

The Multidisciplinary Roots of Global Leadership

JOYCE S. OSLAND

So the journey is over and I am back again where I started, richer by much experience and poorer by many exploded convictions, many perished certainties. For convictions and certainties are too often the concomitants of ignorance. Those who like to feel they are always right and who attach a high importance to their own opinions should stay at home. When one is traveling, convictions are mislaid as easily as spectacles; but unlike spectacles, they are not easily replaced.

—Aldous Huxley, *Jesting Pilate*

The field of leadership, reviewed in the previous chapter, is not the sole contributor to understanding global leadership. The differences in degree and kind between domestic and global leadership are also rooted in global leadership's multidisciplinary evolution. There are numerous fields that global leaders would benefit from studying, such as international affairs, diplomacy, anthropology, and cognitive and cross-cultural psychology, to name just a few. However, early scholars in the field of global leadership have drawn heavily from four fields that address effectiveness in working across cultures. They are Intercultural Communication Competence (communicating appropriately and effectively with diverse cultures), Expatriation (working abroad), Global Management (managing across national borders), and Comparative Leadership (national indigenous leadership styles). We will briefly cover the highlights from these fields that relate to global leadership and identify their contributions to the study of global leadership.

Intercultural Communication Competence

“Living in a diverse world—or leading a diverse work force—is more than a mental construct, a memorized list of cultural differences, or a willingness to be tolerant. It’s about examining how well we function at the margins and interfaces of life, where divergent ways of being and believing meet and collide” (Kemper, 2003).

Intercultural communication competence prepares people to function well at the margins where cultures collide. For reviews, see Dinges and Baldwin, 1996, Deardorff, 2006, and the *SAGE Encyclopedia of Intercultural Competence* (Bennett, 2015); for a review of intercultural competence, see Leung, Ang, and Tan (2014). Intercultural communication competence has much to contribute to any field that crosses cultural boundaries. This topic is especially important, however, for global leaders as they attempt to understand and motivate followers, partners, and stakeholders and transmit their vision and receive feedback from others. As you can imagine, the abilities to engage in active listening and accurately interpret communications are especially crucial for global leaders working with people of diverse cultural backgrounds.

Intercultural communication competence has been defined as “the ability to effectively and appropriately execute communication behaviors that negotiate each other’s cultural identity or identities in a culturally diverse environment” (Chen & Starosta, 1999: 28). Appropriateness means taking cultural expectations and the feelings of the other person into consideration and behaving consistently in accordance with those expectations. Intercultural communication competence comprises knowledge, skills, attitudes, and awareness (Fantini, 2000). It includes knowledge that is culture-specific (pertaining to a particular country), culture-general (pertaining to all foreign cultures), and context-specific (e.g., a business setting). Individuals who are competent also possess a good understanding of their own culture.

Intercultural competence involves the ability to establish interpersonal relationships, communicate effectively, manage psychological stress, adjust to different cultures, deal with different society systems, and understand others (Hammer, Gudykunst, & Wiseman, 1978; Wiseman & Abe, 1984; Paige, 1993). According to Gudykunst (1994) the most important intercultural skills are: mindfulness, cognitive flexibility, behavioral flexibility, tolerance of ambiguity, and cross-cultural empathy. Cognitive flexibility can be defined as “the ability to understand, consider, and weigh multiple frameworks, or schemas” (Endicott, Bock, & Narvaez, 2003: 415). Behavioral flexibility refers to a willingness to adopt and use different styles appropriately. Tolerance of ambiguity is “the way people process information about ambiguous situations and stimuli when confronted with an array of unfamiliar, complex, or incongruent clues” (Furnham & Ribchester, 1995: 179). People with a low tolerance find ambiguity stressful, attempt to avoid it, and react prematurely to remove the ambiguity. Those with a high tolerance find ambiguity interesting and challenging in a positive way. Empathy is defined as “the ability to experience some aspect of reality differently from what is ‘given’ by one’s own culture” (Bennett, 1993: 53). Mindfulness is defined as the process of thinking in new categories, being open to new information, and recognizing multiple perspectives. Being mindful means switching from automatic communication routines to paying attention simultaneously to the internal assumptions, cognitions, and emotions of both oneself and the other person (Thich, 1991). Thus, a related skill is the ability to see things through the eyes and minds of others, which is known as perspective taking (Tye, 1990). Although global leader scholars may refer to some of these skills using different terminology, all of them have been identified in the global leadership research as important competencies.

Paige (1993) built on these ideas to create the following description of intercultural communication competence, which includes the ability to do the job in question (technical skills) and acknowledges contextual variations (situational factors):

Knowledge of the target culture

Personal qualities (i.e., flexibility, tolerance of ambiguity, sense of humor, openness)

Behavioral skills (communicative competence)

Self-awareness (one's values and beliefs)

Technical skills (e.g., the ability to accomplish tasks)

Situational factors (e.g., clarity of expectations, psychological pressure)

"There is no prescriptive set of characteristics that guarantees competence in all intercultural relationships and situations" because competence also depends on the "characteristics of the association" between the communicators and on the situation itself (Lustig & Koester, 2003: 65). Not every relationship or every situation requires the same skill set. For example, some people function as cultural mentors who make themselves available to explain what is going on to foreigners working in their country (Osland, 1995). Their motivation often comes from having firsthand experience of the difficulties of crossing cultures and knowing which aspects of their culture puzzle foreigners. It is possible to ask such cultural mentors more direct questions about their culture, with less fear of giving offense, than with more parochial people from the same culture. Thus, in the context of interacting with a cultural mentor, there may be less need for mindfulness and behavioral flexibility and a greater sense of freedom to "be oneself" and behave in accordance with one's own cultural norms.

Several caveats concerning intercultural competence may initially seem counterintuitive (Bennett & Salonen, 2007). First, foreign language fluency does not guarantee intercultural competence (Hammer, 2007). It can be an advantage, however, where locals appreciate those who make the effort to learn their language. But fluency does not automatically translate into intercultural competence. For example, French-speaking European expatriates in Burkina Faso shared that language with many locals. This was not the case for other expatriate nationalities who bumbled around in broken French or one of the local dialects. However, the Africans treated expatriates differently and more positively, not based on their language fluency but on their intercultural competence—whether they were respectful and took the time to observe local greeting rituals and build relationships. Second, cultural knowledge does not equal intercultural competence (Bennett, 2009). A person may know intellectually that a relationship focus is more important than a task focus in certain cultures without having the actual ability to connect with others and build relationships. Similarly, individuals can be experts on Indian culture and even spend their life researching Indian leadership without being able to effectively lead Indians. Cultural knowledge is crucial; to apply it, however, means we have to be able to close the knowing-doing gap. Third, simply living in a foreign country does not guarantee intercultural competence (Hammer, 2007). "Learning from experience requires more than being in the vicinity of events when they occur; learning emerges from the ability to construe those events and reconstrue them in transformative ways" (Bennett & Salonen, 2007: 1). Our last caveat is not counterintuitive to anyone who has ever tried to change human behavior. According to a multidisciplinary review of international research (Mendenhall et al., 2001), intercultural training is more likely to result in knowledge acquisition than in changing attitudes, behavior, adjustment or performance. To summarize, intercultural competence, like global leadership, does not develop easily or quickly without transformational experiences, careful design, and a strong motivation for personal development in this area.

Some scholars view intercultural communication competence as a process that begins with an ethnocentric view that is eventually transformed into intercultural communication competence (e.g., Hoopes, 1979; Bennett, 1993; Pedersen, 1994; Fennes & Hapgood, 1997). Fennes and Hapgood (1997) argue that this process includes: overcoming ethnocentrism, acquiring the ability to empathize with others; and acquiring the ability to both communicate and cooperate across cultural boundaries. The capacity to expand and adapt one's frame of reference and match the behaviors of others is implicit in this process (Fennes & Hapgood, 1997). The basic tools used to understand the cultural communication patterns are:

Communication styles (e.g., low- versus high-context, emotionally restrained versus emotionally expressive, direct versus indirect, linear versus circular, self-effacing versus self-aggrandizing) (Ting-Toomey, 1999; Saphiere, Mikk, & Devries, 2005)

nonverbal communication (e.g., use of time, touching, gestures, facial expressions, voice pitch, eye contact (Knapp & Hall, 2005; Ting-Toomey, 1999))

value orientations (e.g., collectivistic versus individualistic, particularistic versus individualistic, status, high-versus low-power distance) (Fiske, 1992; Hofstede, 2001; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1993; Schwartz, 1994)

interaction rituals (e.g., turn-taking in conversation, greetings and farewells) (Tannen, 1994; Ting-Toomey, 1999)

conflict styles (e.g., controlling, direct, collaborative, avoiding) (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001; Hammer, 2003)

cognitive styles (e.g., holistic versus analytical logic, objective versus subjective ways of knowing, dialectic versus integrative thinking patterns, doubting game versus believing game thinking patterns) (Riding & Rayner, 2000; Hayashi & Jolley, 2002; Nisbett, 2003; Elbow, 1973)

Given the extent of intercultural communication in which global leaders engage, competence in this area is a necessity. To global leadership, the field of intercultural communication competence contributes many valuable lessons, particularly the importance of:

learning the expectations and communication practices of other cultures

practicing mindfulness, empathy, perspective taking, and suspended judgment (which are all foundations for a global mindset)

accepting that our way of viewing the world is unique to ourselves or our culture and learning to understand and value other views

adapting to other cultures

building relationships, handling stress, and switching communication styles as appropriate

acknowledging that different competencies and skills are required in different contexts and situations.

Expatriation

Expatriates are employees who have been sent by their employers to reside and work outside of their home country to a related unit in a foreign country on temporary assignment, usually for a term(s) that lasts more than six months and less than five years (Aycan & Kanungo, 1997). The word 'expatriate' is used to refer to business people, diplomats, employees of international nonprofit organizations, military personnel, and missionaries among others. 'Self-initiated expatriate' or foreign worker is a newer term that refers to an individual who relocates voluntarily to a foreign country on his or her own initiative (independently of any employer and without organizational assistance) and is hired under a local, host-country contract (Crowley-Henry, 2007; Inkson, Arthur, Pringle, & Barry, 1997). International students are not technically categorized as expatriates because they lack an employer, but they share the experience of learning to adapt and function in another culture. For a recent review of expatriate research, see Dabic, González-Loureiro, and Harvey (2015).

Previously expatriates were typically sent abroad by organizations in industrialized countries. Today's expatriates flow in bilateral and multilateral directions, depending on the demand and supply of expatriates (Collings, Scullion, & Morley, 2007). For example, given the shift in economic power, rapidly growing economies such as China and India are using their new wealth to acquire firms elsewhere and thus sending out more expatriates to western countries (Tung & Varma, 2008). Globalization has also caused more "brain circulation" as people study and work in a foreign country and eventually move back home, with the option, however, of returning to their adopted country (Tung & Varma, 2008). Furthermore, there is less company loyalty among today's expatriates, who change employers more frequently. Due to the changing face of expatriation, the term itself has been replaced by 'global mobility and talent management' in many firms (McNulty, 2014).

Just as immersion in a foreign country is viewed as the most efficient and effective way to learn a language, an expatriate assignment has historically been viewed as the best way to develop global leaders. For example, when asked to name the most powerful experience in their lives for developing global leadership capabilities, 80 percent of those surveyed responded that it was living and working abroad (Gregersen, Morrison, & Black, 1998). Thus, Aycan (2001) addressed expatriation as an antecedent to global leadership development by proposing an expatriate acculturation model whose outcome variables were the following global leadership competences: business, technical, and managerial competencies, coping with uncertainties and conflicts, embracing and integrating multiple perspectives, communication competence, and motivating self and other to succeed. In addition, Osland (2001), based on her expatriate research, articulated the link between expatriate transformation and the following global leadership competencies: business savvy, continuous learning, managing uncertainty, cognitive complexity, behavioral flexibility, and cross-cultural skills. This belief in the crucial role of international assignments in developing global leaders prompted renewed interest in the nature of the expatriate experience, selection, adjustment, transformation, and effectiveness, which are summarized in the following paragraphs.

The Expatriate Experience

The intrinsic nature of an overseas assignment makes it a valuable opportunity for personal growth (Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Osland, 1995). In addition to supplementary, more important, and broader work responsibilities, expatriates generally have more independence and potential impact on operations than they do in a domestic job (Oddou & Mendenhall, 1988). The challenging nature of the experience leads many people to question their mental models and develop new ones, which contributes to a global mindset. For better or worse, expatriates are upended by concurrent changes in cultures, job context, and social support—a Petri dish for stress, accelerated learning, paradoxes, and personal transformation (Osland, 1995).

Paradoxes and contradictions are an inherent part of the cross-cultural experience. Paradox can be defined as "a situation involving the presence of contradictory, mutually exclusive elements that operate equally at the

same time” (Quinn & Cameron, 1988). Examples of expatriate paradoxes are “seeing as valid the general stereotype about the culture but also realizing that many host-country nationals do not fit that stereotype,” “as a result of being abroad a long time, feeling at ease anywhere but belonging nowhere,” and “possessing a great deal of power as a result of your role but downplaying it in order to gain necessary input and cooperation” (Osland, 1995). Expatriates dealt with these and other paradoxes by trying to understand the “foreign” side of the paradox, determining their role in the specific situation and whether they had an ethical right to take action, weighing the contingencies, discerning critical factors for success or effectiveness, picking their battles, accepting what they could not change, and learning from the experience so they could apply it to the next paradox (Osland, 2001). Wrestling with paradox helps develop cognitive complexity, the ability to manage uncertainty, and behavioral flexibility—all aspects of global leadership. The link between expatriation and global leadership development will be delineated more fully in [Chapter 9](#).

Expatriate Selection and Adjustment

Despite uncertain results, some firms continue to select expatriates solely on their technical competence, past performance in a domestic setting, or willingness to go abroad (Mendenhall, Kühlman, Stahl, & Osland, 2002; Anderson, 2005; Graf, 2004; Tye & Chen, 2005). While technical skills are necessary, organizational and technical knowledge do not ensure expatriate success (Tung, 1981; Varma, Stroh, & Schmitt, 2001). Willingness to undertake an international assignment is a crucial component, since “no amount of training can prepare a reluctant candidate to do well abroad” (Tung & Varma, 2008: 369). However, willingness to go is merely a threshold requirement rather than a guarantee of success. Past performance in a domestic setting is not a good predictor of excellent performance overseas (Black, Morrison, & Gregersen, 1999; Miller, 1973). The strengths of many North American high-potentials actually translate into liabilities in the global context (Ruben, 1989). The characteristics that get US high-potentials noticed—“propensity for risk-taking, a passion or commitment to seeing the organization succeed, courage to go against the grain, and a keen mind” (Spreitzer, McCall & Mahoney, 1997) are usually found in hard-driving, self-motivated, assertive, and outwardly passionate and self-confident individuals (Mendenhall, 2001b). These qualities are not universally valued and may in fact lead to failure in other countries. The same findings may apply to high-potential employees of other nationalities.

After reviewing the literature, Kealey (2003) proposed that the “model cross-cultural collaborator” possesses three categories of non-technical skills: (1) adaptation skills (e.g., flexibility, stress tolerance), (2) cross-cultural skills (e.g., realism, cultural sensitivity), and (3) partnership skills (e.g., openness to others, professional commitment). Recent research has utilized the NEO PI-R, Five-Factor Model of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992) to judge whether particular personality traits correlate with expatriate outcomes such as adjustment, effectiveness, and likelihood of completing their assignment. The results indicate that expatriates who are emotionally stable, outgoing and agreeable, open to experience (Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black, & Ferzandi, 2006), flexible, and not ethnocentric appear to function better than other expatriates (Caligiuri, 2000; Caligiuri & Di Santo, 2001). This research also indicated that selection practices should identify people who are motivated to attain assigned task goals and interact with others in the workplace and who show cultural flexibility (Shaffer et al., 2006; cf. Black, Gregersen, Mendenhall, & Stroh, 1999). Cultural flexibility is the ability to substitute activities enjoyed in one’s native country with existing, and usually distinct activities, in the host country (e.g., baseball instead of cricket or vice versa). A meta-analysis of 30 studies identified these predictors of expatriate job performance: cultural sensitivity, local language ability, and four of the Big Five personality—extraversion, emotional stability, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (Mol, Born, Willemssen, & Van der Molen, 2005). Surprisingly, openness was not a predictor. Some variables were not measured in enough studies to provide conclusive evidence, but they seem promising: cultural flexibility, selection board ratings, tolerance for ambiguity, ego strength, peer nominations, task leadership, people leadership, social adaptability, and interpersonal interest (Mol et al., 2005). Cultural sensitivity, which was highly correlated with expatriate job performance, will be addressed in [Chapter 4](#) using its more recent connotation—cultural intelligence.

Three categories of selection variables emerged from a landmark review of the expatriate adjustment literature (Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985): the self-oriented dimension (activities and attributes related to self-esteem, self-confidence and mental hygiene); the others-oriented dimension (activities and attributes enhancing the ability

to interact effectively with host-nationals); and the perceptual dimension (cognitive processes facilitating expatriates' ability to understand why foreigners behave the way they do). These categories served as the basis for the rigorously tested and validated (c.f., Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005) international adjustment (IA) model (Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991) and as the intercultural competence content domain of global leadership (Bird, Mendenhall, Stevens, & Oddou, 2010). The Global Competencies Inventory (see [Chapter 6](#)) that grew out of this expatriate adjustment research is used for both expatriate and global leadership selection.

Table 2.1 Individual Determinants of Expatriate Adjustment and Related Global Leadership Competencies

<i>Expatriate Adjustment Determinants</i>	<i>Related Global Leadership Competencies</i>
Self-efficacy	Personal literacy, optimistic
Resilience	Resilience, resourceful, energetic
Behavioral flexibility	Flexibility
Curiosity	Inquisitiveness, cultural interest
Extroversion	<i>No correlate</i>
Broad category width	Savvy
Flexible attributions	Cognitive complexity
Open-mindedness	Open-mindedness
High tolerance for ambiguity	Duality, cognitive complexity
Empathy/respect for others	Cultural sensitivity, social literacy
Nonverbal communications	Social literacy
Relationship skills	Social literacy, building partnerships
Willingness to communicate	Social literacy, constructive dialogue

The international adjustment model (Black et al., 1991) mentioned above included work adjustment, interaction adjustment, and general adjustment, and noted the impact of anticipatory adjustment prior to expatriation as well as in-country adjustment. Although this has been the most frequently referenced adjustment model in the literature, there are also numerous other adjustment models (for a review, see Takeuchi, 2010). Mendenhall (2001a) compiled the individual determinants of expatriate adjustment and compared them with findings from global leadership competency research. The results in [Table 2.1](#) indicate conceptual similarity between expatriate adjustment determinants and global leadership competencies. All the expatriate adjustment determinants, with the exception of extroversion, relate to a subset of global leadership competencies. This provides evidence of similarity between these two fields and explains why expatriation is included in discussions of global leadership and its development. The overview of the global leadership literature in the next chapter indicates, however, that global leadership is more extensive and broader in scope than expatriate adjustment.

Expatriate Transformation

The developmental models of expatriate adjustment are more accurately called transformational models. Peter Adler (1975) developed a five-stage model comprised of (1) contact with the other culture, (2) disintegration, (3) reintegration, (4) autonomy, and (5) independence. Pederson described the transformation that occurs during culture shock as “a series of degeneration and regeneration events of crises in a nonregular and erratic movement of change” that is both conscious and unconscious as the person tries to be more successful in the other culture (Pederson, 1995: 4). Osland (1995) uses the framework of the hero's journey, with its stages of separation and departure, initiation, and return as a metaphor for expatriate transformation.

There are many reports, both anecdotal and empirical, of ways that expatriate change as a result of an international assignment. A US sample of repatriates reported four types of changes: positive changes in self, changed attitudes, improved work skills, and increased knowledge (Osland, 1995). The *positive changes in self* were increased tolerance, patience, confidence, respectfulness, maturity, open-mindedness, competitiveness, adaptability, independence and sensitivity, and decreased impulsiveness. The *changed attitudes* concerned a broader perspective on the world, greater appreciation of cultural differences, increased realization of how

fortunate they were, different attitudes toward work, and a feeling that life is more interesting now than before. These attitudes are indications of greater cognitive complexity. The improved work skills they mentioned referred to improved interpersonal and communication skills, especially better listening skills, improved management style, a better understanding of power, the ability to do higher-quality work, and broadened exposure to business. The increased knowledge they reported comprised a wide array of topics related to both global business and foreign countries. These findings confirm the original research by Oddou and Mendenhall (1991: 30), in which 135 expatriates were surveyed to discover the “value added” of their assignments: increased global perspective of their firm’s business operations; greater planning ability; increased ability to communicate with people of diverse backgrounds; better able to conceptualize and comprehend business trends and events due to their exposure to contrasting cultural, political and economic work systems; and better motivators as a result of working with culturally diverse personnel overseas. These changes have much in common with these global leadership competencies discussed in [Chapter 3](#): business savvy, continuous learning, ability to manage uncertainty, cognitive complexity, behavioral flexibility, and cross-cultural skills. The particular ways they change and the degree to which expatriates are transformed varies according to the individual expatriate, the type of adventure he or she sought overseas (Osland, 1995), and the type of assignment he or she held (Zacarro, Wood, & Herman, 2006).

Repatriates, however, showed agreement in their description of the transformation process itself—a process of letting go and taking on (Osland, 1995) that is summarized in [Table 2.2](#). Many forms of transformation involve a death (“letting go”) and rebirth (“taking on”). During their sojourn, expatriates let go of cultural certainty and take on the internationalized perceptions of the other culture. They learn how other countries perceive their nation, perhaps in ways that are not always favorable; and they learn that other countries have advantages their own do not. Thus, they begin to see their country’s flaws and develop a more cognitively complex, realistic view of it, rather than the implicit faith and pride they had previously. One expatriate reflected, “I still love my country, but I certainly have a better understanding about why other countries don’t think as highly of us.”

Expatriates let go of their unquestioned acceptance of basic assumptions and take on the internationalized values of the other culture. Rather than taking their own cultural values for granted, contact with the other culture leads them to question the validity of their assumptions. At the same time, they may adopt, consciously or unconsciously, the values of the other culture, a natural part of the acculturation process (Berry, 1983). According to one expatriate, “I started to look at the world like the Colombians do and learned to not worry about things I cannot control.” At the same time expatriates may be shedding some of their peripheral values, however, their core values (e.g., patriotism, religious values) become even stronger. As an expatriate reported, “I became more American while I was there. Even though I accepted the way things are there, it made me realize how American I really am.”

[Table 2.2 The Expatriate Transformation Process](#)

<i>Letting Go</i>	<i>Taking On</i>
Cultural certainty	Internalized perceptions of the other culture
Unquestioned acceptance of basic assumptions	Internalized values of the other culture
Personal frames of reference	New or broader schemas so that differences are accepted without a need to compare
Unexamined life	Constructed life
Accustomed role or status	Role assigned by the other culture or one’s job
Social reinforcement knowledge	Accepting and learning the other culture’s norms and behaviors
Accustomed habits and activities	Substituting functional equivalents
Known routines	Addiction to novelty and learning

Source: Reprinted with the author’s permission from J. Osland (1995) *The Adventure of Working Abroad: Hero Tales from the Global Frontier* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass), p. 141.

Expatriates let go of their personal frames of reference and take on new or broader schemas so that differences are accepted without the need to compare them to a cultural frame of reference. In the beginning of a sojourn, people naturally make comparisons between what they observe and what they know from home, their frame of reference. Over time, that frame is expanded to include the new culture, and eventually well-adapted expatriates feel no need for comparisons with home-country standards. Instead, they develop new schemas to organize their perceptions. "I used to make negative comparisons between the employees here and my subordinates at home; eventually I just began to appreciate the locals for who they are and stopped making any comparisons at all. They both have strengths and weaknesses."

Expatriates let go of an unexamined life to take on a constructed life that they themselves put together piece by conscious piece. The surprises, changes and contrasts (Louis, 1980) trigger introspection and an examination of their life in many expatriates. In some cases, it is difficult to replicate the life they had prior to expatriation. Thus, expatriates, and spouses in particular, are compelled to create a new life for themselves after carefully considering what to include. As an expatriate noted, "My wife had nothing. I mean, she woke up and had no structure to her day. She really had to construct her life, and fortunately [she] did it."

Expatriates let go of their accustomed role or status and take on the role assigned by the other culture or by their job. Being a manager in a high-power distance, authoritarian culture entails a higher-status position than being a manager in a low-power, egalitarian culture. Regardless of their position, they are a stranger in a foreign land and may be stereotyped in negative ways for their inability to speak the language or for their nationality. Thus, they have to learn to handle the roles assigned to them and still maintain their own sense of identity.

Expatriates let go of the social reinforcement knowledge from their own culture and take on the other culture's norms and behaviors. Beginning at a young age, people learn how to behave appropriately or to obtain desired reactions in their own culture. Some of that knowledge becomes irrelevant in another culture, and expatriates have to give up some of their own cultural scripts to adopt those of the other culture. This involves both acceptance and learning. As one expatriate commented, "I know how to get things done in my own culture, but they [tactics] don't work here and I had to figure out new tactics, whether I wanted to or not."

Expatriates let go of accustomed habits and activities to take on substitutes that are functionally equivalent. This is similar to the cultural flexibility mentioned above. It is not possible to engage in the same activities and hobbies found at home, so many expatriates take on replacements that serve the same function. Rather than bemoan the loss of her symphony choir at home, one expatriate simply learned whatever instrument would allow her to continue playing music with others in each foreign country.

Finally, expatriates let go of their known routines and take on novelty and learning. The comfort and security of one's own culture is replaced by the uncertainty and surprises of the other culture. Well-acclimated expatriates learn to value this novelty and are energized by the endless opportunities to learn. "As one expatriate described it, living abroad is like returning to childhood when every day brings novel adventures and something new" (Osland, 2001: 151). Osland (2001) identified the impetus behind expatriate transformation as their desire to become acculturated, to fit into another cultures, and to be effective at work, which leads us to the next topic, expatriate effectiveness.

Expatriate Effectiveness

Neither companies nor scholars have been completely clear or in agreement on what constitutes expatriate effectiveness (Harrison, Shaffer, & Bhaskar-Shrinivas, 2004; Shaffer et al., 2006). "Corporations have defined it as accomplishment of assignment objectives, attrition rates or increased revenues, but few have systems in place to track these outcomes and attribute them to individual assignees" (Shaffer et al., 2006). Scholars have measured effectiveness in terms of adjustment (Black, 1988; Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991), the strength of their plans or decisions to go home early without completing their assignment (withdrawal cognitions) (Black & Gregersen, 1990; Naumann, 1992; Takeuchi, Yun, & Tesluk, 2002), and job performance (Arthur & Bennett, 1997). The core aspects of job performance for expatriates are fulfilling specific task requirements and

developing and maintaining relationships with host country nationals (Harrison & Shaffer, 2005: 1455). While these two facets—task and relationship—are especially important for expatriate effectiveness, there is still uncertainty about what tactics are needed to achieve work goals and develop social relationships with strangers in an unfamiliar culture.

Results of Expatriation

Caligiuri and Di Santo (2001) studied what companies hoped to accomplish via expatriation. They asked several focus groups consisting of a total of 36 global HR managers and 14 line managers in a global business unit this question: “What is your organization hoping to develop in employees sent on global assignments?” Content analysis on the answers yielded eight developmental goals of global competence, which were subsequently categorized as knowledge, ability, or personality-related. In addition to reducing ethnocentrism, the other goals involved increasing:

- the ability to transact business in another country
- the ability to change leadership style based on the situation
- knowledge of the company’s worldwide business structure
- knowledge of international business issues
- the network of professional contacts worldwide
- openness
- flexibility

The researchers then surveyed three groups in three different firms to discover how they rated themselves on the eight categories. Group members were all current or former participants in the firms’ global leadership development program: (1) “prepatriates” who were selected for the programs but who hadn’t yet been sent abroad; (2) expatriates who were currently abroad; and (3) repatriates who had returned home after an international assignment.

The results indicate three findings. First, some personality traits, like flexibility and level of ethnocentrism, did not change as a result of a global assignment. No significant differences were revealed in these two traits, which is not surprising since personality traits tend to be stable enduring patterns of how individuals feel, think and behave over time (Buss, 1989; Costa & McCrae, 1992). Because most global leadership models include personality traits, this finding highlights the importance of careful selection procedures. Second, knowledge can be developed as a result of global assignments, which was indicated by higher scores in reported knowledge of professional contacts worldwide and the company’s worldwide business structure. Third, global assignments can sensitize individuals to the challenges of working abroad and increase their humility. Surprisingly, prepatriate scores were significantly higher than those of expatriates or repatriates for openness, ability to transact business in another country, ability to change leadership style, and knowledge of international business issues. Presumably, an international experience made expatriates and repatriates aware of what they do not know (Caligiuri & Di Santo, 2001). To use the conscious competence learning model (Howell & Fleishman, 1982), prepatriates could be categorized in the “unconscious incompetence” quadrant, whereas the expatriates and repatriates may well have advanced to the “conscious incompetence” quadrant. This underscores the learning and cognitive change that takes place in global assignments.

The study of expatriation makes numerous contributions to the field of global leadership and its development, including findings on antecedents, selection, adjustment, effectiveness, expatriate transformation, and the inherent paradoxes that lead to the development of a global mindset.

Global Management

While traditional expatriate managers concentrate on a single foreign country and their relationship with headquarters, global managers are responsible for understanding and operating in the worldwide business environment (Adler & Bartholomew, 1992: 53). One definition of a global manager is “someone who is assigned to a position with a cross-border responsibility, who needs to understand business from a worldwide rather than from a countrywide perspective, needs to balance potentially contradictory demands in the global environment and who must be able to work with multiple cultures simultaneously rather than with one culture at a time” (Cappellen & Janssens, 2005: 348). The study of global managers shares some similarity and overlap with the study of global leadership. Indeed, a major criticism directed at some of the early research on global leadership was that these roles and terms were used interchangeably (Osland, Bird, Mendenhall, & Osland, 2006). While acknowledging that global leaders both lead and manage, some definitions of global leadership stipulate that global leaders “facilitate positive change” (Mendenhall, Reiche, Bird, & Osland, 2012: 8). This requirement is based on Kotter’s (1990a, 1990b) classic study of the difference between leaders and managers, which concluded that leaders, unlike managers, are change agents. There is no evidence to date that this distinction between domestic leaders and managers does not hold true in the global context. Some global managers may also be global leaders if they are change agents and build a global community with a unified purpose, but not all global managers are automatically global leaders. Titles alone do not guarantee leadership behavior. Nevertheless, there are interesting global manager research findings that hold lessons for global leadership.

As with global leadership, the literature on global managers comprises both empirical research and the expert opinion of people who work in the area. The global manager descriptions in this paragraph fall into the latter category. Weeks (1992) described the successful international manager as someone with knowledge of the business, high degrees of tolerance and flexibility, and the ability to work with people; these characteristics appear on our list in [Table 2.1](#) for both expatriate adjustment determinants and global leadership competencies. Given the transnational structure they deemed necessary for global organizations, Bartlett and Ghoshal (1989) contended that effective global managers require the cognitive complexity to hold the matrix of a multistructured entity in their mind and be capable of reorganizing form to follow function as dictated by changing business demands. Adler and Bartholomew (1992) recommended that global managers be “cultural synergizers” while Bartlett, Doz, and Hedlund (1990) referred to them as “cross fertilizers” or “cross-pollinators.” All these authors arrived at their conclusions after taking a serious look at globalization and what it meant for organizations and then extrapolating, relying on inductive reasoning, to determine what kind of managers were needed.

In contrast, the research that follows is empirical in nature. We can get some sense of who global managers are from a study of Finnish global managers with more than one expatriate assignment (Suutari & Taka, 2004). Their most typical career anchors (Schein, 1996) were “managerial competence” and “pure challenge.” They also included “internationalism” as one of their top career anchors, which underscores how important it is to them to work in global jobs in global settings—and how difficult it may be for them to return to purely domestic work.

Two key questions regarding global managers are “What do they actually do, and is that different from domestic managers?” To answer the first question, scholars began by looking at the roles performed by domestic managers and Mintzberg’s (1973) observation of managers as they went about their daily work. He explicated these managerial roles: monitor, spokesperson, leader, liaison, decision maker, innovator, and negotiator. Mintzberg noted, however, that not all managers perform the same roles in the same manner because there are four sets of variables that determine how they do their work: environment (differences in milieu, industry, and organization), job (difference in job level and function), person (differences in manager personality and style characteristics), and situation (differences in temporal and contextual features).

Not all scholars accept a universal theory of management or Mintzberg's managerial roles. Some research indicates that roles vary depending on national culture and the level of industrialization (Lubatkin, Ndiaye, Vengroff, 1997a, 1997b). An environmental difference noted in a study of Central American managers seemed to necessitate an additional managerial role. Observations of managers confirmed that they performed the roles identified by Mintzberg, but they also carried out a protector role with the government (Osland, 1991). This role involved keeping close tabs on potential governmental actions that would impact their business, trying to ward off detrimental legislation or regulations, and trying to craft special arrangements that would protect their firm from damage or risk even if the government did take action. Lobbyists and government liaisons might be more likely to perform this role in larger countries, but the social networks of the Central American managers allowed them to have advanced knowledge and to influence government actions in a way that was deemed different from the traditional liaison role.

[Table 2.3 Global Managerial Roles](#)

Informational Roles	
Monitor	Environmental scanning; information seeking and gathering; monitoring of organizational units' performance
Spokesperson	Information dissemination with internal and external stakeholders; figurehead and advocacy work on behalf of firm
Interpersonal Roles	
Leader	Motivation via coaching and team building and maintenance efficacious work culture; supervision of subordinates
Liaison	Boundary spanning, external networking, integrating relationships between external stakeholders
Action Roles	
Decision maker	Troubleshooting, decision making, facilitation of task completion
Innovator	Visioning, experimentation with new processes, brainstorming, responding to unforeseen opportunities
Negotiator	Deal making, managing conflict, strategy implementation, confrontation with internal and external stakeholders

A research team at the Center for Creative Leadership found significant differences in how domestic and global managers perform their roles (Dalton, Ernst, Deal, & Leslie, 2002). They surveyed 211 managers of various nationalities who worked at four organizations (two Swiss, one Swedish, and one US). Based on Mintzberg's work and their research data, they developed and used seven managerial roles in their research, which appear in [Table 2.3](#). The sample contained both global and domestic leaders, and the researchers tested a variety of factors related to managerial effectiveness (e.g., personality) and surveyed their bosses about their effectiveness. The findings indicated both similarity and difference between global and domestic leaders; the research team attributed the differences to the complexity of the global environment. "The patterns of traits, role skills, and capabilities global managers need to be effective are similar to that of domestic managers. The bosses of global managers say emotional stability, skill in the roles of leader and decision maker, and the ability to cope with stress are key components to managerial effectiveness regardless of the job's global complexity. In addition, bosses look to conscientiousness, skill in the role of negotiator and innovator, business knowledge, international business knowledge, cultural adaptability, and the ability to take the perspective of others as significant to the effectiveness of global managers" (Leslie, Dalton, Ernst, & Deal, 2002: 63). Emotional stability, decision maker and negotiator roles, and the ability to learn played a more significant role with global leaders than they did with domestic leaders. Surprisingly, previous international exposure and work did not contribute to the global managers' effectiveness, and the cosmopolitan managers were not viewed as trusted or well-liked by their peers and other colleagues, according to their bosses' perceptions (Leslie et al., 2002). As one would expect, the selection criteria utilized in this study did not stipulate leadership roles or abilities. While future research may discover that their findings also apply to global leaders, we cannot make this assumption a priori.

The shared platform between domestic and global jobs plus the additional demands placed on global managers was confirmed in another study that interviewed 55 CEOs from various industries in 15 countries (McBer,

1995). Participants described critical incidents that were content analyzed to identify the factors that predicted effectiveness in global managers. Three of the competencies they identified were deemed universal and thus shared by both global and domestic managers: sharpening the focus, building commitment, and driving for success. However, they also identified three competencies that varied depending on the cultural context: business relationships, the role of action, and the style of authority.

The research of Spreitzer, McCall, and Mahoney (1997) was guided by their belief that critical skills for managers are learned from experience. Therefore, the ability to learn should be a selection criterion when companies hire or promote international managers. They developed an instrument for early identification of international executives, called Prospector, which included two categories of behaviors and competencies for international managers (expatriates or executives in an international job). The learning-oriented behaviors are: uses feedback, seeks feedback, cross-culturally adventurous, seeks opportunities to learn, is open to criticism, and is flexible. The competencies are: sensitive to cultural differences, acts with integrity, committed to success, has broad business knowledge, brings out the best in people, is insightful, has the courage to take a stand, and takes risks. International managers were more likely to be described as effective if they were cross-culturally adventurous and insightful, sought opportunities to learn, and were open to criticism (Spreitzer et al., 1997).

The Corporate Leadership Council (2000) surveyed some of its corporate members on issues relating to developing and retaining future global leaders. They identified the six global management skills in highest demand, some of which are focused on specific tasks. This list includes: intercultural adaptability, ability to develop individuals across diverse cultures, global strategic thinking, global team building, ability to start up business in new markets, and ability to interact with local political interests.

A comparison of global manager and global leader competencies will no doubt show areas of overlap since many of the competencies mentioned in this section appear in [Table 2.1](#). The key lessons from the study of global managers are the significant differences between domestic and global managers in terms of how they perform their roles and the findings on characteristics related to perceived effectiveness.

Comparative Leadership

The field of comparative leadership studies the differences and similarities in the indigenous leadership styles of different countries or regions. Leadership schemas and behaviors, as well as perceptions of what constitutes effective leadership, vary from one culture to another. Comparative leadership studies often measure the different styles in the leadership continuum mentioned in [Chapter 1](#) across cultures or rely on cultural value dimensions (Parsons & Shils, 1951; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Hall & Hall, 1990; Hofstede, 1980; Fiske, 1992; Schwartz, 1994; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1993) to identify or distinguish national or regional leadership styles and practices. The word ‘leader’ has different connotations in different languages. For example, the term conjures the positive image of a heroic figure in Anglo-Saxon countries but brings to mind the negative image of dictators in countries like Germany and Spain (Den Hartog & Dickson, 2004). In the Netherlands, the term for the equivalent of followers or subordinates (*medewerkes*) translates as ‘coworkers,’ is reflective of its more egalitarian culture (Dickson, Den Hartog, & Castaño, 2009).

Researchers discovered national differences in leadership characteristics, such as leader status, goals, role, communication, influence, decision making, and perceived effectiveness. For example, cultures characterized by large power distance tend to have autocratic leaders and followers who are less likely to challenge or disagree with them (Adsit, London, Crom, & Jones, 1997). Therefore, participative management techniques imported from low power distance cultures may not be appropriate (Newman & Nollen, 1996). In a study of a Russian factory, participative management actually decreased rather than increased productivity (Welsh, Luthans, & Sommer, 1993). Participative leadership is still not culturally endorsed in Russia as much as in other countries (House et al., 2004). Asking for advice and input may be interpreted as incompetence or weakness in cultures in which leaders are supposed to be omnipotent experts. In collectivist cultures, followers are more likely to identify with leaders’ goals and the group or organization’s shared vision (Earley, 1980; Triandis, 1995). Thus, they are more likely to exhibit a higher degree of loyalty than people from individualistic cultures who tend to place more value on personal goals and self-interest. For reviews on leadership from a cross-cultural perspective, see Gelfand, Erez, and Aycan (2007), Aycan (2008), Dickson, Den Hartog, and Castaño (2009), and Takahashi, Ishikawa, and Kanai (2012).

Culture is not the only source of differences in national or regional leadership patterns. A country’s unique history, geography, economic development, technological status, and institutions all influence leadership patterns. Behrens (2009), for instance, takes a multidisciplinary view (economics, history, literature) to describe management and leadership in Argentina, Brazil, and the United States. Cheung and Chan (2005) used a similar approach to explain the foundations of eminent Hong Kong Chinese CEOs.

Many comparative leadership studies measure well-established frameworks of leadership styles across cultures. Despite documented national differences in leadership, research findings also point out commonalities. A large comparative study that examined how managers from 47 countries handle routine work events found both cultural differences and similarities (Smith, Peterson, & Schwartz, 2002). Bass (1997) found another similarity in comparative leadership studies—laissez faire leaders are perceived as ineffective by their subordinates. Aspects of charismatic and transformational leadership—motivational, encouraging, communicative, trustworthy, dynamic, positive, confidence building—are universally preferred (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, Dorfman, & GLOBE, 1999).

The most extensive comparative leadership contribution to date comes from Project GLOBE (House et al., 2004; Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012). A multinational research team, numbering over 200 members, studied the relationship among leadership, societal values, and organizational culture in phases 1 and 2. They obtained data on indigenous leadership from over 17,000 middle managers in 62 countries representing 951 organizations in the telecommunications, food, and banking industries in their own countries. The researchers developed a new cultural framework, composed of nine dimensions: performance orientation, assertiveness, future orientation, human orientation, institutional collectivism, in-group collectivism, gender

egalitarianism, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance (Javidan & House, 2001). Subsequently, the managers' responses on these dimensions were used to categorize the 62 countries into ten culture clusters. These clusters reported different 'culturally endorsed implicit leadership theories': charismatic/value-based; team-oriented; participative; humane-oriented; autonomous; and self-protective. Thus, the cultural dimensions were shown to influence expectations of leaders.

Project GLOBE also found that different countries have both similar and different views on leadership. As shown in [Table 2.4](#), they identified a list of leader attributes that are universally acceptable, universally unacceptable, and culturally contingent (i.e., they work in some cultures but not in others) (Den Hartog et al., 1999). Similar business conditions and practices, technology, more well-educated employees, and the presence of multinational enterprises may be responsible for at least partial convergence on leadership views. Based on their findings about cultural differences and diverse leadership profiles, GLOBE researchers hypothesized that global leaders require a global mindset, tolerance of ambiguity, and cultural adaptability and flexibility (Javidan, Dorfman, de Luque, & House, 2006), but they did not study global leaders directly.

Phase 3 of Project GLOBE (Dorfman et al., 2012) investigated whether national culture influences executive leadership processes. They interviewed and surveyed over 40 CEOs in 24 countries and also surveyed 1,000 CEOs and 5,000 of their direct reports. Their findings indicate that:

1. National culture does not predict leadership behavior, but it does influence leadership expectations. Leaders tend to behave in a manner expected in their country. Thus, "Roman leaders lead in a manner expected in Rome" (Dorfman et al., 2012: 514).
2. Leaders are more likely to be perceived as effective if their behavior fits their country's leadership expectations. Thus, "Roman leaders damn well best do as the Romans do" (Dorfman et al., 2012: 514).
3. There are universal, consistent leadership actions that lead to effectiveness and success. The charismatic value-based leadership profile, which includes developing a vision, inspiring others, demonstrating integrity, being self-sacrificing as well as decisive, and creating a performance-oriented culture, was universally valued as shown by high ratings in most organizations. Thus, "When in Rome and you don't know what to do, exhibit charismatic/value based leadership" (Dorfman et al., 2012: 514).
4. Both the fit and degree of leadership behavior determine effectiveness. Furthermore, different patterns of behavior are found in CEOs at different levels of effectiveness. CEOs who *fail to match* society's expectations of an idealized level of leadership have less-dedicated top management teams (TMTs) and underperforming corporations. CEOs who *match* their society's expectations regarding leadership tend to have reasonably dedicated top management teams and reasonably successful corporation performance. But CEOs who *exceed* their societal leadership expectations produce superior results (highly dedicated top management teams and high corporate performance). Charismatic and team-oriented leadership predicted and led to both TMT dedication and firm performance. Participative and humane leadership predicted TMT dedication but not firm performance. Thus, with respect to leadership effectiveness, "Woe be to the CEO that falls short of society's expectations" (Dorfman et al., 2012: 514).

[Table 2.4 Project GLOBE Leadership Traits](#)

<i>Universally Acceptable Traits</i>	<i>Universally Unacceptable Traits</i>	<i>Culturally Contingent Traits</i>
Decisive	Ruthless	Enthusiastic
Informed	Egocentric	Self-sacrificial
Honest	Asocial	Risk-taking
Dynamic	Non-explicit	Sincere
Administratively skilled	Irritable	Ambitious
Coordinator	Non-cooperative	Sensitive
Just	Loner	Self-effacing
Team builder	Dictatorial	Compassionate
Effective bargainer		Unique

Dependable
Win—win problem solver
Plans ahead
Intelligent
Excellence-oriented

Willful

Source: Based on Den Hartog et al. (1999).

The selection criteria for Project GLOBE did not include evidence of global leadership roles or skills since this was not their focus. However, the universal attributes they identified and the leadership styles most linked to CEO effectiveness are very helpful to global leaders and warrant further research with samples of effective global leaders.

A major contribution of comparative leadership to the field of global leadership is the understanding that national leadership styles have certain aspects in common as well as many differences rooted in culture or a country's unique history. Therefore, when global leaders have followers from different cultures, they have to be prepared to switch styles based on the situation and the people involved (Gill & Booth, 2003).

Global Leadership as an Evolutionary Field

Perhaps you noticed the absence of leadership as one of the multidisciplinary roots of global leadership? Ironically, these research areas have developed along non-overlapping paths. International management (IM) scholars, rather than leadership scholars, have produced most of the research on global leadership. Because IM scholars were already well-versed in the study of culture and comparative leadership, they were fascinated by the global context and the competencies it demanded of global leaders; they perceived and approached global leadership as a new phenomenon. The goal of IM scholars was “to better understand the global context and how leaders navigated the challenges of that context rather than to explore extant theories of leadership in a newly emerging context” (Reiche, Bird, Mendenhall, & Osland, 2017). Historically, the field of leadership seldom considers the role of context (Liden & Antonakis, 2009). Thus, the leadership scholars who globalized their research generally did so by turning to the field of comparative leadership, producing very useful findings, as we saw in the Comparative Leadership section of this chapter. However, if we simply extend the study of leadership by incorporating culture, we fail to capture the entire phenomenon of global leadership. Similarly, if we focus only on the global context and global leadership findings without taking into consideration the extensive leadership literature, we are also in danger of taking a myopic approach. Thus, there have been recent calls for the further integration of the two areas of study (e.g., Herman & Zaccaro, 2014; Osland, Li, & Mendenhall, 2014) and some attempts at integration (Herman & Zaccaro, 2014; Tolstikov-Mast, 2016; Reiche, Bird, Mendenhall, & Osland, 2017).

Not all global leaders are found in the business sector, but the globalization of the business sector did trigger a great deal of research. Therefore, another way to understand how global leadership evolved is through Bird and Mendenhall’s (2016) quasi-historical review and the trajectory of cross-cultural management to global leadership. After World War II, the field of cross-cultural management often took a comparative approach, but it viewed and researched culture in fairly simplistic ways. This period, “the positioning of cross-cultural management research,” was characterized by two beliefs that were subsequently shown to be mistaken: 1) the hegemony of the US economy prompted some scholars to assume that US management should be imitated worldwide; and 2) the view that industrialization and ‘technological imperative’ would result in the convergence of common manufacturing and management practices all over the world.

Bird and Mendenhall (2016) called the next period, 1960–1980, ‘the rise of international.’ Large, especially US, firms turned to overseas markets for growth. Scholars and companies saw headquarters in a dominant position with a control function over what they termed “foreign” subsidiaries. Businesses and scholars alike had a unidimensional one-way approach: for example, knowledge was transferred by expatriates to locals and expatriates were helped to adjust to locals, but not vice versa. Culture differences were recognized, but more emphasis was placed on what values and practices they shared in common. The later years of this period were characterized by two major changes in the environment. First, Japan’s business fortunes increased, making US companies less competitive and US management theories less attractive. As a result, there was a great deal of research interest in Japanese manufacturing and management practices. Second, the growth of computers and telecommunications meant that companies were doing business in many more countries and in a more interdependent manner. This introduced an era in which culture became even more important.

Bird and Mendenhall (2016) termed the 1980 to 2000 years “the rise of culture.” Business structures became more multinational during this era of regional and matrix organizations. New demands were placed on expatriates who were expected to be more engaged; this resulted in a raft of research on expatriate effectiveness. At the same time, more and more countries (e.g., the BRIC countries) gained greater importance as global players, causing more interest in their culture and practices. The work of many global managers was becoming more transnational, demanding global leadership skills that were first studied in the 1990s. New organizational structures and work processes led to a decrease in managerial control and an increase in shared values and an interest in cultural awareness. Hofstede’s (1984) seminar work received enormous attention from

scholars as well as practitioners and paved the way for the development or acceptance of other cultural value frameworks (Hall, 1966; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Schwartz, 1994; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1993). Thus, looking at phenomena from a global contextual orientation became well entrenched.

The final era, 2000 to the present, was named 'the rise of global' (Bird & Mendenhall, 2016). Employees and leaders are involved in global teams, global projects, and global operations and supply chains. More expatriates have regional or multi-country responsibilities instead of a one-country focus. Emerging economies have assumed great importance, which means an even larger number of countries in play. While the focus and span of their work may have changed to become more global, the global leader's location is not necessarily 'global.' More and more leaders have global responsibilities without ever changing their address or moving from their home country. More global leaders supervise direct reports from many countries. The study of culture itself has become more complex to include nuances based on context, social attributions, and cultural schemas (Osland & Bird, 2000) and a polycultural view (Morris, Chiu, & Liu, 2015; Sackmann & Phillips, 2016), meaning that individuals have multiple, partial, and dynamic cultural affiliations rather than belonging in one static cultural category. Another difference in this era is that we can observe more two-way relations or multidirectional emphasis in global business in the form of an increasing reliance on shared leadership and networks and multidirectional knowledge transfers. Thus, since World War II, there has been growing movement away from the control and dominance of the early years of internationalization to today's global emphasis and greater understanding and respect for global business partners and coworkers. However, one should not expect to find the same trends across the entire political sector due to the current backlash against some aspects of globalization, in particular the increased flow of people across national borders. Thus, global leadership can evolve in different ways in different sectors. Regardless of sector, over time, the global demands on leaders and their roles have also evolved, as you will see in the following chapter.

Thanks to the groundwork laid in the fields of intercultural communication competence, expatriation, global management, and comparative leadership, the nascent field of global leadership has strong supportive roots. The next chapter details the growth of global leadership as a field of study in its own right.