

Change Leadership in a Global Environment

Carl Cooper¹, Ronald Victor Steffel², Thomas E. Griffin²

(1. University of San Diego, San Diego, USA; 2. Nova Southeastern University, Ft. Lauderdale, USA)

Abstract: Peter Schwartz (1996) in “The Art of the Long View” talks of scenarios instead of the traditional strategic approach. The strategy designed with a laser focus often fails because of exogenous variables that are not considered. For example, cultural issues in a diverse global environment can undermine the focused strategy if not properly accounted for in the business model. The leadership that drives the culture of an organization is critical variables to any strategic scenario. Conversely, the culture of an organization is critical to the acceptance of any change. In the turbulent global environment of today’s organizations, a conventional approach to leadership in a worldwide environment will not give one the results mandated. Projects and process changes in global organizations require specific attention. Leaders need to identify and overcome the resistance to change that goes beyond charisma and vision by using the skills of true leadership, to consider the attributes of systemic leadership to synthesize changes in culture and change leadership, thereby achieving a vision and strategic objectives. The authors have reduced some of the primary variables to two major defining elements that affect Change Leadership in a Global Environment namely: Culture and Change Leadership. We offer a synthesis of those elements in the form of “systemic leadership” espoused by Beerel (2012). What has been missing beyond traditional trait and transformation models are the means of empowering leadership in others, understanding and use of emotional intelligence, requirements for continuous organizational learning and the mandate to draw on the knowledge, the passion and the creativity of employees—a Systemic Leadership approach.

Key words: systematic leadership approach; culture and change leadership

JEL codes: M10, M140, M190, Z00, Y2

1. Introduction

On a global basis, we know one have to be fast and flexible. If we are big, we have to act small; to be innovative, productive, and creative. Heil et al. (1995), said, “We’re living in a world with an overcapacity of everything from crackers to jet engines and the only way to grow for most of us is to grab new customers from our competitors while keeping the ones we have. Our products are becoming commodities; quality levels are at their highest ever, and we are having trouble meeting financial analysts’ demands because our own projections are being undermined by a fickle, rapidly evolving marketplace.” To compete, we must focus on the two primary

Carl Cooper, DBA, Adjunct Professor of Business and Management, research areas/interests: supply chain management, leadership, change management, process improvement, quality management. E-mail: carlcooperdba@comcast.net.

Ronald Victor Steffel, Dr./DBA, Adjunct–Nova Southeastern University; research areas/interests: HR and strategy. E-mail: rsteffel@tampabay.rr.com.

Thomas E. Griffin, DBA, Professor of Decision Sciences, Nova Southeastern University; research areas/interests: leadership, organizational behavior, operations, quality, research methods, data analytics. E-mail: tegriffi@nova.edu.

distinctive competencies in an organization's environment, people, and processes. We shall discuss both and the changes required. Only a highly motivated, highly skilled workforce will be able to surprise and delight those they serve. In these times when people are justifiably concerned about their employment, we have to achieve full employee commitment.

So why have not we created the fast, flexible, customer-focused organization internationally competitive? Because leaders have chosen instead, faced with short-term accountabilities and a wide range of uncertainties, to do what will react positively for stock prices, satisfy the stockholders but as a result, ostensibly mortgaging their future.

To bring about those changes, there can be no non-leaders. No one can be exempt. Every person will be expected to lead. They will help design and continually re-engineer every facet of the supply chain process. Heil et al. (1995), continues, "Provide people with a supportive environment, allow them to contribute and pursue their aspirations, while ensuring personal accountability, and they will accomplish extraordinary things."

Leadership is really about choices but it is also about feeling free in making those choices, confident they are well-informed and comfortable. The key is a shared mindset: a unity of culture.

2. Major Impact Areas

2.1 Culture

Schein (2010) described culture in terms of artifacts, expressed beliefs and values, and basic underlying assumptions. "Artifacts are visible structures and observed behavior." He notes that the observed behavior is difficult to decipher. The expressed beliefs and values speak to the organizations goals, what the organization aspires to, and the ideals that present in the organization. However, he also notes, "these beliefs and values may not be in line with the observed behavior and the other artifacts" (p. 24). The underlying assumptions are the taken for granted beliefs and values present in the organization that may not be in concert with the artifacts, beliefs and values. Schein's work illustrates the difficulty in describing a single organization, much less the interaction between organizations.

McDonald and Foster (2013), building on the work of Johnson (1992) further described a "cultural web" as a diverse and inclusive model for defining the attributes of organization culture. All organizations are characterized by a complex relationship of Organizational structures, Control systems, Power structures, Symbols, Stories, Rituals and Routines. One cannot separate a company from its culture. It is simply the way things are done in that particular environment. Often there are cultural barriers that are not intuitively obvious.

In addition, in the global market there are significant differences in the business structure, management style, communications styles, and teamwork. Internet resources highlight many of the differences (World Business Culture). For example, the business structures in the United States and Germany are hierarchal while in Japan the hierarchy is based on consensus and cooperation. Communications in Germany are direct and truthful, while in Japan they are epitomized by subtlety and nuance. In China, the inability to say no can cause loss of face or embarrassment. Teamwork varies by country as well. In Germany, teams are a group of people working specific leader toward a common goal. Teamwork in Japan is a part of the culture and consensus is reached before any formal meetings to avoid confrontation. In the U.S., teams are expected to be fully committed to common goals and be dedicated to their achievement. The paradigm shift needed is how to manage or lead change in a global environment where cultures are very different.

2.2 Change

Change is a highly complex process, which affects every person in an organization from the CEO to the shipping clerk. One must provide support for transitions or the force of the existing culture can easily neutralize a proposed change. Certainly, as noted, each culture has its own approach to employees, their motivation, relationship building, and influence. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) contrasts the various cultures and reinforces why some management techniques such as six sigma, TQM, and so forth, succeed in one culture and perform poorly in another. Miller (2002) noted that between 70 and 80% of the organizational transformation attempts fail. Latham (2013) notes that “over the past 20 years, less than 10% of more than 1,000 applications for the Baldrige Award resulted in award” (p.19). In recent years, it has been suggested that organizations have to adapt, not simply to the environment and culture, but also to the views of participating employees.

Numerous processes and methods of introducing change have been offered. Change managers speak in terms of the goal, the team, the what, and the rules related to effective change (Schein, 2013). Others offer a more comprehensive view of addressing the human or cultural side of change. Jones, Aguire, and Calderone (2004), note that the change initiative must start at the top of the organization and involve every layer of the organization. A formal business case, with appropriate measurements is necessary to communicate the message and create ownership in every level within the organization. Leaders must assess the cultural landscape and communicate the message down to the individual level. Nowhere is this more complex than in a global environment where local cultural artifacts are widely varying and require the commitment of senior management in both organizations to commit to the desired vision and end state.

2.3 Sponsorship

Crucial to any change initiative is the executive sponsorship from the top that focuses on building the vision, as well as the measurable abject of sin goals. The executive sponsorship team from the CEO and their supporting staff must provide the resources for the project. The Project Management Institute defines sponsorship as “individual or group within or external to the performing organization that provides the financial resources, in cash or in kind for the project (PMBOK, 2000, p. 16). Are financial resources sufficient? Jones et al. (2004), suggests the engagement of every individual at every level of the organization in response to the vision started at the top. Jones et al. emphasize that the initiative must start at the top. Senior management must structure change initiatives with the appropriate purpose, focus, and support. The direction, commitment, and priority must be communicated to every level and resistance to the change managed.

Helm and Remington (2005) expand upon the attributes to add that sponsors must have appropriate seniority, the ability and willingness to collaborate with others to insure the success of the program, and to motivate the team through excellent communications skills. The sponsor must have the knowledge of the organization and to objectively challenge the project manager.

2.4 Measurement

Sponsors must create the focused strategy, enable, empower, and engage people, and measure performance with a view to long-term shareholder value. Senior management must review performance to the KPI's and reinforce the desired behavior. Throughout the process, the team must learn and improve in their planning and execution of not only financial measures, but also the changes in the culture to be value driven, focused on teamwork and excellence (Jones et al., 2004). The measurement system must establish the basis for developing the desired leadership culture.

2.5 Leadership

At this point in development, most realize that the primary role of a leader is managing change. Clawson (2013), claims that leadership is about managing energy; first in oneself and then in those around you. The leader must be deeply committed to an outcome that others can engage in and understand. We will take an overview approach to some of the prevailing leadership concepts including Servant Leadership (Northouse, 2013, pp. 219-251).

- **Trait Leadership**—Probably one of the first systematic attempts to study leadership; what innate characteristics made certain people outstanding leaders—“great man” theories. Stogdill (1948; 1974) indicated that there was no consistent set of traits that identified leaders from non-leaders across a variety of situations. He suggested that both personality and situational factors were basic to leadership. Some of those traits included persistence, self-confidence, tolerating frustration, influencing other people’s behavior and the absorption of stress.

Emerging in the 1990s as an important area for assessing the impact of traits on leadership is the concept of emotional intelligence (EQ-1, 2011; Coleman, 2000; Bar-On, 2006). Further studies on Trait Leadership have been uncertain and ambiguous and the list of traits endless.

- **Skills Approach to Leadership**—The Skills approach emphasizes knowledge and abilities needed for effective leadership. Revitalized interest in skills emerged since the ability to solve some of the complex organizational problems came into the forefront (Katz, 1955). Skills are based on what leaders can accomplish vs. traits based on who leaders are. Katz divides skills into three areas: technical, human, and conceptual. These skills vary however, between management levels. In recent years, (Mumford et al., 2000) other skills have been added including career experiences, competencies, the environment, and outcomes.

The skills approach has not been widely used in an applied leadership arena. It could however, be used as a base for leadership development programs. Consider that vital for teaching leaders are also aspects of active listening, influence, creative problem solving and conflict resolution skills.

- **Style Approach to Leadership**—This focuses on what leaders do rather than who they are. Engagement is in two main areas of behavior: concern for results (task) and concern for people (relationships). Popular application of this approach is the work of Blake and Mouton on the Managerial Grid (1985) with five major leadership styles: authority-compliance (9, 1), country club management (1, 9), impoverished management (1, 1), middle-of-the-road management (5, 5), and team management (9, 9). This style offers limited support for effective leadership in areas of productivity or job satisfaction or morale (Yuki, 1994).

- **Situational Style of Leadership**—The concept is that different situations demand different kinds of leadership. An adaption effort on a leader’s style must occur depending on the different situations. Classification is in four styles: high directive–low supportive, high directive–high supportive, low directive–high supportive and low directive–low supportive. The original model was developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1969) with Blanchard (1985) and his Situational Leadership II. This approach is often used as a standard for training leaders. It recognizes the need for leaders to be flexible with adaption of their style to the respective situation. There however, is a degree of ambiguity and lacks clarity in movement from one classification to another. Demographics and use in group settings need further studies.

- **Contingency Style of Leadership**—Effective leadership depends on how the leader’s style fits the situation or context of the setting (Fiedler & Chemers, 1974). It is predictive of leadership effectiveness using a Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) scale, which measures the leadership style and three variables (leader–member

relations, task structure, and position power) to measure situations. Although backed by a large amount of research, this style relies heavily on the LPC scale, which is questionable as to its validity and usability.

- **Path—Goal Style of Leadership**—This is about leaders helping associates to meet their goals by varying the leaders behavior best suited to the associate's work they are doing (House, 1971). It depends heavily of the motivational skills of the leader with the basic principles derived from the expectancy theory. It becomes hard to use this theory practically in organizations with so many assumptions that inter-relate. Unlike other styles, path-goal does not promote subordinate involvement in the process. Nevertheless, it does have the redeeming feature of emphasizing the vital ways in which leaders help subordinates.

- **Leader—Member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership**—Takes the approach that leadership is a process on the interactions between leader and follower (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). Further research indicated that a good leader-member exchange leads to the increased productivity of the follower. Trust, respect, and commitment is promoted but the “how to” is not explicit probably given the complexities of the process.

- **Transformational Leadership**—Burns (1978) also looked at the leader-follower relationship but felt that leadership cannot be separated from the needs of the follower. He differentiated between “transactional” leadership (majority of relationships between leader and follower) and “transformational” leadership (raises the level of motivation—knows needs and wants of the follower in order for them to reach their full potential). Assessment can be through a Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which measures behavior in seven areas such as consideration, charisma, contingent reward, etc. The validity of the MLQ has been challenged by some further research (Tejeda, Scandura, & Pillai, 2001). It does, however, revolves around the growth of the follower, and has been widely used for its intuitive appeal. This style also espouses that leadership is not the sole responsibility of a leader but jointly from the relationship between leader and follower.

- **Authentic Leadership**—This style is in the early stages of development but may have some potential. A need exists for leadership that is honest and genuine, trustworthy, transparent, highly communicative, with moral sensitivity and responsiveness to people's needs and values. To date, there is no single accepted definition but many depending on the emphasis (Chan, 2005). The approaches have not been fully substantiated and there remains a lack of evidence as to its effectiveness.

- **Appreciative Leadership**—Some characteristics of this style (Boonstra, 2013) include knowing values and involving others in the change process, building relationships on trust, and appreciating differences because these differences can be a source of renewal. Conflict can then be used to open a dialogue. It builds on positive aspects—what works.

- **Learning Leadership**—People encouraged to experiment and learn from that experience—Team learning—Systems Thinking (Senge, 1999).

- **Team Leadership**—This is a rapidly growing area of leadership. Teams are comprised of members with specific roles, sharing common goals and coordinate activities (Levi, 2011). However, inter-relationships are quite complex. Additional studies are required in team diagnosing and action taking.

- **Servant Leadership**—In 1987 Max DePree wrote, “Leadership is an Art.” He not only truly believed in the rule of “abandoning oneself to the strength of others” but practiced it as well. Not just the “expert” others, not just designers or highly educated associates, but all his employees. DePree felt the art of leadership is “liberating people to do what is required of them in the most effective and humane way possible”. He suggested that an “elegant” leader is the “servant” of his followers and their debtor. He removes the obstacles that might prevent positive change to occur thus allowing the follower to reach their full potential. Max DePree was Chairman and

CEO of Herman Miller and was the force behind his company continually changing for the future and renewing its enterprising spirit. Leadership he said, is “more tribal than scientific; more a weaving of relationships than an amassing of information”. His philosophy extended to a corporate “bill of rights” for employees; the right to be needed, to be involved, the right to a covenantal relationship, to understand, to affect one’s own destiny, to be accountable, with the right to appeal and make a commitment.

Consider that we are discussing one of the primary distinctive competencies of any organization, namely the people. We must recognize and understand the diversity of people and their talent. We must endorse this liberation based on compassion and sound reasoning. We must admit we cannot as a leader know or do everything. It is thinking about institutional heirs; about stewardship rather than ownership. We talk of stewards in terms of relationships, of legacy, of effectiveness, of civility and value (Greenleaf, 1977).

Therefore, in summary, Servant Leadership is about being humble, value-drive and using influence and persuasion rather than command and control (Cialdini, 2007). As Guillaume et al. (2013) indicated, it is about inspiration rather than position and title; about character and caring rather than skills; about creating an environment of love rather than a culture of fear. It focuses on others strengths rather than weakness. It is about listening rather than giving orders. It is about stepping inside someone else’s shoes; to understand their reactions and perspective. It is about humility rather than pride, about long-term benefits rather than short-term profits; about a global vision rather than territorial instinct. It is about creating new futures rather than maintaining the status quo.

3. A Synthesis—A Systemic Leadership Approach—The Primacy of the Whole

“To better understand the melding of culture, change, and leadership, think Systems; think Primacy of the Whole” (Senge, 1994, p. 25) who suggests that relationships are, in a genuine sense, more fundamental than things, and that the whole is more valuable than the sum of the parts.

We tend to assume the parts are primary, independent of the whole and see organizations as things rather than patterns of interaction and relationships. However, one cannot fix the organization by fixing the managers; one need to examine what is around and impacting them. Try relationships and processes. In our world, the unconnected individual does not exist (Wheatley, 1999. pp. 32-34). Gregory Bateson (1980) suggests we stop teaching facts—the “thinks” of knowledge—and focus instead on relationships. None of us appears to exist independent of our relationship with others.

Our corporate experiences have shown we tend to break things down to their individual parts in order to fix them, assuming that this will optimize the whole. Naturally the, a manager’s personal ability comes to the forefront for this narrow approach. However, one cannot fix the whole by isolating and correcting the parts (Senge et al., 1995, pp. 190-191).

What we know if we want substantial change; the system and the status quo it represents will be fighting us every step of the way. It has been said many times, that if we put a good person in a bad system, the system wins every time.

Today’s systems thinkers understand the significance of the system that encompasses individuals in their work. This system becomes a substantial determinant of performance when compared to the personal ability of the individual. W. Edwards Deming (1986) stated “Placing blame on workforces who are only responsible for 15% of mistakes, where the system designed by management is responsible for 85% of the unintended consequences... A

manager needs to understand that the performance of anyone is governed largely by the system that he works in ... It is the structure of the organization rather than the employees, alone, that holds the key to improving the quality of output.” Supporting Deming, John Seddon (2003) claims simply “it’s the system that governs performance”.

We have talked about some key variables; culture, change and a number of popular leadership approaches. We can deduce that leaders in inspired cultures take a more holistic approach and serve as advocates and change agents for all systems and processes. They are indeed responsible for new cultural imperatives having significance by aligning vision, attitudes, and behaviors. The research also found these “best” leaders: (Best of the Best, 2003)

- Act and initiate change based on the right things to do.
- Radiate goodness, humbleness, caring, and kindness.
- Be humane, real, authentic, appreciative, and balancing hearts and minds.
- Acknowledge the value of others’ contributions.
- Be skilled at inclusion, collaboration and relationships, and dialogue.
- Be accessible, empathetic, committed to the community.

We have now alluded to the fact that we live in a highly complex, rapidly changing world, where everything is connected to everything else. It is vital that a more holistic approach is needed to understand, integrate and manage this complexity—no simple solutions or final answers but Systems Thinking tends to have a World View and Paradigm.

4. Systemic Leadership

“Leadership is not defined by the exercise of power, but by the capacity to increase the sense of power among those led” (Follet, 1924, p. 122).

When our generation was first introduced into organizational life, we were subjected to directions emanating from a manager to follow processes for the accomplishment of certain goals. We tended not to question the validity of those directives; whether they were simply “Band-Aids” or effective for the long term. Leaders were accepted by virtue of their positions in the hierarchy. We simply followed orders. That was the world of leadership, as we knew it.

However, leadership is foremost a social activity, one conducted through relationships, with dependency on interacting with colleagues and others, the immediate environment along with the existing culture in and around the organization. As indicated above under culture (Schein, 2010) leadership is influenced by culture, culture by leadership—the environment and person in a symbiotic relationship. Especially in a worldwide marketplace, the environment can affect the leaders ability to perform, constraining attempts to make the changes the organization needs.

Considering the complex network of organizational systems, to remain competitive and meet the rapidly escalating customer demands, traditional top-down leadership is proving inadequate. Traditional leadership development approaches tend to focus on enhancing traits, capabilities and harness the differentiating characteristics of individuals, largely ignoring the organizational context within which the leaders function. The intricacies of interconnecting systems that comprise their organizations sphere are not understood.

An alternative approach to leadership based on systems theory, addresses leadership within the context of the organizational system. We can see that the old methods of governing organizations, people and nations are not

functioning well these days. More than ever before humanity needs a drastic change in the way we relate to one another and the planet at large. That is not to say that the autocratic leader, the one man show, the “great man” will disappear. There is lots of fear within organizations and the autocratic approach is still in use by those who thrive on its directive doctrines.

There is another management style present, however. This new style substitutes fear with trust, command and control with support and cooperation and tends to be in balance with the entire system. This style moves away from approaches where leader-specific traits and personalities are the focus of leadership in the organization, but is more focused on the integrated and complex systems including among others, culture, technology, change processes and the leader’s relationship to the networks. This style is a “tipping point”, where management ends and leadership begins. Cohesion and alignment between people and their values and behaviors, become vital. It is called “Systemic Leadership”.

From the premise of systemic leadership, it follows that services and products are delivered to stakeholders and markets through systems, not by individuals with specific leadership traits. From this perspective, the purpose of leadership is to optimize and enhance these systems. Successful leaders are those who are able to strategically harness the knowledge of systems and synchronize them; along with understanding the complexities of the internal and external factors of change.

The advantages of the many are amplified by James Surowieski (2005) in his book *The Wisdom of Crowds*. He states “If one put together a big enough and diverse enough group of people and ask them to make decisions affecting matters of general interest, that group’s decision will over time be intellectually superior to the individual, no matter how smart or well informed he is”.

Highly qualified employees and teams need empowerment, self-organization, and cooperative structures to achieve optimization. Certain conditions can support a system of systemic leadership in an organization, including strong organizational values, fostering of high-level collaboration, support of relationship, building of a trust environment, appreciation of diversity and humility and continually adjusting to the demands brought about by change and its impact on the organizational network.

The key attitude in the understanding and the implementing of systemic leadership (Kunovski, 2010) is that the “system is governed by the wisdom of the system itself (collective intelligence)”. The new leaders will be in the service of the system (see Servant Leadership above). They will feed the systemic wisdom back into the system itself. The leader is being led by the wisdom of the people he leads. In such a case, we do not have a leader but rather a shared ownership and responsibility or a “systemic shared leadership”. This is how we can govern our organization, nation, or indeed, our humanity. This is how leadership sustainability can be accomplished even on a global basis.

One of the key exponents of Systemic Leadership is Annabel Beerel (2012) with an approach that addresses systemic challenges that comes with a highly interdependent world. She “recognizes that groups, organizations, and societies comprise a plurality of stakeholders with competing interests and needs. Due to the growing interconnectivity of nations, culture, societies and groups, new realities present complex systemic challenges ... Systemic Leadership tackles the challenge of change in an integrative and holistic way.”

Let us take a look at some key assumptions of the Systemic Leadership approach:

- There is a symbiotic relationship between leadership and the organization as a system with the system affecting leadership as much as leadership affecting the system. Systemic leaders use a systems mindset to understand the changing nature of reality.

- Consider that existing systems have considerable negative power, with a built-in tendency to favor the status quo.
- Observes the changing networks and relationships within a system.
- Acting systemically means taking the whole system into account rather than selecting individual parts of the system. Looking at the big picture demands observing the operations from a balcony view—an observer view.
- No one person or group of people can know all the perspectives of reality.
- Leadership is defined by the tasks performed rather than skills or traits of particular individuals.
- Leadership activity is not confined to top management or tied to elites or authority. There is a need to distribute leadership throughout the organization.
- Leadership is needed to improve the system, and one of the ways the system needs to change is to make it more enabling of people's leadership.
- Leadership is not something that only those in positions of formal or informal authority are able or expected to do. Therefore, let us refer to “exercising leadership” rather than referring to “the leader” or “the leadership”. Anyone can conceivably exercise leadership from anywhere in the organizational hierarchy. Function, discipline, or level in the organization should not inhibit the opportunity to exercise leadership.
- Managers will not voluntarily take a lead if the organization fails to provide them with clear direction, a clearly accountable job, challenges, and a sense of security.
- Focuses on enhancing the adaptive capacity of the organization by optimizing its learning potential. Systemic leaders understand that adaptive organizations are continuous learning organizations.
- Sees leadership and followership as “mirror images” rather than as subject and object. Everyone is expected to exercise leadership at times while also being a “follower” at other times when someone else is in the leadership role.
- Shared motives and goals throughout.
- Creates a network of alliances across formal and informal authority boundaries.
- Embraces and mobilizes others to accept change in an energetic and committed way.
- The systemic model (Tate, 2013) offers the managers a solution and may persuade them to change when they see it gives them a more important role, one focused on how well the system performs holistically and even at a world paradigm level.

5. Resistance to Systemic Leadership

We can expect that any change (see Change section above) that threatens the status quo to experience difficulty. Systemic Leadership undermines the present fundamental belief about management and leadership. Tate (2013) lists some considerations:

- Can provide deficient leaders with a possible “cop out” since they can blame the system.
- Certainly challenges ingrained belief that leadership is about individual leaders.
- Runs counter to a competency/behavioral framework in which organizations have made a big investment.
- Can be difficult to understand, especially if they lack awareness of organization dynamics, the concept of systems, or Organizational Development methods. Certainly they prefer leaders and leadership to be simple, black and white, good and bad, and easily judged.
- Takes too long to make a difference.

- Letting go may threaten some leaders' self-concept and a cultural way of being. It may be difficult for the whole chain to become less concerned with exercising hierarchical control in order to be able to "liberate" leadership. Not all managers want to give away part of their decision-making power, responsibilities, or control. Not all want to receive more.

6. Summary

So we have Systemic Leadership—an underlying focus on Systems thinking with emphasis on a Process Orientation—constantly measuring the culture, the pulse and health of the whole system—the entire global environment.

Leaders need to learn how to facilitate processes within the system, to focus on establishing supporting relationships that nurtures growth, development, creativity, value-added processes, and problem solving instead of focusing solely on tasks. By having increased participation within the organization, there are more observers to interpret data and information. Participation in leadership allows people to deal with uncertainties and provides opportunities to interpret that data in a multitude of ways. Organizations then become more intelligent through this holistic approach.

A new leadership agenda is long overdue. Reform, based on continuous improvement can only occur if more leadership forces are heralded. Leadership needs to be released.

In addition, the concept of power needs to be redefined. Power is engendered through relationships and should be shared. Everyone is not only capable, but must participate in that leadership. Leaders are needed to help in developing a clear identity especially in this world of chaos and confusion. Bosses are no longer needed. Leadership at all levels is needed to help people understand that the best work is accomplished through participation. In recognizing the human need for meaning, Wheatley (2006) believes that we can influence change anywhere. There must be new meaning and descriptions for leaders, stewards, servants, and facilitators. We are in the midst of a radical transition in developing a new worldview. The old ways of doing things is slowly disintegrating, yet the new ways have yet to emerge with any substantial support. Wheatley (2006) urges us to embark on the journey together. The answer may lie in a Systemic Leadership approach—in a One World Scenario.

7. Area for Future Challenges

Now comes the true challenge. Making it happen. Recently Zappos announced they are in the middle of instituting a entirely new organization structure, focusing their 1500 workers, 400 circles into what is called a Holacracy. No more managers. No more job titles. No more typical corporate structure. Authority is distributed with everyone performing as a leader; an innovative entrepreneur. They share a common purpose and are accountable for specific roles on behalf of the corporation (Sweeney C. & Gosfield J., Fast Company, Jan. 6, 2014).

The future will show that companies will experience positive results when governed by this organic systemic leadership and are more sustainable. This will tend to verify that the system is always wiser than the leader or the leadership team presently in control.

In the systemic mind, leadership is required to achieve two mandated goals: to safeguard the future while also considering current business. This tends to challenge today's paradigm emphasis on short-term results.

The authors invite one to the land of “Nobility”. To make things happen...

“I’ve seen knights in armor panic at the first sight of battle. I’ve seen the lowliest unarmed squire pull a spear from his own body to defend a dying horse. Nobility is not a birthright; it is defined by one’s actions.”

— Kevin Costner as Robin Hood, Robin Hood, Prince of Thieves.

References:

- Ain M., Bailey D., Bromley P. and Kalyta M. (2003). “The best of the best”, Report First Light PMV Inc., Toronto, ON.
- Bar-On R. (2006). “The bar-on model of emotional-social intelligence(ESI)”, *Psicothema*, Vol. 18, suppl., pp. 13-25.
- Bateson G. (1980). *Mind and Nature*, New York: Bantam Books.
- Beerel A. (2012). *Leadership and Change Management*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Blake R. R. and Mouton J. S. (1985). *The Managerial Grid III*, Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Blanchard K. H. (1985). *SL II: A Situational Approach to Managing People*, Escondido, CA: Blanchard Training and Development.
- Boonstra J. J. (2013). *Cultural Change and Leadership in Organizations*, Malden, MA: John Wiley and Sons.
- Burns J. M. (1978). *Leadership*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Chan A. (2005). “Authentic leadership measurement and development: Challenges and suggestions”, in: W. L. Gardner, B. J. Avolio, & F. O. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic Leadership Theory and Practice: Origins, Effects, and Development*, Oxford: Elsevier Science, pp. 227-251.
- Cialdini R. B. (2007). *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion*, New York: Harper Collins.
- Clawson J. G. (2013). “Is leadership born or built?”, *The Washington Post*, December 1.
- Coleman D. (2000). “Leadership that gets results”, *Harvard Business Review*, March-April.
- Deal T. and Kennedy A. (2000). *Corporate Culture: The Rights and Rituals of Corporate Life*, New York: Perseus Books.
- DePree M. (1987). *Leadership is an Art*, East Lansing, MI: MSU Press.
- Deming W. E. (1986). *Out of the Crises*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- EQ-1 (2011). *Emotional Intelligence*, MHS, Toronto, ON.
- Fiedler F. E. and Chemers M. M. (1974). *Leadership and Effective Management*, Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Follet M. P. (1924). *Creative Experience*, New York: Longmans, Green and Company.
- Graen G. B. and Uhl-Bien M. (1995). “Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years—Applying a Multi-Level, Multi-Domain Perspective”, *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 219-247.
- Greenleaf R. K. (1977). *Servant Leadership*, New York: Paulist Press.
- Guillaume O., Odechukwa I. and Williams D. J. (2013). “Servant Leadership in Multinational Corporations”, in: *The 4th Annual International Business Conference*, Saint Leo, FL: February 13.
- Heil G., Parker T. and Tate R. (1995). *Leadership and the Customer Revolution*, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Hershey P. and Blanchard K. H. (1969). “Life-cycle theory of leadership”, *Training and Development Journal*, Vol. 23, pp. 26-34.
- House R. J. (1971). “A path-goal theory of leadership effectiveness”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 16, pp. 321-328.
- Johnson G. (1992). “Managing strategic change: Strategy, culture and action”, *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 25, No. 1.
- Jones J., Aguirres D. and Calderone M. (2004). *Reliance Report: Strategy+ Business*, Booz, Allen & Hamilton.
- Katz R. L. (1955). “Skills of an Effective administrator”, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 33-42.
- Kotter P. (1990). *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs From Management*, New York: Free Press, pp. 3-8.
- Kunovski V. (2010). *Blog*, September 19.
- Latham J. R. (2013). “A framework for leading the transformation to performance excellence (Part I)”, *Quality Management Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 2.
- Levasseur R. E. (2010). “People skills: Ensuring project success—A change management perspective”, *Interfaces*, March-April, p. 159.
- Levi D. (2011). *Group Dynamics for Teams*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Martin J. (1992). *Cultures in Organizations: Three Perspectives*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- McDonald S. and Foster R. H. (2013). “The use of Johnsons cultural web to improve understanding of organizational culture: A critical review”, *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 30, No. 4.
- Miller D. (2002). “Successful change leaders: What makes them? What do they do different?”, *Journal of Change Management*, Vol.

2, No.4, p. 10.

- Mumford M. D., Zaccaro S. J., Harding F. D., Jacobs T. O. and Fleishman E. A. (2000). "Leadership skills in a changing world: Solving complex social problems", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 11-35.
- Northouse P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage Publishing.
- PMBOK, Project Management Institute, 2000.
- Schein E. (2010). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (4th ed.), San Francisco: John Wiley and Sons.
- Schwartz P. (1996). *The Art of the Long View*, New York: Doubleday.
- Seddon J. (2003). *Freedom from Command and Control*, Buckingham: Vanguard Education.
- Senge P. M. (1994). *The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook*, London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Senge P. M. (1999). *The Dance of Change: The Challenges of Sustaining Momentum in Learning Organizations*, London: Nicolas Brealey.
- Senge P., Scharmer C. O., Jaworski J. and Flowers B. S. (1995). *Presence: Exploring Profound Change in People, Organizations and Society*, London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Stogdill R. M. (1948). "Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature", *Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 25, pp. 35-71.
- Stogdill R. M. (1974). *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*, New York: Free Press.
- Surowiecki J. (2005). *The Wisdom of Crowds*, New York: Anchor Books.
- Sweeney C. and Gosfield J. (2014). *The Art of Doing*, Fast Company, Zappos, January 6.
- Tate W. (2013). "Managing leadership from a systemic perspective", Centre for Progressive Leadership, A White Paper, January.
- Tejeda M. J., Scandura T. A. and Pillai R. (2001). "The MLQ revisited: Psychometric properties and recommendations", *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 12, pp. 31-52.
- Trompenaars F. and Hampden-Turner C. (1998). *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wheatley M. (2006). *Leadership and the New Science: Discovering Order in a Chaotic World* (3rd ed.), San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- World Business Culture, available online at: <http://www.worldbusinessculture.com>.
- Yuki G. (1994). *Leadership in Organizations* (3rd ed.), Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.