of diverse people and groups and will allow them to have a voice. For instance, where this author works now there are benefits for people that are couples in same sex relationships. This is a nice gesture and perhaps if you have a large population of gays and lesbians in your community and labor pool, it is a great idea from a business standpoint.

What Does Diversity Look Like?

If we take a closer look at some of the other extremes, we find that "Everybody has multiple identities. You're a woman, a parent, a gay, a disabled person, and of Hispanic origin, so which group do you go to?" (Van Horn as cited in Whitelaw, 2010, para.8) This is an example of my previous point where this can be taken so far that it distracts from the business at hand. It is good to be an employer of choice and to consider the needs of all the stakeholders involved for sure. However, there must at some point be a business case to support the expenditures and to justify all of it. Once you have this defined appropriately then the leadership needs to have diversity programs that teach tolerance and create a common mission or purpose that goes beyond the obvious outside appearances.

A Diversity Example

An example of building a case or defining business need could involve someone with disabilities. Reasonable accommodation is something that must be taken into consideration when hiring people that might have a disability. If you have two people who are closely qualified, that can do the job and the one in a wheelchair is seemingly the best hire, who do you hire? Let us say for example you are located in an old building downtown that is not designed to accommodate such a person with a disability. You must ask some questions such as “if I hire this person can they reasonably get to the worksite to do the work?” If the answer is no then you might ask “what if I bring the work to them”. If you have a situation, where the work is on the tenth floor and cannot be moved to accommodate them then what do you do? Are you required to build an elevator or have some other means of accommodating this person if you hire them? The answer is no if the cost would hurt the business financially. There are so many variables in understanding the legal and moral aspects of all of this, which is why there are many classes being taught, and books being written and sold to try and cover all of those possible variables. We are just scratching the surface here, more to come.

CHANGE FOR GLOBAL LEADERS

There are many ways to approach change management whether it be in a local or a multinational situation. This author would argue that aside from the cultural considerations which are addressed later in this presentation that people are people and all have emotions, feelings and an ability to use their cognitive function to analyze and make decisions. The biggest difference between successful implementation and failure to implement change relates to the acculturation or institutionalization of the new way of doing things and the creation of a new culture that is by design. This culture can include people from diverse backgrounds with diverse interests and experiences.

There are some characteristics related to the organization itself that need to be considered here. First, there is congruence in the organization to what is being proposed as an intervention. Is there harmony with the current systems and methods being used, there is a much greater likelihood of long-term success. The stability of an organization’s environment can make a large difference in the success factors as well. If, for instance, we have a market that is fluctuating and this is having an effect on our ability to keep our people in position, this will certainly influence our ability to develop and implement new programs. If people are coming and going and there is a lack of consistency in application, the likelihood of failure is again higher than otherwise. Unionization (could also include the European Union) is also a key consideration to success in one organization or another. If there is union representation that is objecting to the new changes for fear of losing jobs, benefits, etc. then this can surely hamper progress

and it takes a lot more skill on the part of the OD practitioner to counter this energy and figure out how to work together with these folks.

Once you have gone through and checked how you stack up against the aforementioned characteristics there are some processes to go through that involved socialization, commitment, reward allocation, as well as sensing and calibration. Concerning the socialization factor, questions need to be asked about what kind of supporting mechanisms there are to further engrain the changes that have been made? Is it going to be in the processes, how about the new hire orientation? How do the people in place pass this along to the newer folks to continue the saga into the future? The goal here for the OD practitioners is to have people saying, "That is how we do it around here" as a normal part of their everyday practices. To gain the commitment from all the people necessary to keep things moving towards institutionalization everyone should be included at all levels and people over time need to determine how this new method or practice works for them. They need to be able to make it their own so to speak within certain parameters. The OD practitioners should be there to help with that effort. For instance, if part of our new ways include a checklist and the person using the checklist can alter a few items to make it work better for them and the integrity of the checklist is not compromised, and then let them make it personal. Perhaps they will even find a slightly better way that should be used in all the checklists. If this is the case, the right thing to do is to give them public praise for their ingenuity and ask others to be looking for similar improvement. That is a sure fire way to gain commitment. This leads me into rewards allocation.

Appeal must be made to both the intrinsic and extrinsic side of the equation as much as possible. The type of situation that I just described above might be linked to the intrinsic side of the motivation equation. Something to do with pay and bonuses might link to the extrinsic side. If people feel that they are being treated fairly and equitably in terms of these rewards then they are likely to continue to support the effort. Lastly, what is referred to as sensing and calibration is simply another way of saying what has been said throughout this lesson. Having systems in place for constantly checking the environment and sensing when there is a deviation from the intended behaviors that support the new way of doing things. Once that sensing has detected such a deviation, there is a process in place to work on realignment. These are some of the most critical processes to consider when institutionalizing your change intervention (Cummings & Worley, 2009).

Global Leadership Strategies for Leading Change

Let us say that you have just finished your Masters of Business Administration (MBA) program and you are hired by a consulting company to go into larger organizations and assess their current situation and then determine and recommend at what level a strategic change intervention should occur. You are trying to understand the history and culture of the organization as well as the market and business they are in. How about their numbers? Where are they at compared to where they were a year ago, two years ago? How much assessment have they done (if any) on looking toward the future? Do they need large-scale change or perhaps just incremental changes? How about the synergies of mergers and acquisitions, would this make sense? Once you have done your due diligence and interviewed a number of key people at all levels, attended some meetings, studied the history and tried to determine the type of culture they have, then you begin to peel away the layers of the onion as we have described above.

When you are done with your initial research on the first organization in question you discover that they have done a thorough SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis and have come to understand that in the very near future, the market is going to demand that we change our services a bit. In addition, it is discovered that we do not have some of the skill sets that will be needed to compete in the new market. These are highly specialized skills sets in engineering and we analyze how we might best acquire these skill sets. Should we "make or buy" as is often discussed in the world of project management. If we "buy" then this means we go out and hire all the people that have these skill sets already. Part of this decision is based on how much time we have until we have to compete in this new market. For this particular example, we will say that we do not have much time and that we have to have this talent soon. We find a company that has this talent and is in a similar line of work and is struggling financially. First, we approach the owners of the company as discuss the possibility. If there is a possibility that this acquisition makes sense for both parties, we do our due diligence on the operations and culture, etc. to determine whether there is or to what degree there is a fit between them and ourselves.

Since we are primarily targeting the engineers we go and meet with them all individually and then in groups. We discuss this potential deal and what it means to them professionally and personally. If we sell them on the potential of this deal, it might be worth pursuing. If not, then it might cost us more than we would gain. If we do not understand the motivation level, the skills they bring, and what needs to be done to acculturate them into our culture, then we could very likely lose them in a short period and this would be counterproductive.

Once we determine whether all this makes sense, then we make an offer and negotiate with the current owners. If we arrive at a deal, then we must decide how the transition will take place. What tangible items do we need to keep and what does not make sense any longer. The same thing goes with the intangible assets (the human capital or people), which of them do we need to keep and which need to be moved out on onward? For the sake of this part of the discussion, let us say that all of this is figured out and we have the people and equipment we now need to meet the market demands in the coming months. Now we must go back to many of the areas that were discussed above (human processes) related to acculturating new people into the culture and or onto new teams. Assessment needs to be done to determine fit factor and to integrate them nicely into the system that we have designed for success. This intervention might be called a trans-organizational change. One thing to keep in mind as you make these decisions to “make or buy” is the fact that many acquisitions fails for many reasons. Elements of the process outlined above are not done at all or not done well. This is one of the highest risk means of redesigning an organization for the future. Support this with literature

If there is no sense of urgency driven by the market changing, the customer demands changing or any other driving force you should always be training your work force and creating a mindset around continuous change. The leaders should always be seeking out new ideas from their people in one on one meetings/discussions, in group or team meetings, in performance reviews or any other opportunities that make sense. There should be time allotted for discussions and SWOT analyses to be done on a quarterly basis perhaps. The leadership should encourage and accept their people’s ideas and ideally, allow them to create action plans and champion the same. The people should be trained to constantly scan the horizon for news that could impact the organization’s destiny. This is a mindset and the more it is encouraged and accepted as normal, the more likely it will flourish. Change should not be a big ordeal for a stable company, it should be part of the norms of the culture and the leaders make this a reality by encouraging behaviors that promote change, leading by example and holding people accountable for the opposite. It behooves all of us to embrace change in its many forms and fashions and if we do, we will be much less at risk for being in the position to have to resort to radical types of change as you read about above (Cummings & Worley, 2009).

Universal Aspects of Managing Change

The field of Organizational Development (OD) has evolved so much over the last 10 to 20 years it is truly fascinating. It is up to people like us to continue to spread the word, passion and excitement about what this field is about and how it can help organizations’ to prosper and grow in the next century and beyond. Human Resources (HR) has a few different directions that a practitioner can move into depending on the nature of the person in question. At least half of the tasks needed to be executed in the area of HR are technician or tactical types of tasks. These might be all areas related to enforcing policies and procedures, discipline and termination, payroll, benefits, and so on. These are all very important functions and necessary to the survival of the firm. The other side of the HR function is one of growth and development of the people and the organization as an organic changing entity. It is an exciting and rewarding path not only for the practitioner but for all who are involved, providing it is done right. Our discussion here is about the elements of change management which is one of the key functions in the growth and development area of the HR function.

An intervention is something that is done to an existing way of doing things that is designed to change the existing way and ideally, to make it better in some significant way. As was mentioned earlier, if the person in charge of the intervention does not understand what he or she is doing and is just trying something without any assessment or study of the problem that is presented, they are likely to fail. If failure happens often enough, the people get immune to any further attempts at intervention and each subsequent attempt is harder and harder to sell to the people and try to execute. An analogy of peeling

away the layers of an onion has been used to describe change management. You do your homework/research, study the possible interventions and you make your best educated guess at which one might have the most impact immediately. After that you use the steps necessary to apply the method, program, etc. to the organization. Next you reassess to see how much impact it has had on the problem. That is the first layer of the onion that is peeled away. Then you go through the process again and again until you get to the core of the onion. It is a process of unfolding, uncovering, investigating, trying new and different ways of conducting business and it is truly an art form that is developed over time through practice (Cummings & Worley, 2009).

Culture and Change Management

In this example, we have come to the place in the OD process where we need to transform much of the culture of the organization. The way we have done things over the last 30 years has served us well; however, now that we have a new vision and are planning our approach to attaining that vision we have realized that our old paradigm (mental model) will not get us there. We have become complacent and somewhat lazy just assuming that our way is the best and tend to just wait for the phone to ring and take orders from customers. We have also gotten to the place where we feel customers are an inconvenience that must be dealt with and it is showing in lost customers and complaints from our latest customer survey. This is obviously not going to take us into our new world and the way we currently think and conduct business in many areas of the organization internally have a very similar look and feel to them as described above. The old paradigm and culture that supports that old way of thinking must change. How do we do this you ask? That comes next.

Now we need a new vision of how people will look, act and feel when conducting our business in the new paradigm. We want to create a somewhat different culture that is more collaborative and serves the customer as if it were his/her last. Customers are both internal and external and everyone has a supplier and a customer. As should be known by now, the top leadership must lead the way and demonstrate these new behaviors. In this case my executive staff is the supplier of what I need to face the customer. I meet with my executive staff and let them know exactly what I need as their customer, how I need it, and when I need it. I also reassure them that if anything gets in their way of serving their customer (me), then I will do everything in my power to remove that or any other obstacle that arises. Let us say that the supplier is working diligently to meet my expectations and my deadline and there is a budget issue. They ran over budget for some legitimate reason. My job is to make sure they have what they need to successfully serve me and thusly serve the end (paying) customer. In the end, this particular customer was served as they had expected and they have chosen to stay with the organization because of the changes they have seen as demonstrated from the top. In the past, the deadline would have been missed and excuses would have been made and the customer would be the last to know. The customer would have ever hardly heard from or seen the top executives in the middle of the deal. This was done by the top leaders to demonstrate the behaviors that are expected all the way down the line and how our new paradigm might look, feel and act. The whole ordeal is later described in a newsletter and meetings are held with top management to share the story and to answer any questions or concerns. The top leaders lay out the same expectation with the rest of the staff as they did with the executive staff and let everyone know that this is now expected of all people whether they be at the top or the bottom of the organization. First, identify your customers and suppliers in any given situation and then work with them accordingly to deliver what they need on time and with good quality. Anything less is not going to be acceptable and the consequences of such unacceptable behavior are also spelled out for all to hear (along with policy changes as appropriate).

The next thing to do is to find some champions on the staff that are key supporters of the culture change and let them take the next customer deals and work them the same way further illustrating the look, feel and actions of this new paradigm. People are assigned to work with the champions to gain the necessary insights to move forward and model the same behaviors themselves. This is a critical step and should not be overlooked. At this point the resistance will begin to surface and the people who are heavily invested in the old way of doing things are going to either aggressively or using passive aggressive tactics try to derail and progress being made. Yes, something as obvious as this that should save the organization as a whole will be resisted. Why, because these people have a very strong fear of losing what they have built over the years and they are not too positive they are ready, willing and able to give all that up and

start over. If they cannot succeed in the new paradigm they could lose their job or get a big demotion and this could lead to this person losing their house, family, and all the benefits they have become accustomed to. That would be enough to drive most people to resist. That is where communications need to be strong and follow up needs to be consistent. If these resistors cannot or will not shape their ways to accommodate the new way of doing business and to show visible support, they should be terminated. By giving people a chance to acclimate and become part of the new way and supporting them, you have made it known that this is the only acceptable way of doing business now. By terminating people who simply won't adjust after given a chance you also send out a very strong message that this is what is required and nothing less is good enough (Cummings & Worley, 2009).

CONCLUSION

In the review of the literature, there were a number of articles and related sources that addressed concerns and issues related to global change management, diversity, building teams along with 11 characteristics global leaders should strive to attain and maintain. One constant theme seemed apparent throughout which was that there are more similarities than differences in how a global leader should address these critical issues around the globe. It is at the core of all of this that the ones being impacted here are human beings and at the core, we are all the same color. We all have similar patterns as we progress through the stages of life. This goes back to the author's original assertion that change management and many other skills global leaders use have a lot of similarities wherever you apply them considering any differences in culture that could be a factor. This will be the subject of the next paper. When we work to create one organizational culture, it should allow for any differences in background and regional cultural differences to blend together to form a circle around our cultural values as a nation, company or any other similar type of organization. The last paragraph in this presentation furthers the claim that institutionalization of the change is one of the most important keys to success in any situation.

Martin & Beaumont (2001) claimed that the extent to which strategic change is embedded in the organization can be measured by the degree of penetration and durability of changes in the attitudinal and behavioral dimensions of the outcomes of employee psychological contracts. Bate (1994; 1996 as cited in Martin & Beaumont, 2001, para. 15) has put forward a number of criteria that can be used to measure the extent of change, two of which are especially relevant in assessing the degree of institutionalization or embeddedness of change in organizations. These are the degree of penetration into the organization and the durability or permanence of the new forms of strategic discourse, relationships and/or structures. From the perspective of employees, the extent to which such changes are apparent can be measured by the outcomes of changed psychological contracts is the capacity and willingness of individuals to engage in future HR change initiatives (Pettigrew & Whipp, 1991; Pale et al, 2000, as cited in Martin & Beaumont, 2001, para. 15). In this sense the degree of embeddedness of strategic change creates a feedback loop into current and future organizational and relational contexts (2001, para. 15).

Future research should focus on other aspects of critical skill sets needed as they relate to addressing culture and the impact it has on all of global leadership. Though the author seemed to conclude here that there were a lot of similarities with many aspects of managing and leading in a global environment, the cultural aspect is posed as the big variable in all of this and prime for further inquiry.

REFERENCES

- Appelbaum, Steven H; Close, Tamara G; Klasa, Sandy. *Management Decision* 37.5 (1999): 424-436.
- Clawson, J.G., (2014), 11 Key Characteristics of a Global Business Leader, Darden Ideas to Action, retrieved at: <http://ideas.darden.virginia.edu/2014/01/11-key-characteristics-of-a-global-business-leader/>
- Cummings, T.G. and Worley, C. G., (2009), *Organizational Change Organization Development and Change*, 9th Edition, South-Western Cengage Learning, Mason, OH.
- Ganesh, S. (2012), *Creating an Optimized Organization: Key Opportunities and Challenges*, Retrieved from www.kpmg.com/optimized-organization-Key-Opportunities-Challenges.com, (July 31, 2014)

- Martin, Graeme; Beaumont, Phil. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. Dec2001, Vol. 12 Issue 8, p1234-1250. 17p. 1 Diagram, 2 Charts. DOI: 10.1080/09585190110083776. , Database: Business Source Premier
- Najafbagy, Reza, *Palestine-Israel Journal of Politics, Problems of Effective Cross-Cultural Communication and Conflict Resolution*. 2008, Vol. 15/16 Issue 4/1, p146-150. 5p.
- Whitelaw, K, (2010) *Defining Diversity: Beyond Race and Gender*, NPR, retrieved at <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=122327104>