



EMERGING
LEADERSHIP
JOURNEYS

The Relationship between GLOBE's Future Orientation Cultural Dimension and Servant Leadership Endorsement

Shane Sokoll
Regent University

Understanding cultural nuances, practices, and dimensions in today's ever globalizing world is a key competency for today's organizational leaders and those of the future. In an attempt to build upon the knowledge already presented the literature regarding cross-cultural interaction and multicultural leadership competencies, this model paper explores the cultural dimension termed future orientation that is used in the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) project and its relationship to and effect on followers' reception of servant leadership behaviors. Future orientation is defined by House et al. (1999) as "the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies engage in future-oriented behaviors such as planning, investing in the future, and delaying gratification." The distinctive, central focus and base of servant leadership behaviors, as explained by Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008) and Fields and Winston (2010), is serving the needs of followers. Based on a comparison of the conceptual theories and empirical findings from the GLOBE study and the literature on servant leadership, this model paper makes two hypotheses: a) employees from cultures that value high future orientation will highly value servant leadership behaviors exhibited by leaders; and b) employees from cultures that hold a lesser value of future orientation will value servant leadership behaviors exhibited by leaders less than employees from cultures with a high future orientation.

The leaders of yesterday look vastly different from the leaders of the future. As humanity finds itself in the midst of a globalizing world going through hyper-speed changes on numerous fronts, organizations from scores of nations are racing to identify leadership approaches and wisdom that can meet the challenges of today and tomorrow (Holbeche, 2009; Maak & Pless, 2006). Jack Welch, the former CEO of General Electric (GE), delivered a speech to his employees where he described this daunting world scene and the call for a new type of leader, in which he stated,

The Jack Welch of the future cannot be me. I spent my entire career in the United States. The next head of General Electric will be somebody who spent time in Bombay, in Hong Kong, in Buenos Aires. We have to send

our best and brightest overseas and make sure they have the training that will allow them to be the global leaders who will make GE flourish in the future. (as cited in Javidan & House, 2001)

Global leadership competencies are in increasing demand. Navigating multinational, multicultural working relationships requires a new set of KSAOs (knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics – i.e., competencies) that are vast in number and complex in depth. In an attempt to add to the literature regarding multicultural leadership competencies, this model paper presents an exploration of the cultural variations in the concepts future orientation and servant leadership theory.

The cultural dimension termed “future orientation,” defined by House et al. (1999) and adapted by Ashkanasy, Gupta, Mayfield, and Trevor-Roberts (2004) in the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) project, refers to “the extent to which members of a society or an organization believe that their current actions will influence their future, focus on investment in their future, believe that they will have a future that matters, believe in planning for developing their future, and look far into the future for assessing the effects of their current actions” (Ashkanasy et al., p. 285). Scholarly research has found a positive and negative relationship between high and low future orientation and leadership behaviors such as strategic planning, entrepreneurship, decision making, corruption, visioning, social responsibility, performance, development, and support of subordinates, as well as a relationship with human resource management practices such as recruitment, interviewing, selection, training and development, compensation and rewards, retention strategies, and organizational communication (Alavi & McCormick, 2004; Catana & Catana, 2010; Dastmalchian, Javidan, & Alam, 2001; Frank, Kessler, & Fink, 2010; Grisham, 2009; Hytter, 2007; Ofer, 2008; Papalexandris & Panayotopoulou, 2004; Roxas, Lindsay, Ashill, & Victorio, 2008; Sarros, Gray, Densten, & Cooper, 2005; Seleim & Bontis, 2009; Yeganeh & Su, 2007, 2008; Zhao, 2006). This model paper proposes the research of yet another leadership variable relationship with the concept of future orientation: servant leadership theory.

Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership Theory

Implicit leadership theory (ILT) describes how individuals form and hold opinions about what types of actions, attributes, personalities, characteristics, knowledge, abilities, and skills are needed to achieve exceptional leadership (Dorfman, Hanges, & Brodbeck, 2004). According to Lord and Maher (1991), an individual’s opinions about effective leadership affect how the individual, as a follower, responds to and accepts others as leaders. Dorfman et al. (2004) extended ILT to the cultural level and labeled it *culturally endorsed implicit leadership theory* (CLT) based upon the concept that the belief system held by individuals is often shared with those of common cultures. The GLOBE study found that the type of leadership styles believed to be effective by individuals in

organizations has a positive relationship with the level that the organization and society as a whole value future orientation (Dorfman et al.). For example, when organizations were seen as valuing future orientation, the CLT embraced at the organizational level would probably be made up of the type of leadership styles that the GLOBE study described as “Participative, Humane-Oriented, Team-Oriented, and Charismatic/Value-Based” (Dorfman et al., p. 331). The comprehensive list of leadership attributes that correspond with these CLT dimensions are: delegator, non-micromanager, egalitarian, other oriented, non-autocratic, non-dictatorial, not bossy, non-elitist, modest, self-effacing, patient, generous, compassionate, group-oriented, collaborative, loyal, consultative, communicative, team builder, informed, integrator, diplomatic, worldly, win-win problem solver, effective bargainer, non-hostile, honest, non-vindictive, non-irritable, orderly, administratively skilled, organized, good administrator, foresight, prepared, anticipatory, plans ahead, enthusiastic, positive, morale booster, motive arouser, risk taker, self-sacrificial, convincing, sincere, just, trustworthy, willful, decisive, logical, intuitive, improvement-oriented, excellence oriented, and performance oriented. The correlations found between high levels of organizational future orientation and the CLTs from the GLOBE study provide an example of the insights that can be gleaned about how future orientation affects individuals’ potential perceptions about certain types of leadership behaviors. Exploring how the level of societal and organizational future orientation might affect the reception of other types of leadership behaviors beyond those researched in the GLOBE study might prove worthwhile. For example, how would the level of societal and organizational future orientation affect the perception of the effectiveness of servant leadership behaviors?

Servant Leadership Theory

Servant leadership theory has had multiple dimensions and constructs proposed and studied by researchers over the years. Russell and Stone (2002) found in the literature the following 20 servant leadership attributes: vision, honesty, integrity, service, trust, modeling, pioneering, appreciation of others, empowerment, communication, credibility, competence, stewardship, visibility, influence, persuasion, listening, encouragement, teaching, and delegation (p. 147). Beyond these attributes, Fields and Winston (2010) identified 25 more servant leadership attributes that have been attempted to be measured with instruments: humility, servant-hood, caring for others, developing others, goal-setting, team-building, shared decision making, voluntary subordination, authentic self, covenantal relationship, responsible morality, transcendent spirituality, transforming influence, forming relationships with subordinates, helping subordinates grow and succeed, behaving ethically, conceptual skills, putting subordinates first, creating value for those outside the organization, leader’s agapao love, altruism, wisdom, persuasion mapping, emotional healing, creating value for the community (p. 22). Table 1 (parts 1 and 2) shows the 20 servant

leadership attributes identified in the literature by Russell and Stone, the 25 additional leadership attributes identified in the literature by Fields and Winston, and the CLT attributes that correspond with a high level of organizational future orientation described by Dorfman et al. (2004) in the GLOBE study.

Servant Leadership Validated

Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008) empirically researched the servant leadership construct in an attempt to validate the distinctiveness of servant leadership from other leadership approaches and their effectiveness. As Liden et al. (2008) pointed out, Greenleaf (1977), who coined the term servant leadership and introduced the leadership style in an articulated manner, did not continue down the path of formal theory design and research to validate the attributes and results of servant leadership behaviors. The Liden et al. study included two phases: a pilot study with a sample of 298 university students from a single university, and a follow up organizational study with 164 employees and 25 supervisors from a single production and distribution company (p. 165). Liden et al.'s research resulted with empirical validation of seven servant leadership dimensions (conceptual skills, empowering, helping subordinates grow and succeed, putting subordinates first, behaving ethically, emotional healing, and creating value for the community); thus, making it a landmark study in the development and exploration of the construct.

Servant Leadership Simplified and Validated Again

One of the primary aims of Fields and Winston's (2010) research was to simplify the servant leadership construct and to design and test a simplified measurement tool to assess the servant leadership approach. The 45 attributes of servant leadership itemized in Table 1 (parts 1 and 2) show the complexity of the servant leadership construct that has developed as researchers have sought to explore this leadership phenomenon. As can also be seen in Table 1 (parts 1 and 2), some dimensions of servant leadership have overlapped with other leadership theories, which often confuses the servant leadership construct's distinctiveness. Fields and Winston, with the assistance of a panel of experts on servant leadership theory, formed a single-dimension, ten-item measurement tool. Table 2 presents Fields and Winston's single-dimensioned servant leadership behaviors and the ten-item instrument. The single dimension tool seeks to measure the distinctive behaviors of servant leadership that focus on the leader's service to and development of followers. The instrument was successful in empirically testing the servant leadership distinctive through a sample of 456 employees across multiple industries (Fields & Winston).

Table 1 (part 1 of 2): GLOBE's Leadership Attributes Favored by High Level Future Orientation Organizations & SL

GLOBE	Russell & Stone's Lit. Review	Fields & Winston's Lit. Review
administratively skilled	appreciation of others	altruism
anticipatory	communication	authentic self
collaborative	competence	behaving ethically
communicative	credibility	caring for others
compassionate	delegation	conceptual skills
consultative	empowerment	covenantal relationship
convincing	encouragement	creating value for the community
decisive	honesty	creating value for those outside the organization
delegator	influence	developing others
diplomatic	integrity	emotional healing
effective bargainer	listening	forming relationships with subordinates
egalitarian	modeling	goal-setting
enthusiastic	persuasion	helping subordinates grow and succeed
excellence oriented	pioneering	humility
foresight	service	leader's agapao love
generous	stewardship	persuasion mapping
good administrator	teaching	putting subordinates first
group-oriented	trust	responsible morality
honest	visibility	servant-hood
improvement-oriented	vision	shared decision making
informed		team-building
integrator		transcendent spirituality
intuitive		transforming influence
just		voluntary subordination
logical		wisdom

Table 1 (part 2 of 2): GLOBE's Leadership Attributes Favored by High Level Future Orientation Organizations & SL

GLOBE (continued)	Russell & Stone's Lit. Review	Fields & Winston's Lit. Review
loyal	appreciation of others	altruism
modest	communication	authentic self
morale booster	competence	behaving ethically
motive arouser	credibility	caring for others
non-autocratic	delegation	conceptual skills
non-dictatorial	empowerment	covenantal relationship
non-elitist	encouragement	creating value for the community
non-hostile	honesty	creating value for those outside the organization
non-irritable	influence	developing others
non-micromanager	integrity	emotional healing
non-vindictive	listening	forming relationships with subordinates
not bossy	modeling	goal-setting
orderly	persuasion	helping subordinates grow and succeed
organized	pioneering	humility
other oriented	service	leader's agapao love
patient	stewardship	persuasion mapping
performance oriented	teaching	putting subordinates first
plans ahead	trust	responsible morality
positive	visibility	servant-hood
prepared	vision	shared decision making
risk taker		team-building
self-effacing		transcendent spirituality
self-sacrificial		transforming influence
sincere		voluntary subordination
team builder		wisdom
trustworthy		
willful		

win-win problem solver
worldly

Table 2: Fields and Winston's New Parsimonious Measure of Servant Leadership Behaviors

Practices what he/she preaches
Serves people without regard to their nationality, gender, or race
Sees serving as a mission of responsibility to others
Genuinely interested in employees as people
Understands that serving others is most important
Willing to make sacrifices to help others
Seeks to instill trust rather than fear or insecurity
Is always honest
Is driven by a sense of higher calling
Promotes values that transcend self-interest and material success

Response scale for extent to which this statement described the behavior of a focal leader:

1 = definitely no; 2 = no; 3 = neutral; 4 = yes; 5 = definitely yes

Items comprising a new parsimonious measure of servant leadership behaviors (Chronbach alpha = .96)

Future Orientation and Servant Leadership Model

The GLOBE study found a tendency of organizations with a culture of high future orientation to be inclined to embrace certain types of leadership: Participative, Humane-Oriented, Team-Oriented, and Charismatic/Value-Based (Dorfman et al., 2004). As can be seen in Table 1 (parts 1 and 2), certain attributes of these leadership styles are similar or overlap with servant leadership attributes as described in the literature. Distinctively, the central focus and base of servant leadership behaviors, as explained by Liden et al. (2008) and Fields and Winston (2010), is serving the needs of followers. GLOBE's leadership attribute labeled "other oriented" corresponds with this distinctive servant leadership attribute. Table 1 (part two) shows the alignment between GLOBE's "other oriented" attribute and multiple variations of the attribute that have been explored in servant leadership research. As GLOBE found leadership attributes that would be preferred by followers in high future oriented cultures, many of which have been explored as part of the servant leadership construct (including its distinctive attribute), this model paper proposes that more exhaustive exploration of servant leadership and how it relates to cultural future orientation will confirm that the level of cultural future orientation affects the preference of followers for servant leadership behaviors.

Multiple aspects of serving the needs of followers require servant leaders to take a futuristic approach in their interactions with followers. Greenleaf (1977) elucidated that servant leaders seek to help employees develop to their fullest potential, which includes *future* leadership capabilities. Similarly, Liden et al. (2008) stated, "Servant leadership differs from traditional approaches to leadership in that it stresses personal integrity and focuses on forming strong *long-term* relationships with employees" (p. 162). Is it not probable that followers from cultures with higher levels of future orientation, where

long-term career planning and individual professional development are important and valued, would have a tendency to positively embrace and respond to servant leader behavior that is focused in part on developing followers for long-term professional success?

Several studies around the topic of GLOBE's future orientation dimension and leadership and organizational practices attest to the high value that individuals from high future orientation cultures place upon long-term career planning, training, development and future professional success. Zhao's (2006) study found that international recruiters underestimated the amount of value applicants from high future orientation cultures place on long-term intrinsic rewards, such as training and development opportunities. Zhao explains that such learning opportunities better prepare and ensure applicants for long-term professional success and suggests that recruiters craft job advertisements that clearly explain long-term learning opportunities available so that the best candidates will be attracted and apply for employment at the companies they represent. Ofer (2008) conducted research in Japanese organizations and found that due to its high future orientation, a unique critical success top management support process is investing in project management training. Ofer explained that this is important because most project managers in Japan have a strong technical background, but little training in general management or project management. Ofer pointed out that Japanese project managers often make decisions with consideration of what will support them in the long term; therefore, in order to ensure success in the future, they seek training support. Based on findings from studies such as Zhao's and Ofer's, together with the alignment of servant leadership behaviors focused on serving the needs of followers, such as helping followers to develop for ensured, long-term success, this model paper proposes that the potential positive response by followers from high future orientation cultures to servant leadership behaviors is probable and therefore worth the time and effort to investigate the potential relationship and results through further research.

Instruments to Measure the Future Orientation-Servant Leadership Model

Now that a simplified, distinctive servant leadership tool has been designed and empirically confirmed (Fields & Winston, 2010), pursuing a more comprehensive, empirical understanding of the relationship between the cultural phenomena of future orientation and servant leadership is more attainable. This paper proposes the use of Fields and Winston's tool over that of Liden et al. (2008) due to its parsimonious, single dimension approach and shown psychometric validity. In order to succinctly determine if employees in organizations that value high future orientation have a tendency to positively embrace servant leadership behaviors, this paper proposes that research be conducted utilizing GLOBE's instrument to assess organizational future

orientation and a CLT altered version of Fields and Winston's servant leadership instrument. As Fields (2007) pointed out, there are two approaches used to explore variables that may influence how followers perceive leaders: ratings of specific leaders provided by followers, and followers' general, preconceived ideas of successful leadership. Fields and Winston's servant leadership instrument was originally tested based on the first approach, asking followers to rate specific behaviors of their leaders. In this model, it is proposed that Fields and Winston's servant leadership instrument be altered to follow the format of GLOBE's CLT questions in order to test followers' implicit leadership theories regarding the servant leadership behaviors measured in Fields and Winston's instrument.

Hypotheses of the Future Orientation-Servant Leadership Model

The following hypotheses are made in conjunction with the proposed model that explores the relationship between the independent variable of cultural future orientation and the dependent variable of followers' CLT regarding servant leadership behaviors:

Hypothesis 1: Employees from cultures that value high future orientation will highly value servant leadership behaviors exhibited by leaders.

Hypothesis 2: Employees from cultures that hold a lesser value of future orientation will value servant leadership behaviors exhibited by leaders less than employees from cultures with a high future orientation.

Both hypotheses essentially propose that there is a positive relationship between the level of a culture's future orientation and the value placed on servant leadership behaviors within the culture.

Conclusion: Benefits of Researching the Future Orientation-Servant Leadership Model

Several benefits exist for globalizing organizations and their leaders regarding possible findings from using the proposed model to test the two proposed hypotheses. First, the results will provide information that can be used by leaders to determine if practice of servant leadership behaviors should be considered. Second, the results will provide information to assist in determining if practice of servant leadership behaviors would have a more positive effect upon followers from high future orientation cultures than followers from low future orientation cultures. Likewise, benefits to academic researchers will be gained from investigation of the proposed model. Along with adding to a fuller understanding of the construct of future orientation and the construct of servant leadership, the findings from the proposed research have the potential to offer new understanding of how the future orientation concept affects the endorsement

of servant leadership by followers. Second, the servant leadership construct that recently gained empirical validation through Fields and Winston's (2010) study and the SL instrument will be retested with a sample representing at least one additional culture beyond that of the United States, thus examining the effects culture plays in regard to the servant leadership construct. Research of the proposed model is expected to play a small, yet important role in the search to understand how to lead and collaborate across cultures.

About the Author

Shane Sokoll is a student in the School of Global Leadership & Entrepreneurship at Regent University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Shane Sokoll [Email: shansok@regent.edu].

References

- Alavi, S. B., & McCormick, J. (2004). A cross-cultural analysis of the effectiveness of the Learning Organization model in school contexts. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(6/7), 408. doi: 10.1108/09513540410563112
- Ashkanasy, N., Gupta, V., Mayfield, M., & Trevor-Roberts, E. (2004). Future orientation. In R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman & W. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 282-342). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Catana, G., & Catana, D. (2010). Organisational culture dimensions in Romanian finance industry. *Journal for East European Management Studies*, 15(2), 128.
- Dastmalchian, A., Javidan, M., & Alam, K. (2001). Effective leadership and culture in Iran: An empirical study. *Applied Psychology*, 50(4), 532-558. doi: 10.1111/1464-0597.00072
- Dorfman, P. W., Hanges, P. J., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2004). Leadership and cultural variation. In R. House, P. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman & W. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies* (pp. 779-719). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fields, D. L. (2007). Determinants of follower perceptions of a leader's authenticity and integrity. *European Management Journal*, 25(3), 195-206. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.emj.2007.04.005

- Fields, D. L., & Winston, B. E. (2010). Development and evaluation of a new parsimonious measure of servant leadership. School of Global Leadership & Entrepreneurship. Regent University. Virginia Beach, VA.
- Frank, H., Kessler, A., & Fink, M. (2010). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance - a replication study. *Schmalenbach Business Review*, 62, 175.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Grisham, T. (2009). The Delphi technique: A method for testing complex and multifaceted topics. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 2(1), 112-130. doi: 10.1108/17538370910930545
- Holbeche, L. (2009). *Global HRM aligning human resources and business strategy* (2nd ed.) (pp. 381-404). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- House, R., Hanges, P., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S., Dorfman, P., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., & Gupta, V. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. *Advances in Global Leadership*, 1, 171-233.
- Hytter, A. (2007). Retention strategies in France and Sweden. *Irish Journal of Management*, 28(1), 59.
- Javidan, M., & House, R. J. (2001). Cultural acumen for the global manager: Lessons from Project GLOBE. *Organizational Dynamics*, 29(4), 289-305. doi: 10.1016/S0090-2616(01)00034-1
- Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161-177. doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006
- Lord, R., & Maher, K. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance* (Vol. 1). Cambridge, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. (2006). Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society - a relational perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66(1), 99-115.
- Ofer, Z. (2008). Top management involvement in project management: Exclusive support practices for different project scenarios. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 1(3), 387-403. doi: 10.1108/17538370810883837
- Papalexandris, N., & Panayotopoulou, L. (2004). Exploring the mutual interaction of societal culture and human resource management practices: Evidence from 19 countries. *Employee Relations*, 26(5), 495-509. doi: 10.1108/01425450410550473

- Roxas, H., Lindsay, V., Ashill, N., & Victorio, A. (2008). Institutional analysis of strategic choice of micro, small, and medium enterprises: Development of a conceptual framework. *Singapore Management Review*, 30(2), 47.
- Russell, R. F., & Stone, G. A. (2002). A review of servant leadership attributes: Developing a practical model. [DOI: 10.1108/01437730210424]. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(3), 145-157.
- Sarros, J. C., Gray, J., Densten, I. L., & Cooper, B. (2005). The organizational culture profile revisited and revised: An Australian perspective. *Australian Journal of Management*, 30(1), 159. doi: 10.1177/031289620503000109
- Seleim, A., & Bontis, N. (2009). The relationship between culture and corruption: a cross-national study. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 10(1), 165-184. doi: 10.1108/14691930910922978
- Yeganeh, H., & Su, Z. (2007). Comprehending core cultural orientations of Iranian managers. *International Journal*, 14(4), 336-353. doi: 10.1108/13527600710830359
- Yeganeh, H., & Su, Z. (2008). An examination of human resource management practices in Iranian public sector. *Personnel Review*, 37(2), 203-221. doi: 10.1108/00483480810850542
- Zhao, H. (2006). Expectations of recruiters and applicants in large cities of China. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(5), 459-475. doi: 10.1108/02683940610673979