CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE PREVAILING WORLDVIEWS AND VALUE SYSTEMS IN RELATION TO HOW THEY ARE SHAPED BY CULTURE AND IDENTITY

Naomi Gaitho[i]
Pan African Christian University,
Nairobi, Kenya

Abstract:
Global leadership is one of the social issues in the contemporary business environment linked with worldviews and value systems. The term worldview encompasses a set of beliefs, values, and moral codes that influence various social aspects, including how to deal with issues in society and the interpretation of the role of individuals in society. This research examines both worldviews and value systems in the context of global leadership. In particular, the paper explores various types of worldviews, including relativism. The study also examines worldviews based on cultural theory. This theory identifies four idealized ways of viewing the world and hypothesizes that people are likely to draw from one of the four cosmologies when developing arguments and advocating for change. These worldviews are egalitarian, hierarchical, individualist, and fatalist. In terms of value systems, the paper explores the definition and characteristic of value systems. The research also explores two value systems: individualism and collectivism. Overall, the research demonstrates that managers cannot afford to ignore the significance of both worldviews and value systems in the current business environment.

Keywords: prevailing worldviews, value systems, culture and identity

1. Background of Worldviews

In terms of origin, the term worldview is a direct translation from *Weltanschauung*, which is a German term (Nilsson, 2013). This word was used by philosophers such as Immanuel Kant, among others, to indicate a set of beliefs that shape and underlie all the thoughts and actions of human beings. Koltko-Rivera (2004) notes that Wilhelm Dilthey was one of the first scholars to expound his philosophy as a worldview.

---

[i] Correspondence: naomigaitho@gmail.com

2. Worldviews

2.1 Definition of Worldviews

The worldview concept is synonymous with belief or meaning system (Nilsson, 2013). Generally, the term often refers to a complete belief system about the world. The concept consists of individual and group observations concerning the self, space, and time (Nilsson, 2013). Scholars contend that worldviews provide profound insights on essential issues of society, like climate change, and useful pathways towards solutions and the role and responsibility of the individual (Hedlund-deWitt, 2013).

2.2 Formation of Cosmologies

Nilsson (2013) states that in childhood, individuals acquire a worldview of everyday life through socialization in one's culture. Worldviews, according to Koltko-Rivera (2004), do not exist in the minds of people in chaotic disorder; instead, they emanate from a latent system. However, beliefs about the world are not a well-organized network of static collection or cognitive models; instead, they are the outcome of processes designed by cultural, social, historical, and individual contexts and perspectives (Nilsson, 2013). Notably, personal and group development shapes the worldview of a child. Young persons, for instance, receive information from schools about worldviews through various branches of science. The practice of religion at home, religious guidelines in school, and church-based spiritual experiences also contribute to the formation of worldview (Koltko-Rivera, 2004).

2.3 Characteristics of Worldviews

Worldviews, according to Koltko-Rivera (2004), are generalized by their generality as well as the ability to be comprehensive. They provide a framework that enables individuals or an entire community to make sense of the world and life and thus comprehend the whole universe in its most significant dimensions and aspects. Overall, each cosmology has its significant factors; however, worldviews focus on issues like the origin of the world and the constituent of reality (Xue, 2014). Worldviews also examine whether human beings have an essence or nature, ethical and unethical issues, and the best form of governance. Other topics captured in worldviews include the purpose of life in general and whether there is life after death, among others.

Since the main essence of worldviews is to make sense of the world and life, worldviews focus on answering all the issues linked to peoples' beliefs (Xue, 2014). In themselves, these explanations can form other cosmologies and range from the revelatory approaches for maintaining religious beliefs to the different methodologies that sustain science and its significant stance. Unlike scientific models or Kuhnian paradigms, which focus on responding to issues in their specific domain such as those linked to business cycles, cancer cell reproduction and geophysics, and so on, worldviews tend to be all-encompassing (Xue, 2014). In being more inclusive, beliefs about the world appear to be vaguer in terms of the questions they pose and the responses they provide. However,

they are not entirely closed to higher precision and can draw upon some sciences or Kuhnian paradigms in the answers they provide.

2.4 Global Leadership and Worldviews

Matthews and Thakkar (2012) define global leadership as the process of leading people spread across the globe. Such leaders engage a diverse group of stakeholders as they lead individuals in different time zones, cultures, and distances as well as in complex organizational settings like networked or matrix structures (Mobley, Wang & Li, 2009). Global leaders ought to formulate proper strategies that enable them to determine whether to adopt a local or international approach in their areas of operations. The leaders must also be highly flexible as they lead people with diverse expectations of leadership.

As mentioned above, worldviews are the way that people address various issues of life. Worldviews, according to Auxier (2015), provide the philosophical foundations of leadership by forming their perceptions of the world. Since each person is unique, their perspective of reality, life, belief system, and foundation, as well as life experiences, is also distinct. Just like individuals can be similar but no two are exactly alike, the same is true of peoples' worldviews. Therefore, leaders operating in a global society will continually encounter employees, customers, and other stakeholders with diverse worldviews. While effective leaders must understand their cosmology, they must also be conversant with different views of the world and thus develop a better understanding with followers and customers as well as develop effective communication.

3. Value Systems

3.1 Definition of Value System

Value systems play a critical role in global leadership because they can strongly influence or determine the behavior of members within an organization. Smith and Hume (2005) state that value systems can be examined based on an economic as well as a social science perspective. In the social science domain, a value system is the ordering and prioritizing of the ideological and ethical values that a society or an individual holds (Smith & Hume, 2005). In the economic domain, the value system refers to the chain of activities in an organization and its suppliers, distribution channels, other enterprises with the corporate family of an organization and end-users.

3.2 Values

According to Raeff, Greenfield and Quiroz (2000), value refers to the characteristics, attributes, and qualities that an individual or group of people believe are desirable or worthwhile. They are the fundamental convictions that give people a sense of good and evil or right and wrong. While two groups or individuals can share a set of similar values, they prioritize the values differently (Raeff, Greenfield & Quiroz, 2000). As such, two groups or individuals have two different value systems despite having many values that

are alike. Regardless of the number of values that people have in common, Smith and Hume (2005) state that because of the differing value systems, such groups or individuals will still disagree on the wrongness or rightness of certain actions, both in specific and ideal situations.

3.3 Ethical and Ideological Values

According to Burleson and Mortenson (2003), the values that individuals or groups hold fall into two major categories: ethical and ideological. Ethical values distinguish between moral and immoral acts, right and wrong, and good and evil. At the societal level, values often form the basis of what is prohibited and permitted. Ethical values include virtues such as honesty, responsibility, self-control, and open-mindedness, among others. Ideological values focus on social, economic, political, and religious morals (Burleson & Mortenson, 2003). In principle, ideological values ought to emanate from the particulars of ethical values and their prioritizations. Freedom, equality, happiness, world peace, and social respect are some of the examples of ideological values.

3.4 Characteristics of Value Systems

Value systems can be personal, communal, or societal (Smith & Hume, 2005). Own value systems are believed by, and only applicable to, an individual. The societal or communal value system, on the other hand, is described and applied to a society or community. In most cultures, collective value systems can be enforced through the law or can be legal codes. Value systems can also be internally consistent. Here, ideological values are logically derived from the natural outcomes of the particulars of fundamental ethical values, with the values being constant. However, Smith and Hume (2005) state values systems are not always consistent.

Moreover, value systems can be idealized or realized. The idealized ones are a representation of the value prioritization of a group or individual. In contrast, the realized ones are made manifest in the actions and decisions of a group of individuals (Smith & Hume, 2005). Idealized value systems are absolute; that is, they are codified as a strict set of behavior or prescriptions, while the realized ones contain limited exceptions that are rules used to resolve disputes between values in practical circumstances. Value systems are generally evolutionally; therefore, the value system that is dominant in a society relies on the existing challenges that a particular culture is facing.

3.5 Culture

Culture is one of the main factors that determine worldviews. Culture, according to Nohria and Khurana (2010), is the aggregate deposit of experience, beliefs, values, knowledge, meanings and religion. It also includes various concepts of the universe, attitudes, spatial relations, and notions of time. Equally, culture entails numerous people sharing a knowledge system (Vaisey & Lizardo, 2010). In its broadest sense that captures most definitions of worldviews, culture is a behavior that is cultivated over time, the

totality of an individual's accumulated and learned experience that is transmitted socially, or the practices acquired through social learning.

Cultural differences, according to Mobley, Wang and Li (2009), are made manifest in different forms, including symbols, rituals, heroes and values. Symbols, for instance, are the most superficial form of culture and represent words, objects, pictures, and gestures that convey a particular meaning that is only understood by individuals that share a specific background. However, values, which are the core of culture (Werness, 2003), are the main determinants of worldviews and value systems. Notably, values are comprehensive predispositions on the way of life concerning others, including the right-wrong, and the natural-unnatural debate. Moreover, Werness (2003) posits that a consistent set of values is often linked with a particular worldview or value system. Values can be used to determine the worldview that one specific community holds on sustainability and other issues. For instance, the cornucopian worldview assumes that technology is a desirable capital in society that can replace preservation.

Some of the cosmologies that emanate from culture include the Western, Maori, and African Worldview (Werness, 2003). For example, unlike indigenous worldviews, which contend that there can be many truths, the western worldview holds that there is only one truth; the one based in the Western or scientific way. Moreover, unlike the indigenous view, which argues that people are not the most important beings in the universe, the Western view contends that humans are the most significant on the planet. Overall, the western worldview is ethnocentric and thus argues it is superior to other cultures.

3.6 Identity

Identity is another critical factor that influences the formation of worldviews and value systems. Identity involves both the individual and social levels. At the social level, it is a set of individual or a social category distinguished by rules that decide membership and alleged characteristic attributes or features (Bertram-Troost et al., 2018). At the secondary level, identity refers to distinguishable characteristics that individuals take particular in or views as of high social significance but more or less changeable (Bertram-Troost et al., 2018). Based on this dual definition, identity determines worldviews because it involves social categories and is also the source of self-dignity or respect for individuals.

Moreover, identity refers to the way that groups and individuals define themselves and are defined by others in terms of religion, ethnicity, race, or language (Bertram-Troost et al., 2018). Since worldviews pertain to the values and beliefs that a society, group, or individual honor, it is closely linked with identity. Notably, through identity, individuals and groups are distinguished in their social relations with other persons and collectivities.

According to Bertram-Troost et al. (2018), identity determines worldviews and value systems in different ways, including how individuals' upbringing and the influence of the immediate environment. For instance, individuals raised in a patriarchal society are likely to assume that men are superior to women and thus develop a superiority

complex identity. Likewise, individuals with groups that are a minority in a particular society are likely to forge a marginalized identity and therefore have an inequality worldview. Some of the worldviews linked with identity include the liberal, fascist/Marxist worldview and Islamic, Christina and Budhist world view, among others.

4. Major Worldviews

4.1 Relativism Worldview
a. Moral Relativism
Moral relativism, according to Pishghadam, Jajarmi and Shayesteh (2016) is the belief that an absolute or universal set of ethical practices does not exist. This cosmology seeks to adhere to the adage that "*when in Rome do as the Romans do*." In particular, the worldview argues that the falsity or truth of moral judgments, or their rationalization, is not universal or absolute; instead, it is about the practices, convictions, and traditions of a set of people (Pishghadam, Jajarmi & Shayesteh, 2016). For instance, bribery can be right in terms of the practices and norms shared in some societies. However, this in itself does not probe the truth of moral judgment, especially when dealing with trans-cultural ethical references. Overall, relativism involves several approaches: descriptive moral relativism (DMR), meta-ethical moral relativism (MEMR), and normative moral relativism (NMR).

b. Descriptive Moral Relativism
Cultural relativism or DMR contends that culture is the determinant of the veracity of moral standards (Collier-Spruel et al., 2019). In particular, this thinking holds that though several values such as respect and honesty appear to be universal, people have different views about things like culture, religion, and morality. The descriptive viewpoint does not contend that all these perspectives are equally wrong or right; it just upholds, as an empirical fact, that people throughout history have believed different things.

c. Meta-ethical Relativism
The meta-ethical relativism insists that ethics is proportional to the standards of one's culture; hence, it is not justifiable to uphold the ethical standards of one society over those of another community (Collier-Spruel et al., 2019). Here, moral choices are made by communities based on their unique practices, beliefs as well as customs. While one act could be acceptable in one culture, it could be immoral in another society. However, Pishghadam, Jajarmi and Shayesteh, (2016) state that the cosmology negates the existence of universal ethical values that ought to be applied universally. Resultantly, it is impossible to have a common framework for addressing moral disputes or attain a consensus on various ethical issues that are rampant in our societies. Nonetheless, as Collier-Spruel et al. (2019) posit, though the ethical practices of different cultures are distinct, the fundamental values behind these practices are similar.

d. Normative Moral Relativism

NMR is the notion that each society ought to accept the different moral values of other cultures (Pishghadam, Jajarmi & Shayesteh, 2016). Notably, because universal ethical principles do not exist. Each moral value is only right within the framework where it is believed. As such, there is no absolute truth or right; instead, there are only beliefs that are true or right relative to the society where they are held. Acts such as bribery are acceptable in some communities and unacceptable in other cultures. However, normative relativism contends the approval of corruption in one culture or its disapproval in another society does not make it right in any ultimate sense.

4.2 Significance of Relativism to Global Leaders

Relativism is significant in the current business environment, which is characterized by the internationalization of firms. According to Choi (2016), differences in ethnicity, local practices, language, race, gender, religion, local practices, and value systems are some of the essential features for global leaders at the international and domestic levels. As such, cultural diversity is an indispensable component for policymakers, business management, and global leaders. Organizing corporations in such a way that people from diverse cultures can work and live together is a challenge for most global leaders (Choi, 2016). In particular cultural diversity involves ethical challenges for various reasons.

4.3 Criticism of Relativism

However, various scholars contend that it is difficult to uphold the principles of relativism. In particular, advocates of moral objectivism or moral universalism argue that objective actions that are right or wrong exist independent of personal or social values and opinions (Arnett, 2017). Notably, recognized approaches to business ethics that are within moral universalism exist. For instance, the utilitarian approach contends that universal moral principle exists; consequently, there is always one right response to any ethical issue. In a situation involving ethical dilemmas, the utilitarian approach, as highlighted by Cohen and Ahn (2016), insist that global leaders out to identify and implement the action that maximizes the well-being and happiness of most people. As such, the utilitarian approach considers both the local and universal norms to determine the morality of an action.

Moreover, relativism has adverse effects on the moral beliefs of individuals. Notably, in case the rightness or wrongness of an act is determined by the norms within a society. People must obey such standards within their culture; otherwise, to diverge from such practices is to act immorally (Keller, 2019). in case a person belongs to a society or community that holds that both racial and chauvinist practices are morally acceptable. Here, an individual must accept such actions as ethical. However, such a standpoint promotes social conformity but fails to create room for social improvement and moral reform.

Moreover, as Choi (2016) points out, people from the same society can have diverse practices. For instance, in the US, various moral positions exist on issues ranging

from abortion to animal experimentation (Keller, 2019). As such, it is difficult to determine the right moral practice in the absence of consensus. Regardless, relativism is an essential worldview that reminds global leaders that each society has distinct ethical values and that respective cultures influence such principles (Choi, 2016). The cosmology also encourages global leaders to explore the underlying reason behind various beliefs.

4.4 Worldviews based on the Cultural Theory
4.4.1 The Cultural Theory

The cultural theory, which was established by Mary Douglas, is one of the models that demonstrate the link between global leadership and worldviews. According to Xue et al. (2014), this theory contends that people can be classified based on two sociality perspectives: grid and group. The group dimension is the level that people are seen as members of social groupings and the degree to which group membership absorbs and maintains the life of individuals. The grid dimension focuses on the level that people perceive their lives to be confined by externally imposed prescriptions and rules. Xue et al. (2014) posit that grids are a specific set of standardized classifications that separate individuals and control their interactions. The group and grid perspectives involve four ideal worldviews: egalitarianism, hierarchism, individualism, and fatalism, emerge. In general, each cosmology provides a distinct description of human nature, the natural world, individual group description, distributive justice, blame, danger, and responsibility.

Each cosmology also shows how its supporters perceive, organize and justify social relations, constructing a preference about the interaction between the natural and social worlds as well as guiding them though and action (McEvoy, et al. 2017). It is a belief and value system that shapes the perception, preferences, and attitudes of adherents. As political and social life demands organization as well as mobilization of bias, the approach maintains the political choices and attitudes emanate from cosmologies, which are called political cultures.

Additionally, the cultural theory develops the idea of institutional/cultural cognition that unites political processes, social practices, sustainable development, and human life (McEvoy, et al. 2017). The theory also seeks to conquer the dualism between physical and human nature and individuals and institutions. The approach is to evaluate the opposing views on a wide range of global issues uses including environmentalism, the perceived risks of climate change, global warming, renewable energy, inequality in the workplace, global sustainability modeling, and promoting ethics, among others.

4.4.2 Egalitarian Cosmology

Egalitarianism emanates from the principles of Socialism and Communism. Watkins and Brook (2016) contend that modern egalitarianism is a response to the failure of communism. The cosmology, according to Zanocco and Jones (2018), holds that people ought to be or are in equal economically, politically, and in other aspects. In particular, this cosmology contends that there are no significant differences that can be used to

justify that one individual has greater inherent rights than others. Consequently, the unequal distribution of benefits is unjust, and the government ought to use coercive measures to remedy such injustices.

4.4.3 Eradication of Inequality

Currently, adherents of egalitarianism are advocating for the elimination of economic inequalities, which are rampant in the 21st century. For instance, a recent annual wealth check report recently released by Oxfam showed a rise of approximately $900bn in the wealth of 2200 tycoons worldwide, which was an increase of 2.5bn per day throughout 2018 (Elliott, 2019). The 12% increase in the wealth of the super-rich was in contrast to the decline in the wealth of the poorest half of the planet's population. Resultantly, the number of tycoons possessing wealth equivalent to that of half of the planet's population declined between 2017 and 2018 from 43 to 26.

Egalitarians such as John Roemer, who is an American economist, contend that society must compensate individuals for their apparent lack of natural talent to create wealth because of their misfortune in the birth lottery (Cherry, McEvoy & Sælen, 2017). For instance, through egalitarianism, global managers can use modern econometric techniques to eliminate economic inequality. Notably, Elliott (2019) states that adding a tax wealth on the 26 persons is likely to raise around $418bn per annum. This figure is adequate to cater for the education cost of each child that is currently not in school, and simultaneously provide funds that will enable the health care to avert around 3 million deaths.

4.4.4 The Source of Success

Unlike most Americans that argue that wealth inequalities are the legitimate outcome of each person's productive efforts and sacrifices, advocates of this worldview see it differently. The cosmology contends that in case a person is successful because of their intelligence, hard work, diligence, and talents, that person is just lucky and does not merit the rewards of their hard work (Mohanraj & Sreejana, 2018). As such, the desire to succeed through hard work is something that people inherit or develop in childhood. Therefore, egalitarianism contends that people are lucky to be born diligent, intelligent to have mentors that inculcated the hard work ethos or to be born to loving parents. Similarly, since an individual cannot earn talents, the gift of intelligence and ambition, then then they are fortunate to excel in sports by being able to jump higher, run faster, or memorize more academic content (Mohanraj & Sreejana, 2018). Therefore, instead of rewarding people for being lucky, society is supposed to deprive the fortunate individuals of their material results and compensate unsuccessful persons for their misfortune.

4.4.5 Group Identity in Egalitarianism

Furthermore, Mohanraj and Sreejana (2018) state that egalitarians have a strong group identity, though they prefer status equality within the group. They also reject the

concentration of wealth and power, and often distrust experts representing the individuals in a position of authority. As such, egalitarians view the poisonous by-products of industrial technologies like greenhouse gases generated by multinationals pose risks to all people.

Moreover, McEvoy et al. (2017) state that in a social setting that is directed by egalitarianism, the incorporation of actors in the social context is steady. On the other hand, the subordination to binding prescriptions is weak. The players have close ties but end up rejecting excess social stratification as they worry that such an arrangement will create inequality and corruption. To satisfy their aspiration to transform society towards egalitarianism, their view of nature has to validate the notion that nature is fragile and ephemeral (McEvoy et al., 2017). As such, nature is seen as a ball on the edge of a precipice, and any slight interference can cause catastrophic consequences. Therefore, all resources ought not to be exploited in an attempt to preserve inter and intra-generational equity.

5. Application of Egalitarianism

5.1 Solving Urban Transport Issues
In terms of the challenge of urban transport, which is another challenge that global leaders are facing in most major cities, egalitarians tend to see this as demand-side challenges. Consequently, to make cities more habitable and sustainable, advocates of the cosmology advocate for the reduction in demand for car use or mobility (McEvoy et al., 2017). As such, the transport behavior ought to be changed through inner conviction like setting good examples, discussion, and education. Therefore, egalitarians advocate for urban policies that support for alternative means of transport such as walking, cycling, because this satisfies the desire to transform cities into more equitable places.

5.2 The Climate Change Challenge
In particular, the nature 'benign myth' contends that nature is resilient and robust, and thus largely impervious to human actions (McEvoy et al., 2017). Accordingly, cosmology assumes that natural causes rather than artificial activities such as the use of non-renewable energy is the primary cause of climate change. This view is popular among Republicans in the US, who contend that the current climate changes across the globe is caused by natural factors rather than human activities (Rhodes, 2017). Consequently, republicans in the US contend that few restrictions ought to put on entrepreneurial and business activities. For this reason, the current US regime, which is led by the Republicans, has withdrawn from the Paris climate protocol because of the numerous restrictions that the 2017 agreement in France places on business, especially in the US for their contribution to the carbon footprint (Auxier, 2015).

In addition, egalitarian groups such as the antinuclear Clamshell alliance, often highlight potentially disastrous social and environmental consequences (Hedlund-de Witt, 2013). Nonetheless, this does not imply that egalitarianism is always more risk-

averse in comparison to individualism and hierarchy. Auxier (2015) also contends that humanity is headed on path to disaster unless people make intense changes in the way they live. Egalitarianism contends that people must recognize the fragile state of nature and just make necessary demands on it (Auxier, 2015). Notably, the proponents of the worldview contend that people must begin by minimizing the use of fossil fuels, on which industrialized economies are based.

5.3 Hierarchism Worldview

Communitarianism or hierarchism is a cosmology that emphasizes the link between the community and the individual. The overriding idea of this worldview is the belief that community relationship is the main factor that molds the personality and social identity of an individual (Hedlund-de Witt, 2013). Though hierarchism originated in the 20th century, the worldview has been in existence over the years and its principles are represented by philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle and theologians like Aquinas (Rhodes, 2017). The cosmology is also present in the writings and dialectics of Confucius as well as in India. However, Auxier (2015) states that this worldview was not common in the West until the 1980s through the work of a small team of political philosophers. The cosmology was unpopular in the West because of its association with collectivism and socialism.

5.4 Strong Group Identity in Hierarchism

Besides having a strong group identity, Johnson, Swedlow and Mayorga (2019) state that hierarchs consider themselves to be bound by social prescriptions. They focus more on a group's welfare and tend to be conscious whether other people are members of a group or outsiders and place much emphasis on lines of authority, procedures, order and social stability. In general, hierarchs show much trust to persons in authority and believe in technologies that been examined and authorized by relevant authorities. The worldview also distrusts political and social adventures that that are not in line with traditionally established lines of authority and social structures. Johnson, Swedlow and Mayorga (2019) also state that actors in this cosmology embrace a collective way of life that is established by role differentiation and authority.

6. Relevance of Hierarchism to Global Leaders

6.1 Fixing Cross-cultural Issues in the Workplace

Hierarchism is highly relevant to global leaders because of various reasons. First, the worldview acknowledges that natural talents are not distributed equally; some individuals are more creative than others, others are more intelligent and still other have high emotional quotient as well as the ability to collaborate with colleagues (Hedlund-de Witt, 2013). With global leaders being required to operate in a cross-cultural environment that is characterized by a diverse workforce, understanding the unequal distribution will

enable them to minimize discrimination against workers because of gender or racial differences.

6.2 Addressing Environmental Issues

Hierarchism is built on the 'nature tolerant' axiom, which occupies a middle ground between the ephemeral and benign allegory (Johnson, Swedlow & Mayorga, 2019). Based on this myth, nature is tolerant to well-regulated human activities but unnecessary human intrusion can result in large and disastrous repercussions for the natural world. Consequently, this cosmology focuses on the precautions raised by the specialists sanctioned by their group, and pay attention to the regulatory constraints on intrusions into nature enacted by recognized authorities. Likewise, hierarchism sees nature as a ball that can roll within the set limits and return to the center safely and the government assumes responsibility for managing the boundary between the abnormal and the normal states of nature (Hedlund-de Witt, 2013). In research examining the history of the environment in the US, Douglas and Widavsky compares environmental groups in the country and contend those who are more hierarchical are ready to make compromises between environmental conservation concerns and economic demands.

6.3 Addressing Challenges in the Transport Sector

Moreover, through hierarchism global leaders can address transport challenges. According to Johnson, Swedlow and Mayorga (2019), hierarchism advocates for the use of supply-side strategies when dealing with transport issues in urban areas. In particular, the expansion of infrastructure such as roads and transit rails ought to be a solution to transport issues as long, they do not lead to chaos in urban centers. Other supply side strategies that can be used to address transport issues include rules, traffic guidance systems and technocracy.

6.4 Individualistic Cosmology

The social setting of this cosmology condemns both group limits and binding prescriptions (Nilsson, 2013). This is because the worldview prioritizes individual freedom and players are both self-reliant and self-seeking. To fulfill individual success Koltko-Rivera (2004) states that individualists endorse entrepreneurship, competition and free markets. This cosmology is rationalized by the assumption that growth limits can be achieved or surpassed through innovation, which also provides social prosperity and economic support.

Unlike hierarchism, the group identity among individualists is low and they are often bounded by few structural prescriptions (Nilsson, 2013). As a result, individuals prefer social systems that have few regulations and rules and that lack the group membership concept. They highly value personal liberties and are seemingly reluctant to embrace business and personal restrictions like carbon taxation so as to avert the threats climate change such as global warming.

7. Application of Individualist Cosmology by Global Leaders

7.1 The Transport Challenge

Individualists also examine transport issues in terms of supply-side strategies (Johnson, Swedlow & Mayorga, 2019). As such, individualists do not focus on the environmental or external costs incurred through the use of cars. To them, the purpose of automobility is to enable them travel freely and any barrier to this ought to be removed. Accordingly, external incentives such as faster transport are the factors that determine whether individualists switch to sustainable transport.

7.2 Individualist and Climate Change

Individualist also contend that nature is robust to artificial turmoil; and therefore, benign, and just like a ball it can always go back to equilibrium irrespective of how fur it is pushed. In one study focusing on the dangers of global warming, individualists rejected the findings of the UN because the research proposed regulation of industrial pollution as a solution Johnson, Swedlow and Mayorga (2019). However, when nuclear power was proposed as the solution, the individualists concurred that global warming is a serious challenge.

8. Major Value Systems

8.1. Individualism Verses Collectivism
8.1.1 Individualism

The individualistic value system prioritizes the self-interest of an individual as well as those of the members of the immediate social circle (Pinillos & Reyes, 2011). In particular, this value system emphasizes on individual rights rather than responsibilities. Other attributes of this value system include focus on individual initiative, personal privacy, self-realization, autonomy, and individual decision making (Pinillos & Reyes, 2011). People or organizations from such societies have fewer collective cognitions and more private self-cognitions. Moreover, individuals a society that adheres to the individualistic system prefer personal appraisal.

8.1.2 Collectivism Value System

Collectivism, according to Pinillos and Reyes (2011) focuses on the wants and needs of the community or society, which override individual interests. Moreover, such societies emphasize on group loyalty, while the group reciprocates by catering for individual well-being (Pinillos & Reyes, 2011). The value system is also characterized by emotional dependence on organizations and groups, the assumption that group decisions override personal decisions, less personal privacy, an understanding of individual identity such as determining one's position in a group and prioritizing the interest of others.

8.2 Prevalence of Individualism and Collectivism

The individualist and collectivism are the two value systems that are common across the globe. The individualist approach is common in most Western countries such as the US, the UK, France and Australia (Ravenhill, 2017), among others. On the contrary, the collectivist value system is common in most Easter countries such as Japan and China (Ravenhill, 2017). With the Western and Eastern countries dominating the international economies, global managers are likely to encounter the individualistic or the collectivist approach irrespective of their country of operation. Moreover, Ravenhill (2017 states that human resource practices, which is one of the key functions for global managers are either converging or diverging. With both value system having a high influence on HR practices, global managers are even more likely to encounter the collectivistic and individualistic approaches in all countries, including emerging economies.

8.3 Individualism and Organizational Performance

McDonnell et al. (2015) also points out that most countries operating under the individualism value system such as the US and the UK operate in a liberal market economy (LME), which often relies on the principles of the shareholder theory. The sole reason for the existence of an organization, based on this approach and as pointed out by Nohria & Khurana (2010) and Mobley, Wang and Li, (2009) is to increase shareholder value by maximizing profit for business owners. Therefore, global managers operating in countries such as the US and Australia will be influenced by the individualistic value system to prioritize organization performance, which in turn will increase shareholder value by maximizing profits.

8.4 Individualism and Trade Unions

The individualism value system also results in the creation of internal labour market (Brewer & Chen, 2007). In particular, trade unions, which have a high influence on the Human resource management practices that global leaders adopt, are prevalent in most LMEs such as the US (MacDonald, 2014). In the US, employment relations (ER) are influenced by capitalist ideologies and individualistic open economies that is dominant in the country (Lester, 2015). Resultantly, organizations and trade unions in the US exhibit a hostile relationship; thus, the country is characterized by anti-union culture. The labor movements in America constitute of central federations such as the American Federation of Labor (AFL) and national unions (Calmfors & Horn, 2016). As such, the national labour unions are highly influential because they strike funds and control labor movements. Moreover, the trade unions in the US prioritize individualistic issues such as better working conditions and remuneration and employer-employee relations (Lester, 2015).

However, in the US and other countries such as the UK that embrace the individualism value system unionism is on a steady decline (Calmfors & Horn, 2016). In turn, strikes have been drastically reduced and employees are encouraged to conduct

collective bargaining in-house, particularly during the recruitment process. Such collective bargaining focuses on individual rather than collective interest.

8.5 Unionism in Collectivism

Farndale et al. (2017) notes that through collectivism, the significance of trade unions and collective bargaining is recognized. Unlike in the individualism system where employees communicate directly with managers, collective bargaining and other negotiations in collectivist systems occurs through trade unions and focuses on the interest of the group rather than individuals. Moreover, like other central economy markets (CEMs), unionism in collectivist nations such as China and Japan is based on enterprise/firm associations. Trade unions in collectivist value systems often focus on collective issues such as wage rates of all workers, employee transfer and workplace safety (Steven, 2016). Moreover, in most collectivist societies the government is highly involved in employee relations. Despite the increase influence of unionism, strikes are rare in Japan because worker-union interactions are often conducted on the basis of joint consultation (Dobbelaere, Kiyota & Mairesse, 2015).

8.6 Worker Recruitment in Individualistic Societies

Although global leaders across all countries continuously need workers, the value system of each nation determines how employees are recruited. Notably, the tactic use in the recruit exercise in each country is determined by institutions like universities, labor unions as well as government organizations (Sanders & Yang, 2016). Organizations in individualistic societies such as the use approaches that promote self-recognition including advertising recruitment opportunities through social media platform, newspaper adverts and job portals (Baydur, 2017). Since most individualistic societies are highly competitive, global leader often find it easy to recruit employees in such countries. Notably, after relevant platforms are used to publicize available job opportunities, potential candidates send application in-person or through the email.

Additionally, with the US labor system focusing on creating value for shareholders rather than stakeholder, prospective candidates in such countries concentrate on calculative rather than moral association with firms. Thus, Baydur (2017) posits that the main concern of employees in individualistic countries is personal issues like better remuneration, career growth and migration into better jobs in other companies. Moreover, academic institutions in individualistic countries often produce prospective candidates that have general skills, and thus can fit in all fields (Baydur, 2017). Resultantly, companies operating in different sectors like the hospitality, aviation and automobile sector compete for the same workers. After all, the individualistic value system is based on the *survival for fittest* principle.

8.7 Recruitment of Employees in Collectivist societies

Watanabe (2018) contends that recruitment exercises in collectivist countries such as Japan often focus on the personality of individuals rather than academic qualification.

Notably, recruitment activities in China and other collectivist countries concentrates on attributes like communication skills and motivation and ambition of prospective candidates, among others. Nonetheless, just like in individualistic societies, academic institutions in countries like Japan play a critical role in potential candidates with vital skills. This is especially important because unlike in the US where organizations recruit actual graduates, firms in Japan recruit individuals that are about to graduate (Townley, 2014).

Moreover, instead of equipping candidates with general skills, academic institutions in collectivist societies equip them with industry-specific skills. Resultantly, inter-industry competition that is common in the US is relatively reduced in Japan because of the rigid job structure that ensures employees remain a single profession throughout their working life. Furthermore, Japan relies on the stakeholder rather than the shareholder approach. The stakeholder theory contends that besides providing maximum returns for shareholders, organizations must also prioritize the interest of all stakeholders (Chung, 2015). Through this approach, workers in collectivists prioritize the collective unit rather than individual interest.

8.8 The Application of Value Systems by Global Leaders

According to Sparrow, Brewster and Chung (2016), the contemporary business landscape across the globe is characterized by persistent employer-worker conflicts, which result in numerous strikes. Based on the BBC News (2019) business activities in the Jomo Kenyatta International Airport, which is the largest airport in Kenya, ware disrupted by an industrial action in early 2019. While most worker practices in the country as pointed out by Kamoche et al. (2016) are aligned with the individualistic value system that is common in the US, Kenya is characterized by high unionism and low employer-worker interactions. Furthermore, instead of subsidizing, strikes have intensified in Europe as pointed out by (Sparrow, Brewster & Chung, 2016). Notably, in January 2018 the UK's private sector lost over 213,000 working days because industrial actions (The Conversation, 2019). This was 28% higher when compared to the same period in 2017.

However, global managers can address industrial relation issues such as strikes by adopting the appropriate value system based on the emerging issue. For instance, the collectivist value system, where trade unions have an exclusive bargaining power of removing industrial actions is appropriate for individualistic societies that are prone to strikes. Resultantly, institutions in countries like the UK and Kenya ought to focus on increasing interactions between employers and employees and ensuring that workers are involved in negotiation exercise. Moreover, as mentioned above, the recruitment exercise essential in enabling organizations to attract as well as retain the best talent. Nonetheless, the individualism value system, which is predominant in most LDEs forces candidates to focus on getting academic qualifications rather than actual work skills. Consequently, global managers in organizations using the individualistic value system to recruit and motivate prospective candidates can consider embracing the recruitment model common in Japan and other collectivism countries to fill skills gaps in their organizations.

9. Conclusion

From the discussion above, it is clear that worldview is the total system of values and beliefs values that characterize a given group or culture. Apart from relativism, other worldviews linked with global leadership are highly associated with the cultural theory and include egalitarianism, hierarchism and the individualistic cosmology. Relativism contends that universal and objective ethics does not exist; therefore, the only source of right and truth is one's cultural context. Relativism has three main perspectives, descriptive, ethno-ethical and normative relativism. The worldview plays a critical role in enabling global leaders to manage the diverse workforce in the current culturally diverse workforce.

Based on the cultural theory, all individuals or societies can be categorized into four cosmologies through two social dimensions relations: grid (social regulation) and group (social integration). The four worldviews are differentiated based on two factors: group which involves social networking characteristics and grid which entails the level of social differentiation. The group factor focuses on the desire to maintain out/in-group boundaries while the grip dimension concentrates on the level of individual control or conversely the external constraints of an individual. Hierarchism, for instance, is critical to global leadership because it acknowledges the diversity as well as unequal distribution of talent. As such, the worldview enables global leaders to appreciate how diversity contributes to rich, interesting and well-functioning community, and would thus encourage awareness in an organization and at the community level.

Value system refers to the way that individual or groups order and prioritize their ideological as well as ethical values. Values, which are at the core of the value systems refer to the qualities and attributes such as honesty, accountability and equality that people consider as desirable and worthwhile. The two dominant value systems across the globe include individualism and collectivism. Individualism, which prioritizes the interest of an individual, is common in the in the US, UK and other Western countries. In these countries, the value system expresses the interest of individuals through performance management, trade union membership and employee recruitment. Collectivism, on the other fund prioritizes that interest of other individuals and is common in most Easter countries including Japan and China. The value system is expressed through recruitment exercise that focuses on creating long-term relationship and unionism that facilitates collective bargaining and thus minimizes industrial actions. In general, worldviews and value systems are critical in enabling global managers to address various societal and organizational issues including climate change, transport system challenge, managing a diverse workforce and implementing various HR practices.

Conflict of Interest Statement
The author declares no conflicts of interests.

About the Author

Ms. Naomi Gaitho is a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) student in Organizational Leadership at Pan African Christian University, Nairobi, Kenya.

References

Arnett, R. C. (2017). Cultural Relativism and Cultural Universalism. *The International Encyclopedia of Intercultural Communication*, 1-9.

Auxier, W. R. (2015). A Comparison of Worldviews of Business Leaders from Disparate Geographic Cultures. *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*, *8*(2), 8.

Baydur, I. (2017). Worker Selection, Hiring, and Vacancies. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, *9*(1), 88-127.

BBC News (2019). *Kenyan airport strike strands hundreds*. [online] BBC News. Available at: https://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-47467271?intlink_from_url=https://www.bbc.com/news/topics/cym524y9ejpt/strike-action&link_location=live-reporting-story [Accessed 19 Mar. 2020].

Bertram-Troost, G., Versteegt, I., Van der Kooij, J., Van Nes, I., & Miedema, S. (2018). Beyond the split between formal school identity and teachers' personal worldviews: Towards an inclusive (Christian) school identity. *Education Sciences*, *8*(4), 208.

Brewer, M. B., & Chen, Y. R. (2007). Where (who) are collectives in collectivism? Toward conceptual clarification of individualism and collectivism. *Psychological review*, *114*(1), 133.

Burleson, B. R., & Mortenson, S. R. (2003). Explaining cultural differences in evaluations of emotional support behaviors: Exploring the mediating influences of value systems and interaction goals. *Communication Research*, *30*(2), 113-146.

Calmfors, L., & Horn, H. (2016). *Trade Unions, Wage Formation and Macroeconomic Stability*. Springer.

Cherry, T. L., McEvoy, D. M., & Sælen, H. (2017). Conditional cooperation and cultural worldviews. *Economics Letters*, *158*, 51-53.

Choi, J. (2016). *Pluralism, relativism, and postmodernism in the healthcare chaplaincy and the evangelical chaplain* (Doctoral dissertation, Biola University).

Chung, C. (2015). The Conceptualization of Global Integration and Local Responsiveness in International HRM Research: A Review and Directions for Future Research. In *Discussion Paper JHD-2015-02*. Henley Business School.

Cohen, D. J., & Ahn, M. (2016). A subjective utilitarian theory of moral judgment. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *145*(10), 1359.

Collier-Spruel, L., Hawkins, A., Jayawickreme, E., Fleeson, W., & Furr, R. M. (2019). Relativism or tolerance? Defining, assessing, connecting, and distinguishing two moral personality features with prominent roles in modern societies. *Journal of personality*, *87*(6), 1170-1188.

Crate, S. A., & Nuttall, M. (2016). *Anthropology and Climate Change: from actions to transformations*. London: Routledge.

Dobbelaere, S., Kiyota, K., & Mairesse, J. (2015). Product and labor market imperfections and scale economies: Micro-evidence on France, Japan and the Netherlands. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, *43*(2), 290-322.

Elliott, L. (2019). World's 26 richest people own as much as poorest 50%, says Oxfam. Retrieved 18 March 2020, from https://www.theguardian.com/business/2019/jan/21/world-26-richest-people-own-as-much-as-poorest-50-per-cent-oxfam-report

Farndale, E., Brewster, C., Ligthart, P., & Poutsma, E. (2017). The effects of market economy type and foreign MNE subsidiaries on the convergence and divergence of HRM. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *48*(9), 1065-1086.

Hedlund-de Witt, A. (2013). Worldviews and their significance for the global sustainable development debate. *Environmental Ethics*, *35*(2), 133-162.

Johnson, B. B., Swedlow, B., & Mayorga, M. W. (2019). Cultural theory and cultural cognition theory survey measures: confirmatory factoring and predictive validity of factor scores for judged risk. *Journal of Risk Research*, 1-24.

Kamoche, K., Siebers, L. Q., Mamman, A., & Newenham-Kahindi, A. (2015). The dynamics of managing people in the diverse cultural and institutional context of Africa. *Personnel Review*, *44*(3), 330-345.

Keller, D. R. (2019). Realism or Relativism?. In *Ecology and Justice—Citizenship in Biotic Communities* (pp. 111-131). Springer, Cham.

Koltko-Rivera, M. E. (2004). The psychology of worldviews. *Review of general psychology*, *8*(1), 3-58.

Lester, R. A. (2015). *As unions mature: An analysis of the evolution of American unionism*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Matthews, L. C., & Thakkar, B. (2012). The impact of globalization on cross-cultural communication. *Globalization-education and management agendas*, 325-340.

McDonnell, A., Boyle, B., Bartram, T., Stanton, P., & Burgess, J. (2015). Similarity or variation? Employee representation and consultation approaches amongst liberal market economy multinationals. *Relations Industrielles/Industrial Relations*, *70*(4), 645-670.

McEvoy, J., Gilbertz, S. J., Anderson, M. B., Ormerod, K. J., & Bergmann, N. T. (2017). Cultural theory of risk as a heuristic for understanding perceptions of oil and gas development in Eastern Montana, USA. *The extractive industries and society*, *4*(4), 852-859.

Mobley, W., Wang, Y. & Li. M. (2009). *Advances in global leadership*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.

Mohanraj, S. G., & Sreejana, S. (2018). Egalitarian Worldview: The Fundamental Deliberation of Nature in the Poems of WS Merwin. *Language in India*, *18*(1).

Nilsson, A. (2013). *The psychology of worldviews: Toward a non-reductive science of personality*. Lund University.

Nohria N. & Khurana R. (2010). Handbook of Leadership Theory and Practice. Massachusetts: Harvard Business Press.

Pinillos, M. J., & Reyes, L. (2011). Relationship between individualist–collectivist culture and entrepreneurial activity: evidence from Global Entrepreneurship Monitor data. *Small Business Economics*, *37*(1), 23-37.

Pishghadam, R., Jajarmi, H., & Shayesteh, S. (2016). Conceptualizing sensory relativism in light of emotioncy: A movement beyond linguistic relativism. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *4*(2), 11-21.

Raeff, C., Greenfield, P. M., & Quiroz, B. (2000). Conceptualizing interpersonal relationships in the cultural contexts of individualism and collectivism. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, *2000*(87), 59-74.

Ravenhill, J. (2017). *Global political economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rhodes, C. J. (2017). US withdrawal from the COP21 Paris Climate Change Agreement, and its possible implications. *Science progress*, *100*(4), 411-419.

Sanders, K., & Yang, H. (2016). The HRM process approach: The influence of employees' attribution to explain the HRM-performance relationship. *Human Resource Management*, *55*(2), 201-217.

Smith, A., & Hume, E. C. (2005). Linking culture and ethics: A comparison of accountants' ethical belief systems in the individualism/collectivism and power distance contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *62*(3), 209-220.

Sparrow, P., Brewster, C., & Chung, C. (2016). *Globalizing human resource management*. London: Routledge.

Steven, R. (2016). *Japan and the new world order: global investments, trade and finance*. New York: Springer.

The Conversation (2019). *New styles of strikes and protest are emerging in the UK*. [online] The Conversation. Available at: https://theconversation.com/new-styles-of-strikes-and-protest-are-emerging-in-the-uk-94528 [Accessed 19 Mar. 2020].

Townley, B. (2014). Selection and appraisal: reconstituting. *New Perspectives on Human Resource Management (Routledge Revivals)*, *92*.

Vaisey, S., & Lizardo, O. (2010). Can cultural worldviews influence network composition?. *Social Forces*, *88*(4), 1595-1618.

Watanabe, H. R. (2015). The struggle for revitalisation by Japanese labour unions: Worker organising after labour-market deregulation. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, *45*(3), 510-530.

Watkins, D., & Brook, Y. (2016). *Equal is Unfair: America's Misguided Fight Against Income Inequality*. St. Martin's Press.

Werness, H. B. (2003). *Continuum Encyclopedia of Native Art: Worldview, Symbolism, and Culture in Africa, Oceania, and North America*. A&C Black.

Xue, W., Hine, D. W., Loi, N. M., Thorsteinsson, E. B., & Phillips, W. J. (2014). Cultural worldviews and environmental risk perceptions: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *40*, 249-258.

Zanocco, C. M., & Jones, M. D. (2018). Cultural worldviews and political process preferences. *Social Science Quarterly*, *99*(4), 1377-1389.