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Abstract

This study examined the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies military leaders need in order to be successful in their roles as Security Assistance Officers (SAO). The adequacy or inadequacy of the SAOs’ cross-cultural leadership competencies were investigated to determine how the presence or absence of these competencies affect host nation personnel at the United States Embassy in Cairo, Egypt.

This study utilized a mixed-method approach in order to gain a better understanding of the cross-cultural leadership competencies of military leaders. For the quantitative portion of this study, the Global Competencies Inventory (GCI) was administered in order to access SAOs’ perceptions of their own cross-cultural leadership competencies. An in-depth, open-ended, conversational-style, guided interview was administered to the Foreign Service Nationals (FSN) to gain deeper understanding of the most effective and least cross-cultural leadership competencies exhibited by SAOs.

The quantitative data were collected via the GCI on-line survey. Thirty-two SAOs responded for a 70% response rate. Interviews were conducted with six FSNs who responded to the quantitative portion of the study. Parametric statistical tests were used to analyze the quantitative data, and themes and patterns were identified in the qualitative data.

This study determined the SAOs possess an adequate level of overall cross-cultural leadership competency with a few caveats. Areas of weakness included tolerance of ambiguity, social flexibility, self-awareness, and emotional
sensitivity competencies. The SAOs scored exceptionally high in the self-management overarching dimension, and the self-identity and self-confidence competencies. In addition, this study revealed that favoritism, family, humor, and fairness were newly discovered themes associated with the SAOs' cross-cultural leadership that positively and negatively affected the FSNs. Researchers are encouraged to replicate this study using a larger representative sample across the various U.S. embassies in the Middle East.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, “Our loyalties must transcend our race, our tribe, our class, and our nation; and this means we must develop a world perspective…” (1986, p. 253)

The United States Department of Defense (DoD) is a global, cross-cultural organization responsible for providing national security and defense through the application of air, land, sea, and space power. Consequently, the military sector of the DoD is often called upon to deploy or relocate to various foreign countries to support United States (U.S.) national security. The U.S. military’s full spectrum of operations across the globe calls for its military leaders to have the knowledge and skills needed to operate effectively in foreign environments. These military operations in cross-cultural environments include, but are not limited to, combat operations, nation building, counter-terrorism operation, and of particular interest to this research, security cooperation. (Federation of American Scientists [FAS], n.d.).

Security Cooperation (SC) is one method used by the DoD to enhance U.S. security, promote democracy, and establish and improve an ally or friendly country’s specific capabilities (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2006; FAS, n.d.). The DoD defines SC as activities which “build defense relationships that promote specific US security interests, develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations, and provide US forces with peacetime and contingency access to a host nation” (U.S. Department of Defense, 2004, p. GL-9). Security Assistance (SA) is a sub-component of SC,
which is comprised of a group of programs that facilitates the transfer of defense articles and services in support of SC through foreign military sales; foreign military financing grants and loans; and international military education and training (FAS, n.d.). Security Assistance Officers (SAOs) are U.S. military members authorized and trained to manage SA programs administered by the DoD. These programs help the United States establish influence and develop relations with friendly and allied countries across the globe (FAS, n.d.).

SAOs are diplomatic specialists deployed by the United States to help foster Security Assistance (SA) relationships (Holzhauer, 2002). These specialists are military commissioned and non-commissioned officers with diverse backgrounds and leadership capabilities that support effective SA assignments (Holzhauer, 2002; U.S. Air Force, 2006). SAOs are also responsible for providing management oversight of SA activities to ensure compliance with legal and policy provisions (U.S. Air Force, 2006; U.S. Department of Defense, 2005). SAOs accomplish these responsibilities by interfacing with host nation counterparts through meetings, negotiations, and correspondence (U.S. Air Force, 2006; U.S. Department of Defense, 2005). In addition, SAOs must also be “adept leaders who can work with community, international, and private organizations whose members come from widely divergent cultural backgrounds” (McFarland, 2005, p. 64) as well as Foreign Service Nationals (FSN) employed at the U.S. Embassy.

FSNs are local host nation, non-U.S. citizens hired by the U.S. Embassy to perform non-sensitive support functions (U.S. Department of State, 2009).
FSNs are a valuable resource for U.S. embassies because of their subject-matter expertise, host country government contacts, and the continuity they provide the U.S. mission (Burton & Stewart, 2008). Given that SAOs are relied upon to routinely lead and manage FSNs at the U.S. Embassy, interface with host nation counterparts, and promote SA relationships, it would be prudent for the United States to ensure that these individuals possess a sufficient amount of cross-cultural competency and leadership skills.

Since leaders are responsible for the overall direction and strategic vision of their organizations, it is essential they understand the shared values, assumptions, and beliefs of the followers and counterparts they influence, especially in cross-cultural organizations (Schein, 2004). Chin, Gu, and Tubbs (2001) emphasized this need by stating, “Contingency theories of leadership have taught us that leaders are only effective in relation to a particular context” (p. 20). Hence, leaders must change their behavior in relationship to the context (Chin et al., 2001).

In order to understand how to effectively change behavior, leaders must examine how their own behavior and culture differs from the behavior and culture of their followers and counterparts (Harris, Moran, & Moran, 2004). In addition, a leader’s upbringing and experience are instrumental in formulating cultural values, which “will influence their attitudes and behavior in ways that may not be conscious” (Yukl, 2006, p. 431). Moreover, “organizational leaders use their power and influence to shape corporate culture” (Ferrell, Fraedrich & Ferrell, 2009, p 185). Thus, if leaders are not aware of their own ingrained behaviors,
norms, and values and how they can interact and conflict with the behaviors, norms, and values of other cultures, it can be inferred that there is a potential for their actions and decisions to have a negative multiplying effect on the cross-cultural organizations they lead (Mancheno-Smoak, Endres, Potak & Athanasaw, 2009).

It is important to research cross-cultural leadership characteristics for several reasons (Dorfman 1996; House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997). Yukl (2006) summarized the benefits. First, the increased globalization of cross-cultural organizations, like the DoD, “makes it more important to learn about effective leadership in different cultures” (Yukl, 2006, p. 430). Leaders in these types of organizations are routinely confronted with the need to build relationships and influence people from different cultures and in certain regions of the world. The U.S. military supports this notion by explaining that military leaders serving in diplomatic and liaison roles must facilitate communications and understanding with foreign militaries and organizations (U.S. Air Force, 2006). Yukl (2006) supported the previous statement by explaining that leaders “must be able to understand how people from different cultures view them and interpret their actions” and vice versa (p. 430). Failure to understand the perspective of foreign counterparts, especially in the arena of SC, can “often contribute to misunderstood intentions…altered perceptions, and in many instances significantly impact mutual expectations and outcomes” (Kron, 2007, p. 75). Lastly, and most importantly, “cultural values and traditions can influence the attitudes and behavior of managers in a number of different ways” (Yukl, 2006, p.
Therefore, it can be inferred that these same cultural values and traditions can also influence the attitudes and behaviors of leaders.

Learning to interact with people of different cultural norms and beliefs can present major challenges for military leaders. For example, the ideas, behaviors, values, and norms of Americans and their host nation counterparts can cause “cultural friction,” potentially isolating military from the local community (McFarland, 2005). Accordingly, military leaders must understand that “imposing American values on unwilling people in a foreign country may have undesired strategic and operational consequences” (Skelton & Cooper, 2004, p. 14). British Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Edward Lawrence, better known as “Lawrence of Arabia” stressed the importance of cultural awareness while serving in a leadership and military advisory role to foreign counterparts (Kaplan, 1995; Lawrence, 1997). Lawrence explained that military operations and national security decisions could suffer when military leaders lack sufficient knowledge of foreign cultures (McFate, 2005).

When military leaders lack the multicultural training, competencies, skills, knowledge, and abilities needed to help influence and build relationships, they become less effective as diplomats for the United States and the SA mission. Thus, without an adequate level of cross-cultural leadership competency training, military leaders risk “…alienating the people the U. S. is trying to influence and lead,” ultimately eroding the nation’s strategic legitimacy and credibility in the Middle Eastern region (Sargent, 2005, p. 12).
Several military cultural competency courses and documents (Appendix A) are available to help military members with “working across cultural differences” (Holmes, 2009, p. 18). Although DoD organizations have recognized the need to increase the amount of cultural education programs for military members, a need still exists to measure the effectiveness of these military cross-cultural competency programs (Holmes, 2009).

The U.S. Army commissioned the U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) to conduct the Cultural Understanding and Language Proficiency (CULP) study to address cross-cultural competencies associated with military training programs. The overall goal of the CULP study was “to provide a scientific research perspective on increasing linguistic and cultural capability in the Army” (Abbe, Gulick, & Herman, 2007, p. v). In fact, one major point the CULP study highlights is that more research is needed to establish the validity of cross-cultural competencies, measures, and predictors for the military population (Abbe et al., 2007). Additionally, the CULP study identifies that “research is needed to address the extent to which [cross-cultural competency] dimensions and their components are responsive to education and training” (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 36). For instance, Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, the professional military education organization for U.S. Airmen, identified the need for more “testing, surveys and other tools to measure” their cross-cultural program’s effectiveness (Holmes, 2009, p. 18).
Statement of the Problem

The rapid onset of globalization has forced many organizations to rethink their “cognitive map” for interfacing with followers and associates from different cultures (McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002). As a result, it would appear it is more important than ever for cross-cultural organizations like the DoD to prepare its members to operate and lead in environments distinctively different from their own. In order to effectively influence their host nation counterparts and lead “members who come from widely divergent cultural backgrounds” (McFarland, 2005, p. 64), military members serving as SAOs must have a sound understanding of the host nation culture. Although, the DoD has developed various programs and documents (Appendix A) to help improve the cross-cultural competency of its military leaders operating and leading in cross-cultural organizations and multi-cultural environments, it is not clear that these programs are educating and providing military leaders with the essential cross-cultural competencies needed to interact with, influence, and lead individuals whose cultural context differ from their own.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation was to provide more insight on the relative importance of the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies identified in the literature review. This dissertation accomplished that purpose by investigating the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, and desired behaviors of military leaders. These competencies and behaviors are required to successfully lead and influence followers and host nation counterparts in cross-
cultural organizations. As stated previously, several military cross-cultural competency courses and documents (Appendix A) are available to help military members with “working across cultural differences” (Holmes, 2009, p. 18). Although the various DoD military services have recognized the need to increase the amount of cross-cultural education programs for military members, a need exists for research to measure the effectiveness of these via the analysis of cross-cultural leadership competencies of military leaders (Holmes, 2009). Most importantly, the validity of these cross-cultural leadership competencies has yet to be established for the military population (Abbe et al., 2007). Key cross-cultural leadership competencies identified by this study should help DoD “insure that limited time and resources for cultural training are being used in the most effective manner” (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 35).

This study utilized a mixed-method research approach, which employed a combination of a quantitative questionnaire and qualitative interviews to access and analyze the relative importance and effectiveness of the cross-cultural leadership competencies of the SAOs. The specific research population was the military branch of DoD at the Office of Military Cooperation in Cairo, Egypt.

**Significance of the Study**

Military leaders need the skills and wisdom to lead cross-cultural followers effectively in multicultural environments. In order to prepare military members to serve as SAOs, it has been suggested that extensive development in cross-cultural leadership is needed to improve the chances of success. This study was intended to provide more insight on the relative importance of the essential
cross-cultural leadership competencies identified in the literature review. As a result of this study, the field of organizational leadership will have a better understanding of the competencies and behavioral characteristics that successful military leaders operating in cross-cultural organizations and diverse environments should possess. Most importantly, data collected from this study is intended to help the DoD and the U.S. Armed Forces bolster the competencies in their cultural literacy and competence programs. This increase in competency, in turn, should aid its members in becoming more successful as leaders and diplomats in the Middle Eastern Region.

The relevant theories related to this study included cross-cultural competency, cross-cultural leadership, and leadership. This study was designed to provide insight related to cross-cultural leadership characteristics and desired behaviors inside a cross-cultural environment. The findings are then represented in a correlative format. The context of this study was the U.S. Armed Forces branch of the Department of Defense in the Office of Military Cooperation at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt.

**Research Questions**

This study attempted to answer the following research questions, evolved from the problem statement:

1. What level of cross-cultural competency do military members serving in a specific geographic region possess?
2. Which specific cross-cultural leadership competencies are exceptional and inadequate, and how does the presence or absence of these competencies affect how the host nation personnel perceive the military members?

Therefore, the investigated hypothesis is:

- Ho: The military population does possess an adequate or better level of cross-cultural competency defined as GCI score ≥ 4.0.

- Ha: The military population does not possess an adequate level of cross-cultural competency, defined as GCI score < 4.0.

**Conceptual/Theoretical Framework**

This study employed the Tashakkori and Teddlie’s (2003) sequential mixed-method research design to answer the research question. Mixed-method research can be defined as “a type of research design in which [QUAL] qualitative and [QUAN] quantitative approaches are used in types of questions, research methods, data collection and analysis procedures, and/or inferences” (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, p. 711). In regards to this study, the analysis of cross-cultural competency characteristics of military leaders working in cross-cultural organizations, both QUAL and QUAN research portions, was conducted sequentially (Trochim, 2005). This type of design is characterized by the development of open-ended interview questions within the QUAL portion.

The first portion of this research design used a QUAN survey instrument to measure the cross-cultural competency of the research subjects. Thus, the Global Competencies Inventory (GCI), a validated instrument, was employed to
help collect data reflected in the 17 facets of cross-cultural competencies identified in the cross-cultural research literature and the expatriate research literature (Mendenhall, Stevens, Bird, & Oddou, 2008a). The GCI was administered to 32 SAOs who attended a military cross-cultural training program before operating as a leader at the U.S. Embassy in Egypt for at least a one-year period.

The second portion of this research design was developed from the findings in the first portion of the research design. The intent of the QUAL portion is to enrich the findings from the QUAN portion. As a result, the QUAN research findings informed the development of an open-ended, pilot study questionnaire and in-depth, guided interview questions to help draw inferences on how the FSNs perceive the cross-cultural leadership competencies of the SAOs. In addition, and most importantly, the QUAL portion provided insight into cross-cultural leadership competencies identified as most and least effective by the survey instrument. The open-ended, pilot study questionnaire was administered to eight FSNs who have directly witnessed cross-cultural leadership characteristics and behaviors of the SAOs. This was followed by an in-depth, guided QUAL interview of six individuals from the FSN population.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made for this study:

1. The issues of cross-cultural competency can be measured.
2. SAOs who exhibit the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies are most likely effective leaders and diplomats within the context under study.

3. The FSNs could effectively assess the cross-cultural leadership characteristics and behaviors of the respective SAOs.

Limitations of the Study

The researcher’s current military commitment and assignment only allowed the study to be conducted in the Middle Eastern country of Egypt.

Definition of Terms

Throughout the chapters of this dissertation, the following definitions are provided to facilitate common understanding.

*Cross-cultural leadership:* Cross-cultural leadership is defined as the leader’s ability to achieve the organization’s mission while maintaining the capability of:

…operating effectively in a global environment while being respectful of cultural diversity. This is an individual who can manage accelerating change and differences. The global [cross-cultural] leader is open and flexible in approaching others, can cope with situations and people disparate from his or her background, and is willing to reexamine and alter personal attitudes and perceptions. (Harris et al., 2004, p. 25)
Cultural awareness: The act of understanding the need to consider cultural terrain and using the information extrapolated from the environment in decision-making (Wunderle, 2008).

Cultural Competency: The term cultural competency refers to the ability to use one’s knowledge, experience, and skill to facilitate “communication and skill acquisition across cultures” (Barrera & Corso, 2002, p. 104).

Cultural Intelligence: Cultural intelligence (CQ) is defined as a person’s capability to function effectively in situations characterized by cultural diversity (Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2005; Earley & Ang, 2003; Earley & Mosakowski, 2005).

Culture: Culture is the customary values, beliefs, norms, perceptions, and behaviors learned and practiced by members of a collective society. Dahl (2004) defines culture as:

A shared set of basic assumptions and values, with resultant behavioural norms, attitudes and beliefs which manifest themselves in systems and institutions as well as behavioural patterns and non-behavioural items. There are various levels to culture, ranging from the easily observable outer layers (such as behavioural conventions) to the increasingly more difficult to grasp inner layers (such as assumptions and values). Culture is shared among members of one group or society, and has an interpretative function for the members of that group. Culture is situated between the human nature on the one hand and the individual personality on the other. Culture is not inheritable or genetic, but culture is learned.
Although all members of a group or society share their culture, expressions of culture resultant behaviour are modified by the individual's personality. (pp. 5-6)

*Globalization:* Globalization is “the creation or expansion of an identifiable network around the globe” which enables people to connect and operate across transnational distances and cultural domains” (Allison, 2000, p. 72-73).

*Global mindset:* Global mindset is the skill of combining openness, flexibility and awareness of diversity across cultural domains with the “propensity and ability to synthesize across this diversity” (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2002, p. 117).

*Leadership:* Leadership is the art of skillfully influencing and motivating others to willfully accomplish the mission or achieve a set of goals (U.S. Air Force, 2001).

**Scope of the Study**

This study gathered and analyzed data from 32 SAOs (research subjects) at the Office of Military Cooperation, Cairo, Egypt. The study surveyed eight FSNs who have witnessed the cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, and behaviors of the SAOs and followed up these surveys with open-ended interviews of six FSNs.

**Dissertation Structure**

This dissertation is presented in five chapters. Chapter 1 introduces the context for the study, examines the research questions, identifies theoretical and conceptual frameworks, and offers descriptions of terms used within the study.
The review of literature in Chapter 2 provides an analysis of the concept of culture by exploring the theories and research in regards to cross-cultural organizations, cross-cultural leadership, and cultural competency. Chapter 3 explains the study’s methods of research and shows how validity instrumentation and data collection were reached. Chapter 4 presents the research findings and a review of results. Finally, Chapter 5 outlines a summary of the study, discusses implications of the findings, and issues a call for potential future research.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Chapter 1 provides an overview of the research subject area and reveals the nature of the study and its primary questions. In preparation for conducting this study and as a means of gaining more insight into the area of cross-cultural leadership, Chapter 2 provides a review of the relevant bodies of literature by examining the concept of culture and its various theoretical levels, definitions, and scholarly findings. In addition, this chapter explores the areas of cross-cultural organizational research, cultural competency, cross-cultural leadership, and gaps in the current body of literature.

Concept of Culture

As indicated in the previous section, there are numerous terms and definitions for the concept of culture for military members to decipher. The concept of cross-cultural leadership is no exception. This section of the literature review explores culture via its associated definitions and most significant research findings. Culture can shape “the core values and norms of its members” (Erez & Gati, 2004, p. 584). The culture of one group, tribe, organization, and society can change whenever they come “into contact with another culture, through international trade, migration, and invasion” (Erez & Gati, 2004, p. 584). Additionally, cultural awareness involves understanding enough about the characteristics of a particular group, tribe, organization, and society in order to operate effectively in that environment (Skelton & Cooper, 2004). This section of the chapter investigates the complex nature of culture and cultural awareness by
exploring its associated definitions, various cultural theories, and the most prominent scholarly research findings.

**Definitions and Theories of Culture**

There are numerous definitions for the concept of culture, ranging from those in the fine arts arena to the social science field. The ability to view culture from so many conceptual contexts and the apparent lack of a single definition may be problematic for scholars conducting cross-cultural research. Rost (1992) highlighted this issue by explaining that the lack of a single definition for various behavioral and social science concepts in general are problematic because scholars normally fail to carefully consider the form and essential elements that should frame these various definitions. The concept of culture is no exception to Rost’s findings. Before one can begin to properly frame and develop the essential elements for the diverse classification of culture, one should first begin reviewing the ultimate text for definitions, the dictionary.

**Random House Dictionary’s culture definition.** The Random House Dictionary provides one of the broadest definitions of culture:

The quality in a person or society that arises from a concern for what is regarded as excellent in arts, letters, manners, scholarly pursuits. That which is excellent in the arts, manners, etc. A particular form or stage of civilization, as that of a certain nation or period. Development or improvement of the mind by education or training. The behaviors and belief characteristic of a particular social, ethnic, or age group. The sum total ways of living built up by
a group of human beings and transmitted from one generation to another. (Flexner & Hauck, 1993, p. 488)

According to Peterson (2004), “…dictionary definitions of culture can incorporate multiple elements such as history, common traits, geographical location, language, religion, race, hunting practices, music, agriculture, art…” (p. 17). Although the Random House Dictionary focuses on defining culture “as a total way of life,” its definition neglects to clarify the cognitive, behavioral, and relational aspects of this concept (Chandler, 2005, p. 7).

**Tylor’s culture definition.** Edward Tylor is credited with developing the very first comprehensive definition of the term culture. Tylor (1871) defined culture as “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (p.1). Tylor’s definition and theory provides a universalistic perspective of culture and suggests that people have more in common than they do not (Mendyka & Bloom, 1997). His definition of culture, however, is largely based upon observable behaviors rather than the underlying cognitive motivators. Although his definition is broad, it is not a universal definition that encompasses all aspects of culture.

**Mead’s culture definition.** American cultural anthropologist, Margaret Mead, provided extensive insights into American and Western culture during the mid-twentieth century. Mead’s (1955) research provides a versatile definition that addresses intra-cultural organizations. The author explained that culture is “…a body of learned behavior, a collection of beliefs, habits and traditions,
shared by a group of people and successively learned by people who enter the 
society” (1955, p. 13). However, like Tylor, Mead based her definition upon 
observable behaviors rather than on their underlying cognition and values. 
Ultimately, both Tylor and Mead provided adaptable definitions of culture that 
focus upon the external organizations, institutions, and products of culture, but 
their definitions do not address the less obvious aspects of behaviors, thoughts, 
and values that motivate members of a society.

Interpretation and grouping of culture definitions. The previous 
sections highlighted definitions, which were developed to facilitate the 
understanding of the concept of culture. Other scholars have added to the 
understanding of the concept of culture by interpreting and grouping the various 
definitions. For instance, Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1963) published a text that 
contains hundreds of interpretations for culture; however, it too lacks a universal 
definition for culture. The research of other scholars, such as House et al. (1997) 
confirms the previous assessment by indicating that there is lack of a 
“consensually agreed-upon definition” for culture in anthropological literature (p. 
536). As a result of their finding, House et al. (1997) compiled the following group 
of definitions used by social scientists to facilitate understanding of culture (p. 
537):

1. A patterned way of thinking, feeling, and reacting, acquired and 
   transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting the distinctive 
   achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in 
   artifacts (Kluckhohn, 1961).
2. The collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one human group from another (Hofstede, 1980).

3. The part of the environment that is created or modified by human beings (Herskovits, 1955).

4. Systems of shared meanings placed upon events (Smith, Peterson, & Misumi, 1994).

5. Norms, roles, belief systems, laws, and values that form meaningful wholes and that are interrelated in meaningful ways (Triandis, 1972).

6. A historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life (Geertz, 1973).

7. A learned, shared, compelling, interrelated set of symbols whose meanings provide a set of orientations for members of a society (Terpstra & David, 1991).

8. The cumulative deposit of knowledge; experience; meanings; beliefs; values; attitudes; religions; concepts of self, the universe, and self-universe relationships; hierarchies of statutes; role expectations; spatial relations; and time concepts acquired by a large group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving (Samovar & Porter, 1976).
Values, beliefs, perceptions and behaviors based culture definitions.

Although the list by House et al. (1997) and other definitions demonstrate the full richness of the term culture, the most common definitions focus on values, beliefs, perceptions, and behaviors (Weaver, 2000; Chandler, 2005). House et al. (1997) identified “several essential common threads that run throughout the various conceptualizations and definitions” of culture (p. 538). The authors explained that most definitions of culture have the following eight characteristics:

1. Some form of collective agreement
2. Some form of shared meaning
3. Linguistically, behaviorally, and symbolically manifested cultural norms and cultural forces in the form of artifacts
4. Common member experiences and religion inherent in the notion of culture
5. Cultural variables that take on the force of social influence, largely because members of collectivities identify with an agreed-upon specific set of values and common social identities
6. Cultural interpretations, symbols, artifacts, and effects that are transmitted across generations
7. A set of compelling behavioral, affective, and attitudinal orientations
8. Common experiences and a set of agreed-upon norms that reflect commonalities of a group, society, organization, etc.
Harris et al. culture definition. The previous sections provided major definitions and interpretations to assist scholars and leaders in understanding the concept of culture. However, trying to navigate through the plethora of information to locate a universal definition for culture could be a daunting effort for most in the field of leadership. Harris et al. (2004) offered a more simplistic definition of culture by explaining, “[C]ulture is a distinctly human means of adapting to circumstances and transmitting this coping skill and knowledge to subsequent generations” (p. 4). Accordingly, the authors clarified that culture can impact the behavior, values, patterns, attitudes, and actions of generations because it is the driving force behind human behavior (Harris et al., 2004). The authors pointed to Huntington’s (1996) research as a means of explaining how culture shapes and affects every facet of human behavior:

Culture and cultural identities…are shaping the patterns of cohesion, disintegration, and conflict in the post-cold war world.
Global politics is being reconfigured along cultural lines…peoples and countries with similar culture are coming together. Peoples and countries with different cultures are coming apart. (p. 4)

Dahl’s culture definition. The concept of culture can be addressed using multiple definitions, analyzed and examined from a wide range of perspectives, and broken down into cognitive (values, beliefs, and/or perceptions), behavioral (norms and actions), and/or relational (relationship) categories, yet no universal definition includes all aspects of culture. However, before conducting an examination of culture, a cohesive definition is needed. Therefore, for the
purpose of this chapter, the concept of culture will be explored from a perspective that incorporates the cognitive, behavioral, and relational aspects of culture into a common definition (House et al., 1997). The definition provided by Dahl (2004) establishes an appropriate foundation for defining culture for this chapter:

A shared set of basic assumptions and values, with resultant behavioural norms, attitudes and beliefs which manifest themselves in systems and institutions as well as behavioural patterns and non-behavioural items. There are various levels to culture, ranging from the easily observable outer layers (such as behavioural conventions) to the increasingly more difficult to grasp inner layers (such as assumptions and values). Culture is shared among members of one group or society, and has an interpretative function for the members of that group. Culture is situated between the human nature on the one hand and the individual personality on the other. Culture is not inheritable or genetic, but culture is learned. Although all members of a group or society share their culture, expressions of culture resultant behaviour are modified by the individual’s personality. (pp. 5-6)

Theories of Culture

Scholarly research findings and underpinning theories. In the same way that definitions attempt to advance understanding of the concept of culture for military members in cross-cultural leadership positions, cultural research findings attempt to advance the body of knowledge by facilitating the work of
scholars. The starting point for understanding cultural values and how they impact organizations can be found in Dutch social scientist Geert Hofstede’s original research.

**Cultural dimensions theory.** Many scholars look to Hofstede’s extensive research in cultural dimensions to build a foundation for research in cultural competency. Hofstede (2001) expanded Mead’s definition of culture (1955) by exploring organizational culture from value perspectives. Hofstede’s original 1967 research and subsequent 1972 study are instrumental in helping to understand the core cultural concepts that differentiate cultures (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1999).

Hofstede’s 1967 study used the dimensions of values and culture as key constructs for research. His research leads to defining culture as “the collective programming of the mind, which characterize the members of one organization from others” (Hofstede, 1991a, p. 237). The study also explored culture from a national perspective with some discussion on organizational cultures. Hofstede relied on Kluckhohn’s research. Kluchkohn’s (1967) work anthropologically defines value as “…a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influenced the selection from available models, means and ends of action” (p. 5). Schwartz’s (1992) later work supports Hofstede by highlighting how cultural values can be clustered into the categories of power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, and security.
One of Hofstede’s biggest contributions to the field of cultural research is his examination of how cultural dimensions are related to organizational behaviors, attitudes, and outcomes. His research may have been one of the most influential cultural classifications over the past two decades (Hall, 1976; Hofstede, 2001; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985; Schwartz, 1994; Trompenaars, 1993). Hofstede’s (1980) study of International Business Machines (IBM), a multinational firm, was the genesis for introducing cultural dimensions to the field of cultural research. His study analyzed survey data of over 117,000 IBM employees in 70 different nations from 1967 to 1973 (as cited in Gannon & Newman, 2002). As a result, he developed the following well-known cultural dimensions (Hofstede, 2001):

1. **Power Distance**: The extent followers in organizations or countries are willing to accept that superiors have more power.

2. **Individualism**: This dimension involves organizations or countries with loose ties between individuals or followers. This is the opposite of collectivism.

3. **Masculinity**: This dimension indicates the extent organizations or countries are assertive and have clear and distinct social gender roles. This is the opposite of femininity.

4. **Uncertainty Avoidance**: This dimension indicates the extent organizations or countries feel threatened by uncertain and unknown situations.
Hofstede and Bond’s (1988) subsequent study of Chinese employees and managers added a fifth dimension to the initial four cultural dimensions. They analyzed Chinese employees and managers based in 23 countries, using Confucian dynamism, later renamed the “long-term versus short-term orientation” dimension (Yeh & Lawrence, 1995). The fifth dimension is defined as follows:

5. Long-term Versus Short-term Orientation: The society’s “time horizon” or how society assigns importance to the future versus the past and present.

The previous section identified the foundation for cross-cultural leadership and values. Although Hofstede’s (1991b, 2001) five cultural dimensions appear to be the “dominant typology of cultural values in the context,” it does not escape criticism (Erez & Gati, 2004, p. 586). Various scholars have identified numerous problems with Hofstede’s research (DiMaggio, 1997; Dorfman & Howell, 1988; Graves, 1986; Lindell & Arvonen, 1996; Nasif, Al-Daeaj, Ebrahimi, & Thibodeaux, 1991; Newman & Nolleen, 1996; Olie, 1995; Punnett & Withane, 1990; Schwartz, 1999). For instance, Punnett and Withane (1990) argued that Hofstede’s research was not designed to measure the cultural factors, but rather to measure employee satisfaction and employee perception of work. In sum, Punnett and Withane view Hofstede’s cultural factors as an afterthought to his original research. Other scholars, such as Nasif et al. (1991) argued that Hofstede’s research was flawed because it assumed a cultural homogeneity of a domestic population although most nations are made up of various ethnic groups. As a result, there is a potential for the findings to be arbitrary since the analysis is
limited to the character and personality of the individuals being surveyed (Jones, 2007).

Hofstede’s theories provide classifications for cultural factors related to the behaviors, mindsets, and outcomes of individuals within an organization. He examined organizational culture using a value approach. His theories are an appropriate starting point for examining the effect of cross-cultural values on organizations. However, a number of additional theories deserve mention as well. For example, the country clusters theory as posited by Roner and Kraut (1977) examines organizational management within groups of countries; Hall (1983) investigated culture and its relationship to time management; Hall and Hall (1990) identified culture through contexts of communication; Luthans and Hodgetts (2002) defined culture from a collectivist perspective.

Country clusters theory. Roner and Kraut (1977) performed an analysis of several empirical studies, which used country cluster attitudinal data as a means of exploring comparative management. Their research focused on country clusters and their associated “underlying dimensions, purpose and implications of clustering, and critiques of the cluster approach” (Grisham, 2006, p. 25). Their cluster groupings are very similar to those used in the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) survey discussed later in this chapter. Most importantly, the authors indicated there is limited country cluster research for Middle Eastern countries.

Time theory. Hall (1983) explored the concept of culture though the perspective of time in intercultural relations. Hall also stressed the ability to
exhibit polychronic and monochronic attitudes of culture. Hall refers to the concepts of time and the rhythm of life for understanding culture, explaining “the more perfect the rhythm, the easier it is for another person to perceive the details of what is taking place before his eyes” (Hall, 1983, p. 168). Furthermore, Hall explained that rhythm can be interpreted as empathy because it requires individuals to come to a common understanding; in more simplistic terms, it requires individuals to move to the same musical beat.

**Communication theory.** The research of Hall and Hall (1990) identifies several key concepts to understand culture through effective communication. For example, the concept of high and low context communication deals with the richness of a culture’s communication. High context cultures in the Middle East rely heavily upon relationships, compared to low context cultures such as America that rely more on formal contracts. In addition, Hall and Hall stressed the concept of time as communication. The authors explained that Middle Eastern cultures are polychronic in nature due to their propensity to handle several things at one time. Conversely, American culture tends to focus on one thing at a time and is, thus, labeled as monochronic in nature.

Each theory examines a different cultural value and analyzes its effect upon organizations. These theories all contribute to a fuller understanding of the core cultural concepts of value that differentiate cultures and demonstrate the effects that those values have upon organizations. In addition to analyzing cultural values within an organization, cultures can also be examined via the values and perspectives of individual members within a society. They can be
defined by the behaviors demonstrated among groups of people, or from the actions of a nation in its entirety. For this reason, it is necessary to investigate the concept of cross-cultural theories at the micro, meso, and macro levels.

**Micro-, meso-, & macro-level cultural theories.** The previous theories provide more insight into the concept of culture and their respective impact on organizational leadership. The concept of culture can also be explored as a model with overlapping components of society, which provide guidelines for operating and interacting within those components (Ballantine & Roberts, 2008). Most notably, some scholars argue that the impetus for cultural theories is found in the micro-level (from an individual perspective), meso-level (subgroups), or the macro-level (among/across nations and the globe) (Wiktorowicz, 2004).

**Micro-level cultural theory.** Culture at the micro-level explores individual social interaction in small groups or organizations (Ballantine & Roberts, 2008). Small groups such as a college fraternity, weekly bowling league, or a study-group are labeled micro-cultures for their affect on a limited group of people within a snapshot of time (Gordon, 1970). Micro-level cultural theories focus on the psychological traits of an individual’s attitudes and beliefs in social interaction (Wiktorowicz, 2004). In addition, they can also help analyze the internal and external cognitive dynamics of culture. For example, the British imperialist campaigns in India, Iraq, Egypt, and various other countries are considered micro-level entities for analysis since this type of research highlights ethnocentrism (Dodge, 2003; Macfie, 2000; Monaghan & Just, 2000; Tripp, 2000; Wolpert, 2000).
**Meso-level cultural theory.** The meso-level of culture focuses on the sub-society social units or subcultures “that are smaller than the nation but large enough to sustain people throughout the life span” (Ballantine & Roberts, 2008, p. 75). Examples of subcultures that share the common values and beliefs of the dominant society but have unique customs, religious aspects, and rituals include ethnic groups such as Native Americans or religious groups such as Mormons or Hasidic Jews in the United States (Arnold, 1970; Ballantine & Roberts, 2008; Gordon, 1970). Meso-level cultural theories concentrate on explaining culture as learned behavior, a collection of beliefs, habits, rituals, customs and traditions. Meso-level cultural theories also view culture as a behavioral or cognitive construct (Monaghan & Just, 2000). To illustrate this perspective, Edward Tylor, British scholar and founder of the concept of anthropology, defined culture as a learned process, a “…complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (as cited in Salzman, 2001, p. 72). Lastly, some meso-level theories argue that the group, society, or national cultural category traits can define culture. Supporters of these types of meso-level theories believe that individuals can alter their traits or individuality based on their surroundings (Johnston, 1995).

**Macro-level cultural theory.** At the macro-level, culture can be explored from the national and even global perspective (Ballantine & Roberts, 2008). An example of society with subcultures globally linked by a set of common beliefs or values is the Muslim culture (Ballantine & Roberts, 2008). Macro-level cultural
theories analyze culture from the rational collections of a nation’s decisions and actions (Allison & Zelikow, 1999; Johnston, 1995; Lichbach & Zuckerman, 2002; Wedeen, 2002). Furthermore, macro-level theories can often combine both meso- and macro- levels which may be viewed as a collective concept which provides an array of rules and actions of conduct for cross-cultural leaders within a particular culture (Johnston, 1995). French anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss illustrated a version of this theory by providing the following definition of culture:

Culture is neither natural nor artificial. It stems from neither genetics nor rational thought, for it is made up of rules of conduct, which were not invented and whose function is generally not understood by the people who obey them. Some of these rules are residues of traditions acquired in the different types of social structure through which...each human group has passed. Other rules have been consciously accepted or modified for the sake of specific goals. (as cited in Monaghan & Just, 2000, p. 41)

**Dynamic multi-level culture model.** The micro-, meso-, and macro-level cultural theories provide a roadmap for leaders to navigate through the multi-levels of culture. Erez and Gati (2004) provided an example of a macro-level theory of culture, which further expands the concept of culture through a multi-level model. The authors’ model facilitates a structural and dynamic analysis that clarifies the relationship between various levels of culture. Furthermore, the Erez and Gati model can help researchers conceptualize how “smaller” subcultures can contribute to a larger cultural group (Potosky, 2008). Of particular interest to
this literature review is the fact that Erez and Gati’s model considers global culture as the most macro-level dimension of culture as illustrated in Figure 2.1.
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*Figure 2.1. Erez’s and Gati’s dynamic model of top-down, bottom-up processes across levels of culture. Adapted from “A dynamic, multi-level model of culture: From the micro level of the individual to the macro level of a global culture,” by M. Erez, and E. Gati, 2004, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53(4), pp. 583-598.*

As shown by Erez and Gati (2004) in Figure 2.1, the nucleus of culture is at the individual or micro-level. The next level includes groups or subgroups of people at the meso-level, and it expands to include organizations, nations and international systems at the macro-level. The model provided by Erez and Gati can help researchers to understand how subcultures can contribute to larger cultural group systems. Additionally, definitions of culture can be studied by comparing and analyzing previous cultural research, by identifying the needs and values of people, and by categorizing culture from a macro-level or a micro-level.
Cultural theories comparison research. Darlington (1996) provided a comparison used by scholars to study and define culture from 1961 to 1994 as shown in Appendix B. The appendix highlights the various types of studies developed to understand the phenomenon of culture. Darlington’s (1996) research also emphasizes the existence of over 160 definitions for culture. According to the author, various scholars of culture have validated Hofstede’s research, mainly the dimensions of power distance and individualism. In addition, Darlington provided a comparison of cultural dimensions studied by other scholars throughout time (Appendix B).

Fundamental values theory. In their analysis of culture, Sagiv and Schwartz (2000) identified three common needs for all cultures: (a) humane requirements, (b) the preservation of society, and (c) the relationship of humankind to the natural and social world. The authors’ survey examined 57 cultures, using seven fundamental value dimensions to establish evidence of an organizational pattern for values across cultures: (a) harmony, (b) embeddedness, (c) hierarchy, (d) mastery, (e) affective autonomy, (f) intellectual autonomy, and (g) egalitarianism (Sagiv & Schwartz, 2000). These dimensions, and others such as power distance and individualism-collectivism, are found in the scholarly research of Hofstede and the GLOBE research program.

Cultural categories theory. Harris et al. (2004) offered ten categories for understanding culture from a macro-cultural or a micro-cultural level. The authors explained that the following ten categories can be used as “a basic model for assessing a particular culture” (p. 9): (a) sense of self and space, (b)
communication and language, (c) dress and appearance, (d) food and feeding habits, (e) time and time consciousness, (f) relationships, (g) values and norms, (h) beliefs and attitudes, (i) mental process and learning, and (j) work habits and practices. The works of Darlington (1996), Sagiv and Schwartz (2000), and Harris et al. (2004) provide several additional perspectives on the dimensions of culture.

Cultural theories are beneficial for helping cross-cultural leaders to understand expected norms regarding a particular culture. Although cultures can be studied at length in isolation, the effect of one society’s interaction with a different culture must also be a component of study. Consequently, definitions and theories of cultural awareness must also be addressed.

Definitions and Theories of Cultural Awareness

Analysis of the various associated definitions and theories of the concept of culture can help cross-cultural leaders navigate through a particular culture, but to have a true understanding of a given culture, it is necessary to have a basic understanding of the political, social, and other dimensions of that culture (Skelton & Cooper, 2004). Thus, cross-cultural leaders must be able to extrapolate information learned from a particular culture by recognizing and understanding the effects of their own culture on their followers’ values and behaviors, by assigning meaning, and by making key decisions in order to accomplish the organization’s mission or objective (Wunderlee, 2008). This ability is known as cultural awareness. Wunderle implied that cultural awareness is simply the act of understanding the need to consider cultural terrain in
decision-making. However, within a cultural awareness construct, several levels should be considered before a decision is made.

**Cultural awareness levels of understanding cognitive hierarchy.** The U.S. Army (2006) identified the following four levels of understanding and incorporated them into a hierarchy to help conceptualize the meaning of cultural awareness of military members: (1) data, (2) information, (3) knowledge, and (4) understanding. The data level is the lowest level, which relies on interpreting unprocessed signals detected from the environment. Information is the next level of the hierarchy, which processes the data to provide further meaning. Knowledge is acquired by analyzing the information in the previous level to provide meaning and value. Lastly, the understanding level of the hierarchy synthesizes the knowledge gained from the culture in order for military members to apply it to their decision-making.

The graphical representation of the cultural levels of understanding cognitive hierarchy, as displayed in the pyramid in Figure 2.2, provides military members with “meaning to gain understanding of the events and conditions in which they make decisions and conduct operations” (Wunderle, 2008, p. 10). The cultural awareness pyramid points to cultural competence as a fusion between decision-making and cultural intelligence that provides cross-cultural leaders with insight into the objectives or motives of a specific actors or groups of a particular culture (Connable & Speyer, 2005). The concepts of cultural competence and cultural intelligence will be further explored in a later section of this chapter.

Conceptual model for developing cultural awareness. As mentioned earlier, cultural awareness provides leaders the means to extrapolate information from the surrounding environment for decision-making purposes (Wunderle, 2006). Solberg (2002) offers a conceptual model for developing cultural awareness. Solberg’s model is comprised of the following main components that facilitate the definition of culture and the development of cultural awareness: (1) cultural influences, (2) cultural variations, and (3) cultural manifestations.

The cultural influences component analyzes cultural awareness according to its major social structures or institutional factors, such as heritage, religion, traditions, and language. The cultural influences component can help cross-
cultural leaders understand what factors may influence the way host nation counterparts may think or behave. The cultural variations component prompts cultural awareness by exploring variations in universal traits of a particular culture. These culture variations include the categories of behaviors, values, and cognition (reasoning styles) (Vane et al., 2004). Lastly, the cultural manifestations component of the conceptual model provides a means to facilitate cultural awareness via the analysis of the thought and behavior patterns of a particular culture. Hence, this component may provide cross-cultural leaders with a means to understand what they may encounter during negotiations. Most importantly, this component can aid cross-cultural leaders in understanding how the host nation counterparts may perceive authority, risk, compromise, etc. Wunderle (2006) summarized the conceptual model of cultural awareness by explaining, “[c]ultural influences and culture variations explain why the culture is the way it is. Cultural manifestations, on the other hand, refer to what one encounters in the culture” (p. 13).

**Cross-Cultural Competency Defined**

The previous sections highlight how the rapid increase in globalization and research of culture and its underpinning theories demonstrate the importance of cross-cultural competency for leaders. In addition, there are varying definitions, theories, debates, and conceptualizations for the concept of culture. These various definitions and theories attempt to define the associated variables and factors that make up cultures; however, each has its own conceptual, empirical, and theoretical limits (Lichbach & Zuckerman 2002; Wedeen 2002). It is
important for cross-cultural organizations to empirically review the documented
definitions and theories in order to define and conceptualize culture in regards to
their own mission objectives. Most importantly, the leaders of these organizations
must possess the skills, attitudes, knowledge, and cultural awareness to
effectively lead these organizations in foreign environments comprised of
followers with cultures dissimilar to their own. The following sections explore the
phenomenon of cross-cultural competency via its definition; associated concepts;
and essential competencies, characteristics, and behaviors.

Stanek (2000) emphasized that in today’s world, global and cross-cultural
organizations require leaders who possess the understanding and capability to
interact with their respective customers, governments, and host nation
counterparts. Various other scholars suggested that leaders operating in cross-
cultural environments should possess a global mindset (e.g. Arora, Jaju, Kefalas,
& Perenich, 2004; Beechler & Baltzley, 2008; Bouquet, 2005; Gupta &
Govindarajan, 2002; Rhinesmith 1992). This term explains the ability to combine
openness, flexibility, and the awareness of diversity across cultural domains with
the “propensity and ability to synthesize across” diversity (Gupta & Govindarajan,
2002, p. 117). Yukl (2006) also supported the need for competent cross-cultural
leaders stating that leaders “…must be able to understand how people from
different cultures view them and interpret their actions” and vice versa (p. 430).
Furthermore, McBride (1992) pointed out that cross-cultural leaders must
possess the ability to navigate national and cultural issues with little adjustment
and disruption to the organization and its mission.
In response to the need to understand cross-cultural competency, various scholars have researched the attributes, attitudes, and behaviors needed for these leaders to be successful in their roles. The recent interest in this has led to numerous studies and training programs that help organizations develop leaders who can effectively create positive change and lead a multi-cultural workforce in this globalized environment (McBride, 1992).

**Cross-Cultural Competency Defined**

Abbe et al. (2007) defined cross-cultural competency as the “knowledge, skills, and affect/motivation that enable individuals to adapt effectively in cross-cultural environments” (p. 2). Additionally, the concept of cross-cultural competency focuses on “the individual capability that contributes to intercultural effectiveness regardless of the particular intersection of cultures” (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 2). Hammer (1987) supported the Abbe et al. (2007) cross-cultural competency definition by explaining that in addition to the cognitive, behavioral, and motivational factors that are relevant for a particular country and region, other evidence suggests that a core set of competencies may enable cross-cultural leaders to adapt to any culture.

The preponderance of cross-cultural competency research converges around the predictors of intercultural effectiveness (Abbe et al., 2007). The authors concluded that cross-cultural competence is a dynamic process in nature in which the associated traits and competencies can be developed over time (Abbe et al., 2007). This appears to be consistent with perspectives of previous expatriate cross-cultural literature in which scholars such as Leiba-O'Sullivan
(1999) and Bennett (1986; 1993) emphasized the dynamic nature of cross-cultural competence. In fact, Johnson, Lenartowicz, & Apud (2006) offered a review of cross-cultural competency literature that supported the Abbe et al. conclusion by stating:

As a result of our specific interest in IB [international business], we started out by investigating how the terms “CC”, “cultural competence” or “cultural competency” have been defined and used in the international business literature. This was done in two stages. First, we searched ten top business journals over a 10-year period (1995-2004) for articles where national culture was either the main topic or a variable explaining some business phenomenon. This search resulted in 189 articles, but the construct of our interest was found only once, in Leiba-O'Sullivan (1999). However, Leiba-O'Sullivan’s aim was not to define CC but to argue for a distinction between two types of CC—*dynamic* and *stable*—with reference to Black and Mendenhall’s (1990) three-dimensional taxonomy of cross-cultural competencies. Thus Leiba-O'Sullivan discussed CC in terms of “knowledge, skills, abilities, and other”, where “other” included personal interests and personality constructs. (p. 76)

Abbe et al. (2007) developed a model for cross-cultural competence, which is intended to be comprehensive by providing a synthesis of the body of literature relevant to military leaders in Figure 2.3.
Figure 2.3. The general framework for cross-cultural competence for military leaders. Adapted from “Cross-Cultural Competence in Army Leaders: A Conceptual and Empirical Foundation,” by A. Abbe, L. M. V. Gulick, and J. L. Herman, 2007, p. 2.

The Abbe et al. (2007) model provides a graphical representation of how the most prominent cross-cultural competence variables in the body of literature interrelate, as well as demonstrating a framework of predictors of intercultural effectiveness. Most importantly, the authors make a point of emphasizing that cross-cultural competence “is a set of variables that contribute to intercultural effectiveness. Whereas previous models have tended to emphasize subjective outcomes by focusing primarily on adjustment, outcomes of interest here include both subjective and objective outcomes” (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 3). In addition, the model illustrates how antecedent variables, such as dispositional traits,
contribute to the development of an individual’s cross-cultural competence. Of particular interest is the middle portion of the model are cross-cultural competence and its associated characteristics of knowledge, affect/motivation, and skills, which appear to be drivers for intercultural effectiveness for cross-cultural leaders. Previous conceptualizations of interpersonal competencies and intercultural communications in the literature point to three common components for the definition and structure of cross-cultural competency: (a) knowledge and cognition, (b) affect and motivation, and (c) skills (Chen & Starosta, 1996; Spitzberg, 1990, 1991; Wiseman, Hammer, & Nishida, 1989). The Abbe et al. research further breaks down the three components of cross-cultural competence into sub-components as identified in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge &amp; Cognition</th>
<th>Affect &amp; Motivation</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>Attitudes &amp; Initiative</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Schema</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Self-Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Complexity</td>
<td>Need for Closure</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The literature provides various terms for the concept of cross-cultural awareness such as cross-cultural competency, intercultural awareness/competency, international competency, global competency, etc. Although these terms are often interchangeable, the most important element to
highlight is that all terms focus on cultural difference at the national as well as the societal level (Abbe et al., 2007). The next section discusses the ties between culture, cultural awareness and leadership. For the remainder of the chapter, competencies and dimensions associated with cross-cultural awareness and competency for leaders will be referred to as cross-cultural leadership.

**Cross-Cultural Leadership**

As indicated in the previous section, numerous terms and definitions are used for the concept of culture. The concept of cross-cultural leadership is no exception. This section of the chapter will explore cross-cultural leadership via its associated definitions and research findings.

**Definitions of cross-cultural leadership.** Within the past century, over 350 definitions have been created to help define the concept of leadership (Daft, 2007), and yet, no one “has been able to define leadership with precision, accuracy, and conciseness so that people are able to label it correctly when they see it happening or when they engage in it” (Rost, 1992, p. 6). Mendenhall et al. (2008a) highlighted this increased interest in cross-cultural leadership research by stating “…since the early 1990s, an increasing number of scholars have been studying effective global [/cross-cultural] leaders and attempting to delineate the competencies that are critical to their success” (p. 1). The authors also indicated in their literature review “global [cross-cultural] leadership is a multi-dimensional construct” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 1).

As mentioned earlier, scholars have developed various definitions of culture and cross-cultural leadership to aid leaders in understanding how to
influence followers in diverse organizations. Despite the vast array of leadership research literature, a consensually agreed-upon definition for leadership or even cross-cultural leadership among scholars still does not exist (Bass, 1990; Dorfman, 1996; House et al., 1997). Jokinen, Bond, Byers, McCarthy, & McCraken (2005) highlighted this deficiency by saying, “a more concise definition of “global [, cross-cultural] leadership is needed, with adequate identification criteria, in order to create common understanding of the subject term” (Jokinen et al., 2005, p. 212). Furthermore, since definitions of leadership “vary in terms of emphasis on leader abilities, personality traits, influence relationships, cognitive versus emotional orientation, individual versus group orientation, and appeal to self-versus collective interest” (House et al., 1997, p. 548), scholars and practitioners have been unable to identify a single element or combination of elements that thoroughly define the characteristics of leadership. As a result, numerous theories have emerged to categorize the attributes associated with the concept of cross-cultural leadership.

**GLOBE Research Project definition.** One major step in narrowing cross-cultural leadership down to a single definition occurred during the development of the GLOBE Research Project. The GLOBE Research Project was a cross-cultural research study of leadership, which used 154 investigators in sixty nations from across the world to examine the effects of culture on desired leadership characteristics (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004; House et al., 1997). During the development of the GLOBE Research Project, which consisted of more than 84 scholars from over 56 countries, the following
universal definition for organizational leadership emerged, “...the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members” (House et al., 1997, p. 548).

**Leadership definition characteristics.** Rost offered a more structured approach to defining leadership. Rost (1992) explained that in order for a leadership definition to be effective, it must be based on the four following essential elements: (a) the relationship between the leader and follower must be based on influence, (b) the leaders and followers make up the relationship, (c) both leaders and followers intend to make real change, and (d) both leaders and followers have a mutual purpose (mission) for developing the relationship.

Based on Rost’s (1992) essential elements of leadership definition, GLOBE’s definition is considered largely effective because it is based on a relationship of influence, composed of a leader and follower relationship, and containing a mutual purpose. However, the definition lacks the third essential ingredient: “intention of real change” (Rost, 1992).

**Working definition for cross-cultural leadership.** Moran, Harris, and Moran (2007) offered a definition of cross-cultural leadership that presents some of the behaviors and characteristics needed for operating in a global environment; however, it lacks the “mutual purpose” ingredient explained by Rost (1992). Harris et al. described cross-cultural leadership as:

…being capable of operating effectively in a global environment while being respectful of cultural diversity. This is an individual who
can manage accelerating change and differences. The global [cross-cultural] leader is open and flexible in approaching others, can cope with situations and people disparate from his or her background, and is willing to reexamine and alter personal attitudes and perceptions. (p. 26)

Therefore, for the purpose of this chapter, the previous definition is modified to include all essential ingredients of leadership defined by Rost (1992). By adding the “mutual purpose” element to the Harris et al. (2006) definition, this chapter defines cross-cultural leadership as:

…[the ability for a leader to achieve the organization’s mission while maintaining the capability of] operating effectively in a global environment while being respectful of cultural diversity. This is an individual who can manage accelerating change and differences.

The global [cross-cultural] leader is open and flexible in approaching others, can cope with situations and people disparate from his or her background, and is willing to reexamine and alter personal attitudes and perceptions. (p. 25)

**Cross-cultural leadership research findings.** As in the field of organizational leadership, research in the area of cross-cultural leadership has grown exponentially over the last 20 years. Various updates to cross-cultural research in the Stogsdill (1974) text, The Handbook of Leadership, best illustrates evidence of explosion in this field of study. Dickson, Den Hartog, and Michelson (2003) summarized the changes in this text by stating:
In the first edition (Stogsdill, 1974), cross-cultural leadership is barely mentioned. By the second edition (Stogsdill & Bass, 1981), an entire chapter on cross-cultural issues in leadership had been added, spanning about 25 pages. By the third edition (Bass, 1990), that chapter had expanded to over 40 pages. Now, close to 15 years later, it would be essentially impossible to prepare a single chapter that presented an exhaustive account of the research on cross-cultural issues and leadership. (p. 730)

**Limited cross-cultural leadership research.** Bass (1990) examined over 100 research studies on “the effects of differences in cultural or sub-cultural units on managerial behaviors, attitudes, preferences, and motivations” (House et al., 1997, p. 549). His analysis revealed two major findings in the cross-cultural leadership literature: the majority of research focuses on the applicability of the Western leadership theory model in various cultural settings, and “…a great deal of effort has been made to compare the leadership styles and requirements of small groups of nations” (House et al., 1997, p. 549). Consequently, Bass’s (1990) review identifies that there is limited cross-cultural leadership research for regions of the South Pacific, Africa, Eastern Europe, and the Middle East.

analysis identifies numerous studies with empirical evidence relevant to the cross-cultural leadership body of literature. Their selection is based on one or more of the following factors (p. 552):

1. The analysis is based on 10 or more cultural units.
2. The studies address important issues.
3. The studies assess conventional organizational behavior using dependent variables such as satisfaction, performance, stress, turnover, and degree of conflict.
4. The studies introduce important moderators of relationships between cultural dimensions or attributes and dependent variables.
5. The studies cover cultural units (countries, geographic regions, or ethnic groups) not covered in the studies reviewed by Bass (1990).
6. The studies illustrate new, innovative, and especially useful methodology.

House et al.’s (1997) extensive review of cross-cultural leadership provides the field with many key findings. For instance, the authors argued that “the construct of culture has eluded precise definition” of leadership (p. 613). House et al. (1997) asserted that there are several near-universal propositions for the concept of leadership. One example is the work of Bass (1997) who stated that the elements of transformational leadership (charisma, intellectual stimulation of followers, and individualized consideration toward followers) have a
more positive effect than contingent reward. In addition, the authors indicated that there are some categories of leader behavior that are influenced by cultural forces as well as the frequency of their performance and effectiveness (House et al., 1997; Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Paterson, & Bond, 1989).

House et al. (1997) suggested that more “research is needed to determine which leader behaviors are etic, which are emic, and how etic behaviors are manifested emically” (p. 614). The authors stated that case studies and other qualitative research approaches can offer more insight into “specific cultural entities, and generate theoretical hypotheses and prescriptive assertions to be tested qualitatively” (House et al., 1997, p. 615). In addition, House et al. proposed that triangulation should be used as a means to avoid sampling bias. As a result of their review, House et al. (1997) provided a table of empirical cross-cultural leadership studies conducted since 1989 shown in Appendix C.

**Interpersonal and philosophical aspects.** Since cross-cultural leaders are often required to interact and engage with their host nation counterparts and followers, it is important to explore the interpersonal and philosophical aspects of culture. Arruda and Hickson (1996) indicated that the phenomenon of culture often affects elements of management (with some leadership characteristics) and organizations. The authors replicated the research of Tayeb (1994) for their own study. As a result, Arruda and Hickson (1996) determined that subtle changes in culture can create interpersonal (societal norms, patterns, and processes unique to each culture) and philosophical (individual perspectives and moral values) concerns.
**Reward allocation.** Erez (1997) explains four major types of motivational practices that managers (leaders) can utilize in various cultures: (1) reward allocation, (2) goal-setting and decision-making participation, (3) job enrichment, and (4) quality improvement of systems, organizational processes, and customer satisfaction. For the purpose of this chapter, leaders can apply these same practices. One of the practices Erez listed is the concept of reward allocation. This concept enables leaders to provide rewards based on the equity, equality, and the particular of the follower.

**Western bias in cross-cultural leadership research.** Peterson and Hunt (1997) provided an excellent source for “useful historical perspective of the role of social issues, theories and methods” on cross-cultural leadership (p. 730). Peterson and Hunt (1997) also emphasized the importance of scientific cross-cultural leadership research, raising concerns of Western bias in current cross-cultural leadership theories. The authors inferred that a Western bias exists in cross-cultural research because of how the various cultures across the globe tend “to organize themselves for production work into large-scale [Western] organizations” (Gannon & Newman, 2002, p. 219). Mellahi (2000) also highlighted evidence of Western bias in cross-cultural leadership research by explaining how Western leadership values are highly emphasized over indigenous leadership values in Management of Business Administration programs across the United Kingdom.

**Cross-cultural leadership in project management.** The field of cross-cultural leadership has benefitted from practical real-world experience and
lessons learned. For instance, Pheng and Leong (2000) examined the lessons learned from constructing a hotel in China. They described the behaviors and characteristics of the Chinese construction industry. Pheng and Leong especially analyzed the high/low context communication associated with corresponding Chinese worker relationships. In addition, the authors highlighted the characteristics of trust and respect as important elements of Chinese culture. Furthermore, the authors explained that building projects in China not only require a solid understanding of cross-cultural management (leadership) for project managers, but also require extensive knowledge of project management and human resources management.

Hofstede’s cultural dimension and cross-cultural leadership. Dickson et al. (2003) provided an update on the advances of two important reviews of cross-cultural leadership literature. First, the authors built on the research of the House et al. (1997) text on cross-cultural leadership in *New Perspectives on International Industrial/Organizational Psychology*, edited by Earley and Erez (1997). Secondly, Dickson et al. (2003) provided an update to the extensive text on cross-cultural leadership in Peter Dorfman’s acclaimed scholarship in the field of knowledge management outlined in his chapter on international and cross-cultural leadership in the *Handbook for International Management Research*, edited by Punnett and Shenkar (2003). The Dickson et al. (2003) update focused on the application of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions. Dickson’s updates to the theories of Hofstede and Dorfman, regarding cultural dimensions and cross-cultural leadership, add to the extensive body of literature available for cross-
cultural leadership. The authors explained the level of sophistication in how researchers view etic and how universal findings have become more complex. Dickson et al. also emphasized the numerous advances and modifications for the definition of culture and the association dimension of cross-culture leadership. More recently, the authors provided evidence of how specific topics of culture and cross-cultural leadership have been propelled in various research studies and journals. Much of the available literature is focused upon personality traits and individual competence levels. However, two additional theories regarding situational contingency and transformational leadership are particularly relevant to the concept of cross-cultural leadership.

**Prevalent Leadership Theories in Cross-Cultural Leadership Literature**

The preponderance of literature for cross-cultural leadership pivots around traits, personalities, and competence theories. However, situational contingency leadership (Fiedler, 1967), charismatic leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House, 1977), and transformational leadership (Burns, 1978) are three theories that stand out in the surveying of cross-cultural leadership literature.

**Situational contingency leadership theory.** One of the pillars for aiding scholars and leaders in understanding cross-cultural leadership can be found in the situational contingency leadership theory. Husted (2000) pointed to Fiedler’s (1967) situational contingency theory of leadership as a means for cross-cultural leaders to comprehend the complexity associated with executing the organization’s mission while maintaining an awareness of the differing cultural norms of the host nation. Situational contingency leadership enables leaders to
become more effective in cross-cultural environments by prompting them to focus on the particular variables that relate to their current environment. Examples of leadership variables critical to the environment include “quality of leader-member liking, the degree of task structure, and the position power of the leader” (Gibson & Marcoulides, 1995, p. 178). For this reason, Husted (2000) inferred that leaders must have the flexibility to alter their leadership style as the situation and environment warrants.

Charismatic/transformational leadership. The concept of charismatic/transformational leadership is another pillar for understanding cross-cultural leadership. According to some scholars, the transformational leadership model as developed by Burns (1978) is another behavior that cross-cultural leaders utilize when dealing with followers from different diverse backgrounds in cross-cultural environments. Bryant (2003) indicated that transformational leadership can help promote deep-seated interaction with organizational followers. Other scholars have investigated leadership and follower interaction and have determined that transformational leadership is the most effective approach to influence organizational effectiveness due to its focus on beliefs, needs, and values (Bass, 1985; Khunert & Lewis, 1987; Schein, 1985). Furthermore, other scholars, such as Den Hartog et al. (1999), supported the use of transformational leadership by stating that the:

…attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership are universally endorsed as contributing to outstanding leadership based on a study among approximately 15000 of these managers.
In addition, they present evidence that the endorsement of many attributes varies across cultures (examples of such attributes were presented in the section on culture dimensions). (p. 753)

According to Den Hartog et al. (1999), the GLOBE survey is the most comprehensive research on cross-cultural leadership. Most importantly, the authors emphasized that based on the GLOBE survey results, the characteristics associated with charismatic and transformational leadership can be universally endorsed for their value in building successful leadership in various cultures (Burns, 1978; Conger & Kanungo, 1998). These characteristics include the elements of trust, empathy, transformation, power, and communication.

**Desired Cross-Cultural Leadership Characteristics and Competencies**

In order to understand why some leaders fail or succeed in organizations and environments not similar to their own culture, the essential competencies of cross-cultural leadership and cultural competency should be investigated. Cross-cultural leadership competencies are essential behaviors, characteristics, dimensions, and traits that leaders need to lead teams in cross-cultural organizations. These competencies encompass knowledge, skills, abilities, and behavior dimensions. This section highlights some of the most significant cross-cultural leadership competencies in the scholarly literature.

**Ten concepts of cross-cultural leadership.** Harris and Moran (1996) expanded on the key behaviors for cross-cultural leadership by offering 10 concepts, which may have direct relevance to the effectiveness of cross-cultural
leaders in today’s environment. Firoz, Maghrabi, & Kim (2002) identified these concepts in their article:

1. Global Leadership—being capable of operating effectively in a global environment and being respectful of cultural diversity.

2. Cross-Cultural Communication—recognizing what is involved in one's image of self and one’s role, personal needs, values, standards, expectations, all of which are culturally conditioned.

3. Cultural Sensitivity—integrating the characteristics of culture in general, with experiences in specific organizational, minority, or foreign cultures.

4. Acculturation—effectively adjusting and adapting to a specific culture, whether that be a subculture within one's own country or abroad.

5. Cultural Influences on Management—understanding that management philosophies are deeply rooted in culture, and that management practices developed in one culture may not easily transfer to another.

6. Effective Intercultural Performance—applying cultural theory and insight to specific cross-cultural situations that affect people's performance on the job.

7. Changing International Business—coping with the interdependence of business activity throughout the world, as well as the subculture of the managerial group.
8. Cultural Synergy—building upon the very differences in the world's people for mutual growth and accomplishment by cooperation. Cultural synergy through collaboration emphasizes similarities and common concerns, and integrates differences to enrich human activities and systems.

9. Work Culture—applying the general characteristics of culture to the specifics of how people work at a point in time and place.

10. Global Culture—understanding that while various characteristics of human culture has always been universal, a unique global culture with some common characteristics may be emerging. (Global Leadership section, para. 2)

**GLOBE project cross-cultural leadership dimensions.** One major research discovery for the field of cross-cultural leadership is the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) Project. The Javidan and Hauser (2004) research on the GLOBE survey was instrumental in identifying numerous dimensions and behaviors essential to successful cross-cultural leadership. For instance, the authors indicated that the GLOBE survey offers the following nine independent variables or cross-cultural dimensions:

- **Uncertainty Avoidance:** Extent organizations or countries feel threatened by uncertain and unknown situations (Hofstede, 2001).

- **Power Distance:** The extent followers in cross-cultural organizations or countries are willing to accept that superiors have more power (Hofstede, 2001).
Institutional Collectivism: The degree to which individuals of a particular culture and cross-cultural organization encourage and reward collective distribution of resources (Hofstede 2001; Triandis, 1995).

Group Collectivism: The degree to which individuals of a particular culture express pride, loyalty and cohesiveness (Triandis, 1995).

Assertiveness: The degree to which individuals of a particular culture expresses assertiveness (Hofstede, 2001).

Gender Egalitarianism: The degree to which cross-cultural organizations, countries, and societies promote gender equality (Hofstede, 2001).

Future Orientation: The degree to which individuals of a particular culture engage in planning of future activities (Kluckholm & Strodbeck, 1961).

Performance Orientation: The degree to which cross-cultural organization or society rewards performance (McClelland, 1961).

Humane Orientation: The degree to which cross-cultural organizations and societies reward fairness and are friendly, altruistic, and generous to others (Kluckhohn & Strodbeck, 1961).

In addition, Javidan’s and Hauser’s (2004) analysis of the GLOBE survey was instrumental in helping the authors to identify the following six cross-cultural leadership characteristics:

- Charismatic/Value Based Leadership: The ability for a leader to inspire and motivate followers (refer to transformational leadership).
- Team-Oriented Leadership: The ability to build common purpose among members of a team.
Participative Leadership: The degree to which followers are involved in decision-making.

Humane-Oriented Leadership: The ability to exhibit compassion and generosity in leadership.

Autonomous Leadership: A leadership style, which relies on individualistic and independent attributes.

Self-Protective Leadership: A leadership style, which promotes safety and security of a group or organization.

Various scholars provide a diverse array of cross-cultural competencies needed for leaders working abroad. These competencies define “personal traits, behaviors, skills, values, and knowledge” that will enhance the effectiveness of professionals working outside their cultural backgrounds (Jokinen et al., 2005, p. 201). Early and Ang (2003) referenced James Q. Wilson’s research on morality and ethics as a good source for understanding the essential values needed for cultural competency: sympathy, fairness, self-control, and duty. The authors also highlighted the Riggio, Maessamer, and Throckmorton social intelligence base model and its following associated skills as a good approach for understanding cross-cultural leadership competencies:

- Expressivity – encoding messages and interaction
- Sensitivity – decoding messages and interpreting cultural norms and roles
- Control – controlling emotions (Early & Ang, 2003)

Project management dimensions. As previously mentioned, the investigation of the real-world application of cross-cultural leadership
competencies has aided scholars and leaders in understanding more about leadership in diverse organizations and foreign environments. For instance, Shore and Cross (2005) reviewed the roles of national culture on international science projects. They stated, “…national culture and its influence on the project management process have received little emphasis in the literature” (p. 55). The authors’ research posed several questions that specifically address the field of project management. The authors underlined the work of Hofstede and the GLOBE survey dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, long/short term orientation, performance orientation, and humane treatment.

Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) highlighted the findings from their cross-cultural training programs, as well as their research of managers (leaders) from 30 different companies operating in over 50 countries. Their research describes the cultural differences in the following five dimensions:

- Universalism versus particularism: Universal rights compared to the rights of the individuals.
- Communitarism versus individualism: Self-interest versus interests of the entire community.
- Neutral versus emotional: Objectivity and detachment versus effusiveness and expressiveness.
- Diffuse versus specific: Low context versus high context.
- Achievement versus ascription: Individual performance compared to position.
Virtual teams dimensions. The research of Jarvenpaa, Knoll, and Leidner (1998) focused on the dimension of trust in a global virtual team setting. The authors’ research of 75 teams operating in different countries revealed that the existence of trust among team members enables followers to take risk without fear of reprimand (Kramer and Tyler, 1996). Lastly, Jarvenpaa et al. (1998) identified four perspectives for researching the competency of trust:

- Individual personality differences (Frost, Simpson, & Maughan, 1978)
- Institutional phenomenon (Lewis & Weigert, 1985; Sitkin & Roth, 1993)
- Cross-cultural issues (Farriss, Senner, & Butterfield, 1973)
- Interpersonal relations (Cummings & Bromiley, 1996; Deutsch, 1958; Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995; McAllister, 1995)

Essential cross-cultural leadership roles. Another way scholars have investigated cross-cultural leadership competencies is through the concept of roles. Rosen, Digh, Singer, and Phillips (2000) studied over 75 CEOs and 1,058 participants operating in 18 different countries. The authors presented several different views of cultural intelligence (CQ), which they referred to as global literacy. Of particular interest to this literature review is the perspective of cultural literacy. The authors explained that this perspective helps cross-cultural leaders value and leverage cultural differences. Rosen et al. also described roles essential for cross-cultural leadership such as proud ancestor (understanding and appreciating heritage), inquisitive nationalist (insatiable curiosity for foreign cultures), respectful modernizer (learning how to apply elements of other cultures to own culture), cultural bridger (celebrating commonalities of foreign cultures...
and overcoming differences), and global capitalist (balancing capitalism and social responsibility in a global business platform).

**“Common sense” competencies.** Peterson (2004) identified the following 11 “common sense” traits or competencies that can lead to success for cross-cultural leaders: (1) cultural self-awareness, (2) cultural awareness of others, (3) cultural sensitivity, (4) cross-cultural communication skills, (5) tolerance for ambiguity, (6) flexibility, (7) open-mindedness, (8) humility, (9) empathy, (10) outgoing personality, and (11) self-reliance. Peterson suggested that cross-cultural leaders should focus on the traits they perceive as weaknesses and develop an action plan to transform their weaknesses into strengths.

**Desired mental characteristics.** Jokinen et al. (2005) provided a detailed review and analysis of existing cross-cultural leadership and other related literature. The major benefit of this research is that it incorporated the main findings of previous research into a comprehensive framework of cross-cultural competencies. Most importantly, the findings provided a starting point for practitioners in the field of cross-cultural leadership training. The authors identified the following list of fundamental cross-cultural leadership competencies: self-awareness (self-management), engagement in personal transformation, and inquisitiveness.

In addition, the research of Jokinen et al. (2005) provides a list of desired mental characteristics that cross-cultural leaders should possess. The authors explained that these characteristics play a major role in influencing how cross-
culture leaders interact with followers and approach certain tasks. The following is a list of desired mental characteristics for cross-cultural leaders: optimism, self-regulation, social judgment skills, empathy, motivation to work in an international environment, cognitive skills, and acceptance of complexity and its contradictions.

One particular finding in the Jokinen et al. (2005) research indicates that “…more understanding is needed about the importance of different types of previous experience to the development of global [cross-cultural] leadership competencies” (p. 212). Thus, the underlying assumption of their research was that leaders who receive various cultural training and possess extensive international experience will exhibit essential cross-cultural leadership characteristics.

The knowledge and cognition component of cross-cultural competence consists of the following three sub-component competencies: (a) cultural awareness, (b) cross-cultural schema, and (c) cognitive complexity. The cultural awareness competency looks at evidence that contributes to the factors that help individuals understand what factors shape their own beliefs, values, and behaviors and how they relate to a cultural context (Abbe et al., 2007). Cross-cultural schema refers to cultural-general knowledge “abstracted from specific cultures or experiences on which it is based” (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 14). Lastly, the cognitive complexity competency refers to the leader’s ability to work outside his/her own culture and deal with complex, unexpected situations and apply the knowledge learned in future situations.
The affect and motivation component of cross-cultural competence consists of the following three sub-component competencies: (a) attitudes and initiative, (b) empathy, and (c) need for closure. The attitudes and initiative competency reflects the leader’s attitude and disposition to understanding and interacting with a specific culture. The empathy competency refers to the leader’s ability to “put oneself in another’s shoes or to behave as if one could” (Ruben, 1976, p. 340). Lastly, the need for closure competency refers to the leader’s need to find resolution and to entertain new information that may conflict with the quest to find those answers (Kruglanski & Webster, 1996). The need for closure competency can negatively impact a leader’s cross-cultural competency because of the leader’s need for predictability, structure, and low tolerance for ambiguity (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994).

The skills component of cross-cultural competence consists of the following three sub-component competencies: (a) interpersonal skills, (b) self-regulation, and (c) flexibility. The interpersonal skills competency refers to the leader’s ability to initiate and engage in conversation as well as establishes relationships (Cui & Van Den Berg, 1991). The self-regulation competency refers to a leader’s ability to control emotion and manage and cope with stress. Lastly, the flexibility competency refers to the leader’s ability to adapt to surrounding environments and cultural contexts.

**Mendenhall et al. core cross-cultural leadership dimensions.**

Mendenhall et al. (2008a) conducted research on cross-cultural leadership literature and its associated competencies. The authors’ literature review
revealed, “Social scientists have delineated over fifty competencies that influence global [cross-cultural] leadership effectiveness” (p.1). However, many of these competencies overlap conceptually and are often separated only by semantic differences in the labels given them by the researcher. As a result, the authors were able to group the numerous competencies found within the literature review into six core dimensions: (a) cross-cultural relationship skills, (b) traits and values, (c) cognitive orientation, (d) global business expertise, (e) global organizing expertise, and (f) visioning.

Mendenhall et al. (2008a) further summarized the competencies into three broad facets or dimensions for individuals: “the cognitive/perceptual, other/relationship, and self/self-efficacy domains” (p. 6). As a result, the authors’ research has led to the development of the following cultural measurement inventories: the Global Competencies Inventory (GCI) and its streamlined version, the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES). The authors renamed the three broad dimensions for the purposes of clarity and pedagogy. The renamed dimensions for both the GCI and IES are illustrated in Table 2.2.
Table 2.2

Renamed Broad Dimensions for Global Competencies Inventory and Intercultural Effectiveness Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad Dimensions</th>
<th>Global Competencies Inventory (GCI)</th>
<th>Intercultural Effectiveness Scale (IES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive/Perceptual</td>
<td>Perception Management</td>
<td>Continuous Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Relationship</td>
<td>Relationship Management</td>
<td>Interpersonal Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>Self-Management</td>
<td>Hardiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from “Specification of the Content Domain of the Global Competencies Inventory (GCI),” by M. Mendenhall, M. Stevens, A. Bird, and G. Oddou, 2008a.

In summary, there are several successful models, which are followed by cross-cultural leaders such as situational contingency leadership and transformational leadership, particularly as developed by Burns (1978). The effectiveness of the chosen leadership model is determinant upon the behaviors demonstrated by global and cultural leaders. The work of Early and Ang (2003), Harris and Moran (1996) and Javidan and Hauser (2004) identify the dimensions and behaviors that are vital to effective cross-cultural leadership. These attitudes and behaviors can be measured for the purpose of appraising and developing effective leadership traits in individuals.

**Measures of Cross-Cultural Competence**

In response to the need for cross-cultural leadership competence, many scholars and organizations have invested considerable resources to develop measures and tools needed to develop their leaders. For example, some consulting firms have focused their research on developing tools to supplement
their training and coaching services (Abbe et al., 2007). Other organizations focused research toward a specific population, such as to assess the cross-cultural skills of counseling psychologist (e.g., the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory, LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991). Thus, there is a plethora of measures to aid organizations in preparing their leaders for roles in cross-cultural environments. Abbe et al. (2007) provided a table of key measures for cross-cultural competence (Appendix D). However, this table only lists measures that provide evidence of validity and can be generalized to other populations. The following section will provide synopsis of these measures based on the following cross-cultural competence constructs: (a) multi-dimensional, (b) developmental, (c) trait-based, (d) behavior, and (e) others.

Cross-cultural competence as a multi-dimensional construct. Cross-cultural competence is a measurable multi-dimensional construct. Several examples of this construct are seen in the evaluation of cultural intelligence (CQ), which analyzes a person’s ability to function in culturally diverse situations, and the Munroe Multicultural Attitude Scale Questionnaire (MASQUE). These multi-dimensional constructs, examined in detail below, provide a method of measuring a leader’s strengths and can be used to help individuals to succeed as leaders in intercultural organizations by giving them insight into their own abilities.

Cultural intelligence (CQ). One example of a recent multi-dimensional measure of cross-cultural competence identified in the literature is the concept of cultural intelligence (CQ). CQ is defined as a person’s capability to function
effectively in situations characterized by cultural diversity (Ang et al., 2005; Earley & Ang, 2003; Earley & Mosakowski, 2005). To further explain, CQ can provide leaders with insight into their own personal capabilities, which are instrumental in helping them to cope, perform, and lead followers from different cultures in cross-cultural organizations. Thus, this measurement is accomplished through the incorporation of the four dimensions in the CQ scale: cognitive, behavioral, motivation, and strategic (meta-cognitive) (Earley, 2002; Earley & Ang, 2003).

Validation efforts for CQ are rapidly increasing in the arena of cross-cultural leadership (Abbe et al., 2007). Many scholars are developing CQ into a self-report tool format that facilitates the understanding of cross-cultural contexts (Ang et al., 2004; Kim, Kirkman, & Chen, 2008; Templer, Tay, & Chandrasekar, 2006). As well, these same scholars are exploring the predictive power of CQ as a means to explore one’s own emotions and the emotions of others to make decisions and solve problems. In addition, CQ measures can be implemented into a multi-rater, a tool for brevity (e.g., supervisor and peer ratings, behavioral observation) (Abbe et al., 2007). However, the literature cautions that the cognitive and behavioral dimensions may be subject to bias in self-reporting (Herman, Buffardi, & Tetrick, 2006).

**Multicultural Attitude Scale Questionnaire (MASQUE).** The MASQUE is another multi-dimensional construct tool, which uses a set of dimensions similar to CQ (Munroe & Pearson, 2006). However, in addition to covering the CQ dimensions of cognitive, motivational, and behavioral, the MASQUE includes
subscales such as knowing, caring, and acting. Furthermore, the MASQUE covers broader cultural topics different from CQ such as gender, race, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status. Overall, the MASQUE has an adequate Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient rating of .72 (Munroe & Pearson, 2006). The CQ and MASQUE tools are used to respectively evaluate a person’s cultural intelligence and their attitudes toward multicultural interactions. The measurements can be used to offer insight into their areas of strength and can help individuals to become successful cross-cultural leaders.

An additional construct that may be utilized is the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), which can be used in a similar fashion to evaluate a leader’s personal experiences related to differences between cultures.

**Cross-cultural competence as a development construct.** The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is an example of a developmental construct measurement tool, which can access a potential cross-cultural leader’s subjective experiences of cultural difference. The IDI uses the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity as a foundation to determine whether a leader has more of an ethnocentric (one’s own primary culture strongly influences perceptions and/or decisions) or an ethno relative orientation (leader may lack cultural awareness of host nation’s culture) towards culture (Bennett, 1986; Bennett, 1993). The IDI is comprised of five scales which all received adequate alpha reliability levels of .80 or better (DeVellis, 1991; Nunnally, 1978; Paige, Cohen, & Shively, 2004). Cross-cultural competence can be measured using multidimensional construct tools, which evaluate cultural intelligence and
multicultural attitudes. It can also be measured using a developmental construct tool to determine cultural sensitivity. Finally, it can be measured as a trait-based category using a variety of different cross-cultural measurement tools.

**Cross-cultural competence as trait-based.** The cross-cultural competence as a trait-based category consists of measures and measurement tools that access the personality traits of leaders with the objective of identifying essential predictors of cross-cultural effectiveness (Matsumoto et al, 2001). Examples of trait-based cross-cultural measurement tools are the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire (MPQ) (Van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2000), the Intercultural Adjustment Potential Scale (ICAPS) (Matsumoto et al., 2001), the Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory (ICSI) (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992), and the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI) (Kelley & Meyers, 1995).

**Multicultural personality questionnaire (MPQ).** Another of a tool, which can help access cross-cultural leadership competencies, is the MPQ. The MPQ uses the following personality trait subscales to access a leader’s cultural-competency: empathy, emotional stability, social initiative, open-mindedness, and flexibility (Van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2000; Van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2001). The literature provides evidence that the MPQ subscales correlate with more general personality constructs.

**Intercultural adjustment potential scale (ICAPS).** The ICAPS uses the following personality trait subscales to access a leader’s cultural-competency: emotion regulation, openness, flexibility, and creativity (Matsumoto et al., 2001).
The creativity subscale is also referred to as critical thinking (Matsumoto et al., 2001).

**Cross-cultural adaptability inventory (CCAI).** The CCAI is comprised of subscales from both the trait (flexibility/openness, emotional resilience, personal autonomy) and skill (perceptual acuity) categories (Kelley & Meyers, 1995). This tool is heavily used in measuring the outcome of training programs (e.g., Goldstein & Smith, 1999). However, there appears to be little to no evidence of the CCAI’s validity in the literature. Also, “despite frequent use in training programs, the CCAI lacks sufficient evidence to warrant further use” (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 31).

**Cross-cultural competence as behavioral aspect.** Scholars have also developed tools to access cross-cultural competence for the behavioral aspect. Behavioral measures assess cross-cultural behaviors that enable leaders to be successful in cross-cultural settings and organizations (Hammer, 1987). Most importantly, the behavior measures competencies that facilitate effective communication (Martin & Hammer, 1989). One such measurement tool is the Behavioral Assessment Scale for Intercultural Communication Effectiveness (BASIC) (Koester & Olebe, 1988). The BASIC is comprised of the following behavioral subscales: respect, interaction posture, empathy, task roles, relational roles, interaction management, orientation to knowledge, and tolerance for ambiguity (Koester & Olebe, 1988).

**Other measurement approaches.** Other measurement tools using different approaches have been developed in response to the increase in cross-
cultural leadership research (e.g., Elmer, 1987; Myeni, 1983; Towers, 1990). Examples of recently developed cross-cultural measurement tools are the Situational Judgment Test for Cross-Cultural Interactions (CCSI SJT) (Ascalon, 2005), Cross-Cultural Adaptability Scale (CCAS) (Vanderpool, 2002), and Global Competencies Inventory (GCI) (Mendenhall et al., 2008a).

**Situational judgment test for cross-cultural interactions (CCSI SJT).**
One example of a different approach in measuring cross-cultural competency is CCSI SJT (Ascalon, 2005). This particular measurement focuses on the subscales of empathy and ethnocentrism. The CCSI SJT provides participants with an empathy-ethnocentrism quadrant result of their cross-cultural competency. However, further development and testing is needed to strengthen the CCSI SJT validity (Abbe et al., 2007).

**Cross-cultural adaptability scale (CCAS).** The CCAS is another example of a different approach to cross-cultural competency measurement. The CCAS was essentially designed to evaluate and guide training military personnel for peacekeeping operations (Vanderpool, 2002). The CCAS is comprised of the following six factors: (a) interpersonal relations/sense of identity, (b) openness to experience, (c) organizational goals, (d) cross-cultural experience, (e) personal goals, and (f) problem solving.

**Global competencies inventory (GCI).** The Global Competencies Inventory (GCI) provides an assessment of the likelihood that cross-cultural leaders will be able to work effectively in cross-cultural environments. The GCI consists of a combination of global and cross-cultural categories that include
cognitive/perceptual, relationship, and self-orientation dimensions, which are labeled as perception management, relationship management, and self-management respectively (Mendenhall et al., 2008a).

The GCI Perception Management dimension “examines how people [cross-cultural leaders] cognitively approach cultural differences” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 5). It is comprised of the following five competency scales: (a) nonjudgmentalness, (b) inquisitiveness, (c) tolerance of ambiguity, (d) cosmopolitanism, and (e) category inclusiveness. The GCI Relationship Management dimension examines a cross-cultural leader’s “orientation toward the importance of relationships in general; how aware they are of others and their interaction styles, values, etc...” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 10). It is comprised of the following five competency scales: (a) relationship interest, (b) interpersonal engagement, (c) emotional sensitivity, (d) self-awareness, and (e) social flexibility.

The GCI Self-Management dimension examines a cross-cultural leader’s “strength of identity and their ability to effectively manage emotions and stress” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 14). It is comprised of the following seven competency scales: (a) optimism, (b) self-confidence, (c) self-identity, (d) emotional resilience, (e) non-stress tendency, (f) stress management, and (g) interest flexibility.

**Cross-Cultural Leadership Common Themes**

The literature review of previous cross-cultural leadership research helps highlight the recurring common cross-cultural leadership competencies,
characteristics, behaviors, and dimensions. However, in practice, the review also alludes to a need for more empirical research to validate these findings (Jokinen et al., 2005). According to the literature review, communication, empathy, flexibility, open-mindedness/openness, trust and transformation were prevalent themes throughout the cross-cultural leadership body of knowledge.

The communication theme involves the cross-cultural leader’s ability to interact with host nation counterparts or subordinates through “shared feelings, beliefs, and ideas to an exchange of wants and needs to clear action steps and mutual commitments” (Harkins 1999, pg. xii). Communication is a medium, which enables cross-cultural leaders to convey empathy, trust, and inspiration among subordinates and host nation counterparts.

The empathy competency is another common theme in cross-cultural leadership (Jokinen et al., 2005). This competency refers to the cross-cultural leader’s ability to “being participative and sensitive to others’ needs and assumptions” (Jokinen et al., 2005, p. 207), while expressing genuine concern for them in the process (Gregersen, Morrison, & Black, 1998).

The flexibility competency is a common cross-cultural theme, which refers to the ability and willingness to accept the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of subordinates from diverse cross-cultural backgrounds different from the leader’s own background. Most importantly, the literature indicates that cross-cultural leaders should be willing to substitute their own personal interests with interests of the host nation culture in order to facilitate relationship building (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, Mendenhall, Stevens, Bird, & Oddou, 2008b). Scholars indicate cross-

Open-mindedness/openness is another competency identified as essential to cross-cultural leadership in the scholarly body of knowledge. The open-mindedness/openness common them “refers to the extent to which one [the cross-cultural leader] is inclined to withhold or suspend judgment about persons or situations or behavior that is new or unfamiliar” (Mendenhall et al., 2008b, p. 12). Black (1990) and Shaffer et al. (2006) referred to open-mindedness/openness as the obverse of ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism is defined as “the propensity to view one’s own cultural traditions and behaviors as right and those others as wrong” (Black, 1990, p. 114).

The trust competency is a common cross-cultural theme which is built around the dimensions of honesty, fairness, and benevolence (Jarvenpaa et al., 1998). Scholars have identified this competency as an essential behavior of relationship building and cross-cultural leadership because it can prompt a willingness in host nation counterparts and subordinates to be vulnerable to the actions of the cross-cultural leader “based on the expectation that the other [cross-cultural leader] will perform a particular action important to the trustor [host nation counterpart and subordinate], irrespective of the ability to monitor that other party [cross-cultural leader]” (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995, p. 712).
Lastly, transformation competency is another common theme identified in the cross-cultural literature. The cross-cultural leadership body of knowledge explores transformation from two perspectives—personal and transformational leadership. From the personal transformation perspective, engagement in personal transformation is identified as a core competency of cross-cultural leadership (Jokinen et al., 2005). This competency also involves the leader engaging in continuous self-development of personal knowledge and skills (Brake, 1997) in order to improve cultural literacy and competence. From a transformational leadership perspective, this competency is essential to helping leaders deal with followers from diverse backgrounds and cultures (Burns, 1978). Scholars have indicated transformation in terms of leadership is the most effective approach to motivating cross-cultural organizations due to the focus of key cultural aspects such as beliefs, needs, and values (Bass, 1985; Den Hartog et al., 1999; Khunert & Lewis, 1987; Schein, 1985). Appendix E provides an overview of common cross-cultural themes and associated scholars. In addition, there appears to be a bias toward Western cross-cultural competencies in the body of knowledge (House et al., 1997). Moreover, the literature review reveals limited research on cross-cultural leadership competencies for regions of the South Pacific, Africa, Eastern Europe, and the Middle East (Bass, 1990; House et al., 1997).

**Department of Defense and the Call for Cultural Competency**

Over the past decade, the military sector of the Department of Defense (DoD) has engaged in numerous deployments in foreign locations, requiring its
military members to interface with indigenous populations (McFarland, 2005). These members often serve as diplomatic specialists, such as security assistance officers, foreign area officers, and exchange officers, to build relationships and to ensure mission success.

Due to the increase in U.S. military operations in the Middle East, “There is a growing recognition of the need for cultural awareness in [U.S.] military battle preparations, training, and doctrine” (Wunderle, 2008, p. 3). Military members serving in diplomatic and liaison roles must facilitate communications and understanding with foreign militaries and organizations (Air Force Instruction 16-109, 2006). Yukl (2006) supported the previous statement by explaining leaders “must be able to understand how people from different cultures view them and interpret their actions” and vice versa (Yukl, 2006, p. 430). Failure to understand the perspective of foreign counterparts can “often contribute to misunderstood intentions…altered perceptions, and in many instances significantly impact mutual expectations and outcomes” (Kron, 2007, p. 75). Lastly, and most importantly, “cultural values and traditions can influence the attitudes and behavior of managers in a number of different ways” (Yukl, 2006, p. 431).

Learning to influence and lead host nation counterparts can present major challenges for military members. For example, the ideas, behaviors, values, and norms between Americans and host nation counterparts can cause cultural friction, potentially building a barrier (McFarland, 2005). Accordingly, military members must understand that “imposing American values on unwilling people in a foreign country may have undesired strategic and operational consequences”
British Lieutenant Colonel Thomas Edward Lawrence, better known as “Lawrence of Arabia” stressed the importance of cultural awareness, while serving in a leadership and military advisory role to foreign counterparts (Lawrence, 1997; Kaplan, 1995). Lawrence explained that military operations and national security decisions could suffer when military members lack knowledge of foreign cultures (as cited in McFate, 2005). Abbe et al. (2007) emphasized the importance of cross-cultural competence for military members by stating:

Because early termination is not a voluntary option for military personnel as it is for Peace Corps volunteers or for expatriate managers, cross-cultural competence is likely even more important for the Army [Department of Defense] than for other contexts. Expatriate managers, Peace Corps volunteers, or students can opt to terminate and return home; military personnel do not have comparable options for early return. The implications of this difference are not trivial; deploying Soldiers and leaders without the requisite knowledge and skills to succeed may have consequences that extend far beyond the individual. The potential for individual Soldier actions to have far-reaching, sometimes strategic, consequences highlights the need for clear conceptualization and training of cross-cultural competence. In addition, these potential consequences highlight the need to consider outcomes in addition to job performance. Building interpersonal relationships across
cultural boundaries has implications for overall mission success, even after the particular individual has left the area of operations, and personal adjustment outcomes may have implications for the organization’s ability to retain and further develop individual leaders. (pp. 1-2)

Lessons learned from recent U.S. military operations in the Middle East have identified that the institutional preparation for deploying military members need considerable revisions in the language, as well as political, ideological, and cultural training domains (Center for Army Lessons Learned [CALL], 2004). There are various documented examples of what can happen when military members lack cross-cultural awareness. For example, soldiers who lacked understanding of Islamic religious practices increased animosity among the local Iraqi community. In one instance:

Iraqis arrested by U.S. troops have had their heads forced to the ground, a position forbidden by Islam except during prayers. This action offends detainees as well as bystanders…the military has enough to worry about without alienating the local population. (Skelton & Cooper, 2004, pp. 12-16)

Military members that lack cross-cultural awareness can also have difficulty in comprehending the dynamics of tribal structures, religion, and political connections. This lack of awareness has contributed to power imbalances in Iraq (Abbe et al., 2007). This lack of knowledge has caused some American forces to “disproportionately empower tribal structures, and others to virtually ignore them”
(Abbe et al., 2007, p. 2). In addition, military members who are not careful in the selection of local hired translators can ignite tribal rivalries as well as negatively impact U.S. objectives in an attempt to gain disproportionate influence (CALL, 2004).

A U.S. army infantry commander provides another example of what happens when military members lack proper cross-cultural training to understand the behavior, characteristics, and motives of the local population during military operations in Iraq. The commander stated:

I had perfect situational awareness. What I lacked was cultural awareness. I knew where every enemy tank was dug in on the outskirts of Tallil. Only problem was, my soldiers had to fight fanatics charging on foot or in pickups and firing AK47s and RPGs. Great technical intelligence…. Wrong enemy. (Scales, 2004, para. 4)

In 2004, in response to the above examples and other documented criticism, various DoD organizations conducted self-assessments of their cross-cultural awareness training for its military members. By and large, DoD rated its culture and language preparation to military members deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan as inadequate (Defense Science Board, 2004). Similarly, the U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) gave itself an overall rating of “inadequate” (p. 25). Likewise, both the United States European Command (EUCOM) and the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) have rated their ability to analyze and synthesize
social, cultural, and tribal domains associated with the evolving threats in their respectively areas of responsibility as “inadequate” as well (p. 25).

Various U.S. politicians have also identified deficiencies in cross-cultural awareness training programs for the DoD. Then ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee (HASC), Missouri Representative Ike Skelton, criticized the U.S. Armed Forces’ professional military education programs for failing to incorporate a cultural competency component into its curricula (Erwin, 2004). Congressman Skelton communicated his concern with the state of cross-cultural awareness training for U.S. military members in his memorandum to then Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld dated October 21, 2003 (Erwin, 2004). In his memorandum, Congressman Skelton wrote:

[If] we had better understood the Iraqi culture and mindset, our war plans would have better understood the Iraqi culture and mindset, our war plans would have been even better than they were, [and] the plan for the post-war period and all of its challenges would have been far better…. we must improve our cultural awareness…to inform the policy process. Our policies would benefit from this not only in Iraq, but…elsewhere, where we will have long-term strategic relationships and potential military challenges for many years to come. (as cited in Erwin, 2004, para. 2)

Subsequently, Secretary Rumsfeld responded with a memorandum that states “foreign language skill and regional expertise are essential enabling capabilities for DOD activities in the transition to and from hostilities” (as cited in
The Rumsfeld memorandum also directed all military department secretaries to transform their force by providing “stabilization and reconstruction capabilities...[but they will be] capable of operating in a range of cultures and languages...” (as cited in Wunderle, 2008, p. 4). Furthermore, the Rumsfeld memorandum tasked the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to develop measures for evaluating and reporting the cross-cultural development of military personnel (Wunderle, 2008).

Retired Major General Robert H. Scales, Jr., former Commander of the U.S. Army War College and Deputy Chief of Staff for Doctrine, supported Skelton’s argument by testifying before the House Armed Services Committee (HASC) on October 21, 2003. Major General Scales testified that there is an urgent need to immerse military leaders in the language, culture, and history of a region in order to be effective in interacting with local populations and collecting credible intelligence (Scales, 2004). One year later, Major General Scales further argued for cross-cultural training for military members during his July 15, 2004 appearance before the HASC:

So far we have spent billions to gain a few additional meters of precision, knots of speed or bits of bandwidth. Some of that money might be better spent in improving how well our military thinks and studies war in an effort to create a parallel transformational universe based on cognition and cultural awareness...[Reflective senior officers] are telling us that wars are won as much by creating alliances, leveraging nonmilitary advantages, reading intentions,
building trust, converting opinions, and managing perceptions—all
tasks that demand an exceptional ability to understand people, their
culture, and their motivation… [T]oday’s military is so overstretched
that it may become too busy to learn at a time when the value of
learning has never been greater. (p. 203)

Military training programs. As previously stated in this chapter, recent
DoD self-assessments and other political criticism have identified deficiencies in
military cross-cultural training programs. For example, although the Defense
Language Institute Foreign Language Center is considered to be one of DoD’s
premier language-training center for military members transitioning into roles as
foreign area officers, there is limited cross-cultural awareness training in the
program’s curriculum “despite clear guidance from the Defense Foreign
Language Program as described by the National Security Agency (NSA) and the
Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)” (Sampson, 1999, p. 74).

The body of literature indicates a lack of evidence that DoD cross-culture
training programs address the essential characteristics and competencies of
cross-cultural leadership highlighted earlier in this chapter. Likewise, the various
U.S. military cross-cultural training manuals and doctrinal publications do not
adequately address the concepts and competencies associated with cross-
cultural awareness (Abbe et al, 2007). Only a few civilian publications address
this deficiency. Glen Fisher’s (1997) Mindsets: The Role of Culture and
Perception in International Relations; Margaret K. (Omar) Nydell’s (2002)
*Arab Mind* “are three books that military leaders at all levels might consult before deploying to the Middle East” (Wunderle, 2008, p. 8). Furthermore, DoD cross-cultural training only “generally offer programs that are not comprehensive in nature; that is, the training is restricted to environmental briefing, basic culture orientation, and some language training” (Harrison, 1994, p. 19). Aspects of military cross-cultural awareness programs often tend to be overly simplistic, focusing mainly on behavioral guidelines or points of etiquette (Wunderle, 2008). Kron (2007) best summarized the deficiency in the DoD cross-cultural training programs by stating:

> The United States Department of Defense professionals who engage with our Middle Eastern partners are generally well prepared to deal with the obvious cultural differences. U.S. service members and particularly those involved in implementing security cooperation activities in the Middle East receive effective “cultural awareness” training, but the scope and depth is primarily to avoid embarrassing social offenses. (p. 75)

As a result of the increased need for cultural competency training for military leaders, various branches of the U.S. Armed Forces have overhauled their doctrines. Then Lieutenant General David H. Petraeus, commander of the Combined Arms Center at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, led the initiative to integrate cultural competency into the Army’s doctrine as well as the curriculum for Army professional military education. In addition, he collaborated with the U.S. Marine Corps’ Lieutenant General James F. Amos to incorporate cultural
competency training into the joint DoD military branch arena (U.S. Army, 2006). Accordingly, the new emphasis on cross-cultural training has prompted the DoD to develop and implement various military programs and documents to help provide military members with a certain level of cultural literacy and competency before serving as cross-cultural leaders in the Middle Eastern Region. A list of cross-cultural training programs and documents is contained in Appendix A.

McFarland (2005) indicated that culturally literate military members have the self-awareness needed to understand and appreciated their relationships with their foreign counterparts. The author highlighted how cultural competence is an essential leadership requirement for military members due to the increase in coalition and multinational military operations for the U.S. military. McFarland (2005) also stated that the current list of military cultural training and education programs “are only mostly crafted around educating the foreign student about U.S. Cultural norms and operations rather the inverse” (p. 64). Most importantly, the author stressed that military leaders should be educated on the cultural norms and values that would be instrumental in facilitating cultural competency as well bridging “cultural differences” between the U.S. and the host nation.

**The need to validate the effectiveness of DoD cross-cultural competency programs.** As stated previously, several military cultural competency courses and documents (Appendix A) are available to help military members with “working across cultural differences” (Holmes, 2009). Although DoD organizations have recognized the need to increase the amount of cultural education programs for military members, it appears they have yet to measure
their program’s effectiveness. Further research is needed to determine if the mandated improvements to the DoD cross-cultural competency training, education, and self-development programs are focusing on the essential competencies identified in the cross-cultural leadership literature. Consequently, the U.S. Army commissioned the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) to conduct the Cultural Understanding and Language Proficiency (CULP) study. The overall goal of the CULP study was “to provide a scientific research perspective on increasing linguistic and cultural capability in the Army” (Abbe et al., 2007, p. v). In fact, one major point the CULP study highlights is that more research is needed to establish the validity of cross-cultural competencies, measures, and predictors for the military population (Abbe et al., 2007). Additionally, “research is needed to address the extent to which [cross-cultural competency] dimensions and their components are responsive to education and training” (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 36). For instance, Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, the professional military education organization for U.S. Airmen, identified the need for more “testing, surveys and other tools to measure” their cultural program’s effectiveness (Holmes, 2009, p. 18).

**Gaps and Deficiencies in the Cross-Cultural Leadership Literature**

While important research has been undertaken within the last several years to help scholars and leaders understand cross-cultural leadership and how to effectively implement the associated competencies, several gaps exist in the body of literature. This section will examine the issues associated with the lack of
a concise cross-cultural leadership definition, perceived American bias, lack of validity of associated competencies in practice, the deficiencies in military cross-cultural training programs, and most importantly, the limited research and lack of validity of associated competencies in the U.S. military population.

**Lack of a concise definition for cross-culture leadership.** Earlier, this chapter indicated that the scholarly body of literature lacks a consensually agreed-upon definition for cross-cultural leadership among scholars (Bass, 1990; Dorfman, 1996; House et al., 1997). Jokinen et al. (2005) highlighted this deficiency by explaining, “The research on global [/cross-cultural] leadership competencies is characterized by missing consensus on concise definitions and classification of such fundamental terms as “global”, “management”, “leadership”, and “competency” (p. 201).

Jokinen et al. (2005) suggested future cross-cultural leadership research; focus on developing a more concise definition, which provides an “adequate identification criteria, in order to create common understanding of the subject term” (p. 212). In the absence of a consensus, the current research used a proposed definition based on Rost’s (1992) criteria leadership definition criteria and the Harris et al. (2004) research:

…*[the ability for a leader to achieve the organization’s mission while maintaining the capability of]* operating effectively in a global environment while being respectful of cultural diversity. This is an individual who can manage accelerating change and differences. The global [/cross-cultural] leader is open and flexible in
approaching others, can cope with situations and people disparate from his or her background, and is willing to reexamine and alter personal attitudes and perceptions. (p. 25)

**Limited and biased research pertaining to the Middle Eastern region.** As previously mentioned in this chapter, there are concerns that American bias is present in current cross-cultural leadership literature (Peterson & Hunt, 1997). Likewise, several empirical studies in the cross-cultural leadership literature have identified limited research in the Middle Eastern region (Badawy, 1979; Haire, Ghiselli & Porter, 1966; Griffeth, Hom, DeNisi & Kirchner, 1980; Sirota & Greenwood, 1971; Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede, 2001; Roner & Kraut, 1977).

**Lack of research establishing valid cross-cultural competencies.** Of particular interest in the cross-cultural body of literature is the lack of evidence, establishing validity for cross-cultural competence measures in the military population (Abbe et al., 2007). The CULP study also highlights several research gaps that should be addressed to help improve cross-cultural leadership competence for military leaders. For example, the CULP study indicates a lack of research, which addresses “the extent to which the [cross-cultural] dimensions and their components are responsive to education and training” (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 36). Another research gap identified by the CULP study is the lack of a cross-cultural schema that consists of “abstract representations of concepts, situations, or events” that should be developed to aid military leaders in developing their own cross-cultural competency (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 36). Furthermore, the CULP study highlights how the current cross-cultural research
does not identify “what culture-general knowledge contributes to intercultural outcomes” as another research gap (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 37). The final example of a research gap identified in the CULP study is the issue of how the current cross-cultural body of research “has not yet addressed how regional/cultural knowledge or experiences contribute to cross-cultural (i.e., transferable) competence” (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 37).

Although the literature review of the cross-cultural leadership research findings helps highlight the recurring common cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, behaviors, and dimensions in practice (e.g. trust, flexibility, communication, transformation, openness, and empathy), the review also suggests a need for more empirical research to validate them (Jokinen et al., 2005). In addition, there appears to be a bias towards Western cross-cultural competencies in the body of knowledge (House et. al., 1997; Peterson & Hunt, 1997). Moreover, the literature review reveals there is limited research on cross-cultural leadership competencies for regions of the South Pacific, Africa, Eastern Europe, and the Middle East (Bass, 1990; House et al., 1997).

**Deficiency in military cross-cultural training protocols.** As previously mentioned in this chapter, the body of literature indicates a lack of evidence that DoD cross-cultural training programs address the essential characteristics and competencies of cross-cultural leadership highlighted earlier. The literature indicates that current DoD cross-cultural training only “generally offer programs that are not comprehensive in nature; that is, the training is restricted to environmental briefing, basic culture orientation, and some language training”
(Harrison, 1994, p. 19). Aspects of military cross-cultural awareness programs often tend to be overly simplistic, focusing mainly on behavioral guidelines or points of etiquette (Wunderle, 2006). Future research on cross-cultural leadership for the military population should focus on the competencies and predictors that would enable military members to successful leaders in cross-cultural environments (Abbe et al., 2007). The results of such research should be incorporated into the DoD cross-cultural training programs as well as the expatriate cross-cultural training programs.

Lack of research establishing valid cross-cultural competencies for military members. Most importantly, research in the area of cross-cultural leadership competency for the military population has "received very little attention and warrants closer examination" (Abbe et al., 2007, p. 36). In addition, there is limited research in on the predictors or cross-cultural competencies and dimensions that enable military members to successfully lead in cross-cultural organizations (Abbe et al., 2007). Furthermore, future research is needed to determine which cross-cultural leadership competencies are perceived as more relevant than others in a particular culture as well as the types of previous experience that enable military leaders to develop successful competencies (Abbe et al., 2007; Graf, 2004; Jokinen et al., 2005).

Summary
The current level of military deployments to places such as Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as a growing unease with service members’ ability to deal with cross-cultural issues, has increased the recognition that additional cross-
cultural assessment and training capabilities are required. This effort is hampered by competing definitions and a multitude of suggested competencies that must be fully understood. The literature review indicates that “much more empirical research is needed to test the validity and relative importance of different [cross-cultural] competencies in practice” (Jokinen et al., 2005, p. 212). The literature review also indicates there is limited empirical cross-cultural leadership research in the regions of the South Pacific, Africa, Eastern Europe, and the Middle East (Bass, 1990; House et al., 1997). Furthermore, the literature review indicates that there appears to be a lack of empirical research to analyze the effectiveness of cross-cultural training for military leaders (Abbe et al., 2007; Holmes, 2009). The literature review has discovered no evidence of research for determining the cultural competency of military members serving as cross-cultural leaders. Lastly, the literature review highlights the need for DoD to address cultural shortcomings in its professional military education and in its operating doctrine.
Chapter 3

**Method**

This chapter describes the rationale for and process utilized in the current study to aid leaders and scholars in better understanding the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, and desired behaviors needed to successfully lead and influence followers and host nation counterparts in cross-cultural organizations. As a result, this chapter will provide a detailed discussion for the following key elements for the study’s methodology: (a) population, (b) instrumentation, (c) procedures, (d) mixed-method study design, (e) limitations of the study, and (f) linguistic considerations.

**Research Objective**

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the objective of this study was to expand upon the Cultural Understanding and Language Proficiency (CULP) research conducted by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences by providing more insight into the relative importance of the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies identified in the literature review. The CULP study indicates that more research is needed to establish the validity of cross-cultural competencies, measures, and training for the military population (Abbe et al., 2007). As a result, this study investigated the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, and desired behaviors military leaders need to successfully lead and influence followers and host nation counterparts in cross-cultural organizations.
Research Questions

This study attempted to answer the following research questions, evolved from the problem statement in Chapter 1:

1. What level of cross-cultural competency do military members serving in a specific geographic region possess?

2. Which specific cross-cultural leadership competencies are exceptional and inadequate, and how does the presence or absence of these competencies affect how the host nation personnel perceive the military members?

Within the quantitative portion of the study, the investigated hypothesis was the following:

- Ho: The military population does possess an adequate or better level of cross-cultural competency, defined as GCI score ≥ 4.0.

- Ha: The military population does not possess an adequate level of cross-cultural competency, defined as GCI score < 4.0.

Study Participants

The participants for the quantitative portion of this study included 32 U.S. military officers and non-commissioned officers (Security Assistance Officers [SAOs]) who have operated as cross-cultural leaders at the Office of Military Cooperation, U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt for at least one year. The successful completion of the Middle Eastern Orientation Course at Hurlburt Field, Florida and/or a Foreign Area Officer training program or equivalent was a qualification for a research subject in this study. In addition, the qualitative portion of the study
also included open-ended interviews of six host nation followers (Foreign Service Nationals [FSNs]) who have witnessed the U.S. military officers and non-commissioned officers perform at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt and were impacted by their leadership.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, SAOs are U.S. military personnel trained to work closely with host nation counterparts and FSNs in administering Security Assistance actions (U.S. Air Force, 2006; U.S. Department of Defense, 2005). FSNs are local host nation, non-U.S. citizens hired by the U.S. Embassy to perform non-sensitive support functions (U.S. Department of State, 2009). FSNs are a valued resource for U.S. Embassies because of their subject-matter expertise, host country government contacts, and the continuity they provide the U.S. mission (Burton & Stewart, 2008). Both groups of participants provided the insightful data needed to help answer the research questions.

**Research Instruments**

This study employed a mixed-method research approach to help answer the research questions. The quantitative [QUAN] portion of this mixed-method research approach employed an instrument known as the Global Competencies Inventory (GCI) (Mendenhall et al., 2008a) to access SAOs’ perceptions of their own cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, and desired behaviors. The qualitative [QUAL] portion of this mixed-method approach consists of a carefully developed in-depth open-ended conversational-style guided interview to gain deeper understanding of the most effective and least cross-cultural leadership competencies exhibited by SAOs.
Global Competencies Inventory

Previously mentioned in Chapter 2, the GCI survey was created by Mendenhall et al. (2008a) to capture the self-reported perceptions of the cross-cultural leadership competencies and cultural adjustment of organizational leaders assigned or scheduled for assignment to cross-cultural organizations in foreign environments. The GCI was selected as the appropriate QUAN tool for this study because it consists of a combination of cross-cultural categories that include cognitive/perceptual, relationship, and self-orientation dimensions which focus on intercultural adaptability (Mendenhall et al., 2008a) as well as the majority of competencies and themes identified throughout the cross-cultural competency body of literature.

The GCI consists of 180 items and is available online (Mendenhall et al., 2008a). The results are reported by ranking the respondent’s score in three competency categories, each with two sub-scales: Low (limited or partial), Moderate (basic or good), and High (high or superior). Thus, the instrument employs a Likert scale of 1 to 6, with 1 representing “limited” cross-cultural competency and 6 representing “superior” cross-cultural competency. For the purposes of this study, “good” or the Likert score of “4” was defined as the minimum desirable level of cross-cultural competence to serve as a SAO. The competency category rankings are presented in a feedback report, which indicates the survey participant’s likelihood of being able to work and lead effectively in an environment with cultural norms different from their own.
Mendenhall et al. (2008a) indicated “that the content domain of global [cross-cultural leadership] competencies can be usefully summarized using three broad facets or dimensions for individuals: the cognitive/perceptual, other/relationship, and self/self-efficacy domains” (p. 6). Mendenhall et al. reclassified these broad dimensions as Perception Management, Relationship Management, and Self-Management for the purposes of clarity and pedagogy and incorporated them into the GCI. Each broad domain consists of subdimensions or competencies that measure the “personality predisposition associated with effective intercultural behavior and dynamic global managerial skill acquisition” (Mendenhall, Osland, Bird, Oddou, & Maznenski, 2008).

**Perception management.** The *Perception Management* domain measures how people approach cultural differences and includes the following five dimensions or competencies:

- **Nonjudgmentalness** refers to the degree to which cross-cultural leaders “withhold or suspend judgment about persons or situations or behavior that is new or unfamiliar” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 6).

- **Inquisitiveness** reflects the amount of openness cross-cultural leaders have towards a different and/or new environment. This also involves the extent cross-cultural leaders pursue “understanding ideas, values, norms, situations, and behaviors that are new and different” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 6).

- **Tolerance of ambiguity** reflects a cross-cultural leader’s “ability to manage uncertainty in new and complex situations where there is not necessarily a
‘right’ way to interpret things” (Mendenahll et al., 2008a, p. 7). Jokinen et al. (2005) identified this competency as acceptance of complexity and its contradictions.

- Cosmopolitanism reflects a cross-cultural leader’s natural interest and curiosity about the different countries, cultures, world, international events, and traveling and living abroad. Boyacigiller, Beecher, Taylor, and Levy (2004) and Levy, Beechler, Taylor, and Bayacigillar (2007) stated this is an important trait for cross-cultural leaders to possess.

- Category inclusiveness refers to the cross-cultural leader’s “tendency to cognitively include and accept things (including people) based on commonalities rather than dividing things into groups or categories” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 7).

**Relationship management.** The Relationship Management domain assesses a cross-cultural leader’s ability to develop and maintain relationships (Mendenhall et al., 2008a). This domain includes the following five dimensions or competencies:

- Relationship interest “refers to the extent to which people [cross-cultural leaders] exhibit interest in, and awareness of, their social environment” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 10).

- Interpersonal engagement “refers to the degree to which people [cross-cultural leaders] have a desire and willingness to initiate and maintain relationships with people from other cultures” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 10).
• **Emotional sensitivity** “refers to the extent to which people [cross-cultural leaders] have an awareness of, and sensitivity to, the emotions and feelings of others” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 12).

• **Self-awareness** “refers to the degree to which people [cross-cultural leaders] are aware of: (1) their strengths and weaknesses in interpersonal skills, (2) their own philosophies and values, (3) how past experiences have helped shape them into who they are as a person, and (4) the impact their values and behavior have on relationships with others” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 12).

• **Social flexibility** “refers to the extent to which individuals [cross-cultural leaders] present themselves to others in order to create favorable impressions and to facilitate relationship building” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 13).

**Self-management.** The *Self-Management* domain assesses a cross-cultural leader’s ability to maintain his/her identity and effectively manage emotions and thoughts in stressful situations (Mendenhall et al., 2008a). This domain includes the following seven dimensions or competencies:

• **Optimism** “refers to the extent to which people [cross-cultural leaders] maintain a positive, buoyant outlook toward other people, events, situations and outcomes” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 14).

• **Self-confidence** “refers to the degree to which people [cross-cultural leaders] have confidence in themselves and have a tendency to take
action to overcome obstacles and master challenges” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 15).

- **Self-identity** “refers to the extent to which people [cross-cultural leaders] maintain personal values independent of situational factors and have a strong sense of personal identity” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 16).

- **Emotional resilience** “refers to the extent to which a person [cross-cultural leader] has emotional strength and resilience to cope with challenging cross-cultural situations” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 17).

- **Non-stress tendency** “refers to the scope of the dysfunctional stressors that may influence people [cross-cultural leaders] in their daily work and social life in intercultural situations” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 17).

- **Stress management** “refers to the degree to which people [cross-cultural leaders] actively utilize stress reduction techniques in their personal lives and are willing to use new techniques in the future” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 19).

- **Interest flexibility** “refers to the willingness [for a cross-cultural leader] to substitute important personal interests from one’s own background and culture with similar, yet different interests in the host culture” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 19).

**In-Depth Open-Ended Guided Interview**

Although the GCI appears to adequately measure cross-cultural competency, it does not cover every desired characteristic and behavior identified in the body of literature. In particular, the GCI lacks dimensions for
measuring the common themes of communication and trust as identified in the cross-cultural literature. In addition, the GCI is a self-reported survey tool, which allows leaders to rank how they perceive their own cross-cultural competencies. Since distortion and unconscious influence can occur when leaders self-report their own cross-cultural competency perceptions, this study’s research design incorporated measures to compensate for the bias (Schacter, 1999). Finally, it is important to compare the perceptions of the foreign nationals with whom the SAOs interact to the self-perceptions expressed in the quantitative portion of the study. Thus, a carefully worded in-depth open-ended conversational style interview was developed to compensate for potential bias generated by self-reported surveys and to gain an understanding of external perceptions of the SAO behaviors (Schwarz & Oyserman, 2001).

The in-depth, open-ended, conversational-style, guided interview provided insight into cross-cultural leadership competencies identified as most and least effective by the survey instrument (Patton, 2002). The questions for the in-depth open-ended guided interview were structured to capture the FSNs’ general perceptions of the SAOs’ leadership abilities as well as their Perception Management, Relationship Management, and Self-Management competencies (Mendenhall, 2008a). The questions were relatively broad in nature, which allowed the FSNs to structure their responses in accordance with their own unique frames of reference using terminology they applied in everyday Egyptian-Arabic conversations.
The in-depth, open-ended, guided interview was developed through protocols identified in the literature review and the results of a pilot study conducted prior to interviews with the FSNs. The data results of the GCI drove the development of an open-ended questionnaire pilot study “to enable the researcher to understand and capture the points of view of other people without predetermining those points of view through prior selection of questionnaire categories” (Patton, 2002, p. 21). The cross-cultural competencies that fell outside the 95% confidence interval during the quantitative [QUAN] data analysis warranted further investigation and were included in the qualitative [QUAL] portion of this study. As a result, a pilot study open-ended questionnaire was developed and administered to nine FSNs to evaluate the reliability and validity of results, linguistic translation, and overall effectiveness. The pilot study helped shape and clarify the questions of the in-depth open-ended conversational style guided interview. Changes resulting from the pilot study brought more clarity and conciseness to the interview itself.

The final, in-depth, open-ended, guided interview was administered to six FSNs who have directly witnessed the cross-cultural leadership characteristics and behaviors of the SAOs. The researcher contacted each of the six FSNs by telephone and/or email and, after providing a short explanation of the purpose, requested information on approximately 39 questions (Appendix F). The questions were intended to provide a balanced analysis of the FSNs’ perceptions and experiences associated with the SAOs at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt. Each interview lasted approximately 60 minutes.
These questions were carefully-worded, open-ended, and conversational-style in nature, which allowed the FSNs to structure their responses as they preferred and in their own words as they discussed their perceptions and experiences with the SAOs at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt. Each FSN provided answers to the 39 questions using terminology that reflected their own interpretation and underlying paradigms. Each interview transcript was prepared as a set of paragraphs. Each paragraph was numbered to facilitate the coding process. The FSNs’ responses were documented and the data was transcribed into the Text Analysis Mark-up Software (TAMS) Analyzer software program for analysis.

Procedure

The QUAN data collection process involved the administration of the GCI to SAOs who have operated or are currently operating at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt for at least one year. The QUAL data collection process involved the administration of an in-depth open-ended guided interview to FSNs who have directly witnessed the cross-cultural leadership competencies of SAOs. No SAOs participated in the QUAL data collection process of this study. This study was deliberately limited to the Office of Military Cooperation at the U.S. Embassy of Cairo, Egypt. The research subjects (SAOs) and interview participants (FSNs) were selected from the available population.

Participant Selection. The request to survey and interview SAOs and FSNs was submitted to Department of Defense and State Department senior leadership at the U.S. Embassy at Cairo, Egypt for approval. The researcher
worked through the Office of Military Cooperation to obtain contact information for SAOs who have operated at the U.S. Embassy within the last five years. The data collection process was initiated with an email informing the SAOs of the impending research study and survey instructions (Appendix G). The email was sent two weeks prior to the opening of the GCI. This study sought approximately 32 volunteers (research subjects) through email notification to the SAO population in the U.S. Embassy of Cairo, Egypt. The email provided a short description of the intent of this study.

This study also sought approximately six FSN volunteers (interview participants) by sending a written memorandum to the FSN population in the U.S. Embassy of Cairo, Egypt. The memorandum was translated into Arabic and provided a short description of the intent of this study. FSNs who have worked in the Office of Military Cooperation (OMC)-Egypt, at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt for at least a five-year period were identified as potential subjects for the QUAL portion of this study.

Participant Instructions. SAOs and FSNs who agreed to participate in this study were asked to reply to the email or memorandum within two weeks after receipt of the notification. Once all volunteer acknowledgement e-mails were received, the SAOs were sent a copy of the signed Chief of Office of Military Cooperation Letter of Consent (Appendix H) and the Informed Consent Form (Appendix I). Once the SAO volunteer completed and returned the Informed Consent Forms, the website address for the research instrument (GCI) was provided to the research subjects. This study obtained permission from the Kozai
Group, Inc. to use the GCI. All respondents were provided written and verbal assurance that all individual responses would not be identifiable (Appendix I). Participation for this study was strictly voluntary.

**Study Design**

The purpose of this study is to increase the understanding of the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, and desired behaviors needed to successfully lead and influence followers and host nation counterparts in cross-cultural organizations, using a mixed-method research design. Mixed-method research involves using “multiple research methods to take advantage of the unique advantages that each method offers” (Trochim, 2005, p. 120). Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) further defined mixed-method research as “a type of research design in which QUAL and QUAN approaches are used in types of questions, research methods, data collection and analysis procedures, and/or inferences” (p. 711). Most importantly, mixed-method research offers researchers a method to mitigate the associate weaknesses of QUAL and QUAN research while capitalizing on their inherent strengths when both are conducted simultaneously (Trochim, 2005).

This study utilized Tashakkori and Teddlie’s (2003) sequential mixed-method design. The QUAN and QUAL portions received equal status. Since this project involved both QUAN and QUAL research questions, a mixed-method design is appropriate. This type of design is characterized by the development of research questions based on the data collected in the QUAN portion of the study. The QUAN instrument drives the development of the open-ended interviews for
the QUAL portion of the study. Figure 3.1 represents the research design, which was utilized for this study.

In accordance with Figure 3.1, the GCI was administered to 32 SAOs for self-reporting of their own cross-cultural leadership competencies. Next, the results of the GCI data were analyzed to draw inferences and determine which competencies required further investigation. An open-ended, pilot study questionnaire was developed and administered to the nine FSNs to determine the appropriateness of the QUAL questions and to help refine the in-depth, open-ended, conversational style interview questionnaire. In-depth, open-ended, conversational style interviews were conducted to capture how the FSNs perceived the cross-cultural competencies of the SAOs. Finally, the data from the QUAN and QUAL portions of this mixed-method study were compared and interpreted to aid in answering the research questions.
Quantitative Framework. The QUAN portion of this study captured the self-reported existing perceptions of the SAOs’ cross-cultural leadership competencies. QUAN research is best used to measure how people feel and/or think about a particular subject (Trochim, 2005). Since “quantitative measures are succinct, parsimonious, and easily aggregated for analysis" (Patton, 2002, p. 20), a validated tool, such as the GCI (Mendenhall et al., 2008a), helped facilitate
data collection related to the cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, and desired behaviors of the SAOs.

**Qualitative Framework.** As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the GCI structure does not cover every desired characteristic and behavior identified in the body of literature. In particular, the GCI lacks dimensions for measuring the common themes of communication and trust as identified in the cross-cultural literature. In addition, the GCI is a self-reported survey tool, which allows leaders to rank how they perceive their own cross-cultural competencies. In order to prevent potential bias and reduce the possibility of the research participants distorting and unconsciously influencing their results when self-reporting their own perceptions of cross-cultural leadership competencies, this research design included a measure to compensate for this bias (Schacter, 1999). Thus, carefully worded, open-ended, pilot study questionnaires and in-depth, guided, conversational style interviews were administered to FSNs to compensate for potential bias generated by self-reported surveys and to gain an understanding of external perceptions (Schwarz & Oyserman, 2001).

**Validity and Reliability.** Validity and reliability are terms heavily associated with measurement in research (Leedy & Ormrod, 2008). The validity and reliability of a researcher’s instrument can directly impact the learning value gained about the specific phenomenon the researcher is attempting to study (Leedy & Ormrod, 2008).

**Validity.** The GCI is a validated instrument specifically designed to evaluate intercultural capability (Caligiuri, Tarique & Jacobs, 2009). Numerous
global companies and organizations such as Mitsubishi Motors, Sharp, Fujitsu, and others have used the GCI to help prepare their human capital for cross-cultural roles and assignments (Kozai Group, 2008).

Bird, Mendenhall, Stevens, and Oddou (2010) conducted research which defined the domain definition of intercultural competence for cross-cultural leadership and helped established the framework for the GCI. The authors’ research established the validity of the content domain for the GCI measures rather than the statistical measurement properties of the GCI measures. The extensive review of Bird et al. (2010) cross-cultural literature proposed the GCI is comprised of “17 dimensions that have been shown to consistently emerge from the extant empirical literature” (p. 820). Additionally, Furuya, Stevens, Bird, Oddou, and Mendenhall (2009) used the GCI as one of several tools to investigate global business knowledge learning and transfer of Japanese expatriate managers. The GCI dimensions helped access the interpersonal personality characteristics of the subjects of the study (Furuya et al., 2009).

**Reliability.** Reliability of a survey instrument measures “the degree to which a measure is consistent or dependable; the degree to which it would give you the same result over and over again” (Trochim, 2005, p. 60). The GCI pilot study of 2,308 participants yielded an overall scale reliability of .86. (Mendenhall et al., 2008a).

**Human Subjects Research.** Prior to commencing this research study, successful completion of the Human Participants Protection Education for Research was obtained. In addition, the Internal Review Board of this
researcher’s college granted permission to the researcher to complete a research study using humans as the basis for obtaining data.

**Data Analysis.** The data collected for the study was analyzed using several different techniques. Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie (2003) suggested that two decisions must be made in relation to the analysis of the QUAN and QUAL data: the dominance of the approaches employed and how the different data analyses inform each other. For this study, the QUAN and QUAL data had equal dominance. Since the QUAN data was collected first, it was used to inform the QUAL portion of the study. The preliminary analysis of the QUAN data was used to help develop the interview structure for the QUAL portion of the study. Additionally, after both sets of data had been collected, the results were compared to confirm or disconfirm inferences from each approach.

The QUAN data results from the GCI were entered into the IBM® SPSS® Statistics software to test the hypothesis and to determine which competencies warranted further investigation. Since the study contained at least 30 participants, the central limit theorem allows for an assumption of a normal distribution for the mean scores of the sample data. Therefore, the Student’s T-test was used to test the null hypothesis. However, normality of the sample data is always a concern whenever Likert data are used. Moreover, normality assumptions of the sample data were evaluated and will be addressed in Chapter 4.

Ninety-five percent confidence intervals were developed for each of the QUAN dimensions. Confidence intervals that fell below and did not include a
score of “4,” were defined to be the minimum acceptable level of competence and indicated a failure to accept the null hypothesis for that scale and warranted additional qualitative investigation. The QUAL data were entered into the Text Analysis Mark-up Software (TAMS) Analyzer software program. This program allowed for the input and analysis of the QUAL data. Coding began with the process of data collection (Punch, 2005).

Appropriate categories and themes were generated from the literature review and QUAN data results (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The Text Analysis Mark-up Software (TAMS) Analyzer software program allowed coding during the data entry process. As the researcher transcribed each response from the in-depth open-ended guided interviews, the data were evaluated for subjects that might represent themes for coding. The researcher analyzed the percentage of responses for each coded theme to help determine which cross-cultural competencies FSNs felt were most important or least important to the success of SAOs operating at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt. Next, the coded QUAL data were compared to the QUAN Student’s T-test results to provide further insight into the SAOs self-reported perceptions of their own cross-cultural leadership competencies. The comparison and analysis of both the QUAN and QUAL data helped the researcher interpret and draw conclusions on cross-cultural leadership competencies of the population sample.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for this study:

1. The issues of cross-cultural competency can be measured.
2. SAOs who exhibit the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies are most likely effective leaders and diplomats.

3. The self-assessment tools provide adequate measurements of cultural competency.

Limitations

The following limitation is identified in the study: The researcher’s current military commitment and assignment only allowed this study to be conducted in the Middle Eastern country of Egypt.

Linguistic Consideration

Since English is a second language for the FSNs, linguistic accommodations were incorporated into this study. As a result, in order to alleviate problems associated with translating English text into the Arabic language, this research used the translation-back translation procedure for the closed-ended interview questionnaire (Werner & Campbell, 1970). In addition, this study used Brislin’s (1986) formulated set of guidelines for “writing new items and modifying existing ones” to optimize the translatability of the carefully worded in-depth open-ended guided interview questions (Van de Vijver & Leung, 1997, p. 38). However, the FSNs that participated in the QUAL portion of this study refused to have an interpreter present because they indicated they possessed sufficient English language skills to adequately answer the in-depth open-ended guided interview questions.
Summary

Chapter 3 illustrated the methods that were used in conducting this dissertation study. SAOs who work in the OMC-Egypt, at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt for at least a one-year period were identified as the population for this study, and online data collection in the form of the GCI instrument was detailed. This chapter revealed the research questions and the study design, via a review of its overall design, instrument, and data collection process. The following chapters will present an analysis of the study’s findings and provide interpretation of and recommendations based on the results.
Chapter 4

Findings

Chapter 3 explained the methodology for investigating the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies needed as identified in Chapter 2. For the convenience of the reader, this chapter will present the data, which was collected utilizing the Global Competencies Inventory (GCI) and interviews with Security Assistance Officers (SAOs) and Foreign Service Nationals (FSNs), respectively.

Characteristics of the Sample Population

Description of Security Assistance Officers (SAO). Of the 46 Security Assistance Officers (SAO) that were sent invitations to take the GCI survey, 32 responded for a 70% response rate. The descriptive characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 4.1. The majority of the participants were male \((n = 28, 87.5\%)\). The SAO population was comprised of commissioned officers \((n = 28, 87.5\%)\) and non-commissioned officers \((n = 4, 12.5\%)\). The majority of the SAO population had an age range from 31 to 40 years of age \((n = 18, 56.3\%)\). A small minority of the SAOs spoke Arabic as a second language \((n = 2, 6.3\%)\).
Table 4.1

Demographic Characteristics of Security Assistance Officers Sample Population for Global Competencies Inventory Survey (N = 32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Military Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Commissioned Officer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Military Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates/Technical Certificate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate/Juris Doctor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Cross-Cultural Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Institute of Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance Management</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Area Officer Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Language Ability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of Foreign Service Nationals (FSN).

Open-ended pilot study questionnaire. Of the 23 Foreign Service Nationals (FSN) that were sent invitations to take the open-ended pilot study questionnaire, nine responded for a 39% response rate. The descriptive
characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 4.2. The majority of these participants were male (n = 8, 87.5%). Also, the majority of FSNs had between 6 and 10 (n = 4, 44.4%) and 26 and 30 years (n = 4, 44.4%) of experience and an age range of 51 and 60 years of age (n = 6, 66.7%).

Table 4.2.

Demographic Characteristics of Foreign Service National Sample Population for Open-Ended Pilot Study Questionnaire (N = 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Educational Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates/Technical Certificate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In-Depth Open-Ended Conversational-Style Guided Interview.** Of the 23 Foreign Service Nationals (FSN) that were sent invitations to participate in the in-depth, open-ended, conversational-style, guided interview, six responded for a 26% response rate. The descriptive characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 4.3. The majority of the participants were female (n = 4,
The majority of FSNs had between 11 to 20 years ($n = 4, 66.7\%$) of experience and an age range from 31 to 50 years ($n = 3, 50.0\%$).

Table 4.3

**Demographic Characteristics of Foreign Service National Sample Population for In-Depth Open-Ended Conversational-Style Guided Interview (N = 6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>%n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Educational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presentation of the Research Findings**

The data were analyzed utilizing SPSS 13.0 for the quantitative (QUAN) data and Text Analysis Mark-up Software (TAMS) Analyzer for coding and analyzing of the qualitative (QUAL) data. The findings for this study were reported in relation to the following research questions:
This study attempted to answer the following research questions, derived from the problem statement:

1. Do military members serving in a specific geographic region possess an adequate or better level of cross-cultural competency?

2. Which specific cross-cultural leadership competencies are exceptional and inadequate, and how does the presence or absence of these competencies affect how the host nation personnel perceive the military members?

The investigated hypothesis within the quantitative portion of the study was, therefore:

- **Ho:** The military population does possess an adequate or better level of cross-cultural competency defined as GCI score $\geq 4.0$.

- **Ha:** The military population does not possess an adequate level of cross-cultural competency, defined as GCI score $< 4.0$.

**Quantitative Results**

The QUAN data results from the GCI were entered into the IBM® SPSS® Statistics version 18 software to test the hypothesis and determine which competencies warranted further investigation. As stated in Chapter 3, the central limit theorem allows for assumption of a normal distribution of the mean scores of the sample since this study contained 32 participants. Therefore, the Student’s T-test was used to test the null hypothesis. Each cross-cultural leadership competency variable was checked for normality both visually and analytically. An outside source was consulted to review the statistical analysis of the quantitative
portion of this study. The statistical consultant indicated that all statistical tests were used appropriately for this particular data set and assumptions necessary for conducting these tests (i.e., normality) were sufficiently met (Appendix J). An example of the normality plot for QUAN data is shown in Figure 4.1, confirmed these results. Variables were then compared using the Student’s T-test with appropriate confidence intervals. Q-Q plots for all test variables are located in Appendix K.

![Normal Q-Q Plot of Overall GCI](image)

*Figure 4.1 Normality Q-Q Plot of overall Global Competencies Inventory statistical results*

Ninety-five percent confidence intervals were developed for each of the QUAN dimensions. Confidence intervals that fell below and did not include a
score of “4,” were defined to be the minimum acceptable level of competence and indicated a failure to accept the null hypothesis for that scale and warranted additional QUAL investigation.

The 95% confidence interval for the overall GCI scores included 4.0, therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected. The mean for the overall GCI scores was 4.81. Figure 4.2 illustrates where the overall GCI scores, 17 dimensions, and three overarching dimensions fall in relationship to the 95% confidence interval.

![Chart showing 95% confidence interval for Security Assistance Officer population](image)

*Figure 4.2. Ninety-five percent confidence interval chart for Security Assistance Officer population.*
According to the Figure 4.2, the SAOs scored exceptionally high in the Self-Management (mean = 4.91) overarching dimension, and the self-identity (mean = 4.66) and self-confidence (mean = 4.50) dimensions. The Tukey-Kramer procedure was used to determine the statistical significance among the GCI overarching dimensions. The results, presented in Table 4.4 indicate there was a level of significance between Self-Management (mean = 4.91) and Relationship Management (mean = 3.91).

Table 4.4

Tukey-Kramer Analysis Global Competencies Inventory Overarching Dimensions Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self Management</th>
<th>Perception Management</th>
<th>Relationship Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Management</td>
<td>-0.77844</td>
<td>-0.24719</td>
<td>0.22156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception Management</td>
<td>-0.24719</td>
<td>-0.77844</td>
<td>-0.30969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Management</td>
<td>0.22156</td>
<td>-0.30969</td>
<td>-0.7784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, the SAOs scored low in the tolerance of ambiguity (mean = 3.38), self-awareness (mean = 3.31), social flexibility (mean = 3.34), and emotional sensitivity (mean = 3.22) dimensions. The exceptionally high and low dimensions’ mean scores and Student T-test 95% confidence intervals results warrant further investigation. The confidence intervals for Perception Management (mean = 4.38) and Self-Management (mean = 4.91) overarching dimensions and the remaining dimensions included a score of 4.0 in the 95%
confidence interval. A more detailed breakdown of the statistical results for the GCI scores is located in Appendix K.

**Qualitative Results**

Data from the pilot study questionnaires and in-depth, open-ended interviews were entered into the TAMS Analyzer software program and coded beginning with an initial framework for gathering the themes from all of this information. The initial framework on the importance of cross-cultural leadership competencies needed for U.S. military members included the following categories which were derived from the individual dimensions contained in the GCI: *nonjudgmentalness, inquisitiveness, tolerance of ambiguity, cosmopolitanism, category inclusiveness, relationship interest, interpersonal engagement, emotional sensitivity, self-awareness, social flexibility, optimism, self-confidence, self-identity, emotional resilience, non-stress management,* and *interest flexibility.* As the interview transcripts were entered, each statement was evaluated for coding into one of these categories.

In the process of entering transcripts, additional subjects emerged and were added as separate coding categories. These included the following: *category inclusiveness, communication, cosmopolitanism, emotional resilience, emotional sensitivity, inquisitiveness, interest flexibility, interpersonal engagement, leadership, non-stress tendency, nonjudgmentalness, optimism, relationship interest, self-awareness, self-confidence, self-identity, social flexibility, stress management, tolerance of ambiguity* and *trust.* Overall, the nine questionnaires and six interviews generated a total of 156 positive and negative
comments, which contained 874 references to cross-cultural themes as identified in the literature review. Some of the codes added during the data collection and data analysis received only a few references from a few sources and therefore did not emerge as themes, but these codes did provide a framework for understanding the data. The code categories, which emerged as themes were mentioned by four or more sources with at least six or more references, are presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5

Themes with Six or More References Related to Security Assistance Officer

Cross-Cultural Leadership Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Reference Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empathy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Sensitivity (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Sensitivity (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Ambiguity (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Flexibility (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Awareness</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Engagement (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Interest (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquisitiveness (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Resilience (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitanism (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Identity (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open-mindness / Openness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonjudgmentalness (GCI Dimension)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Concepts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 121
These themes fell into two categories related to the cross-cultural leadership competencies of SAOs. The first category was comprised of the common characteristics, traits, or themes identified in the cross-cultural literature. The literature review highlighted the recurring common cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, behaviors, and dimensions in practice (Jokinen et al., 2005). According to the literature review, communication, empathy, flexibility, open-mindedness/openness, trust and transformation were prevalent themes throughout cross-cultural leadership body of knowledge. The second category was comprised of other diverse cross-cultural themes not included in the GCI, but identified by the FSNs as having positively and negatively impacted them whenever they interacted with the SAOs at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt. These included the characteristics and concepts of favoratism, respect, family, humor, and fairness. The following section provides a summary of results for each of the themes identified during the QUAL portion of this study. A more detailed overview of QUAL results is located in Appendix L.

**Common Cross-Cultural Leadership Themes**

The cross-cultural leadership competency themes of communication, transformation, trust, empathy, flexibility, and open-minded/openness were identified in the literature review as essential characteristics, traits, and behaviors necessary for leading diverse members in cross-cultural organizations. The following section presents examples of significant responses generated by the in-depth, open-ended, guided interviews.
Communication. As mentioned in Chapter 2, communication appeared to be an important theme that enabled cross-cultural leaders to convey empathy, trust, and inspiration among host nation counterparts and followers. The theme of communication was mentioned by five sources in 31 different references. This theme received 10 positive references and 18 negative references. As mentioned in Chapter 3, this theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ ability to interact with host nation counterparts or subordinates through “shared feelings, beliefs, and ideas to an exchange of wants and needs to clear action steps and mutual commitments” (Harkins, 1999, pg. xii). This theme evolved from responses describing how the FSNs perceived how the SAOs communicated and listened to them and other associates. Examples of interviewee responses for the communication theme included the following:

FSN #1 stated that U.S. military leaders are good at using documentation to record employee progress and communicating organizational goals and requirements and felt that military leaders are good at providing both oral and written directions as well as follow-up. FSN #2 indicated that Americans do not always include FSNs in the communication process. FSN #2 noted that the Americans do not courtesy-copy FSNs on emails, which indicates disrespect and a lack of coordination.

In addition, the FSNs indicated that poor communication can negatively impact the SAOs’ decision-making and relationship with the FSNs. According to FSN #1, military leaders at the U.S. Embassy do not have the whole picture
when speaking to a single FSN. FSN #1 explained that SAOs are not getting true perspective from the FSN population as a whole. As a result, FSN #1 inferred that SAOs should be cautious whenever a FSN makes a statement on behalf of the FSN population because that FSN's motivation may for personal gain.

FSN #1 added that the U.S. military members normally respond to confusion (ambiguity) with sarcasm. FSN #1 claimed, “They (military) tend to not trust FSNs numbers [data], knowing maybe the information is not eventually correct. They often make fun of any information they sense is not completely accurate and will not use it.” FSN #1 felt that U.S. military members should try to work with the FSN responsible for gathering the data to determine “how correct” the data is and to develop a plan to acquire the most accurate data.

In accordance with the prevalent theme of communication identified in Chapter 2, the FSNs indicated the SAOs fail to properly use communication to instill a sense of trust. For example, FSN #1 stated military members try to make FSNs feel comfortable in order to get them to open up and express themselves freely. However, FSN #1 also noted that U.S. military members hide behind military regulations when they are not confident, rather than soliciting feedback from FSNs and using sound judgment. In his/her opinion, the U.S. military members are very clear and direct in their communication to FSNs, providing steps and a timeline. However, the FSNs do not like being treated as if they are in the U.S. military.

FSN #3 indicated that the U.S. military does not truly understand the Egyptian culture. For example, FSN #3 felt that U.S. military members attempt to
communicate by joking, smiling, and lifting the lines of class and rank to interact with the FSNs. FSN #3 stated, “If the Americans truly understood the Egyptian culture, they would know that doing this is a bad thing. If you are in a higher class or different position than a FSN, you will lose the respect of the rest of the FSNs if you interact with them in a very familiar way.”

FSN #3 claimed that Egyptians do not usually present new ideas to the U.S. military members, for several reasons. First, the U.S. military members always feel that their ideas are better. Secondly, the Americans do not solicit input from the FSNs or make them a part of the decision-making process. FSN #3 felt that Americans are very naïve about Egyptian culture, and they do not study the Egyptian characteristics and behaviors in any depth. FSN #3 also observed that Americans are very direct, while FSNs are very indirect.

FSN #4 believed that older U.S. military members are better at communicating than younger U.S. military members. In FSN #4’s opinion, senior leadership is fairly good at communicating and soliciting input from FSNs because their training and experience enable them to understand culture better. However, FSN #4 said that the younger U.S. military members have a harder time communicating.

In FSN #5's opinion, it is a privilege for the Americans that the Egyptians can speak English and can communicate with them. FSN #5 believed that FSNs are more willing to change and accommodate others than Americans are; for example, the Germans and French will not speak to Americans in English, even though they may know how to speak English because they feel that visitors
should be able to speak their language. FSN #5 said that the FSNs try to speak English and be flexible.

According to FSN #5, positive or negative interactions depend on the character of the military member. FSN #5 mentioned a U.S. military member who was responsible for inspecting their building, and s/he said that this individual was very strict and directive in how he spoke to him/her. Instead of having a dialogue to determine how they could correct the problems, the military member just dictated to him/her what was wrong. As stated in Chapter 2, being able to clearly and effectively communicate with host nation counterparts and followers can promote an environment of trust.

**Transformation.** The theme of *transformation* was mentioned by five sources in 123 different references. This theme received 56 positive references and 58 negative references. The concepts that evolved from responses of how the FSNs view the personal and transformational leadership of the SAOs are comprised of the following associated subthemes: *cultural awareness, interpersonal engagement, relationship interest, inquisitiveness, self-confidence, emotional resilience, cosmopolitanism, stress management,* and *self-identity.*

**Cultural awareness.** The theme of *cultural awareness* was mentioned by five sources in 26 different references. As stated in Chapter 3, *cultural awareness* is defined as the act of understanding the need to consider cultural terrain and using information extrapolated from the environment in decision-making (Wunderle, 2008). This theme received six positive references and 16 negative references. This theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs
perceived the SAOs’ understanding of Egyptian culture. Examples of interviewee responses for the *cultural awareness* theme included the following:

Many of the survey participants felt that Americans are lacking in cultural understanding. For example, FSN #1 indicated that someone at the Office of Military Cooperation should be assigned as a cultural expert. FSN #2 noted that Americans never ask for the opinions of FSNs; in this participant's opinion, Americans do not try to understand the Egyptian culture unless something bad happens. FSN #2 felt that most Americans are not properly educated about the Egyptian culture.

FSN #2 noted that Americans do not seem to care and that they never fully try to address the [cultural awareness] problems. Finally, FSN #2 stated, “Americans know very little about Egyptian culture. They do not use their own hearts and brains to develop relationships. They tend to rely on outside sources and recommendations.”

FSN #3 provided both positive and negative feedback. FSN #3 felt that some American officers get closer to the human aspect of leadership and learn and understand why Egyptians are a certain way. FSN #3 believed that their efforts add more dimension and depth to cultural understanding, which helps Americans to become more tolerant. On the other hand, FSN #3 noted that some U.S. military members are very judgmental. FSN #3 also claimed that many service members come to Egypt with pre-conceived notions of Egypt and Egyptians. For instance, one officer would say, “I know Egyptians...” and would be convinced that all Egyptians would act in a certain manner. FSN #3 also
indicated that if Americans do not understand something about the culture or Egyptian process, they often dismiss the issue.

**Interpersonal engagement.** The theme of *interpersonal engagement* was mentioned by five sources in 21 different references. This theme received 13 positive references and eight negative references. As indicated in Chapters 2 and 3, interpersonal engagement promotes relationship development and strong rapport (Mendenhall et al., 2008a). The theme evolved from the responses showing how the FSNs perceived the SAOs “desire and willingness to initiate and maintain relationship” (Mendenhall et al., 2008a, p. 10). Examples of interviewee responses for the *interpersonal engagement* theme included the following:

FSN #1 stated that the Office of Military Cooperation has invested a considerable amount of their social budget to promote relationship among FSNs and host nation counterparts. According to FSN #2, Americans mainly mingle with FSNs during social events; s/he felt that Americans should interact more on a daily basis. FSN #2 also shared that it is rare for a FSN in the organization to feel a true or sincere feeling of friendship. FSN #2 stated that there is a lack of a sincere natural relationship between the FSNs and U.S. military members; the relationships are merely professional. Most FSNs develop friendships for personal gain.

FSN #3 indicated that the Americans are good about routine visits with their Egyptian counterparts if they have a personal friendship. FSN #3 claimed that Americans are not judgmental when they deal with Egyptians one-on-one.
However, s/he noted that professional friendships between the Americans and Egyptians were never equal. In his/her opinion, some officers think they are above FSNs.

FSN #4 observed that Americans do not get very close with the FSNs. In FSN #4’s experience, Americans tend to keep their distance, but they would interact when the FSN's family members were around. FSN #5 felt that it depended on the character of the service member. Some U.S. military members are open and willing to be social and engaging, while other members stand behind their uniforms and do not fully engage with FSNs.

**Relationship interest.** The theme of *relationship interest* was mentioned by five sources in 15 different references. This theme received seven positive references and eight negative references. As mentioned in Chapter 2, cross-cultural leaders with a high level of relationship interest tend to be more curious about host nation counterparts and followers with cultures different than their own (Mendenhall et al., 2008a). In turn, this high level of *relationship interest* enables cross-cultural leaders to develop relationships with host nation counterparts and followers that promote a sense of *trust* within the organization (Mendenhall et al., 2008a). The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ awareness of and curiosity about their social environment. Examples of interviewee responses for the *relationship interest* theme included the following:

FSN #1 noted, “U.S. military members do their best to attend cultural events such as birthdays, picnics, Iftars [Ramadan] evening feast meal], etc. This is a good thing. When they have a chance to develop a relationship during
working hours, it improves the perception of the individual through the eyes of the FSN.” FSN #1 also stated, “The Office of Military Cooperation has invested a considerable amount of their social budget to promote relationship among FSNs and host nation counterparts.”

FSN #3’s positive relationship interest theme responses included, “I like it very much when they set up golf tournaments and donate the proceeds to charity.” FSN #3 also noted, “The best way to communicate with FSNs is through discussion of their family. Family is the way to friendship. If I want to know a person, I can learn a lot about them by asking about their family.” In his/her negative relationship interest theme response, FSN #3 stated, “An officer thought he could make an impact with the Egyptian military with weekly meetings. He was ridiculed by the other American officers for investing so much time on one-on-one meetings with the Egyptian military. His colleagues felt that little benefit will come from them.”

FSN #4 believed Americans show interest in many Egyptian events. FSN #4 claimed that Americans do not make jokes about [the Muslim] religion or make vulgar remarks in front of the ladies. FSN #4’s negative relationship interest theme responses included several observations. For example, FSN #4 stated, “I don’t think the Americans get that close with the FSNs. They keep some distance from having, but will interact when the FSNs’ family members are around.”

FSN #5 felt that U.S. military members should soften their approach when it comes to dealing with confusion and bureaucracy in Egypt. FSN #5 noted that
U.S. military members depend upon the FSNs to resolve the confusion associated with working in Egypt. FSN #5 said, “In the Middle East, we have a way of ‘socializing’ the business to get what we want. The military members do not have this ability.”

**Inquisitiveness.** The theme of inquisitiveness was mentioned by five sources in 14 different references. This theme received six positive references and seven negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs' willingness to attempt to understand “underlying reasons for cultural differences and to avoid stereotyping” and capacity to learn and grow from the situation (Mendenhall, 2008a, p. 6). Examples of interviewee responses for the inquisitiveness theme included the following:

FSN #1 provided an example of the U.S. military members’ inquisitiveness by explaining that some U.S. military members find Egyptian traditions and culture interesting, while others stay away from this area. FSN #1 also noted, Military members are really afraid to address new ideas, thoughts, and attitudes different from their own. Normally, they stay [hide] behind their regulations to justify their reason for not using your ideas. To be nice, they will listen to you, but will normally rely on their own way of conducting business.

FSN #2 stated that the Americans started to learn more about Islam during 9-11 and that they asked more direct questions to try to understand the religion. However, FSN #2 also noted that Americans never ask for the opinions
of FSNs, and that they do not try to understand the Egyptian culture unless something bad happens.

FSN #3 shared that Egyptians do not normally present new ideas to U.S. military members; the military always feels that their ideas are better. In addition, the Americans do not solicit input from the FSNs or include them in the decision-making process. FSN #3 felt that some U.S. military members are very good leaders and claimed to have witnessed some very good examples; others, however, lack leadership ability. FSN #3 mentioned one particular commander/deputy who was very interested in what they [the FSNs] were doing for the mission. On the other hand, s/he said that some other leaders look at their assignments as a vacation or a waiting station for retirement. These leaders become totally disengaged from the FSNs.

FSN #4 indicated that the U.S. military members appreciate and value the work of the FSNs within the organization, but they are not very democratic. The leaders listen to opinions, but in the end, they always stick to their own ideas and perspectives. FSN #4 said that the U.S. military members have a good system for risk management and feedback. However, FSN #4 also witnessed that U.S. military members do not listen well to FSNs and only hear what they want to hear.

FSN #5 expressed frustration with American attitudes. FSN #5 claimed that sometimes Americans understand and appreciate the Egyptian way of doing business, but others would say, “take the American way or leave it.” FSN #5 does not believe U.S. military members ask questions about the Egyptian culture
because they want to learn for personal growth. FSN #5 said the Americans ask questions because they want to gather information and provide a report to their organization.

**Self-Confidence.** The theme of self-confidence was mentioned by five sources in 12 different references. This theme received four positive references and eight negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs' confidence in themselves and their ability to handle situations in the cross-cultural environment. Examples of interviewee responses for the self-confidence theme included the following:

According to FSN #1, the U.S. military leaders are sometimes reluctant and/or uncomfortable with dealing and/or directing FSNs. S/he said s/he could sense that the military leaders were sometimes uncomfortable about certain aspects of the culture. FSN #1 noted that the U.S. military leaders do not always feel comfortable questioning why FSNs were taking leave for religious holidays such as Ramadan. FSN #1 said that one military member felt embarrassed asking what “Ramadan was all about;” s/he stated that the military member should not have felt embarrassed if he did not know.

The FSN participants differed widely in their opinion of American self-confidence. FSN #1 noted that confident service members tend to treat and interact with FSNs in a positive manner; however, when they are not confident, they tend to hide behind military regulations, rather than soliciting feedback from FSNs and using sound judgment. According to FSN #2, it is very rare for Americans to display self-confidence. FSN #3 stated, “The U.S. military believes
in their leadership. Their confidence does not impact their relationship with FSNs. FSN #4 felt that the Americans are very self-confident.

**Emotional resilience.** The theme of *emotional resilience* was mentioned by five sources in 10 different references. This theme received six positive references and three negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ emotional strength and resilience to deal with the cross-cultural environment. Examples of interviewee responses for the *emotional resilience* theme included the following:

All of the FSNs interviewed believed that Americans are good at controlling their emotions. For example, FSN #1 felt that U.S. military members are very good at controlling their emotions when dealing with FSNs. For instance, they do not display their feelings when they are angry at FSNs or when something goes wrong. FSN #1 shared it is good to know that s/he would not get yelled at if s/he made an honest mistake. FSN #2 also noted that Americans are very good at controlling their emotions and that they are careful about not raising their voices. FSN #3 stated that it is difficult for an FSN to tell if an American officer is happy or angry because they hide their emotions so well. FSN #3 also noted that they are good at keeping distance between themselves and FSNs. However, FSN #3 felt that this distance intimidates the FSNs and creates a barrier that could hinder the “open door policy.”

FSN #5 wrote, “They can control their emotions well. There was only one example of an American that allowed their emotions [to] get out of control. This person was always nasty to me. I don’t know if she did not like me because of my
personality or I was a FSN.” Like the other FSNS, FSN #5 noted that U.S. military members try to keep their emotions to themselves; FSN #5 pointed out, for example, that during the Iraqi War the U.S. military members would not speak of events or express their feelings about their comrades dying from roadside bombs. FSN #5 found this strange and felt that they should be free to express themselves.

**Cosmopolitanism.** The theme of cosmopolitanism was mentioned by five sources in 10 different references. This theme received seven positive references and two negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNS perceived the SAO’s natural interest and curiosity about the host nation and its culture. Examples of interviewee responses for the cosmopolitanism theme included the following:

FSN #1 commented that when it comes to family, U.S. military members really appreciate the family bond in Egypt. FSN #1 stated that the U.S. military members often promote family time and encourage all organizational members to not neglect their families. FSN #2 also commented on the family theme, stating, “I like the fact that Americans are respectful of the family bond in Egypt. They will always approve leave and time off for family events.” FSN #3 only saw a focus on commonalities in religion; s/he said that Islam is almost similar to Christianity.

FSN #4 also complimented Americans on doing an excellent job of starting relationships. FSN #4 said that they show their appreciation for families by asking about family members and children, and that they are very concerned about the FSN’s personal well being; they will most likely approve any time off for
family matters. In FSN #4’s opinion, it was evident that Americans appreciate families and show that they care.

FSN #5 said that the military normally asks questions about the concept of family in Egypt. FSN #5 said that the Americans want to know how the Egyptians deal with their kids having boyfriends and girlfriends, and how long the Egyptians allow their children to live with them.

According to FSN #5, the Americans tended to focus more on the differences than the commonalities. FSN #5 said that he saw it as a privilege that the Egyptians could speak English and could communicate with the Americans. In FSN #5 opinion, the FSNs are more willing to change and try to accommodate others than Americans were.

**Stress management.** The theme of stress management was mentioned by five sources in eight different references. This theme received four positive references and three negative references. The theme evolved from responses describing how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ ability to utilize stress reduction techniques to handle stressful situations when dealing with diverse cross-cultural environments. Examples of interviewee responses for the stress management theme included the following:

The FSN interviewees offered mixed results when asked how Americans handled stress. For example, FSN #1 indicated that the Americans try to remain calm in order to get the facts, and then solve the problem. FSN #1 said that they bring a calmer presence to stressful situations, and that they would lay out the steps to solve problems. FSN #1 also said that they would sit down with the
FSNs to help analyze the problem and work together to help solve the problem. FSN #2, however, said that he did not feel Americans handled confusion well.

FSN #3 felt that U.S. military members become very frustrated with the Egyptian bureaucracy and government and are easily stressed. FSN #3 believed that FSNs handle stress well because of their religious beliefs: They feel that whatever happens to them is God’s will. Americans, on the other hand, believe that they have control over what happens to them and become stressed when they cannot control a situation. FSN #3 felt that the lack of control leads to stress. FSN #3 said that Americans manage the stress associated with a problem by having a meeting to structure the problem and by determining the course of action to correct it.

**Self-identity.** The theme of *self-identity* was mentioned by five sources in six different references. This theme received three positive references and three negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ ability to manage personal values independent of situational environment. Examples of interviewee responses for the *self-identity* theme included the following:

FSN #1 observed that Americans continue to participate in their own customs and traditions while being careful not to offend the FSNs and/or other host nation counterparts. FSN #1 used the Peace Vector Club (PV), a pub operated by U.S. military members in Maadi, a suburb of Cairo, Egypt, as an example. The PV Club is a closed environment. American service members do
not allow outsiders or FSNs to attend PV Club events during Ramadan for fear of offending someone.

According to FSN #3, Americans take pride in their military and believe that their way is the best way. FSN #3 felt that bureaucracies in Egypt and America are similar. FSN #3 noted that the U.S. military members keep their personal identities while interacting with the Egyptian culture, but this is slowly impacting the young FSNs who are working at the U.S. Embassy. FSN #3 claimed that the young Egyptian women, in particular, are picking up bad American habits.

FSN #4 expressed appreciation at hearing and having someone express their love for God without being explicit about their religion. For example, one U.S. military member demonstrated that he was a Christian during his retirement ceremony without offending a mixed audience. FSN #4 said that the way the military member conveyed his belief was a good example of how U.S. military members could focus on the commonalities. Lastly, FSN #5 stated that some U.S. military members still hold true to their Christian values while still finding a way to relate to Muslims.

**Trust.** The theme of trust as mentioned by five sources in 17 different references. This theme received one positive reference and 15 negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs' ability to exhibit honesty and benevolence when dealing with FSNs. Examples of interviewee responses for the trust theme included the following:
Many of the responses indicated a lack of trust on both sides. For example, FSN #1 felt that U.S. military members normally respond to confusion (ambiguity) with sarcasm. FSN #1 said that they tend to not trust FSNs' numbers because the information may not be correct, and that they often make fun of any information that they sense is not completely accurate and will not use it. FSN #1 felt that the Americans sometimes distrust FSNs and always seem to be asking for verification. In FSN #1’s opinion, some U.S. military members feel that FSNs are always trying to “pull one over” on the Americans.

According to FSN #1, the lack of trust occurs on both sides. FSN #1 felt that there is no perceived trust between the FSNs and U.S. military members. For example, FSN #1 said that s/he trusts certain U.S. military members, but notices that if there is a difference between a FSN and an American, then the U.S. military member will take the American side. In the end, the U.S. military members trust FSNs to do the job, but the FSNs do not trust U.S. military members to look out for their best interests.

FSN #2 felt that Americans do not trust FSNs. FSN #2 indicated that the Americans tend to hide their true feelings about people and talk behind their backs. FSN #3 had a similar opinion. FSN #3 noted that the FSNs feel that the American officers will not take care of them. FSN #3 also stated that excluding FSNs from certain meetings about the organization is not a good thing.

FSN #4 believed that there is a somewhat-adequate level of trust between the Americans and FSNs, but FSN #5 shared that the Americans view anything the FSNs say as requiring verification. FSN #5 said that there is no trust between
the Americans and FSNs, and Americans feel that there is always a hidden agenda with FSNs. However, FSN #5 thought that after the Americans deal with FSNs for a while, they begin to realize their capability and adjust their leadership accordingly.

**Empathy.** The theme of empathy was mentioned by five sources in 41 different references. This theme received 14 positive references and 27 negative references. The concepts evolved from responses of how the FSNs view the SAOs' ability of “being participative and sensitive to others' needs and assumptions” (Jokinen et al., 2005, p. 207), while expressing genuine concern for them in the process (Gregersen et al., 1998). The empathy theme is compromised of the following associated themes: respect, emotional sensitivity, and cultural sensitivity.

**Respect.** The theme of respect was mentioned by five sources in 22 different references. This theme received seven positive and 15 negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs' ability to help promote and maintain a positive feeling of esteem among the FSNs. Examples of interviewee responses for the respect theme included the following:

FSN #1 thinkought that U.S. military members often make fun of any information coming from FSNs they sense is not completely accurate and will not use it. FSN #1 felt that they respect the differences, but they feel that they are forced to get along because of federal regulation. FSN #1 also believed that U.S. military members are not always aware of how certain behaviors can be
conceived as disrespectful in the Egyptian culture. FSN #1 said that some U.S. military members have the courage to ask FSNs about why they feel a certain way about a particular situation.

FSN #3 felt that some officers are aware of how their actions would be viewed as disrespectful and some do not care. FSN #3 shared that some U.S. military members are very sensitive to the feelings of others and some are not. FSN #3 also indicated that American service members do not truly understand the Egyptian culture, or they would realize that people who are in a higher class or different position could lose the respect of FSNs by interacting with them in an overly familiar way.

FSN #4 said,

Americans give credit to FSNs for their hard work. Some do not make you feel like an outsider while working on projects. They make you feel a part of the team. This is rare…uncommon. Some Americans tend to keep FSNs behind the scenes.

FSN #4 also stated, “I believe Americans show interest in many Egyptian events. They don’t joke about one’s religion and make vulgar remarks in front of the ladies.” FSN #4 felt that the Americans should respect their credibility and knowledge. FSN #4 cited a story of how the Senior OMC leadership restricted the amount of duty-free goods that the FSNs could buy at the AAFES as an example of how Americans need to have a better understanding of how the different socioeconomic classes think. FSN #4 also mentioned a particular service member who was upset because he had to wait in line behind Egyptians
who were taking a long time buying duty-free items that should be set aside for
U.S. military members as an example of negative respect.

FSN #5 added to the topic of how military leadership dealt with the Army
Air Force Exchange Store (AAFES) policy of only allowing FSNs to buy some
quantities of duty-free food goods and consume them on Embassy property. FSN
#5 felt that the way this situation was handled was not good. In FSN #5’s opinion,
the military generalized the whole FSN population instead of focusing on the
individual offenders. FSN #5 believed that most FSNs are honest and do not
want to jeopardize this privilege, but the military punished the whole FSN
community by closely watching FSNs at the AAFES’ checkout and inspecting
their bags for excessive purchases. FSN #5 emphasized, “I’m working in the
American Embassy, and I have the same amount of risk as the Americans. I
should be treated the same way.”

**Emotional sensitivity.** The theme of emotional sensitivity was mentioned
by five sources in ten different references. This theme received five positive
references and five negative references. The theme evolved from responses of
how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ awareness of and sensitivity to the emotions
and feelings of others. Examples of interviewee responses for the emotional
sensitivity theme included the following:

FSN #2 responded to the negative emotional sensitivity question by
saying that the Americans’ assessment of FSNs’ emotions are not accurate. FSN
#2 believed that the Americans should approach everyone according to their
background. FSN #3 observed that some are very sensitive to the feelings of
others, while some are not. Lastly, FSN #4 said that the Americans are very careful to avoid speaking about sensitive subjects such as religion, clothing, etc. In contrast, the FSNs like to know what other people believe, and they have a high tendency to bring up these topics. FSN #4 said that it is good the military shies away from these topics because it avoids fanaticism. In FSN #4’s opinion, showing a tendency or preference for one particular belief or another stirs up emotions. In addition, FSN #4 believed that the FSNs will base a person’s character on one particular belief instead of looking at the whole person.

**Cultural sensitivity.** The theme of cultural sensitivity was mentioned by five sources in 11 different references. This theme received two positive references and seven negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ awareness of and sensitivity to the Egyptian culture. Examples of interviewee responses for the cultural sensitivity theme included the following:

FSN #1 stated,

Sometimes the military members cannot understand why and how FSNs feel. U.S. military members are not aware of how certain behaviors can be conceived as disrespectful in the Egyptian culture. Some (military members) have the courage to ask FSNs and about why they feel a certain way about a particular situation.

According to FSN #2, Americans tend to shy away from confusion. For instance, FSN #2 said that they focus too much on fasting during the Ramadan holiday instead focusing on the overall meaning. As a result of this lack of
understanding, the Embassy advises all Americans to not eat around FSNs and Egyptians during Ramadan.

FSN #4 mentioned a comment during a retirement ceremony, when the speaker joked that he had shoes in his closet older than the retiree, as an example of negative cultural sensitivity, since the statement was offensive to people from the Middle Eastern culture. FSN #4 also stated, “I think they should know more about the Egyptian way of thinking. In particular, they need to know how the different socioeconomic classes think.”

**Flexibility.** The theme of *flexibility* was mentioned by five sources in 17 different references. This theme received three positive references and 12 negative references. The concepts evolved from responses describing how the FSNs view the personal and transformational leadership of the SAOs. The *flexibility* theme is compromised of the following associate themes: *tolerance of ambiguity* and *social flexibility*.

**Tolerance of ambiguity.** The theme of *tolerance of ambiguity* was mentioned by five sources in 10 different references. This theme received zero positive references and nine negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ ability to manage uncertainty in new unfamiliar territory. Examples of interviewee responses for the tolerance of ambiguity theme included the following:

FSN #3 said that if Americans do not understand something about the culture or Egyptian process, they dismiss the issue. FSN #3 added that American military members become very frustrated with the Egyptian bureaucracy and
government and are easily stressed. FSN #3 believed that FSNs handle stress well because of their religious beliefs. In FSN #3’s opinion, FSNs feel that whatever happens to them is God’s will. On the other hand, Americans believe that they have control over what happens to them and become stressed when they cannot control the situation. The lack of control leads to stress.

FSN #4 did not believe that the military understands the whole culture and the way of doing business in Egypt. FSN #4 indicated that the Egyptian culture is slow to respond to any official correspondence; there is a lot of routine, bureaucracy, and paperwork. FSN #5 said that sometimes the Americans understand the Egyptian way of doing business and appreciate it, while others would say “take the American way or leave it.” FSN #5 said that this is a source for frustration for FSNs sometimes.

FSN #5 shared his/her opinion by saying,

I think they depend mostly on the FSNs to resolve the confusion associated with working in Egypt. In the Middle East, we have a way of “socializing” the business to get what we want. The military members do not have this ability. They need to learn how to soften their approach in dealing with confusion and bureaucracy in Egypt.

**Social flexibility.** The theme of social flexibility was mentioned by five sources in six different references. This theme received three positive references and three negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs' ability to present themselves in a manner in order to
create a favorable impression. Examples of interviewee responses for the social flexibility theme included the following:

FSN #1 commented that he thinks Americans really care and are concerned. For example, their efforts to not eat out in the open during Ramadan shows that they care and are flexible. FSN #1 also said that the Americans try to make FSNs feel comfortable in order to them to open up and express themselves freely.

FSN #2 claimed that it is very rare for Americans at the Embassy to adjust their behaviors to create good first impressions. However, FSN #3 said exactly the opposite. In FSN #3’s opinion,

The Americans try to adjust their behaviors to make good first impressions with the Egyptian military counterparts. They try to be flexible by adjusting how they communicate to make their counterparts feel comfortable. They slow their speech patterns down and use simple words.

FSN #4 stated, “I do not think the Americans know much about the Egyptian culture to understand how they can adjust their culture.” FSN #5 added that most act as if they are tourists in Egypt; they won’t go out of their way to accommodate FSNs. However, FSN #5 did say that it depends on the character; some U.S. military members are more flexible than others.

Open-mindedness/openness. The theme of open-mindedness/openness was mentioned by five sources in nine different references. This theme received three positive references and five negative references. The concept that evolved
from responses was how FSNs perceived the SAOs ability “to withhold or suspend judgment about persons or situations or behavior that is new or unfamiliar” (Mendenhall et al., 2008b, p. 12). This common theme was directly comprised of the GCI dimension and theme of nonjudgmentalness, which refers to the SAOs’ ability to withhold or suspend judgment about people or a particular culture. Examples of interviewee responses for the nonjudgmentalness theme included the following:

FSN #1 felt that only a small percentage of U.S. military members exhibit signs of prejudice. FSN #1 said that one military member was reluctant to interact with her because of her appearance (head cover). FSN #1 said she was not sure if he was uncomfortable dealing with a Muslim woman or if he just did not like her for her personality.

FSN #3 claimed that the U.S. military members are very judgmental. FSN #3 said that they come here with preconceived notions of Egypt and Egyptians. For example, FSN #3 mentioned one officer would say “I know Egyptians…” and he would be convinced that all Egyptians would act in a certain manner. FSN #3 also said,

If it’s a personal friendship, the Americans are good about routine visits with their Egyptian counterparts. They are not judgmental when they deal with the Egyptian one-on-one. Professional relationships between the Americans and Egyptians are never equal. Some officers think they are above FSNs.
FSN #4 felt that Americans are good at holding back judgment. FSN #4 said,

They are very careful to avoid speaking on sensitive areas of religion, clothing, etc. In contrast, the FSNs like to know your beliefs; they have a high tendency to bring these topics up. The military [sic] shy away from these topics. It’s a good thing, because you find a lot of fanatics. If you show your tendency/preference for one particular belief or another, you may stir up emotions. Also, the FSNs will base your character on that one particular belief instead of looking at the whole person.

FSN #5 believed that good U.S. military members ignore their successor’s comments about a person and judge for themselves. FSN #5 wrote, “For me, the uniform does not make a difference. I still see you all as Americans.” FSN #5 said that during Ramadan, an American in the elevator was making an offending comment about the holiday. The American said. “It’s ridiculous to determine the start of a holiday by the lunar moon sighting.” One FSN immediately told the person to stop making comments about Ramadan because they were offensive. FSN #5 warned,

When you do not bother to learn about the country’s culture, you need to be aware that you can potentially make comments that would offend people. If the FSNs witness this, they will start to generalize all Americans in this aspect.
Other Cross-Cultural Concepts

The FSNs highlighted other cross-cultural concepts that were not directly related to common cross-cultural themes identified in the literature review. These include the concepts of favoritism, leadership, family, humor and fairness. The other cross-cultural concepts were mentioned by five sources in 65 different references. This theme received 21 positive references and 32 negative references.

Favoritism. The theme of favoritism was mentioned by five sources in 17 different references. This theme received four positive references and 13 negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ exhibiting preference for their own culture versus the culture of others. Examples of interviewee responses for the favoritism competency included the following:

According to FSN #1, some FSNs feel the U.S. military members look down on them. FSN #2 said, “Americans do not put FSNs in their communication process. They do not courtesy copy us on emails...no coordination. This is a sign of disrespect.” FSN #3 stated,

Some relationships are very professional. The U.S. officers want to really know what the FSNs are thinking. Others just view you as just a FSN and not care about your opinions. If it’s a personal friendship, the Americans are good about routine visits with their Egyptian counterparts. They are not judgmental when they deal with the Egyptian one-on-one. Professional relationships between
the Americans and Egyptians are never equal. Some officers think they are above FSNs.

FSN #3 claimed that FSNs normally feel like an intruder on Office of Military Cooperation’s social events. S/he said that FSNs tend to shy from these planning committees and events. FSN #4 discussed the embarrassment and humiliation s/he felt when the senior U.S. military leadership restricted the amount of duty-free goods FSNs could buy at the Embassy’s Army and Air Force Exchange Store (AAFES). FSN #3 noted that the military leaders did not learn anything from this incident because they did not call a town hall and solicit feedback from the FSNs about this situation.

FSN #4 contributed a negative favoritism theme response by saying that one military member was upset because he had to wait in line behind Egyptians who were taking a long time buying duty-free items that should be set aside for U.S. military members. However, FSN #4 also said that Americans are not arrogant toward FSNs and appreciate them. FSN #4 said that they do not treat FSNs differently from SAOs; they feel they can mingle with everyone.

FSN #4 added,

Americans give credit to FSNs for their hard work. Some do not make you feel like an outsider while working on projects. They make you feel a part of the team. This is rare...uncommon. Some Americans tend to keep FSNs behind the scenes. For example, I was allowed to accompany a military member to the Ambassador’s quarters because I was a part of the team.
On the other hand, FSN #4 also said, “I don’t think they (Americans) should socialize that much with the FSNs because of their position.” FSN #4 mentioned that force protection officers at the Embassy sometimes make the FSNs feel that they are not authorized to know stuff or get involved in the decision-making process because they are not American or are a potential threat.

FSN #5 responded to the positive/negative favoritism theme with,

At the beginning, they kept distance between themselves and the FSNs. However, after some time, they begin to loosen up.

Example: At the annual Office of Military Cooperation Gala planning meeting several years ago, I was the only FSN. I felt afraid…no one would interact with me. After some time, some of the Americans started to warm up to me. But, I still believe I was probably looked at as an outsider and not a FSN.

FSN #5 discussed his/her feelings about the way the military leadership dealt with the AAFES/FSN situation, stating, “I'm working in the American Embassy and I have the same amount of risk as the Americans. I should be treated the same way.”

Leadership. The theme of leadership was mentioned by five sources in 23 different references. This theme received seven positive references and eight negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ leadership ability and understanding of the concept of leadership. Examples of interviewee responses for the leadership theme included the following:
FSN #1 indicated that military leaders at the U.S. Embassy do not have the whole picture because they are not getting their information directly from employees. However, U.S. military leaders tend to be better than the U.S. Department of State leaders at the U.S. Embassy. FSN #1 said that the U.S. military leaders are sometimes reluctant and/or uncomfortable dealing with and/or directing FSNs. FSN #1 mentioned that U.S. military leaders are good at using documentation to record employees’ progress and communicate organizational goals and requirements, and s/he felt that someone in the Office of Military Cooperation at the U.S. Embassy should be assigned as a cultural expert.

FSN #2 did not see evidence of a group and management effort to minimize differences between both cultures. FSN #2 indicated that leadership knows about some of their problems, but they do not try to fix them. FSN #2 expressed a sense of disappointment in the U.S. Military. FSN #2 stated,

I expected the U.S. military members to be better than the FSNs.

For instance, out of 50 U.S. military members I dealt with over the years, only three deserved the title of leader. Most were not fair when dealing with FSNs.

According to FSN #3, some U.S. military members are very good leaders. FSN #3 said that s/he has witnessed some good examples, but some lack leadership ability. FSN #3 mentioned that s/he once had a commander/deputy who was very interested in what the FSNs were doing for the mission. FSN #3 also said that some leaders are open-minded and expect feedback from all
levels, but other leaders just look at their assignments as a vacation or a waiting station for retirement. FSN #3 felt that these leaders become totally disengaged from the FSNs.

FSN #3 shared, “Some American officers get closer to the human aspect of leadership and learn and understand why Egyptians are a certain way. Their efforts add more dimension and depth to cultural understanding. This helps them to become more tolerant.”

FSN #5 believed that U.S. military members really do not know much about how to lead Egyptians. FSN #5 sensed that Americans believe Egyptians still ride camels and are shocked to discover Egyptians have technology (i.e. cell phones, internet, latest computers, etc.) and are well-educated. FSN #5 thought this view needs to change. In FSN #5’s opinion, Americans view anything the FSNs say as needing to be verified and that there is no trust. However, FSN #5 said that after they deal with the FSNs for a while, they begin to realize their capability and lead accordingly.

**Family.** The theme of family was mentioned by five sources in 11 different references. This theme received six positive references and two negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ interest and promotion of the concept of family. Examples of interviewee responses for the family theme included the following:

FSN #1 said that when it comes to family, U.S. military members really appreciate the family bond in Egypt. FSN #1 claimed that the U.S. military members often promote family time and encourage all organizational members to
not neglect their families. FSN #1 also indicated that observing Ramadan
practices and enjoying the families are priorities for the military. FSN #2 stated, “I
like that fact that Americans are respectful of the family bond in Egypt. They will
always approve leave and time off for family events.”

According to FSN #3, “The best way to communicate with FSNs is through
discussion of their family. Family is the way to friendship. If I want to know a
person, I can learn a lot about them by asking about their family.”

FSN #4 said,

Americans do an excellent job of starting relationships. They ask
about your family and are very concerned about your personal well
being…they appreciate your family. They will most likely approve
any leave or time off for family matters. They ask about your kids….
They appreciate families and show that they care.

According to FSN #5, certain military leaders will try to promote a big
family feel in the Embassy. However, s/he said that they still sometimes treat and
lead Americans and FSNs separately. FSN #5 also said that the military normally
asks about the concept of family in Egypt. FSN #5 stated that they want to know
how Egyptians deal with their kids having boyfriends and girlfriends and how long
they allow their children to live with them. FSN #5 also stated that Americans are
surprised to learn that Egyptian children live with their parents until they are
married, which can be as late as age 32 or 33.

Humor. The theme of humor was mentioned by five sources in eight
different references. This theme received two positive references and six
negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs' ability to use humor to engender support and build relationships. Examples of interviewee responses for the humor theme included the following:

In FSN #1's opinion,

The military members normally respond to confusion (ambiguity) with sarcasm. They tend to not trust FSNs' numbers, knowing maybe the information is not eventually correct. They often make fun of any information they sense is not completely accurate and will not use it.

FSN #2 added, "Also, they make fun of our culture. For instance, they mock our staying of "In Shallah.""

According to FSN #3, Americans are not aware of how their behaviors impact the mission and how they are perceived by FSNs. For example, FSN #3 said that joking or flirting with a female co-worker may be acceptable in the U.S., but many FSNs would be offended seeing this behavior in the office. S/he noted,

The U.S. military think they can communicate by joking, smiling, and lifting the lines of class and rank to interact with the FSNs. If the Americans truly understood the Egyptian culture, they would know that doing this is a bad thing. If you are in a higher class or different position than a FSN, you will lose the respect of the rest of the FSNs if you interact with them in a very familiar way.
FSN #4 felt that U.S. military members are considered to be very positive compared to Egyptian culture. FSN #4 said that it is usually nice to see a military member with a sense of humor and feels that it is refreshing to see them laugh in a social setting. According to FSN #4, “Americans show interest in many Egyptian events; they don’t joke about one’s religion or make vulgar remarks in front of the ladies.”

FSN #4 referred to the discussion about the retiring officer and the speaker who joked about the shoes as a negative humor theme response; likewise, FSN #5 mentioned the American in the elevator who said, “It’s ridiculous to determine the start of a holiday by the lunar moon sighting.”

Fairness. The theme of fairness was mentioned by five sources in seven different references. This theme received two positive references and five negative references. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ ability to remain fair and impartial in their dealings with them. Examples of interviewee responses for the fairness theme included the following:

FSN #2 expressed disappointment that the U.S. military members s/he had dealt with were not fair when dealing with FSNs. In his/her opinion: Americans give credit to FSNs for their hard work. Some do not make you feel like an outsider while working on projects. They make you feel a part of the team. This is rare…uncommon. Some Americans tend to keep FSNs behind the scenes. For example, I
was allowed to accompany a military member to the Ambassador’s quarters because I was a part of the team.

FSN #5 referred to the AAFES/FSN duty-free purchasing policy as an example of negative fairness. FSN #5 stated, “I have not faced anything that was striking. They deal with us on a professional level. They evaluate us on our performance.”

Summary

The QUAN findings of this study indicated that SAOs possess an adequate level of cross-cultural competency based on the GCI scores. The Student’s T-test was used to test the null hypothesis. The SAOs scored exceptionally high in the Self-Management overarching dimension, and the self-confidence and self-identity dimensions. Conversely, the SAOs scored low in the social flexibility, self-awareness, emotional sensitivity, and tolerance of ambiguity dimensions. The exceptionally high and low dimensions warrant further investigation. The Perception Management and Self-Management overarching dimensions and the remaining dimensions included 4.0, the defined level of competence in the 95% confidence intervals.

The QUAL findings of this study indicated that the SAOs’ cross-cultural leadership affected FSNs. In addition to the cross-cultural competencies identified in the literature, the interviews revealed that favoritism, family, humor, and fairness were newly discovered themes associated with the SAOs’ cross-cultural leadership that positively and negatively affected the FSNs. Additionally, interview data provided insight into the reasons for SAOs’ scoring of GCI cross-
cultural competencies. QUAL themes that did not receive at least six responses were not considered for analysis. The next chapter will provide a discussion of the findings in relation to the literature.
Chapter 5

Discussion and Conclusions

The intent of this study was to gain better understanding of the essential cross-cultural competencies identified in Chapter 2 that are needed to successfully lead and influence followers and host nation counterparts in cross-cultural organizations. This chapter includes a discussion of the results in Chapter 4 and conclusions drawn from the results. Limitations of this study, as well as recommendations for future research, are also described in this final chapter.

Summary Overview of Results

The study used a mixed-method design in which two research questions were asked, resulting in both quantitative (QUAN) and qualitative (QUAL) findings. Primarily, QUAN data were gathered and analyzed in the first portion of this study to answer the first research question (RQ1), “Do military members serving in a specific geographic region possess an adequate or better level of cross-cultural competency?” In the second phase of this study, QUAL data were gathered to answer the second research question (RQ2), “Which specific cross-cultural leadership competencies are exceptional and inadequate, and how does the presence or absence of these competencies affect how the host nation personnel perceive the military members?”

Research Question 1. As discussed in Chapter 4, in answering RQ1, this study found the SAOs did possess an adequate level of cross-cultural competencies in accordance to the research design. A Student’s T-test was used to help answer the research question and test the null hypothesis. The 95%
confidence interval for the overall Global Competencies Inventories (GCI) scores included a score of “4” which was defined as the minimum acceptable level of cross-culture competence. The GCI scores had a mean of 4.81. Therefore, the null hypothesis that the overall GCI score was $\geq 4.0$ was not rejected. Thus, it was concluded that the SAO population possessed a satisfactory level of cross-cultural competence, as measured by this self-reported instrument.

Although the QUAN results indicate that the SAOs possessed an adequate level of self-reported cross-cultural competency, the QUAL data gleaned from those they interacted with seem to contradict the QUAN results. The overwhelming amount of evidence collected from the interviews across the range of cross-cultural competencies identified in the literature review gave a strong indication that the FSNs perceived the SAOs as not fully possessing an adequate level of cross-cultural competency. In fact, more negative (84) responses than positive (66) responses were provided out of the total 874 references from the FSNs in regards to their perceptions about the SAOs’ cross-cultural competencies. The FSNs were asked to provide their thoughts about the leadership capabilities of SAOs. Examples of the FSNs’ negative perceptions of the SAOs’ cross-cultural competency included statements like “military leaders…do not have the whole picture,” “military members really do not know much about leading Egyptians,” “most of them [U.S. military members] were not properly taught about Egyptian culture,” and “disappointment.”

The study’s results indicate that there appears to be a perception gap between how SAOs and FSNs view the cross-cultural leadership competency of
the SAOs. This view may be distorted by the SAOs’ and FSNs’ cultural backgrounds and perspectives. Fundamental differences in culture can result in both groups looking at the same reality from different perspectives. In addition, there is a slight possibility of distortion and unconscious influence or “extreme responding” by the SAOs’ when self-reporting their own cross-cultural competency perceptions on the GCI (Schacter, 1999). To compensate for self-reporting bias, the QUAL portion of this study was included to provide more insight in the SAOs cross-culture leadership dimensions. A more detailed explanation of SAO and FSN cultural perspectives is provided in the next section.

Research Question 2. As discussed in Chapter 4, in answering RQ2, an examination of the cross-cultural dimensions means confidence intervals for each competency, and interview responses were used to help answer this question. This analysis provided some interesting results. According to the QUAN results, the SAOs were adequate in all competencies, except for four. They scored low in tolerance of ambiguity (mean = 3.38), social flexibility (mean = 3.34), self-awareness (mean = 3.31), and emotional sensitivity (mean = 3.22) competencies. The SAOs scored exceptionally high in the Self-Management (mean = 4.91) overarching dimension, and the self-identity (mean = 4.66) and self-confidence (mean = 4.50) competencies. The next section will discuss the high scoring single overarching dimension and two competencies, the four low scoring competencies, and other cross-cultural concepts that were not directly related to the common themes identified in the literature review.
Exceptional Cross-Cultural Leadership Competencies. Although the three overarching dimensions of Perception Management, Relationship Management, and Self-Management included the score of "4" in their 95% confidence intervals, the individual competencies making up each overarching dimension prompted further investigation. As indicated in Chapter 4, the SAOs scored exceptionally high in the Self-Management (mean = 4.91) overarching dimension and its individual associated sub-dimensions of self-confidence and self-identity dimensions. Thus, this warranted a Tukey-Kramer statistical test to compare the three overarching dimensions to determine any significance among the mean scores. According to the Tukey-Kramer results, a significant difference existed between the Self-Management (mean = 4.91) and Relationship Management (mean = 3.91) dimensions at $\alpha = .05$. The FSNs’ responses in interviews regarding their perceptions of the SAOs’ Self-Management and Relationship Management overarching dimensions proved to be very interesting.

The Self-Management overarching dimension contained over 51 total references during the interview portion. The themes (optimism, self-confidence, self-identity, emotional resilience, stress management, and interest flexibility) making up the Self-Management dimension during interviews received 26 positive responses and 20 negative responses (Mendenhall et al., 2008a). Although the responses for the Self-Management dimension lean towards the positive, the FSNs’ negative responses suggest that they may not eventually agree with the SAOs high self-reported score for this dimension. For example, the Self-Management associate sub-dimensions of self-confidence (mean = 4.50)
and self-identity (mean = 4.66) received two of the highest mean scores during the QUAN portion of this study. However, self-confidence received eight negative and four positive references, and self-identity received three negative and three positive comments during the QUAL interview portion of this study. Thus, it appears the QUAN and QUAL data for the Self-Management dimension contradict each other.

Some examples of the FSNs’ disagreement with the SAOs’ high self-confidence score include responses such as the one provided by FSN #1, who stated, “The U.S. military leaders are sometimes reluctant and/or uncomfortable with dealing and/or directing FSNs.” FSN #1 also said, “When they are not confident, they tend to hide behind military regulations instead of soliciting feedback from FSNs and using sound judgment.” FSN #2 commented, “It is very rare that Americans display self-confidence.”

The FSNs seemed to be split on their responses regarding the self-identity theme. FSN #4 expressed appreciation at hearing and witnessing the military members express their love for God without being explicit about their particular religion. However, FSN #3 provided the following interesting response that disagreed with the high self-identity score by saying, “If Americans are honest with themselves, they do not adapt well to Egyptian culture.”

**Inadequate Cross-Cultural Leadership Competencies.** According to the QUAN results, the SAOs were inadequate in the tolerance of ambiguity (mean = 3.38), social flexibility (mean = 3.34), self-awareness (mean = 3.31), and emotional sensitivity (mean = 3.22) competencies. One point to note is that three
of the four low scoring competencies (social flexibility, self-awareness, and emotional sensitivity) come from the Relationship Management overarching dimension. This may suggest the SAOs may be deficient in the area of Relationship Management even though the 95% confidence interval included the score of “4” for this overarching dimension. In addition, the overwhelming number of negative responses in regards to the common cross-cultural theme of trust may also be interpreted as inadequate. Lastly, the responses for the communication cross-cultural theme indicate the SAOs may lack the proper communication skills to instill a sense of trust between them and the FSNs.

The Relationship Management overarching dimension contained over 55 total references during the interview portion. The themes (relationship interest, interpersonal engagement, emotional sensitivity, self-awareness, and social flexibility) making up the Relationship Management dimension during interviews received 28 positive responses and 27 negative responses (Mendenhall et al., 2008a). The QUAL data may suggest the FSNs’ responses support the significant difference between the mean scores for the Relationship Management overarching dimension and its low social flexibility, self-awareness, and emotional sensitivity associated scores.

For example, the Relationship Management associated sub-dimensions of social flexibility (mean = 3.34), self-awareness (mean = 3.31), and emotional sensitivity (mean = 3.22) received the lowest mean scores during the QUAN portion of this study. The negative and positive responses for emotional sensitivity and social flexibility were split; each of them received three negative
and three positive responses. Self-awareness received three negative responses and no positive responses.

The FSNs’ perceptions on the SAOs’ tolerance of ambiguity competency supports the low self-reported GCI score. Many FSNs thought the SAOs lack the ability to handle confusion in their particular environment. FSN #3 indicated the lack of control when dealing with ambiguous situations with FSNs and host nation counterparts tended to stress the SAOs. In fact, some FSNs highlighted that whenever the SAOs were faced with confusion and difficulty associated with Egyptian bureaucracy or culture, they often responded with sarcasm or dismissed the situation altogether. The SAOs’ actions, in turn, were viewed negatively by the FSNs.

The FSNs’ overall perception of the SAOs’ emotional sensitivity competency suggests that SAOs are very sensitive to the FSNs’ feelings, but their behavior gives the impression that they are cold and disconnected from the people they lead. Under the social flexibility theme, for example, the responses collected from the FSNs indicated that the SAOs try to adjust their behavior to accommodate the cultural setting, but they do not possess the training and experience to execute this properly. FSN #3 said,

The Americans try to adjust their behaviors to make good first impressions with the Egyptian military counterparts. They try to be flexible by adjusting how they communicate to make their counterparts feel comfortable. They slow their speech patterns down and use simple words.
However, FSN #4 highlighted the SAOs’ perceived lack of training in *social flexibility* by stating, “I do not think the Americans know much about the Egyptian culture to understand how they can adjust their culture.” FSN #5 also highlighted a perceived desire by the SAOs to improve their *social flexibility* dimension by stating, “Most act as tourists here in Egypt. They won’t go out of their way to accommodate FSNs.”

As previously mentioned in the last chapter, only code categories which received at least six or more references were presented in the QUAL results section of Chapter 4. Although the *self-awareness* competency only received three references during the QUAL data analysis of this study, its low GCI mean score warrants further analysis. FSN #1 supported the *tolerance of ambiguity* low score by stating “I do not know that they [SAOs] are aware of their own weaknesses and strengths.” As well, FSN #2 offered another perception of the SAOs’ *self-awareness* competency. FSN #2 indicated the some SAOs are aware of how their leadership weakness impacts the FSNs, but they do not think it is worth the effort to improve them since they will only be in Egypt for a short time.

It was no surprise that the theme of *trust* for the SAO population would be interpreted as inadequate. The theme of *trust* was mentioned by five sources in 17 different references. As mentioned in the literature review, scholars have identified *trust* as an essential behavior of relationship building and cross-cultural leadership. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ ability to exhibit honesty, fairness, and benevolence when dealing with FSNs (Jarvenpaa et al., 1998). This theme received only one positive reference
and 15 negative references. Many of the responses indicated a lack of trust on both sides. For example, FSN #1 indicated the U.S. military sometimes does not trust FSNs and always seems to ask for verification of their data. In addition, FSN #3 noted that the FSNs feel the American officers will not take care of them.

As previously mentioned, the responses for the communication cross-cultural theme indicate the SAOs may lack the proper skills to effectively convey empathy, trust, and inspiration among host nation counterparts and followers. Although the respondents indicated the SAOs are normally deliberate in their directions and good at documenting organizational goals, the FSNs disliked the unemotional and disconnected way SAOs often convey them. Some of the respondents also claimed that SAOs do not always solicit input from the FSNs and/or approach the appropriate FSN to get the “whole story.” FSN #2 noted the SAOs’ failure to include FSNs in correspondence and key meetings was very disrespectful. FSN #4 highlighted the younger SAOs’ inexperience and lack of cultural awareness as reasons for poor communication between FSNs and SAOs. Ultimately, the QUAL results revealed that the SAOs’ lack of understanding of how to properly communicate their wants and needs to host nation counterparts and followers in relationship to Egyptian culture negatively impacted the level of trust between the FSNs and SAOs.

Other Cross-Cultural Themes. The FSNs also highlighted other cross-cultural themes that were not directly related to the GCI but positively and negatively affected the FSNs. These include the themes of favoritism, leadership,
family, humor, and fairness. These themes offered more insight into how the SAOs can improve their cross-cultural leadership competencies.

The theme of favoritism appeared to be a surprising discovery in this study. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs' favored their own culture over the culture of others. This theme negatively affected the FSN interviewees who perceived they were treated unfairly because of their nationality.

Of course, any type of favoritism in organizations is serious and should be addressed immediately. Organizations that support favoritism may have a less talented and committed workforce, high turnover, absenteeism, low morale, higher workplace tension, and low job satisfaction (Sanchez and Brock, 1996; Wright, Ferris, Hiller & Kroll, 1995). The United States and the federal government have implemented various laws and regulations to offset various forms of discrimination and favoritism, such as age, gender, race, ethnicity, sexual preference, etc. As a result, the U.S. Department of Defense and the SAOs are prohibited by federal and military law from committing any acts that may be viewed as discriminatory. That being said, SAOs may not be fully aware of what behaviors and actions may be viewed as discriminatory by other cultures.

Also, it appears that what may be viewed as favoritism by the FSNs may be more of an issue of “inadvertent exclusiveness.” Due to the sensitive nature and security requirements of some military-based discussions and projects, the SAOs may have unconsciously excluded the FSNs from certain activities, which
caused a feeling of perceived discrimination (Ensher, Grant-Vallore, &
Donaldson, 2001).

The FSNs provided several examples to demonstrate why they felt SAOs
were showing *favoritism* towards their own culture. For example, FSN #1 felt that
the SAOs looked down on FSNs. FSN #2 said, “Americans do not put FSNs in
their communication process. They do not courtesy copy us on emails…no
coordination. This is a sign of disrespect.” FSN #3 claimed that FSNs normally
feel like intruders at organizational social events. FSN #3 also said that FSNs
tend to shy from these planning committees and events. FSN #5 discussed
his/her feelings about the way the military leadership dealt with the Army Air
Force Exchange Store/FSN situation, stating, “I’m working in the American
Embassy, and I have the same amount of risk as the Americans. I should be
treated the same way.”

It appears the SAOs’ failure to include FSNs in decision-making processes
and their evident discomfort with dealing with FSNs created a culture of
“inadvertent exclusiveness.” In order to combat this culture, the SAOs need to
understand that the FSNs want to have a voice in organizational decisions that
may affect them.

*Leadership* was another theme that the FSNs referred to throughout the
interviews. The theme evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the
SAOs’ *leadership* ability and understanding of the theme of leadership. This FSN
perception of the SAOs’ leadership capabilities stems from their own cultural
perspective. Some FSNs felt that some SAOs exhibited positive leadership
capabilities because they tried to understand the Egyptian culture. FSN #3 offered an insightful perspective of the SAOs’ leadership capability by stating:

Some American officers get closer to the human aspect of leadership and learn and understand why Egyptians are a certain way. Their efforts add more dimension and depth to cultural understanding. This helps them to become more tolerant.

According to the FSNs, the senior SAOs are fairly good at communicating and soliciting input from FSNs; however, the younger officers have a more difficult time. It appears the lack of training and experience could be one of the reasons why the younger SAOs have more difficulty in this area.

The theme of family was a very interesting discovery in this study. The theme of family evolved from responses of how the FSNs perceived the SAOs’ interest and promotion of the concept of the family. Like many cultures in the Middle East, family is the focal point of society. It appears the SAOs were able to positively influence and connect with the FSNs whenever they asked questions about the Egyptian concept of family and/or about the FSNs’ families in general. Hanson and Lynch (1998) suggested that cross-cultural leaders can build relationships and learn as much about the host nation’s culture by gathering specific information related to cultural views of child-rearing practices and family roles and structures. The FSNs even indicated that SAOs can start and maintain valuable relationships with FSNs by exhibiting sincere concern for the welfare of FSN families.
Humor was another theme that appeared to affect FSNs. This theme received two positive and six negative references. Although the FSNs appreciated the SAOs using humor in an attempt to connect with them, some FSNs felt they were negatively affected by the inappropriate use of humor. For example, some FSNs indicated that the SAOs often made fun of certain aspects of their culture, especially when they did not understand it. Other FSNs indicated that they did not understand American humor and were often confused or offended by it. An example of this is when a high-level U.S. Embassy official made a joke about a younger SAO by stating, “I have shoes in my closet older than him” during an official ceremony. This joke confused some FSNs because their culture considers shoes to be unclean. Comparing a person to a shoe is deeply offensive in Middle Eastern culture. Hodges (1998) cautioned leaders in using American-based humor in cross-cultural settings because host nation counterparts cannot always distinguish between sarcasm and true feelings.

Lastly, fairness seems to be an important theme for FSNs. This theme highlighted the FSNs’ perception of the SAOs’ ability to remain fair and impartial in their dealings with them. A perceived high level of organizational fairness can increase the trust and individual commitment of host nation followers (Lemons & Jones, 2001). Overall, the FSNs felt that they were treated differently from the Americans and not included as part of the “team” when it came to certain organizational events or decisions even though they have the same physical risks as the Americans. This perception may stem from the lack of understanding of why FSNs are excluded from certain events or discussions due to security
reasons. The SAOs may have more success in the area of fairness by explaining the reasons why FSNs are excluded from certain events or discussions based on sensitive U.S. national security requirements.

The significant differences in perceptions of cross-cultural leadership were identified via the analysis. The inferences made from the analysis of the QUAN and QUAL results indicate the SAOs may not value the relationship aspect of cross-cultural leadership. In relationship-focused cultures, followers prefer to conduct business with individuals they believe they can trust. Trust is established through relationships, and Egyptians prefer to know the people with whom they are doing business. On the other hand, America has an individualistic culture that tends to focus more on the task aspect of leadership. Task-focused cultures are open to doing business with individuals outside their cultures; however, they view business and personal relationship as separate (Wunderle, 2008).

People of different cultures have different expectations of their leaders. Origin and cultural background have an effect on their expectations (Mendenhall, Punnett, & Ricks, 1995). The SAO culture is extremely task-focused and highly individualistic with medium power distance (Hofstede, 2001). On the other hand, the FSNs have a high collectivistic and high power distance culture. FSNs also have a more temperate view of leaders, perhaps due to their high power distance culture. In addition, FSNs seem to have an elitist, transcendent view of their leaders. They view their leaders as the paternalistic and charismatic figure for their organization.
Middle Eastern cultures like Egypt take pride in their families and in the organizations that employ them. Because of their culture, the FSNs tend to value charismatic and team-oriented leadership. The FSNs’ culture emphasizes in-group and institutional collectivism, high power distance, and male domination (Javidan, Dorfman, Sully de Luque, & House, 2006). In addition, their Middle Eastern culture appeals to the emotional aspect of leadership interaction (Hall, 1976).

In addition to developing their Relationship Management Dimension, SAOs need to understand how the concepts collectivism and charismatic leadership can positively influence followers. SAOs must also realize that the relationship between leaders and followers is much more emotional and personal in the Middle East (Javidan et al, 2006). Also, ethnocentrism and cultural arrogance can damage relationships with followers of cross-cultural organizations.

Most FSNs highlighted that it is important that SAOs have the willingness to appreciate the host nation culture and to be more open to understanding, respecting, and accepting specific cultural habits or backgrounds of the local staff. Most FSNs agree that trust and inclusiveness in organizational decision-making and planning can be effective characteristics in cross-cultural leadership. Not addressing these cultural differences can lead to misunderstanding, which, in turn, leads to conflict, low morale, and lack of work productivity in work settings (Levy-Leboyer, 2004).
Implications for Practice

This section builds on the initial justification in Chapter 1 and provides insight related to cross-cultural leadership characteristics and desired behaviors inside a cross-cultural environment. This research has implications for theories and practices related to the cross-cultural leadership competencies for military members, diplomats, and business leaders operating in foreign environments. There are four implications for the field of leadership and cross-cultural competency, which came to light during this study. The first is the inadequate level of some cross-cultural competencies as indicated by the QUAN data and interview responses. The SAOs’ low self-reported scores in the associated GCI dimensions and the FSNs’ interview responses indicate that the SAOs do not place a great emphasis on the relationship and emotional aspect of cross-cultural leadership interaction with the host nation followers. It would appear that the SAOs would benefit from understanding and applying the basic concepts of transformational leadership while interacting with FSNs. Transformational leadership involves the necessary process of developing the personality traits of one’s leadership paradigm in order to develop relationships and inspire host nation counterparts and followers (Northouse, 2001). It would be helpful for the Department of Defense (DoD) and other cross-cultural organizations to investigate this inadequate overarching dimension and associated sub-dimensions of social flexibility, self-awareness, and emotional sensitivity. In addition, the Perception Management sub-dimension of tolerance of ambiguity
and the common cross-cultural theme of trust also warrant investigation due to their low self-reported SAO scores.

The second implication for this study deals with the exceptional cross-cultural leadership competencies as indicated by the QUAN data and interview responses. As discussed previously with the inadequate cross-cultural leadership competencies, DoD and other cross-cultural organizations could benefit from investigating why military members are successful in the sub-dimensions of self-confidence and self-identity. The results of this investigation can translate into a strategy for improving the inadequate cross-cultural leadership competencies for the military population.

The third implication arises from other cross-cultural themes identified by the FSNs’ interview responses. The respondents were clear in the interviews about their dissatisfaction with what they perceived as favoritism, lack of fairness, and inappropriate use of humor by the SAOs. However, the FSNs indicated the SAOs positively influenced and connected with them whenever they discussed and expressed interest in the concept of family. Understanding how to overcome this FSN perception of favoritism and lack of fairness, while investigating cultural differences in American and Egyptian humor and how to promote the value of family, could be valuable for DoD and other federal stakeholders.

The fourth and final implication in this research deals with how the U.S. military and host nation counterparts and followers view leadership. This study identified the presence of a perception gap between how SAOs and FSNs view leadership. Further exploring this perception gap and developing a strategy to
reduce it by educating both the U.S. military population and host nation counterparts on the differences and expectations of leadership, in respect to their cultural background and values, may prove to be beneficial.

Limitations

The study addresses the QUAN results, the interview responses, and literature in the field of cross-cultural leadership. The researcher assumed that both the SAOs and FSNs provided honest, clear perceptions of the SAOs’ cross-cultural leadership competencies. The findings may not, nor are they intended to, generalize the SAO and FSN communities, but the hope is that the findings will provide knowledge for consideration in cross-cultural leadership interaction with host nation counterparts.

The researcher’s military commitment and assignment location necessitated that the research subject population be members of the SAO population located at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt. The GCI QUAN portion of this mixed-method study has strength in its generalizability. However, since the sample size was relatively small and the scope was limited to the population of SAOs who are working in the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt, the results can only be considered indicative. In addition, the QUAL portion of this study, which consisted of open-ended interviews with the information-rich FSNs at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt, has the strengths of in-depth analysis and insight. Again, however, the results can only be considered indicative.
Suggestions for Future Research

Future research should address the perception of cross-cultural leadership competencies between the U.S. military population and host nation counterparts and followers. Specifically, the field of cross-cultural leadership would benefit from more research on how to aid diplomats in analyzing the leadership perception gaps and developing strategies to overcome cross-cultural leadership deficiencies. U.S. military leaders must improve their ability to positively influence host nation followers and “build relationships that promote U.S. interests, build allied and friendly nation self-defense and coalition capabilities” (Federation of American Scientists, n.d.).

In addition to the recurring common cross-cultural leadership competencies (*communication*, *empathy*, *flexibility*, *open-mindedness/openness*, *trust*, and *transformation*) identified in the literature review, other cross-cultural themes identified in this study such as *favoritism*, *family*, *humor*, and *fairness* should also be considered for investigation. Empirical research will help validate the impact of these themes in the *Relationship Management* dimension of cross-cultural leadership.

Future research should also investigate the training and education for future military leaders so that effective strategies and approaches may assist the adaptability and flexibility of cross-cultural leadership competencies. Research into military cross-cultural competency training and education programs should focus on improving the *Relationship Management* dimension of U.S. military leaders. Future cross-cultural competency training and education programs
should also consider the effects of role-playing exercises which focus on improving the inadequate cross-cultural competencies identified in this study as well as helping military members determine which host nation behaviors are normative, "excessive maneuvers, or a combination of both" (Hall, 1976, p. 19).

Further exploration should take place regarding the use of charismatic/transformational leadership in cross-cultural settings. In particular, future research should investigation the impact of the transformational leadership associated factors of idealized influence, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation on the Relationship Management dimension of cross-cultural leadership (Northouse, 2001).

Also, researchers are encouraged to replicate this study using a larger representative sample across the various U.S. Embassies in the Middle East. This would provide more insight in cross-cultural leadership of SAOs. More emphasis should be placed on using open-ended interviews and case studies to gain more insight into perceptions of host nation followers (Yukl, 1989). This could also be extended to include other Department of Defense and Department of State organizations that deal with different cultures.

Finally, future research should consider the use of a 360° feedback tool to help assess the effectiveness of the cross-competencies of military leaders. In addition to having military leaders self-report their perceptions of their own cross-cultural competencies, a module that allows the host nation followers and counterparts who are affected by their leadership may provide a means to measure the perception gap between both cultures.
Conclusion

This research has brought to light further understanding of the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, and desired behaviors of military leaders. The mixed-method study results concerning the perception of the SAOs’ leadership competencies have produced an informed discussion. Most results and findings, which extend previous research, are interesting because they help add depth to the understanding of cross-cultural leadership. The GCI results have indicated that the SAOs possess an adequate level of overall cross-cultural leadership competency, however with a few caveats. The main thought is that the military members serving in diplomatic roles need to understand the importance of the Relationship Management dimension of cross-cultural leadership and how to effectively master it. In the future, the U.S. military and the field of leadership should continue to investigate and endeavor to understand how to improve the cross-cultural leadership competencies that make leaders successful in foreign environments.
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Appendix A

Department of Defense List of Cultural Programs

and Documents for Military Members


2. The Marine Corps Intelligence Activity’s Arab and Islamic Culture DVD (2004) and Cultural Intelligence for Military Operations: Iraq Cultural Intelligence Study (2004)


6. Joint Special Operations University Middle East Orientation Course (JSOU Middle East Orientation Course [MEOC]) (2005)


10. David Rababy’s proposed Cultural Awareness and Intelligence: Middle East Culture Training Module (2005)
## Appendix B

### Cultural Researchers (Darlington, 1996; Table 3.1 Modified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Bonhous, 1994)</td>
<td>Types of intelligence system</td>
<td>Comparative analysis of preferred styles</td>
<td>Need to develop a balance of all styles to avoid an organizational learning disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Disfano, 1992)</td>
<td>Differences in Value Orientation</td>
<td>Case Studies Literature Review</td>
<td>Profile of effective global executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars, 1993)</td>
<td>Dilemmas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seven Cultures of Capitalism- different sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Laurent, 1983)</td>
<td>Managers' implicit theories on management</td>
<td>Questionnaire survey</td>
<td>Country clusters of implicit theory, e.g. organizations as authority systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lessem and Neubauer, 1994)</td>
<td>Multiple levels of difference based on philosophies</td>
<td>Comparative surveys of art, religion, literature, philosophy and societal constructs</td>
<td>Four diverse management systems form a basis for European unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Maznevski, 1994)</td>
<td>Differences in Value Orientation</td>
<td>Value Orientations Training Intervention with Performance Assessment</td>
<td>Proposed Model of Synergistic Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Said (1991), (1994)</td>
<td>National literature/textual style and content</td>
<td>Comparative analysis</td>
<td>Appreciate the differences and recognize we make culture as part of self-organization process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tayeb (1988), (1994)</td>
<td>National and Corporate attitude surveys</td>
<td>Literature, cultural and work</td>
<td>Proposed causal model of culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Trompenaars, 1984)</td>
<td>Differences in behaviour</td>
<td>Value Orientations</td>
<td>Distinct national cultures e.g.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Empirical Cross-Cultural Leadership Studies

Conducted Since 1989

*(House et al., 1997; Table 20.1 Modified)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gerbert &amp; Steinkamp (1991)</td>
<td>Three questionnaire responses: total number of staff, turnover, and profit. Leader behavior described using two dimensions: patriarchal and production orientation</td>
<td>Patriarchal care taking is inversely related to economic success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerstner &amp; Day (1994)</td>
<td>Questionnaire with 59 attributes relevant to leadership given to students enrolled in a U.S. university.</td>
<td>Results indicate that business leader prototypes vary systematically as a function of a particular country. Significant correlations between Hofstede's dimensions of culture and the present study dimensions for rank order of countries. Demonstrates the usefulness of Hofstede dimensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede, Bond, &amp; Luk (1993)</td>
<td>Used data obtained from an earlier survey of organizational cultures (Hofsted, Neuijen, Ohayv, &amp; Sanders, 1990).</td>
<td>Reanalyzing the data from Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv, &amp; Sanders at the individual level shows that the dimensions of organizational culture found in the previous study completely disappeared at the individual level, and a new set of dimensions (termed psychological culture) emerged. These results focus attention on the importance of defining one's level of analysis to avoid ecological and reverse ecological fallacies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Davis, &amp; Allen (1994)</td>
<td>Questionnaires consisting of 24 items on individualism/collectivism and 15 items on entrepreneurship, administered to executives in a variety of industrial firms in the U.S., South Africa, and Portugal. Portuguese version back-translated and pretested; other two samples responded in English.</td>
<td>Although Hofstede’s country scores different widely among the three countries, organizational scores show negligible difference. Also, an exploratory analysis reveals a curvilinear relationship (as hypothesized) between levels of organizational individualism and entrepreneurship, with entrepreneurial activity peaking at moderate levels of individualism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Empirical Cross-Cultural Leadership

Studies Conducted since 1989 (House et al., 1997; Table 20.1 Modified) – Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peterson et al. (1995)</td>
<td>House, Schuler, &amp; Levanoni’s role conflict and ambiguity measure (1983) and Pareek’s role overload measures (1976) are used. Translated and back translated. Data collected during training program.</td>
<td>Addresses what role stress issues are likely to arise in cultures that vary along Hofstede’s cultural dimensions. Role stress varies more by country than by demographic or organizational characteristics. Contrary to the implications of Hofstede’s uncertainty avoidance measure, role stress is not associated with high uncertainty avoidance. In ecological analysis, high power distance relates to high role overload and to low role ambiguity. The study points to an emic (culture-specific) quality in the interpretation of the construct across cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahim, Kim, &amp; Kim (1994)</td>
<td>Rahim’s Leader Power Inventory and the Job Description Index (JDI) &amp; compliances scale. Translated and back translated.</td>
<td>Power bases of both samples are remarkably similar. U.S. managers have greater position power; Korean managers have greater personal power bases. In both samples, referent power base explains the highest percent of variation in satisfaction. Performance contingent coercive power is the least effective. Managers in both individualist and collectivist cultures are most effective in inducing subordinates’ compliance and satisfaction by enhancing personal power bases, such as expert and referent power. Legitimate power may be used to gain compliance from subordinates, but may lead to reduction in satisfaction with supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralston, Gustafson, Elsass, Cheung, &amp; Terpstra (1992)</td>
<td>Chinese Culture Connection’s CVS administered to practicing managers in the U.S., Hong Kong (H.K.), and the People’s Republic of China (P.R.C.). Manova and WABA analysis is performed.</td>
<td>U.S. and H.K. managers score equally, but significantly higher than the P.R.C. sample on integration. All three score about the same on moral discipline. In Confucian work dynamism, P.R.C. score the highest, followed by H.K. and the U.S., in that order. On human heartedness, U.S. score highest, followed by H.K. and then by P.R.C. This last finding is consistent with Hofstede’s ranking of the U.S. and H.K. on the masculinity dimension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Empirical Cross-Cultural Leadership

**Studies Conducted since 1989 (House et al., 1997; Table 20.1 Modified) – Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt &amp; Yeh (1992)</td>
<td>POIS (Profiles of Organizational Influence Strategies) used. In Australia and U.K., data collected during a training program. In Taiwan, a survey was conducted. Japanese data collected in prior study. Translated into Chinese and Japanese and back translated.</td>
<td>Explores structure of leader influence behavior toward subordinates. Results compared with results of the U.S. sample used in developing POIS. Interpretable 7-factor solution obtained for all nations except Australia, for which an interpretable 6-factor solution emerged. English leaders place greater emphasis on appealing to higher authorities and assertiveness in subordinate relationships than did U.S. managers. Australians are more similar to U.S. managers in their emphasis on reasoning and bargaining with subordinates. U.S., U.K., and Australian leaders use friendliness in combination with reason. The leader influence processes used in Taiwan and Japan are more similar to each other than to those in Australia and the U.K.; that is, they reflect assertiveness and reasoning tactics. Although both Taiwan and Japan tend toward high power distance, the Japanese emphasize sanctions less and bureaucratic channels more than the Taiwanese do. Scores are consistent with Hofstede’s power distance scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shackleton &amp; Ali (1990)</td>
<td>Used Hofstede’s approach for measuring power distance and uncertainty avoidance. Translated and back-translated. Part of the sample was given questionnaires to take home to complete; the remainder was given questionnaires during a training program. Power distance and uncertainty avoidance subscales of Hofstede’s country scores are plotted on power distance and uncertainty avoidance dimensions.</td>
<td>Pakistan’s managers, in spite of being in the U.K., exhibit a substantial effect of country origin rather than current country values. As hypothesized, Sudanese scores on power distance and uncertainty avoidance are found to lie between the scores of African and Arab nations reported by Hofstede, and Hofstede very close to those obtains the British scores. These results provide support for the relative rankings of Hofstede’s uncertainty avoidance and power distance dimensions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Empirical Cross-Cultural Leadership
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shenkar &amp; Ronen (1987)</td>
<td>Hofstede’s 14-item work goals questionnaire was modified and administered during a training program. Translated and back translated.</td>
<td>Examines the effects of traditional and modern ideologies and economic conditions influencing the importance of work goals. Results suggest shared cultural traditions Chinese societies, on one hand, and variations due to modern ideologies and economic conditions, on the other, especially between China and others, suggest the emergence of two new concepts—cultural pluralism and cultural disjunction. That is, multiple cultures exist in a society and there are differences in culturally derived expectations and economic, political, social, and organizational relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith et al. (1994)</td>
<td>Questionnaire translated and administered to middle managers in 14 countries. Scores standardized within subjects. Items required managers to rate each of 8 sources of meanings for each of 8 organizational events, on 5-point rating scales.</td>
<td>Relates sources of meaning of critical incidents in each country to Hofstede’s rankings of countries in terms of his four dimensions. Managers in countries Hofstede classified as high individualism and low power distance report greater reliance on their own experience and their subordinates, whereas managers in low individualism and high power distance countries report greater reliance on formal rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Dugan, &amp; Trompenaars (1996)</td>
<td>Values of managers studied using many instruments originally collected by Trompenaars although not for this study. Convenience sampling. Translated and back-translated. Transformations of individual-level data to derive ecological measures analyzed through multidimensional scaling and regression analysis.</td>
<td>Sample etrogeneity does not influence results. Two interpretable dimensions emerged: egalitarianism vs. conservatism and loyalty. Results generally consistent with Hofstede’s country scores on these dimensions. Finds support for national culture as the source of variation in power distance and egalitarian commitment, and Confucian work dynamism. Uncertainty avoidance and masculinity are included in measures. Emerged dimensions are associated with life expectancy, per-capita income, and socioeconomic status of subjects in samples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Peterson (1994)</td>
<td>5-point questionnaire scale produced elicit responses about processes in 8 critical organizational events. Translated and back-translated. Used demographic data to control for sample heterogeneity.</td>
<td>Derives three factors describing managers' various combinations of reliance on rules and procedures, beliefs, unwritten rules, advice from subordinates, colleagues, and superiors, and their own experience. Leader event management processes are consistently related to differences in national cultures Hofstede identifies. Relationships consistent with Hofstede's dimensions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Paterson, &amp; Bond (1986)</td>
<td>Questionnaire, partly adapted from Misumi's performance and maintenance scales and partly developed for this study, assess employees' perceptions about their supervisors in the electronics industry in Britain, the U.S., Japan, and H.K. Translated and back-translated.</td>
<td>Both similarities and differences exist between general leadership styles across nations. In the U.S. there is a clear distinction between performance and maintenance behavior, but not in other countries. Identifies several emic items related to maintenance and performance constructs. Specific emic measures differentiated among countries are better than measures of global leadership styles. Suggests importance of measuring emic manifestations of more general etic descriptions of leader behaviors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeh &amp; Lawrence (1995)</td>
<td>Reanalyzed Franke, Hofstede, &amp; Bond's data (1991), purporting to link cultural factors to economic growth; used the same regression analysis as Franke, Hofstede, &amp; Bond, but paid particular attention to outliers.</td>
<td>Production orientation significantly correlates with economic success. Link between cultural dimensions and economic growth predicted by Franke, Hofstede, &amp; Bond does not hold for Pakistan. Reanalysis after removing Pakistan from the data set finds the correlations between individualism and Confucian work dynamism change significantly. The authors argue that, in light of this correlation, the link between Confucian work dynamism and economic growth is suspect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D

**Cross-Cultural Common Theme Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s) (Year)</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Open-mindedness/openness</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbe et al. (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eoes (1985)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (1990)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brake (1997)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brein &amp; David (1973)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns (1978)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conger &amp; Kanujo (1998)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David (1976)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early &amp; Ang (2013)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erez (1997)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregersen et al. (2005)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall (1983)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall &amp; Hall (1990)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinks (1999)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersey et al. (2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede (2001)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House (1997)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson &amp; Inksor (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huaced (2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jokinen et al. (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khunt &amp; Lewis (1987)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kluckhorn &amp; Stroebek (1961)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kooester &amp; Olebe (1988)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natsumoto et al. (2001)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayer, Davis et al. (1995)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McColland (1961)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nendenhall &amp; Ociou (1985)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nendenhall et al. (2008a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nendenhall et al. (2008b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numford (1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson (2004)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riggi, Møssamer et al. (1991)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosen, Digh et al. (2000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schein (1985)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz (1992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheaffer et al. (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore &amp; Cross (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triandis (1995)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trompenaars &amp; Hampen-Turner (1998)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Zee &amp; van Oudenhoven (2001)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderpool (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Measures of Cross-Cultural Competence and Related Constructs (Abbe et al., 2007, Table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Constructs or Dimensions</th>
<th>Author/Source</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Intended Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Intelligence Scale (CQ)</td>
<td>Cognitive, meta-cognitive (strategic), behavioral, motivational</td>
<td>Ang, van Dyne, Koh, &amp; Ng, 2004</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Development Inventory</td>
<td>Orientation toward cultural difference</td>
<td>Hammer, Bennett, &amp; Wiseman, 2003</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Personality Questionnaire</td>
<td>Cultural empathy, emotional stability, social initiative, flexibility, open-mindedness</td>
<td>Van der Zee &amp; van Oudenhoven, 2000</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Sensitivity Inventory</td>
<td>Individualism/collectivism; flexibility and open-mindedness</td>
<td>Bhawuk &amp; Brislin, 1992</td>
<td>Combination test/self-report</td>
<td>Expatriate managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munroe Multicultural Attitude Scale</td>
<td>Know, care, act</td>
<td>Munroe &amp; Pearson, 2006</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory</td>
<td>Flexibility/openness, emotional resilience, perceptual acuity, personal autonomy</td>
<td>Kelley &amp; Myers, 1995</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Adaptability Scale</td>
<td>Openness, attention to interpersonal relations, sense of identity, person-organization goal alignment, problem-solving, cross-cultural experience</td>
<td>Schmidtchen, 1997 (as cited in Vanderpool, 2002)</td>
<td>Self-report</td>
<td>Military personnel in peacekeeping operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Assessment Scale for Intercultural Communication Effectiveness</td>
<td>Display of respect, interaction posture, orientation to knowledge, empathy, task related roles, relational roles, interaction management, tolerance for ambiguity</td>
<td>Koester &amp; Olebe, 1988</td>
<td>Peer or observer report</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospector</td>
<td>Sensitivity to cultural differences, business knowledge, courage, brings out the best in people, integrity, insightful, committed, takes risks, seeks feedback, uses feedback, is cultural adventurous, seeks learning opportunities, open to criticism, flexibility</td>
<td>Spreitzer et al., 1997</td>
<td>Self or other report</td>
<td>International executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-Cultural Social Intelligence</td>
<td>Empathy, ethnocentrism</td>
<td>Ascalon, 2006</td>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>Expatriate managers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

In-Depth Open-Ended Guided Interview Protocol

I. Introduction

1. Welcome the participant:
   a. Thank you for agreeing to meet with me and for participating in this study.

2. Explain the purpose of the interview:
   a. The purpose of this interview is to ask you to reflect on your experiences while working with the U.S. military members at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt. There are no right or wrong answers. I just want to get your opinions about the cross-cultural leadership characteristics, behaviors, or competencies of U.S. military members.

3. Explain the purpose of the consent form and have the interviewee sign it:
   a. Participation is voluntary.
   b. May I have your permission to audio tape this interview?
   c. You may choose to not answer any of the questions. You may also choose to end the interview at any time.
   d. The interview will be completely confidential.
   e. Do you have any questions about the consent form?

Secure two signed copies.

4. Explain the structure of the interview:
   a. I would like to ask you a few questions dealing with your beliefs about your interaction with the U.S. military members.
   b. The following interview will be conducted in a semi-structured format. The following questions provide a rough outline of issues to be covered as well as possible areas that may be addressed. Additional questions may be asked in order to probe a particular issue related to the participant’s response.
   c. This will include the use of prompts such as the following:
• That’s interesting. Please tell me more about this.

• You mentioned ______. In your own words, how would you define this?

d. Questions will include introductions with the phrases “in your mind,” “in your opinion,” or “based on your thought on the subject.”

e. There are no right or wrong answers. I am just trying to get an idea about what you believe regarding the cross-cultural leadership characteristics, behaviors, or competencies of the military members.

f. Are you ready to proceed with this interview?

II. General Leadership Questions:

1. What do you consider the purpose of leadership?

2. What are your thoughts of the leadership capabilities of the military members serving as the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt?

III. Cross-Cultural Leadership Interview Questions:

1. Perception Management:

a. Nonjudgmentalness:

• What is your opinion of the U.S. military members’ ability to withhold/not judge people, situations, and/or behaviors different than their own?

• Have you ever witnessed any of the U.S. military members making a quick decision in regards to FSNs and/or Egyptian culture? Please explain and provide an example.

• In your mind, how do you think the U.S. military members view their own traditions, culture, and way of doing business compared to the Egyptian ways?

b. Inquisitiveness:

• What are your views or thoughts on the U.S. military members’ openness towards new ideas? In particular, explain your
perspective on how U.S. military members view Egyptian ideas, values, and behaviors.

- Could you share an example of the U.S. military members’ willingness or lack of willingness to try to understand the FSNs and their respective culture?

- From what you can recall, did the U.S. military members learn anything from this experience? In your mind, what was the lesson learned?

c. Tolerance of Ambiguity:

- What is your opinion on the U.S. military members’ ability to manage or handle confusion?

- What have you witnessed in regards to the U.S. military members’ experiences with dealing with the Egyptian bureaucracy/government? How did they react when faced with this?

- Did the U.S. military members find this confusion challenging or did they shy away from it? Please explain what you witnessed.

d. Cosmopolitanism:

- In your mind, what are your thoughts on the U.S. military members’ ability to focus on the common things (commonalities) between the American and Egyptian cultures instead of the differences?

- Could you think of an example in which the U.S. military members tried to minimize the differences between the FSNs and Americans? Please provide an example.

2. Relationship Management:

a. Relationship Interest:

- What is your opinion of how U.S. military members go about starting friendly and professional relationships with the FSNs at the embassy?

- Do you have any examples of how the U.S. military members generate interest in the Egyptian social environment? What are some of the indicators? Please explain.
b. Interpersonal Engagement:

- How do the U.S. military members go about developing and maintaining relationships with FSN’s and other Egyptian counterparts? Please provide examples.

- How do the U.S. military members interact with FSNs and Egyptian counterparts in social settings (i.e. Office of Military of Cooperation Gala, Marine Corps Ball, Ramadan Iftar, holiday parties, etc.)? Do they tend to only talk to their American friends or do they attempt to include FSNs and other Egyptians in the conversation? If so, please provide an example.

c. Emotional Sensitivity:

- What is your opinion on how the U.S. military members sense the feelings and emotions of the FSNs and other Egyptian members?

- Please share your experience of how the U.S. military members deal with the concept of respect in the Egyptian culture. Are they aware of how certain actions can be viewed as being disrespectful towards FSNs and other members of the Egyptian culture? How did they handle this?

d. Self-Awareness:

- In your mind, do the U.S. military members understand how their weaknesses, strengths, values, limitations, personal feelings, etc. can impact how they interact and lead FSNs and Egyptian counterparts? If so, explain how do they adjust, compensate, or leverage these strengths and weaknesses?

- Could you provide examples that indicate they have or do not have an understanding of their own weaknesses and strengths?

e. Social Flexibility:

- What is your perspective on how military members adjust their behaviors in order to create a good first impression with FSN’s or Egyptian counterparts? What are some of the actions they implement? Please explain.

- Could you explain how the military members learn to adjust their behaviors for first introductions with FSN’s and Egyptian
counterparts? What were the results? Were they successful or not successful? Please explain your answer.

3. Self-Management:

a. Optimism:

- In your mind, what is the general overall attitude of the U.S. military members towards dealing with the complex Egyptian culture? Do they have a general positive or negative attitude?

- What are some examples of the U.S. military members’ negative attitude towards Egypt, its people, events, situations, culture, etc.?

- What are some examples of the U.S. military members’ positive attitude towards Egypt, its people, events, situations, culture, etc.?

- Do the U.S. military members tend to share/encourage a positive outlook within the FSN community? If so, how do they accomplish this? Please share some examples.

b. Self-Confidence:

- In your mind, what is your perception of U.S. military members’ confidence in their own leadership and abilities when dealing with the FSNs and other Egyptians at the U.S. Embassy?

- Do they or do they not work hard and/or exhibit will power to accomplish their goals? Please provide examples.

c. Self-Identity:

- What are your views on the U.S. military members’ ability to maintain their own personal values and American traditions without impacting the FSN and Egyptian culture at the U.S. Embassy?

- Please explain your thoughts on the U.S. military members’ ability to adapt to the Egyptian cultural while being honest.

d. Emotional Resilience:

- What is your perspective on the U.S. military members’ capability to control their emotions while interacting with FSNs and Egyptians in the U.S. Embassy?

e. Non-Stress Tendency:
• How do the U.S. military members deal with their emotions in stressful situations?

f. Stress Management:

• What are the techniques you witnessed the U.S. military members implement to handle stressful situations when interacting and leading FSNs at the U.S. Embassy?

g. Interest Flexibility:

• What do you know about the U.S. military members’ willingness to substitute their own American sports and hobbies for those of Egyptian culture (i.e. Soccer (Futbol) for American Football, Ruby, desert camping, belly dancing, etc.)?

• What are some of the Egyptian activities the U.S. military members participate in?

4. Communication:

• In your mind, what are your views on the U.S. military members’ ability to communicate effectively to the FSNs and Egyptians they interact and lead at the U.S. Embassy?

• What are some of the techniques they employ to facilitate their communication?

5. Trust:

• What is the perceived level of trust between the FSNs and the U.S. military members?

• What are some of the techniques the U.S. military members employ to establish trust with the FSNs and Egyptians?

IV. Demographic Questions

1. What is your age or age range? 20 to 30, 31 to 40, 41 to 50, 51 to 60, 61 to 70, over 71.

2. How long have you served at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt?

3. What is your current position?

4. What would you consider to be your functional background?
5. *What is your highest level of education completed with area? HS, College, Masters, Doctorate?*

V. Closing

1. *Is anything else that we have not discussed, regarding the cross-cultural leadership of the U.S. military members?*

2. *Do you have any questions for me regarding this project?*

3. *Thank you very much for participating.*
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Data Collection Participant Instructions

Participant Instructions

First of all, I would like to thank you for agreeing to participate in this study. The research collected will serve a two-fold purpose. First and foremost, it may help us to better understand the effective cross-cultural leadership characteristics of Security Assistance Officers (SAOs). Secondly, it will help me in partially fulfilling the requirements of earning a Doctorate of Education. Below, I have provided an abbreviated description on the background of the research as well as the instructions for completing the online questionnaire. I am currently a U.S. Air Force Officer and have received permission from the U.S. Embassy to conduct this research.

Background of the Research

This study is developed because of the perceived need to better understand the effective global and cultural leadership characteristics of SAOs working in the U.S. Embassy in Cairo, Egypt. More specifically, this study will increase the understanding of the essential cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, and desired behaviors needed to successfully lead and influence followers and host nation counterparts in cross-cultural organizations.
Online Questionnaire Instructions

1. Please read the attached Letter of Consent if you agree to continue as a participant in this research. Complete and return the Informed Consent Form to me at carlos.braziel@agsfaculty.indwes.edu.

2. Once I receive the Informed Consent Form, I will e-mail you the website address.

3. Please complete the online questionnaire on your own, using your experience/understanding of the selected cross-cultural leadership competencies, characteristics, and desired behaviors as related to your role as a SAO.

4. Should you have questions or need clarification, please e-mail me at carlos.braziel@agsfaculty.indwes.edu or call me at stateside: 937-412-1208 or Egypt: 011-2-012-392-7014.

Again, thank you for your participation.
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Cover Letter to Security Assistance Officers

(Informed Consent Letter)

MEMORANDUM FOR WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

FROM: OMC-CG
Unit 64901, Box 29
APO AE 09839-4901

SUBJ: Informed Consent Letter – Major Carlos Braziel

I authorize Major Carlos Braziel, a doctoral candidate in organizational leadership at Indiana Wesleyan University, Graduate School of Education, Marion, Indiana, to include the Office of Military Cooperation-Egypt in the research project titled: Analysis of Global/Cross-Cultural Leadership for United States Military Leaders: A Case Study of United States Military Security Assistance Officers in Cairo, Egypt. I understand each member’s participation in this study is strictly voluntary.

I further understand that the study will include data collection involving the completion of an online survey and that the results are confidential and the collection method of these results ensures participant confidentiality. I further understand that each individual response will be tabulated in a collective sense and results and conclusions will be shared on a plant-wide basis. Individual responses will not be presented in any form. Names will remain confidential and only general descriptions and common themes will be reported in the study.

I understand that if I have any questions or concerns regarding the study procedure, I can contact the researcher, Major Carlos Braziel at address, OMC/PRM, Unit 64901 Box 29, APO, AE, 09839-4901, e-mail: carlos.braziel@ags.faculty.indwes.edu or Dr. Boyd Johnson at Indiana Wesleyan University, 1900 West 30th Street, Marion, IN. 46951-5279, e-mail: boyd.johnson@indwes.edu.

In signing this form, I acknowledge that I understand what my organization’s participation in this study involves and I have received a copy of this form. I fully understand that there are minimal risks involved in completing this instrument and results are confidential. I also understand that I may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty and participation is voluntary. I hereby agree to participate, as described above, freely and voluntarily.

Sincerely,

F.C. Williams
Maj Gen, USAF
Chief, Office of Military Cooperation, Egypt
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Informed Consent Form

RESEARCH PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Analysis of Cross-Cultural Leadership Competencies of
United States Military Members:
A Case Study
of
United States Military Security Assistance Officers
In
Cairo Egypt

Carlos Braziel, Principal Investigator

Dr. Boyd Johnson, Research Advisor

Adult and Graduate Studies Department of Leadership

Purpose of Research: The purpose of this study is to examine the cross-cultural leadership competencies of military members in order to assess the effectiveness of cross-cultural military training programs. The goal is to add perspective for additional research into improving the training programs for military members who are scheduled to serve as diplomats and liaisons in cross-cultural organizations.

Specific Procedures to be Used: If you agree to participate in this in-depth guided open-ended interview for this study, you will provide your thoughts on cross-cultural leadership competencies of military members serving at the United
States Embassy in Cairo, Egypt. You will answer questions such as “What do you consider to be the purpose of leadership?” or “What are your thoughts of the leadership capabilities of the military members serving as the United States Embassy in Cairo, Egypt?”

Duration of Participation: Participating in the interview will likely take up to an hour.

Risks to the Individual: There is a possibility that you may feel discomfort with an interview question. You may choose not to answer any question that you do not feel comfortable answering. To protect confidentiality, recordings of the interviews will be transcribed and identifying information such as names will be removed. Your signed consent form will be kept separate from any survey and interview responses. The potential risks involved are minimal, but there are always some risks from any human interaction and sharing of information.

Benefits to the Individual or Others: Besides contributing to a better understanding of leadership in diverse organizations, there are no direct benefits. However, the study could benefit the research into cross-cultural leadership and make contributions to future improvements in the field.

Compensation: There will be monetary compensation of 100 Egyptian Pounds for your participation in this study.

Extra Costs to Participate: There is no cost to participate other than the time invested.

Initials ____________  Date ________________
**Injury or Illness:** It is unlikely that injury or illness should result from this study. If a medical situation does arise, the emergency procedures in place at the school will take precedence.

**Confidentiality:** All reasonable efforts will be made to keep your personal information confidential. We cannot guarantee absolute confidentiality. Certain information, including but not limited to the possibility of harm to yourself or others, may be subject to report to the proper authorities. Any reports of this study will not include any identifiable personal information. Audio tapes will be transcribed and your personal information will not be kept with the transcriptions or the recordings. It is the intention of the research to keep transcriptions and recordings for a period of seven years and then destroy them through shredding or data erasure. Information shared in a group setting is limited to the confidentiality of the researcher. Others in the group may choose to share the information you share with them.

**Voluntary Nature of Participation**
I do not have to participate in this research project. If I agree to participate I can withdraw my participation at any time without penalty. To withdraw, contact the researcher at the email or phone number provided below and express your desire to withdraw from the study. There will be no penalty for withdrawal.

**Contact Information:**
If I have any questions about this research project, I can contact Carlos Braziel at 937-412-1208, or carlos.braziel@agsfaculty.indwes.edu. I may also contact the research advisor, Dr. Boyd Johnson at 765-674-6901 or boyd.johnson@indwes.edu. If I have concerns about the treatment of research participants, I can contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Indiana Wesleyan University, Office of the Dean of Graduate Studies, 1900 West 50th Street, Marion, IN 46953. (765) 677-2090.
I HAVE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO READ THIS CONSENT FORM, ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RESEARCH PROJECT, AND AM PREPARED TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS PROJECT.

____________________________________               _________________
Participant’s Signature       Date

____________________________________
Participant’s Name

_____________________________________         __________________
Investigator’s Signature       Date
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Consultant Review of Data Analysis for Global Competencies Inventory

Statistical Results

Date: 14 January 2011

To: Carlos Braziel

From: DeAnne C. French

Subject: Data Analysis

Dear Mr. Braziel,

I hope that our meeting this morning gave you all the information you needed to finish preparing for your dissertation defense. I reviewed the statistical analysis of the quantitative portion of your dissertation. Apart from a few questions I had that would have been clear to your committee (because I lacked their background with your project), I was satisfied that the statistical tests you chose were appropriate. Moreover, the assumptions necessary for conducting these tests (i.e., normality) were sufficiently met that we can have confidence in the results.

If I or the Statistical Consulting Center at Wright State University can be of any further help to you, please do not hesitate to contact us.

I enjoyed my brief involvement with this project. Good luck with your defense!

Sincerely,

DeAnne French, Ph.D.
Statistical Consultant
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*Normality Q-Q Plots for Global Competencies Inventory Statistical Results*
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Global Competencies Inventory Scores Statistical Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Intervall of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception Management</td>
<td>1.615</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>-.10 to .85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonjudgementalness</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.55 to .61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquisitiveness</td>
<td>-.399</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>-.84 to .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of Ambiguity</td>
<td>-2.129</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.625</td>
<td>-1.22 to -.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmopolitanism</td>
<td>1.718</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>-.09 to 1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category Inclusiveness</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.65 to .59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Management</td>
<td>-.351</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.64 to .45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Interest</td>
<td>-.619</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-.80 to .43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Engagement</td>
<td>-1.375</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.469</td>
<td>-.98 to .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Sensitivity</td>
<td>-3.041</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.781</td>
<td>-1.31 to -.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness</td>
<td>-2.302</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.688</td>
<td>-1.25 to -.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Flexibility</td>
<td>-2.042</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.656</td>
<td>-1.16 to -.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Management</td>
<td>4.344</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.52 to 1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism</td>
<td>1.341</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>-.18 to .87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>2.490</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.09 to .91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Identity</td>
<td>2.946</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.20 to 1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Resilience</td>
<td>1.451</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>-.16 to .98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Stress Tendency</td>
<td>-.321</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.69 to .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Management</td>
<td>-.310</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.71 to .52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Flexibility</td>
<td>-1.123</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>-.313</td>
<td>-.88 to .26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall GCI</td>
<td>4.214</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.42 to 1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In-Depth Open-Ended Guided Interview Qualitative Results

Communication:

• FSN #1 Positive Communication Theme Response: U.S. military leaders are good at using documentation to record employees’ progress and communicate organizational goals and requirements.

• FSN #1 Positive Communication Theme Response: Observing Ramadan practices, enjoying the families are priorities for military.

• FSN #1 Positive Communication Theme Response: They are good at providing oral and written direction as well as follow-up.

• FSN #3 Positive Communication Theme Response: I see that they try to talk to even the FSN drivers. They ask about what’s appropriate for weddings and funerals. They ask how to say certain things in Arabic.

• FSN #5 Positive Communication Theme Response: The military leaders try to be more civilian than military when dealing with FSNs. They try to be a bit civilian in the way they communicate with FSNs. Instead of being directive, they try to persuade because it appears to be a more effective way at the Embassy.

• FSN #2 Negative Communication Theme Response: Americans do not put FSNs in their communication process. They do not courtesy copy us on emails…no coordination. This is a sign of disrespect.
• FSN #1 Negative Communication Theme Response: Military leaders at the U.S. Embassy do not have the whole picture…not getting information directly from employees.

• FSN #1 Negative Communication Theme Response: For example, military members often imprint their own ideas into our social invites. The annual Office of Military Cooperation Ramadan Iftar (Dinner) should not be buffet style…it should be family style. The custom is for everyone to eat the first date together as soon as the fast ends. It is very different for everyone to get their plate of food and return to their tables in time. We (FSNs) often feel like we are invading on a military social event even though it is supposed to be for us (FSNs). Military members should approach FSNs to be a part of the planning committee for this event to ensure the desires of the FSNs are heard.

• FSN #1 Negative Communication Theme Response: Military members are afraid to address new ideas, thoughts, and attitudes different from their own. Normally, they stay [hide] behind their regulations to justify their reason for not using your ideas. To be nice, they will listen to you, but will normally rely on their own way of conducting business.

• FSN #1 Negative Communication Theme Response: Some military members will only use to their own ideas. He/she [military members] will listen to the FSNs, but not consider your advice.

• FSN #1 Negative Communication Theme Response: The military members normally respond to confusion (ambiguity) with sarcasm. They
tend to not trust FSNs numbers, knowing maybe the information is not eventually correct. They often make fun of any information they sense is not completely accurate and will not use it.

- FSN #1 Negative Communication Theme Response: They try to work with the FSN responsible for gathering the data to determine “how correct” the data is and will develop a plan to acquire the most accurate data.

- FSN #1 Negative Communication Theme Response: They try to make FSNs feel comfortable in order to them to open up and express themselves freely.

- FSN #1 Negative Communication Theme Response: When they are not confident, they tend hide behind military regulations instead of soliciting feedback from FSNs and using sound judgment.

- FSN #1 Negative Communication Theme Response: U.S. military members are very clear and direct in their communication to FSNs. They provide steps and a timeline. The FSNs do not like being treated as a military member.

- FSN #3 Negative Communication Theme Response: The U.S. military thinks they can communicate by joking, smiling, and lifting the lines of class and rank to interact with the FSNs. If the American truly understood the Egyptian culture they would know that doing this is a bad thing. If you are in a higher class or different position than a FSN, you will lose the respect of the rest of the FSNs if you interact with them in a very familiar way.
• FSN #3 Negative Communication Theme Response: The best way to communicate with FSNs is through discussion of their family. Family is the way to friendship. If I want to know a person, I can learn a lot about them by asking about their family.

• FSN #3 Negative Communication Theme Response: Egyptians normally do not present new ideas to the military members. The military always feel that their ideas are better. Also, the Americans do not solicit input for the FSNs or make them a part of the decision-making process.

• FSN #3 Negative Communication Theme Response: The Americans are very naïve about Egyptian culture. They do not go into great depth about the Egyptian characteristics and behaviors. Americans are very direct. FSNs are very indirect.

• FSN #4 Negative Communication Theme Response: I think they should know more about the Egyptian way of thinking. In particular, they need to know how the different socioeconomic classes think. Story: When the Senior OMC leadership restricts the amount of duty-free goods FSNs can buy at the Embassy’s Army and Air Force Exchange Store (AAFES), this offended many the FSN community. Many FSNs felt that they were being accused of black-marketing duty-free goods on the local economy. Buying from AAFES is viewed as a privilege and a sign of prestige for FSNs working at the U.S. Embassy. Many were upset when senior military leadership imposed this new rule. Middle class FSNs will not abuse the system. The whole situation of the AAFES’ clerks checking our bags as
we check was intimidating and humiliating. The military leaders did not learn anything from this incident because they did not call a town hall and solicit feedback from the FSNs about this situation.

- FSN #4 Negative/Positive Communication Theme Response: They are good at communicating to the FSNs. Senior leadership is fairly good at communicating and soliciting input from FSNs. Their training and experience enables them to understand culture. The younger military members have a harder time communicating.

- FSN #5 Negative Communication Theme Response: I don’t think military members ask questions about our culture because they want to learn for personal growth. I think they ask questions to gather information about us and provide a report to their organization. I feel they mainly ask questions to do their job. Example: Once I met someone who told me they were living here to learn about the culture by walking around, watching Egyptian movies, talking to Egyptians, etc. I felt like this military member was spying on me and my country instead of truly learning about my country.

- FSN #5 Negative Communication Theme Response: Sometimes they tend to focus more on the differences versus the commonalities. I feel that it is a privilege the Egyptians can speak English and communicate with the Americans. FSNs are more willing to change and try to accommodate others versus Americans. For example: In their respective countries, Germans and the French will not speak to you English even though they
may know how to speak English. They feel you should be able to speak their language. FSNs try to speak your language and be flexible.

- **FSN #5 Negative Communication Theme Response:** At the beginning, they kept distance between themselves and the FSNs. However, after sometime, they begin to loosen up. Example: At the annual Office of Military Cooperation Gala planning meeting several years ago, I was the only FSN. I felt afraid…no one would interact with me. After sometime, some of the Americans started to warm up to me. But, I still believe I was probably looked at as an outsider and not a FSN.

- **FSN #5 Negative Communication Theme Response:** It all depends on the character of the military member. For example: The security officer responsible for inspecting our building was very strict and directive in how he spoke to me. Instead of have a dialogue to determine how we can correct the problems, he just dictated to me what was wrong.

**Transformation:**

- **FSN #2 Negative Cultural Awareness Theme Response:** As a result of their lack of understanding, the Embassy advises all Americans not to eat around FSNs and Egyptians during Ramadan.

- **FSN #2 Negative Cultural Awareness Theme Response:** Americans never ask for the opinions of FSNs. They do not try to understand the Egyptian culture unless something happens. If everything, they do not care.
- FSN #2 Negative Cultural Awareness Theme Response: Most of them were not properly taught about the Egyptian culture. Americans never try to fully address the problem.

- FSN #2 Negative Cultural Awareness Theme Response: Americans know very little about Egyptian culture. They do not use their own hearts and brains to develop relationships. They tend to rely on outside sources and recommendations.

- FSN #3 Positive Cultural Awareness Theme Response: Some American officers get closer to the human aspect of leadership and learn to understand why Egyptians are a certain way. Their efforts add more dimension and depth to cultural understanding. This helps them to become more tolerant.

- FSN #3 Negative Cultural Awareness Theme Response: The military members are very judgmental. They come here with perceived notions of Egypt and Egyptians. For example, an officer would say I know Egyptians…he would be convinced that all Egyptians would act in a certain manner.

- FSN #3 Negative Cultural Awareness Theme Response: If they don’t understand something about the culture or Egyptian process, they dismiss the issue.

- FSN #4 Negative Cultural Awareness Theme Response: I think the military does not understand the whole culture and the way of doing business here in Egyptian. The Egyptian culture is slow to respond to any
official correspondence. There is a lot of routine, bureaucracy, and paperwork.

- FSN #4 Negative Cultural Awareness Theme Response: I think they should know more about the Egyptian way of thinking. In particular, they need to know how the different socioeconomic classes think.

- FSN #1 Positive Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response: U.S. military members do their best to attend cultural events such as birthdays, picnics, Iftars, etc. This is a good thing. When they have a chance to develop a relationship during working hours, it improves the perception of the individual through the eyes of the FSN.

- FSN #1 Positive Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response: The Office of Military Cooperation has invested a considerable amount of their social budget to promote relationship among FSNs and host nation counterparts.

- FSN #1 Positive Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response: Cultural events and parties are a means to generate relationship interest between both cultures. This improves morale and helps establish a better future for our organization.

- FSN #2 Positive Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response: Americans normally mingle with FSNs during social events. They should interact more on a daily basis.

- FSN #2 Negative Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response: It is very rare in the organization that you feel a true sincere feeling of friendship. There is no natural relationship between the FSNs and military members.
The relationships are merely professional. Most friendships are developed by the FSNs for personal gain.

- FSN #3 Positive Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response: If it’s a personal friendship, the Americans are good about routine visits with their Egyptian counterparts. They are not judgmental when they deal with the Egyptian one-on-one. Professional relationships between the Americans and Egyptians are never equal. Some officers think they are above FSNs.

- FSN #3 Negative Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response: An officer thought he could make an impact with the Egyptian military with weekly meetings. He was ridiculed by the other American officers for investing so much time on one-on-one meetings with the Egyptian military. His colleagues felt that little benefit will come from them.

- FSN #4 Negative Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response: I don’t think the Americans get that close with the FSNs. They keep some distance…but will interact when the FSNs’ family members are around.

- FSN #4 Positive Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response: I believe Americans show interest in many Egyptian events. They don’t joke about one’s religion and make vulgar remarks in front of the ladies.

- FSN #4 Positive Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response: Americans do an excellent job of starting relationships. They ask about your family and are very concerned about your personal well being…they appreciate your family. They will most likely approve any leave or time off for family matters. They ask about your kids… They appreciate families and show
that they care.

- **FSN #5 Negative Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response:** It depends on the character. Some military members are open and are willing to be social and engaging. Some military members stand behind their uniform and do not engage with FSNs fully.

- **FSN #5 Positive Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response:** During social events, most military members will engage with FSNs, due to the planned seating chart.

- **FSN #5 Negative Interpersonal Engagement Theme Response:** When the military put on the uniform, it disconnects them from their emotions and the feelings of others. But as the military members become friendlier, the FSNs will slowly not see the uniform anymore. They will begin to see him/her as a person.

- **FSN #1 Positive Relationship Interest Theme Response:** U.S. military members do their best to attend cultural events such as birthdays, picnics, Iftars, etc. This is a good thing. When they have a chance to develop a relationship during working hours, it improves the perception of the individual through the eyes of the FSN.

- **FSN #1 Positive Relationship Interest Theme Response:** The Office of Military Cooperation has invested a considerable amount of their social budget to promote relationship among FSNs and host nation counterparts.

- **FSN #2 Negative Relationship Interest Theme Response:** It is very rare in the organization that you feel a true sincere feeling of friendship. There is
no natural relationship between the FSNs and military members. The relationships are merely professional. Most friendships are developed by the FSNs for personal gain.

- **FSN #3 Negative Relationship Interest Theme Response:** Some relationships are very professional. The U.S. officers want to really know what the FSNs are thinking. Other just view you as just a FSN and not care about your opinions.

- **FSN #3 Negative Relationship Interest Theme Response:** As a general observation, they tend to be positive. At the individual level, the American officers need to be more tolerant and have more patience.

- **FSN #3 Positive Relationship Interest Theme Response:** I like it very much when they setup golf tournaments and donate the proceeds to charity.

- **FSN #3 Positive Relationship Interest Theme Response:** The best way to communicate with FSNs is through discussion of their family. Family is the way to friendship. If I want to know a person, I can learn a lot about them by asking about their family.

- **FSN #3 Negative Relationship Interest Theme Response:** An officer thought he could make an impact with the Egyptian military with weekly meetings. He was ridiculed by the other American officers for investing so much time on one-on-one meetings with the Egyptian military. His colleagues felt that little benefit will come from them.

- **FSN #4 Negative Relationship Interest Theme Response:** I don’t think the
Americans get that close with the FSNs. They keep some distance…but will interact when the FSNs’ family members are around.

- **FSN #4 Positive Relationship Interest Theme Response:** I believe Americans show interest in many Egyptian events. They don’t joke about one’s religion and make vulgar remarks in front of the ladies.

- **FSN #4 Negative Relationship Interest Theme Response:** One event that raised concerns was during a retirement ceremony. The speaker was trying to explain that the military member was very young…too young to retire. The speaker made the following joke, “I have shoes in my closet older than him.” All the Americans got the joke, but the Egyptians were shocked. In Egyptian culture, shoes are considered to be dirty…unclean. If the speaker respects the military member, why would he/she compare the person to shoes? This was very confusing for the FSNs. This statement would offend someone from the Middle Eastern culture.

- **FSN #5 Positive Relationship Interest Theme Response:** At the beginning, they kept distance between themselves and the FSNs. However, after sometime, they begin to loosen up. Example: At the annual Office of Military Cooperation Gala planning meeting several years ago, I was the only FSN. I felt afraid…no one would interact with me. After sometime, some of the Americans started to warm up to me. But, I still believe I was probably looked at as an outsider and on a FSN.

- **FSN #5 Negative Relationship Interest Theme Response:** I think they depend mostly on the FSNs to resolve the confusion associated with
working in Egypt. In the Middle East, we have a way of “socializing” the business to get what we want. The military members do not have this ability. They need to learn how to soften their approach in dealing with confusion and bureaucracy in Egypt.

- FSN #1 Positive/Negative Inquisitiveness Theme Response: Some military members find our traditions and culture interesting. Others stay away from this area.

- FSN #1 Negative Inquisitiveness Theme Response: Military members are really afraid to address new ideas, thoughts, and attitudes different from their own. Normally, they stay [hide] behind their regulations to justify their reason for not using your ideas. To be nice, they will listen to you, but will normally rely on their own way of conducting business.

- FSN #2 Positive Inquisitiveness Theme Response: During 9-11, the Americans started to learn more about Islam. They asked more direct questions to try to understand the religion

- FSN #2 Negative Inquisitiveness Theme Response: Americans never ask for the opinions of FSNs. They do not try to understand the Egyptian culture unless something happens.

- FSN #3 Negative Inquisitiveness Theme Response: Egyptians normally do not present new ideas to the military members. The military always feel that their ideas are better. Also, the Americans do not solicit input for the FSNs or make them apart of the decision-making process.

- FSN #3 Positive/Negative Inquisitiveness Theme Response: Some
military members are very good leaders. I have witnessed some good examples. Some lack leadership ability. I had a commander/deputy who was very interested in what they were doing for the mission. They are open-minded and expect feedback from all levels. Other leaders just look at this assignment as a vacation or a waiting station for retirement. These leaders become totally disengaged from the FSNs.

- FSN #4 Positive/Negative Inquisitiveness Theme Response: In our organization…. The positive side: They appreciate and value the work, but they are not very democratic. He/she will listen to opinions, but will always stick to their own ideas and perspectives. They have a good system for risk management and feedback. Negative: Military leaders do not listen well to FSNs. They only hear what they want to hear.

- FSN #5 Positive/Negative Inquisitiveness Theme Response: Sometimes they understand the Egyptian way of doing business and appreciate it. Others would say “take the American way or leave it.” This is a source for frustration for us sometimes.

- FSN #5 Negative Inquisitiveness Theme Response: I don’t think military members ask questions about our culture because they want to learn for personal growth. I think they ask questions to gather information about us and provide a report to their organization. I feel they mainly ask questions to do their job. Example: Once I met someone who told me they were living here to learn about the culture by walking around, watching Egyptian movies, talking to Egyptians, etc. I felt like this military member was spying
on me and my country instead of truly learning about my country.

- **FSN #5 Positive/Negative Inquisitiveness Theme Response:** Sometimes they understand the Egyptian way of doing business and appreciate it. Others would say “take the American way or leave it.” This is a source for frustration for us sometimes.

- **FSN #1 Negative Self Confidence Theme Response:** The U.S. military leaders are sometimes reluctant and/or uncomfortable with dealing and/or directing FSNs.

- **FSN #1 Negative Self Confidence Theme Response:** I can sense when the military members are sometimes uncomfortable about certain aspects of our culture. For example, the U.S. military leaders do not always feel comfortable questioning why FSNs are taking leave for religious holidays such as Ramadan. One military member felt embarrassed asking what “Ramadan was all about.” He should not have felt embarrassed if he did not know. Other U.S. military members sometimes make fun of our culture...like the Ramadan holiday. In particular, the often make sarcastic remarks about our fasting practice during Ramadan. They say, “Oh you guys will probably go in the backroom and eat something when no is one is looking.”

- **FSN #1 Positive Self Confidence Theme Response:** If they are very confident, they tend to treat or interact with FSNs in a positive manner.
• FSN #1 Negative Self Confidence Theme Response: When they are not confident, they tend hide behind military regulations instead of soliciting feedback from FSNs and using sound judgment.

• FSN #2 Negative Self Confidence Theme Response: It is very rare that Americans display self-confidence.

• FSN #3 Positive Self Confidence Theme Response: The U.S. military believes in their leadership. Their confidence does not impact their relationship with FSNs.

• FSN #4 Positive Self Confidence Theme Response: Yes, they are very self-confident.

• FSN #1 Positive Emotional Resilience Theme Response: U.S. military members are very good at controlling their emotions when dealing with FSNS. Example: If something goes wrong, you feel that they are angry but they will not display this feeling. It’s good to know that you will not get yelled at for making an honest mistake.

• FSN #2 Positive Emotional Resilience Theme Response: Americans are very good at controlling their emotions. They are very careful at not raising their voice.

• FSN #3 Positive Emotional Resilience Theme Response: If an American officer is happy or angry, it’s hard for a FSN to tell because they hide their emotions so well.

• FSN #4 Positive Emotional Resilience Theme Response: Americans are very good at controlling emotions in general. You do not know if they are
happy or angry. They are very good at keeping distances with FSNs. However, the distance creates a barrier between them and the FSNs. This barrier could hinder the “open door policy.” FSNs are sometimes afraid to deal with someone.

- FSN #5 Positive/Negative Emotional Resilience Theme Response: From what I’ve witnessed, it is ok. They can control their emotions well. There was only one example of an American that allowed their emotions get out of control. This person was always nasty to me. I don’t know if she did not like me because of my personality or I was a FSN.

- FSN #5 Negative Emotional Resilience Theme Response: Military members try to keep their emotions to themselves. For example: During the Iraqi War, the military members would not speak or express their feelings about their comrades dying from roadside bombs. I found this strange because they should be free to express themselves.

- FSN #1 Positive/Negative Cosmopolitanism Theme Response: Common things (i.e. family, habits, etc.)...there is no surprise...more second nature. However, when it comes to the differences, it more of a problem.

- FSN #1 Positive Response Cosmopolitanism Theme Response: They respect the differences... they feel that they are forced to get along because of federal regulation.

- FSN #1 Positive Cosmopolitanism Theme Response: When it comes to family, U.S. military members really appreciate the family bond in Egypt.
The military members often promote family time and encourage all organizational members not to neglect their families.

- FSN #2 Positive Cosmopolitanism Theme Response: I like the fact that Americans are respectful of the family bond in Egypt. They will always approve leave and time off for family events.
- FSN #3 Positive Cosmopolitanism Theme Response: I see only focus on commonalities in religion. I see Islam is almost similar to Christianity.
- FSN #4 Positive Cosmopolitanism Theme Response: Americans give credit to FSNs for their hard work. Some do not make you feel like an outsider while working on projects. They make you feel a part of the team. This is rare…uncommon. Some Americans tend to keep FSNs behind the scenes. For example, I was allowed to accompany a military member to the Ambassador’s quarters because I was a part of the team.
- FSN #4 Positive Cosmopolitanism Theme Response: Americans do an excellent job of starting relationships. They ask about your family and are very concerned about your personal well being…they appreciate your family. They will most likely approve any leave or time off for family matters. They ask about your kids… They appreciate families and show that they care.
- FSN #5 Positive Cosmopolitanism Theme Response: The military normally asks about the concept of family in Egypt. They want to know how we deal with our kids having boyfriends and girlfriends. They also want to know how long we allow our children to live with us. They are
surprised to learn that our children will live with us until they are married….which can be as late as age 32…33.

- FSN #5 Positive/Negative Positive Cosmopolitanism Theme Response: Sometimes they tend to focus more on the differences versus the commonalities. I feel that it is a privilege the Egyptians can speak English and communicate with the Americans. FSNs are more willing to change and try to accommodate others versus Americans. For example: In their respective countries, Germans and the French will not speak to you English even though they may know how to speak English. They feel you should be able to speak their language. FSNs try to speak your language and be flexible.

- FSN #1 Positive Stress Management Theme Response: They will sit down with the FSN to help analyze the problem and work together to help solve the problem.

- FSN #1 Positive Stress Management Theme Response: They try to remain calm in order to get the facts, and then try to solve the problem. They bring a calmer presence to a stressful situation. They will lay out the steps to solve the problem.

- FSN #2 Negative Stress Management Theme Response: I never felt that they handled confusion well. Americans do not normally get upset about out of cycle updates of Egyptian regulations.

- FSN #3 Negative Stress Management Theme Response: American military members become very frustrated with the Egyptian bureaucracy
and government.

- **FSN #3 Negative Stress Management Theme Response:** American officers are easily stressed. FSNs handle stress well because of their religious beliefs. FSNs feel that whatever happens to them is God’s will. On the other hand, American’s believe that they have control over what happens to them and will become stressed when they cannot control the situation. The lack of control leads to stress.

- **FSN #3 Positive Stress Management Theme Response:** Americans manage stress associated with a problem by having a meeting to structure the problem and determine the course of action to correct it.

- **FSN #1 Positive Self-Identity Theme Response:** They continue to participate in their own customs and traditions while being careful not to offend the FSNs and/or other host nation counterparts. For example, the Peace Vector Club (PV) (a pub owned and operated by military members in Maadi, a suburb of Cairo, Egypt) is a closed environment. They do not allow outsiders or FSNs to attend PV Club events during Ramadan for fear of offending someone.

- **FSN #3 Positive Self-Identity Theme Response:** Americans take pride in their military. Americans believe their way is the best way. I believe bureaucracy in Egypt and America is similar.

- **FSN #3 Negative Self-Identity Theme Response:** The officers keep their identity while interacting with the Egyptian culture. This is slowing impacting the young FSNs who are working at the U.S. Embassy. In
particular, the young Egyptian women are picking up the bad traits.

- **FSN #3 Negative Self-Identity Theme Response:** If Americans are honest with themselves, they do not adapt well to Egyptian culture.

- **FSN #4 Positive Self-Identity Theme Response:** It is very nice to hear/have someone express their love for God without being explicit about their religion. One military member during his retirement ceremony demonstrated he was a Christian without offending a mixed audience. They way the military member conveyed his belief is a good example how military members can focus on the commonalities.

- **FSN #5 Positive Self-Identity Theme Response:** Some still hold true to their Christian values and find a way to still relate to Muslims.

**Trust:**

- **FSN #1 Negative Trust Theme Response:** The military members normally respond to confusion (ambiguity) with sarcasm. They tend to not trust FSNs numbers, knowing maybe the information is not eventually correct. They often make fun of any information they sense is not completely accurate and will not use it.

- **FSN #1 Negative Trust Theme Response:** They are sometimes not very trusting of FSNs. They seem to always ask for verification. Some U.S. military members feel FSNs are trying to get over on the Americans.

- **FSN #1 Negative Trust Theme Response:** No perceived trust between the FSNs and military members. For example, I will trust a particular U.S.
military member; however, if it’s a difference between a FSN and American, then the U.S. military member will take the American side.

- FSN #1 Negative Trust Theme Response: They trust us to do the job, but may not trust U.S. military members to cover our backs.
- FSN #2 Negative Trust Theme Response: Americans do not trust FSNs. They tend to hide their true feelings about a person and talk behind back.
- FSN #3 Negative Trust Theme Response: Officially, FSNs feel that the American officers will not take care of them. The officers have to really believe the FSNs are a part of the OMC team. Excluding FSNs from certain meetings about the organization is not a good thing.
- FSN #4 Positive Trust Theme Response: I think there is somewhat an adequate level of trust between the Americans and FSNs.
- FSN #5 Negative Trust Theme Response: In general, they don’t trust us that much. They feel there is always a hidden agenda with FSNs. There is always a lack of trust when dealing with FSNs.
- FSN #5 Negative/Positive Trust Theme Response: They view anything we say as requiring verification…no trust. However, after they deal with us for a while, they begin to realize our capability and lead accordingly.

Empathy:

- FSN #1 Negative Respect Theme Response: They often make fun of any information they sense is not completely accurate and will not use it.
- FSN #1 Positive Respect Theme Response: They respect the differences… they feel that they are forced to get along because of federal
regulation.

- FSN #1 Negative Respect Theme Response: U.S. military members are not aware of how certain behaviors can be conceived as disrespectful in the Egyptian culture. Some (military members) have the courage to ask FSNs and about why they feel a certain way about a particular situation.

- FSN #2 Positive Respect Theme Response: I like that fact that Americans are respectful of the family bond in Egypt. They will always approve leave and time off for family events.

- FSN #2 Negative Respect Theme Response: Example: An American will go to another FSN to verify a price he paid for something from another FSN. This is disrespectful.

- FSN #2 Negative Respect Theme Response: Americans do not put FSNs in their communication process. They do not courtesy copy us on emails…no coordination. This is a sign of disrespect.

- FSN #3 Positive/Negative Respect Theme Response: Some officers are aware of how their actions would be viewed as disrespectful and some do not care. Some are very sensitive to the feelings of others, some are not....

- FSN #3 Negative Respect Theme Response: If the American truly understood the Egyptian culture they would know that doing this is a bad thing. If you are in a higher class or different position than a FSN, you will lose the respect of the rest of the FSNs if you interact with them in a very familiar way.
• FSN #4 Positive Respect Theme Response: Americans give credit to FSNs for their hard work. Some do not make you feel like an outsider while working on projects. They make you feel a part of the team. This is rare…uncommon. Some Americans tend to keep FSNs behind the scenes.

• FSN #4 Positive Respect Theme Response: I believe Americans show interest in many Egyptian events. They don’t joke about one’s religion and make vulgar remarks in front of the ladies.

• FSN #4 Positive Respect Theme Response: They should respect credibility and knowledge.

• FSN #4 Negative Respect Theme Response: I think they should know more about the Egyptian way of thinking. In particular, they need to know how the different socioeconomic classes think. Story: When the Senior OMC leadership restricts the amount of duty-free goods FSNs can buy at the Embassy’s Army and Air Force Exchange Store (AAFES), this offended many the FSN community. Many FSNs felt that they were accused of black-marketing duty-free goods on the local economy. Buying from AAFES is considered a privilege and a sign of prestige for FSNs working at the U.S. Embassy. Many were upset when senior military leadership imposed this new rule. Middle class FSNs will not abuse the system. The whole situation of the AAFES' clerks checking our bags as we check was intimidating and humiliating. The military leaders did not learn anything from this incident because they did not call a town hall and solicit feedback from the FSNs about this situation.
• **FSN #4 Negative Respect Theme Response:** One military member was upset because he had to wait in line behind Egyptians who were taking a long time buying duty-free items that should be set aside for military members.

• **FSN #5 Negative Respect Theme Response:** The way military leadership dealt with the Army Air Force Exchange Store (AAFES) and FSN policy (FSNs are only able to buy some quantities of duty-free food goods and consume them on Embassy property) was not good. They generalized the whole FSN population instead of focusing on the individual offenders. Most FSNs are honest and do not want to jeopardize this privilege. Therefore, punishing the whole FSN community by closely watching FSNs at the AAFES’ checkout and inspecting their bags for excessive purchases is disrespectful. “I'm working in the American Embassy and I have the same amount of risk as the Americans. I should be treated the same way.”

• **FSN #1 Negative Emotional Sensitivity Theme Response:** I can sense when the military members are sometimes uncomfortable about certain aspects of our culture. For example, the U.S. military leaders do not always feel comfortable questioning why FSNs are taking leave for religious holidays such as Ramadan. One military member felt embarrassed asking what “Ramadan was all about.” He should not have felt embarrassed if he did not know. Other U.S. military members sometimes make fun of our culture…like the Ramadan holiday. In
particular, the often make sarcastic remarks about our fasting practice during Ramadan. They say, “Oh you guys will probably go in the backroom and eat something when no is one is looking.”

- **FSN #1 Negative/Positive Emotional Sensitivity Theme Response:**
  Sometimes the military members cannot understand why and how FSNs feel. U.S. military members are not aware of how certain behaviors can be perceived as disrespectful in the Egyptian culture. Some (military members) have the courage to ask FSNs and about why they feel a certain way about a particular situation.

- **FSN #2 Negative Emotional Sensitivity Theme Response:**
  The Americans’ assessment of FSNs’ emotions is not accurate. They should approach everyone according to their background.

- **FSN #3 Positive/Negative Emotional Sensitivity Theme Response:**
  Some military members are very sensitive to the feelings of others, some are not.…

- **FSN #4 Negative Emotional Sensitivity Theme Response:**
  They are very careful to avoid speaking on sensitive areas of religion, clothing, etc. In contrast, the FSNs like to know your beliefs; they have a high tendency to bring these topics up. The U.S. military tend to shy away from sensitive topics. It’s a good thing, because you find a lot of fanatics. If you show your tendency/preference for one particular belief or another, you may stir up emotions. Also, the FSNs will base your character on that one particular belief instead of looking at the whole person.
• FSN #4 Positive Emotional Sensitivity Theme Response: I saw some positive things. They show compassion and understand emotions by not highlighting the mistakes. They keep the focus on the problem instead of the person.

• FSN #5 Positive/Negative Emotional Resilience Theme Response: When the military put on the uniform, it disconnects them from their emotions and the feelings of others. As the military members become friendlier, the FSNs will slowly not see the uniform anymore. They will begin to see him/her as a person.

• FSN #1 Negative/Positive Cultural Sensitivity Theme Response: Sometimes the military members cannot understand why and how FSNs feel. U.S. military members are not aware of how certain behaviors can be perceived as disrespectful in the Egyptian culture. Some (military members) have the courage to ask FSNs and about why they feel a certain way about a particular situation.

• FSN #2 Negative Cultural Sensitivity Theme Response: Americans will shy away from confusion. For instance, they focus too much on fasting during the Ramadan holiday instead focusing on the overall meaning. As a result of this lack of understanding, the Embassy advises all Americans not to eat around FSNs and Egyptians during Ramadan.

• FSN #4 Negative Cultural Sensitivity Theme Response: Egyptians believe information is power. Americans hear a lot and listen to everyone without knowing the person’s true intentions. Egyptians are raised on “insecurity.”
In the U.S., you have a more secured culture in which you know everything will be there in its place for you. In Egypt, it is a strict society. You don’t really feel secure enough to make mistakes.

- FSN #4 Negative Cultural Sensitivity Theme Response: One event that raised concerns was during a retirement ceremony. The speaker was trying to explain that the military member was very young…too young to retire. The speaker made the following joke, “I have shoes in my closet older than him.” All the Americans got the joke, but the Egyptians were shocked. In Egyptian culture, shoes are considered to be dirty…unclean. If the speaker respects the military member, why would he/she compare the person to shoes! This was very confusing for the FSNs. This statement would offend someone from the Middle Eastern culture.

- FSN #4 Negative Cultural Sensitivity Theme Response: I think they should know more about the Egyptian way of thinking. In particular, they need to know how the different socioeconomic classes think.

Flexibility:

- FSN #1 Negative Tolerance of Ambiguity Theme Response: The military members normally respond to confusion (ambiguity) with sarcasm. They tend to not trust FSNs’ information; knowing that the information is not eventually correct. U.S. military members often make fun of any information they sense is not completely accurate and will not use it.

- FSN #1 Positive Tolerance of Ambiguity Competency Theme Response: They (SAOs) try to work with the FSN responsible for gathering the data to
determine “how correct” the data is and will develop a plan to acquire the most accurate data.

- FSN #2 Negative Tolerance of Ambiguity Theme Response: I never felt that they handle confusion well. Americans do not normally get upset about out of cycle updates of Egyptian regulations.

- FSN #2 Negative Tolerance of Ambiguity Theme Response: Americans will shy away from confusion. For instance, they focus too much on fasting during the Ramadan holiday instead focusing on the overall meaning. As a result of this lack of understanding, the Embassy advises all Americans not to eat around FSNs and Egyptians during Ramadan.

- FSN #3 Negative Tolerance of Ambiguity Theme Response: If they don’t understand something about the culture or Egyptian process, they dismiss the issue.

- FSN #3 Negative Tolerance of Ambiguity Theme Response: American military members become very frustrated with the Egyptian bureaucracy and government.

- FSN #3 Negative Tolerance of Ambiguity Theme Response: American officers are easily stressed. FSNs handle stress well because of their religious beliefs. FSNs feel that whatever happens to them is God’s will. On the other hand, American’s believe that they have control over what happens to them and will become stressed when they cannot control the situation. The lack of control leads to stress.
• FSN #4 Negative Tolerance of Ambiguity Theme Response: I think the military does not understand the whole culture and the way of doing business here in Egypt. The Egyptian culture is slow to respond to any official correspondence. There is a lot of routine, bureaucracy, and paperwork.

• FSN #5 Positive/Negative Tolerance of Ambiguity Theme Response: Sometimes they understand the Egyptian way of doing business and appreciate it. Others would say “take the American way or leave it.” This is a source for frustration for us sometimes.

• FSN #5 Negative Tolerance of Ambiguity Theme Response: I think they depend on mostly on the FSNs to resolve the confusion associated with working in Egypt. In the Middle East, we have a way of “socializing” the business to get what we want. The military members do not have this ability. They need to learn how to soften their approach in dealing with confusion and bureaucracy in Egypt.

• FSN #1 Positive Social Flexibility Theme Response: Trying not to eat out in the open during Ramadan. I think they really care…are concerned.

• FSN #1 Positive Social Flexibility Theme Response: They try to make FSNs feel comfortable in order to them to open up and express themselves freely.

• FSN #2 Negative Social Flexibility Theme Response: It is very rare that Americans here at the Embassy adjust their behaviors to create good first impressions.
• FSN #3 Positive Social Flexibility Theme Response: The Americans try to adjust their behaviors to make good first impressions with the Egyptian military counterparts. They try to be flexible by adjusting how they communicate to make their counterparts feel comfortable. They slow their speech patterns down and use simple words.

• FSN #4 Negative Social Flexibility Theme Response: I do not think the Americans know much about the Egyptian culture to understand how they can adjust their culture.

• FSN #5 Negative/Positive Social Flexibility Theme Response: Most act as tourists here in Egypt. They won’t go out of their way to accommodate FSNs. However, it depends on the character. Some military members are more flexible than others.

Open-mindedness/Openness:

• FSN #1 Positive Nonjudgmentalness Theme Response: Only one percent of the military members exhibit signs of prejudice.

• FSN #1 Negative Nonjudgmentalness Theme Response: One military member was reluctant to interact with me because of my appearance (head cover). I was not sure if he was uncomfortable dealing with a Muslim woman or he just did not like me for my personality.

• FSN #3 Negative Nonjudgmentalness Theme Response: The military members are very judgmental. They come here with perceived notions of Egypt and Egyptians. For example, an officer would say I know Egyptians...he would be convinced that all Egyptians would act in a
certain manner.

- FSN #3 Negative Nonjudgmentalness Theme Response: If it’s a personal friendship, the Americans are good about routine visits with their Egyptian counterparts. They are not judgmental when they deal with the Egyptian one-on-one. Professional relationships between the Americans and Egyptians are never equal. Some officers think they are above FSNs.

- FSN #4 Positive Nonjudgementalness Theme Response: I think they are good at holding back judgment. They are very careful to avoid speaking on sensitive areas of religion, clothing, etc. In contrast, the FSNs like to know your beliefs; they have a high tendency to bring these topics up. The military shy away from these topics. It’s a good thing, because you find a lot of fanatics. If you show your tendency/preference for one particular belief or another, you may stir up emotions. Also, the FSNs will base your character on that one particular belief instead of looking at the whole person.

- FSN #5 Negative Nonjudgmentalness Theme Response: The way military leadership dealt with the Army Air Force Exchange Store (AAFES) and FSN policy (FSNs are only able to buy some quantities of duty-free food goods and consume them on Embassy property) was not good. They generalized the whole FSN population instead of focusing on the individual offenders. Most FSNs are honest and do not want to jeopardize this privilege. Therefore, punishing the whole FSN community by closely watching FSNs at the AAFES’ checkout and inspecting their bags for
excessive purchases is considered disrespectful. “I’m working in the American Embassy and I have the same amount of risk as the Americans. I should be treated the same way.”

- FSN #5 Positive Nonjudgmentalness Theme Response: Good military members ignore their successor’s comments about a person and judge for themselves.

- FSN #5 Negative Nonjudgmentalness Theme Response: For me, the uniform does not make a difference. I still see you all as Americans. During Ramadan, an American in the elevator was making an offending comment about the holiday. The American said. “It’s ridiculous to determine the start of a holiday by the lunar moon sighting.” One FSN immediately told the person to stop making comments about Ramadan because they were offensive. When you do not bother to learn about the country’s culture, you need to be aware that you can potentially make comments that would offend people. If the FSNs witness this, they will start to generalize all Americans in this aspect.

Favoritism:

- FSN #1 Negative Favoritism Theme Response: Some FSNs feel the military members look down on them.

- FSN #2 Negative Favoritism Theme Response: Americans do not put FSNs in their communication process. They do not courtesy copy us on emails…no coordination. This is a sign of disrespect.
• FSN #3 Positive/Negative Favoritism Theme Response: Some relationships are very professional. The U.S. officers want to really know what the FSNs are thinking. Other just view you as just a FSN and not care about your opinions.

• FSN #3 Positive/Negative Favoritism Theme Response: If it's a personal friendship, the Americans are good about routine visits with their Egyptian counterparts. They are not judgmental when they deal with the Egyptian one-on-one. Professional relationships between the Americans and Egyptians are never equal. Some officers think they are above FSNs.

• FSN #3 Negative Favoritism Theme Response: FSNs normally feel like an intruder on OMC social events. FSNs tend to shy from these planning committees and events.

• FSN #4 Negative Favoritism Theme Response: When the Senior OMC leadership restricts the amount of duty-free goods FSNs can buy at the Embassy's Army and Air Force Exchange Store (AAFES), this offended many the FSN community. Many FSNs felt that they were accused of black-marketing duty-free goods on the local economy. Buying from AAFES is considered a privilege and a sign of prestige for FSNs working at the U.S. Embassy. Many were upset when senior military leadership imposed this new rule. Middle class FSNs will not abuse the system. The whole situation of the AAFES' clerks checking our bags as we check was intimidating and humiliating. The military leaders did not learn anything
from this incident because they did not call a town hall and solicit feedback from the FSNs about this situation.

- **FSN #4 Negative Favoritism Theme Response:** One military member was upset because he had to wait in line behind Egyptians who were taking a long time buying duty-free items that should be set aside for military members.

- **FSN #4 Positive Favoritism Theme Response:** The way Americans are not arrogant towards FSNs and appreciate them. They do not discriminate against FSNs. They feel they can mingle with everyone.

- **FSN #4 Positive/Negative Favoritism Theme Response:** Americans give credit to FSNs for their hard work. Some do not make you feel like an outsider while working on projects. They make you feel a part of the team. This is rare…uncommon. Some Americans tend to keep FSNs behind the scenes. For example, I was allowed to accompany a military member to the Ambassador’s quarters because I was a part of the team.

- **FSN #4 Negative Favoritism Theme Response:** I don’t think they (Americans) should socialize that much with the FSNs because of their position.

- **FSN #4 Negative Favoritism Theme Response:** Force protection officers at the Embassy sometimes make us feel that we are not authorized to know stuff and get involved in the decision-making process because we are not American or a potential threat
• FSN #5 Positive/Negative Favoritism Theme Response: At the beginning, they kept distance between themselves and the FSNs. However, after some time, they begin to loosen up. Example: At the annual Office of Military Cooperation Gala planning meeting several years ago, I was the only FSN. I felt afraid…no one would interact with me. After some time, some of the Americans started to warm up to me. But, I still believe I was probably looked at as an outsider and on a FSN.

• FSN #5 Negative Favoritism Theme Response: The way military leadership dealt with the Army Air Force Exchange Store (AAFES) and FSN policy (FSNs are only able to buy some quantities of duty-free food goods and consume them on Embassy property) was not good. They generalized the whole FSN population instead of focusing on the individual offenders. Most FSNs are honest and do not want to jeopardize this privilege. Therefore, punishing the whole FSN community by closely watching FSNs at the AAFES’ checkout and inspecting their bags for excessive purchases is considered disrespectful. “I’m working in the American Embassy and I have the same amount of risk as the Americans. I should be treated the same way.”

Leadership:

• FSN #1 Negative Leadership Theme Response: Military leaders at the U.S. Embassy do not have the whole picture…not getting information directly from employees.
• FSN #1 Positive Leadership Theme Response: U.S. military leaders tend to be better than the U.S. Department of State leaders at the U.S. Embassy.

• FSN #1 Positive Leadership Theme Response: U.S. military leaders are good at using documentation to record employee’s progress and communicate organizational goals and requirements.

• FSN #1 Negative Leadership Theme Response: There should be someone in Office of Military Cooperation at the U.S. Embassy assigned as a cultural expert.

• FSN #1 Negative Leadership Theme Response: The U.S. military leaders are sometimes reluctant and/or uncomfortable with dealing and/or directing FSNs.

• FSN #2 Negative Leadership Theme Response: I don’t feel that there is a group and management effort to minimize differences between both cultures.

• FSN #2 Negative Leadership Theme Response: Leadership knows about some of our problems, but they do not try to fix them.

• FSN #2 Negative Leadership Theme Response: Disappointment. I expected the U.S. military members to be better than the FSNs. For instance, out of 50 U.S. military members I dealt with over the years, only three deserved the title of leader. Most were not fair when dealing with FSNs.
• FSN #3 Positive/Negative Leadership Theme Response: Some military members are very good leaders. I have witnessed some good examples. Some lack leadership ability. I had a commander/deputy who was very interested in what we were doing for the mission. They are open-minded and expect feedback from all levels. Other leaders just look at this assignment as a vacation or a waiting station for retirement. These leaders become totally disengaged from the FSNs.

• FSN #3 Positive Leadership Theme Response: Some American officers get closer to the human aspect of leadership and learn and understand why Egyptians are a certain way. Their efforts add more dimension and depth to cultural understanding. This helps them to become more tolerant.

• FSN #3 Negative Leadership Theme Response: One former general officer wanted to start a cyber warfare initiative with the Egyptian military. Because the Egyptian military did not want to invest in cyber warfare, he stopped supporting all other Egyptian Foreign Military Sales cases.

• FSN #3 Positive Leadership Theme Response: The U.S. military believe in their leadership. Their confidence does not impact their relationship with FSNs.

• FSN #3 Positive Leadership Theme Response: Some officers are very committed to accomplishing goals...some are not....

• FSN #4 Positive Leadership Theme Response: They are good at communicating to the FSNs. Senior leadership is fairly good at communicating and soliciting input from FSNs. Their training and
experience enables them to understand culture. The younger military members have a harder time communicating

- FSN #5 Positive Leadership Theme Response: The military leaders try to be more civilian than military when dealing with FSNs. They try to be a bit more civilian in the way they communicate with FSNs. Instead of being directive, they try to persuade because it appears to be a more effective way at the Embassy.

- FSN #5 Positive/Negative Leadership Theme Response: Certain military leaders will try to promote a big family feel in the Embassy. However, they still sometimes treat and lead Americans and FSNs separately.

- FSN #5 Negative/Positive Leadership Theme Response: Military members really do not know much about how to lead Egyptians. They believe we still ride camels. They are shocked to discover we have technology (i.e. cell phones, internet, latest computers, etc.) and are well-educated. I think this view needs to change. They view anything we say as needing to be verified—no trust. However, after they deal with us for a while, they begin to realize our capability and lead accordingly.

Family:

- FSN #1 Positive/Negative Family Theme Response: Common things (i.e. family, habits, etc.)…this is no surprise…more second nature. However, when it comes to the differences, it more of a problem.

- FSN #1 Positive Family Theme Response: When it comes to family, U.S. military members really appreciate the family bond in Egypt. The military
members often promote family time and encourage all organizational members not to neglect their families.

- FSN #1 Positive Family Theme Response: Observing Ramadan practices, enjoying the families are priorities for the military.

- FSN #2 Positive Family Theme Response: I like that fact that Americans are respectful of the family bond in Egypt. They will always approve leave and time off for family events.

- FSN #3 Positive Family Theme Response: The best way to communicate with FSNs is through discussion of their family. Family is the way to friendship. If I want to know a person, I can learn a lot about them by asking about their family.

- FSN #4 Positive Family Theme Response: Americans do an excellent job of starting relationships. They ask about your family and are very concerned about your personal well being…they appreciate your family. They will most likely approve any leave or time off for family matters. They ask about your kids…. They appreciate families and show that they care.

- FSN #5 Positive/Negative Family Theme Response: Certain military leaders will try to promote a big family feel in the Embassy. However, they still sometimes treat and lead Americans and FSNs separately.

- FSN #5 Positive Family Theme Response: The military normally asks about the concept of family in Egypt. They want to know how we deal with our kids having boyfriends and girlfriends. They also want to know how long we allow our children to live with us. They are surprised to learn that
our children will live with us until they are married….which can be as late as age 32...33.

Humor:

- FSN #1 Negative Humor Theme Response:  The military members normally respond to confusion (ambiguity) with sarcasm. They tend to not trust FSNs numbers, knowing maybe the information is not eventually correct. They often make fun of any information they sense is not completely accurate and will not use it.

- FSN #2 Negative Humor Theme Response:  Also, they make fun of our culture. For instance, they mock our staying of “In Shallah.”

- FSN #3 Negative Humor Theme Response:  Americans are not aware of how their behaviors impact the mission and how they are perceived by FSNs. For example: Joking or flirting with a female co-worker maybe ok in the U.S., but many FSNs would be offended seeing this behavior in the office.

- FSN #3 Negative Humor Theme Response:  The U.S. military think they can communicate by joking, smiling, and lifting the lines of class and rank to interact with the FSNs. If the Americans truly understood the Egyptian culture, they would know that doing this is a bad thing. If you are in a higher class or different position than a FSN, you will lose the respect of the rest of the FSNs if you interact with them in a very familiar way.

- FSN #4 Positive Humor Theme Response:  U.S. military members are considered to be very positive compare to our culture. It is usually nice to
see a military member with a sense of humor. It is refreshing to see them laugh in a social setting.

- FSN #4 Positive Humor Theme Response: I believe Americans show interest in many Egyptian events. They don’t joke about one’s religion and make vulgar remarks in front of the ladies.

- FSN #4 Negative Humor Theme Response: One event that raised concerns was during a retirement ceremony. The speaker was trying to explain that the military member was very young…too young to retire. The speaker made the following joke, “I have shoes in my closet older than him.” All the Americans got the joke, but the Egyptians were shocked. In Egyptian culture, shoes are considered to be dirty…unclean. If the speaker respects the military member, why would he/she compare the person to shoes?! This was very confusing for the FSNs. This statement would offend someone from the Middle Eastern culture.

- FSN #5 Negative Humor Theme Response: For me, the uniform does not make a difference. I still see you all as Americans. During Ramadan, an American in the elevator was making an offending comment about the holiday. The American said. “It's ridiculous to determine the start of a holiday by the lunar moon sighting.” One FSN immediately told the person to stop making comments about Ramadan because they were offensive.

Fairness:

- FSN #2 Negative Fairness Theme Response: Disappointment. I expected the U.S. military members to be better than the FSNs. For instance, out of
50 U.S. military members I dealt with over the years, only three deserved the title of leader. Most were not fair when dealing with FSNs.

- **FSN #4 Positive Fairness Theme Response:** Americans give credit to FSNs for their hard work. Some do not make you feel like an outsider while working on projects. They make you feel a part of the team. This is rare…uncommon. Some Americans tend to keep FSNs behind the scenes. For example, I was allowed to accompany a military member to the Ambassador’s quarters because I was a part of the team.

- **FSN #5 Negative Fairness Theme Response:** The way military leadership dealt with the Army Air Force Exchange Store (AAFES) and FSN policy (FSNs are only able to buy some quantities of duty-free food goods and consume them on Embassy property) was not good. They generalized the whole FSN population instead of focusing on the individual offenders. Most FSNs are honest and do not want to jeopardize this privilege. So punishing the whole FSN community by closely watching FSNs at the AAFES’ checkout and inspecting their bags for excessive purchases. “I’m working in the American Embassy and I have the same amount of risk as the Americans. I should be treated the same way.”

- **FSN #5 Positive Fairness Theme Response:** I have not faced anything that was striking. They deal with us on a professional level. They evaluate us on our performance.
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