FOCAL ARTICLE

Global Leadership: A Developmental Shift for Everyone

KATHERINE HOLT
Peakinsight LLC

KYOKO SEKI
Deep Harmony Co. Ltd.

Abstract

Global leaders operate in a context of multicultural, paradoxical complexity in the world—a context that most leaders find themselves facing today. We argue that 4 developmental shifts are required to be effective in this context: developing multicultural effectiveness, becoming adept at managing paradoxes, cultivating the ''being'' dimension of human experience, and appreciating individual uniqueness in the context of cultural differences. Challenges for industrial–organizational (I–O) psychology are identified in each area. The article concludes by inviting I–O psychologists to integrate competing frameworks, explore related disciplines, revamp leadership competency models, create new tools and frameworks for developing global leaders, and step up to become global leaders ourselves.

There is little doubt that leaders are working in an increasingly global context characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (Johansen, 2009; Kelly, 2006; Richard, 1997). Population growth, changes in the balance of gross domestic product (GDP), and rapid urbanization in Asia and Africa are transforming global opportunities and risks (Gundling, Hogan, & Cvitkovich, 2011). The ''flattening'' of the world through technology and commoditization has created an unprecedented level playing field for business that is in constant flux (Friedman, 2007). Few corporations or organizations are exempt from these interconnected forces, which have disrupted business-as-usual and challenged conventional Western leadership practices.

This new context has naturally encouraged scholars and practitioners to begin examining *global leadership*: What does global leadership entail and what does it take to be an effective global leader? Numerous research studies on global leadership have been published—ranging from *What is Global Leadership?* based on interviews conducted with 70 high-potential global leaders in 14 companies (Gundling et al., 2011) to the epic ''Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior

Effectiveness'' (GLOBE) study, where over 170 collaborators collected data from 17,300 middle managers in 951 organizations from three industries across 62 societies to investigate the contextual relationship between culture and leadership behavior (Chhokar, Brodbeck, & House, 2007; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004).

William Mobley's six-volume *Advances in Global Leadership* series (e.g., Mobley, Li, & Wang, 2011) offers a wealth of material about how global leadership is practiced in different country contexts such as China, Europe, and other parts of the world, as well as in different operational contexts, such as cross-border mergers, joint ventures, and strategic alliances. Practitioners and academics regularly exchange knowledge about global leadership through a variety of forums, including the Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication and the International Leadership Association. Numerous tools have been developed to assess various aspects of global leadership, such as *Cultural Intelligence* (Van Dyne, Ang, & Koh, 2008), the *Global Competencies Inventory* (Bird, Mendenhall, Stevens, & Oddou, 2010), and the *Global Mindset Inventory* (Javidan & Teagarden, 2011). Multiple edited textbooks have been produced as well (e.g., Lane, Maznevski, Mendenhall, & McNett, 2004; Mendenhall, Osland, Bird, Oddou, & Maznevski, 2008). Prescriptions for global leadership abound.

As practitioners who have worked extensively in a global context, we find that the sheer volume of global leadership literature can easily be intimidating, especially to people working in English as their second language. The literature is thought-provoking but often fragmented and generated primarily from a Western perspective. We are particularly disturbed by the tendency of U.S.-based practitioners and consultants to perpetuate old models that ignore culture context.

The GLOBE study is noteworthy in its scope, but the two volumes are imposing and many practitioners are unaware of their existence. Although the chapters in the Mobley series make fascinating reading, they illustrate the fragmented nature of industrial–organizational (I–O) research. The intercultural communication field has produced a completely separate literature over the past 30 years, where the Western perspective is prominent in addressing topics such as expatriation, negotiation, and diverse teams. People in that field debate culture-specific versus culture-general dimensions and are divided between viewing intercultural sensitivity as a developmental process versus a set of knowledges, skills, and personality attributes. Although I–O researchers and practitioners have also written about global leadership skills and personality, many competency models fail to acknowledge the complex, contextual nature of leadership either explicitly or implicitly.

In this focal article, we link some of the fragmented literature and bring our Western and Eastern perspectives to the topic. Most importantly, we will argue that most leaders today can be considered global leaders and that the transition from being an effective leader in a single-culture context to being an effective global leader requires more than adding a new competency or two. Rather, the transition will require several major developmental shifts for leaders: (a) developing multicultural effectiveness (MCE), (b) becoming adept at managing paradoxes associated with global work, (c) cultivating the ''being'' dimension of human experience, and (d) appreciating individual uniqueness in the context of cultural differences. Understanding these shifts and helping leaders make them will likely be a challenge for I–O psychologists because it will require integration across independently generated frameworks, forging connections with other disciplines, revamping our approaches for understanding and measuring competencies, and becoming global leaders ourselves.

We begin by defining global leadership. We then describe the four developmental shifts noted above and identify challenges for I–O psychology associated with each one. We end by offering our view of what

I–O psychologists should do to deal with these challenges. The points made here are informed by the literature and by our own experiences of developing global leaders over the past 2 decades. We also garnered insights from more than 250 individuals whom we interviewed or surveyed in connection with this article, including 40% living in Asia.

Defining Global Leadership

Global leaders and experts in this field lack a shared understanding of what is meant by ''global leadership'' despite many books and articles on this topic (e.g., Bird et al., 2010; Black, Morrison, & Gregersen, 1999; Dalton, Ernst, Deal, & Leslie, 2002; McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002; Mendenhall et al., 2008). Some write about what it takes to become a global leader, some present global leadership as a set of skills, and others talk about leadership and management as roles that some global leaders play. Others focus on ''global mindset'' instead (e.g., Beechler & Javidan, 2007; Javidan & Teagarden, 2011; Levy, Beechler, Taylor, & Boyacigiller, 2007). David Campbell (2006) argues that globalization is not a new phenomenon and the basic principles of leadership are universal and timeless. We agree. We also see continuing debate over the construct of leadership itself (e.g., Kilburg & Donohue, 2011).

Not only is there a lack of clarity about the definition, but few have focused on what it means to be a truly effective global leader. After conducting an extensive review of the literature, Joyce Osland concluded that effectiveness and selection criteria have received little attention (Osland, 2008a, 2008b). Researchers typically allow subjects to nominate themselves as global leaders without providing any parameters. Many researchers and consulting firms have mapped the content domain and developed competency models after interviewing a small sample of supposed experts rather than collecting any quantitative data. As a result, competing frameworks (e.g., literacies, competencies, capital) and proprietary terminology abound. The plethora of models based on different opinions reminds us of the chaos in the personality trait literature before the Big Five were established. The absence of criterion research coupled with the question of ''What are the Big Five for global leadership?'' cry out for I–O attention.

Although there is no convergence, some definitions do exist. Maxine Dalton and her colleagues talk about a global manager as ''one who manages across distance, countries, and cultures … in a globally complex environment'' (Dalton et al., 2002, p. 4). McCall and Hollenbeck (2002) define global executives as ''those who do global work,'' where that work reflects business and cultural complexity derived from the commercial scale and scope plus crossing cultural borders. Mark Mendenhall and his colleagues define global leaders as:

> individuals who effect significant positive change in organizations by building communities through the development of trust and the arrangement of organizational structures and processes in a context involving multiple cross-boundary stakeholders, multiple sources of external cross-boundary authority, and multiple cultures under conditions of temporal, geographical and cultural complexity (Mendenhall et al., 2008, p. 17).

We believe a huge shift is underway that will ultimately define all leaders as global leaders. This shift is blurring the distinction between leadership and global leadership due to the global complexity of the business and cultural context where leaders operate. Over the past 3 decades, we have seen leadership assessment frameworks evolve from managerial skills models that did not mention any global or cross-cultural skills to more comprehensive leadership competency models that include a global competency or two. Sometime ago Stewart Black et al., (1999) pointed out that ''the New World of global business requires that all leaders be explorers!'' (p. 10).

Global leadership is no longer simply the domain of a small number of expatriates working abroad or an elite cadre of senior executives responsible for multicountry operations. Such people are still global leaders, but so are local leaders in BRIC (i.e., Brazil–Russia–India–China) countries who employ people from neighboring countries and manage product lines for global customers. The same goes for people working in various capacities to achieve results throughout global supply chains, as well as professionals interacting with stakeholders across borders and time zones. For example, the "global leader" label can be applied to HR professionals in all functions and geographies, not just people responsible for recruiting and developing talent for global roles or those with formal leadership titles reporting into "international" divisions.

A shared mindset about global leadership is essential in shaping expectations as well as organizational culture. If senior executives responsible for running multicountry operations are the only ones viewed as "global leaders," other people may not realize that this label applies to them as well and may miss opportunities to engage in day-to-day global leadership thinking and behavior. And if people do not view key aspects of global leadership (e.g., MCE or navigating complexity) as part of their role, they may abdicate that responsibility to others.

For the purpose of this article, we will define a global leader as "anyone who operates in a context of multicultural, paradoxical complexity to achieve results in our world"—where everyone is entitled to use global leadership skills. This situation is already a reality in some companies, where all employees are expected to practice global leadership as they interface with customers and coworkers around the world. Thus global leadership is not hierarchical per se, because anyone can be a global leader. Shared global leadership may become the norm if people everywhere begin stepping forward "to co-create the leadership that the world most needs and deserves" (Adler, 2011).

Developing MCE

People in many fields have studied MCE, but we are like blind people groping different parts of the elephant to understand what it looks like. We study the elephant through the lenses of our own disciplines and then use our own languages to construct models that capture what it looks like in those moments. Collectively we have taken thousands of snapshots of the cultural elephant—and posted them on the Internet—where it has become challenging to see the whole picture or the forest for the trees (also known as "ki wo mite mori wo mizu" in Japanese).

Different branches of psychology have studied the relationship between culture and human experience under various labels including cultural, cross-cultural, intercultural, multicultural, and transcultural psychology, and others have studied similar phenomena under the rubric of diversity. To some, multiculturalism is simply a phenomenon to be studied. Others view multiculturalism as a sociopolitical framework or moral position. Paul Pedersen (1999) proposed that multiculturism could become the fourth force of psychology (after behaviorism, psychoanalysis, and humanism) where its potential complementarity could give additional meaning to the other three as well as enhance "the meaningfulness of psychotherapy by providing a context in which to accurately assess, understand, and recommend change" (p. 194). We define the multicultural paradigm quite broadly to include nationality, ethnicity, gender, age, and other sources of social identity, although we mainly focus on the challenges of crossing national boundaries in this article.

Cultures and cultural phenomena have been studied by linguists, anthropologists, sociologists, and management scholars as well as psychologists. However, the intercultural field became centered in the discipline of communication, which views intercultural effectiveness as the ability to communicate effectively across cultures and contexts. After "intercultural

communication'' was introduced in the U.S. Foreign Service during the early 1950s, that field was launched with the publication of *The Silent Language* by Edward Hall (1959). Early intercultural researchers defined ''culture'' narrowly, mostly in terms of ethnicity or nationality, whereas early cross-cultural trainers focused on helping middle-class professionals in the U.S. become successful overseas (Martin & Nakayama, 2010).

Numerous attempts have been made to define the construct of intercultural effectiveness over the past 50 years. In one effort, 24 competencies were rated and then factor analyzed to produce three dimensions: (a) the ability to deal with psychological stress, (b) the ability to communicate effectively, and (c) the ability to establish interpersonal relationships (Hammer, Gudykunst & Wiseman, 1978). In testing another model on 74 business people in China, Geng Cui and colleagues found that cross-cultural adjustment emphasizes personality traits, whereas overseas job performance requires interpersonal skills (Cui & Awa, 1992; Cui & Van Den Berg, 1991). Darla Deardorff (2006) led a project to identify elements for assessing students' intercultural competence. A total of 24 U.S. postsecondary institutions and 23 top national and international intercultural scholars participated. The top three intercultural competence elements based on scholars' ratings were (a) ability to communicate effectively and appropriately in intercultural situations based on one's intercultural knowledge, skills, and attitudes; (b) ability to shift frame of reference appropriately and adapt behavior to cultural context; and (c) ability to identify behaviors guided by culture and engage in new behaviors in other cultures even when behaviors are unfamiliar given a person's own socialization. This study was noteworthy in its ability to gain consensus, and the resulting elements could provide a starting place for future collaboration.

Another type of intercultural model has focused on developmental stages rather than competencies. Milton Bennett (1993, 2011) focused on both ''differences'' and ''development'' in creating the *Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)* in the 1980s. That led to creating the *Intercultural Development Inventory*® *(IDI)* with Mitch Hammer in 1998 (Hammer, 2011; Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). The *IDI*® assesses someone's current developmental state against the DMIS stages: denial of difference, defense against difference, minimization of difference, acceptance of difference, adaptation to difference, and integration of difference. The developmental capability to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to cultural context is conceptualized in these successive stage models very differently from traditional competency-based models of intercultural effectiveness.

Challenges

We appreciate all the models and approaches, including all the research done in different languages that we cannot access. However, it has become difficult to grasp what lies at the core of MCE. Some people view ''multicultural'' as the study of cultural differences, and use ''intercultural'' in referring to the study of the interaction between and among people with differing cultural backgrounds. Others may use those terms synonymously with ''cross-cultural'' and ''transnational.'' Consensus will only emerge when multiple fields integrate their perspectives and approaches. Without a common taxonomy for MCE plus better collaboration and integration across disciplines, we face several challenges: (a) an escalating number of competing frameworks, (b) inadequate validation research on assessment tools, and (c) models that neglect either performance or the multicultural context.

We suspect the first challenge, a plethora of models, stems from interculturalists' passion and enthusiasm for helping people interact more effectively with other cultures. They have created an astonishing number of tools, which can overwhelm practitioners looking for the most effective assessments. Tools coming out of intercultural research

tend to measure a hodgepodge of personal and interpersonal competencies, skills, behaviors, knowledge, values, and personality variables organized into a smaller number of factors (e.g., self, social, culture), which are all different.

The first instrument developed in this area was the *Overseas Assignment Inventory (OAI)* by Michael Tucker, followed by his *Tucker Assessment Profile (TAP)*. Other popular tools include the *Connective Leadership/Achieving Styles Inventory (ASI)* by Jean Lipman-Blumen, *Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI)* by Colleen Kelley and Judith Meyers, *Cultural Intelligence (CQ)* by Soon Ang and Linn Van Dyne, *Cultural Perspectives Questionnaire (CPQ)* by Joe DiStefano and Martha Maznevski, *Global Competence Aptitude Assessment*® by Global Leadership Excellence, *Global Competencies Inventory (GCI)* by the Kozai Group, *Global Mindset Inventory (GMI)* by Mansour Javidan and others at Thunderbird, *GlobeSmart*® by Aperian Global, and *Intercultural Adjustment Potential Scale (ICAPS-55)* by David Matsumoto. And the list goes on. Although accessing basic information on these and other tools is easy, getting information that would typically be found in a test manual is sometimes impossible unless people pay to be certified, and even then the technical research information may not be available for all the tools. Although we applaud efforts by some authors to put that research into the public domain, we still see such efforts as a challenge for many.

This leads us to the second challenge, inadequate validation research. Despite the rigor used in developing various tools mentioned in this article such as the *IDI*® and *OAI*, we are worried about the paucity and quality of validation research in the intercultural field, including the absence of solid performance criterion measures. Intercultural studies of expats tend to focus on adjustment and retention criteria (i.e., adjust/stay rather than leave) rather than global leadership per se. Although some psychologists have been involved in constructing particular tests in this domain, most were developed by people from other disciplines who may not know about APA's *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA & NCME, 1999). A large number of intercultural self-assessments are being used for a variety of purposes, including selection, on the assumption that high scorers are more effective cross-culturally. But where's the evidence? It can be challenging to predict potential or predisposition to be effective in global leadership roles requiring MCE *before* people have had any or much multicultural experience. However, it appears that most vendors haven't conducted longitudinal studies or collected much if any criterion data whatsoever.

Global leadership performance and effectiveness is admittedly a tough criterion to measure, especially for broad groups of global leaders that include people living in their home countries. Although expatriate effectiveness is only a subset, even that has not been defined with any consistency (Shaffer, Harrison, Gregersen, Black, & Ferzandi, 2006). Few corporations track outcomes that can be attributed to specific expat assignments, although they may view someone's success as accomplishing goals or increasing revenues. Researchers have focused on expatriate adjustment or withdrawal cognitions (i.e., plans to prematurely quit their assignments), with few trying to measure job performance.

It can be difficult to sort out problems with the validation research from issues with the tests themselves. Many self-assessments have been normed using large samples of students rather than populations of working adults or global leaders. That can lead to range restriction in testing groups of savvy global leaders when age, experience, and leadership level are correlated with test performance. Alternatively, when test takers can guess the correct answer, they may get a high score but not be able to perform when it counts. Unfortunately, few vendors appear to evaluate whether the transparency of their assessment items may lead to fake-good responses. Other issues for some vendors include shaky online

platforms, antiquated training approaches, and inadequate certification processes.

The third challenge is the lack of focus on performance in some intercultural tools coupled with the lack of multicultural focus in corporate leadership models. Intercultural models tend to measure personal and interpersonal characteristics rather than traditional leadership skills and result-oriented behavior. However, the performance context is vitally important for global business leaders, especially when they are working in globally competitive markets. Intercultural models may acknowledge that operational and technical competencies are important for leaders but don't measure those. So intercultural competency models only contain part of the answer to global leadership effectiveness.

Meanwhile, our corporate colleagues have been building leadership models that neglect multicultural competencies. Fewer than 10% of the models that we examined over the past year contained any language alluding to global work. Such models may have limited value for developing global leaders when they are silent about the need for MCE. We must integrate both multicultural and performance dimensions in constructing global leadership competency models. It would be better if we could find ways to do this holistically rather than just adding another competency or two.

Becoming Adept at Managing Paradoxes

Paradoxes and their cousins (e.g., dilemmas, polarities, opposites, dualities, and dialectics) have received much more attention in the management and intercultural literature than in I–O psychology over the past several decades. In reviewing the paradox literature, Smith and Lewis (2011) noted that contradictory demands increase as organizations become more global and echoed earlier calls for using paradox as a tool for theory and research.

Paradoxes are ''contradictory, mutually exclusive elements that exist simultaneously and for which no synthesis or choice

is possible nor necessarily desirable'' (Cameron & Quinn, 1988). They are ''contradictory, yet interrelated elements (dualities) that exist simultaneously and persist over time; such elements seem logical when considered in isolation, but irrational, inconsistent, and absurd when juxtaposed'' (Smith & Lewis, 2011, p. 387). Dilemmas are viewed as one type of paradox, ''a situation facing a decision maker who can select only one of either two equally attractive or two equally unattractive alternatives'' (Gannon, 2008, p. 6), but current trends are ''polarities to manage, not problems to solve'' (Johnson, 1996, p. xvii).

Paradoxes are an important expression of the dynamic changes and global complexity leaders are facing, especially with market forces shifting toward China and India. Lynn Paine notes that leading in China requires skills that go beyond and may conflict with standard business practices:

> The most effective leaders have also picked up the crucial ability to play roles that Westerners often view as contradictory: They are strategic yet hands-on; disciplined yet entrepreneurial; process oriented yet sensitive to people; authoritative yet nurturing; firm yet flexible; and action driven yet circumspect. Above all, they must have the intellectual dexterity to develop new frameworks and capabilities to meet China's particular circumstances (2010, p. 104).

Global leaders face increasing numbers of dilemmas and contradictions every day, requiring them to deal with paradoxical ambiguity in real time. This can cause great discomfort for Western leaders who were trained in rational analysis and decision making. Holding contradictory concepts in mind can be unnerving for Westerners who assume they must make a choice, whereas Asians tend to be more comfortable embracing both ends of the paradox.

There is no consensus among management scholars or interculturalists about the most important paradoxes facing leaders, especially global leaders. And there are no

common frameworks. Osland and Osland (2006) identified nine paradoxes for expatriates, in four categories:

1. Cultural intelligence: having stereotypes and seeing exceptions, being powerful and powerless, being free of own cultural norms and restrained by host-country customs;
2. Mediation: promoting idealized company values and realizing they do not exist, feeling caught between contradictory demands of headquarters and subsidiary;
3. Self-identity: giving up some home-country values and finding others grow stronger, becoming more cosmopolitan and more idiosyncratic; and
4. Cautious optimism: thinking well of host nationals and being savvy about being taken advantage of by them, feeling at ease anywhere and belonging nowhere.

Fisher-Yoshida and Geller (2009) proposed five paradoxes (knowing self and honoring others, "I"-centric and "we"-centric, communicating across difference, doing and reflecting, short-term and long-term) based on their work in transnational leadership development. Smith and Lewis (2011) used four categories of paradoxes (i.e., learning, belonging, organizing, performing) in laying the foundation for paradox theory. Although those were not developed for global leaders specifically, perhaps they could serve as a starting point for collaboration.

Challenges

I–O scientists and practitioners have generally ignored the issue of paradoxes in developing and implementing leadership competency models. Competency model development has evolved using a Western linear approach. People have taken a very complex phenomenon and simplified it, giving an impression that there is one single goal (i.e., a set of ideal behaviors) for

each level of leadership. Some people have recommended adding a paradox competency to our models (e.g., Schuler, 2011), perhaps something like "deal with paradoxes" or "integrate opposites" or "manage contradictions." We argue this approach does not go far enough. Instead, we need to rethink our global leadership competency models so that managing paradoxes is at the core of these models.

We recently sampled *Fortune* 500 leadership models to assess the current state. Although many incorporate some aspect of adaptability (e.g., learning agility or leadership versatility), we could only find one that mentioned paradox. Many leadership and cross-cultural models contain competencies that capture one pole of a paradox but not the other. And even when both poles are represented, they are viewed independently. There is rarely any examination of the fact that the two competencies can be at odds with one another and the resulting tension needs to be managed. One example of fusing paradoxes into competency language is the "global literacies" model (Rosen, Digh, Singer, & Phillips, 2000). Although this was a good step, this approach did not become a trend in our field.

To illustrate a possible new type of competency framework, we offer one example that articulates 10 paradoxes organized into five categories: performance, relationships, culture, agility, and orientation (Table 1).

We have encountered these paradoxes repeatedly in our work with global leaders, although of course many other people wrestle with them as well—not just leaders. As an example, the "humility - confidence" paradox was mentioned more by the people we interviewed in Asia than elsewhere, possibly because humility is such an important Confucian value. According to the work by Jim Collins on Level 5 leadership, "the most powerfully transformative executives possess a paradoxical mixture of personal humility and professional will. They are timid and ferocious. Shy and fearless. They are rare—and unstoppable" (Collins, 2001, p. 67). We will expand on two of the most gnarly paradoxes, "doing - being" and

Table 1. *Global Leadership Paradoxes*

	Paradox	Description
Performance	Strategic and operational	Global leaders must operate from a long-term perspective in pursuing strategic opportunities. At the same time, they must ensure that all the day-to-day operating details are planned and managed.
	Taking charge and empowering	Global leaders must take charge and exercise control over groups of people. At the same time, they must engage and empower employees to implement what needs to be done.
Relationships	Results and relationships	Global leaders must focus on achieving organizational goals and bottom-line results. At the same time, they must build relationships with a variety of stakeholders to create alignment and foster collaboration.
	Listening and expressing	Global leaders must ask questions and listen to a variety of perspectives. At the same time, they must express their own point of view with clarity.
Culture	Global and local	Global leaders must operate with a global, cosmopolitan mindset. At the same time, they must be sensitive to local markets and needs.
	Common group and uniqueness	Global leaders must pay attention to common group characteristics and respect cultural differences. At the same time, they must try to see and appreciate the unique qualities of each individual.
Agility	Open mind and decisiveness	Global leaders must be open to others' ideas with a nonjudgmental attitude. At the same time, they must analyze data and make decisions, often without consulting others.
	Consistency and versatility	Global leaders must be anchored in their own values so they can provide clear and consistent direction to others. At the same time, they must operate with versatility in adapting to particular conditions, situations, or people.
Orientation	Humility and confidence	Global leaders must be humble about their own accomplishments, limitations, and mistakes. At the same time, they must convey absolute self-confidence that attracts others to follow and trust their leadership.
	Doing and being	Global leaders must consider what they do, taking action to make things happen. At the same time, they must consider who they are, being mindful of their energetic presence.

''common group - uniqueness'' in the next two sections of this article.

Paradoxes such as these have no easy or right answers, no final solutions. Savvy global leaders may not even recognize some of these as paradoxes if they have already incorporated both angles into their leadership style. We believe it's the *process* of managing the paradoxes and dancing with the opposites (Williams & Deal, 2003) that's most important. By exploring paradoxes with others, people can find potentially synergistic ''third way solutions''

(Gundling et al., 2011)—a different path than represented by either end of the duality.

Inventing new ways to assess and measure these more complex competencies presents another challenge for I–O psychology. Different types of rating scales may be needed. Many performance management systems, assessment tests, and frequency-based 360 scales simply convey that ''more is better'' rather than acknowledging any trade-offs between competencies or behaviors. Here are several exceptions:

- The *Leadership Versatility Inventory (LVI)* developed by Kaplan and Kaiser (2003) represents a promising new direction. The LVI operationalizes two dualities (strategic–operational and forceful–enabling) that allow leaders to examine both poles of each dimension simultaneously to identify lopsidedness and imbalance. Their patented "Goldilocks" rating scale allows people to rate whether the leader is doing too much, too little, or just enough of each behavior (Kaiser & Kaplan, 2005). The LVI's focus is fully aligned with our two performance paradoxes; it also speaks to several others.
- The Center for Creative Leadership's "Transition Leadership Wheel" evaluates whether leaders are overdoing or underdoing each of six opposing areas (catalyzing change/coping with transition; being tough/being empathetic; realistic patience/sense of urgency; optimism/realism and openness; self-reliance/trusting others; capitalizing on strengths/going against the grain). They encourage leaders to balance between them by exercising strengths and going against the grain (Bunker & Wakefield, 2006).
- The *Opposite Strengths Inventory* developed by Jay Thomas and Tommy Thomas (2006) encourages people to realize that their effectiveness comes from the interaction of opposing strengths. People rate themselves on a series of bipolar characteristics, then results are presented for three pairs of strengths (thinking–risking, practical–theoretical, and dependent–independent).

Although we see great merit in tools like these that focus on strengths or balance, we yearn for approaches that would help global leaders assess and develop their capacity to manage the tensions and make dynamic real-time adjustments in paradoxical situations. I–O psychology lacks a model for viewing paradox management as a development process and a process for training global leaders in this area.

Cultivating the "Being" Dimension

Global leaders are especially busy people. Communicating across time zones can sometimes feel like a 24/7 job. Working in English as a second or third or fourth language typically adds extra time to each task, especially reading and responding to e-mails. Spending 8–20 hours traveling to corporate meetings consumes time that could have been spent *doing* other things that also must get *done* somehow. Multitasking may be the ultimate expression of *doing*—where leaders who participate on evening global conference calls can simultaneously check e-mails and eat dinner. And all these activities are just part of a job that includes *doing* lots of other things.

Many global leaders appear to be in denial that there is any other way of operating, and that denial blinds them to the doing–being paradox. This situation will only get worse unless we help global leaders make a developmental shift toward cultivating the *being* dimension of human experience. *Doing* is what we do, but *being* is who we are. Ultimately we want global leaders to achieve an integrated, dynamic balance between *doing* and *being*, but let's start by focusing more of their attention on the importance of *being*.

The *being* dimension lacks a common definition and does not appear to have been the subject of empirical research, despite its long history in phenomenology and existential psychology. In *Toward a Psychology of Being*, Abraham Maslow (1999) notes that being-cognition involves "passive contemplation, appreciation, and non-interfering" (p. 130); he calls being-cognitions "exceptional experiences even for self-actualizing people" (pp. 137–138). *Being* deserves far greater attention from global leaders because of their need to communicate with authenticity. In her intercultural work on bodymindfulness, Adair Nagata points out the importance of paying attention to our internal states and

overall state of being, which others sense as our energetic presence. According to her:

> *Energetic presence* is our living presence and the message it communicates, whether or not we are conscious of it. This is variously described as the atmosphere we create, the *vibes* others get from us, or the field or aura surrounding the personal space around the body (2009, p. 233).

She further explains that ...

> When we communicate, all aspects of our selves—body, emotion/feeling, mind, and spirit—are involved, whether we are conscious of them and use them skillfully or not. If we are unconscious of our feelings, our emotions may leak out in our paralanguage, facial expressions, or movements and send messages that contradict the verbal content of what we are saying. If we are unaware of our bodies, our body language may reveal our thoughts and emotions in ways that are not congruent with the text of our speech. Because nonverbal communication is typically beyond our awareness, when we are sending mixed messages—conflicting nonverbal and verbal signals—people have a tendency to believe the nonverbal ones (2009, p. 225).

We define *being* as ''our energetic presence based on who we are.'' Energetic presence has been studied quite extensively by interculturalists as it relates to nonverbal communication, where they estimate that 35–93% of message interpretation relies on nonverbal channels (Busby & Majors, 1987; Sigelis, 1994). If global leaders are not conscious about nonverbal aspects of their energetic presence, especially while they are busy multitasking, their body language might send conflicting signals. Such mixed messages may confuse others or, worse, communicate that they are not telling the truth. Therefore, the *being* dimension must be cultivated for global leaders to demonstrate their authentic selves and gain trust from others.

This is especially important when it comes to communicating in global settings. There are many high-context cultures, particularly in Asia where people pay much more attention to the context in understanding the meaning of communication—how something was said or done energetically rather than the content or explicit verbal message itself. In addition, global leaders may experience more anxiety than usual when dealing with other cultures. That anxiety can get communicated through their energetic presence and be perceived as uncertainty or ineffectiveness. Thus, global leaders must heighten their bodily awareness and congruence of their body language when communicating with people across cultures, especially where they cannot rely on verbal communication due to language barriers.

Such contextual challenges require global leaders to be more mindful about their energetic presence based on who they are and not just what they do. They must be ''present in the moment'' and pay attention to their *being* even while many strategic and operational priorities clamor for their attention. Given the ubiquitous nature of the doing–being paradox, we need a way to approach human development that will help people maximize and find synergies between their *being* and *doing*. As noted by Phil Rosinski (2003), ''more being is usually necessary to ultimately get more doing ... growing as people and as a business go together'' (pp. 106–107).

Challenges

Previous science and practice in the field of global leadership has focused heavily on what Westerners value in terms of action-oriented behavior (i.e., *doing*). The work on learning from experience (e.g., McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, 1988; McCauley, 2006) and action learning (e.g., Dotlich and Noel, 1998; Marquardt, 1999) are two cases in point. We cannot help but think about all

the "actions" incorporated into individual leadership development plans as well.

The biggest challenge to incorporating the *being* dimension into the work of I–O psychology may be its unfamiliarity in the Western world. When we asked global leaders as well as intercultural experts about "qualities of being" that contribute to effective multicultural interaction, some people knew exactly what we were asking about. But a lot of others gave us a blank stare or said they had no clue. One person commented that there are no personal qualities related to *being* or MCE—that it's all a matter of context. These conversations confirmed our suspicion that the *being* dimension of human experience is an underutilized personal resource for many global leaders.

Our review of corporate leadership models and popular competency models used for leadership development revealed lots of *doing* but few dimensions related to *being*. The *Successful Manager's Handbook* by PDI Ninth House (Gebelein et al., 2010) contains a chapter on "Increase Cultural Competence" with many *doing*-oriented suggestions; however, the book offers few tips related to *being* other than the suggestions for exhibiting and interpreting nonverbal behavior in the "Listen to Others" chapter. *Awaken, Align, Accelerate*® by MDA Leadership (Nelson & Ortmeier, 2011) contains "tips for coaching in a global environment" related to each of their 16 competencies; although none focus on cultivating the *being* dimension in global leaders, the "awaken" suggestions throughout the book could be used to raise awareness about some aspects of *being*. *FYI* by Lominger/Korn-Ferry (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2009) contains a "self-knowledge" chapter that doesn't say anything about *being*. Its "action-oriented" chapter contains an overused skill list, which is a good reminder that *over* doing can lessen global leaders' effectiveness. *Over* doing can create stress and diminish the quality of what we "do." Overly *doing*-oriented corporate competency models can escalate that tendency.

We have spent the past 2 decades coaching and training global leaders. Our toolkits are filled with tips and techniques to help people acquire and perform better *doing* skills. Although we can teach people almost anything if they possess enough motivation, when we can help people discover and engage their natural energy to improve the quality of *being*, they achieve better outcomes, and the results are more sustainable.

Appreciating Individual Uniqueness

Negative stereotypes can be a huge obstacle for leaders working globally, such as the stereotype about "ugly Americans" living or traveling abroad. The depth of anti-American feeling in some places is overwhelming yet unrecognized by many Americans. As noted by Martin and Nakayama (2010), "anti-Americanism has a very long history and is complicated by the economic, military, and political differences between the U.S. and other nations around the world" (p. 449). This stereotype may be part of the history and mindset of global teams whether they are aware of it or not, and it constantly affects the interpretations of what American global leaders do. Meanwhile, American leaders who complain or express sweeping negative judgments about another culture perpetuate the negative stereotype.

Stereotypes can be defined as "rigid preconceptions we hold about *all* people who are members of a particular group, whether it be defined along racial, religious, sexual, or other lines" (Sue & Sue, 2008, p. 154). The framework of bipolar cultural dimensions that has characterized much intercultural research is sometimes referred to as "sophisticated stereotyping" (Osland & Bird, 2000). However, the danger of any stereotypes is that they force people to perceive things in a rigid way without logical reasons and data. That often leads to negative stereotypes, which are harmful or destructive connotations about particular groups of people, such as "All Asians

are passive, and all Latinos are loud.'' The existence of negative stereotypes in global teams can taint relationships between the leader and all members (or between members) and can damage them permanently.

Once people create negative stereotypes, the process of letting go of those does not happen overnight. It requires time, effort, and deep internal work. It involves understanding one's own stereotypes, shifting one's perspectives by learning new perspectives about that particular group, practicing new behaviors, and making mistakes until the new perception becomes natural. It also means learning forgiveness toward self and others on a deep level. Once global leaders realize that they have developed negative stereotypes, it is important to go through this inner work in order to be successful in a global context.

Negative stereotypes are responsible for generating many common group–uniqueness paradoxes around the world. One European study found that highly effective leaders had going-in assumptions and stereotypes before their overseas assignments, but afterwards said they could not generalize; however, leaders rated as ineffective said they did not have stereotypes beforehand but did generalize afterwards (Ratiu, 1983). This study illustrates that effective global leaders know how to pay attention to individual uniqueness.

Paying attention to the uniqueness of another individual requires an additional muscle as well. It requires being curious about another individual from a holistic perspective, focusing on the person completely (not just the job or tasks that he or she does) and trying to understand the multiple cultural groups to which he or she belongs and their possible multilayered identities. Beyond trying to grasp their complex cultural identities, it's important to reflect about the unique strengths each person has in both *doing* and *being*. This involves fully appreciating another human being and acknowledging that others may not be able to replace what he or she could contribute. In order for the team to honor and leverage everyone's uniqueness

as well as cultural differences within the team, everyone including the global leader must have a shared mindset that group differences and individual uniqueness are both important—and are gifts to increase the team's performance.

People around the world tend to see that ''business is personal,'' more so than in the U.S. where a common expression is ''Let's get down to business.'' Relationship-building in many Asian cultures such as China is actually a prerequisite for doing business. As we have shown, one way to bypass negative stereotypes is to get to know people individually. Obviously this requires conscious effort as well as time, but such effort is vitally important for global leaders wanting to succeed in working with members of many different cultures.

Challenges

Negative stereotypes may be an unintended by product of an overly simplistic way of learning about cultural differences. Osland and Bird (2000, p. 67) point out that ''business schools tend to teach culture in simple-minded terms, glossing over nuances and ignoring complexities.'' Students may learn cultural differences through the lens of individualism versus collectivism, high- and low-context cultures, and other cultural dimensions (e.g., Hofstede, 1991; Trompenaars, 1993). Training programs that introduce sophisticated stereotypes can be useful in teaching global leaders about cultural differences along with techniques for working with specific cultures; for example, they may learn that Vietnamese value micromanagement more than Westerners, so it is better to pay extra attention to the team process in Vietnam.

Such knowledge can be very helpful for global leaders, especially at the beginning of encountering another culture, because it provides tips and techniques for interpreting people's behaviors and responding to them appropriately. However, a problem arises when the global leader continues to rely only on simplistic knowledge about cultural differences based on the primary cultural

group that someone belongs to. Without making efforts to learn about the unique aspects of that particular human being, a sophisticated stereotype about the person may not apply to that particular individual or could turn into a negative stereotype.

Our challenge is to help global leaders understand and respond appropriately to cultural differences while motivating them and equipping them with the skills to pay attention to the uniqueness of each individual.

What I–O Psychologists Should Do

We highlighted a number of challenges above including fragmented multicultural models and the need to help global leaders manage a variety of paradoxes such as doing - being and common group - uniqueness. These challenges impact the I–O field globally as well as I–O global leaders themselves. I–O psychologists can play a key role in meeting those challenges. We must integrate, explore, revamp, create, develop, and become global leaders ourselves.

Integrate

I–O psychology can take the lead in integrating the vast knowledge and competing frameworks for understanding MCE and managing paradoxes as well as leveraging others' thinking about global leadership competencies along the way (e.g., Bird, 2008; Bücker & Poutsma, 2010; Fulkerson, 1999; Goldsmith, Greenberg, Robertson, & Hu-Chan, 2003; Stuart, 2009). This will require recognizing and appreciating contributions from other disciplines such as intercultural communication and organizational behavior as well as other areas of psychology. We must exchange information and forge ongoing connections with experts in those fields. Forming multicultural research teams can help us create models and tools that will apply to a wide range of cultural groups. For example, researchers from outside the U.S. found a sixth factor called

"honesty–humility" that turned the Big Five into the Big Six, sometimes known as the HEXACO model (Ashton & Lee, 2007). This exchange will be a dynamic process as other disciplines are evolving along with the multicultural phenomena being studied.

Those of us wanting to come up to speed on paradoxes will find plenty of resources available. Books by De Wit and Meyer (2010), Fisher-Yoshida and Geller (2009), Gannon (2008), Sainsbury (2009), and Williams and Deal (2003) would be good places to start. *FYI* by Lominger/Korn-Ferry (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2009) contains a "Dealing with Paradox" chapter that may be helpful as well. Let's invite the leading management and intercultural paradox researchers to work with us in cocreating new frameworks for paradoxes as well as MCE. The paradox framework proposed in Table 1 could be a first step in that collaboration.

Explore

We should explore how concepts and tools developed in other disciplines can help jump start work in I–O psychology on cultivating our *being* dimension, eliminating the risks of negative stereotyping, and focusing on individual uniqueness. We could start in the intercultural communication domain by studying nonverbal communication to develop approaches for assessing various *being* aspects such as attention, body movement, vocal quality, and the atmosphere that people create with their presence. Some other possible avenues include the following:

- The *Cultural Orientations Framework* (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) contrasts the modes of thinking and doing to a mode called "being" that is characterized by spontaneity, where the present is experienced to the fullest.
- The *Cultural Perspectives Questionnaire* (DiStefano & Maznevski, 2000) reports the distribution of values within a culture as well as differences in mean scores across cultures, so

people can see the risk of stereotyping both ways (i.e., generalizing about a whole group from knowing one person, or generalizing about an individual based on knowing overall culture characteristics).

- *Personal Leadership* (Schaetti, Ramsey, & Watanabe, 2008) is an inner methodology consisting of two principles—mindfulness and creativity—plus six practices (i.e., attending to judgment, attending to emotion, attending to physical sensation, cultivating stillness, engaging ambiguity, and aligning with vision) that enable practitioners to disentangle from their cultural programming and consider right action in the largest possible context they can at that time. It emphasizes the importance of a third realm of intercultural competence, practicing what people know about differences, not just having cultural-specific and cultural-general knowledge and skills.

We can also study and leverage emerging developments in other areas such as neuroscience (e.g., Cozolino, 2010; Gordon, 2000; Rock & Page, 2009) or process work (e.g., Mindell, 2000). For example, the Process Work Institute (www.processwork.org) operates with a philosophy that body symptoms, relationship conflicts, and problems in our external world all hold meaning that provides access to a spirit that could be integrated into our conscious awareness. Such approaches could help people better understand their *being* dimension.

Although shamanistic, somatic, artistic, and other intuitive-based approaches are used elsewhere to understand and develop individual uniqueness, such methods may be dismissed or discounted by hard core I–O psychologists. Nonetheless, they are attracting quite a global following, and it behooves us to learn more about the basis for that attraction. We may also want to explore what we can learn from quantum physics, where relationships matter more than independent entities and where fractals

teach us that the leader's internal state can influence the whole team (Wheatley, 2006).

By reading the revised 1989 classic *On Becoming a Leader* by Warren Bennis, we can appreciate how important it is to ''discover and cultivate that authentic self, the part of you that is most alive, the part that is most you'' (Bennis, 2009, p. xxviii). Let's help global leaders cultivate their authentic selves by expanding our understanding about human beings!

Revamp

It's time to rethink and revamp our leadership competency models. Paradoxes must be embraced and included as a core aspect of such models. Our Western behavior-based competency model and 360 paradigms have served us well for 30 years but are breaking down in today's dynamic global environment. Quite a few models still contain U.S.-centric competencies and colloquial terminology. Many corporate leadership competency models are ripe for renewal, which could make this a good time for resourceful I–O practitioners to restructure some of those models around paradoxes. We need a more dynamic framework that will help us deal with increased complexity and change. Let's analyze the interplay between global complexity, paradoxes and MCE while resisting the temptation to merely add a global competency or two to corporate models.

Create

To accompany new models, we must create tools for assessing dynamic competencies and design frameworks for supporting people's development. Several approaches mentioned earlier such as bipolar ratings or the Goldilocks scale (Kaiser & Kaplan, 2005) may be helpful in building new tools. After revisiting our current developmental models, we may need to borrow or create new ones for developing global leaders to handle the demands of multicultural and paradoxical complexity. We already know that people can only deal with paradoxes

at higher stages of cognitive development (Kitchener & King, 1994; Laske 2009). Dealing with multicultural complexity usually requires attitudinal, emotional, and behavioral shifts as well.

One option could involve adapting the DMIS model (Bennett, 1993) to propose a parallel developmental model for managing paradoxes (DMMP) for assessing someone's ability to manage paradoxes along a continuum, as shown in Table 2.

Until new competency models, tools, and developmental frameworks are created, let's raise the bar and demand better science in the use of multicultural assessments. Here are some questions to ask: (a) How is MCE assessed by the tool? (b) What outcomes are being predicted, especially performance outcomes? (c) What constitutes a ''level playing field'' for assessments being used globally, in different languages? (d) When and how should the tool be used in making selection decisions? (e) What changes do pre and post self-assessments capture; how much of those changes are long-term versus temporary?

Develop

After creating models, we must apply them to the task of developing global leaders. I–O practitioners could start overhauling global leadership development programs by questioning any training that focuses only on cultural differences. We should insist that *being* and uniqueness components

be incorporated, along with reflection and meditation practices. We could champion coaching approaches that focus on both *being* and *doing*. And although it might sound like more heresy to our intercultural colleagues, I–O psychologists could adapt another intercultural communication schema to develop and introduce three levels of paradox training: (a) *mindset* to recognize paradoxes and be positive toward them, (b) *skillset* to identify potential misunderstandings and choose appropriate behavior for managing paradoxes, and (c) *sensitivity* to experience and manage paradoxes in sophisticated ways. Meanwhile, let's help global leaders learn that individual and cultural differences are not obstacles but rather gifts to the team—and how to leverage both.

Become

Finally, we must cultivate these capabilities in being and becoming global leaders ourselves. Some common ways to develop global leaders that we can apply to ourselves are shown in Table 3. We need to start by cultivating a mindset that we are global leaders. We can start by working on our own *being* (otherwise we won't be seen as authentic), developing our authentic selves and our distinctive voices as global leaders. We can join multicultural research teams and integrate reflective practices into the process as we work together. We can attend workshops and do networking at the

Table 2. *Developmental Model for Managing Paradoxes (DMMP)*

1. Denial: Global leaders don't realize that paradoxes exist and don't recognize alternatives to their own approaches.
2. Defense: Global leaders recognize the existence of ''either/or'' polar alternatives but prefer the one that they are most familiar or comfortable with.
3. Minimization: Global leaders accept both alternatives with a ''both/and'' mindset and strive for balance yet may minimize the less-preferred way.
4. Acceptance: Global leaders are curious about paradoxes, respect both alternatives, and see their own behavior in context; they can accept paradoxical tension but not necessarily know what to do about it.
5. Adaptation and integration: Global leaders shift their frames of reference to analyze problems from the other mindset; they engage in adaptive behavior and work with others to deal practically with paradoxes.

Table 3. *Common Ways to Develop Global Leaders*

- Experience—learning on the fly, hardships, trial and error, making mistakes, sink or swim
- Assignments—international assignments, multicultural team assignments, early career assignments, stretch assignments, rotations, exchange programs
- Project teams—global virtual team membership, task forces, action learning groups, long-term project work
- Training—intercultural communication training, global leadership development programs, language training, negotiation and conflict resolution training, targeted skills training, interactive cases, videotapes
- Coaching—mentoring, feedback, executive coaching, cultural guides, role models
- Assessment—360 feedback on global leadership assessments, cross-cultural assessments, assessment centers, cultural simulations and role plays
- Networking—participating in multicultural associations, attending annual global leadership conferences, staying connected via VOIP/skype, social learning
- Personal development plans

annual Summer Institute for Intercultural Communication (SIIC) in Portland, Oregon. We can put ourselves in a variety of multicultural situations and should think broadly and creatively about this goal. For example, we could volunteer to work in nonprofit organizations that support immigrants in the local community, create more opportunities for non-U.S. professors to spend sabbatical time in our organizations, and so forth. And we can be more intentional about learning while in these situations by being more curious and paying more attention, seeking feedback more frequently, asking intercultural colleagues for pointers on adapting typical learning strategies for the multicultural context, and asking for coaching. Finally, we can learn more about the capabilities highlighted in the article and practice applying that knowledge; for example, which paradox is most difficult, and how can we practice managing that paradox? Let's walk the talk in making the developmental shifts that global leaders need to undertake!

Final Thoughts

Anyone can be a global leader if they are operating in a context of multicultural, paradoxical complexity to achieve results in our world. This is a radical notion, a call for people all over the world to step into the leadership task of cocreating

our common future on this planet. Global leaders need to start by making the shifts we identified: developing MCE, becoming adept at managing paradoxes, cultivating more *being*, and appreciating individual uniqueness in the context of cultural differences. And global leaders who happen to be managing global teams must help their people make those shifts as well. Although this article was written for the I–O community, we are advocating that everyone needs to adopt a global leadership mindset. We invite I–O psychologists to join us in helping people make that change, starting by making that shift ourselves. Then let's collaborate with other social science disciplines to create global leadership models, paradox frameworks, multicultural assessments, and training tools to make this new paradigm come alive.

References

Adler, N. J. (2011). Leading beautifully: The creative economy and beyond. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 20*, 1–14.

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing.* Washington, DC: AERA.

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11*, 150–166.

Beechler, S., & Javidan, M. (2007). Leading with a global mindset. In M. Javidan, R. M. Steers, & M. A. Hitt (Eds.), *The global mindset (advances in*

international management) (Vol. 19, pp. 131–169). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards a developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In R. M. Paige (Ed.), *Education for the intercultural experience.* Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Bennett, M. J. (2011). The experience of cultural difference and the development of intercultural competence. In S. Guan (Ed.), *Intercultural and international communication research* (Vol. 1, pp. 113–160). Beijing: Peking University Press.

Bennis, W. (2009). *On becoming a leader* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Basic.

Bird, A. (2008). Assessing global leadership competencies. In M. E. Mendenhall, J. S. Osland, A. Bird, G. R. Oddou, & M. L. Maznevski (Eds.), *Global leadership: Research, practice and development* (pp. 34–63). New York, NY: Routledge.

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.

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

Bücker, J., & Poutsma, E. (2010). Global management competencies: A theoretical foundation. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25,* 829–844.

Bunker, K. A., & Wakefield, M. (2006). Leading in times of change. *Harvard Management Update, 11,* 1–4.

Busby, R. E., & Majors, R. E. (1987). *Basic speech communication: Principles and practices.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. (1988). *Organizational paradox and transformation: Toward a theory of change in organization and management.* New York, NY: Ballinger/Harper & Row.

Campbell, D. P. (2006). Globalization: The basic principles of leadership are universal and timeless. In W. H. Mobley & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 4, pp. 143–158). Oxford, England: JAI Press/Elsevier.

Chhokar, J. S., Brodbeck, F. C., & House, R. J. (Eds.). (2007). *Culture and leadership across the world: The globe book of in-depth studies of 25 societies.* New York, NY: Erlbaum.

Collins, J. (2001). Level 5 leadership: The triumph of humility and fierce resolve. *Harvard Business Review, 79,* 66–76.

Cozolino, L. (2010). *The neuroscience of psychotherapy: Healing the social brain.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Cui, G., & Awa, N. E. (1992). Measuring intercultural effectiveness: An integrative approach. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16,* 311–328.

Cui, G., & Van Den Berg, S. (1991). Testing the construct validity of intercultural effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15,* 227–240.

Dalton, M., Ernst, C., Deal, J., & Leslie, J. (2002). *Success for the new global manager: How to work across distances, countries, and cultures.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10,* 241–266.

De Wit, B., & Meyer, R. (2010). *Strategy synthesis: Resolving strategy paradoxes to create competitive advantage* (3rd ed.). Hampshire, UK: Cengage.

DiStefano, J. J., & Maznevski, M. L. (2000). Creating value with diverse teams in global management. *Organizational Dynamics, 29,* 45–63.

Dotlich, D. L., & Noel, J. L. (1998). *Action learning: How the world's top companies are re-creating their leaders and themselves.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Fisher-Yoshida, B., & Geller, K. D. (2009). *Transnational leadership development: Preparing the next generation for the borderless business world.* New York, NY: AMACOM.

Friedman, T. L. (2007). *The world is flat 3.0: A brief history of the twenty-first century.* New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Fulkerson, J. R. (1999). Global leadership competencies for the twenty-first century: More of the same or a new paradigm for what leaders really do? In W. H. Mobley, M. J. Gessner, & V. Arnold (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 1, pp. 27–48). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Gannon, J. J. (2008). *Paradoxes of culture and globalization.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Gebelein, S. H., Nelson-Neuhaus, K. J., Skube, C. J., Lee, D. G., Stevens, L. A., Hellervik, L. W., & Davis, B. L. (2010). *Successful manager's handbook* (9th ed.). Minneapolis, MN: PreVisor.

Goldsmith, M., Greenberg, C. L., Robertson, A., & Hu-Chan, M. (2003). *Global leadership: The next generation.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gordon, E. (Ed.). (2000). *Integrative neuroscience: Bringing together biological, psychological and clinical models of the human brain.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: Harwood Academic.

Gundling, E., Hogan, T., & Cvitkovich, K. (2011). *What is global leadership: 10 key behaviors that define great global leaders.* Boston, MA: Nicholas Brealey.

Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language.* Greenwich, CT: Fawcett.

Hammer, M. R. (2011). Additional cross-cultural validity testing of the intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35,* 474–487.

Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27,* 421–443.

Hammer, M. R., Gudykunst, W. B., & Wiseman, R. L. (1978). Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2,* 382–393.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind.* London, England: McGraw-Hill.

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

Javidan, M., & Teagarden, M. B. (2011). Conceptualizing and measuring global mindset. In W. H. Mobley, M. Li, & Y. Wang (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 6, pp. 13–39). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

Johansen, B. (2009). *Leaders make the future: Ten new leadership skills for an uncertain world.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Johnson, B. (1996). *Polarity management: Identifying and managing unsolvable problems.* Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press.

Kaiser, R. B., & Kaplan, R. E. (2005). Overlooking overkill? Beyond the 1-to-5 rating scale. *Human Resource Planning, 28,* 7–11.

Kaplan, R. E., & Kaiser, R. B. (2003). Developing versatile leadership. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 44,* 19–26.

Kelly, E. (2006). *Powerful times: Rising to the challenge of our uncertain world.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Wharton School.

Kilburg, R. R., & Donohue, M. D. (2011). Toward a ''grand unifying theory'' of leadership: Implications for consulting psychology. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 63,* 6–25.

Kitchener, K. S., & King, P. M. (1994). *Developing reflective judgment: understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Lane, H. W., Maznevski, M. L., Mendenhall, M. E., & McNett, J. (Eds.). (2004). *The Blackwell handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Laske, O. E. (2009). *Measuring hidden dimensions of human systems: Foundations of requisite organization* (Vol. 2). Medford, MA: IDM.

Levy, O., Beechler, S., Taylor, S., & Boyacigiller, N. A. (2007). What we talk about when we talk about 'global mindset': Managerial cognition in multinational corporations. *Journal of International Business Studies, 38,* 231–258.

Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (2009). *FYI for your improvement: A guide for development and coaching for learners, managers, mentors, and feedback givers* (5th ed.). Minneapolis, MN: Lominger International.

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

McCall, M. W., Jr., Lombardo, M. M., & Morrison, A. M. (1988). *The lessons of experience.* Lexington, MA: Lexington.

McCauley, C. D. (2006). *Developmental assignments: Creating learning experiences without changing jobs.* Greensboro, NC: CCL.

Marquardt, M. J. (1999). *Action learning in action: Transforming problems and people for world-class organizational learning.* Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.

Martin, J. N., & Nakayama, T. K. (2010). *Intercultural communication in contexts.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Maslow, A. H. (1999). *Toward a psychology of being* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

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

Mindell, A. (2000). *Quantum mind: The edge between physics and psychology.* Portland, OR: Lao Tse Press.

Mobley, W. H., Li, M., & Wang, Y. (Eds.). (2011). *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 6). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

Nagata, A. L. (2009). Bodymindfulness for skillful use of self. In B. Fisher-Yoshida, K. D. Geller, & S. A. Schapiro (Eds.), *Innovations in transformative learning: Space, culture, & the arts* (pp. 223–243). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Nelson, S. E., & Ortmeier, J. G. (Eds.). (2011). *Awaken, align, accelerate: A guide to great leadership.* Minneapolis, MN: Beaver's Pond.

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

Osland, J. S. (2008b). The multidisciplinary roots of global leadership. In M. E. Mendenhall, J. S. Osland, A. Bird, G. R. Oddou, & M. L. Maznevski (Eds.), *Global leadership: Research, practice and development* (pp. 18–33). New York, NY: Routledge.

Osland, J. S. & Bird, A. (2000). Beyond sophisticated stereotyping: Cultural sensemaking in context. *Academy of Management Executive, 14,* 65–77.

Osland, J., & Osland, A. (2006). Expatriate paradoxes and cultural involvement. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 35,* 91–114.

Paine, L. S. (2010). The globe: The China rules. *Harvard Business Review, 88,* 103–108.

Pedersen, P. (Ed.). (1999). *Multiculturalism as a fourth force.* Philadelphia, PA: Taylor & Francis.

Ratiu, I. (1983). Thinking internationally: A comparison of how international executives learn. *International Studies of Management and Organizations, 13,* 139–150.

Richard, J. S. (1997). *The learning army: Approaching the 21st century as a learning organization.* Carlisle Barracks, PA: U.S. Army War College.

Rock, D., & Page, L. J. (2009). *Coaching with the brain in mind: Foundations for practice.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

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

Rosinski, P. (2003). *Coaching across cultures: New tools for leveraging national, corporate & professional differences.* London, England: Nicholas Brealey.

Sainsbury, R. M. (2009). *Paradoxes* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schaetti, B. F., Ramsey, S. J., & Watanabe, G. C. (2008). *Making a world of difference. Personal leadership: A methodology of two principles and six practices.* Seattle, WA: Flying Kite.

Schuler, R. S. (2011, August). Global managers and global competencies: An ambicultural approach to management and leadership. In R. S. Reis, & S. L. Cretoiu (Chairs), *Global competencies: East & West, the pursuit of the complementarities.* Symposium presented at the Annual AOM Meeting, San Antonio, TX.

Shaffer, M. A., Harrison, D. A., Gregersen, H., Black, J. S., & Ferzandi, L. A. (2006). You can take it with you: Individual differences and expatriate effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 109–125.

Sigelis, T. (1994). Nonverbal communication in intercultural interactions. In R. W. Brislin & T. Yoshida (Eds.), *Improving intercultural interactions: Modules for cross-cultural training programs* (pp. 268–294). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review, 36*, 381–403.

Stuart, D. (2009). Assessment instruments for the global workforce. In M. A. Moodian (Ed.), *Contemporary leadership and intercultural competence: Exploring the cross-cultural dynamics within organizations* (pp. 175–189). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2008). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Thomas, J. W., & Thomas, T. J. (2006). *The power of opposite strengths: Making relationships work.* Austin, TX: Thomas Concept.

Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business.* New York, NY: Irwin.

Van Dyne, L., Ang, S., & Koh, C. (2008). Development and validation of the CQS: The cultural intelligence scale. In S. Ang (Ed.) *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement and applications.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Wheatley, M. J. (2006). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Williams, R. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *When opposites dance.* Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.