

**Toward a Practical Model for Developing Global Mindsets in Leaders**

**Schon Beechler (contact author)**  
**Director, Positive Programs in Executive Educations**  
**Ross School of Business**  
**University of Michigan**  
**Ann Arbor, MI**  
**Email: [Schon.Beechler@GMail.Com](mailto:Schon.Beechler@GMail.Com)**

**Christopher Musselwhite**  
**CEO, Discovery Learning**  
**Greensboro, NC**  
**Email: [CMusselwhite@DiscoveryLearning.Com](mailto:CMusselwhite@DiscoveryLearning.Com)**

**Kathleen Ponder**  
**Global Director, Learning Methods**  
**Duke Corporate Education**  
**Durham, NC**  
**Email: [Kathleen.Ponder@DukeCE.Com](mailto:Kathleen.Ponder@DukeCE.Com)**

**Darren Overfield**  
**Executive Coach, Kaplan DeVries, Inc.**  
**Greensboro, NC**  
**Email: [darren@kaplandevries.com](mailto:darren@kaplandevries.com)**

**Draft: January 11, 2010**

**Please do not copy or quote without authors' permission.**

## **Toward a Practical Model for Developing Global Mindsets in Leaders**

### Abstract

While much recent work has been published on global leadership (e.g., Mendenhall, et al., 2008; Beechler and Javidan, 2007; Levy et al., 2007; Clapp-Smith, et al., 2007), this topic deserves further exploration from two perspectives. The first perspective looks at the content of global leadership in terms of the demands, competencies, attitudes and attributes of successful global leaders. The second perspective focuses on the development of successful global leaders. In this paper we build on the existing work in global leadership from both perspectives, integrating work from adult learning and development, to establish a viable framework for conceptualizing global mindset and developing successful global leaders.

Our goals in this paper are 1) to present a broad review of what is known about what makes an effective global leader; 2) to create an integrated model that addresses, from a practical perspective, the schema that must be considered to understand the challenges and demands placed on global leaders; and 3) to begin identifying what individuals and organizations can do to effectively prepare leaders for the complex demands of global work.

## **Introduction**

Many firms competing globally are pushed simultaneously into contradictory strategic directions. In order to survive and prosper against global competition, companies must embrace closer regional and global integration, continuously cut costs and improve efficiency and simultaneously meet demands for local responsiveness, flexibility and speed. To further add to the complexity, the business demands of integration and responsiveness vary from one subsidiary to another and from function to function. These complex and diverse competitive and organizational realities create tremendous managerial complexity (Prahalad and Doz, 1987) with senior managers needing to balance competing country, business, and functional concerns (Evans and Doz, 1992; Murtha, Lenway, and Bagozzi, 1998). Not surprisingly, the topics of global leadership and global leadership development have become important both within practitioner and academic circles to as the demand for global leaders outstrips supply (Ilan and Higgins, 2005; Logan, 2008). No longer is it relevant to ask whether a leader will be globalized; the real question is how much and in what ways (McCall and Hollenbeck, 2002).

While much recent work has been published on global leadership (e.g., Mendenhall, et al., 2008; Beechler and Javidan, 2007; Levy et al., 2007; Clapp-Smith, et al., 2007) this topic deserves further exploration from two perspectives. The first perspective, the focus on most writing in the field, looks at the content of global leadership and focuses on the demands, competencies, attitudes and attributes of successful global leaders. The second perspective focuses on the development of successful global leaders. It is obvious that the skills, behaviors and attitudes that need to be developed must be defined before effective development can be

systematically undertaken. Our goal in this paper is to build on the existing work in global leadership from both perspectives, integrating work from adult learning and development, to establish a viable framework for the development of successful global leaders.

As we will highlight in this paper, the development of global leaders must address their capacity to adapt by modifying and expanding their mental models or mindsets and by adapting their behaviors to react effectively in novel and unfamiliar situations. Dalton & Ernst (2004) identify adaptability as a key factor for success for leading globally because it is impossible to prepare for every eventuality in such a complex environment. To succeed, managers must “adapt what they do to the interacting dimensions of distance, country infrastructure, and cultural expectations” (p.371). Dalton and Ernst also argue that managers are more likely to fail when they do not adapt how they lead, negotiate, make decisions, or share information (2004: 371). It is critical, therefore, that we find ways to develop this adaptability in global leaders.

In the following sections, we present a broad review of what is known about what makes an effective global leader; describe an integrated model that addresses, from a practical perspective, the schema that must be considered to understand the challenges and demands placed on global leaders; and begin to identify what individuals and organizations can do to effectively prepare leaders for global work.

### **Distinguishing Global Leadership from “Domestic” Leadership**

Global leadership is more challenging and difficult than leading in a single cultural context (McCall and Hollenbeck, 2002; Hollenbeck, 2001). According to Lane et al (2004), there are four aspects of the global context that combine to create significant challenges for global leaders: (1) Multiplicity across a range of dimensions; (2) Interdependence among a host of stakeholders, political, economic and environmental systems; (3) Ambiguity in terms of

understanding causal relationships, interpreting cues and signals, identifying appropriate actions and pursuing plausible goals; and (4) Flux in terms of quickly transitioning systems, shifting values and emergent patterns of organizational structure and behavior (Lane, et al., 2004)

These factors combine to increase the level of complexity facing the global leader, making finding the “right” course of action more challenging. Global leaders must deal with multiple stakeholders in each context and these stakeholders often have conflicting and complex requirements that are difficult to satisfy.

In addition, underlying cultural values often differ widely across multiple country and cultural contexts, making leading in a global context different from domestic leadership. This is both a difference in degree, but also a difference in kind. For example, if one member of my team expects me, as a leader, to take care of them, to guide them in a paternalistic autocratic way while another member of my team expects me to bring out the knowledge and expertise in the group by empowering them through facilitative leadership, my effectiveness as a leader is much more difficult to attain than if everyone in my team has the same expectations and I have the behavioral repertoire and competence to fulfill those expectations.

In this paper, we propose a practical model of global leadership focused on understanding a leader’s *global mindset* and what developing this mindset entails. Following Beechler and Javidan (2008), who extended the “domestic leadership” definition by Yukl (2006), we define global leadership as”... *the process of influencing individuals, groups, and organizations (inside and outside the boundaries of the global organization) representing diverse cultural/political/institutional systems to contribute towards the achievement of the global organization’s goals*” (Beechler and Javidan, 2007, p. 140). This definition has two important assumptions:

1. *Global Leadership is a process* -- not a single competency added to a domestic leader's skill portfolio. As a process, global leadership extends beyond a leader's personal skills and attributes, to their interpersonal skills and the quality of relationships the leader holds with the people around him/her in a global context.
2. *What knowledge a leader integrates and how they integrate it, are different* for a global leader than for a domestic leader. Global leaders must acquire new knowledge about the different contexts in which they work and/or conduct business. A leader's familiar and even tested mindset may not accommodate a global corporate problem. In addition, the way they use knowledge and information to analyze a situation and act entails a broader set of choices, and at a higher level of complexity. Increased capacity and the ability to handle increased complexity are the hallmarks of global leadership (Gupta and Govindarajan, 2002; Osland and Bird, 2004; Levy et al., 2007; Beechler and Baltzley, 2008).

Like everyone, global leaders have an anchor in their own culture and societal context; they are grounded in certain values and points of view on a range of topics. At the same time, a global leader, by operating in multiple and varying contexts, has a more unrestricted field of view and has the potential to be able to see the same landscape through a number of different lenses (Beechler and Baltzley, 2008). Global leaders have a kaleidoscopic perspective across a range of value sets and societal issues that transforms how they see their own values, sense of identity, and of course, their view of the world. Importantly, they also have a different level of understanding of others' views of the world. This results in a leadership decision-making process that is very different to that used by domestic leaders (Beechler and Baltzley, 2008).

Much research on global leadership has been focused on the behaviors and knowledge (competencies) that global leaders need to succeed (Mendenhall and Osland, 2002; Mendenhall et al., 2008). However, as McCall and Hollenbeck (2002) point out, "...whatever attributes a company desires in its leaders, they are the outcome of the developmental process rather than the input to it" (p.5). While a global leader's behaviors provide visible evidence of global leadership, it is the leader's *mindset* that shapes and influences these behaviors (Paul, 2000; Bird and Osland, 2004). This mindset, reflecting past and current experiences and assumptions, influences future

action, shapes perception, and therefore determines how decisions are made, what strategies are pursued and how they are implemented (Murtha, Lenway & Bagozzi, 1998; Levy et al., 2007). A *global mindset* enables leaders to consider both global and local aspects to doing business – they must think globally and act locally and think locally and act globally (Paul, 2000) and is critical in business today: “... no one in business today can afford not to have a ‘global mindset’” (C.K. Prahalad quoted in Govindarajan and Gupta, 2001: xiii).

The concept of global mindset appeared first in the work of Perlmutter (1969) who created a taxonomy of approaches to internationalization: ethnocentric (home country), polycentric (host country mindset) and geocentric (world mindset). Bartlett and Ghoshal (1989) expanded on the idea of geocentrism, identifying a “transnational” mindset. Rhinesmith (1992:64) argues that people with global mindsets drive for the broader picture, accept life as a balance of contradictory forces, trust organizational processes rather than structure, value diversity, are comfortable with ambiguity, and seek to be open to themselves and others.

Having a global mindset means that an individual is aware of diversity across businesses, countries, cultures and markets; develops and interprets criteria and business performance that are independent from assumptions of a single country, culture or context; synthesizes across this diversity (Govindarajan and Gupta, 2001; Maznevski and Lane, 2003). This involves a high level of cognitive complexity, coupled with an external and open focus (Levy et al., 2007) allowing an individual to take multiple, diverse perspectives into account in formulating attitudes, and behaviors (Clapp-Smith, Luthans and Avolio, 2007).

### **Our Model of Global Mindset**

We build on the work of Kefalas (1998) and Maznevski and Lane (2004) by conceptualizing of global mindset as a set of schema. Schema are hypothetical cognitive

structures that help individuals perceive, organize, process, and utilize information (Berger, 1993). Schemas help us perceive features in our environment and provide a readiness to process certain information. They are the building blocks of mental models (Kefelas, 1998), which Peter Senge (1990) defines as “deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action” (p. 8). Kefalas (1998) defines global mindset as a cognitive schema or world view that organizes experiences and ideas, helps to make sense out of them, and guides decision making and action (see also Rhinesmith, 1992; Maznevski and Lane, 2004; Levy et al., 2007). This mindset is a filter through which we look at the world and is a way of being, rather than a set of skills (Kefalas, 1998). A person who has a global mindset sees the world as a whole, scanning from a broad perspective, searching for commonalities, exploiting commonalities to discover differences, and using the knowledge gained from this worldwide search to design and execute strategies maximizing benefits to local and global stakeholders (Kefalas, 1998; Rhinesmith, 1994).

Kefalas (1998) identifies two dimensions of global mindset: conceptualization and contextualization. Conceptualization refers to building mental models of the world, whereas contextualization refers to adapting these mental models while acting. Conceptualization relates to mental capacity and thinking, while contextualization is about acting in the local environment or context. Take, for example, a successful executive of a small Canadian-based company who has always lived in Edmonton. The manager’s company is purchased by a Japanese company with existing operations in Russia, Saudi Arabia and South Africa. The executive’s assignment is to integrate the Canadian operating systems with Japan and the other locations. This will require strong conceptualization skills on the part of the executive. By contrast, the same Canadian company has an executive who has lived and worked in France and Mexico and speaks four

languages. This executive's assignment in the new organization is to move to Russia for two years and assume management of the Russian operation. This executive may need stronger contextualization skills than the manager in Edmonton.

Building on these ideas, a comprehensive but practical model to aid and enable the development of leaders for work in a global context must address three needs. First, it needs to address both the conceptual and contextual challenges faced by the leader. Second, it needs to meet leaders where they are by acknowledging a potentially complex array of skills, deficits, experiences and personal challenges. No two leaders or their situations are identical. Third, it needs to inform the formation of a developmental plan that is unique to each leader's circumstances and needs.

### **Global Mindset Development: Overall Parameters**

A key challenge in developing a set of schema that create a global mindset is that the developmental process must allow for continuous change, both in response to the individual's personal learning and in response to environmental changes (Maznevski and Lane, 2004). The process of furthering a global mindset, therefore, is most compatible with a constructivist theory of adult cognitive development, an understanding that learning and change result from a process of continuous personal meaning making, the way adults create and recreate their world by living in it rather than searching for an objective truth to be discovered (e.g., Kegan, 1982, 1994). Adults develop when, over time, they construct meanings that are increasingly more complex and multifaceted and when they challenge their own certainties. Potent developmental experiences present an individual with an awareness of complex connections, an examination of an issue from multiple sides, a perception of the ways that different perspectives overlap, and present circumstances that demand a choice among options.

Time alone (age, stage of life) does not guarantee adult development and neither do potent developmental experiences, however. Instead, development results from an interaction of life experiences with an individual's drive to grow by tackling greater amounts of complexity, as well as a set of personal characteristics related to both cognitive and affective adaptability and versatility (e.g., Goleman 2006, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002; Kegan, 1994; Kaplan and Kaiser, 2007). A functional model for developing global mindset, therefore, must consider both the individual (their conceptualizations) and their work and life environment (their context). We identify four primary, interdependent schema comprising global mindset which also suggest key developmental arenas: **(1) Environmental Schema; (2) Organizational or Company Schema; (3) Cultural schema; and (4) Self Schema.** The first three schema describe the context in which developmental opportunities are likely to occur and the fourth describes the arena of a global leader's personal conceptualization of who they are as an individual.

While not labeled as such, these four schema occur in much of the research and writing about global leadership development and a study conducted by the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) which included 211 managers from 39 nations working in 30 countries supports the importance of these schemas (Dalton & Ernst, 2004; Leslie et al., 2002). This study examined the interrelationships among managers' roles, personality traits, experiences, and capabilities in organizations categorized as either low- or high-global-complexity and the correlation between these variables and boss' ratings of perceived leadership effectiveness. The study identified four pivotal capabilities "uniquely related to the effectiveness of global managers" (Dalton & Ernst: 366). The first pivotal capability, *international business knowledge*, is part of our Environmental and Organizational Schema. The second, *cultural adaptability*, is part of our Cultural Schema.

The third and fourth pivotal capabilities, *the ability to take perspective and the ability to innovate*, are part of our Self Schema.

### **The Environmental Schema**

The environmental schema abstracts meaning from a very complex global business environment in order to anticipate and effectively respond to opportunities and threats. The business environment daily confronts global leaders with complex economic, political-legal, and social challenges (Terpstra, Sarathy & Russow, 2006; Fulkerson, 2002; Hall, Zhu, and Amin, 2001. The economic challenges alone are numerous (e.g., the size of markets and their potential, a nation's physical endowments, infrastructure, systems of trade, government regulations) (Terpstra et al., 2006). Global leaders must compete on product and price in very different markets, confronting very complex political-legal environments (Terpstra et al., 2006). Leveraging this political environment requires knowing the intricacies of relationships, protocols, and policies and also demands evolving the self schema, described below, to allow novel perspective-taking and personal adaptability.

This business environment affords the global leader endless opportunities for development as job experiences are identified in the leadership literature as the primary vehicle for developing global leadership skills (McCall and Hollenbeck, 2002; McCall, Lombardo, and Morrison, 1988; McCall, 1998). Unfamiliar conditions in the communities where they must live and work provides experiences that stimulate new thinking. Expatriated leaders and leaders who either move their family or are separated from their family find themselves challenged to develop not only business coping mechanisms but ways of coping personally with their changed fabric of their social life.

## **The Organizational or Company Schema**

We define the Organizational or Company Schema within global mindset as a person's knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes about the organization's history, resources, strategy, the work to be done, employees, the formal structures, processes, and systems, as well as the informal organization – the emergent, unplanned arrangements including structures, processes, and relationships (Nadler and Tushman, 1980). In a global context, the organizational schema includes the organizational structures and processes that address the strategic challenges of local responsiveness and global integration and alignment between global and regional strategies and structures.

Complex multinational corporations have been forced to reinvent their structures, strategies, and systems to effectively function across country borders, with structural responses including megamergers, joint ventures, and newly devised strategic relationships designed to allow entry into a variety of mature and emerging markets (McCall and Hollenbeck, 2002). Globally operating organizations vary in the size and scope of their international presence and the number of nationalities in their work force, developing a wide variety of responsive business strategies and structures. The global leader's organizational or company schema must be capable of understanding what currently exists and address issues of what needs to change or be maintained in the future. For example, as the multinational evolves, how many international jobs will exist, how many global executives will be needed and with what skills, how will complex decisions be made and who will be involved, how they will respond to a myriad of local laws and regulations, consumer preferences, local financial and socio-economic conditions, etc.?

Small or large conceptual shifts adding up to a different way of seeing the organization and its operations are required of the global leader. If the leader's global responsibilities

encompass multiple lines of business or multiple companies in different countries, then they must be able to conceive of the organization as a whole and see the relationships of all the parts to the whole, rather than seeing the rest of the organization and its parts only from a personal, divisional, or company perspective (Kegan, 1994). Galbraith (2000), in a discussion of global organizations, notes that "...serious students of cross-border organization have arrived at the position that keeping it simple is stupid; the world is complex, and a simple organization in a complex world becomes less and less viable" (p.2). We believe that possessing an organizational or company schema whose complexity and dynamism is equal to the demands of their work is critical to the global leader's success.

### **The Cultural Schema**

We define the Cultural Schema as a world view that helps individuals make meaning of, adapt to, and act in cultures which are different from the global executive's personal cultural experience. We separate the Cultural Schema from the Environmental and Organizational Schemas because of its central importance to global leadership and global mindset. We agree with McCall and Hollenbeck (2002) who state that "...the cultural context in which the business takes place has a profound effect on the content of the lessons learned and affects both how business is done and what must be done" (p. 9). In fact, the challenge of developing a complex and effective Cultural Schema can eclipse the challenge of learning how to run the global business.

What is culture and what about it is important to global leaders? Culture is a multi-faceted phenomenon which has been studied and defined by many scholars. Indeed, there are over 150 definitions of culture (Wilson, Hoppa, & Sayles, 1996) . Terpstra refers to culture as learned behaviors that are related, integrated, and shared by a group of people and/or a society (Terpstra

et al, 2006: 98-99), while Wilson, Hoppa, and Sayles (1996: 3) refer to culture as a pattern of shared values reflected in the preferences of groups of people for certain behaviors, attitudes, and systemic practices in their ideal work situation.

The management and organizational literature has widely explored attributes of specific cultures at a societal level, uncovering differences and similarities which a global leader must analyze and manage (e.g., (e.g., Geertz, 1977; Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961; Hall, 1973). Hofstede's (1980) work, considered seminal in the international management literature work, identifies four dimensions of cultural difference: *Power Distance* is the extent to which the less powerful members of organizations and institutions (like the family) accept and expect that power is distributed unequally; *Uncertainty Avoidance* is a society's tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity; *Individualism vs. Collectivism* is the degree to which individuals are integrated into group; and *Masculinity vs. Femininity* refers to the distribution of roles between genders.

Wilson, Hoppa, and Sayles (1996 ) built a framework explaining seven additional dimensions of cultural difference that people in all cultures face as they work together:

1. *Dilemmas encountered when relating to others*: (individual vs. collective identity, tough or tender means of achievement, equal or unequal orientation to authority;
2. *Dilemmas that surface when accomplishing work*: Response to dynamic vs. stable responses to ambiguity, active vs. reflective means of knowledge acquisition, perspective on time: scarce or plentiful;
3. *Dilemmas that emerge when responding to change or progress*: a doing vs. being outlook on life.

The more recent and ambitious GLOBE study (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program), a 10-year research program involving 60+ countries

and more than 17,000 managers, had as its goal increasing knowledge relevant to cross-cultural interactions and one significant contribution was a look at how cultures differ in their acceptance and practice of leadership (e.g., House, 2004). To be effective, a global leader's mindset must include a cultural schema rich with knowledge about the unique features of the cultures in which business is conducted and an approach characterized by dispassionate curiosity and pragmatism. This requires cognitive and affective flexibility and adaptability which requires a self schema with the same characteristics.

### **The Self Schema**

In our model of global mindset, there are two broad schematic categories: those associated with the global leader's experiences and knowledge (Environmental, Organizational, Cultural Schemas) and those associated with the knowledge, attitudes, and dispositions of an individual: the Self Schema. In our conceptualization of the Self Schema, we highlight aspects of the individual most critical to the development of the other three schemas associated with global mindset and, ultimately, to a global leader's business success: intrapersonal skills and interpersonal social skills, or what are commonly referred to as emotional intelligence and competence.

Numerous leadership and management competencies have been associated with emotional competence (Churness, 2009; Hollenbeck, 2001; Spreitzer, McCall, and Mahoney, J. 1997). A global study of top performing leaders found that about one-third of their superior performance was due to technical skill and cognitive ability, and two-thirds due to emotional competence (Hunter, Schmidt, & Judiesch, 1990; Goleman, 1998). For leaders in senior positions, over four-fifths of the difference was due to emotional competence. In another study, partners in a multinational consulting firm with superior emotional intelligence delivered \$1.2 million more

profit than did other partners (Boyatzis, 1999). In yet another study executives selected based on emotional competence were far more likely to perform in the top third; those lacking emotional competencies under-performed by almost 20% (McClelland, 1999).

Emotions play a critical role in the operation of all mental processes, with emotion-cognitive interactions consisting of both dynamic momentary/situational responding and patterns of response related to enduring personal traits (Isard, 2009). Intrapersonal and interpersonal skills relating to emotionality – ‘emotional intelligence’ - have been described and studied by various researchers (e.g., Salovey, Woolery, & Mayer, 2009; Goleman, 1998; Boyatzis, 1999; Boyatzis, Goleman, and Khee, 2009; McClelland, 1999; Mayer, et al, 1998; Salovey, P. et al., 1999).

Salovey and Sluter (1997) define emotional intelligence as the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth. They offer a four branch model of emotional skills: 1. Perception, Appraisal, and Expression of Emotion; 2. Emotional Facilitation of Thinking; 3. Understanding and Analyzing Emotions; Employing Emotional Knowledge; 4. Reflective Regulation of Emotions to Promote Emotional and Intellectual Growth.

We believe a subset of emotional skills related to emotional intelligence are particularly critical to the development of global mindset and create important psychological capital available to a global leader (Luthans, et al., 2007): (1) *Self Efficacy* - having confidence to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (2) *Optimism* - making a positive attribution about succeeding now and in the future; (3) *Hope* - persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals in order to succeed; and (4) *Resilience* - sustaining and bouncing back to attain success when beset by problems and adversity (Luthans et al, 2007;

Snyder and Lopez, 2002; Snyder and Lopez, 2007; Seligman, 1998).

*Self-efficacy* or self-confidence appears in the literature on global leadership as a driver of cultural adjustment (Mendenhall, 2001) and cultural intelligence (Earley and Ang, 2003). Black, Morrison, and Gregersen (1999) point to successful expatriates' self-confidence as important to their willingness to learn new ways of thinking and behaving outside of their home country and Early and Ang (2003) note that efficacy is one driver of individuals' motivation to understand and adapt to a new environment.

*Optimism* helps individuals have a more positive expectancy of stressful or unfamiliar events, stimulates motivation to learn, and allows for greater learning opportunities from such events (Luthans, 2002; Goleman, 2000; Clapp-Smith, et al., 2007). David Campbell (1997), commenting on the attitudes of hundreds of very senior leaders who consistently rated their organization's cultural attributes as far more positive than individuals working one or more levels below them, observed that it is the optimism of these individuals that allowed them to rise to the top; people follow leaders who are optimistic in their outlook. Leaders with optimism will tend to attribute failure in cross-cultural interactions to underlying cultural dynamics and will use such an attribution to seek strategies for successfully navigating future cultural encounters (Clapp-Smith, et al, 2007).

*Hope* represents the will to achieve certain goals, a reservoir of determination and commitment that can be called upon to cause movement toward a goal (Snyder, 2007; Seligman, 1998). Hope helps those that discover that their mental models are narrow, culturally biased, or insufficient to make sense of paradoxical cues in a cross-cultural setting to incorporate more pathways into their cognitive strategy and broaden their capacity for perspective taking (Clapp-Smith, et al., 2007).

*Resiliency or hardiness* has been identified by a number of authors who have examined expatriate performance overseas as one of the core global leadership competencies (for a summary of the literature, see Osland and Bird, 2004; Mendenhall, et al., 2008). Resilience is a complex interactive process tied to the ability to learn to live with ongoing fear and uncertainty and show positive adaptation in spite of difficult and challenging life experiences (Linley and Joseph, 2004; Bonano, 2004; Zimmerman and Arunkumar, 1994). It is the ability to maintain equilibrium following highly aversive events, persevering and adapting even when things go awry, and not ‘breaking’ under extreme stress.

These elements of self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience have been found to have a relationship with performance outcomes in US, Chinese, Central Asian, and Indian samples (Clapp-Smith et al., 2007). These same positive resources widen the “array of thoughts” (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Fredrickson, 2009), expand cognitive and metacognitive abilities (Clapp-Smith, et al, 2007) and broaden behavior repertoires (Fredrickson & Branigan, 2005; Fredrickson, 2009).

### **Factors Influencing the Development of the Self Schema**

The aspects of the Self Schema discussed above result from a combination of genetically determined traits, beliefs and values shaped by family and societal cultures, and from cognitive and emotional experiences that create disequilibrium. We believe that three characteristics of the individual particularly influence the psychological capital necessary for global mindset: personality type, level of interpersonal needs, and level of conceptual development.

Dalton and Ernst (2004) define personality as “...a person’s consistent and stable response to the world” (p. 372) and contend that individuals who understand their own personality can develop more realistic and intentional interactions with people who are different

from them. Research conducted over the past 100 years demonstrates that regardless of the language one speaks or culture in which a person lives, five broad themes describe the most prominent facets of normal human personality (e.g. Goldberg, 1990; Howard and Howard, 2001). Table 1 provides more detailed information on the dimensions that comprise the Five Factor Model of Personality (FFM). Meta-analytic studies have demonstrated a robust relationship between the FFM and job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Howard and Howard, 1991) and leadership (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002).

-----  
INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE  
-----

Certain personality characteristics are particularly important to the success of global leaders (Dalton & Ernst, 2004; Leslie et al, 2002). The Center for Creative Leadership studied 211 managers from 39 nations working in 30 countries and found that certain personality characteristics were associated with successful global leadership and were better predictors of effectiveness than experience (Leslie, et al, p. 61). For example, *conscientiousness* was positively associated with knowledge and success orientation for global managers (but not for domestic managers); *agreeableness* was positively correlated with the role of global leaders but not domestic leaders; *neuroticism* was negatively associated with numerous roles of domestic and global managers and had a high negative correlation with global managers; and *extroversion* has more impact on perceptions of effectiveness of global managers compared to domestic managers.

In contrast to personality characteristics that enhance goal achievement, other personality features can interfere with leadership effectiveness and act as ‘derailers’ of a leader’s career. These dysfunctional dispositions reflect how individuals behave when they are under stress, are

overworked, have let down their guard, or do not care about the impression they make (Hogan & Kaiser, 2008). Summarizing a comprehensive literature review, Hogan et al. (in press) note that “... every study of managerial failure reviewed...points to ‘overriding personality defects’ (Bentz, 1985) as a key issue [in why managers fail]...The defects disrupt the interpersonal relationships needed to build a team and corrupt the judgment needed to guide its [the team’s] performance” (p. 8).

Table 2 summarizes how personality attributes can be strengths but when carried to an extreme—as is likely when a manager is under stress—can interfere with one’s ability to build relationships with others and form high performing teams (Hogan et al., 2007; Hogan, Hogan & Kaiser, in press).

-----  
INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE  
-----

Because global leadership is more challenging and inherently more complex than managing in a single cultural environment, it is arguably more stressful and, thus, more likely to evoke career derailing personality features which must be managed using the emotional competence we associate with the Self Schema. Developing an awareness of personal personality traits and preferences – both constructive and derailing features - enables a global leader to know when and where to act ‘naturally’ and when a different response is warranted.

The interpersonal skills associated with the Self Schema also stem, in part, from a set of needs experienced by all human beings in varying degrees: (1) The need for *inclusion or affiliation*, which refers to the extent to which individuals need to have social interactions and associations with others; (2) The need for *control* or the extent to which individuals want to lead and influence others as well as the extent to which they prefer to be led and influenced; and (3)

The need for *affection* which refers to the emotional connections between people and the extent to which individuals seek to establish relationships with others, particularly one-to-one relationships (Waterman & Rogers, 1996; Ryan, 1989; Schnell and Hammer, 2001; Schnell, Hammer, Fitzgerald, Fleenor, and Van Velsor, 1996; Schutz, 1955). These needs describe a psychological condition that, if not satisfied, leads to a state of discomfort or anxiety (Shutz, 1955; California Psychological Press, 2009),.

Individuals differ in the extent to which they express these needs and to the extent they actually want these needs satisfied in social settings. This has great impact on the ability of leaders to engender trust, inspire productivity and job satisfaction, and revitalize the people around them (Schnell and Hammer, 1996). Needs are fairly stable over a life-time, yet the expression of the needs can be altered by significant life events or a deliberate intent to behave in ways different from the individual's actual needs. Culture appears to have some influence on the amount of need that is expressed to others. For example, Asian leaders report expressing more affection or openness than leaders from other geographic regions (CCL, 1992-2006).

Understanding and accommodating the needs of followers who have different needs than the leader is important to building strategic business relationships and this ability is associated with the interpersonal skill realm of the Self Schema. The extent to which leaders want and express the need for affection for example, specifically impacts the development of trusting relationships.

Another aspect of the Self Schema that is critical to the development of global mindset concerns recognizable developmental stages of understanding that are qualitatively different ways of making sense of the world in adulthood (e.g., Kegan, 1980, 1982, 1994; McCauley et al. ,2006; Kohlberg,1969; Selman; 1974). There is agreement among most developmental psychologists

that leaders can be identified by their “internal action logics” or mental models, their understanding of their environment which drives decisions and actions (Hoppa, 2007, p. 22).

Three stages of mental model development have been identified: (1) Dependent, (2) Independent, and (3) Inter-dependent (McCauley et al, 2006; Hoppa, 2007). Table 3 (Kegan, 1994) defines these stages along with the implications for global managers (p. 21-22).

-----  
INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE  
-----

The flexibility, adaptability, and relational skill associated with the Self Schema depends, in part, on an independent or interdependent level of meaning making, setting in motion an internalized system for subjecting all values and loyalties to reanalysis in a way that approaches differences with respect and reflects an understanding that we all don't make sense of reality in the same way (Kegan, 1994). Leaders operating at an Independent Level create a Self Schema much better suited to coping with the complex challenges of the modern global organization whose work involves managing cultural, environmental, and organizational differences than those at the dependent level (McCauley, 2006; Hoppa, 2007).

### **The Relationship Between The Four Schemas of Global Mindset and Performance**

The importance of each the four schemas to a global leader's effectiveness varies by the individual's role in the organization as well as the more general environmental context in which they work. For example, for a team leader within a single cultural context who is designing services for a domestic customer, none of the schema would have to be particularly large or complex for them to succeed in their role. On the other hand, a leader in charge of a global virtual team must understand the different cultures (including their own) of their team members and the organization's structural schema (region vs. region, region vs. headquarters, resource

allocation, decision-making structure). And a leader in charge of the regional operations of a large multinational organization needs all four schemas developed at a high level of complexity.

Contrary to most writing in the field, this model does not assume that “more is always better.” For example, if an individual’s schema becomes too large and too complex, or if they must process information and interconnections among too many realms, it can unnecessarily complicate decision-making, slowing down decisions and causing inaction, with negative consequences. For example, Leslie et al (2002) examined cosmopolitanism, defined as experiences including number of languages spoken before age 13, number of countries educated in, number of countries lived in, number of languages spoken and expatriate experience (p. 47). Expectedly, Leslie et al. found positive correlations between a manager’s assessment of their cosmopolitanism and their international business knowledge and cultural adaptability. Unexpectedly, however, they also found that managers with high cosmopolitanism scores were rated lower by their bosses on interpersonal relationship proficiency. These paradoxical results suggest that a person who easily adapts to every situation may appear less genuine and consequently less trustworthy.

Because a leader’s global mindset consisting of the four interacting schema drives the everyday behavior of global managers and hence the outcomes they achieve, developing schema robust enough to meet the complexity of global challenges is critical. The greater the capability of the four schemas to exercise predictive validity within a given context, the greater the chance that the leader’s behavior will meet others’ needs and expectations and the higher the likelihood of responding effectively to global challenges (Hollenbeck, 2001; McCall and Hollenbeck, 2002; Kegan, 1994).

We now turn to two questions that are fundamental to the challenge of understanding the applicability of this model to the development of global leaders: (1) How are these schema expanded and evolved?; and (2) What can organizations do to facilitate this process?

### **Developing the Four Schemas of Global Mindset**

A global leader does not possess a unitary global mindset but, instead, one that is multi-faceted, represented by the four schemas. In addition, these schema are not static but change with time and context. As we discuss below, this view of global mindset has clear implications for the development of (and selection) of global leaders. Developing the schemas is a transformative learning experience, one which results in new world views, and not just new skills (Lewin, 1951; Kegan, 1983; Luthans, 2007; Kohlberg, 1969). Assisting global leader's mindset development, therefore, isn't achieved by classroom activities alone but instead requires guided analysis of global experiences. Purposefully stretching and developing each of the four schema, without over-stretching them past the breaking point, is critical to their development.

To create optimum opportunities for the schemas to grow, consideration of three conditions is important:

(1) *The leader's personal learning agility* - global leaders must personally come to the task as agile learners, pursuing both *adaptive learning* - learning that is required to survive in a changing environment, and *generative learning* - learning that enhances creative capacity (Senge, 1990). Learning agility - seeking out new ways of seeing and behaving in new and difficult situations and relishing experimenting and learning - is a hallmark of effective global leadership (Ryan, 2009). Selecting for and fostering learning agility in leaders is therefore critically important.

(2) *The organizational and societal attitude and approach to learning.* Organizations that value learning by creating safe conditions for exploring mistakes and experimenting with solutions, for example, and which support formal and informal learning activities stimulate schema development (Senge, 1990; Argyris, 1999),

(3) *The characteristics of the schemas themselves.* We believe that the four schemas of global mindset, represented in Figure 1 below using the metaphor of balloons, possess five important characteristics that influence their development. First, *the schemas are flexible and elastic.* They can grow and expand over time as an individual's mindset changes and develops. This elasticity is critical to manage contingencies, changes, and unpredictability in relationships among the various elements in the leader's decision-making environment and is associated with a leader's level of adaptability and conceptualization (Kegan, 1994; Hoyer, and Rybash, 1994). This flexibility and elasticity can be facilitated by promotions, expatriate assignments, and participation in formal development programs that challenge leaders' assumptions and perspectives. However, these developmental activities must be orchestrated so that they are received at the right time (McCall and Hollenbeck, 2002) and provide just the right amount of developmental stretch. Additionally, expatriate assignments and global job rotations must be debriefed so that the 'right' lessons are learned from them. Providing mentors and coaches raises the likelihood that experiences turn into learning.

-----  
INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE  
-----

*Second, a schema expands only with pressure.* All learning and growth, including the growth of these four schemas, occurs through encounters with conflict and challenge to one's personal perceptions and resources (e.g., Argyris, 1999; Piaget, J., 1954; Yates, 1991; Hart, 1983).

Without experiences that disorient and create disequilibrium in thinking and feeling, the schema will not expand. The global leader's own expectations and experience may create the pressure or the pressure may emanate from external events. Yet the amount of pressure must be 'just right.' Too much pressure, and the individual is overwhelmed, experiencing paralyzing shock that prevents growth and change; too little pressure, and the schema doesn't shift and assumptions, points of view, and beliefs remain unchanged.

Third, *each schema's scope and depth develops independently*. A leader may have a large amount of knowledge and a complex set of assumptions and cognitive interconnections about the organization and its structure and have relatively little knowledge, assumptions and interrelationships about culture. Or an individual may have a well-developed grasp of a particular culture, environment, and organization, but lack flexibility, adaptability and interpersonal skill. Because the four schemas develop differentially, it is important to begin developmental planning for a particular executive by assessing the utility of their schemas separately, and not assuming that because they have a great depth of knowledge and experience with multiple cultures foreign to their own that their knowledge of the business landscape – the environment and organization schemas – is equally developed.

Fourth, *each schema influences the other; they exhibit interdependence*. The self schema, for example, largely influences the degree of flexibility and adaptability available to effectively consider and act upon facets of the environment, culture, or organization. Likewise, the organizational schema may enhance or inhibit a leader's conceptualization of the complexities of a particular business environment. In addition, facing the pressures associated with a complex business environment can motivate a desire to develop the personal skills and attitudes needed to cope (the self schema).

Fifth, *the requisite complexity and importance of each of the four schemas is situationally determined*. The scale and scope of an assignment, the experience, traits, and role of the leader, the complexity of the business environment and cultures all influence which schema will be most, and least, relevant and important for success at a given point in time. Unique situations and problems may require more emphasis and attention to one schema than others. Multi-country global assignments large in scale require a ‘larger’ or more complex schema, while a well-defined, less complex assignment requires a less complex, ‘smaller’ schema. For example, a team leader within a single cultural context designing services for a domestic customer doesn’t require any of the schema to be particularly large or complex for them to succeed in their role. On the other hand, a leader in charge of a global virtual team must understand the different cultures (including their own) of their team members and the organization’s structural schema (region vs. region, region vs. headquarters, resource allocation, decision-making structure). A leader in charge of the regional operations of a large multinational organization, must explore the environment, their organization, and, the represented cultures and themselves. These leaders need four highly developed, complex schema available to them to handle these challenges.

Given the characteristics of the schemas, we offer the following suggestions for effectively developing global mindset:

(1) **Develop Each of the Schemas Based on Individual Need.** Ensure that the extent of the development is tailored to an individual leader’s personal “current state.” Schema or ‘Balloon Profiles’ can be drawn for particular individuals, indicating by size the robustness of each schema. Balloon Profiles can also be drawn for specific roles or jobs within an organization, depicting how much each of the schemas needs to be developed and what aspects are important in order to meet the needs of a particular global assignment. Comparisons between the balloon

profiles of individual executives and the balloon profile of a particular global assignment can be made to determine the degree to which the individual's and the job profiles overlap, thus suggesting suitability for assignment and development strengths and gaps.

(2) **Design Guided Learning Experiences.** Just having an international experience does not guarantee growth of the schemas. Although some 'learning about' is necessary to grow each of the schemas, the majority of schema growth will only occur through carefully orchestrated learning experiences, those with clear learning outcomes related to each of the schemas, visceral impact, and a rhythm of challenge and learning support (McCall, Lombard, and Morrison, 1988).

Transformative learning experiences are characterized by authenticity (they relate to immediate job challenges), high aesthetic value and enjoyment, as well as high intellectual and emotional stimulation. An example is a guided experience created by Bob Reinheimer at Duke Corporate Education. Senior business executives, unable to see how they could succeed with severely reduced resources, were whisked away to rural India and given the role of delivering home-made lunches in metal "Tiffin" boxes to executives in the city using only the tools used by the successful business owner: a bicycle and the boxes. The experience transformed the perspectives of these executives. To make learning maximally effective, a guide is needed to point out the relevant learnings and ensure that important understandings are not missed. A mentor or a coach exposes, explores and challenges a manager's mental models and supports them as they try out new ways of thinking and behaving.

(3) **Create space and place to reflect.** The schedule of global leaders is excruciatingly busy. Taking time out to think often seems like an unproductive activity. Yet stretching the schemas - developing more complex points of view and perspectives - requires time and explicit attention. Supporting global leader communities of practice that explore pressing issues and ask questions

such as “*How can we frame this challenge differently?*” “*What are we missing?*” “*What have we discounted, what remains unsaid?*” is one reflective process. Creating space in international travel schedules for interacting informally with new people and establishments is another.

(4) **Insist on continuously developing and supporting development of the Self Schema.** A leader’s cognitive and affective capacities profoundly impact the development of the other three schemas and hence their global leadership effectiveness. As global assignments grow in complexity, more demands are placed on the leader’s psychological resources. Offer opportunities for leaders to diagnose the state of their emotional intelligence, change readiness, learning agility, and overall leadership versatility and discover their strengths and developmental needs. Then, encourage development of an ongoing developmental plan that includes coaching and mentoring to facilitate the ongoing evolution of thought and action. Offering immersive learning experiences that portray a leader’s unseen ways of behaving with others, organized around provocative global challenges, can jump-start a leader’s development.

## CONCLUSIONS

While the need for global leadership is increasing dramatically in organizations around the world, there is a shortage of global leaders that is expected to increase in the future. Not surprisingly, there is a great deal of interest in both academic and practitioner circles to identify and develop global leaders and a number of recent books, chapters and articles have been published on this topic. In this paper we summarized the existing work in the field, focusing on global mindset, the most critical element for effective global leadership. We expanded on the work of Kefelas (1998) and others to identify four schema that make up a global mindset and which provide opportunities for development: the self schema, the organizational schema, the

culture schema, and the environmental schema. Finally, we provided a number of recommendations based on our framework for developing global mindset in leaders.

Future research should build on the foundation that we have laid in this paper to identify, more specifically, how each of the four schema develop, the relative importance of schema development to global leadership success, and the complex interplay between the schema, the work of the leader, and the external context.

## REFERENCES

- Argyris, Chris 1999. *On organizational learning*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Argyris, Chris 1982. *Reasoning, learning, and action: Individual and organizational*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Alon, I. and J. Higgins 2005. Global leadership success through emotional and cultural intelligences, *Business Horizons*, 48(6): 501-521.
- Barrick, M.R. & Mount, M. K. 1991. The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis, *Personnel Psychology*, 44: 1-26.
- Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. 1989. *Managing across borders: The transnational solution*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Beechler, S. and Baltzley, D. 2009. Finding and developing global leaders, Chapter 25 in J. Storey, P. Wright and D. Ulrich (Eds.), *The Routledge companion in strategic human resource management*. Routledge: London.
- Beechler, S. and Javidan, M. 2007. Leading with a global mindset, In M. Javidan, R. Steers & M. Hitt, (Eds.), *Advances in international management: The global mindset*. Oxford:Elsevier/JAI Press.
- Bentz, V. J. 1985. *A view from the top: A thirty-year perspective on research devoted to discovery, description, and prediction of executive behavior*. Paper presented at the 93rd Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, August.
- Berger, Jennifer G. 2006. Adult development theory and executive coaching practice. In D. Strober and A. Grant (Eds.), *Evidence based coaching handbook*: 345-390. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

- Bird, A. & Osland, J. S. 2004. Global competencies: An introduction. In H. Lane, M. Maznevski, M. Mendenhall & J. McNett. (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of global management. A guide to managing complexity*: 57-80. London, UK: Blackwell.
- Black, J.S. , Morrison, A. and Gregersen, H. (1999) *Global Explorers: The Next Generation of Leaders*. NY: Routledge.
- Bloom, Benjamin (Ed.). 1956. *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The cognitive domain*. New York: Donald McKay.
- Bonano, D. 2004. Loss, trauma, and human resilience. *American Psychology*, 59: 20-28.
- Boyatzis, R., Goleman, D., & Rhee, K. 2009. Clustering competence in emotional intelligence: Insights from the Emotional Competence Inventory (ECI). In R. Bar-on and J. Parker, (Eds.), *Handbook of emotional intelligence*: San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, D. 1997. *Presentation on the Campbell Organizational Survey*. Leadership at the Peak, Center for Creative Leadership, Colorado Springs, Colorado.
- Center for Creative Leadership.1992-2006. *Reports on FIRO-B Mean Scores: Sample Profiles from the CCL Test Database*. Greensboro, NC.
- Cherniss, G. 2000. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New Orleans, LA, April 15, 2000.
- Clapp-Smith, R., Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. 2007. The role of psychological capital in global mindset development. In M. Hitt, R. Steers & M. Javidan, (Eds.), *The global mindset: Advances in international management*, 19: 105-130). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Dalton, M. and Ernst, C. 2004. Developing leaders for global roles. In C. McCauley and E. VanVelsor, (Eds.) *The center for creative leadership handbook of leadership development* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.): 361-382 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Davies, M., Stankov, L., & Roberts, R. 1998. Emotional intelligence: In search of an elusive construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 989-1015
- Dweck, C. 2006. *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York: Random House.
- Earley, C. P., & Ang, S. 2003. *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Evans, P. and Doz, Y. 1992. Dualities: A paradigm for human resource and organizational development in complex multinationals, in V. Pucik, N. Tichy& C.Barnett, (Eds), *Globalizing*

- management: Creating and leading the competitive organization*: Wiley, New York,
- Feist, G. J., & Barron, F. 1996. *Emotional intelligence and academic intelligence in career and life success*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Society, San Francisco, CA, June.
- Fredrickson, B. 2009. *Positivity: Groundbreaking research reveals how to embrace the hidden strength of positive emotions, overcome negativity, and thrive*. Sacramento: Crown.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Branigan, C. 2005. Positive emotions broaden the scope of attention and thought action repertoires. *Cognition and Emotion*, 19(3): 313-332.
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Losada, M. F. 2005. Positive affect and the complex dynamics of human flourishing, *American Psychologist*, 60(7): 678-686.
- Fulkerson, J. 2002. Growing Global Executives, in R. Silzer, (Ed.). *The 21<sup>st</sup> century executive: Innovative practices for building leadership at the top*: San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Galbraith, J. 2000. *Designing the global corporation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gardner, H. 1983. *Frames of mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. 1977. *The interpretation of cultures*. NY: Basic Books Classics.
- Goldberg, L. 1990. An alternative “description of personality”: The Big-Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59: 1216-1229.
- Goleman, D. 1995. *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam.
- Goleman, D. 1998. *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. 2006. *Emotional Intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. NY: Random House.
- Govindarajan, V., & Gupta, A. 2001. *The quest for global dominance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gupta, A. & Govindarajan, V. 2002. Cultivating a global mindset. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(1): 116–126.
- Hall, E. 1973. *The silent language*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Hall, D., Gurong, Z., Amin, Y. 2001. Developing Global Leaders: To Hold On to Them, Let Them Go!, In W. Mobley and M. McCall, Jr. (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership*, Vol.2: 442-453. Stamford Ct.: JAI Press, 2001.
- Hart, L. 1983. *The human brain and human learning*. New York: Longman.

Health – EU. 2009. *Social Environment*. [http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/my\\_environment/social\\_environment/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/health-eu/my_environment/social_environment/index_en.htm)

Hemphill, J. K. 1959. Job description for executives. *Harvard Business Review*, 37(5): 55-67.

Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hollenbeck, G. P. 2001. A serendipitous sojourn through the global leadership literature, In W. Mobley and M. McCall, Jr. (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership*, Vol.2: 442-453. Stamford Ct.: JAI Press.

Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. In press. Management derailment: Personality assessment and mitigation. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *American Psychological Association handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*: Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hogan, R., & Benson, M. 2009. Personality theory and positive psychology: Strategic self-awareness. In R. B. Kaiser (Ed.), *The perils of accentuating the positive*: 57-76. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.

Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. 2008. Quality control: Why leaders need to understand personality. *Leadership in Action*, 28 (5): 3-7.

Hoppa, M. H. 2007. Adult development theory may boost global leadership. *Leadership in Action*. Vol. 27(3): 21-22. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

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

House, R. J. & Javidan, M. 2004. Overview of GLOBE, In R. House, et al. (Eds.), *Culture, Leadership and Organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Howard, P. & Howard, J. 2001. *The owner's manual for personality at work: How the Big Five personality affect performance, communication, teamwork, leadership*. U.S.: Center for Applied Cognitive Studies.

Hoyer, W., & Rybash, J. 1994. Characterizing adult cognitive development, *Journal of Adult Development*, 1(1): 23-50.

Hunter, J. & Hunter, R. 1984. Validity and utility of alternative predictors of job performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 76(1): 72-93.

- Hunter, J., Schmidt, F., & Judiesch, M. 1990. Individual differences in output variability as a function of job complexity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75: 28-42.
- Izard, C. 2009. Emotion theory and research: Highlights, unanswered questions, and emerging issues, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60: 1-25.
- Javidan, M., House, R., & Dorfman, P. 2004. A nontechnical summary of GLOBE findings, In R. House, R. et al. (Eds.), *Culture, Leadership and Organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Judge, T., Bono, J., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. 2002. Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 765-780.
- Kaplan, B. and Kaiser, R. 2007. *The versatile leader*. San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
- Kefalas, A. 1998. Think Globally, Act Locally. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 40(6): 547-562.
- Kegan, R. 1980. Making meaning: The constructive-development approach to persons and practice. *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 58: 373-380
- Kegan, R. 1983. *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kegan, Robert 1994. *In over our heads: The mental demands of modern life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kluckhohn, F., & Strodtbeck, F. 1961. *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Kohlberg, L. 1969. Stage and sequence: The cognitive development approach to socialization. In Goslin, D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Socialization: Theory and Research: 305-366*. New York: Rand McNally.
- Lane, H. Maznevski, M., Bird, A. & McNett, J. (Eds). 2004. *The Blackwell handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lane, H., Maznevski, M., & Mendenhall, M. & McNett, J. 2004. Globalization: Hercules meets Buddha. In H. Lane, M. Maznevski, M. Mendenhall & J. McNett (Eds), *The Blackwell handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity*: 3-25. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Leslie, J., Dalton, M., Ernst, C., & Deal, J. 2002. *Managerial effectiveness in a global context: A working model of predictors*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Levy, O., Beechler, S., Taylor, S. & Boyacigiller, N. 2007. What we talk about when we talk about global mindset, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 38(2): 231-258.

- Lewin, K. 1951. *Field theory in the social sciences*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Linley, P.A. and Joseph, S. 2004. Positive change following trauma and adversity: A review. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 17: 11-21.
- Logan, G. 2008. Global leadership talent shortage forecast, *PersonnelToday.com*, May 21, <http://www.personneltoday.com/articles/2008/05/21/45938/global-leadership-talent-shortage-forecast.html>
- Luthans, F. 2002. The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 6: 695-706.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C., & Avolio, B. 2007. *Psychological capital*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D., & Salovey, P. 1998. *The multifactor emotional intelligence scale*. New York: Basic Books.
- Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. 1998. Competing models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of human intelligence* (2nd ed.): New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Maznevski, M. L., & Lane, H. W. 2004. Shaping the global mindset: Designing educational experiences for effective global thinking and action. In N. Boyacigiller, R. Goodman, R. & M. Phillips (Eds), *Crossing cultures: Insights from master teachers*: London: Routledge.
- McCall, M. W. & Hollenbeck, G. P. 2002. *Developing global executives: The lessons of international experience*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- McCall, M.W. 1998. *High flyers: Developing the next generation of leaders*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- McCall, M.W., Lombardo, M., and Morrison, A. 1988. *The lessons of experience*. NY: Free Press.
- McCauley, C., Drath, W., Palus, C., O'Connor P., Baker, B. 2006. The use of constructive-development theory to advance the understanding of leadership, *The Leadership Quarterly*: 634-652.
- McClelland, D. 1973. Testing for competence rather than intelligence. *American Psychologist*, 28(1): 1-14.
- McClelland, D. 1999. Identifying competencies with behavioral-event interviews. *Psychological Science*, 9(5): 331-339.

- Mendenhall, M. 2001. *Developing global business leaders: Policies, processes, and innovations*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Mendenhall, M., & Osland, J. 2002. *An overview of the extant global leadership research*. Symposium presentation, Academy of international business, Puerto Rico, June.
- Mendenhall, M.E., Bird, A., Osland, J., & Oddou, G., & Maznevski, M. 2008. *Global leadership: Research, practice, development*. London: Routledge.
- Mezirow, J. 1991. *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mintzberg, H. 1975. The manager's job: folklore and fact, *Harvard Business Review*, July-August: 49-61.
- Mintzberg, H. 1994. Rounding out the manager's job, *Sloan Management Review*, Fall: 11-26.
- Murtha, T., Lenway, S. & Bagozzi, R. 1998. Global mind-sets and cognitive shift in a complex multinational corporation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19(2): 97-114.
- Musselwhite, C. 1985. *The impact of timing on readiness to learn and transfer learning from leadership development training: A case study*. Dissertation Abstracts International: Doctoral Dissertation, North Carolina State University.
- Musselwhite, W. C. 2004. *Dangerous opportunities: Making change work*. Xlibris.
- Nadler, D. and Tushman, M. 1980. A model for diagnosing organizational behavior, *Organizational Dynamics*, Autumn: 35-51.
- Paul, H. 2000. Creating a mindset. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 42(2): 187-200.
- Piaget, J. 1954. *The construction of reality in the child*. NY:Basic Books.
- Prahalad, C.K. and Doz, Y. 1987. *The multinational mission: Balancing global integration with local responsiveness*. New York: Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan.
- Reinhold, Diane, May 2005. *Global simulation client input and concept study: Senior global managers and global HR directors*. Report from the Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC.
- Rhinesmith, S. H. 1992. Global Mindsets for Global Managers, *Training & Development*, 46(10): 63-69.
- Rhinesmith, S. H. 1993. *Globalization: Six keys to success in a changing world*. Alexandria, VA: The American Society for Training and Development.

- Rhinesmith, S. 1996. *A manager's guide to globalization: Six skills for success in a changing world*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ryan, J. 2009. Accelerating performance: *Five leadership skills you and your organization can't do without*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership
- Ryan, L. 1989. *Clinical interpretation of the FIRO B* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.) Palo Alto, Ca: Consulting Psychological Press.
- Salovey, P., Bedell, B., Detweiler, J., & Mayer, J. 1999. Coping intelligently: Emotional intelligence and the coping process. In Snyder, C. (Ed.), *Coping: The psychology of what works*: 141-164). New York: Oxford University press.
- Salovey, P., Woolery, A., & Mayer, J. (in press). Emotional intelligence: Conceptualization and measurement. In G. Fletcher and M. Clark (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2: Interpersonal Processes): 118-130. Oxford, England: Blackwell Publishers.
- Salovey, P. & D. J. Sluter (1997) *Emotional development and emotional intelligence*: New York: Basic Books.
- Schein, E. H. 1992. *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd. Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schnell, E. and Hammer, A. 1996. *Interpretive report for organizations – FIRO-B*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychological Press.
- Schnell, E and Hammer, A. 2001. *Introduction to the FIRO-B instrument in organizations*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychological Press.
- Schnell, G., Hammer, A., Fitzgerald, C., Fleenor, J., and Van Velsor, E. 1996. *Relationships between the MBTI and the FIRO-B: Implications for their joint use in leadership development*. Research paper, Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.
- Schutte, N., Malouff, J., Hall, L., Haggerty, D., Cooper, J., Golden, C., & Dornheim, L. 1998. Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25: 167-177.
- Seligman, M. 1990. *Learned optimism*. New York: Knopf.
- Selman, R. 1974. *The development and conceptions of interpersonal relationships*, Vols. 1-2. Publication of the Harvard-Judge Baker Social Reasoning Project, Harvard University.
- Senge, P. 1990. *The fifth discipline*. New York, NY: Doubleday Currency.

- Spreitzer, G., McCall, M., and Mahoney, J. 1997. Early identification of international executives, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82: 6-29.
- Sternberg, R. 1996. *Successful intelligence*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Stober, D, Grant, A. (Eds.). 2006. *Evidence-based coaching handbook*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Snyder, C. and Lopez, S. 2007. *Positive psychology: The scientific and practical exploration of human strengths*. Sage Publications: London, UK.
- Terpstra, V. Sarathy, R. & Russow, L. 2006. *Global environment of business*. Garfield Heights, Ohio: NorthCoast Publishers, Inc
- Thorndike, R. L., & Stein, S. 1937. An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 34: 275-284.
- Triandis, H. 1994. Cross-cultural industrial and organizational psychology. In H. Triandis, M. Dunnette & L. Hough. (Eds), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 4): 103–172. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Trompenaars, F. & Hampden Turner, C. 1997. *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Van Velsor, E., & Leslie, J. 1995. Why executives derail: Perspectives across time and cultures. *Academy of Management Review*, 9: 62-72.
- Van Velsor, E. & Musselwhite, C. 1986. The timing of training, learning, and transfer, *Training and Development Journal*, August: 58-59
- Waterman, D. and Rogers, B. 1996. *The FIRO-B*. CA: California Psychological Press.
- Wechsler, D. 1940. Nonintellective factors in general intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 37: 444-445.
- Wikipedia. 2009. *Social environment*. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social\\_environment](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Social_environment).
- Wilson, M., Hoppa, M. & Sayles, L. 1996. *Managing across cultures*. The Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC.
- Yates, T., 1991. Theories of Cognitive Development, in M. Lewis (Ed.), *Child and adolescent psychiatry: A comprehensive textbook*. Baltimore: Williams and Williams.
- Yukl, G. 2006. *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall.

Zimmerman, M.A. and Arunkumar, R. 1994. *Resiliency research: Implications for schools and policy*. Social Policy Report of the SRCD, 8, 1-7.

**Table 1: The Five Factor Model of Personality**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Description</b>
(N) Neuroticism	This personality type has a general tendency to experience negative affects such as fear, sadness, embarrassment, anger, guilt, and disgust. People with high N scores tend to be less able to control their impulses and cope poorly with stress.
(E) Extraversion	Extraverts are sociable. They like people, prefer large gatherings, and are assertive, active, and talkative. They like excitement and stimulation and tend to be energetic and optimistic.
(O) Openness	People with high O scores have an active imagination, aesthetic sensitivity, attentiveness to inner feelings, preference for variety, intellectual curiosity, and independence of judgment. They are willing to entertain novel ideas and unconventional values and they experience emotions more keenly than closed individuals.
(A) Agreeableness	The agreeable person is altruistic, sympathetic to others and eager to help them, and trusting and cooperative rather than competitive.
(C) Conscientiousness	The person with a high C score is purposeful, strong-willed and determined, achievement oriented, scrupulous, punctual, and reliable.

Source: Costa & McCrae (1992).

**Table 2: Dimensions of the Dark Side of Personality**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>As a Strength</b>	<b>As a Shortcoming</b>
Excitable	Empathy and concern	Emotional explosiveness
Skeptical	Social and political insight	Excessive suspicion
Cautious	Evaluates risks appropriately	Indecisiveness and risk aversion
Reserved	Emotionally unflappable	Insensitive and poor communicator
Leisurely	Good social skills	Passive aggressive
Bold	Courage and energy	Overbearing and manipulative
Mischievous	Unafraid of risks	Reckless and deceitful
Colorful	Celebrations and entertainment	Impulsive and distractible
Imaginative	Creatively and vision	Bad ideas
Diligent	Hard working and high standards	Micromanagement
Dutiful	Corporate citizenship	Indecisiveness

Source: Hogan & Benson (2009)

**Table 3: Developmental Stages for Global Managers**

Development Stage	Description of the Stage	Implication for Global Managers
Dependent	Deeply imbedded in their own society's and organization's needs, traditions, values, and practices	Think in terms of either or and see differences as threats
Independent	View themselves as a product of their past experience, education, and culture	Comfortable expanding their company's boundaries to create productive relationship
Interdependent	Look for the greater good for their company and humanity as a whole	They think and act beyond familiar categories such as of culture and social class

Source: Hoppa (2007: 21-22)

**Figure 1: Four Schemas of Global Mindset**