Chapter 9
Alternate Views of Global Leadership: Applying Global Leadership Perspectives to Leading Global Teams

Benjamin Biermeier-Hanson, Mengqiao Liu, and Marcus W. Dickson

While it is likely not a surprise to many readers of this chapter, the last two decades have seen a steady increase in recognizing the importance of taking a global perspective in examining organizational behavior. The idea of adopting a global mind-set, particularly in the area of leadership, has taken a firm hold in our cultural zeitgeist. A recent search using the term "global leadership" on the media giant Amazon.com came up over 12,200 results. Similarly, an identical search on PsycInfo came up with over 1,600 results. Given the variety of terms that have been applied to this field of study, it is likely that these results do not begin to encompass all the existing literature. Business schools, executive training programs, and best-selling books all recognize the importance of globalization, and focus on developing and teaching a global mind-set, which is viewed as critical for success in our increasingly "flat" world (e.g., Freidman, 1999, 2005; Javidan, Steers, & Hitt, 2007; Mendenhall, Osland, Bird, Oddou, & Maznevski, 2008; Thunderbird, 2008).

This global mind-set has been defined as the ability to utilize and interpret criteria and performance across a wide array of cross-cultural contexts (Gupta & Govindarajan, 2002). The clear theme that emerges from these diverse perspectives is that the importance of the global mind-set is here to stay, both for scientists and practitioners of Organizational Behavior or Industrial–Organizational psychology. In other words, it is clear that the industrialized world is not becoming more isolationist. Rather, advances in technology and increased competition in the global market continue to drive the need for an increased understanding of organizational behavior in a global context.

One of the major biases inherent in much of the organizational behavior literature is the Western-centric focus of the theoretical frameworks that we use to describe and prescribe behavior for both leaders and teams. While the study of leadership,

B. Biermeier-Hanson (✉) • M. Liu • M.W. Dickson, Ph.D.
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Wayne State University,
5057 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, MI 48202, USA
e-mail: b.biermeier@wayne.edu; mengqiao.liu@wayne.edu; marcus.dickson@wayne.edu

in particular, has been of interest to scholars and philosophers around the world for centuries (see Krause, 1997; Takala, 1998 for examples of historical work on leadership that has been applied to modern organizational contexts), the scholarly framework that incorporates both science and practice is rooted in studies conducting primarily in the Western hemisphere, raising the question of whether scholars and practitioners can equally apply this knowledge to other parts of the world. Fortunately, recent research efforts have begun to build a large body of knowledge that informs both how we study and apply our theories globally. While leadership has long been a focus of study in the cross-cultural domain, there is also an increasing proliferation of literature around global teams.

The focus of the present chapter is thus on discussing and integrating these two interrelated topics. We recognize that there are many approaches that we could have taken, given the breadth and depth that exists in the global leadership and global team literatures. Indeed, other chapters within this book focus on more specific approaches to these topics (e.g., examining the Project GLOBE scales or evaluating leadership competencies in a global context). We opt to take a somewhat different perspective. Our approach utilizes a variety of perspectives on global leadership to frame our discussion of global teams. The chapter thus provides a brief overview of global leadership research. This is followed by a review of some of the dominant models of global leadership that are specifically relevant for leading global teams, and we provide evidence-based suggestions for practitioners. Our goals in this chapter are thus twofold: First, we aim to summarize some key findings from the literature on these topics. Second, in order to better assist scholars, coaches, and current and aspiring global leaders, we provide a series of implications and best practices designed to bridge the "knowing-doing" gap (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2000).

Leadership in a Global Context

It is almost impossible today to find a textbook on leadership that does not include at least one chapter devoted to cross-cultural or global issues (e.g., Day & Antonakis, 2012; Locke, 1999; Yukl, 2012). Similarly, many books on cross-cultural research in organizations have a section devoted to leadership. Other books even make cross-cultural leadership research one of their primary foci (e.g., House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). While there is clearly an immense amount of research and discussion on cross-cultural leadership, the definitions and approaches taken to examining this broad phenomenon vary widely.

We have chosen to view the literature in this area as taking two broad approaches to examining leadership in a global context. Regardless of the approach taken, the driving force behind this research is to expand our understanding of leadership beyond our primarily North American perspective. As such, effort has gone into both reducing North American bias in leadership research (Peterson & Hunt, 1997) and into developing a better understanding of the best practices for leaders in global settings.

The first framework, examining global leadership, is a relatively new concept that stems from some existing leadership theories and takes a broad global view of leadership. It posits the existence of a "global leader" and focuses on what makes such a leader culturally competent. It is fundamentally a normative approach, in that there are certain traits and abilities that are universal to all leaders (Steers, Sanchez-Runde, & Nardon, 2012). The second approach, cross-cultural leadership, has a longer history of empirical research, ranging from two-country studies to large multinational efforts. While initial efforts in this area were also normative, it has progressed to endorse a contingency approach (Steers et al., 2012), in that it focuses on identifying cultural contingencies that are related to effective leader traits and behaviors. We will briefly overview the definition of each approach in the following paragraph and discuss their relationship to leading global teams later in the chapter.

The global leadership approach is aimed at developing better global leaders and takes a more holistic perspective, viewing global leaders in terms of broad styles and/ or competencies. The study of "global leadership," highlighted in a recent issue of the *Journal of World Business*, is a separate yet conceptually related stream of research from the cross-cultural leadership literature, though it is in its relative infancy in comparison. At present, the construct of global leadership is primarily at the construct definition and refinement stage, with little empirical research to support its validity (Osland, Taylor, & Mendenhall, 2009).

Osland and colleagues define global leadership as "a process of influencing the thinking, attitudes, and behaviors of a global community to work together synergistically toward a common vision and common goals" (Osland, Bird, Mendenhall, & Osland, 2006, p. 204). This construct, examining global leadership in terms of both styles and competencies that are essential or effective for global leaders, takes a much broader view than the cross-cultural research endeavors, examining it in terms of styles and competencies that are essential or effective for global leaders, which examines the cultural contingency of specific traits and behaviors. In many ways, it is similar to the search for universals within the cross-cultural leadership literature. While the research on this approach is limited, it does provide a useful framework through which global team leadership can be examined in a different way than is possible through the lens of cross-cultural leadership.

The study of cross-cultural leadership is based on the notion that not all leadership traits and behaviors are universally effective. Cross-cultural leadership has often been difficult to pin down. That is, the issue of culture compounds disagreement over leadership definitions. Rather than forcing a definition, it is perhaps more useful to overview cross-cultural leadership research by examining the questions that are asked within this research stream.

One of the focal questions in this research is whether leadership (and leadership traits or behaviors) are universal or contingent depending on the culture in which they are enacted. Graen and colleagues (Graen, Hui, Wakabayashi, & Wang, 1997) posit that the primary research question is whether phenomena are etic (universal across all cultures) or emic (unique to a culture). Initial work in this area focused on identifying universally effective or endorsed traits or behaviors. More recent endeavors have addressed more complex questions, investigating the cultural

contingency of leadership. This complexity has led to a more in-depth understanding of what is etic and what is emic, and where these contingencies occur.

The search for cultural contingencies has led to developing and measuring typologies of cultural dimensions. Geert Hofstede put forth arguably the most famous of these (Hofstede, 1980), though others by Schwartz (1999) and Trompenaars (1993, 2006) have been developed. The primary focus in the later discussion of leading global teams will focus on work done by the GLOBE study (House et al., 2004). Project GLOBE was a 62-nation study that utilized the conceptual dimensions from Hofstede, with modifications in measurement. They examined both ideal (i.e., desired or "should be") and actual (i.e., "as is") culture at both the organizational and national levels. In doing so, they identified culture clusters that organized participating countries by their endorsed values, allowing the identification of both universal and culturally contingent leadership traits and behaviors. This framework is discussed in terms of the universal approach and the cultural contingencies approach.

Teams in a Global Context

Research on groups and teams[1] has long been a domain of interest in psychology. It was not until the past few decades, however, that we started to understand teams in an organizational context (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003). Although the idea of teams has been applied in both domestic and multinational settings (see Guzzo & Dickson, 1996, and Earley & Gibson, 2002, for broad reviews of the team literature), the latter is far less well understood.

Without doubt, the driving force of studying global teams is rooted in globalization. The growing adoption of team-based systems across multinational organizations and the advancement in cross-cultural literature has greatly informed us about the opportunities and challenges of global teams in today's world. That is, while team effectiveness can be enhanced by the diverse knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) of the members, it can nevertheless be dampened by diversity in values, attitudes, and other characteristics (e.g., Milliken & Martins, 1996; Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007). Therefore, a major goal of the current chapter is to integrate leadership theories with research on global teams and provide empirical as well as practical discussion on how to maximize the benefits and mitigate the challenges. It is, of course, important to remember throughout that "Although global teams are highly complex, they are teams first" (Maznevski & Chui, 2012, p. 142).

Contemporary research on global teams follows three major approaches: multinational teams, virtual teams, and cross-cultural teams. Research on multinational or multicultural teams mainly focuses on multinational structures and

---

[1] In the current chapter, we use the labels "team" and "group" interchangeably to refer to a collective entity that is bound by common goals shared by more than two people that interact with each other (Earley & Gibson, 2002; Guzzo & Dickson, 1996), though we acknowledge that some have advanced conceptual differentiations between the two (e.g., Katzenbach & Smith, 1993).

technologies that shape the work environment, demography, and team composition that concern the impact of heterogeneity and diversity, and team processes that involve cognition, exchange, and conflict (Earley & Gibson, 2002). Specifically, given the geographic dispersion of global teams, research on multinational structures and technologies is concerned with the technological tools that can enhance the effectiveness in communication and teamwork provided the geographic boundaries. In team composition, cultural diversity as a function of individual differences such as attributes, beliefs, values, and perspectives is examined in relation to team effectiveness. In addition, team processes characterized by collective or shared entities (i.e., teamwork, collective efficacy, shared understanding) have been examined, focusing on how these constructs may differ across different cultures. The important factors highlighted within the three domains of research, albeit distinct conceptually, may interact to exert effect on global team effectiveness.

Yet another stream of research has been devoted to virtual teams, defined as "temporary, culturally diverse, geographically dispersed, electronically communicating work-group(s) of members… who think and act in concert within the diversity of the global environment" (Jarvenpaa & Leidner, 1999, p. 792). Research in this area pertains to conceptualizations and operationalizations of virtuality, as well as factors that facilitate or hinder the success of global virtual teams (Stanko & Gibson, 2009; Zander, Mockaitis, & Butler, 2012).

Research on cross-cultural teams is characterized by an emphasis on identifying and measuring cultural differences that influence team processes and effectiveness. In particular, two major approaches have been taken in this stream of research. First, considerable research has been undertaken to examine the main effects of contextual factors, such as culture-specific values, beliefs, or characteristics, on team-related attitudes and processes in different cultures (e.g., Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez 2000; Gibson & Zellmer-Bruhn, 2001; Kashima et al., 2005; Kirkman & Shapiro, 1997, 2001; Morris, Menon, & Ames, 2001). Building upon the first line of research, the second approach focuses on the moderating effect of cultural differences in teams (i.e., cultural contingencies; e.g., Earley, 1999; Erez & Somech, 1996; Gibson, 1999; Man & Lam, 2003). Collectively, research on cross-cultural teams encompassing both approaches has greatly advanced our understanding of teams across different cultural environments.

In studying global teams, the importance of adopting a multilevel approach cannot be overstated. Essentially, global team effectiveness is a product of the interaction of individual and organizational elements. On the one hand, organizational context (characterized by structure, technology, and leadership, etc.) sets boundaries to influence team processes and individuals' responses. On the other hand, characteristics of the team members (e.g., attributes, attitudes, etc.) can in turn impact team-level outcomes via the formation of shared perceptions and knowledge (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003). Although the past two decades have witnessed considerable progress in a variety of perspectives pertaining global teams (e.g., composition, selection, and diversity; e.g., Bhagat & Steers, 2009; Hampden-Turner & Trompenaars, 1997), we recognize that empirical investigation on global teams is still underrepresented in the literature (Malhotra, Majchrzak, & Rosen, 2007; Zander et al., 2012).

Part of the underrepresentation can be attributed to the lack of a comprehensive theoretical framework for studying global teams that integrates elements, processes, and contingencies in global team effectiveness (Earley & Gibson, 2002).

Based on the preceding discussion, we have chosen to incorporate both team and leadership research in our efforts to form a more holistic picture on leading global teams. We recognize that the concepts of leadership and teams are inseparable due to overlapping constructs (e.g., the Project GLOBE cultural dimensions on individual and team levels) as well as interactions between leaders and members in team processes. Although this is by no means the most comprehensive review on the global team literature, it is our hope that this integration of leadership and team research captures the dynamic entity of global teams and enables us to provide better informed recommendations on best practices.

Leading Teams in a Global Context

In this section, we apply the literature on global teamwork to various "alternate" frameworks of global leadership. Each leadership framework is defined and explained in detail, focusing on both the cross-cultural leadership approach and the global leadership approach, generally, and their individual approaches, specifically.

The existing literature on leadership in a global context can be viewed either through a cross-cultural leadership or a global leadership lens. There are several established approaches that lay within each of these broad categorizations. It should be noted, however, that there is overlap between these approaches. We are utilizing this framework for purposes of organizational clarity, recognizing that, for example, the work on identifying broad leadership competencies is related to earlier investigations into universal leadership traits. We attempt to clarify and delineate these approaches by providing sufficient theoretical background to support our practical implications while acknowledging the conceptual overlap that exists due to the nature of the literature.

As discussed earlier, the nascent global leadership literature primarily focuses on broad leader competencies and styles (e.g., Mendenhall, Reiche, Bird, & Osland, 2012). Consistent with this literature, we integrate both leadership and teams research in this area by discussing various leadership competency paradigms as one model and leadership styles as another. The cross-cultural leadership approach encapsulates the universalist approach searching for emics (e.g., Lonner, 1980), and the various cultural dimensions approaches that focus on etics (e.g., Hofstede, 1980; House et al., 2004).

Global Leadership

Global leadership competencies. The concept of leadership competencies has received considerable attention recently in both the academic and practitioner literature despite criticisms regarding their effectiveness and their actual relationship to

performance (Bolden & Gosling, 2006). Leadership competencies are essentially skills or abilities that characterize effective leaders. Not surprisingly, there is a wide range of ways of thinking about—and assessing—global leadership. Bird and Stevens (2012) have grouped these into a few major categories, including cultural difference assessments, intercultural adaptability assessments, and global leadership competency assessments.

Among these many conceptualizations, several constructs have been proposed that reflect the idea of leadership competencies. The underlying assumption in all of these is that individuals possessing these competencies have at least the opportunity to be an effective global leader. Both broad level competencies, such as the global mind-set, and specific competencies, such as cultural intelligence, have been proposed and received theoretical and empirical attention. Additionally, many organizations choose to develop their own competency models of global leadership that are aligned with their corporate vision (Bolden, Gosling, Marturano, & Dennison, 2003), though these are often developed from existing leadership development models instead of more empirically supported models. We have focused on competency models that have implications for leading global teams, rather than on competency models focusing on global leadership more generally. The theory and practical usage of these models in a multinational team context are discussed, along with the limitations inherent to a competency approach.

The "global mind-set," as an emerging construct, has become increasingly popular among those researching and practicing leadership in a multinational context. This, in part, stems from the global leadership construct (Mendenhall et al., 2012), in which the development of critical skills and competencies are a foundational part of becoming a global leader (Mendenhall, 2006). While this literature is still developing, several existing competencies, such as cultural intelligence, have been conceptually linked to the global mind-set. Additionally, entire competency models, such as the model developed at Thunderbird assessed by the Global Mindset Inventory (see Javidan, Teagarden, & Bowen, 2010), are devoted to developing this mind-set. Other approaches do not specify a set of competencies. Rather, they provide broader practical advice for developing and utilizing global leadership competencies.

When considering leadership competencies, it is important to note that their development takes both time and intentional effort (Mendenhall, 2006). Regardless of the competencies specified, several strategies that Mendenhall suggests have been shown to be effective. First, when coaching developing leaders, the experience must be highly individualized. Second, the coaching must focus on present, rather than future challenges. Third, these developmental sessions must be confidential and allow an "inner freedom to learn." In other words, the leader must not fear retribution for experimentation with their new competencies.

Even with these practical guidelines, it is difficult to examine these competency models in depth due to the number of models (especially when considering the number of models that are developed in-house), the lack of empirical work, and the sheer number of possible competencies. For example, Mendenhall and Osland (2002) identified 56 global leadership competencies, a number they acknowledged is too large to be of any practical use. Further, these competencies may not be relevant for every global leadership position (Conger & Ready, 2004). Rather than describing,

in depth, various competency models, we instead put forth some initial empirical findings relating global leadership competencies and competency models to meaningful outcomes while encouraging both scholars and practitioners to continue investigations in this domain.

There is some emerging empirical support for the efficacy of these competency models. Bird, Mendenhall, Stevens, and Oddou (2010) developed an initial competency model utilizing three primary facets: perception, relationship, and self-management, consisting of 17 dimensions. Others have found initial support for this framework, finding that it is predictive of business acumen, interpersonal skills, and system management skills (Furuya, Stevens, Bird, Oddou, & Mendenhall, 2009).

Caligiuri and Tarique (2012) found that extraversion, openness to experience, low neuroticism, and previous cultural experiences related to what they termed dynamic cross-cultural competencies. These competencies included high levels of cultural flexibility, tolerance for ambiguity, and low levels of ethnocentrism. They further found support that these competencies were related to supervisor's ratings of focal leaders' global leadership effectiveness, providing initial empirical linkages between global competencies and global outcome variables. Despite this emerging evidence, more empirical work is needed linking various competency models to outcomes. We further encourage researchers to work toward a greater consensus regarding the competency models in this area. Greater uniformity in both the predictive competency models and the outcomes used would be of great benefit to researchers and practitioners who are attempting to make sense of the vast array of models available.

While there is some emerging empirical support for the use of leadership competencies, there are also numerous criticisms that have been leveled against this approach. Buckingham (2001) argued that the competency approach can encourage unhelpful conformity among leaders. Along similar lines, Carroll, Levy, and Richmond (2008) argue that a focus on competencies can serve to restrain thinking in leaders rather than developing and fostering it. Finally, it has been argued that competency models can disassociate leader behavior from its context, leading to failure in the continued development and effectiveness of the leader (Salaman, 2004). While these criticisms have merit, competency models are increasingly popular. Practically speaking, it is important to recognize the limits of competency models in this context. In particular, it is critical to ensure competency models are used for developmental purposes, rather than appraisal (Conger, 2005), especially given the lack of clear consensus on the structure and weightings of the competencies making up a generalized global leadership competency model.

Despite the vast variety of theories on global leader competencies, research linking leader competencies and global team effectiveness is still in its early stages (Hajro & Pudelko, 2010). In fact, when taking a broader look at the team literature in general, research on leadership has largely remained on the individual level, whereas less is known in the team context (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003). Although there is ample evidence that leaders do indeed impact team performance (e.g., Jacobs & Singell, 1993), leader competencies that are required for leading a team effectively may differ from those needed for individual success (Mathieu, Maynard,

Rapp, & Gilson, 2008). Similarly, global leadership competencies, although discussed extensively, are not well understood in the context of global teams.

In this section, we highlight a few clusters of competencies (of the more than 250 global leadership competencies that have been identified; Bird & Stevens, 2012) that have been argued to be major contributors to global team success. On the broad level, research on global mind-set has demonstrated a positive relationship between global mind-set and firm performance (Nummela, Saarenketo, & Puumalainen, 2004). Specific competences, such as cross-cultural communication competence and cross-cultural intelligence, have been shown to facilitate global team success to various extents.

Cross-cultural communication competence refers to one's ability to communicate effectively in a multicultural setting, which entails knowledge of the culture and language, affective skills (e.g., empathy, charisma, etc.), and behavioral skills (relationship skills, communication skills, etc.). Given that global teams are highly susceptible to issues with team interaction, cross-cultural communication competence can be particularly important in successfully communicating goals and vision, establishing interpersonal relationships, and achieving high team performance (Matveev & Nelson, 2004; Zander et al., 2012). For example, Matveev and Nelson found a positive relationship between the level of cross-cultural communication competence of team member and team-level performance in cross-cultural teams, highlighting the importance for leaders to develop high levels of competency in cross-cultural communication. These specialized communication skills can be especially important for virtual teams that are geographically dispersed. In a multinational setting, the leader's communication with team members was found to positively predict team performance despite the challenges associated with geographic dispersion (Cummings, 2007). The author suggested that this communication facilitates exchange of information and fosters interpersonal relationships, which subsequently mitigate the negative impact of geographic dispersion.

Research on cross-cultural intelligence (CQ) focuses on yet another taxonomy of leadership competencies, consisting of meta-cognitive, cognitive, motivational, and behavioral factors that contribute to both successful global leaders and teams. In a field study on culturally diverse teams, Groves and Feyerherm (2011) found leader CQ to be positively associated with both leader and team performance, even after controlling for leader emotional intelligence and other leadership competencies (i.e., mentoring, innovating, directing, and monitoring). The authors suggested that leaders with high levels of CQ may be more motivated and better equipped to overcome communication issues and intrateam conflict, which in turn leads to better team performance.

Findings from a qualitative study by Hajro and Pudelko (2010) revealed the importance of several specific leadership competencies in determining effective functioning of multinational teams. Particularly, knowledge transfer and management were recognized as the top competences among global team leaders, which not only contribute to the development of business strategies and activities but also facilitate interactions and information exchange among members of different teams and departments. In addition, cross-cultural awareness, the extent to which an individual

is aware of the values and beliefs of people from different cultures, was found to be the second most important competence for multinational leaders. It was suggested that cross-cultural awareness among leaders may lead to improved team performance via its effects on fostering social relations and organizational support. Furthermore, findings suggested that successful global leaders are the ones who possess motivating capabilities, through which they can motivate members to exchange information and ideas, take an active approach when facing challenges, and perform to the best of their abilities. Other competencies, such as having knowledge of a foreign language and creating a system of shared values and norms in global teams, were also perceived to be associated with team performance.

When discussing competency in global teams, differentiations need to be made between leadership and team competencies. Although both have been associated with team performance, the former describes KSAs possessed by individuals (i.e., leaders) whereas the latter concept concerns the collective or aggregated entities of a team (Mathieu et al., 2008). Consequently, the mechanisms through which they influence team outcomes may differ. Although team competencies are not the focus of this chapter, we recognize that connections can be drawn between the two lines of research. On the one hand, a leader is essentially part of a team, such that leadership competencies serve as an important component in team competencies. On the other hand, and perhaps more importantly, constructs in leadership and team competencies do overlap, but only to a certain extent. For instance, cognitive ability (Devine & Philips, 2001), task-related knowledge (Mathieu & Schulze, 2006), and cross-cultural communication skills (Matveev & Nelson, 2004) have been frequently discussed in both areas of research, begging the question of why the two have not yet been better connected. We believe that the approach taken by Lopez and Ensari (2013) to understand competencies from individual, interpersonal, and team perspectives offers a potential avenue for bridging the different streams of research in competencies in global teams.

Best practices. There are several best practices that emerge from the global leadership literature.

1. Utilize global leadership competency assessment as a developmental tool, not for appraisal or selection.

    As Bird and Stevens (2012) note, "It is important to remember … that the field of global leadership is still in its infancy, with no established definition and no accompanying set of clearly defined behaviors. Given the nature of the phenomenon it may be unrealistic to expect that this will be resolved any time soon" (p. 137). There is still a lack of strong validity evidence for the predictive power of the vast majority of the various competence assessments that are related to global leadership. Further, some of the tools are explicitly designed as self-reports, and it is well established that taking developmental experiences or assessments and using them for promotion or annual evaluation purposes thoroughly undermines the developmental usefulness of the experience or tool, partially because tools used for these different purposes likely assess different dimensions, and partially because employees no longer have motivation to be

honest in their self-assessment, but rather are motivated for inflating their accomplishments (e.g., see Rupp, Snyder, Gibbons, & Thornton, 2006 for a discussion of this related to developmental assessment centers). Thus, these types of competency assessments are likely better used as developmental tools rather than selection or assessment tools. In other words, use these tools to help global team leaders (in training or in situ) identify areas of strength and areas in need of additional development experiences, and compare results within-person over time (i.e., is the person showing growth in the dimensions identified as needing growth).

2. Highlight the competencies considered to be important, and why.

   Although these global leadership competencies are best treated in a developmental framework rather than a selection framework, that doesn't mean that they shouldn't be emphasized and communicated to employees. When those in global team leadership positions are aware of the competencies that have been found to be important for others in similar settings, they are better able to target their own developmental efforts toward those competence areas.

Leadership Styles

The global leadership approach to understanding global team effectiveness has also utilized the leadership styles approach as one perspective that can inform the development of global leaders. The idea of leadership styles has been used in a variety of ways within the existing literature. Transformational, ethical, charismatic, values based, and other types of leadership have all been characterized as both theories and as working styles.

There has been more empirical work on leadership styles in multinational contexts than on competency models in those contexts. The existing work on leadership styles has primarily focused on the full-range-leadership theory (FRLT; Avolio & Bass, 1991). This particular framework has been the dominant model within the academic literature in the last two decades (Gardner, Lowe, Moss, Mahoney, & Cogliser, 2010; Lowe & Gardner, 2000).

Briefly, the FRLT is made up of nine dimensions: Individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, idealized influence, attributed and behavioral, contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive), and laissez-faire leadership. The first five dimensions make up transformational leadership, the following three make up transactional leadership, and the last dimension reflects the lack of leadership to encompass the full range of possible leadership styles. Considerable support has been found for the psychometric structure of the model (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003) and for its relationships to various outcomes. Transformational leadership has been linked to trust (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996), leadership satisfaction (Yammarino & Bass, 1990), and performance outcomes (Barling, Weber, & Kelloway, 1996). Further, there is support that transformational leadership

augments transactional leadership. That is, transactional leadership is a necessary condition for transformational leadership to occur (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). These findings provide both theoretical background and practical implications for developing leaders and have been used in both appraisal and developmental contexts.

While there is considerable support in both research and practice for the explanatory power of this model of leadership styles, limitations do exist, particularly in relation to multinational contexts. Further complicating matters, little work has been done examining transformational leadership in the specific context of multinational teams (Kearney & Gebert, 2009).

First, there is an increasing consensus that there is no single "silver bullet" way of leading that is effective across all cultures (e.g., Dulewicz & Higgs, 2004), though we address this in more detail below. The styles of leadership that are preferred vary by country as well (e.g., House et al., 2004). Thus, the perceptions and effectiveness of different leadership styles differ from country to country (e.g., Jung & Avolio, 1999), creating additional barriers that must be navigated when leading global teams.

Some have argued that global leadership development efforts should focus on training leaders to account for these differences so that they can lead with a style congruent to the culture in which they are operating (e.g., Javidan, Dorfman, De Luque, & House, 2006). Others have argued that truly effective leaders are true to themselves (i.e., authentic; Walumbwa, Avolio, Gardner, Wernsing, & Peterson, 2008), and that changing one's style may not lead to greater effectiveness in cross-cultural domains (e.g., Goffee & Jones, 2000). Others have argued that it is not possible to be all things to all people. As Schneider (1987) noted, "almost all of the current leadership theories… tell a leader what to do, given a certain situation, and make the assumption that leaders are infinitely flexible…" (p. 449), a position that he refuted strongly.

We believe both perspectives have merit, if not taken to extremes. A greater understanding of cultural differences can only aid developing leaders in multinational contexts. At the same time, changing one's leadership style may result in a lack of authenticity, potentially leading to ineffectiveness. Despite the large body of literature done in the Western hemisphere on leadership styles, further work must be done to examine the extent to which leaders can and should adapt their styles to match different cultural settings. While future research is needed, the current literature does provide a starting point for examining leadership in a multinational team context.

While many researchers have argued for the importance of identifying "best" leadership styles for global teams, the extent to which a particular leadership style is effective in a team context may itself vary across cultures. Nevertheless, some leadership styles have been recognized as more universally effective across the globe. Indeed, Bass (1997) entitled an article "Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?", and he concluded that it does, though he acknowledged that the behaviors and interactions that make up transformational leadership may differ widely in different cultural contexts. Following from Bass' assertions about the universality of transformational leadership, we briefly summarize the major findings in global leadership styles and team effectiveness from within the FRLT perspective.

Bass and Avolio (1993) suggested a hierarchy of leadership styles based on their associations with outcomes, ranging the most effective to the least effective: transformational leadership, contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive), and laissez-fair leadership. Research has consistently shown that leadership styles higher in the hierarchy (e.g., transformational leadership) are more positively associated with a variety of desirable team outcomes. Although this pattern of findings tends to be weaker when objective measures of criteria are used (Bass, 1997), meta-analytic evidence has suggested that this hierarchy of correlation has held up consistently (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

Although transformational leadership seems to be more associated with team success relative to other leadership styles, absolute differences do exist across countries in perceived leadership (mean and variances) and correlations between different styles and team outcomes (e.g., Boyd Jr, 1988; Yokochi, 1989). These discrepancies, likely resulting from cultural or organizational specific factors, may serve as obstacles in understanding the linkage between leadership styles and team effectiveness in global teams. Consequently, the effectiveness of varying leadership styles has been less frequently examined in the context of cross-cultural or multinational teams. Nevertheless, what research there is has generally supported the positive effects of transformational leadership. For example, in studying diverse teams in a multinational organization, Kearney and Gebert (2009) found that high levels of transformational leadership enable diversity to exert a positive impact on team performance by maximizing task-relevant information elaboration and collective team identification.

Findings from Project GLOBE also shed light on leadership styles in cross-cultural teams. For instance, charismatic/value-based and team-oriented leadership styles were found to be effective in facilitating team building, communication, and coordination across many countries (Den Hartog et al., 1999). Other leadership styles, such as humane and self-protective leadership styles, tend to be perceived differently across cultures (Dickson, Den Hartog, & Castaño, 2009).

With an increasing popularity of global virtual teams, research, albeit limited, has also been conducted to examine the effectiveness of leadership styles in geographically dispersed virtual teams. Through interviews, Davis and Bryant (2003) discovered a positive association between transformational leadership and global virtual team outcomes, whereas laissez-fair leadership tends to have a negative effect on the same outcomes. Similarly, Joshi, Lazarova, and Liao (2009) revealed the important role of inspirational leadership in fostering trust and commitment among team members, which tends to be especially important given the challenges faced by geographically dispersed teams. On the contrary, Carte, Chidambaram, and Becker (2006) did not reveal significant results regarding the effects of transformational leadership and team performance.

Given the geographic dispersion of global virtual teams, empowerment can serve as a big contributor of team success (Kirkman, Rosen, Tesluk, & Gibson, 2004). Self-leadership, a leadership style that distributes power and responsibilities to all members of a team, has been suggested to benefit global virtual teams

(Davis & Bryant, 2003). Although empirical evidence is lacking on the effectiveness of self-leadership, existing theoretical propositions have provided a potential avenue for future research on the relationship between self-leadership and the success of global virtual teams.

Building upon the aforementioned findings, we encourage researchers to further investigate the role of leadership styles in a global team context. In particular, future research should explore the mechanisms through which certain leadership styles exert a positive impact on team effectiveness, and the cultural and organizational contingencies associated with such relationships. A multilevel approach considering individual-, team-, and organizational level factors should also be taken when examining leadership styles in global teams.

Best practices. Looking broadly across the literature on leadership styles, some key best practices emerge.

1. Communicate constantly (Tann, 2013). One reason for the success of transformational leadership in global teams, we believe, is that transformational leadership entails keeping the vision constantly salient to the team—a team that may not otherwise always have the same understanding of the vision, due to cultural differences or differences in their career experiences. Transformational leadership is inherently about communication—of the vision, of expectations for how work is done, and of how the team will work together.

2. Be open to the ideas of the team. The intellectual stimulation component of the transformational leadership style is generally seen as occurring when the leader promotes divergent ways of thinking among followers. When the leader also models openness to the different ways of thinking about and resolving problems that can emerge from a global team, the team members will have more opportunity to contribute from what they bring to the table. A recent survey by the European Professional Women's Network found "Openness to new and different ideas" to be tied for the most frequently occurring response among women in global leadership roles when asked the question "What are the five most important qualities needed to lead an international team successfully?" (Demailly & Rabotin, 2006). We conclude that a transformational style of leadership that models openness to the ideas and contributions of the diverse members of the global team is more likely to succeed.

Cross-Cultural Leadership

The search for universals. The universal approach addresses whether phenomena are universal—i.e., invariant across cultures—or culturally contingent—i.e., vary predictably from culture to culture based on characteristics of those cultures. This in many ways is the primary question underlying cross-cultural leadership research. However, the search to identify global leadership competencies is, in many ways, also a continuing search for universals. Thus, while we discuss these approaches

(global leadership and cross-cultural leadership) separately, we recognize that they are by no means orthogonal. Rather, these research traditions have been and continue to be influencing and overlapping with one another.

The goal of identifying things that are universal is common among many disciplines and contexts, and has led people to define "universality" in very many ways, for many different purposes. Lonner (1980) attempted to bring some order to the chaos of those efforts by providing a taxonomy of universality, consisting of several subtypes of universals that build on each other in complexity. At the most basic level is the simple universal, which is what much of the global leadership framework is built upon, and which served as the starting point for early forays into cross-cultural leadership research (Dickson, Den Hartog, & Mitchelson, 2003). A simple universal is a phenomenon that occurs consistently in every country or culture. Lonner suggested that *frustration leads to aggression* could be considered a simple universal, for example.

Variform universals occur when a general attribute is important across countries or cultures, but differences in enactment exist across cultures. That is, a particular value can be universally endorsed but could mean vastly different things in different countries. Dickson and Den Hartog (2005) put forth *visionary* as a trait that is a variform universal. They note that in some cultures (such as the United States), a more forceful communication of the leader's vision is effective, whereas in other cultures (such as China), a more passive and nonaggressive communication of the vision is more effective. Thus, the characteristic is universal, but varies in its form (variform). The variform universal is one of the primary foci of many research efforts into cross-cultural leadership, such as Project GLOBE (House et al., 2004).

Functional universals exist when a relationship between two variables is universally found in every cultural setting, but the strength of the relationship can vary significantly from culture to culture. The relationship between goal setting and performance, for example, may be found in every culture, though it may be a stronger relationship in countries higher on Performance Orientation. (Lonner identified other universals within his taxonomy, including universals related to temporal ordering of behaviors and universality across time rather than culture, but these three are the most relevant for our present purposes.)

Bass (1997) proposed an addition to Lonner's taxonomy—the variform functional universal. The variform functional universal incorporates the variability in enactment of a variform universal and the variability in strength of relationship of a functional universal. Thus, a relationship between two variables is always found, but the enactment of those variables may not be consistent, and the strength of the relationship might vary across cultures. Bass advocated for this understanding of universal when describing the universality of the effectiveness of transformational leadership, where he noted that transformational leadership is always effective, but that it can be more effective (i.e., stronger relationship) in some cultures than in others, and that the behaviors that make up the components of transformational leadership might look different from culture to culture. Indeed, Bass noted that "Transformational leadership may be autocratic and directive or democratic and participative" (p. 136).

Research searching for simple universals has declined over time, in part because it oversimplifies many real-world relationships. Dickson et al. (2003) note that it is much more common to search for differences between cultures and cultural dimensions on leadership traits. Further, other researchers have begun to investigate unique ways of looking at leadership in different cultures, rather than imposing existing North American theories. Much research thus focuses on searching for variform or variform functional universals. Contrasting this more current focus on variform and variform functional universals with our emphasis on what we can now refer to as simple universals in the global leadership competency literature, the challenge of understanding the implications for leading global teams becomes clear. This latter approach is our present focus, and we address it and its implications below.

The research focus on identifying cultural universals in leadership has generated a line of studies that greatly advanced our understanding of the commonality of leadership's impact across cultures. For example, in one of the earliest reports from Project GLOBE, Den Hartog et al. (1999) found that leadership attributes associated with transformational/charismatic and team-oriented leadership, such as being trustworthy, encouraging, dependable, and communicative, are universally perceived as effective in facilitating team building, communication, and coordination across many countries. In contrast, leadership styles characterized by self-centered and malevolent attributes are perceived as undesired across the world. However, the authors noted that the findings do not suggest universality in the *expression* of leadership, only in the perception of effectiveness. In other words, the actual leadership behaviors that are common or that yield desired results may well vary across different cultures, and thus the findings may represent variform or variform functional universality, rather than simple universality as it may at first appear.

According to Bass and Avolio (1993), the different leadership styles described in the FRLT can be ordered hierarchically based on the consistent strength of their associations with important team outcomes. Transformational leadership and contingent reward consistently have stronger associations with outcomes such as customer market share, satisfaction with and commitment to the team, and team performance. This ordering, first verified in the United States (Waldman, Bass, & Einstein, 1986), has been replicated across several cultures, including Austria (Steyrer & Mende, 1994), China (Davis, Guan, Luo, & Maahs, 1996), India, and Japan (Yokochi, 1989). Part of this phenomenon can be contributed to the universality of the cognitive prototype of an "ideal leader." That is, when asked to describe an ideal leader, individuals across the globe describe characteristics that are aligned with the conceptualization of transformational leadership, such as charisma, dedication, intelligence, and sensitivity (Bass, 1997). Despite the consistency in the order of the relationships, however, Bass again (1997) argued that such leadership styles are variform functional universals, such that the size of the relationships varied, as did the behavioral manifestations of the dimensions. For instance, while transactional leadership was shown to correlate positively with team effectiveness in the United States and German, this relationship was found to be much closer to zero in a Canadian sample (Boyd Jr, 1988). Similarly, the characteristics that define charisma likely vary from culture to culture, as well.

In investigating the relationships between leadership attributes and organizational outcomes in Western and Asian countries, Dorfman et al. (1997) found mixed support for the universal approach. Particularly, Dorfman and his colleagues found that leader attributes such as being supportive, charismatic, and practicing contingent reward positively predicted subordinates' commitment, satisfaction, and job performance in all five countries (Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Mexico, and the U.S.), thus supporting cultural universality. In contrast, some other leader behaviors had differential impact on the same outcomes across cultures, providing counter-evidence to the argument of universal leadership.

Despite the theoretical argument and empirical evidence for some elements of leadership style being universally effective, this approach is not without limitations. One of the concerns in applying universality in global teams, as Dickson et al. (2009) discussed, is a compromise between broadening the construct and providing applicable recommendations in leading global teams. That is, as the definition of universality expands to a certain extent, the difficulty in making practical implications increases as well. For instance, although transformational leadership is likely to be effective in any culture, it is often unrealistic to expect an expatriate leader to understand the enactment of this leadership in a specific culture and act accordingly. Therefore, we encourage researchers to extend the search on universals and further investigate cultural variations that may serve as contingencies for universality.

One caveat to this finding comes from research on leader ethics. Work by Resick and his colleagues (Martin et al., 2013; Resick et al., 2011) suggests that, while there is a fair amount of cultural contingency in what organization members perceive to be highly ethical, there is great consistency in factors that are perceived to be unethical, specifically relating to acting in one's own self-interest and being perceived as abusing one's authority or misusing one's power. Their sample of cultures is too small to suggest that this is a universal finding, but the implication is that there is a specific and consistent range of behaviors that are critical to avoid, seemingly in a wide range of cultural settings.

Cultural contingency approaches. The focus of the most recent cross-cultural leadership research, and team leadership to a degree, focuses on examining dimensions of societal culture to better determine whether traits and behaviors are culturally contingent in their effectiveness (Dickson et al., 2003). That is, determining the cultural contingency of leadership traits or behaviors helps to identify whether they are effective (or not) in a given culture. In many ways this is a natural extension from the search for universally effective traits or behaviors. This stream of research moves to examining whether phenomena exist in other cultures and, if they do, determining if the relationships are the same or if they differ in magnitude or in how it is enacted. Further, these approaches have succeeded in identifying clusters of cultures, based on similarity along cultural dimensions, which provide concrete guidance for global leaders who are attempting to determine how they can best communicate with and lead a global team.

There are numerous conceptualizations of societal dimensions that have been utilized in cross-cultural leadership research. Beginning with his classic global

study of IBM, Geert Hofstede (Hofstede, 1980, 2001) put forth one model that has five dimensions of culture that can be measured along a continuum. Despite numerous criticisms leveled against it, Hofstede's model (and models who drew inspiration from it, such as the Project GLOBE model) remains one of the most influential models in this stream of research. Others have suggested alternative models. Schwartz (2006) identifies seven cultural value orientations, which combine to form three cultural value dimensions. Trompenaars (1993) puts forth seven dimensions. These approaches all have considerable overlap with each other and have received varying degrees of empirical attention. We turn our focus here, however, to Project GLOBE, which utilized dimensions similar to Hofstede's to examine leadership across 62 different countries in the largest cross-cultural leadership study to date. The implications and linkages to the teams literature and practical tips are also discussed.

The previously mentioned Project GLOBE—Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness—research study is one of most comprehensive studies of cross-cultural leadership to date (House et al., 2004). Its purpose is to examine leadership and organizational cultures around the world to identify universals and contingencies in as many countries as was feasible. In undertaking such a massive effort, the project moved beyond simple two-country comparisons, allowing large clusters of cultures to be compared in order to provide more comprehensive guidance to scholars and practicing leaders. This multinational study has generated numerous books and publications that have helped advance our understanding of global leadership (e.g., Hanges & Dickson, 2006).

Project GLOBE utilized many of Hofstede's original dimensions while modifying others. Specifically, GLOBE identifies nine cultural dimensions, which are performance orientation, future orientation, gender egalitarianism, assertiveness, collectivism (institutional and in-group), power distance, humane orientation, and uncertainty avoidance (see Table 9.1 for definitions of the dimensions). As noted earlier, cultures were grouped into clusters based on similarity in responses along the dimensions measured. Ultimately, 10 clusters were identified: Anglo, Latin Europe, Nordic Europe, Germanic speaking Europe, Dutch speaking Europe, Eastern Europe, Latin America, Arab cultures, Southern Asian cultures, and Confucian cultures (Gupta & Hanges, 2004).

One of the benefits of utilizing the culture cluster approach (rather than simply examining individual cultures) is that effective traits or enacted behaviors are more likely effective within a cluster. That is, a leader that is effective in China, for example, is also likely to be effective in South Korea (Gupta & Hanges, 2004). Practically speaking, the culture cluster approach can potentially be efficient and cost-effective when a multinational company is expanding business across multiple regions within one culture cluster, such that a global leader can be selected or trained to be effective in working in a broader geographic area that shares core cultural values, rather than attempting to prepare leaders for teams from all possible cultural backgrounds.

The approach of cultural contingencies also applies when examining global leadership in the team context. In other words, the magnitude (or even direction) of the relationship between leadership and team effectiveness can depend on the cultural context. For instance, Dorfman and Howell (1988) found that the positive association between charismatic leadership and employee satisfaction was stronger

Table 9.1 GLOBE cultural dimensions (House et al., 1999, p. 25)

Cultural dimension	Definition
Performance orientation	The extent to which an organization or society encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence.
Future orientation	The degree to which individuals in organizations or societies engage in future-oriented behaviors such as planning, investing in the future, and delaying gratification.
Assertiveness	The degree to which individuals in organizations or societies are assertive, confrontational, and aggressive in social relationships.
Institutional collectivism	The degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action.
In-group collectivism	The degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations or families
Power distance	The degree to which members of an organization or society expect and agree that power should be unequally shared
Humane orientation	The degree to which individuals in organizations or societies encourage and reward individuals for being fair, altruistic, friendly, generous, caring, and kind to others
Uncertainty avoidance	The extent to which members of an organization or society strive to avoid uncertainty by reliance on social norms, rituals, and bureaucratic practices to alleviate the unpredictability of future events

in the United States than in Mexico. In a similar pattern, the impact of contingent reward on job satisfaction and supervisor satisfaction was greater among American employees compared to their Mexican counterparts.

Dickson et al. (2009) argued that the best strategy to study culturally contingent leadership is to rely on cultural dimensions, focusing particularly on the alignment (or misalignment) between leader characteristics and cultural-specific values. Using Hofstede's cultural dimensions, Taras, Kirkman, and Steel (2010) provided meta-analytic evidence that culture significantly impacts how leadership styles are perceived. Research focusing on specific dimensions has suggested that the impact of transformational leadership can be magnified in collectivistic cultures given that members of such cultures tend to identify with their leader's goal and a shared vision, and are more motivated with a collective interest (Jung, Bass, & Sosik, 1995). In contrast, transactional leadership may be more effective in individualistic cultures due to a stronger motivation to seek individual achievement and reward (Jung & Avolio, 1999). Confirming this argument, Walumbwa and Lawler (2003) found that the effect of transformational leadership on team members' job satisfaction and turnover intentions was strengthened by collectivism.

Regarding power distance, Dorfman et al. (1997) argued that the differential relationships between leadership styles and outcomes can be attributed to the cultural differences in power distance, such that directive leadership had a positive impact on team members' satisfaction and commitment in countries endorsing a high power distance (e.g., Taiwan and Mexico), whereas the same patterns of relationships were shown for participative leadership in countries endorsing a low power distance (e.g., the U.S. and South Korea). Differential impact of leadership

styles was also shown when performance outcome was used as the criterion, such that supportive and directive leadership were effective in Mexico whereas participative leadership was effective in the U.S. In a similar pattern, Newman and Nollen (1996) found that participative leadership positively predicts unit performance only in cultures with a low power distance. Using the FRLT leadership taxonomy, Elenkov and Manev (2005) demonstrated that idealized influence, individualized consideration, and management by exception (passive) were more closely associated with the influence of top management on organizational innovation in cultures with lower power distance.

Uncertainty avoidance, a dimension in both Hofstede's and Project GLOBE taxonomies of cultural dimensions, has also been shown to moderate the extent to which leader behaviors exert an impact in cross-cultural teams. Elenkov and Manev (2005) demonstrated that while relationships between certain leadership characteristics (i.e., individualized consideration, contingent reward leadership, and active management by exception) and their influence on organizational innovation were strengthened in higher uncertainty avoidance cultures, the impact of leadership characterized by inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation was less associated with organizational innovation in cultures with high uncertainty avoidance. The Project GLOBE study also showed that leader attributes such as cautious, formal, and orderly were better perceived in high versus low uncertainty avoidance cultures (Den Hartog et al., 1999; Dorfman, Hanges, & Brodbeck, 2004a, 2004b), suggesting that leadership characterized by these attributes may have differential impact based on how much uncertainty is endorsed in the culture.

To conclude the discussion on cultural contingencies, recent development in leadership research has equipped us with new perspectives to understand leadership in global teams. Although empirical research is still quite limited, preliminary evidence has suggested that people in different cultures vary in how they perceive and endorse different leadership styles. Therefore, we argue that a contingency framework should be incorporated to assist in aligning leadership behavior and styles with the host cultural context.

We believe that utilizing this framework has a great deal of utility for practicing leadership in a global context given the depth of information that is provided by this approach. That is, quantifying cultural dimensions allows for the measurement of the context in which a leader operates. By explicitly considering this context a leader can better plan their development by comparing their fit with the culture in which they will operate, thereby identifying critical areas of fit (or misfit) that should be the focus of developmental initiatives prior to departure and in-country. Additionally, this approach provides concrete guidance as to which particular traits and behaviors are likely to be effective based on the culture, allowing a leader to minimize culturally dissonant behavior and to maximize the potential for effectively leading teams.

Best practices. There are several best practices that emerge from the literature relating to cultural universals and contingencies, including the domain of cultural dimensions.

1. Highlight cultural differences, but do not be bound by them. Cultural values, expectations, and norms are typically not salient to the people holding them, until

they encounter people with different cultural values, expectations, and norms (House et al., 2004). Successful global team leaders will be knowledgeable about cultural differences in such things as communications style (e.g., explicit or implicit), what is considered respectful (e.g., public disagreement with others' ideas), and how tolerant or comfortable people are with ambiguity and uncertainty (e.g., the level of detail of a project plan). These differences can and should be highlighted and discussed within the team, with the recognition that the global team process will at times require each member to step outside of his/her comfort zone in order for the team to work together most successfully. This recognizes that each team member is more than his/her culture—that the team is not limited by the cultural differences of the team members.

2. Avoid assumptions, even when they seem evident. Related to the point above, it is important that the global team leader model a behavior of checking in with team members when unexpected events or responses occur. Even in global teams with experienced members, cultural habits and language differences can lead to responses that are not what other team members expect, which can then be misinterpreted. Inadvertent use of phrases with different meanings in different cultures can lead to confusion (e.g., "to lay something on the table" means to put it on hold in the US, but to raise it for immediate action in the UK). Differences in cultural sensitivities can similarly yield misunderstandings (e.g., in more individualistic cultures, attributing group characteristics to individuals based on their race, ethnicity, or nationality may be offensive, while it can be a more common practice in more collectivistic cultures). Thus, the global team leader who emphasizes and models the importance of checking in with team members when unexpected events or responses occur ("I was surprised when you said "X"—can you help me understand your thought process?") has a greater chance of success than one who assumes that he/she understands the origins of the unexpected events or responses ("Johan is afraid of making mistakes").

3. Identify specific points of likely discomfort and address them. Global teams are almost by definition uncertain situations. People who often have not worked together before, who may have come together as a global team because their respective companies were at some point acquired by a global organization, and who have different experiences of the most effective work processes are asked to work together successfully. While people from some cultures generally have less difficulty with uncertainty, some cultures are in general less tolerant of or comfortable with ambiguity and uncertainty. This is one predictable point of discomfort that can occur within a global team and taking steps to recognize it and treat it not as a barrier but as a team strength (i.e., by having some team members who embrace ambiguity and some who prefer more certainty, the team avoids either extreme) will help the global team leader to succeed.

4. After focusing on cultural differences, move beyond them. Though our cultural backgrounds are a part of us, all of us are more than our cultural backgrounds. Promoting personal interactions and connections among team members will help the team to move beyond the cultural expectations of each other, into personal relationships. Govindarajan and Gupta (2001) note that inability to cultivate trust

among team members is a common predictor of global team failure, and those factors that promote individual relationships among team members serve to cultivate trust. Thus, intrateam communication about nonwork issues (i.e., the equivalent of "water-cooler conversation") can be quite important for the team, helping the team to move beyond culture toward interpersonal relationships (Tann, 2013).

Conclusion

This chapter is by no means an exhaustive summary of either the global leadership or global teams literature. Rather, it is an overview of two different approaches to studying leadership in a multinational context that integrates the literature around global teams. In doing so, it provides practical implications for leading multinational teams within each approach. Leadership competency models and styles, and the extant related literature on global teams, provide the foundation of the global leadership approach. The search for universals and contingencies, in turn, set the stage for our discussion of global teams leadership within the cross-cultural research domain. We recognize that there are overlaps between these approaches. Given these, we conclude with an integrated list of best practices that have emerged from both literatures (see Table 9.2).

Table 9.2 Best practices for leading global teams

Best practice	Suggestions for implementation
1. Utilize global leadership competency assessment as a developmental tool, not for appraisal or selection.	• Make developmental use of the many tools available related to global leadership competencies, but remember that there is a lack of strong validity evidence to justify their use in selection/promotion settings
2. Highlight the competencies considered to be important, and why	• Model the competencies desired, both to members of global teams, and to leaders of global teams
	• Recognize that not all global team members will be attuned to subtleties or implicit communication, and so spend time explicitly addressing the dynamic competencies shown to affect global team effectiveness, and help team members find ways to develop those competencies
3. Communicate constantly	• Focus on demonstrating and developing communication competence. Global team members who are geographically dispersed need more communication than may be typical for other teams—even other virtual teams. Cultural misunderstandings or variations in norms have the possibility of driving a team off-track, and so regular, frequent communication can help keep the culturally diverse team members' efforts aligned
	• Promote, model, and allow communication within the team that is not task related. Allow the team to develop personal relationships that transcend their geographic and cultural distance

(continued)

Table 9.2 (continued)

Best practice	Suggestions for implementation
4. Be open to the ideas of the team	• By definition, global team members likely have different understandings of how best to approach a task. Effective global team leaders will seek the input of their team members, especially when the situation is culturally located (i.e., requires knowledge of specific cultural preferences or norms)
	• Work to move beyond the comfortable expectation that "the way I've done it has always worked well, and so must be the best way"
5. Highlight cultural differences, but do not be bound by them	• Remember that cultural differences do help explain preferences in leadership styles in general, but not for every person, and not in every industry (House et al., 2004). There are a tremendous number of factors that come into play in global team interactions, including personality, career experience, time zone differences (is it morning or late evening where this team member is right now?), and many others
	• At times, being less rigid to accommodate cultural differences may be merited. But giving
6. Avoid assumptions, even when they seem evident	• Cultivate the process of pausing before responding to unexpected responses or behaviors. Use the pause to question why the team member might have responded differently than expected, rather than assuming what the team member's intentions were
	• Cultivate and model reflexing listening
	• Test conclusions about behaviors, and be conscious of the attributions and assumptions that team members of different cultural backgrounds may make about your own behavior
7. Identify specific points of likely discomfort, and address them	• As in any project, effective global team leaders identify potential pitfalls and points of misunderstanding or conflict that could derail a team. Cultural values operate below the level of consciousness, and potential differences in cultural values (e.g., related to time and deadlines, the role of women in the team, the degree of detail desirable in planning, etc.) can derail a team's trust and effectiveness. Identifying those potential points of differentiation, and bringing them into salience, can help the team recognize cultural differences when they emerge, rather than making erroneous attributions for their colleagues' behaviors
8. After focusing on cultural differences, move beyond them	• Treating team members as individuals is a key element of effective leadership styles. While means on cultural values represent common values held by members of different cultures, there is always substantial variation around those means. Global team leader knowledge of cultural differences can be especially useful at the start of a team's relationship, but knowledge of each team member's style, values, and performances standards can subsequently become more important

References

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 261–295.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1991). *The full range leadership development programs: Basic and advanced manuals*. Binghamton, NY: Bass, Avolio & Associates.

Barling, J., Weber, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Effects of transformational leadership training on attitudinal and financial outcomes: A field experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 827–832.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 52*, 130–139.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership: A response to critiques. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 49–80). New York: Academic.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bhagat, R. S., & Steers, R. M. (2009). *Culture, organizations and work*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

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

Bird, A., & Stevens, M. J. (2012). Assessing global leadership competencies. In M. E. Mendenhall et al. (Eds.), *Global leadership: Research, development, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 113–140). New York: Routledge.

Bolden, R., & Gosling, J. (2006). Leadership competencies: Time to change the tune? *Leadership, 2*, 147–163.

Bolden, R., Gosling, J., Marturano, A., & Dennison, P. (2003). *A review of leadership theory and competency frameworks*. Exeter: Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter.

Boyd, J. T., Jr. (1988). *Leadership extraordinary: A cross national military perspective on transactional versus transformational leadership*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova University.

Buckingham, M. (2001). Don't waste time and money. *Gallup Management Journal, 3*, December. Retrieved from http://gmj.gallup.com/content/default/asp?ci=259&pg=1

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

Carroll, B., Levy, L., & Richmond, D. (2008). Leadership as practice: Challenging the competency paradigm. *Leadership, 4*, 363–379.

Carte, T. A., Chidambaram, L., & Becker, A. (2006). Emergent leadership in self-managed virtual teams. *Group Decision and Negotiation, 15*, 323–343.

Conger, J. (2005, June). *360 and Competency Frameworks: Are we in the Land of Oz*? (Vol. 22). Presentation to the Corporate Research Forum, London.

Conger, J. A., & Ready, D. A. (2004). Rethinking leadership competencies. *Leader to Leader, 2004*, 41–47.

Cummings, J. N. (2007). Leading group from a distance: How to mitigate consequences of geographic dispersion. In S. Weisband & L. Atwater (Eds.), *Leadership at a distance: Research in technologically supported work* (pp. 33–50). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Davis, D. D., & Bryant, J. L. (2003). Influence at a distance: Leadership in global virtual teams. *Advances in Global Leadership, 3*, 303–340.

Davis, D. D., Guan, P. L., Luo, J. J., & Maahs, C. J. (1996). *Need for continuous improvement, organizational citizenship, transformational leadership and service climate in a Chinese enterprise*. Unpublished manuscript. Presented at the meeting of the International Congress of Applied Psychology, Jerusalem.

Day, D. V., & Antonakis, J. (2012). Leadership: Past, present, and future. *The Nature of Leadership, 3*, 25.

Demailly, C., & Rabotin, M. (2006, September). Being a successful global team leader. EuropeanPWN. Retrieved January 15, 2014, from http://www.europeanpwn.net/index.php?article_id=136

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

Devine, D. J., & Philips, J. L. (2001). Do smarter teams do better? A meta-analysis of cognitive ability and team performance. *Small Group Research, 32*, 507–532.

Dickson, M. W., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2005). What good is this to me? Managerial implications of global leadership research. In R. R. Sims & S. J. Quatro (Eds.), *Leadership: Succeeding in the private, public, and non-for-profit sectors* (pp. 348–366). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Dickson, M. W., Den Hartog, D. N., & Castaño, N. (2009). Understanding leadership across cultures. In R. S. Bhagat & R. M. Steers (Eds.), *Culture, organizations, and work* (pp. 219–244). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dickson, M. W., Den Hartog, D. N., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2003). Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 729–768.

Dorfman, P. W., Hanges, P. J., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2004a). Leadership and cultural variation. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies* (pp. 669–719). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorfman, P., Hanges, P., & Brodbeck, F. (2004b). Leadership and culture variation: The identification of culturally endorsed leadership profiles. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies* (pp. 669–719). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. (1988). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited. *Advances in International Comparative Management, 3*, 127–150.

Dorfman, P. W., Howell, J. P., Hibino, S., Lee, J. K., Tate, U., & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8*, 233–274.

Dulewicz, S. V., & Higgs, M. J. (2004). Design of a new instrument to assess leadership dimensions and styles. *Selection and Development Review, 20*, 7–12.

Earley, P. C. (1999). Playing follow the leader: Status-determining traits in relation to collective efficacy across cultures. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 80*, 192–212.

Earley, P. C., & Gibson, C. B. (2002). *Multinational work teams: A new perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.

Elenkov, D. S., & Manev, I. M. (2005). Top management leadership and influence on innovation: The role of sociocultural context. *Journal of Management, 31*, 381–402.

Erez, M., & Somech, A. (1996). Is group productivity loss the rule or the exception? Effects of culture and group-based motivation. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*, 1513–1537.

Freidman, T. (1999). *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.

Freidman, T. (2005). *The world is flat*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Furuya, N., Stevens, M. J., 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.

Gardner, W. L., Lowe, K. B., Moss, T. W., Mahoney, K. T., & Cogliser, C. C. (2010). Scholarly leadership of the study of leadership: A review of The Leadership Quarterly's second decade, 2000–2009. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*, 922–958.

Gibson, C. B. (1999). Do they do what they believe they can? Group efficacy and group effectiveness across tasks and cultures. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*, 138–152.

Gibson, C. B., & Zellmer-Bruhn, M. E. (2001). Metaphors and meaning: An intercultural analysis of the concept of teamwork. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 46*, 274–303.

Goffee, R., & Jones, G. (2000). Why should anyone be led by you? *Harvard Business Review, 78*, 62–70.

Govindarajan, V., & Gupta, A. K. (2001, July 15). Building an effective global business team. MIT Sloan Management Review. Retrieved January 15, 2014, from http://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/building-an-effective-global-business-team/

Graen, G. B., Hui, C., Wakabayashi, M., & Wang, Z. M. (1997). *Cross-cultural research alliances in organizational research: Cross-cultural partnership making in action. Cross-cultural research in industrial organizational psychology* (pp. 160–189). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Groves, K. S., & Feyerherm, A. E. (2011). Leader cultural intelligence in context testing the moderating effects of team cultural diversity on leader and team performance. *Group & Organization Management, 36*, 535–566.

Gupta, A., & Govindarajan, V. (2002). Cultivating a global mindset. *Academy of Management Executive, 16*, 116–126.

Gupta, V., & Hanges, P. J. (2004). Regional and climate clustering of societal cultures. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 societies* (pp. 669–719). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guzzo, R. A., & Dickson, M. W. (1996). Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance and effectiveness. *Annual Review of Psychology, 47*, 307–338.

Hajro, A., & Pudelko, M. (2010). An analysis of core-competences of successful multinational team leaders. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 10*, 175–194.

Hampden-Turner, C., & Trompenaars, F. (1997). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hanges, P. J., & Dickson, M. W. (2006). Agitation over aggregation: Clarifying the development of and the nature of the GLOBE scales. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 522–536.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American psychologist, 55*(7), 709.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., et al. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. *Advances in Global Leadership, 1*, 171–233.

Jacobs, D., & Singell, L. (1993). Leadership and organizational performance: Isolating links between managers and collective success. *Social Science Research, 22*, 165–189.

Jarvenpaa, S., & Leidner, D. (1999). Communication and trust in global virtual teams. *Organization Science, 10*, 791–815.

Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., De Luque, M. S., & House, R. J. (2006). In the eye of the beholder: Cross cultural lessons in leadership from Project GLOBE. *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 20*, 67–90.

Javidan, M., Steers, R. M., & Hitt, M. A. (Eds.). (2007). *The global mindset*. Oxford, England: Elsevier Jai.

Javidan, M., Teagarden, M., & Bowen, D. (2010). Making it overseas. *Harvard Business Review, 88*, 109–113.

Joshi, A., Lazarova, M. B., & Liao, H. (2009). Getting everyone on board: The role of inspirational leadership in geographically dispersed teams. *Organization Science, 20*, 240–252.

Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 755–767.

Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (1999). Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*, 208–218.

Jung, D. I., Bass, B. M., & Sosik, J. J. (1995). Bridging leadership and culture: A theoretical consideration of transformational leadership and collectivistic cultures. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 2*, 3–18.

Kashima, Y., Kashima, E., Chiu, C., Farsides, T., Gelfand, M., Hong, Y., et al. (2005). Culture, essentialism, and agency: Are individuals universally believed to be more real entities than groups? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 35*, 147–169.

Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The discipline of teams*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.

Kearney, E., & Gebert, D. (2009). Managing diversity and enhancing team outcomes: The promise of transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*, 77.

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*, 744–764.

Kirkman, B. L., Rosen, B., Tesluk, P. E., & Gibson, C. B. (2004). The impact of team empowerment on virtual team performance: The moderating role of face-to-face interaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 47*, 175–192.

Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (1997). The impact of cultural values on employee resistance to teams: Toward a model of globalized self-managing work team effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review, 22*, 730–757.

Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2001). The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*, 557–569.

Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Bell, B. S. (2003). Work groups and teams in organizations. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology (Vol. 12): Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 333–375). Wiley-Blackwell: New York.

Krause, D. G. (1997). *The way of the leader*. New York: Berkley Publishing Group.

Locke, E. A. (1999). *The essence of leadership: The four keys to leading successfully*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Lonner, W. J. (1980). The search for psychological universals. *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1*, 143–204.

Lopez, P., & Ensari, N. (2013). Fostering multiculturally and internationally competent individuals and teams. In R. L. Lowman (Ed.), *Internationalizing multiculturalism: Expanding professional competencies in a globalized world* (pp. 173–198). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Lowe, K. B., & Gardner, W. L. (2000). Ten years of The Leadership Quarterly: Contributions and challenges for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly, 11*, 459.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly, 7*, 385–425.

Malhotra, A., Majchrzak, A., & Rosen, B. (2007). Leading virtual teams. *The Academy of Management Perspectives, 21*, 60–70.

Man, D. C., & Lam, S. K. (2003). The effects of job complexity and autonomy on cohesiveness in collectivistic and individualistic work groups: A cross-cultural analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24*, 979–1001.

Martin, G. S., Keating, M. A., Resick, C. J., Szabo, E., Kwan, H., & Peng, C. (2013). The meaning of leader integrity: A comparative study across Anglo, Asian, and Germanic cultures. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*(3), 445–461.

Mathieu, J., Maynard, M. T., Rapp, T., & Gilson, L. (2008). Team effectiveness 1997-2007: A review of recent advancements and a glimpse into the future. *Journal of Management, 34*, 410–476.

Mathieu, J. E., & Schulze, W. (2006). The influence of team knowledge and formal plans on episodic team process-performance relationships. *Academy of Management Journal, 49*, 605–619.

Matveev, A. V., & Nelson, P. E. (2004). Cross cultural communication competence and multicultural team performance perceptions of American and Russian managers. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 4*, 253–270.

Maznevski, M. L., & Chui, C. (2012). Leading global teams. In M. E. Mendenhall et al. (Eds.), *Global leadership: Research, development, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 141–162). New York: Routledge.

Mendenhall, M. E. (2006). The elusive, yet critical challenge of developing global leaders. *European Management Journal, 24*, 422–429.

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

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

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

Milliken, F. J., & Martins, L. L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 402–433.

Morris, M. W., Menon, T., & Ames, D. R. (2001). Culturally conferred conceptions of agency: A key to social perception of persons, groups, and other actors. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 5*, 169–182.

Newman, K. L., & Nollen, S. D. (1996). Culture and congruence: The fit between management practices and national culture. *Journal of International Business Studies, 27*, 753–779.

Nummela, N., Saarenketo, S., & Puumalainen, K. (2004). A global mindset—A prerequisite for successful internationalization? *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 21*, 51–64.

Osland, J. S., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., & Osland, A. (2006). Developing global leadership capabilities and global mindset: A review. In G. K. Stahl & I. Björkman (Eds.), *Handbook of research in international human resource management* (pp. 197–222). Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.

Osland, J. S., Taylor, S., & Mendenhall, M. E. (2009). Global leadership: Progress and challenges. In R. S. Bhagat & R. M. Steers (Eds.), *Culture, organizations, and work* (pp. 245–271). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Peterson, M. F., & Hunt, J. G. J. (1997). International perspectives on international leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8*, 203–231.

Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. (2000). *The knowing–doing gap: How smart companies turn knowledge into action*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management, 22*, 259–298.

Resick, C. J., Martin, G. S., Keating, M. A., Dickson, M. W., Kwan, H., & Peng, C. (2011). What ethical leadership means to me: Asian, American, and European perspectives. *Journal of Business Ethics, 101*(3), 435–457.

Rupp, D. E., Snyder, L. A., Gibbons, A., & Thornton, G. (2006). What should developmental assessment centers be developing? *The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 9*(2), 75–98.

Salaman, G. (2004). Competences of managers, competences of leaders. In J. Storey (Ed.), *Leadership in organizations: Current issues and key trends* (pp. 58–78). London: Routledge.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 437–453.

Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology, 48*, 23–47.

Schwartz, S. H. (2006). A theory of cultural value orientations: Explication and applications. *Comparative Sociology, 5*(2–3), 137–182.

Stanko, T. L., & Gibson, C. B. (2009). Virtuality here and now: The role of cultural elements in virtual teams. In R. S. Bhagat & R. M. Steers (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of culture, organization, and work* (pp. 272–304). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

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

Steyrer, J., & Mende, M. (1994, July). *Transformational leadership: The local market success of Austrian branch bank managers and training applications.* Paper presented at the meeting of the International Congress of Applied Psychology, Madrid, Spain.

Takala, T. (1998). Plato on leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics, 17*, 785–798.

Tann, R. (2013, February 25). Leading a global team: 4 Secrets from the ultimate virtual manager. The muse. Retrieved December 20, 2013, from https://www.themuse.com/advice/leading-a-global-team-4-secrets-from-the-ultimate-virtual-manager

Taras, V., Kirkman, B. L., & Steel, P. (2010). Examining the impact of culture's consequences: A three-decade, multilevel, meta-analytic review of Hofstede's cultural value dimensions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 405–439.

Thunderbird. (2008). *Global mindset inventory*. Phoenix, AZ: Garvin School of Business.

Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business*. Avon: The Bath Press.

Van Knippenberg, D., & Schippers, M. C. (2007). Work group diversity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 515–541.

Waldman, D., Bass, B. M., & Einstein, W. O. (1986). *Effort, performance and transformational leadership in industrial and military settings* (Working Paper 84-78). Binghamton: State University of New York.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management, 34*, 89–126.

Walumbwa, F. O., & Lawler, J. J. (2003). Building effective organizations: Transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related attitudes and withdrawal behaviours in three emerging economies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 14*, 1083–1101.

Walumbwa, F. O., Lawler, J. J., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). Leadership, individual differences, and work-related attitudes: A cross-culture investigation. *Applied Psychology, 56*, 212–230.

Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Transformational leadership and multiple levels of analysis. *Human Relations, 43*, 975–995.

Yokochi, N. (1989). *Leadership styles of Japanese business executives and managers: Transformational and transactional.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, United States International University, San Diego, CA.

Yukl, G. A. (2012). *Leadership in organizations*. 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.