

Global Leadership Competency and Personality Traits:

A Study in Thai Context

Sarit Petcharat¹, Sucharat Rimkeeratikul²

Received: February 12, 2021

Revised: March 27, 2021

Accepted: April 7, 2021

Abstract

This study aims to investigate the trait components of global leadership competency (GLC) as additional guidelines for a self-assessment of Thai foreign relations officers (FRO). Participants in the study were 54 FRO from 16 ministries and two independent organizations in Thailand. The study employed a quantitative method using a self-report questionnaire to collect data on the leadership traits and intercultural competence traits which are considered key components of GLC. Pearson's correlation revealed that leadership traits and intercultural competence traits are interdependent and can be used as variables for investigating GLC. Exploratory factor analysis was used to combine and regroup the leadership traits and intercultural competence traits to explore the trait components of GLC in the Thai context. Findings revealed that there were eight trait components, as follows: goal-oriented, mind-oriented, team-oriented, sociability-oriented, progress-oriented, exploration-oriented, self/other-oriented, and global-oriented.

Keywords: foreign relations officers, global leadership, global involvement, global leadership competency, intercultural competence

Introduction

Today, the numbers of people who work in a multi-national setting are steadily increasing. They have more responsibilities and play important roles in the modern world. In Thailand, key government organizations assign foreign relations officers (FROs) to promote, support and facilitate international cooperation between Thailand and world communities in such fields as trade, Science, technology, defense, health, and education; and in such sectors as public, private, individual, and international organizations. Therefore, FROs' performance is very important because it affects many stakeholders both inside and outside the country. Since the counterparts of FROs are from around the world, it is necessary that FROs be equipped equally with knowledge and skills in the field, and competencies for working in a cross-cultural environment so that they can perform their work effectively. In spite of taking such a crucial role, FROs have been annually evaluated in terms of their performance only by using a one-size-fits-all government assessment form which ignore aspects of cross-cultural competency which are vital for the successful performance of their duties. Global

¹ Faculty of Liberal Arts, Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand

² Language Institute, Thammasat University, Bangkok, Thailand

leadership competency (GLC), which is widely accepted as a crucial competency for those working in a cross-cultural environment, should be applied as an additional self-assessment guideline to take account of this missing aspect of an FRO's official performance assessment.

For this reason, the objective of this study was to determine what aspects of GLC would be necessary for FROs in the use of an additional self-assessment guideline. Since GLC is mainly comprised of intercultural competence and leadership dimensions (Caligiuri & Tarique, 2012), the data acquired from FROs in this current study regarding intercultural competence and leadership personality traits (Goldsmith et al., 2003; Bird et al., 2010) were combined and regrouped, with the help of statistics, to establish the trait components of global leadership competency (GLC) in the Thai context. These components can be used as additional self-assessment guidelines that would be beneficial for individual FROs, also for other possible domestic usage.

Literature Review

Leadership

In Thai government organizations, it seems that leadership is restricted to senior officers and executives, while it is not considered relevant to young or low-ranking officers. When talking about leadership, people tend to think about the old idea of great personalities or the preferred attributes of their superiors. These out-dated perspectives might limit some important qualities of leadership. In fact, the meaning of leadership varies depending on the dynamics of time, value or culture (Daft, 2015). In academic field, many studies have focused on investigating leadership aspects among people at management level or in high-ranking positions; however, leadership is not

limited to people in high-level positions (Dubrin, 2007).

In a broader perspective, anyone can possess leadership qualities. Leadership is a way of thinking and acting, in a sense that is not about greatness or public visibility which has little to do with a title or a formal position in an organization (Daft, 2015). In other words, leadership is a way of thinking and acting of individuals regardless of their positions or titles, which influence both themselves and others, and yield positive outcomes to an organization or community. Leadership is desirable for every organization at all levels because it is a special asset and, ultimately, it improves the performance and success of organizations (Northouse, 2010). Besides, leadership can be learned, practiced and developed to some extent as it is similar to other professional skills (Daft, 2015). To conclude, this study adheres to the notion that the qualities of leadership can apply to anyone because they are beneficial to a wider range of individuals which fits the modern concept of an organization where an individual is empowered to utilize their full potential, accomplishing both personal and organizational goals.

Global Leadership

Although the benefits of leadership for everyone are considerable, they do not only cover domestic setting. In the age of globalization, the idea of traditional domestic leadership seems to be inadequate for today's organizations where success involves international cooperation. When coworkers, customers, partners and competitors do not share the same or similar cultural mindsets, extra attributes, especially cross-cultural ones, are required to cope with intercultural challenges, transforming domestic leadership into global leadership. (Mendenhall et al., 2008).

As to what global leadership is, Turner et al. (2019) reviewed the existing literature on global leadership and collected more than ten definitions of it. Like traditional leadership, there is no agreed-upon definition of global leadership (Mendenhall et al., 2008). The term is defined in a similar scope to traditional leadership; the difference is that global leadership is viewed in an international and cross-cultural environment, which is considered as a vital factor affecting the leadership process or activities (Mendenhall et al., 2013; Conger, 2014; Reiche et al., 2017).

Individuals who are global leaders can be differentiated from domestic leaders by their involvement at a global level. Mendenhall et al. (2012) explained that many researchers wrongly assume that all managers could become global leaders. More scrutiny is necessary as to whether such managers can be considered to qualify as global leaders or how global they are; merely job titles, or even job descriptions, when applied beyond the domestic context cannot guarantee the qualifications of a global leader. Therefore, Mendenhall et al. (2012) suggested that the involvement of leaders at a global level should be examined and presented to ensure the validity of the study. To measure global involvement level, Mendenhall et al. (2012) contended that each global leader has experiences at different levels based on their exposure to complexity (multiplicity: more and different challenges, Interdependence: sticking to interconnectedness, ambiguity: managing and interpreting complex information, and flux: continuous changes of things), flow (frequency of reciprocal information flow, volume of information flow, and scope of information flow) and presence (frequency of working abroad, and number of foreign destinations) in a global environment.

To conclude, global leadership in this study is defined as a way of thinking and acting for positive changes and more effective performance under international and cross-cultural circumstances, while global leaders are regarded as individuals who influence others as well as themselves by a way of thinking and acting for positive changes and more effective performance under international and cross-cultural circumstances. At this point, it comes close to what Jokinen (2005) and Yoon & Han (2018) posited that global leadership competency includes personal attributes which facilitate individuals to influence others and themselves by a way of thinking and acting for positive changes and more effective performance under international and cross-cultural circumstances.

Intercultural Competence

Although the term cross-cultural competence is quite new, its use and importance have been recognized, admitted and applied widely in society. It is considered a must-have skill for the 21st century (Hammer, 2011), and was named and defined differently. However, intercultural competence is widespread and has been introduced and applied in many fields such as human resources, business, government and non-government organizations, education, social work, religious organizations, health care (Deardorff, 2009; Hammer, 2011; Elo, Benjowsky & Nummela, 2015; Dianetti, 2015), and certainly in leadership (Bird et al., 2010). Also, it has been broadly used in evaluating the potential of those who live and work in a cross-cultural environment (Deardorff, 2006; Almarza, Martinez & Llavor, 2015; Dimitrov et al., 2014; Stasys, Simanskiene, & Rauzuoliene, 2017; Ichimura, 2018).

Intercultural competence is a key component of global leadership (Caligiuri & Tarique, 2012),

which is widely accepted as a crucial competency for those working in a cross-cultural environment. Intercultural competence and leadership are interdependent and fulfilling each other. In this globalization era, without intercultural competence, leadership is unlikely to be achieved (Moodian, 2009; Neves & Tomie, 2017). However, no balance of intercultural competence and leadership has been observed in the existing global leadership studies. They tend to have either few or no cross-cultural dimensions. (Turner et al., 2019).

As to the meaning of intercultural competence, many researchers have tried to understand and explain it by conceptualizing it. Spitzberg & Changnon (2009) collected many existing related intercultural competence models which collectively comprised more than 300 components. However, Pusch (2009) argued that Deardorff (2006)'s pyramid model is one of the most accepted models of intercultural competence. The pyramid model begins with the requisite "attitudes" including respect, openness and curiosity as a base of the pyramid. These attitudes then lead toward acquirement of knowledge (e.g. cultural self-awareness and sociolinguistic awareness) and skills (e.g. listening, analyzing and relating), yielding desired internal outcomes (adaptability and flexibility) before finally reaching the desired external outcomes (behaving and communicating effectively and appropriately in an intercultural context) at the top of the pyramid.

Nevertheless, research on intercultural competence is ongoing and at present there are no agreed definitions, components, or models for intercultural competence. Researchers are still trying to apply or adapt existing models as well as to identify new components/models to fit the backgrounds and requirements of their studies.

Based on the existing literature and the research objectives that guide this study, intercultural competence is defined as an individual's attributes required for working and living in an international and cross-cultural environment.

Global Leadership Trait

Leadership can be studied through many approaches and each approach is beneficial in different ways. It is clear that there is no one best approach, and approaches that best suit the needs and circumstances can be opted for in an integrative approach (Mendenhall et al., 2008; Amiri et al., 2010). Since the traits of global leadership provide a straightforward approach to individuals and provides information that is beneficial to training or development programs, this study focused only on the trait approach to global leadership. Global leadership can be divided into two inter-related domains: leadership, and intercultural competence (Cumberland et al., 2016 and Bird et al., 2010). Furthermore, Turner et al. (2019) reviewed the traits of global leadership in the literature and revealed that the existing global leadership studies still lack some dimensions relating to cross-cultural competency. Since both dimensions are equally important (Moodian, 2009; Neves & Tomie, 2017), this study focused on both leadership and intercultural competence traits to establish a balanced construction of GLC with regard to FROs.

In terms of leadership, existing studies have identified numerous possible traits and along the way new ones continue to appear endlessly depending on researchers' views, experiences and subjectivities as well as contexts and eras (Northouse, 2010). Consequently, the authors decided to take 15 leadership traits from the study of Goldsmith et al. (2003) as research variables. Those traits are demonstrating integrity,

encouraging constructive dialogue, creating a shared vision, developing people, building partnerships, sharing leaderships, empowering people, thinking globally, appreciating diversity, developing technological savvy, ensuring customer satisfaction, maintaining a competitive advantage, leading change, achieving personal mastery, and anticipating opportunities.

As to intercultural competence, its traits were revealed by various researchers. The authors decided to take intercultural competence traits from the study of Bird et al. (2010) as research variables. Bird et al. (2010) reviewed the existing global leadership and related literature and identified 17 intercultural competence traits from the three domains: perception management, relationship management, and self-management. All of These 17 traits are 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 tendency, stress management, and interest flexibility.

Methodology

This current study employed a quantitative method using a self-report questionnaire adapted from the studies of Mendenhall et al. (2012), Goldsmith et al. (2003), and Bird et al. (2010) as a research tool. Pearson's correlation and exploratory factor analysis were used to investigate the trait components of GLC among Thai FROs.

Instrument

A self-report questionnaire was employed as the main research tool to elicit the necessary data for proposing the trait components of GLC. The

content validity of the questionnaire was checked by five experts in related fields using the item-objective congruence (IOC) index. The questionnaire is composed of three parts to collect different types of data, as follows:

Demographic Data

The first part of the questionnaire was designed to investigate participants' backgrounds including gender, age, education level, periods of related job experience, and position ranking.

Global Involvement Level

The second part of the questionnaire was designed to investigate the characteristics of the participants' duties in terms of global involvement. The questionnaire in this section was based on Mendenhall et al. (2012)'s framework of global, comprising three dimensions, namely, complexity: multiplicity, interdependence, ambiguity, and flux; flow: richness, and quantity; and presence: frequency of working abroad, and number of foreign destinations. However, two sub-variables: ambiguity, and flux were omitted to suit the nature of FROs' duties, and to make the questionnaire more comprehensible. The questionnaire based on this framework theory comprised eight questions, and all of the eight items were scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The items were totaled whereby a higher score denoted a greater level of the participants' global involvement.

Global Leadership Competency

In this section, the questionnaire which was divided into two domains: personality traits of leadership adapted from the study of Goldsmith et al. (2003), and personality traits of intercultural competence adapted from the study of Bird et al. (2010) was used to collect the data on

participants' personality traits. Each trait was measured by two questions: straightforward and reverse worded. Each question was scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Participants

The participants of this study were 54 Thai foreign relations officers (FRO) working in government organizations. To make sure that the participants were from various fields, a stratified sampling method was employed. Self-report questionnaires were distributed to three FROs from each of the 16 ministries and two selected independent departments covering a wide range of job responsibilities, totaling 54 FROs. A coordinator of each organization facilitated the distribution and collection of the questionnaires both by hand and electronic channels. The participants were given one week to complete the questionnaire and were clearly informed that the retrieved data would be kept confidential, and personal and organizational information would not be revealed or mentioned in the study report.

Data Analysis

Inferential statistics were used to investigate global leadership in this study. First, Pearson's correlation was applied to explore the relationship between intercultural competence and leadership traits to confirm that the two variables were suitable for this study. Next, exploratory factor analysis was applied to combine and regroup the intercultural competence and leadership traits to explore the trait components of GLC among the FROs.

Results

Demographic Data

Table 1 show the participants' demographic data. The participants covered a wide range of FROs. Most of them were female (61.1%). As to position rankings, they are mostly in practitioner level (31.5%), and professional level (46.3%). The majority of them were well-educated and had a master's degree (61.1%). They were mostly aged 31-40 years (37%) and 41-50 years (37%). Almost half (44%) of them had 1 – 5 years of experience in a cross-cultural environment while the other half had a longer experience.

Table 1 Demographic Data

Demographic Data	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	20	37.0
Female	33	61.1
Age		
21 - 30 Yr	11	20.4
31 - 40 Yr	20	37.0
41 - 50 Yr	20	37.0
51 - 60 Yr	2	3.7

Demographic Data	Frequency	Percent
Education		
Bachelor's degree	15	27.8
Master's degree	33	61.1
Ph.D.	1	1.9
Work Experience		
1 - 5 Yr	24	44.4
6 - 10 Yr	11	20.4
11 - 15 Yr	9	16.7
16 - 20 Yr	7	13.0
21 - 25 Yr	2	3.7
Position Ranking		
Practitioner	17	31.5
Professional	25	46.3
Senior professional	7	13.0
Director	3	5.6

Global Involvement Level

The global involvement level of the participants' duty was analyzed by descriptive statistics to see whether the participants of this study are suitable for global leadership studies which require those who are working in a cross-cultural environment to some extent. Global involvement score was divided into five classes, namely very low (1.0-2.0), low (2.1-3.0), high (3.1-4.0), and very high (4.1-5.0). The overall global involvement level of the participants was anticipated to be at a "high level" to validate the participants as a proper resource.

Stage 1: Mean scores of all items in the global involvement scale were totaled to reveal the global involvement level of FRO's duty. Table 2 shows the mean score of global involvement at 3.51 out of 5.0 (S.D. = .646). The participants have a high level of global involvement and their scores cluster closely around the mean score, meaning that their global involvement levels are

not much different from each other. In detail, the participants are having the best scores on dimensions of "multiplicity" ($M=4.70$) and "interdependence" ($M=4.15$), while having the least scores on the dimensions of "frequency of working abroad" ($M=1.75$) and "number of foreign destinations" ($M=2.17$).

Stage 2: Additional details of the global involvement level were analyzed. The participants were classified by their global involvement score ranges (very low, low, high, and very high) to reveal the number of participants in each group, showing a clearer picture of the participants' global involvement level. Table 3 shows that most of the participants (51%) have a high level of global involvement while only 1.9% of them are in the very low global involvement class.

Stage 3: To sum up, mosts of the participants had a high level of global involvement. They worked and exchanged information with many foreign organizations through various

channels for mutual prosperity. Although their cooperation activities seemed to regularly take place in Thailand rather than abroad, the satisfying scores on other global involvement dimensions were adequate to suggest that the

participants were qualified and suitable for a global leadership study. The data gained from them was valuable and made the results of this study more reliable.

Table 2 Global Involvement Level in each Dimension

Item	n	\bar{X}	S.D.
Global Involvement Level	54	3.51	0.646
Multiplicity	54	4.70	0.537
Interdependence	54	4.15	0.684
Frequency (of reciprocal information flow)	54	4.04	0.846
Volume	54	3.46	1.041
Scope	54	3.69	1.113
Quantity	54	4.09	0.957
Frequency (of working abroad)	53	1.75	1.285
Number (of foreign destinations)	54	2.17	1.489

Table 3 Global Involvement Level (Classified by Participants' Scores)

Class	(No. of participants)	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very low	1	1.9	1.9	1.9
Low	14	25.9	25.9	27.8
High	28	51.9	51.9	79.6
Very high	11	20.4	20.4	100
Total	54	100	100	

Global Leadership Competency

To explore the trait components of GLC among FROs, a procedure was devised and divided into five stages. In the first stage, the reliability of the research tool was verified while the variables and sample size were examined in the second and third stages, respectively. The main analysis was in the fourth stage, and the last stage was the interpretation and explanation of the analysis. Details of each stage are as follows.

Stage 1: The global leadership scales were verified by descriptive and inferential statistics. On the leadership trait scale as shown in Table 4, the scores of each participant were not very different ($\bar{X} = 3.89$, S.D. = .44) and the scale was reliable with an alpha coefficient of .857. As to the intercultural competence trait scale, the scores of each participant clustered closely around the mean score of 3.77 (S.D. = .41) as shown in Table 5, and the scale was reliable with an alpha coefficient of .873.

Table 4 Leadership Trait Scale

Trait		N	Min	Max	X\bar{x}	S.D.
Overall		54	2.17	4.43	3.89	.43573
Demonstrating integrity	Item1	53	1	5	4.53	.799
	Item2	53	1	5	3.43	1.366
Encouraging constructive dialogue	Item3	53	2	5	4.38	.740
	Item4	53	1	5	2.98	.971
Creating a shared vision	Item5	53	2	5	3.94	.745
	Item6	53	1	5	3.81	1.161
Developing people	Item7	53	2	5	4.45	.748
	Item8	53	1	5	3.74	1.179
Building partnership	Item9	53	2	5	4.62	.596
	Item10	53	1	5	4.17	1.087
Sharing leadership	Item11	53	1	5	4.26	.944
	Item12	53	2	5	4.21	1.026
Empowering people	Item13	53	2	5	4.21	.840
	Item14	53	1	5	2.81	1.075
Thinking globally	Item15	53	2	5	4.26	.763
	Item16	52	1	5	4.10	1.107
Appreciating diversity	Item17	53	2	5	4.17	.802
	Item18	53	1	5	3.21	1.230
Developing technology savvy	Item19	53	2	5	4.40	.768
	Item20	53	1	5	3.62	1.244
Ensuring customer satisfaction	Item21	53	1	5	4.21	.863
	Item22	53	1	5	3.83	1.205
Maintaining a competitive advantage	Item23	53	2	5	4.26	.684
	Item24	54	1	5	4.24	1.008
Leading change	Item25	54	1	5	3.72	.940
	Item26	54	1	5	2.37	.958
Achieving personal mastery	Item27	53	3	5	4.23	.542
	Item28	54	1	5	3.91	.896
Anticipating opportunities	Item29	54	2	5	4.04	.726
	Item30	54	1	5	3.09	.830

Table 5 Intercultural Competence Trait Scale

		N	Min	Max	X\bar{x}	SD
	Overall	54	3.03	4.62	3.77	.40944
Nonjudgmentalness	Item1	54	2	5	3.94	.763
	Item2	54	1	5	3.48	.986
Inquisitiveness	Item3	54	4	5	4.37	.487
	Item4	54	1	5	4.15	1.053
Tolerance of ambiguity	Item5	54	1	5	3.81	.892
	Item6	54	2	5	3.65	1.084
Cosmopolitanism	Item7	54	2	5	3.98	.765
	Item8	54	1	5	3.19	1.245
Category inclusiveness	Item9	54	2	5	4.00	.673
	Item10	54	2	5	3.98	1.019
Relationship interest	Item11	54	2	5	4.13	.728
	Item12	54	1	5	3.48	1.285
Interpersonal engagement	Item13	54	2	5	4.07	.749
	Item14	54	1	5	4.06	.960
Emotional sensitivity	Item15	54	2	5	4.04	.823
	Item16	54	1	5	3.02	1.090
Self-awareness	Item17	54	2	5	3.65	.781
	Item18	54	1	5	2.89	1.093
Behavioral flexibility	Item19	54	3	5	4.20	.595
	Item20	54	2	5	3.76	.950
Optimism	Item21	54	2	5	3.78	.816
	Item22	54	2	5	4.19	.803
Self-confidence	Item23	54	2	5	3.65	.756
	Item24	54	2	5	3.56	.945
Self-identity	Item25	54	2	5	4.07	.749
	Item26	54	2	5	3.59	.836
Emotional resilience	Item27	54	2	5	4.00	.752
	Item28	54	1	5	3.76	1.098
Non-stress tendency	Item29	54	1	5	3.72	.878
	Item30	54	1	5	3.13	1.100
Stress management	Item31	54	2	5	3.81	.848
	Item32	54	1	5	4.15	1.123
Interest flexibility	Item33	54	1	5	3.83	1.042
	Item34	54	1	5	3.19	1.290

Stage 2: The relationship between the traits of intercultural competence and leadership was analyzed by Pearson's correlation to investigate whether the two variables were suitable for this

study. In Table 6, Pearson's correlation reveals a moderately positive relationship between the leadership and the intercultural competence score, $r=0.552$, $n=54$, $p=.000$.

Table 6 Pearson's Correlation between Leadership and Intercultural Competence (IC) Scores

		Leadership score	IC score
Leadership score	Pearson Correlation	1	.552**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	n	54	54
IC score	Pearson Correlation	.552**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	n	54	54

**. Correlation is significant at .01 level (2-tailed).

Stage 3: Inferential statistics was employed to verify a proper sample size and data for a running factor analysis in the next stage. Table 7 shows the results of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's test. It reveals that although

the sample size of this study was not large, the KMO test showed an adequate sampling size score at .537, while Bartlett's test of sphericity ($p=.000$) also confirmed that the data is fit for running factor analysis (IBM, n.d.)

Table 7 KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	.537
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	1038.296
df	496
Sig.	.000

Stage 4: Exploratory factor analysis was applied to combine and regroup the leadership and intercultural competence traits together as trait components of GLC among FROs. Table 8 indicates that all variables (traits) possess Communalities between .650 to .843 and Factor Loadings over .30 which are at satisfactory levels (Costello & Osborne, 2005). The factor analysis revealed nine components with Eigen values over 1. To have the proper number of traits in each

component, the authors selected only eight new components (Eigenvalues between 9.127 – 1.132). Correlated variables were grouped and separated from other variables with low or no correlation. In addition, the content of each variable was also considered in the grouping process. However, two variables, namely, achieving personal mastery and emotional sensitivity were not statistically grouped properly,

so the authors assigned them to suitable components on the basis of their content.

According to the content and meaning of the variables (traits) in each component, the authors named these new eight components as goal-oriented: creating a shared vision, demonstrating integrity, maintaining a competitive advantage, ensuring customer satisfaction, and sharing leadership; mind-oriented: emotional resilience, optimism, stress management, and non-stress tendency; team-oriented: empowering people, building partnership, developing people, and encouraging constructive dialogue; sociability-

oriented: interest flexibility, interpersonal engagement, and relationship interest; progress-oriented: cosmopolitanism, leading change, anticipating opportunities, developing technology savvy, and achieving personal mastery; exploration-oriented: inquisitiveness, self-identity, behavioral flexibility, and self-confidence; self/other-oriented: nonjudgmentalness, self-awareness, category inclusiveness, and emotional sensitivity; and global-oriented: appreciating diversity, tolerance of ambiguity, and thinking globally.

Table 8 Global Leadership Competency (in Terms of Personality Traits)

New component	Eigenvalues	Communality	Item	Factor loading
1 Goal-oriented	9.127	.676	Creating a shared vision	.768
		.650	Demonstrating integrity	.706
		.668	Maintaining a competitive advantage	.687
		.691	Ensuring customer satisfaction	.572
		.842	Sharing leadership	.481
2 Mind-oriented	3.209	.759	Emotional resilience	.748
		.772	Optimism	.745
		.728	Stress management	.553
		.805	Non-stress tendency	.403
3 Team-oriented	2.313	.723	Empowering people	-.781
		.843	Building partnership	-.701
		.679	Developing people	-.603
		.720	Encouraging constructive dialogue	-.411
4 Sociability-oriented	2.095	.832	Interest flexibility	.779
		.807	Interpersonal engagement	.772
		.828	Relationship interest	.695
5 Progress-oriented	1.708	.722	Cosmopolitanism	.787
		.702	Leading change	.446
		.736	Anticipating opportunities	.408
		.722	Developing technology savvy	.342
		.618	Achieving personal mastery	-

New component	Eigenvalues	Communality	Item	Factor loading
6 Exploration-oriented	1.553	.717	Inquisitiveness	.787
		.763	Self-identity	.627
		.756	Behavioral flexibility	.355
		.514	Self-confidence	.346
7 Self/other-oriented	1.272	.676	Nonjudgmentalness	-.630
		.715	Self-awareness	-.592
		.761	Category inclusiveness	-.527
		.683	Emotional sensitivity	-
8 Global-oriented	1.132	.796	Appreciating diversity	.892
		.712	Tolerance of ambiguity	.397
		.804	Thinking globally	.302

Stage 5: The components of the new GLC combination were given conclusive definitions based on their encompassing variables (traits) to make the components more comprehensible and convenient for further usage as follows.

1. **Goal-oriented** refers to the degree to which individuals are committed to achieving the organization's goals, public interest, and competitive advantage honestly and ethically by sharing favorable vision and useful resources with both colleagues and business partners.

2. **Mind-oriented** refers to the degree to which individuals can be optimistic and manage their emotions even in unpleasant circumstances.

3. **Team-oriented** refers to the degree to which individuals properly treat and communicate with colleagues and are willing to work as a team for mutual benefits.

4. **Sociability-oriented** refers to the degree to which individuals can make friends and socialize gladly with people from in/out-groups.

5. **Progress-oriented** refers to the degree to which individuals follow the world's trends and new technology, and can improve themselves

according to opportunities and make positive changes.

6. **Exploration-oriented** refers to the degree to which individuals are keen to face and learn new challenges flexibly and confidently, but still be able to maintain their identity.

7. **Self/other-oriented** refers to the degree to which individuals are aware of themselves and sensitive to others' feelings and actions, not judging or generalizing, but trying to understand the way others really are.

8. **Global-oriented** refers to the degree to which individuals embrace the value of globalization, appreciating diversity and being tolerant of uncertainty and ambiguity.

Discussions

The current study reveals that intercultural competence traits and leadership traits in this study are positively and moderately correlated. This coincides with previous research in the literature emphasizing a strong relationship between leadership and intercultural competence as core components of global leadership (Moodian, 2009; Neves & Tomie, 2017). However,

the study of Turner et al., (2019) showed that existing global leadership studies still lack an intercultural dimension which is crucial for today's globalization era. To form a balanced combination, exploratory factor analysis was employed to combine and regroup the 15 leadership and 17 intercultural competence traits as trait components of GLC where leadership and intercultural aspects are blended smoothly. The new eight components were identified based on factor loadings and the content of those traits covering many important aspects of global leadership. These trait components of GLC, other than the existing competency evaluations, can be used as an additional self-assessment guideline for FROs as well as other individuals working in a cross-cultural environment. Along with other traditional capacities, the guidelines can help individuals understand and improve themselves as global workers, leading to more efficiency in both individuals and their organizations. Furthermore, in terms of research, the new trait components fulfill the aspect of intercultural competence in global leadership, especially in the Thai context.

Conclusion

Measuring the global involvement level of participants in global leadership research is beneficial as it helps verify the sources of data and makes the results of studies more reliable. In addition, the global involvement level could be analyzed and presented in other aspects such as its relationships with GLC or other relevant variables which are expected to widen the understanding of global involvement. Also, understanding the global involvement characteristics of jobs in various related international organizations, e.g. private companies, hospitals, educational institutes, and intergovernmental organizations will be beneficial to many parties. People already in

the field will be able to better understand the nature of their jobs, leading to improved management and performance. Besides, those interested in the related fields, such as new graduates, can prepare themselves adequately for the future. As to intercultural competence, it has been proved advantageous in various fields. This study emphasizes how crucial intercultural competence is in the field of global leadership. The results show that intercultural competence can be integrated with leadership attributes to form a well-blended global leadership combination. However, this study focused only on personality traits (using a quantitative method), so other approaches (e.g. skills and behavior) and research methods (e.g. interviews, observation and behavioral simulation) of the intercultural dimension in the field of global leadership can be further conducted to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of global leadership.

References

Almarza, G. G., Martinez, R. D., & Llavador, F. B. (2015). *Identifying students' intercultural communicative competence at the beginning of their placement; towards the enhancement of study abroad programmes. Intercultural education.* 26(1), 73-85. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14675986.2015.997004>

Amiri, Mojtaba P., Amiri, Morteza P., & Amiri, A. P. (2010). *A dynamic model of contingency leadership effectiveness. Clinical Leadership & Management Review,* 24(2), 1-10.

Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., Stevens, M. J. & Oddou, G. (2010). Defining the content domain of intercultural competence for global leaders. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 25(8), 810-828. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941011089107>

Caligiuri, P., & Tarique, I. (2012). Dynamic cross-cultural competencies and global leadership effectiveness. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 612-622. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2012.01.014>

Conger, J. A. (2014). Addressing the organizational barriers to developing global leadership talent. *Organizational Dynamics*, (43)3, 198-204. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2014.08.006>

Costello, A. B. & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 10(7), 1-9. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868>

Cumberland, D. M., Herd, A., Alagaraja, M. & Kerrick, S. A. (2016). Assessment and development of global leadership competencies in the workplace: A Review of Literature. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 18(3), 301 – 317.

Daft, R. L. (2015). *The leadership experience* (6th ed.). Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.

Deardorff, D. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of studies in international education*, 10(3), 241-266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306287002>

Deardorff, D. K. (Eds.). (2009). *The sage handbook of intercultural competence*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publication.

Dianetti, A. (2015). *France and the United States: How intercultural competence can make or break a business in a global world*. Senior Honors theses, 93. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/honors/93>

Dimitrov, N., Dawson, D. L., Olsen, K. C., & Meadows, K. N. (2014). Developing the intercultural competence of graduate students. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 44(3), 86-103.

Dubrin, A. J. (2007). *Leadership: research findings, practice, and skills* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Elo, M., Benjowsky, C., & Nummela, N. (2015). *Intercultural competences and interaction schemes – four forces regulating dyadic encounters in international business*. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 48, 38-49. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13527590410556827>.

Goldsmith, M., Greenberg, C. L., Robertson, A. & Hu-Chan, M. (2003). *Global leadership: the next generation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Ltd.

Hammer, M R. (2011). Additional cross-cultural validity testing of the Intercultural Development Inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 35, 474-487. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.02.014>

IBM. (n.d.). KMO and Bartlett's test. Retrieved October 1, 2020, Retrieved from https://www.ibm.com/support/knowledgecenter/en/SSLVMB_substs/statistics_casestudies_project_ddita/spss/tutorials/fac_telco_kmo_01.html

Ichimura, M. (2018). The structure of intercultural competence factors for Japanese business persons. *Global Human Resource Development Education and Research*, 2, (1-12). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10131/00011727>

Jackson, J., & Sorensen, G. (2016). *Introduction to international relations: Theories and approaches* (6th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Jokinen, T. (2005). Global leadership competencies: a review and discussion. *Journal of European Industrial*. (29)3, 199 – 216. DOI: 10.1108/03090590510591085

Lucia, A. D. & Lepsinger R. (1999). *The art and science of competency model*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.

Mendenhall, M. E., Osland, J. S., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R. & Maznevski, M.L. (2008). *Global leadership: research, practice, and development*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Mendenhall, M. E., Osland, J. S., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R., Maznevski, M. L., Stevens, M. J., & Stahl, G. K. (2013). *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development* (2nd ed, New York, NY: Routledge.

Mendenhall, M. E., Reiche, B. S., Bird, A. & Osland, J. S. (2012). Defining the “global” in global leadership. *Journal of world business*, 47, 493 – 503.

Moodian, M. A. (2009). *Journeys through the ecological niche: An introduction to and overview of the textbook*. In M. A. Moodian (Eds.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence* (pp. 3-6). Sage Publications, Inc.

Neuliep, J. W. (2014). *Intercultural communication: A conceptual approach* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Neves, V. M. L., & Tomei, P. A. (2017). The effect of global mindset on leadership behavior: An analysis of a diversified sample of countries. *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture & Change in Organizations: Annual Review*, 17(1), 19-37. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.18848/1447-9524/CGP/v17i01/19-37>

Northouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: theory and practice*. (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Pusch, M. D. (2009). The interculturally competent global leader. In D. K. Deardorff (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 69). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Reiche, S. B., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M. E., & Osland, J. S. (2017). Contextualizing leadership: A typology of global leadership roles. *Journal of International Business Studies*. (48)5, 552-572. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-016-0030-3>

Spitzberg, B. H. & Changnon, G. (2009). *The sage handbook of intercultural competence*. D. K. Deardorff. (Ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publication.

Stasys, R., Simanskiene, L., & Pauzuoliene, J. (2017). *Assessment of staff intercultural competences in health care organizations*. *Scientific annuals of economics and business*. 64(3), 379-394, Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1515/saeb-2017-0024>

Turner, J. R., Baker, R., Schroeder, J., Johnson K. R., & Chung, C. H. (2019). The global leadership capacity wheel: Comparing HRD leadership literature with research from global and indigenous leadership. European. *Journal of Training and Development*, 43(1/2), 105-131. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-07-2018-0061>

Yoon, D. Y., & Han, S. H. (2018). *Global leadership competencies and knowledge transfer in Korean multinational corporations: Self-efficacy as a moderator*. *Social Behavior and Personality*. 46(7), 1143-1156. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6753>