From Cross-cultural Management to Global Leadership: Evolution and Adaptation.

Allan Bird
Darla and Frederick Brodsky Trustee Professor in Global Business
D'Amore-McKim School of Business
Northeastern University
313a Hayden Hall
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115
Tel: +1-617-373-2002
Fax: +1- 617-373-3768
Email: a.bird@neu.edu
Note: *Corresponding author*

Mark E. Mendenhall
J. Burton Frierson Chair of Excellence in Business Leadership
College of Business
University of Tennessee, Chattanooga
406 FA Fletcher Building
615 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37403
Tel: +1-423-425-4406
Email: Mark-Mendenhall@utc.edu

Published in Journal of World Business. Citation is:

Bird, A., & Mendenhall, M.E. (2016). From cross-cultural management to global leadership: Evolution and adaptation. *Journal of World Business*, 51(1): 115-126.

From Cross-cultural Management to Global Leadership: Evolution and Adaptation.

Abstract

We provide a quasi-historical review of how the field of global leadership evolved. In doing so, we conceptually map an overall trajectory of the field of global leadership, discussing the nature of its origins in the field of cross-cultural management. We trace evolutionary trends in the field of cross-cultural management from 1960 to the present, and explore how these trends influenced the formation of the global leadership literature. After reviewing the primary domains of the global leadership field, we conclude with a discussion of the implications of our analysis for future research and managerial practice.

Keywords: global leadership, cross-cultural management, comparative management.

From Cross-cultural Management to Global Leadership: Evolution and Adaptation.

1. Introduction

The past fifty years of international business research has seen an extraordinary evolution in our awareness and understanding of cross-cultural management. As consciousness of the challenges and rewards of managing across national and cultural boundaries has grown, the nature of the global business context has also evolved. In this article we provide a quasi-historical review of the field of global leadership, tracing its initial roots in the fields of international, comparative, and cross-cultural management.. In doing so, we conceptually map an overall trajectory of the field of global leadership as well as delineate its current terrain. Our intent is not to provide a comprehensive treatment of the global leadership field nor of the international, comparative, and cross-cultural management literatures, which would be beyond the scope of this paper and would require book-length treatments. Rather the emphasis will be on how a changing context and evolving phenomena brought us to where we are in the study of global leadership.

Before going further, we offer an additional clarification. From inception there has been ambiguity and dissent over the terminology that management scholars use when discussing management outside a purely domestic context. Some prefer "international management," others prefer "cross-cultural management." Reasonable cases can be made for both. Our preference leans toward "cross-cultural management" as the more widely accepted, and hereafter we will use that term to refer to all research that relates to management outside of a domestic context, unless making specific reference to a defined sub-category or field.

We next offer an overview of precursors to the advent of global leadership divided into four eras or "stages" and review how the cross-cultural management literature generally approached the study of leadership in each stage, and discuss how various research streams from these stages combined to give birth to the field of global leadership. We then provide an overview of the global leadership literature, and finally conclude our analysis with a discussion of its implications for future research and practice.

2. A brief history of global leadership

We begin with a brief history of cross-cultural management research viewed from the vantage point of a focus on global leadership. Given the brevity of this historical overview, it necessarily paints a picture that can be misleading in its presentation of an orderly path of development. The reality is significantly messier in terms of digressive exploratory tangents, detours into theoretical dead-ends and intractable disagreements over conceptual terms and organizing frameworks. Nevertheless, we contend that there is a discernible, though meandering, path of development that results in a coherent field of scholarly inquiry into a phenomenon called global leadership that has generated the attention of numerous scholars. This is evidenced by recent special journal issues devoted to the construct by *Journal of World Business* (Steers, Sanchez-Runde, & Nardon, 2012), *Organizational Dynamics* (Executive Summaries, 2013), and *European Journal of International Management*

(Maznevski, Stahl, & Mendenhall, 2013) as well as the fifteen year existence of an annual edited book series that has now shifted to journal status: *Advances in Global Leadership.*

2.1. Positioning cross-cultural management research as a field of inquiry

After World War II, management and organizational behavior blossomed as fields of research in academe. Many younger scholars assume that cross-cultural management followed only after these fields were well established, but that is not the case. The field of cross-cultural management arose simultaneously to the general fields of management and organizational behavior. As Table 1 indicates, journals with a distinct focus on the study of management and organizational behavior in international contexts were established simultaneously to mainstream management journals and have continued that trend to the present. Scholarly journals in psychology trace back to the early 1900s, but journals focused specifically on organizational psychology and the management of organizations did not appear until the 1950s. It's noteworthy that the *Journal of International Business Studies* and *Thunderbird International Business Review* published their first volumes just three years after the appearance of *Administrative Science Quarterly* and the *Academy of Management Journal*. Also noteworthy is that the *Journal of World Business* began publication ten years ahead of the *Academy of Management Review* and fourteen years ahead of the *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. As long as there has been scholarly interest in management, there has been concomitant interest in cross-cultural management. Table 1 also illustrates the rise of cross-cultural management research through the proliferation of journals focused on this field over time.

Insert Table 1 about here

Early work in cross-cultural management often consisted of identifying a phenomenon or theory of interest and asking, “Is this phenomenon the same in another country?” or “Does this theory apply in another culture?” Typical of these types of studies were Herzberg’s studies of motivation in Finnish workers (1965) and job attitudes among Soviet workers (1965).

Reflecting the developmental state of management and organizational behavior theorizing at the time, many of these studies lacked sophistication in their approach to exploring differences. This situation was exacerbated by a lack of understanding of the complex ways in which cultures might vary as well as in the influences of culture across myriad norms, processes and ways of thinking. Nevertheless, there was a concerted effort to identify and address the challenges of cross-cultural research. By the early 1960’s, volumes on cross-cultural methodology had already begun to appear (Moore, 1961).

This was also a period in which the hegemony of the U.S. economy led many scholars to consider American management approaches as the pinnacle to which managers and organizations in other countries should aspire. Also common at this time was a widely held view of industrialization imposing a set of technological imperatives that would lead all nations to a common form of manufacturing and management. This perspective, later referred to as the "technological imperative" (Tassey, 2007) was presumed to compel a convergence toward those behaviors that were most efficient. Consequently, it was not uncommon to find scholars who were focused on identifying universal management principles (Likert, 1963) or testing the applicability of American theories in other cultures (Nagandhi & Estafan, 1965; Newman, 1970).

2.2. 1960-1980: The Rise of International

From 1960 to 1980 the field of cross-cultural management focused primarily on the study of organizational behavior and management systems with a view of countries other than the U.S. as having cultural and organizational systems that were viewed as "foreign" or "other" in nature. Following World War II, large, primarily American, firms began to look to overseas markets to enhance revenue, and much attention was focused in the literature on uncovering how local cultural, legal, business, and political systems operated. Dominant organizational structuring was reflected in "international division" and "foreign subsidiary" configurations with a heavy focus on the control function of expatriate managers sent from headquarters and the home country to supervise and train local managers. There was recognition of difference, but also an implicit focus on identifying and emphasizing those values and practices that home and host country have in common. Knowledge transfer was conceived as being largely uni-directional in sequence: from headquarters to subsidiary and from home country to host country.

Unicultural and comparative research during this period was largely respectful of difference, but the undertone was one of dominance in theoretical perspective and of identifying how best to extend North American management techniques. A swell of research began that focused on how to help expatriates adjust culturally to the host culture, with little emphasis on assisting local employees in adjusting to expatriates and the headquarter/home country culture.

Toward the end of this period, with Europe fully recovered from WWII and Japan firmly established as not only a major exporter, but also a growing presence around the world, two shifts took place. First, American manufacturing found itself increasingly uncompetitive in foreign markets, leading to a loss in confidence in American manufacturing and management techniques. Simultaneously, Japanese manufacturing and management techniques became a source of increasing interest. Management scholars developed similar interests in Japanese concepts and models (Ouchi, 1981; Mendenhall & Oddou, 1986). Quality control circles, kaizen, kamban, and just-in-time became common-place terms. Second, multinational companies found themselves doing business in more than a handful of countries and the rise of computers and telecommunications made it possible to link headquarters and subsidiaries in ways that facilitated greater interdependence. These developments moved culture to the front and center.

2.3. 1980-2000: The Rise of Culture

In the 1980-2000 time period scholars' foci shifted in tandem with the evolution of the onset of "multi-domestic," "regional," and "matrix" organizational structures emerging in MNCs. These organizational restructurings increased the need for expatriate managers to expand their skill sets in order to operate effectively in their responsibilities by developing effective working and social relationships with host-national subordinates. The age of the "detached expatriate" manager ended, and the age of the "engaged-expatriate manager" ensued. A plethora of research studies on expatriate effectiveness occurred in response to this shift in MNCs' priorities.

As globalization transformed the nature of the milieu in which managers operated in the 1990s, organizational structuring in MNCs retained much of their same designs on paper, but in reality became global and virtual in nature, and reflected what Bartlett and Ghoshal (1992) had conceived in the late 1990s – the advent of the transnational organization. Even if MNCs' organizational designs did not reflect the transnational organization on paper, for many global managers the nature of their work became essentially transnational in fact. The context of globalization, with its inherent elements of interdependency, multiplicity, flux and complexity (Lane, et. al., 2004) required global managers to confront the necessity of adopting new global leadership skills beyond those that were required to be an effective expatriate manager.

With these shifts in organizational structure and process came increasing need for managers to loosen managerial control and rely more extensively on shared values. This, in turn, led to an emphasis on greater cultural awareness. Theories that focused on values or other core orientations that were universal in nature, but were manifested differently across cultures, existed before 1980 as well (Hall, 1966; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1965). However, as noted, the emergence of Hofstede's (1984) seminal work, *Culture's Consequences*, triggered a massive focus on conducting comparative studies in management and organizational behavior, with a host of these ensuing studies conducted in the area of comparative leadership. Though not commonly employed by anthropologists in the study of cultural systems, values orientations and their attendant surveys provided management scholars with a practical means of studying cultural variation. Moreover, findings could be easily translated into actionable recommendations for managers. The increased use of Hofstede's findings and his survey gave rise to several other frameworks in this genre (e.g., Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997; Schwartz, 1992). Simultaneously, more research emerged in the 1980s, with a heavy focus on expatriation and cross-cultural adjustment.

Much of the types of research of this second time period (1980-2000) continue to the present as well; however, we believe a clear transition has taken place, not just in the leadership realm, but in cross-cultural management and all the other sub-fields of international management toward research that often implicitly and more often explicitly studies phenomena from a global contextual orientation.

2.4. 2000-Present: The Rise of Global

The current period, into which we transitioned sometime around the start of the 21st century is one that is global in focus. Leaders now find themselves leading global teams (Zander, Mockaitis & Butler, 2012), global projects, and global operations often from the countries of their birth. They may not be expatriates, but nevertheless they are global leaders. Or, if they are expatriates, they may be leading multiple global teams and organizational divisions outside of the region in which they are based. In essence, they can be called on to lead "anyone, anywhere, at any time." The global category does not necessitate global leaders putting aside the skills they have gained that were identified in findings from cross-cultural management research. Rather, it requires adding to that repertoire of knowledge and skills. For example, in terms of cultural acumen, it requires enhanced understanding of contextualization in cultural systems and how negotiated cultures emerge and should be managed and led within global organizational systems, multicultural contexts, and global M&As (Brannen & Salk, 1996). This is reflected particularly in the heavy emphasis on boundary spanning (Beechler, Sondergaard, Miller & Bird, 1984) in which global leaders engage. It is noteworthy that boundary spanning is the most frequently identified activity of global leaders in research findings, and yet does not receive mention in Yukl's (2012) comprehensive leadership volume until the publication of the 8th edition.

3. Cross-cultural management: Unicultural, comparative, and intercultural

We now explore how cross-cultural management research generally approached the study of leadership-related issues across the time periods discussed above. In her review of the extant cross-cultural management research published in leading management journals from 1971 to 1980, Adler (1983) distinguished between three types or categories of cross-cultural management research: unicultural, comparative, and intercultural. *Unicultural* research focused on organizational management within a single country; for example, organizational commitment in German organizations. *Comparative* research examined organizational management in two or more countries and delineated comparisons between them; for example, conflict resolution norms in Mexico, India and Turkey. Finally, *intercultural* research focused on the interaction between or among organizational members from two or more countries; for example, communication effectiveness between Danish expatriate managers and Filipino employees in the Philippines.

Adler (1983) found that unicultural articles were the most common, comprising 48 percent of all cross-cultural organizational behavior articles she reviewed. Comparative articles comprised 30 percent of the extant research, and intercultural articles, at 22 percent, were less than half that of the unicultural category. All together, they comprised just 3.6 percent of 11,219 articles published in 24 leading (primarily North American-based) management journals.

3.1. Unicultural

Unicultural studies are founded on anthropological and sociological paradigmatic lenses, with seminal examples being Abegglen's (1958) work, *The Japanese Factory*, Richman's (1965) volume on Russian management or McMillan's (1965) writing on industrial leaders in Latin America. More recent examples of scholarship in the unicultural category are Puffer and various co-authors' investigation of work and organizational processes in Russia (1994; Puffer & McCarthy, 2001; Puffer & McCarthy, 2003; McCarthy, Puffer & Shekshina, 1993;) and Mbigi and Maree's writings on African management (1995). In terms of leadership, scholars working from a Unicultural focus have provided the field with in-depth, sophisticated, and nuanced knowledge of the dynamics of country-specific and culture-specific leadership processes – and other systems, processes and behaviors that relate directly to leadership effectiveness (e.g., conflict resolution, motivation, etc.). This research has been a significant benefit also to practicing managers who have found themselves working abroad, and confronted with leadership processes that differ markedly from their own. For example, expatriates who have been able to find these scholarly works and study them have greatly benefited at personal and professional levels from this research in assisting them to more effectively live and work in new cultures.

3.2. Comparative

Comparative studies are based on psychological and sociological perspectives that often use theories and frameworks of culture to explore these perspectives. Appearing on the horizon shortly around the same time as the publication of Adler's (1983) article, Geert Hofstede's (1984) seminal *Culture's Consequences*, had a dramatic and permanent impact on the field of international management, shifting the focus of many international management researchers to the Comparative category from 1981 to the present. Scholars working in this dimension of international management often utilize the cultural models of Kluckholn and Strodtbeck (1961), Triandis (1995), Hall (1966; 1973), Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998), Schwarz (1992), and the GLOBE project (House, Mansour, Hanges & Dorfman, 2002) as the conceptual foundations for their research.

One of the unanticipated side-effects of the worthwhile focus on the utilization of the above cultural models for conducting research in multi-nation contexts has been a tendency to emphasize a singular focus on culture as an explanatory framework to the exclusion of other contextual variables on cross-cultural management phenomena. Concurrent with Hofstede's seminal work, Child (1981) argued for employing multiple lenses, noting that in addition to culture there were other contingencies that also gave rise to variations in managerial behavior. However, for many scholars comparative management essentially became synonymous with the term, "cross-cultural management."

Arguing against the "comparative management equals cross-cultural management" paradigm were a small cadre of scholars who focused on a more complex view of culture. Osland and Bird (2000), for example, cautioned that the use of cultural values frameworks tended towards the formation of sophisticated stereotyping processes that discouraged more complex conceptualizations of culture characterized by a greater attention to multiple factors. In a similar vein, Brannen (2004; Brannen & Salk, 2000) emphasized the necessity of multiple cultures and contextualization in order to better understand the emergence of "negotiated cultures" created by managers and subordinates in the multicultural contexts of multinational subsidiary operations and in multinational mergers and acquisitions.

Comparative research has generated a massive amount of journal publications since the 1980s, which in turn has been a significant catalyst for the field's ongoing progression and health. In terms of leadership, scholars working from a comparative focus have generated tremendous amounts of knowledge regarding the multiplicity of differences that exist between national and cultural leadership systems and why those differences exist. For example, Wanasika et al. (2014), explore leadership across Sub-Saharan Africa, while Takahashi, Ishikawa and Kanai (2012) explore leadership in Japan, China, Indonesia and Thailand.

3.3. Intercultural

Intercultural research focuses extensively on *how* people who differ culturally from one another successfully or unsuccessfully bridge the cultural differences associated with management and leadership practices delineated by comparative research studies. This category of international management research has been heavily influenced by theories from the fields of social psychology, inter-cultural communication, and cross-cultural psychology. Additionally, scholars working in this area often combine cultural frameworks routinely used in comparative research with theories from the aforementioned fields to attempt to better understand the dynamics of interpersonal exchange between people who are culturally different from one another. Some scholars came to view the term, "cross-cultural management" as embodying research that was both of the comparative-category and also the intercultural category, thus expanding the conceptual tent of cross-cultural management.

The burgeoning expatriate literature is mostly housed within the intercultural category, and the global leadership field has distinct roots in this category, which we will subsequently discuss; however, before we explore this causal connection, it is important to first introduce another foundational cause – perhaps the primary causal factor – to the coming forth of global leadership as a distinct field of study.

3.4. Global: A fourth category of cross-cultural management research

In the 1990s, leaders of organizations found themselves crossing borders across all dimensions of business and government more rapidly, more constantly, and more frequently than they had in previous decades. Global supply chains became the norm. Global markets became the norm. Immediate, real-time global communication with all stakeholders became the norm. Global knowledge sharing became the norm. Global finance systems became the norm. Global competitors became more ubiquitous and dangerous. Global careers became increasingly important. Social media, branding, marketing, selling, and communication became the norm. Something was changing – the world of business seemed less "international" in nature and more, somehow, "global" in nature. For many businesspeople and scholars the term, "global" replaced "international" as the adjective commonly used to describe organizational and leadership strategies, thinking, and behavior.

What had changed in the environment from the 1980s to the 1990s was difficult to characterize. Often it was simply called "globalization" (Lane, et. al., 2004). Previously, "international" had to do with working with people from other countries, sometimes simultaneously and sometimes unilaterally, but at the turn of the 21st century those working relationships evolved. Managers and leaders were now working with ever-present, ongoing interactions between all these people from multiple countries between each other in the present – in other words, the world seemed less linear and now more non-linear in nature.

As a result, organizational leaders and consultants such as Rhinesmith (1992), Brake (1997), Rosen and associates (2000) and Goldsmith and associates (2003) recognized that firms needed more than country or area specialists as leaders to work across borders; they realized that they needed "global leaders" – leaders who could thrive in a world that reflected this new reality of real-time, multiple spanning of technological, financial, cultural, organizational, stakeholder, and political boundaries. Thus, we add a new category to the three that Adler (1983) constructed for categorizing cross-cultural management research, that of *Global.*

As scholars began to explore leadership in a global context they tended to do so with implicit assumptions that everyone in the field shared their understanding of what they meant when they used the term, “global” as a construct. Just as there is widespread disagreement in the general leadership field about the exact nature and definition of the construct, “leadership,” a similar situation exists in terms of scholars who conduct research in the Global category: as yet, there is no widespread, common agreement among scholars as to what the nature of “global” entails. Scholars have begun to work on delineating the variables inherent in the “global” construct and preliminary construct definitions and typologies have been established (Mendenhall, et. al., 2012), but these frameworks will no doubt be refined across time, and likely be further refined in the future as more scholars work to better understand the dynamics of the context in which leaders work in the 21st century.

4. The origins of global Leadership research

An understanding of global leadership as a research stream requires recognition that several tributaries flowed into its creation, and continue to feed its vitality. In addition to the demands of the global construct discussed in the above section, we trace the course of each of those streams, discussing distinctive features and contributions. The foundation for global leadership research is multifaceted and reflects a composite of contributions from the expatriate, intercultural communication, comparative leadership and global management research streams. Although not directly focused on the challenge of leading in a global context, each stream provided perspectives useful in thinking about attributes, skills and roles involved in leading globally and were incorporated by scholars in their theorizing about, and empirical approaches toward global leadership.

4.1. Stream one: Expatriation

Employees sent from their home country to work for an extended period of time (typically anywhere from six months to five years) are commonly referred to as expatriates (Aycan & Kanungo, 2002). From the mid-1960's forward, with the expansion of primarily North American and European businesses outside their home markets, expatriate managers represented emergent global managers. Over time employees on such assignments expanded to include employee flows not just from home country parent to host country subsidiary, but also from subsidiary to headquarters and from one business unit to another across national boundaries (Collings, Scullion & Morley, 2007) as well as to self-initiated expatriates who cross borders in pursuit of international positions (Inkson et al., 1997). Expatriate work inherently involves working across national and cultural boundaries. Consequently the experiences of expatriates – their work, cultural adjustment, and growth – were an obvious foundation on which to build an understanding of global leaders.

4.1.1. Selection

Essential to any consideration of expatriates is the decision of who to select. Historically companies have centered their selection criteria on technical competence, past domestic performance and willingness to accept the assignment (Anderson, 2005; Graf, 2004, Mendenhall, Kühlman, Stahl & Osland, 2002). Originally Miller (1975) and subsequently Black, Morrison and Gregersen (1999) found prior domestic performance was a poor predictor of expatriate performance. Indeed, Ruben (1989) found that characteristics associated with high performance in North American settings – passion for success, risk-taking, assertiveness – were often liabilities in global situations. Tung and Varma (1988) found that willingness to live and work in a new culture was essential, but concluded it was a threshold criterion for taking on an assignment, not a predictor of success. Several studies have concluded that technical skill is a necessary, but not sufficient criteria for superior expatriate performance (Tung 1981; Varma, Stroh & Schmitt 2001).

Researchers focusing on personality characteristics have been somewhat more successful in identifying characteristics predictive of superior performance. Research on the Five Factor Model of personality (Costa & McRae, 1992) identified emotional stability, extraversion, openness and agreeableness as factors influencing successful adjustment and performance (Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black & Ferzandi, 2006). Caligiuri and Di Santo (2001) also found support for a lack of ethnocentrism as being positively associated with adjustment. In their meta-analysis of 30 studies of expatriate performance, Mol, Born, Willemsen & Van der Molen (2005) found that four of the Big Five (the factor, Openness, was not a predictor) along with cultural sensitivity and local language ability were good predictors of performance. One criticism of the use of Five Factor traits for selection is that they are too broad in their conceptualization. Bird, Mendenhall, Stevens, &

Oddou (2010) have argued that personality characteristics more narrowly defined are appropriate. In a study of nearly 400 Japanese expatriates, Furuya, Stevens, Bird, Oddou & Mendenhall (2009) found that measures of personality characteristics associated with intercultural competence were predictive of expatriate performance as well as post-repatriation performance.

4.1.2. Adjustment

Research on expatriates has focused primarily in the area of expatriate adjustment. Early studies of adjustment were done on military personnel and Peace Corps volunteers and other governmental employees in the 1960s and 1970s, with more focus on business expatriates beginning in the 1980s with a significant increase from the 1990s to the present. The most prominent theory of expatriate adjustment produced in the international management literature was created by Black, Mendenhall and Oddou (1991) wherein they laid out a comprehensive framework of international adjustment that focused on three types of adjustment – work adjustment (adjusting to new work roles, responsibilities, contexts, etc.), interaction adjustment (adjusting to cultural differences in norms and modes of interaction) and general adjustment (adjusting to the broader aspects of living and working in another country). Their theory argued that before expatriation there is a phase of "anticipatory adjustment" that is moderated by various individual and organization variables, which in turn influences "in-country adjustment," which in turn is moderated by the following categories of variables: individual, job, organization culture, organization socialization, and non-work. Each of these categories in turn were hypothesized to directly influence the three types of adjustment in specified ways. In a review of 66 studies on international adjustment conducted over 25 years, Bhaskar-Srinivas and colleagues (2005) found strong empirical support for the Black-Mendenhall-Oddou model. The field is rife with other theories of expatriate adjustment as well (for a review see: Takeuchi, 2010) and additionally many atheoretical, empirical studies that investigate the relationship of various variables to a variety of aspects of expatriate adjustment.

Closely tied to adjustment is the question of expatriate effectiveness. Defining effectiveness in an expatriate context has proven to be particularly challenging given a complex context that usually includes multiple stakeholders with competing demands, coordination over space and time and the ambiguity of working in uncertain or unfamiliar settings (Harrison, Shaffer, & Bhaskar 2004). Even when metrics for determining effectiveness have been established, Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black and Ferzendi (2006) note that systems to actually track performance are ineffective or non-existent. All in all, Stroh, Black, Mendenhall and Gregersen (2004) found that two broad facets of expatriate performance – managing tasks and managing relationships – were particularly important to expatriate effectiveness, however this area of the expatriation literature is under-researched and in need of more attention from scholars working in the field.

4.1.3. Transformation

The expatriate experience has also been viewed as having powerful transformative potential. Adler's (1975) model of expatriate adjustment is best viewed as one of the first to recognize transformation as the underlying phenomenon. His model entails five phases: contact with the other culture, disintegration, reintegration, autonomy, and independence. Twenty years later Osland (1995) invoked Campbell's metaphor of the "hero's journey" to describe the transformative experience of expatriation. She identified four types of changes that her sample of American expatriates underwent. Positive changes in self were reflected in increases in open-mindedness, adaptability, sensitivity, tolerance, patience, respectfulness, maturity, confidence, independence and competitiveness. She also found decreases in impulsiveness. Changes in attitude included acquiring a greater appreciation of cultural differences, increased appreciation of one's own good fortunes, broader perspective about the world, a deeper appreciation of life in general and a different attitude toward work and the place that work occupied in one's life. Improved work skills focused greater interpersonal sensitivity and dexterity as well as communication skills, particularly listening skills. There was also a greater appreciation of power dynamics and how to exercise power and more flexible managerial style. Increased knowledge related not only to business but encompassed a wide range of topics spanning social, political and economic matters.

Recent work (Herman & Zaccaro, 2014) has sought to unpack the impact of transformation by examining changes in self-concept and how global work experiences and role demands lead to a complexification of self-identity that enables an adaptive response to the complexities inherent in global leader work roles. Though not rising to the level of transformation, expatriates experience increases in global knowledge (Furuya et al., 2009), professional contacts globally, and deeper understanding of a company's operations and business structure as well as enhanced awareness of expatriates' knowledge limitations (Caligiuri & Di Santo, 2006).

4.2. Stream two: Intercultural communication

Because so much of what global leaders do involves communicating across differences, a second stream of inquiry influencing global leadership research comes from the study of intercultural communication. Within the intercultural communication discipline, the study of intercultural communication competence has focused on behaviors associated with effectiveness. 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 1998: 28), this stream of research directly applies to the study of global leadership. Gudykunst (1994) concludes that the following skills are most important in intercultural competence: mindfulness, cognitive flexibility, behavioral flexibility, tolerance of ambiguity and cross-cultural empathy.

Mindfulness refers to a process of thinking that is open to new information, new categories, and multiple perspectives (Langer, 1992). To be mindful is to pay attention to internal assumptions, cognitions and emotions of oneself and of the person with whom one is communicating. Cognitive flexibility has been more widely framed as cognitive complexity in the international business literature (Levy, Beechler, Taylor & Boyacigiller, 2007) and is usually paired with cosmopolitanism as a dimension of global mindset (Rhinesmith, 1992). It involves the ability to weigh multiple perspectives and to consider a variety of frameworks and schemas in making sense of situations. Behavioral flexibility, also often referred to as adaptability or flexibility, entails the skill of executing situationally-appropriate behavior (Bird, 2013). Budner (1962: 29) defined tolerance of ambiguity as ""the tendency to perceive ambiguous situations as desirable." Focusing specifically on intercultural tolerance of ambiguity, Herman, Stevens, Bird, Mendenhall and Oddou (2010) found a four-dimensional factor structure: valuing diverse others, coping with change, dealing with unfamiliar situations, and managing conflicting perspectives. Finally, cross-cultural empathy is defined by Bennett (1993) as being able to experience some aspect of reality different from one's own culture.

In addition to being a set of skills, intercultural communication competence can also be seen as a process. Considered in this way, research has focused on communication styles – e.g., high- versus low-context, direct vs. indirect, expressive vs. restrained – (Hall, 1973), cognitive styles (Nisbett, 2003; Riding & Rayner, 2000), conflict resolution styles (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001), interaction rituals (Ting-Toomey, 1994), nonverbal communication (Hall & Knapp, 2013), and value orientations (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Hofstede, 1984; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1998; Schwartz, 1992). Each of these aspects from the field of intercultural communication has had an influence on how global leadership scholars view effective communication in global leadership processes.

4.3. Stream three: Comparative leadership

Comparative studies of leadership involving two or more cultures extend back at least as far as Fiedler's (1967) field studies and his conclusion that culture has an effect on group interaction thereby affecting leader behavior. Following the rise of culture-focused research with Hofstede, comparative studies of leadership invoking cultural value dimensions (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck 1961; Hall & Hall 1990; Hofstede 1984; Fiske 1992; Schwartz 1992; Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner 1998) increased significantly. The second edition of Hofstede's (2000) groundbreaking volume alone identifies more than 2,000 comparative studies employing his set of values orientations.

Comparative leadership studies have identified a wide range of differences in leader and follower behavior between one or more cultures. For example, followers in collectivist cultures are more likely than followers in individualistic cultures to identify with their leaders and their organizations (Earley, 1989; Triandis, 1995). Leaders in high power distance cultures are more likely to be autocratic than their counterparts in low power distance cultures (Adsit, London, Crom & Jones, 1997).

Comparative leadership studies have also taken a leadership-theory based approach, seeking to understand the viability or applicability of specific theories in differing cultural context. For example, aspects of participative leadership were found to be less effective in high power distance cultures (Newman & Nollen, 1996; Welsh, Luthans & Sommer, 1993). Kirkman and his colleagues (2009) found a positive relationship between followers' power distance and shared perceptions of transformational leadership as it related to procedural justice. Den Hartog and associates (1999) found that some elements of transformational and charismatic leadership – motivational, encouraging, communicative, trustworthy, dynamic, positive and confidence-building – were common across a wide range of cultures, leading to speculation that these may be universally applicable. Dickson, Den

Hartog and Castaño (2009) as well as Aycan (2008) provide two reviews of the cross-cultural and comparative leadership literature.

A major contribution of the GLOBE study was the delineation of preferred leader attributes that were found to vary or be consistent across cultures (Den Hartog, et al., 1999). Increasingly similar business practices, technology, education-levels as well as expanding interdependent business activities suggest the likelihood of increasing convergence in preferred leader attributes. GLOBE researchers have, in recent years, shifted their attention away from comparative leadership, focusing more directly on global leadership. For example, Javidan, Dorfman, Sully de Luque & House (2006) propose that global mindset, tolerance of ambiguity, flexibility and cultural adaptability are essential qualities for effective global leadership. More recent work (Dorfman et al., 2012) has focused on extending GLOBE data to a broader understanding of global leader attributes.

The contribution of comparative leadership research has been to map the terrain of leadership styles in individual countries as well as to demonstrate how national leadership attributes converge or diverge from leadership attributes found in other countries. Additionally, and particularly with regard to Project GLOBE, these studies have identified universally acceptable and unacceptable traits. Such findings are valuable to corporations in selecting individuals for international leadership assignments in terms of fit with host country expectations and preferences. Moreover, leaders working across multiple cultures can better understand what types of adjustments may be required.

4.4. Stream four: Global management

Because it involves cross-border responsibility and often requires a balancing of competing, sometime contradictory, demands across multiple units in different regions and countries, research on global managers is often couched in terms of a contrast to domestic managers. At the same time, scholars have also argued that managing in a global context entails more than is found in the typical expatriate assignment of working in a single foreign country (Adler & Bartholomew, 1992).

A common starting point for examining managerial roles is Mintzberg's (1973) pioneering effort. He identified seven roles: monitor, spokesperson, leader, liaison, decision maker, innovator and negotiator – while also noting that variations in the frequency and manner in which managers performed these roles was moderated by environment, job, situation and person. Several studies have found differences between domestic and global managers in personality characteristics, work roles and skill requirements. For example, Leslie, Dalton, Ernst and Deal (2002) found that global managers were perceived as needing more emotional stability, conscientiousness, cultural adaptability, perspective-taking capability than domestic managers. Similarly global manager roles entailed larger components of stress-coping, decision-making, negotiating, and innovating. In a similar vain, Spreitzer, McCall and Maloney (1997) hold that learning behaviors – seeking and using feedback, adventurousness and openness to learning, being flexible – constitute a significant determinant of effectiveness for global managers and advocated focusing on specific characteristics and behaviors of being cross-culturally adventurous and insightful, seeking opportunities to learn, and being open to criticism.

These types of studies of global managers led to attempts to understand how to best develop global management skills in current managers who found themselves working in international/global contexts. Since many of these global managers were also expatriates, the expatriation literature focused on engaging in studies to ascertain how to best develop social, work, and emotional skills necessary to work effectively across cultures. Much work has been done in this field and has had a significant impact on scholars' views of global leadership development processes.

5. The literature on global leadership

The early 1990's witnessed a budding interest in leaders working in global contexts. Seeking to understand and explain the differing role and competency demands of leading at the global level, some sought to extend domestic leadership ideas while others drew upon observations and experiences in global settings to identify *sui generis* characteristics of global leadership. Ket de Vries & Mead (1992) extended competency lists developed previously in domestic settings and incorporated additional qualities required for global work. Tichy and colleagues (1992) wrote about "true globalists" drawing upon the differences they had identified in their executive development activities. Rhinesmith (1992) drew upon his consulting experience, as did Brake (1997) several years later, to identify sets of competencies specific to global leaders.

Empirical investigations of global leadership can be roughly categorized by methodology. A variety of studies have adopted qualitative approaches relying on primarily on a small number of interviews, anecdotal reports or case study approaches (Bingham, Black & Felin, 2000; Emerson, 2001; Green, Hassan, Immelt, Marks, & Meiland, 2003; Kets de Vries & Florent-Treacy, 1999: Marquardt & Berger, 2003; Maruca, 1994; McFarland, Senn & Childress, 1993; McKibben, 1997; Millikin & Fu, 2005; Nohria, 2009; William, 1991; Wolfensohn, O"Reilly, Campbell, Shui-bian, & Arbour, 2003).

Less common have been empirical studies that extended beyond focus groups, impressionistic observations and personal experience. The empirical work carried out to date in global leadership has been almost completely focused on unearthing and understanding competencies, traits, attributes, and skills associated with effective global leadership. Yeung and Ready's (1995) work stands out as the first quantitative study in the field. They analyzed a sample of 1,200 managers working in ten corporations and drawn from eight countries. Their list of identified competencies included: articulate a tangible vision and related values and strategy, be a catalyst for strategic change, be a catalyst for cultural change, possess a results orientation, possess a customer orientation and empower others. Black, Morrison and Gergersen (1999) interviewed roughly 130 senior line executives and HR managers in their study of "global explorers," their term for effective global executives. Rosen and associates (2000) surveyed over a 1,000 senior executives from 28 countries, supported 75 interviews. McCall and Hollenbeck (2002) conducted interviews with 101 executives drawn from thirty-six countries.

Goldsmith and associates (2003) reported on their findings from interviews 207 current and potential global leaders. Their study also included over 200 high potentials and questionnaire surveys of 75 executives and focus groups that included 28 CEOS. Also in 2003, Bikson, Treverton, Moini and Lindstrom reported on interviews with 135 senior managers in U.S. public, for-profit and non-profit organizations. Focusing on global leader task analysis and required knowledge, skills and abilities, Caligiuri and Tarique (2009; 2012) surveyed over 240 global leaders. The studies above are representative of the range of approaches employed over the first two decades of identifiable global leadership research.

5.1. Global leadership competencies

From the early 1990s forward, the growing cadre of scholars studying global leaders attempted to delineate competencies critical to their success. Reviews of this literature (Bird & Osland, 2004; Jokinen, 2005; Mendenhall & Osland, 2002; Osland, 2008; Osland, Bird & Mendenhall, 2012) identified over 160 competencies purported to influence global leadership effectiveness. A vast number of these competencies overlapped conceptually (Jokinen, 2005), many differed only in semantic terms (Osland, 2008), and some overlapped with variables that had been found to directly influence expatriate selection, adjustment, effectiveness, and transformation and also variables that were important to intercultural communication. Thus, global leadership scholars drew from the expatriation and intercultural communication literatures in order to provide increased rigor and a better understanding of the dynamics of the competencies that are influential to global leadership effectiveness. Mendenhall and Osland (2002) sought to bring order to the chaotic nature of the field by grouping competency dimensions into six broad categories: visioning, global business expertise, global organizing savvy, traits and values, cognitive orientation, and cross-cultural relationship skills.

Global leadership competencies span a range of qualitatively different types. There are predispositional characteristics of personality (e.g., inquisitiveness or optimism); attitudinal orientations (e.g., cosmopolitanism or results orientation); cognitive capabilities (e.g., cognitive complexity or intellectual intelligence); motivational inclinations (e.g., motivation to learn or tenacity); knowledge bases (value-added technical skills or global business knowledge); and behavioral skills (e.g., cross-cultural communication or boundary spanning). Thus, global leadership comprises a multi-faceted set of competencies.

Bird (2013) reviewed the proliferation of global leader competencies from 1993 to 2012, documenting 160 competencies. He also found that competencies are typically introduced within the context of organizing frameworks (cf., Brake 1997; Kets de Vries & Florent-Treacy, 1999; Morrison, 2000; Bird & Osland, 2004), and that competencies are distributed roughly equally across three categories – 55 fall into a *Business and Organizational Acumen* grouping, 47 group into *Managing People and Relationships* and 58 into *Managing Self*. An integration and synthesis in order to remove conceptual overlap, minimize semantic variation and achieve theoretical frugality resulted in a more parsimonious set of fifteen competencies

In a departure from the competency focus, Caligiuri (2006) adopted a job analytic approach, seeking first to identify the requirements of the tasks of global leaders and then analyzed what knowledge, skills, and abilities were critical to

Feffective job performance. She developed a list of ten global leadership work activities: work with colleagues from other countries, interaction with external clients from other countries, interaction with internal clients from other countries, necessity of speaking a foreign language at work, supervision of employees from different nationalities, development of strategic plans with worldwide scope, management of budgets on a worldwide basis, engagement of negotiations in other countries and with people from multiple countries, management of foreign suppliers or vendors, and management of risk on a worldwide basis. In a subsequent study, Caligiuri & Tarique (2009) found that effectiveness was found to be predicated on high-contact leadership development activities such as short- and long-term expatriate assignments, participation on global teams, global meetings in other countries, leadership development programs and mentoring by executives from outside the manager's home country. These development activities were moderated by the Big Five personality trait extraversion. Caligiuri and Tarique (2012) subsequently found that global leader effectiveness was positively influenced by cross-cultural competence, which in turn was supported by personality traits of extraversion, openness to experience and low neuroticism as well as by several types of cross-cultural experiences.

5.2. Global leadership as expert cognition

There are several difficulties with adopting solely a competency approach to studying global leadership; for example, competency lists are often lengthy, linkages between competencies and effective behavior are often ill-defined, specific competency requirements are likely to vary across a range of complex contexts, the principle of equifinality suggests that no one specific competency profile will be determinative, and empirical studies of competencies often fail to distinguish high performers from average or low performers. This last point is significant because McClelland (1973) defined a competency as an underlying characteristic that predicts superior performance. Moreover, Klein (1999) found that high performers, i.e., "experts," are different from average performers. Experts are better than novices or average performers at such processes as perceiving more – and differentiating between – relevant information, noticing more contextual, behavioral, and cultural cues, combining relevant information into meaningful patterns, perceiving complex interaction among cues, employing intuitive reasoning, and developing more complex perceptions of their work.

Osland and Bird (2005) reasoned that framing global leadership performance as an activity in cognitive expertise resulting in effective behaviors would facilitate a better understanding of how highly effective global leaders perceived their work context and the tasks they were asked to perform, how they approached their work, their cognitive and strategic thinking, how they managed relationships, motivated others and accomplished their objectives.

Employing Cognitive Task Analysis, a methodology used by expert systems and artificial intelligence researchers, they undertook several studies of "expert" global leaders, i.e., the subset of highly effective leaders (Osland, Bird & Odoou, 2007). Their findings (Osland, Bird & Oddou, 2013) confirmed Klein's thesis. Expert global leaders perceived more relevant information, noticed more contextual, behavioral and cultural cues and were able to combine that information into meaningful patterns. They also developed more complex perceptions of their work contexts.

Expert global leaders characterized their work context and work processes in terms of activities that clearly differentiated them from average or novice global leaders, particularly with regard to leading major change initiatives on a global scale (Osland, Oddou, Bird & Osland, 2013).

5.3. Global Leadership Development

The question of how to best develop global leaders has been a focus of scholars from the early stages of the field's emergence. One of the early catalysts for work in this area was the Thurnau Conference of 1998. Held in Thurnau, Germany in 1998, the conference brought scholars together who were working independently of each other in this new field in order to integrate perspectives, develop research partnerships, and publish scholarly findings. The conference was hosted by the combined resources of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, the Foundation of International Management–Bayreuth, the German Marshall Fund of the United States, The University of Bayreuth, and the J. Burton Frierson Chair of Excellence in Business Leadership at the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga.

The conference resulted in publications that addressed global leadership development from perspectives of integrative theorizing from the extant expatriate adjustment literature, institutional HRM processes, German firms' strategic use of international assignments as global leadership developmental programs, strategic HR practices of European, North American and Japanese MNCs and their impact on global leadership development, the efficacy of using assessment centers for global leadership development; repatriation policies, and conceptualizing future research and practice needs in the field (Mendenhall, et. al., 2001).

Although the call to develop global leadership capabilities came ten years earlier (Marsick & Cederholm, 1988), since 1998, the focus on developing global leadership has burgeoned, in no small part due to organizations' needs for global talent. Part of firms wrestling with how to best win the "war for global talent" and creating talent management pipelines has been the important aspect of determining how best to ensure that high potentials are developing global leadership skills as they proceed through a firm's talent pipeline (Logan, 2008). To better understand how global leadership competencies can be developed in people, a sub-set of scholars working the global leadership field began investigating this question. For example, personality traits and existing global competencies and their predictive relationship to developing subsequent global leadership skills have been clarified by Caligiuri and Tarique (2009; 2012), and various global leadership development models have been developed as well (for a review see Osland, Bird & Mendenhall, 2013). Additionally, "best practice" programs in industry have been subjected to scholarly analysis that in turn has yielded significant heuristic value in the field (for an example, see Pless, Maak, & Stahl, 2011). Integration of effective competency development principles from the field of clinical psychology have also begun to be integrated in research (for an example, see Mendenhall, et. al., 2013). Additionally, findings from research on global leadership development are beginning to be applied directly to curricula and programs in business schools (Bird, Lane & Athanassiou, 2014), influencing the developing of global leadership competencies in students before they begin their careers, with global leadership development centers having been established for undergraduate business school students at institutions such as San Jose State University, Northeastern University, and Brigham Young University.

Our discussion of the global leadership literature amounts to an abbreviated introduction to the field, and as such does not broach its complexity or diversity, nor does it apprehend the influence of global leadership research on other areas of global management (e.g., global teams, global strategy, top management teams), or its influence on other research streams (expatriation, intercultural competence, intercultural communication). A review by the authors of the number of articles in scholarly outlets – not including the articles and books that are more aptly categorized in the trade/practitioner realm – yielded a figure of more than 600 scholarly works having been published since 1990, with the lion's share of them published since 2006, reflecting a strong, progressive, upward trend in publication rate in the field.

5.4 *Types of Global Leadership*

It is clear that from the advent of research on global leadership to the present that there remains still a lack of clarity by what scholars mean when they say global. While fledgling attempts have been made to define and operationalize the construct of global (Mendenhall, et. al., 2012), it is necessary for scholars to maintain the momentum of these theoretical efforts in order to avoid the condition that long plagued the expatriate literature; namely, the lack of specification of the construct of "expatriate." For decades, scholars simply stated in their research that they studied "expatriates" and their subsequent findings were widely generalized if there was methodological rigor associated with their research. Over time, it became clear that there were likely different "types" of expatriates that vary based on length of stay, purpose of assignment, degree of cultural challenge of assignment, and intention for accepting the assignment. Further, it seemed clear that cross-cultural adjustment skills likely varied in valence for different types of expatriates. In essence, scholars studying expatriates had to "start over" and begin to more carefully circumscribe the nature or type of expatriates contained within in their samples, and to use methodologies that allow them to differentiate which general cross-cultural adjustment skills move conceptually from figure to ground and vice versa for each type of expatriate (Konopaske, Mendenhall & Thompson, 2009).

Just as a widely agreed upon typology of expatriates would have enabled the expatriate literature to generate more nuanced, and conceptually sophisticated findings regarding the relationship between cross-cultural adjustment skills and specific types of expatriates, so too would the global leadership literature benefit from: 1) continued rigorous efforts to define and operationalize the construct of global, and 2) development of typologies of global leadership that will allow scholars engaging in empirical studies to more carefully circumscribe the nature of the sample, i.e., to delineate what type of global leaders they are studying , and thus draw more refined and in-depth relationships between the dependent variables of their studies and the actual type of global leaders to whom those relationships are linked. The avoidance of simplistic, over-reaching generalizations is an important concern for the field of global leadership to avoid. Initial efforts toward development of a typology of global leadership have recently emerged (Reiche, Bird, Mendenhall, & Osland, 2014), but have only been exploratory in nature. This seems a fruitful area to which global leadership scholars should turn their attention.

6. Conclusion

At its inception, the field of cross-cultural management was focused primarily on "management," with little regard for "leadership" (Haider, 1966). This was consistent both with how scholars approached managerial behaviors in an international setting as well as the thinking around what cross-cultural management entailed and the work that international managers performed. Given organizational structures and internal communication and information systems, international work was primarily managerial in scope. Few activities involved leadership activities of creating and communicating a vision or leading change. Boundary spanning activities, were largely related to local activities as opposed to part of a larger integrated, strategic effort.

Over time, with the advent of globalization and the accompanying technological improvement in communication and information flows, the activities of managers in international settings took on a more strategic role. The exhortation to "Think global, act local" also encouraged system-wide, strategic thinking. International managers currently find themselves tasked with developing and implementing a corporate vision, building organizational culture, fostering diverse stakeholder relations and leading significant change efforts. In short, global managers are called upon to exercise greater leadership.

Researchers studying managers in global contexts have undergone a parallel transformation as a consequence of recognizing that the managers they were studying were increasingly behaving as leaders. In the 21st century it may still be possible to make the traditional distinction between managers and leaders. To the extent that such a delineation is productive, then it is also safe to conclude that the number of global managers who should now be designated as global leaders has also grown substantially.

6.1 *Multiple Theoretical Perspectives*

While it has proven profitable for global leadership scholars to approach the phenomenon largely from the perspectives of competencies, job analysis, expert cognition, and developmental approaches and pedagogies, we hold that studying the phenomenon from additional theoretical perspectives will likely produce rich findings that will advance the field. The general leadership field has benefited from studying leadership from new perspectives such as complexity leadership theory, shared leadership theory, followership theory, relational leadership theory, collaborative leadership frameworks, responsible leadership models, to name but a few. Signs of such a trend in the field of global leadership are emerging as well. For instance, Mittal and Dorfman (2012) argue for the utility of applying servant leadership theory.

Additionally, continued debate regarding the breadth and scope of the conceptual domain of global leadership will be necessary to continually push scholars to steadily refine the construct and better understand its dynamics. For example, Steers et. al. (2012) hold that the global leadership literature reflects three conceptual approaches to the study of the construct: the universal approach, which focuses on the "leader as leader" (e.g., transformational leadership), the contingency approach, which focuses on the "leader as local manager," and the normative approach, which focuses on the leader as global manager – and the role that leadership style and values plays in multinational corporate culture and system outcomes (Shim & Steers, 2012). Conversely, other scholars have focused on a narrower conceptual boundary of the construct (see for example, Mendenhall et. al., 2012). The field requires such debate, research, and refinement of the nature of the phenomenon in order to progress, and our examination of the literature suggests that such robust exchange and development will continue amongst scholars in the field.

6.2 *Managerial Relevance*

It is our view that a wider understanding of the current main approaches that are used to study global leadership would be advantageous for firms to know about and draw from to bolster global leadership selection and development practices in their global talent management systems, but this is not occurring. That firms are largely ignorant of the global leadership literature is not surprising given the well-accepted condition that scholars and executives generally have poorly developed or ineffective knowledge-sharing relationships. Some inroads are being made, as some scholars in the global leadership field also are active consultants to industry and government; however, in the future, the field needs to consider, like all other sub-fields with the realm of management, how to improve the sharing of their value-added findings for practicing mangers in such a way that they can be accepted and comprehended by them. The wave of research in global leadership does not seem to be waning, but rather is growing at a rapid rate.

Similarly, we feel that, just as scholars need to develop a rigorous typology of global leadership that is contextually nuanced, so HR executives should turn their attention to delineating contextual nuance in their selection, development, and deployment of global leaders in their organizations. In our experience, it is common practice to develop global leadership programs that tend to be "one-size-fits-all" both in curricula and in scope. All high potential managers are trained in the same way for different types of global leadership roles. It seems clear from the extant research that there are many different types of global leadership contexts within which some global leadership competencies are likely to be more salient than others. Firms not only need to refer to the best research findings available in the field in order to construct rigorous global leadership training programs, but they need to critically analyze each type of global leadership assignment and provide specialized training based upon the obvious demands and competencies that are clearly associated with that assignment as well (Stroh & Caligiuri, 1998.

We wait with curious expectation to view what advances the field of global leadership experience when it comes time to look at the advancements in the field fifty years hence.

Acknowledgements

Funding for this research was generously provided by the Darla and Frederick Brodsky Trustee Professorship in Global Business.

REFERENCES

Abegglen, J. C. (1958). *The Japanese factory: Aspects of its social organization*. New York: Free Press.

Adler, N. J. (1983). Cross-cultural management research: The ostrich and the trend. *Academy of management Review*, *8*(2): 226-232.

Adler, N. J., & Bartholomew, S. (1992). Managing globally competent people. *The Executive*, *6*(3), 52-65.

Adler, P. S. (1975). The transitional experience: An alternative view of culture shock. *Journal of humanistic psychology*, 15(4): 15-23.

Adsit, D. J., London, M., Crom, S., & Jones, D. (1997). Cross-cultural differences in upward ratings in a multinational company. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *8*(4): 385-401.

Anderson, B. A. (2005). Expatriate selection: good management or good luck?. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *16*(4): 567-583.

Aycan, Z. (2008). Cross-cultural approaches to work-family conflict. *Handbook of work-family integration: Research, theory and best practices*, 353-370.

Aycan, Z., & Kanungo, R. N. (2002). Cross-cultural industrial and organizational psychology: A critical appraisal of the field and future directions. In N. Anderson, D. Ones, Deniz, H. Sinangil & C. Viswesvarangam (Eds.) *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology, Volume 1: Personnel psychology.* , Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd. Pp. 385-408.

Bartlett, C.A., & Ghoshal, S. (1992). What is a global manager? *Harvard Business Review,* 70(5), 124-132.

Beechler, S. & Javidan, M. (2007). Leading with a global mindset. In M. Javidan, R. Steers & M. Hitt (Eds.), *Advances in International Management*, Vol. 19. Oxford, UK: Elsevier. Pp. 131-169.

Beechler, S., Sondergaard, M., Miller, E.L., & Bird, A. (2004). Boundary spanning. In H. Lane, M. Maznevksi, M.E. Mendenhall & J. McNett (Eds.), *The handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity* (pp. 121-133). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Bennett, J. M. (1993). Cultural marginality: Identity issues in intercultural training. *Education for the intercultural experience*, *2*: 109-135.

Bikson, T. K., Treverton, G. F., Moini, J. S., & Lindstrom, G. (2003). Leadership in international organizations: 21st century challenges. *Leadership at a Distance: Research in Technologically-Suppported Work*, , Santa Monica, CA: RAND, MR-1670-IP. Pp. 13-30.

Bingham, C., Black, J. S., & Felin, T. (2000). An interview with John Pepper: What it takes to be a global leader. *Human Resource Management*, *39*(2-3): 287-292.

Bird, A. (2013). Mapping the content domain of global leadership competencies. In Mendenhall, M.E., Osland, J.S., Bird, A., Oddou, G.R., & Maznevski, M.L. (2008). *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development*. London and New York: Routledge. Pp. 80-96.

Bird, A., Lane, H. & Athanassiou, N. (2014). Designing experiential into an international business program. In Taras, V. and Gonzalez-Perez, M.A. (Eds.), *The handbook of experiential learning in international business and international management.* London: Palgrave Handbooks. Pp. 169-185.

Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., Stevens, M. & Oddou, G. (2010). Defining the content domain of intercultural competence for global leaders. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25(8): 810 – 828.

Bird, A. & Osland, J. (2004). Global competencies: An introduction. In Lane, H., Maznevksi, M., Mendenhall, M. E. & McNett, J. (Eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Global Management: A guide to managing complexity.* London: Blackwell. Pp. 57-80.

Bhaskar-Srinivas, P., Harrison, D., Shaffer, M. & Luk, D. (2005). Input-based and time-based models of international adjustment: Meta-analytic evidence and theoretical extensions. *Academy of Management Journal, 48(2):* 257-281.

Black, J.S., Morrison, A., & Gregersen, H. (1999). *Global explorers: The next generation of leaders.* New York: Routledge.

Black, J. S., Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (1991). Toward a comprehensive model of international adjustment: An integration of multiple theoretical perspectives. *Academy of management review*, *16*(2), 291-317.

Brake, T. (1997). *The global leader: Critical factors for creating the world class organization*. Chicago: Irwin.

Brannen, M. Y. (2004). When Mickey loses face: Recontextualization, semantic fit, and the semiotics of foreignness. *Academy of Management Review*, *29*(4): 593-616.

Brannen, M. Y., & Salk, J. E. (2000). Partnering across borders: Negotiating organizational culture in a German-Japanese joint venture. *Human relations*, *53*(4): 451-487.

Budner, S. (1962). Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable. *Journal of personality*, 30 (1): 29-50.

Caligiuri, P. & Tarique, I. 2009. Predicting effectiveness in global leadership activities*. Journal of World Business*, *44(3):* 336-346.

Caligiuri, P. & Tarique, I. 2012. Dynamic cross-cultural competencies and global leadership effectiveness*. Journal of World Business*, *47(4):* 612-622.

Caligiuri, P.M. (2006). Developing global leaders. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 219-228.

Caligiuri, P. & V. Di Santo.(2001). Global competence: what is it and can it be developed through international assignment? *HR Resource Planning*, 24(3): 27–36.

Child, J. (1981). Culture, contingency, and capitalism in the cross-national study of organizations. Research in organizational behavior (vol. 3, pp. 303-356). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). *Foundations of intercultural communication*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Collings, D.G., Scullion, H., & Morley, M.J. (2007). Changing patterns of global staffing in the multinational enterprise: Challenges to the conventional expatriate assignment and emerging alternatives. *Journal of World Business*, 42(2): 198-213.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and individual differences*, *13*(6): 653-665.

Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dorfman, P. W. GLOBE Associates. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed. *Leadership Quarterly*, *10*(2), 219-256.

Dickson, M., Castaño, N., Magomaeva, A. & Den Hartog, D. (2012). Conceptualizing leadership across cultures*. Journal of World Business*, *47(4):* 483-492.

Dorfman, P., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dastmalchian, A. & House, R. (2012). GLOBE: A twenty year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *Journal of World Business, 47*: 504-518.

Earley, P. C. (1989). Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 565-581.

Executive Summaries. (2013). Special Issue: Global Leadership. Organizational Dynamics, 42 (3), July–September: iv–vi.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: XXX.

Fiske, S. T. (1992). Thinking is for doing: portraits of social cognition from daguerreotype to laserphoto. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *63*(6), 877.

Furuya, N., Stevens, M., Bird, A., Oddou, G. & Mendenhall, M. (2009). Managing the learning and transfer of global management competence: Antecedents and outcomes of Japanese repatriation effectiveness. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40: 200-215.

Goldsmith, M., Govindarajan, V., Kaye, B. & Vicere, A. (2003). *The many facets of leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times Prentice Hall.

Graf, A. (2004). Expatriate selection: An empirical study identifying significant skill profiles. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, *46*(6): 667-685.

Green, S., Hassan, F., Immelt, J., Marks, M., & Meiland, D. (2003). In search of global leaders. *Harvard Business Review*, *81*(8): 38-45.

Gudykunst, W.B. (1994). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication, 2nd Edition.* London: Sage.

Haider, M. L. (1966). Tomorrow's executive: A man for all countries. Columbia Journal of World Business, 2: 106-113.

Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension*. New York: Doubleday.

Hall, E. T. (1973). *The silent language*. New York: Anchor.

Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding cultural differences* (Vol. 12). Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural press.

Hall, J. A., & Knapp, M. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Nonverbal communication* (Vol. 2). Walter de Gruyter.

Harrison, D. A., Shaffer, M. A., & Bhaskar-Shrinivas, P. (2004). Going places: Roads more and less travelled in research on expatriate experiences. *Research in personnel and human resources management*, *23*: 199-248.

Herman, J. L., Stevens, M. J., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (2010). The tolerance for ambiguity scale: Towards a more refined measure for international management research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *34*(1): 58-65.

Herman, J. & Zaccaro, S. (2014). The Complex Self-Concept of the Global Leader, in Joyce S. Osland , Ming Li , Ying Wang (ed.) *Advances in Global Leadership (Advances in Global Leadership, Volume 8)* Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 93 - 111

Herzberg, F. (1965a). The motivation to work among Finnish supervisors. *Personnel Psychology, 18*: 245-252.

Herzberg, F. (1965b). Job attitudes in the Soviet Union. *Personnel Psychology, 18:* 393-402.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values (Abridged Edition)*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

Hofstede, G. (2003). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations (2nd edition)*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

House, R., Mansour, J., Hanges, P., & Dorfman,P. (2002). Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: An introduction to project GLOBE. *Journal of World Business, 37(1):* 3-10

Inkson, K., Arthur, M., Pringle, J. & Barry, S. (1997) Expatriate assignment versus overseas experience: Contrasting models of international human resource development. *Journal of World Business, 32 (4)*: 351-368.

of European Industrial Training, 29(3), 199-216.

Kets de Vries, M. F., & Florent-Treacy, E. (1999). *The New Global Leaders: Richard Branson, Percy Barnevik, David Simon and the Remaking of International Business*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Mead, C. (1992). The development of the global leader within the multinational corporation. *Globalizing management: Creating and leading the competitive organization*, 187-205.

Kirkman, B. L., Chen, G., Farh, J. L., Chen, Z. X., & Lowe, K. B. (2009). Individual power distance orientation and follower reactions to transformational leaders: A cross-level, cross-cultural examination. *Academy of Management Journal*, *52*(4), 744-764.

Klein, G. A. (1999). *Sources of power: How people make decisions*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). Variations in value orientations. Oxford, England: Row Peterson.

Konopaske, R., Mendenhall, M., & Thomason, S. (2009). Toward a typology of the expatriate construct. In *Academy of Management meetings. August* (Vol. 10).

Lane, H.W., Maznevski, M.L., & Mendenhall, M.E. (2004). Hercules meets Buddha. In: H.W. Lane, M.L. Maznevski, M.E. Mendenhall & J. McNett (Eds), *The handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity* (pp. 3-25). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Langer, E.J. (1992). Matters of mind: Mindfulness/mindlessness in perspective. *Consciousness and Cognition, 1 (3)*: 289-305.

Levy, O., Beechler, S., Taylor, S. & Boyacigiller, N. 2007. What we talk about when we talk about ' global mindset': Managerial Cognition in Multinational Corporations*. Journal of International Business Studies*, *38(2):* 231-258.

Leslie, J. B., Dalton, M. A., Ernst, C., & Deal, J. J. (2002). *Managerial effectiveness in a global context*. Center for Creative Leadership.

Li, J., Tan; Y., Cai, Z., Zhu, H. & Wang, X. (2013). Regional differences in a national culture and their effects on leadership effectiveness: A tale of two neighboring Chinese cities. Journal of World Business, 48: Li, Jiu;

Likert, R. (1963). Trends toward a world-wide theory of management. *Proceedings of the International Council for Scientific Management, Thirteenth International Management Congress,* 2: 110-114.

Logan, G. (2008) global leadership talent shortage forecast. Personneltoday.com, May 21, http://www.personneltoday.com/articles/2008/05/21/45938/global-leadership-talent-shortage-forecast.html.

Marquardt, M., & Berger, N. O. (2003). The future: Globalization and new roles for HRD. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *5*(3): 283-295.

Marsick, V.J. & Cederholm, L. 1988. Developing Leadership in International Managers– an Urgent Challenge!*. Columbia Journal of World Business*, *23(4):* 3-11.

Maruca, R. F. (1994). The right way to go global: An interview with Whirlpool CEO David Whitwam. *Harvard Business Review*, *72*(2): 135-146.

Maznevski,M., Stahl, G.K., & Mendenhall, M.E. (2013). Thematic issue: Towards an integration of global leadership practice and scholarship: Repairing disconnects and heightening mutual understanding – Introduction. *European Journal of International Management*, 7 (5): 493-500.

Mbigi, L., & Maree, J. (1995). *Ubuntu, the spirit of African transformation management*. Knowledge Resources.

McCall, M.W. Jr. & Hollenbeck, G.P. (2002). *Developing global executives: The lessons of international experience.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

McCarthy, D. J., Puffer, S. M., & Shekshnia, S. V. (1993). The resurgence of an entrepreneurial class in Russia. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *2*(2): 125-137.

McClelland, D. C. (1973). Testing for competence rather than for" intelligence.". *American psychologist*, *28*(1): 1-14.

McFarland, L. J., Senn, L. E., & Childress, J. R. (1993). *21st century leadership: Dialogues with 100 top leaders*. Leadership Press.

McKibben, G. (1997) Cutting Edge: Gillette's Journey to Global Leadership. Harvard Business School.

McMillan, C. (1965). Industrial leaders in Latin America. In W. H. Form (Ed.), *Industrial relations and social change in Latin America.* Gainesville: University of Florida Press.

Mendenhall, M. E., Arnardottir, A. A., Oddou, G. R., & Burke, L. A. (2013). Developing cross-cultural competencies in management education via cognitive-behavior therapy. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *12*(3): 436-451.

Mendenhall, M. E., & Kühlmann, T. M. (2001). *Developing global business leaders: Policies, processes, and innovations*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Mendenhall, M.E., Kuhlmann, T., Stahl, G.K., & Osland, J.S. (2002). Employee Development and Expatriate Assignments. In M. Gannon & K. Newman (Eds.) *The Blackwell handbook of cross-cultural management*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell. Pp. 155-183.

Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. 1986b. The cognitive, psychological and social contexts of Japanese management practices. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Management*, 4(1): 24-37.

Mendenhall, M., & Osland, J. S. (2002, June). An overview of the extant global leadership research. In *Symposium presentation, Academy of International Business, Puerto Rico, June*.

Mendenhall, M.E., Reiche, B.S., Bird, A. & Osland, J. (2012). Defining the "Global" in Global Leadership*. Journal of World Business*, *47(4):* 493-503.

Miller, E. L. (1975). The job satisfaction of expatriate American managers: A function of regional location and previous international work experience. *Journal of International Business Studies*, : 65-73.

Millikin, J. P., & Fu, D. (2005). The global leadership of Carlos Ghosn at Nissan. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, *47*(1), 121-137.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work.* New York: Harper-Collins.

Mittal, R. & Dorfman, P. W. (2012). Servant leadership across cultures. *Journal of World Business, 47*: 555 – 570.

Mol, S. T., Born, M. P., Willemsen, M. E., & Van Der Molen, H. T. (2005). Predicting expatriate job performance for selection purposes A quantitative review. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *36*(5): 590-620.

Moore, F. W. (1961). *Readings cross-cultural methodology.* New Haven, CT: Burns & McEachern.

Morrison, A.J. (2000). Developing a global leadership model. *Human Resource Management,* 39(2&3), 117-131.

Nagandhi, A.R. & Estafan, B.D. (1965). A research model to determine the applicability of American management know-how in differing cultural and/or environments. *Academy of Management Journal, 8:* 309-318.

Newman, W.H. 1970. Is management exportable? *Columbia Journal of World Business*, *5(1):* 7-18.

Newman, K. L., & Nollen, S. D. (1996). Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture. *Journal of international business studies*, 753-779.

Nisbett, R. E. (2003). The geography of thought. New York: Free Pres..

Nohria, N. (2009) From regional star to global leader. *Harvard Business Review*, January: 33-39.

Osland, J. S. (1995). The Adventure of Working Abroad: Hero Tales from the Global Frontier. San Francisco, CA: Joseey-Bass.

Osland, J., Bird, A. & Mendenhall, M. (2012) "Global leadership and global mindset: An updated look." In G. Stahl & I. Bjorkman (Eds.) *International Human Resources Handbook*. 2nd Ed., London: Elgar.

Osland, J., Bird, A. & Oddou, G. (2012) "The Context of Expert Global Leadership." In W. H. Mobley, Y. Wang, & M. Li (Eds.) *Advances in Global Leadership*, vol. 7. Oxford: Elsevier.

Osland, J.S. (2008). Overview of the global leadership literature. In M.E. Mendenhall, J.S. Osland, A. Bird, G.R. Oddou & M.L. Maznevski (Eds.), *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development* (pp. 34-63). London and New York: Routledge.

Osland, J.S. & Bird, A. (2000). Beyond sophisticated stereotyping: Cross-cultural sensemaking in context. *Academy of Management Executive, 14:* 1-12.

Osland, J.S. & Bird, A. (2005). Global leaders as experts. In W.H. Mobley & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership,* Vol. 4 (pp. 123-142). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Osland, J.S., Bird, A., & Oddou, G. (2013.) The context of expert global leadership. In W.H. Mobley, M. Li & Y. Wang (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership,* Vol. 7. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.

Osland, J.S., Bird, A., Osland, A., & Mendenhall, M. (2012). Developing global leadership capabilities and global mindset: A review. In G. Stahl & I. Björkman (Eds.), *Handbook of research in international human resource management* (2nd ed.). London: Blackwell.

Osland, J.S., Bird, A., Osland, A., & Oddou, G. (2007). Expert Cognition in High Technology Global Leaders. *Proceedings*, NDM8, 8th Naturalistic Decision Making Conference, Monterey, CA.

Osland, J.S., Oddou, G., Bird, A. & Osland, A. (2013). Exceptional global leadership as cognitive expertise in the domain of global change. *European Journal of International Management, 7 (5):* 517-534.

Ouchi, W. (1981). Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge. *Business Horizons*, *24*(6), 82-83.

Pless, N.M., Maak, T., & Stahl, G. (2011). Developing responsible global leaders through international service-learning programs: The Ulysses experience. *Academy of Management Learning & Education,* 10(2), 237-260.

Puffer, S. M. (1994). Understanding the bear: A portrait of Russian business leaders. *The Academy of Management Executive*, *8*(1): 41-54.

Puffer, S. M., & McCarthy, D. J. (2001). Navigating the hostile maze: A framework for Russian entrepreneurship. *The Academy of Management Executive*, *15*(4), 24-36.

Puffer, S. M., & McCarthy, D. J. (2003). The emergence of corporate governance in Russia. *Journal of World Business*, *38*(4): 284-298.

Mbigi, L., & Maree, J. (1995). *Ubuntu, the spirit of African transformation management*. Knowledge Resources.

Reiche, B.S., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M.E., & Osland, J.S. (2014). "Toward a Taxonomy of the Global Leadership Construct." Paper presented at the Academy of International Business, Vancouver, Canada, June 25, 2014.

Riding, R. J., & Rayner, S. G. (Eds.). (2000). *International Perspectives on Individual Differences. Vol. 1: Cognitive Styles*. Ablex Publishing.

Rhinesmith, S. H. (1992). Global mindsets for global managers. *Training and Development-Alexandria-American Society for Training and Development*, *46*, 63-63.

Richman, B. M. (1965). *Soviet management*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Rosen, R.H., Digh, P., Singer, M., & Philips, C. (2000). *Global literacies: Lessons on business leadership and national cultures.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Ruben, B. D. (1989). The study of cross-cultural competence: Traditions and contemporary issues. *International journal of intercultural relations*, *13*(3): 229-240.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *25*(1): 1-65.

Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gregersen, H., Black, J. S., & Ferzandi, L. A. (2006). You can take it with you: individual differences and expatriate effectiveness. *Journal of Applied psychology*, *91*(1): 109.

Shim, S., & Steers, R.M. (2012). Symmetric and asymmetric leadership cultures: A comparative study of leadership and organizational culture at Hyundai and Toyota. Journal of World Business, 47 (4): 581-591.

Spreitzer, G.M., McCall, M.W. Jr., & Mahoney, J. (1997). The early identification of international executive potential. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 82(1), 6-29.

Steers, R.M., Sanchez-Runde, C., Nardon, L. (2012). Leadership in a global context: New directions in research and theory. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4): 479-482.

Stroh, L. K., Black, J. S., Mendenhall, M. E., & Gregersen, H. B. (2004). *International assignments: An integration of strategy, research, and practice*. Taylor & Francis.

Stroh, L. & Caligiuri, P. (1998). Increasing global competitiveness through effective people management. *Journal of World Business, 33*: 1 – 26.

Takahashi, K., Ishikawa, J. & Kanai, T. (2012). Qualitative and quantitative studies of leadership in multinational settings: Meta-analytic and cross-cultural reviews. *Journal of World Business, 47:* 530-538.

Takeuchi, R. 2010. A critical review of expatriate adjustment research through a multiple stakeholder view: Progress, emerging trends, and prospects*. Journal of Management*, 36: 1040-1064.

Tassey, G. (2007). The technology imperative. New York: Edward Elgar.

Tichy, N. M., Brimm, M., Charan, R., & Takeuchi, H. (1992). Leadership development as a lever for global transformation. *Globalizing management*. New York: Wiley.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1994). *The challenge of facework: Cross-cultural and interpersonal issues*. New York: SUNY Press.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Oetzel, J. G. (2001). *Managing intercultural conflict effectively*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1998). *Riding the waves of culture* (p. 162). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tung, R. L. (1981). Selection and training of personnel for overseas assignments. *Columbia journal of world business*, *16*(1): 68-78.

Tung, R. L., & Varma, A. (2008). Expatriate selection and evaluation. In M. Gannon & K. Newman (Eds.) *The Blackwell handbook of cross-cultural management*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell. Pp. 367-378.

Varma, A., Stroh, L. K., & Schmitt, L. B. (2002). Women and international assignments: The impact of supervisor-subordinate relationships. *Journal of World Business*, *36*(4), 380-388.

Wanasika, I., Howell, J.P. Littrell, R. & Dorfman, P. (2011). Managerial leadership and culture in sub-saharan Africa. *Journal of World Business, 46:* 234 – 24.

Welsh, D. H., Luthans, F., & Sommer, S. M. (1993). Managing Russian Factory Workers: The Impact of US–Based Behavioral and Participative Techniques. *Academy of management Journal*, *36*(1): 58-79.

William, T. (1991) "The Logic of Global Business: An Interview with ABB's Percy Barnevik," *Harvard Business Review*, 6 9(2), March-April.

Wolfensohn, J., O'Reilly, D., Campbell, K., Shui-Bian, C., & Arbour, L. (2003). In their own words: Leaders speak out. *Harvard International Review*, *25*(3): 50-67.

Yeung, A. K., & Ready, D. A. (1995). Developing leadership capabilities of global corporations: A comparative study in eight nations. *Human Resource Management*, *34*(4): 529-547.

Yukl, G. (2012). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zander, L., Mockaitis, A.I. & Butler, C.L. (2012). Leading global teams. *Journal of World Business, 47: 592-603.*

Table 1. Founding dates of selected management and international management journals

Management Journal	***Founding Date:***
Psychological Bulletin	1904
Journal of Applied Psychology	1917
Human Relations	1947
Personnel Psychology	1948
Administrative Science Quarterly	1956
Academy of Management Journal	1958
Journal of International Business Studies†	*1959*
Thunderbird International Business Review	*1959*
Management International Review	*1960*
Journal of Management Studies	1963
(Columbia) Journal of World Business	***1965***
Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources	*1966*
Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology	*1970*
International Studies of Management & Organization	*1971*
Organizational Dynamics	1972
International Journal of Intercultural Relations	*1972*
Journal of Management	1975
Academy of Management Review	1976
Journal of Organizational Behavior	1979
Strategic Management Journal	1980
Asia Pacific Journal of Management	*1983*
International Journal of Human Resource Management	*1990*
Leadership Quarterly	1990
Human Resource Management Journal	1990
Organization Science	1990
British Journal of Management	1990
International Business Review	*1992*
Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal	*1994*
Journal of International Management	*1995*
Advances in Global Leadership	*1999*
International Journal of Cross Cultural Management	*2001*
European Journal of International Management	*2006*
Journal of Global Mobility	*2013*

†Italics denote international management journals.