CONTEXTUALIZING LEADERSHIP: A TYPOLOGY OF GLOBAL LEADERSHIP ROLES

B. Sebastian Reiche, Allan Bird, Mark E. Mendenhall and Joyce Osland

Version July 2016

To be published in the Journal of International Business Studies

B. Sebastian Reiche, PhD
IESE Business School
Department of Managing People in Organizations
Ave. Pearson, 21
Barcelona 08034, Spain
Tel: +34 93 602 4491
Fax: +34 93 253 4343
E-mail: sreiche@iese.edu

CONTEXTUALIZING LEADERSHIP: A TYPOLOGY OF GLOBAL LEADERSHIP ROLES

Abstract

While the global leadership literature has grown rapidly over recent years, the context in which global leadership occurs remains ill-defined and under-conceptualized. This lack of contextualization risks equating global leadership roles that are qualitatively very different and prevents sufficient clarity for empirical sampling. To foster more cohesive theoretical and empirical work, we develop a typology of global leadership roles that considers context as a critical contingency factor. Drawing on role and complexity leadership theories, we propose four ideal-typical global leadership roles (incremental, operational, connective, and integrative global leadership) that differ in their (1) *task complexity* – characterizing the variety and flux within the task context, and (2) *relationship complexity* – reflecting the boundaries and interdependencies within the relationship context. We further delineate how these contextual demands relate to specific sets of behaviors and actions that allow global leaders to fulfill the requirements of their corresponding ideal-typical global leadership roles. Our paper concludes with a discussion of implications the typology presents for global leadership research and practice, contextualization of the leadership construct more broadly, and the field of international business.

Key words: Global leadership roles; typology; theory; complexity; leadership context

INTRODUCTION

As organizations continue to expand and coordinate their activities abroad, a growing number of individuals engage in global, geographically distributed and virtual forms of work (Hinds, Liu, & Lyon, 2011). For example, a survey by the Economist Intelligence Unit (2009) revealed that nearly 80% of executives participated in virtual work arrangements of some kind, while industry surveys expect substantial increases in global work relocations (PWC, 2010). As a result, the global context is increasingly difficult to escape for any leader, highlighting the increased pressures that organizations face to identify, attract, develop and retain individuals with the ability and motivation to exercise global leadership (Beechler & Javidan, 2007; Caligiuri & Tarique, 2009). Not surprisingly, the question of what characterizes global leadership has received growing attention, both in the corporate arena (Ghemawat, 2012; Reiche 2015) and in academic research (Adler, 2001; Mendenhall, Reiche, Bird, & Osland, 2012).

At the same time, the global context in which leadership increasingly occurs has been insufficiently reflected in the traditional leadership and international business literatures. Specifically, few leadership scholars have explicitly taken into account the context of leadership (e.g., Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Liden & Antonakis, 2009). Instead, as House and Aditya (1997: 445) pointed out, "it is almost as though leadership scholars […] have believed that leader-follower relationships exist in a vacuum." Domestic leadership research that has considered wider aspects of context has primarily focused on cultural aspects and indigenous leadership, with a prominent example being Project Globe (House, Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, & Sully de Luque, 2014; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). While this has resulted in useful research findings, simply expanding domestic leadership research to incorporate cultural considerations risks overlooking other crucial elements of the global leadership phenomenon, such as broader contextual requirements and boundary crossing activities (e.g., Osland, Bird, & Oddou, 2012). An insufficient specification of the context in which leadership occurs is also reflected in the international business literature. Of particular concern is that scholars tend to do little more than link global leadership to leadership beyond the domestic context, as illustrated in definitions of

global leaders as executives who are "in a job with some international scope" (Spreitzer, McCall, & Mahoney, 1997: 7), who "can guide organizations that span diverse countries, cultures and customers" (Gregersen, Morrison, & Black, 1998: 23), or who have "global integration responsibilities in global organizations" (Suutari, 2002: 229).

The lack of contextualization of global leadership is problematic for several reasons. First, deficiency in explicating the underlying construct dimensions risks equating global leadership roles that are qualitatively very different —and hence comparing apples with oranges. McCall and Hollenbeck (2002) cautioned that not all global leadership roles are similar. For example, is it sensible to treat primarily domestic executives whose job description includes a narrowly defined international task as conceptually similar to high-level professionals with global integration responsibilities? Do people qualify equally as global leaders if their work requires virtual, as opposed to physical, global mobility?

Second, insufficient specification of the content domain of the global leadership construct has also prevented global leadership scholars from providing clarity in their sampling criteria. For instance, some researchers have used relatively simple selection criteria in their sampling, operationalizing global leaders simply as "having a global position (working only with global teams) and being responsible for leading these teams" (Story, Youssef, Luthans, Barbuto, & Bovaird, 2013: 2542), as "business managers representing different cultures and having had different exposures to international work experiences" (Li, Mobley, & Kelly, 2013: 38), or as "leaders at a specified pay grade or higher […] who were labeled global leaders [by the organization]" (Caligiuri & Tarique, 2009: 340). Others, however, have included more stringent criteria in an attempt to differentiate among global leaders, such as "documented success as a global change agent," "at least ten years of experience as a leader in their field" and "demonstrated intercultural competence" (Osland et al., 2012). The lack of a shared conceptualization of what is a multifaceted construct of global leadership not only prevents scholars from drawing meaningful conclusions across qualitatively different global leadership roles but also risks further fragmentation, which is not only a sign of an immature research domain, but also a serious barrier to future scientific progress (Pfeffer, 1993).

To address these shortcomings, we develop a typology of global leadership roles. Typologies differ from traditional theories in that they do not specify relationships between independent and dependent variables that are assumed to be consistent across all observed units of analysis but instead conceptualize multiple configurations of constructs that can determine a dependent variable (Doty & Glick, 1994). Typologies and configurational approaches are particularly useful for novel, emerging phenomena (Delbridge & Fiss, 2013) and have been used to conceptualize related constructs such as leadership in virtual teams (Bell & Kozlowski, 2002), transformational leadership (Tichy & Devanna, 1986), and global talent management (Morris, Snell, & Björkman, forthcoming). Drawing on the notion that leadership is a social process (Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey, 2007; Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991), we conceptualize global leadership as the processes and actions through which an individual influences a range of internal and external constituents from multiple national cultures and jurisdictions, and we consider context as a key contingency factor (Doty & Glick, 1994) that differentiates ideal-typical global leadership roles. In particular, we propose four ideal-typical roles that differ in their (1) *task complexity* – characterizing the variety and flux within the task context of a global leadership role, and (2) *relationship complexity* – reflecting the boundaries and interdependencies within the relationship context of a global leadership role. In the following sections, we theorize about the conceptual space of these ideal-types, their constituting constructs, and corresponding behaviors and activities. We conclude with a discussion of the theoretical, methodological and practical implications of our typology for the field of global leadership and beyond.

LEADERSHIP AS A META-LEVEL CONSTRUCT

Over the better part of the 20th century to the present, leadership scholars have spent a considerable amount of time attempting to define their focal construct of study. As Day and Antonakis (2011: 5) state, "leadership is often easy to identify in practice, but it is difficult to define precisely. Given the complex nature of leadership, a specific and widely accepted definition of leadership does not exist and might never be found." Despite the wealth of different conceptualizations of leadership, scholars

seem to agree that leadership entails a process through which one person exerts influence over other individuals to guide, structure, and facilitate task completion and relationships in a collective (Yukl, 2006). In other words, the meta-level construct of leadership came to be viewed as a social process that involves certain activities and behaviors through which a leader can achieve external influence (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Zaccaro et al., 1991).

The social influence process inherent in the meta-level construct of leadership includes different internal constituents such as followers and peers, but also a range of external constituents (e.g., regulators, government agencies, customers, suppliers, business partners, government-community partnerships, NGOs, community leaders) for two reasons. First, evidence suggests that relationships with other constituents influence the nature of the relationship between leaders and their followers (Mehra, Dixon, Brass, & Robertson, 2006; Tangirala, Green, & Ramanujam, 2007). This is particularly important given the growing number of leadership roles that do not always involve face-to-face contact with followers (Hill & Bartol, 2016). Second, integral to the meta-level construct of leadership is that it involves influence on individuals, groups and even organizational units within and beyond the boundaries of the leader's own organization, for example by representing the organization in the wider community, building trusted relationships with external partners, or developing inter-organizational alliances (Balkundi & Kilduff, 2006). In fact, as work demands are shifting from primarily task or managerial duties to communicating vision, building community and leading change, more individuals across more levels of the organization find themselves engaged in leadership, despite lacking formal authority to do so (Bird & Mendenhall, 2016).

This conceptualization also allows for the differentiation of leadership from management. While the majority of the traditional leadership literature has studied leadership in formal, often managerial roles with a focus on administrating, coordinating and structuring organizational activities (Bedeian & Hunt, 2006), scholars have pointed to the importance of leadership activities that reach beyond a particular managerial role to entail influence and exchanges throughout and beyond the wider organization (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). Management and leadership have also been viewed as being differentiated

behaviorally, despite controversy surrounding the degree of overlap between the two (Yukl, 2006). Leaders promote and cope with change, while managers focus on stability and the status quo (Zaleznik, 1977; Kotter, 1990; 2001). These are complementary but not interchangeable functions. Managers possess the legitimate authority to lead, but may lack leadership vision and skills; in contrast, not all leaders require a title, high-level position or formal authority to behave as a change agent (Kotter, 2013). Bennis (1989, p. 7) wrote: "Leaders conquer the context—the volatile, turbulent, ambiguous surrounding that sometimes seem to conspire against us and will surely suffocate us if we let them—while managers surrender to it."

The difficulty in distinguishing and defining the construct of leadership and the varied perspectives that characterize the field bring to mind the Indian parable of the blind men and the elephant (Saxe, 1878). Like the blind men, the proliferation of leadership definitions may well have its roots in context—the physical and social environment in which leadership is observed (Liden & Antonakis, 2009). Context determines the boundary conditions and hence the suitability of specific behaviors and activities through which a leader can achieve external influence. Accordingly, while any form of leadership, e.g. whether purely domestic or global, entails an influence process of internal and external constituents, each will differ as a function of its specific contextual characteristics. In the following, we first review leadership research on the role of context and then offer a working definition of global leadership.

What Do We Talk About When We Talk About Global Leadership?

While it has been common to highlight the role of context for leadership since Fiedler's (1967) contingency model of leadership effectiveness, the question of how exactly contextual conditions influence leadership remains under-researched. For example, in their review of 15 years of leadership research Porter and McLaughlin (2006) identify a lack of consistent, focused attempts to systematically examine the interplay of the organizational context and leadership. Similarly, in their introduction to a Special Issue in *Human Relations*, Liden and Antonakis (2009) lament the scarce consideration of context in the leadership domain. This may be partly due to the fact that leadership researchers primarily examine

specific contingencies such as disruptive events (Morgeson, 2005) rather than the broader contextual space. Leadership researchers who have begun to account for the global context in which leadership occurs have primarily adopted a cultural, comparative lens, applying a preferred leadership theory across cultural borders, or incorporating cultural dimensions into their research (e.g., House et al., 2014; Javidan & Carl, 2004; Koch, Koch, Menon, & Shenkar, 2016). Their emphasis tends to focus less on the broader global context and more on identifying indigenous theories of leadership or testing extant theory across cultures, which is a comparative leadership approach. Their findings are extremely useful in helping global leaders understand the expectations of their multicultural constituents. However, comparative leadership has not informed the development of the global leadership field because its use of context has been for purposes of highlighting differences without necessarily exploring the context-leader behavior relationship in and of itself. Based on reviews of global leadership research, Osland (2013a) frames comparative leadership as one of four multidisciplinary roots of global leadership (along with intercultural competence, expatriation, and global management). Leadership is missing from this list because the original scholars in this field were primarily international business researchers who approached global leadership as an emerging phenomenon. Their goal was to better understand the global context and how leaders navigated the challenges of that context than to explore extant theories of leadership in a newly emerging context. For example, Adler (2001) attempted to clarify the construct boundaries following the first global leadership research that appeared in the 1990s:

> *Global leaders, unlike domestic leaders, address people worldwide. Global leadership theory, unlike its domestic counterpart is concerned with the interaction of people and ideas among cultures rather than with either the efficacy of particular leadership styles within the leader's home country or with the comparison of leadership approaches among leaders from various countries—each of whose domain is limited to issues and people within their own cultural environment. A fundamental distinction is that global leadership is neither domestic nor multidomestic* (Adler, 2001: 77).

Despite her efforts to specify what global leadership is and is not, current global leadership research samples still comprise a bewildering array of expatriates, global managers, people who do any type of global work, as well as nominated effective global leaders (Osland, Li & Wang, 2014). Taken together, the global leadership field has not yet convincingly answered the question of what is and is not global leadership (Mendenhall et al., 2012).

In the organizational behavior field more generally, it has been common to differentiate between task and relational (or social) components of context (e.g., Johns, 2006). While Johns (2006) also theorizes about the situational context, the leadership literature has predominantly distinguished between task and relationship elements as contexts for leadership (e.g., Blake & McCanse, 1991; Stogdill, 1974) and situational leadership as a behavioral response (e.g., Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Specifically, we define the task context with respect to global leadership as the environmental conditions and elements that are relevant for leaders to conduct their specific responsibilities, including available resources, organizational and institutional structures, or relevant constituents. The relationship context, in turn, concerns the characteristics of specific exchanges with other constituents, such as social network structure or social density, for leaders to fulfill their responsibilities (Johns, 2006). Note that although the task elements may include constituents that have a bearing on a leader's responsibilities (e.g., different reporting lines in the organization), the task context, in contrast to the relationship context, does not concern attributes of specific relationships or actual exchanges with these individuals. The limited research that has considered the context in which traditional leadership occurs can be mapped onto these two broad categories of context. For example, previous studies have considered aspects of the task context including environmental risk or hierarchical level (Antonakis et al., 2003), disruptive events (Morgeson, 2005), and organizational culture (Erdogan, Liden, & Kraimer, 2006). Similarly, scholars have examined a few attributes of the relationship context such as the quality of leader-member exchanges (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), centrality in friendship networks (Mehra et al., 2006), and the effect of leaders' upward relationships with their bosses on exchanges with their followers (Tangirala et al., 2007).

We propose that the task-relationship dichotomy of leadership context is also useful to conceptualize global leadership. From a task perspective, previous work has focused on increased task responsibilities (Suutari, 2002) and environmental variety (Beechler & Javidan, 2007) that global leaders confront. Scholars have also pointed to the increased levels of cognitive complexity that these features demand (Herman & Zaccaro, 2014; Osland, Oddou, Bird & Osland, 2013). More broadly, scholars seem to agree that global leaders encounter task conditions that are substantively different from those that domestic leaders face (Osland et al., 2012). This is a consequence of operating simultaneously in multiple environments that require continuous updating and integration of this contextual knowledge for decision-making (Levy, Beechler, Taylor, & Boyacigiller, 2007). For example, global leaders learn to master paradoxes (Holt & Seki, 2012) and dualities (Gregersen & Black, 1992) such as the global/local focus. Taken together, this suggests that global leadership is characterized by significant complexity in the task environment. We therefore refer to the first dimension of global leadership as *task complexity*, and define it as the demands emanating from the environmental conditions and elements relevant for global leaders to conduct their specific responsibilities.

From a relational perspective, research has begun to examine the specific characteristics of interactions in which global leaders engage. Scholars have broadly characterized such interactions as boundary spanning activities, which may involve the crossing of organizational, industry, market, cultural, national, economic and/or institutional boundaries (Beechler, Sondergaard, Miller, & Bird, 2004; Kostova & Roth, 2003). Such interactions often entail the sharing of leadership responsibilities with other constituents (Hill & Bartol, 2016) and the need to adapt communication media choice across interaction contexts (e.g., Tenzer & Pudelko, 2016). Similarly, Mendenhall et al. (2012) pointed to both the quantity and richness of information flows between a global leader and other constituents—often through multiple types of communication channels—as salient relational aspects. Global leadership hence also constitutes significant complexity in the relationship environment. We label this second dimension of global leadership *relationship complexity*, and define it as the demands emanating from the characteristics of the exchanges that global leaders maintain with other constituents to fulfill their specific responsibilities.

Global Leadership Defined

Conceptualizing global leadership as any form of leadership that reaches beyond the domestic context, as previous research has mainly done (e.g., Gregersen et al., 1998; Spreitzer et al., 1997; Suutari, 2002), leaves tremendous variability in the roles and responsibilities that global leadership encompasses. We contend that theorizing about the global context will enable greater conceptual precision in differentiating among global leadership roles and enable scholars to better position their own research sample within the global leadership domain through clearer framing of research questions and identification of more appropriate samples. Drawing on our previous arguments, we define global leadership as

> *the processes and actions through which an individual influences a range of internal and external constituents from multiple national cultures and jurisdictions in a context characterized by significant levels of task and relationship complexity*.

Note that our definition goes beyond formal positions or job titles to include any person who influences a range of internal and external constituents from multiple national cultures and jurisdictions, reflecting an increase in the number of individuals across different organizational levels engaged in leadership activities (Bird & Mendenhall, 2016). Further, while the social influence process involves spanning national cultures and jurisdictions, global leadership does not necessarily entail the crossing of multiple continents (e.g., a leader who works across multiple cultures and jurisdictions within Asia, within Europe, or within the Americas is involved in global leadership). This, we argue, is rather a question of extent of range or scope of social influence processes. Finally, we recognize that global leadership likely differs according to the requisite levels of task and relationship complexity of a particular context, highlighting the need to differentiate between global leadership roles.

Our definition of global leadership further entails differences from purely domestic leadership in both degree and kind. From a task perspective, global leadership greatly increases the valence, intensity and complexity of key task contextual conditions given the larger number of, and more manifold, change

among relevant task elements (Osland & Bird, 2006). In their comparison of U.S. versus global executives, McCall and Hollenbeck (2002) found a difference in the extent to which global leaders need to approach their business environment, especially with respect to government and society. These differences in degree may also accumulate to a difference in kind, for example when exposure to complex task conditions produces new mental models and worldviews (Osland et al., 2012). From a relationship perspective, global leaders likely encounter a greater number of relevant constituents both internal and external to the organization and across borders, including different regulators, government agencies, customers or other business partners (Beechler & Javidan, 2007; Osland, Bird, Osland, & Oddou, 2007). Differences in kind exist because the structure and substance of relationships is likely distinct from purely domestic leaders. Structurally, global leaders cross a wide range of boundaries, including national locations, cultures, and institutional systems (Gregersen et al., 1998; Osland et al., 2013), which purely domestic leaders do not. Such border crossing may cause global leaders themselves to develop multiple identities (Shipilov, Gulati, Kilduff, Li, & Tsai, 2014), qualitatively different self-concepts (Herman & Zaccaro, 2014), and distinct intercultural competencies (Stevens, Bird, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 2014). Global leaders will also develop qualitatively different exchanges with relevant constituents given physical and temporal distance (Hill & Bartol, 2016).

Finally, our conceptualization of global leadership is related to, yet distinct from, other constructs. For example, the literature has discussed cognitive orientations such as a global mindset that help individuals to successfully navigate cross-border settings (e.g., Levy et al., 2007). Levy and colleagues (2007) conceptualize global mindset as a cognitive structure that enables an individual to balance different strategic realities and interact with cultural others at both global and local levels. In that regard, the strategic and cultural dimensions are similar to the distinction between task and relationship complexity of the global leadership context. However, while global leadership is an external influence process, global mindset is an intrapersonal capability. Another related construct is global identity, which concerns an individual's sense of belonging to a worldwide culture that transcends national cultural boundaries and varies from host- or home-country identities (Erez & Gati, 2004). Although self-concept-based leadership

theories (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993) emphasize the importance of social identification, global identity serves as a predictor or a consequence rather than a defining characteristic of global leadership.

TYPOLOGIES AS A MEANS FOR THEORY DEVELOPMENT

The main aim of classification systems is to organize units of study by generating overarching categories that share relevant similarities on a number of underlying dimensions. They are thus an essential intellectual strategy for generating theoretically meaningful categories (Biggart & Delbridge, 2004). In this regard, simple classification schemes and taxonomies order phenomena into mutually exclusive, independent and exhaustive categories and provide a number of discrete decision rules for classification. By contrast, typologies are more than simple classification systems. They are conceptually derived, interrelated sets of ideal-types, each of which constitutes a unique combination of attributes that will determine relevant outcomes. Instead of providing discrete decision rules for classification, typologies assess how the level of similarity of a particular case with an ideal-type relates to a given outcome. They are therefore actual theoretical statements that allow for empirical testing (Doty & Glick, 1994). Two of the most well-known typologies are Prahalad and Doz's (1987) differentiation of multinational corporation (MNC) strategies in the face of pressures for global integration and local responsiveness, and Miles and Snow's (1978) categorization of business-level strategies (prospector, defender, analyzer, and reactor), which have both triggered extensive research streams.

Specifically, typologies are an important tool for making theoretical distinctions between elements of complex phenomena. This is especially relevant for nascent academic disciplines or emerging phenomena, where a systematic classification of a phenomenon's core elements can deliver the building blocks for further theory development (Delbridge & Fiss, 2013; Snow & Ketchen, 2014). We contend that the global leadership field would benefit from such typological theorizing for two reasons. First, reviews of the global leadership literature consistently note that the field is theoretically underdeveloped and difficult to synthesize (Jokinen, 2005; Mendenhall et al., 2012). This may be partly due to the theoretical breadth of the leadership construct itself, which results in conceptual imprecision (Pierce & Newstrom,

2011). However, this is also a result of the wide range of roles that global leadership is thought to encompass as a function of contextual variation. The advantage of typologies over traditional theories is that they explicitly allow for equifinality, i.e., modeling multiple patterns through which constructs can determine a dependent variable of interest (e.g., effectiveness), rather than specifying relationships between independent and dependent variables that are assumed to be consistent across all observed units of analysis. For example, Miles and Snow (1978) identified three distinct ideal-types of organizations that are thought to entail maximal effectiveness. In addition, typologies usually involve contingency factors that restrict the choice of a particular ideal-type (Doty & Glick, 1994). In the case of global leadership, context is a critical contingency that affects the type of behaviors and activities necessary to influence others. Second, typologies do not develop hypotheses describing how unidimensional constructs relate to a particular dependent variable, but rather hypothesize relationships between the level of similarity of an actual unit of analysis to an ideal-type and the dependent variable (Doty & Glick, 1994). For example, the same set of behaviors of a global leader may have different outcomes depending on the particular role requirements a global leader confronts.

Below, we develop four ideal-types of global leadership roles by theorizing about a set of unidimensional, first-order constructs that form the building blocks used to characterize each ideal-typical role, and we articulate how the contextual demands relate to specific sets of behaviors and actions in delineating the four ideal-typical roles.

A TYPOLOGY OF GLOBAL LEADERSHIP ROLES

Drawing on the argument that leadership in general (Liden & Antonakis, 2009) and global leadership in particular (Osland et al., 2012; Mendenhall et al., 2012) depends on the context in which it occurs, we conceptualize context as a critical contingency factor that determines specific global leadership roles and their requirements. Our contention that context affects the requirements of global leadership roles is consistent with role theory (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978). The core tenet of role theory is that individuals assume different roles as they participate in various social

structures (Biddle, 1986; Katz & Kahn, 1978). Within each role that a person takes on, there are role requirements that reflect characteristic behaviors that the role incumbent is expected to perform. These could be tasks, responsibilities, and activities that other constituents within the role expect the role-taker to perform (Katz & Kahn, 1978). For example, followers may expect their leaders to provide regular feedback and show concern in order for leaders to achieve their influence (Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998). Therefore, performing in a particular role entails not only accepting role tasks, but also successfully navigating relationships with other constituents within the role (e.g., followers, clients, etc.).

In line with role theory and our earlier differentiation between task and relationship dimensions of leadership context, we propose that global leadership roles vary as a function of the levels of task and relationship complexity. Central to typological theorizing are unidimensional constructs that are the building blocks of traditional theoretical statements (Delbridge & Fiss, 2013; Snow & Ketchen, 2014). As Doty and Glick (1994) argue, these first-order constructs serve to describe each ideal-type and need to be theoretically specified. In the following, we therefore conceptualize two first-order constructs each for both task complexity and relationship complexity to delineate our typology, before developing four ideal-typical global leadership roles and examples of their corresponding behaviors and actions.

First-Order Constructs

Complexity leadership theory (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007) provides a theoretical basis for our first-order constructs. It was developed to frame leadership as a complex interactive dynamic from which adaptive outcomes emerge. Specifically, it discusses the variable, changing, and interdependent demands that emanate from the context in which leadership occurs. It views leadership as an administrative function that responds to the *variable* demands of different task domains, an adaptive function that initiates and reacts to necessary *change*, and an enabling function that manages the interactions with and entanglement, or *interrelations*, among relevant constituents in the leadership context (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). While the administrative and adaptive functions primarily focus on the task context within which leadership occurs, the enabling function reflects the specific relationship characteristics. Further, global

leadership scholars have highlighted that relationship complexity not only derives from the interdependencies among specific constituents but also involves a spatial dimension that represents the degree to which leaders need to cross *boundaries* in order to navigate relationships with relevant constituents (Mendenhall et al., 2012). We therefore conceptualize variety and flux as foundational constructs of task complexity, and boundaries and interdependence as foundational constructs of relationship complexity.

Variety refers to the diversity of models and manifestations of organizing, competing, and governing along with their attendant actors (Lane, Maznevski, & Mendenhall, 2004). It not only comprises the *number* of fundamental elements of the task environment, such as business units, competitors, customers, regulatory regimes, languages or religions but also the *degree of variation* within each element. For example, a global leader will face qualitatively different challenges in a multi-lingual environment as opposed to a bi-lingual setting. Variety thus reflects the combination of quantity and range of different task conditions that global leaders confront in a particular role.

Flux is the degree to which change in elements of the task environment is destabilizing, and includes three facets: the frequency with which it occurs, its intensity, and its degree of unpredictability. Specifically, changes occur at different times across different locations, often at different velocities and in different directions, making leadership of global change a balancing act (Lane et al., 2004). Scholars have also highlighted that perceptions of what constitutes change, especially destabilizing change, and the suitability of change interventions are not culturally universal (Osland, 2013c; Weick & Quinn, 1999), increasing the unpredictability of change. For example, individuals in less future-oriented cultures tend to be more averse to change, even incremental change (House et al., 2004). Similarly, the degree of local contextualization required in the roll-out of a global change initiative can be difficult to predict in advance.

Boundaries reflect a particular configuration of social structure. The literature has highlighted boundaries as a requisite characteristic of the relational context of global leadership (Beechler & Javidan, 2007; Osland et al., 2007). Specifically, the relationship complexity of a global leadership role may

derive from interactions that cross a number of different boundaries, including functional, organizational and geographic (Kostova & Roth, 2003). In addition to such physical boundaries, global leaders also face identity-based boundaries that reflect the social identifications attached to different local environments (Butler, Zander, Mockaitis, & Sutton, 2012; Herman & Zaccaro, 2014). For example, research suggests that subsidiary managers face pressures of dual identification with the local subsidiary and the wider MNC (Vora & Kostova, 2007). However, boundaries differ not only in terms of their *number* but also in terms of their degree of variation. Indeed, there is evidence that the travel time—rather than geographic distance per se—between two respective locations affects the cost of engaging in cross-border activities (Boeh & Beamish, 2012).

Interdependence concerns the worldwide movement and interconnectedness of constituents and their relevant resources such as information (Lane et al., 2004; Uhl-Bien et al., 2007). Similar to boundaries, interdependence not only refers to the number of interconnections among relevant constituents in a global leadership role, but also to their degree of interdependence. Specifically, greater levels of interdependence require more coordination and sharing of resources through interactions with constituents both in the organization's internal and external environment. For example, R&D activities in MNCs are increasingly located at the level of various subsidiaries and require close cross-unit collaboration (Mudambi & Navarra, 2004). Externally, this is reflected in MNCs facing multipoint competition and global clients who require strategic responses as an integrated whole (Prahalad & Doz, 1987).

Global Leadership Role Ideal-Types

Based on the two foundational dimensions of task and relationship complexity and their four first-order constructs, we develop a typology that distinguishes among four ideal-typical global leadership roles and their corresponding behaviors and actions (see Figure 1). For the sake of theoretical parsimony, we differentiate the four ideal-types according to low and high levels of task and relationship complexity. Further, although this is not a theoretical necessity in typological theorizing (Doty & Glick, 1994), we would expect the two first-order constructs that pertain to the same contextual dimension (e.g., variety and

flux for task complexity) to correlate and, hence, have similar requisite levels for each of the four ideal-types. For example, low levels of variety as reflected in a small number of and little variation among locations, competitors, and regulatory regimes will also limit the potential divergence of change efforts (flux). Further, the relationships among constructs between the task and relational dimensions depend on the particular ideal-type and, as we argue, are greatest for the integrative global leadership role.

In accordance with typological theorizing, we do not conceptualize relationships between individual independent and dependent variables. Instead, as noted previously and in line with role theory (Katz & Kahn, 1978), we consider that global leaders need to engage in particular behaviors and activities that are expected of them in order to fulfill the requirements and set of responsibilities of a particular global leadership role. Consistent with our task-relationship dichotomy of contextual demands, we broadly categorize leadership behaviors and actions into those concerned with task accomplishment (i.e., task-focused) and those that facilitate the development and maintenance of relationships (i.e., person-focused; Fleishman et al., 1991). While scholars have also suggested change-oriented and external behaviors as separate behavioral categories (Yukl, 2012), we subsume change-oriented behaviors under the task-oriented category based on our conceptualization of flux. Given our definition of global leadership as an influence process of both internal and external constituents, we would expect that external behaviors are necessary to meet any global leadership role requirements. Figure 1 lists example behavioral sets for each of the four ideal-typical roles, together with example roles.

-Insert Figure 1 about here-

Incremental global leadership role

The first ideal-typical role, *incremental global leadership*, is characterized by low levels of task and relationship complexity. This ideal-typical global leadership role occurs in a task and relationship context that is uncomplicated, transparent, stable, predictable, and socially bounded. Specifically, this role involves responsibilities that are primarily technical in nature, characterized by a high degree of specialization, and entail a limited number and scope of necessary interactions. In contrast to purely

domestic leadership, an incremental global leadership role reaches beyond to different national cultures and jurisdictions and is slightly more complex (hence the name, incremental). However, the task conditions are characterized by a relatively small number of elements (e.g., selling products internationally only through license agreements), and low variation within each element (e.g., international presence is limited to the same language region). In terms of flux, we consider the incremental global leadership role to occur in fairly stable environments with limited external demands for driving global change efforts, and where role requirements involve only a few different locations (thereby limiting the potential divergence of change efforts or their implementation in each location). Demands emanating from the relationship context are similarly limited. A global leader in the incremental global leadership role encounters cross-border interactions that are restricted to very few groups of constituents (e.g., franchisees with little global dispersion), which reduces the number and variation of physical and identity-based boundaries. Given the focus on technical responsibilities with a high degree of specialization, the number and degree of interdependencies will also be low. An example might be an export director in a company that sells its products internationally only through license agreements to a small number of foreign countries. This individual would be dealing with very few constituents abroad, the license agreements would limit the degree of flux encountered, and relevant interactions would involve few boundaries and relatively little interdependence. The incremental role may thus include global domestics as delineated in the literature (Shaffer, Kraimer, Chen, & Bolino, 2012) to the extent that these individuals engage in influencing internal (e.g., followers) and external (e.g., suppliers) constituents.

Global leaders in an incremental global leadership role are expected to perform certain behaviors and actions to fulfill their role requirements. However, given the relatively low demands emanating from the task and relationship contexts, individuals in this role should encounter a relatively narrow set of role requirements and hence require a relatively narrow behavioral repertoire. For example, given that the task context is limited to mainly technical responsibilities, global leaders in this role will engage in task-focused behaviors that set clear and measurable objectives, assess their level of achievement, and focus on technical innovation. They will also create visions that are narrow in scope. Because flux demands are

low, global leaders in this role will primarily lead incremental change efforts. Further, the limited number of boundaries and interactions that are socially bounded allow for ample personal contact with relevant constituents, which makes it less challenging to engage in person-focused behaviors that nurture relationships. Settings with low levels of interdependence can generally be led through structural arrangements such as designing and implementing formal reporting relationships and standard operating procedures (Kostova & Roth, 2003), thereby pointing to the use of more routinized and standardized forms of communication.

Operational global leadership role

We conceptualize the *operational global leadership role* as an ideal-type that involves high levels of task complexity and low levels of relationship complexity. This ideal-type faces high cognitive demands that arise from highly complex task conditions. This complexity may, for example, stem from substantial environmental variety, as reflected in a wide range of regulatory bodies distributed across different countries or a high number of different customers and high variation in customer needs. An operational global leadership role is also characterized by high levels of flux, for example, due to a rapid pace and divergence of regulatory change across markets. At the same time, the relationship complexity in this ideal-typical role is low. For instance, while a firm's production system may be interlinked with outsourced transportation companies and customers in different countries, integration systems that run smoothly have previously been established, reducing the need for a global leader to engage in continuous and frequent boundary spanning. This role also involves relatively fewer identity-based boundaries because constituents both internal and external to the focal organization may share common sources of identification, as in the case of inter-organizational alliances or because constituents have developed a shared language despite linguistic variation (Reiche, Harzing, & Pudelko, 2015). The number and degree of interdependencies will be similarly low, for example, because interdependencies occur primarily through contractual arrangements rather than personal exchanges, or because relationships with

constituents are relatively stable due to low attrition and turnover, despite high levels of flux in the task environment.

An example is a leader of product development in a firm providing financial services to global customers. The range of financial regulatory bodies in different countries, the number and variety of customers and customer needs, and the pace of regulatory change in this domain would render the tasks in this role highly complex. At the same time, financial services can be handled in a more standardized manner and hence involve relatively few physical boundaries and less frequent face-to-face interactions. The global scope of standardized financial products and similarity in investment motives would also reduce the number and variation of identity-based boundaries. As a result, relationship complexity would likely be low.

Global leaders in an operational global leadership role are expected to perform behaviors and actions that primarily concern fulfilling their task-related role requirements and therefore are mainly task-focused in nature. Specifically, given high levels of variety, global leaders need to deal with what Meyer and colleagues call multiple embeddedness across heterogeneous contexts (Meyer, Mudambi, & Narula, 2011). At the MNC level, this involves exploiting the differences and similarities of multiple host locations; at the subsidiary level, it entails balancing internal embeddedness within an MNC network vis-à-vis their external embeddedness in the host country context. This also involves handling potentially opposing interests (Beechler & Javidan, 2007; Osland et al., 2007), for example in the case of simultaneous competitive and collaborative arrangements between different organizational constituents (Tsai, 2002) that require different strategic responses. As a result, operational global leaders need to locally adapt task-focused leadership behaviors that Yukl (2012) identified for traditional leaders, including task prioritization, resource allocation, monitoring and problem solving. In addition, they need to scan, process and attend to disparate and often contradictory pieces of operational information and continuously update and analyze this information for decision-making purposes. Finally, while this global leadership role requires consideration of flux in more environments and greater unpredictability in change

results, relatively little interdependence reduces the need to adapt a given global change locally. Instead, it requires an allowance for and leading of different operationally-focused change efforts at local levels.

Connective global leadership role

We consider *connective global leadership* an ideal-typical role that is characterized by low task complexity and high relationship complexity. While leaders in this ideal-typical role operate in task contexts that are specialized and clearly bounded, they face high demands for social flexibility. This is because key constituents are geographically dispersed (e.g., distributed work), and culturally, linguistically, functionally, and institutionally diverse. In many cases, this ideal-typical global leadership role entails multiple physical boundaries—for example, when members of a cross-divisional project team are dispersed across different locations. In addition to physical boundaries, this ideal-typical role also involves identity-based boundaries, either because it involves distinct responsibilities across relationships with different groups of constituents (Friedman & Podolny, 1992) or because it requires dealing with different sources of identification held by relevant constituents (Vora & Kostova, 2007). Interdependencies are equally high given a relatively large number of relevant constituents, or because there is a need to interact with a changing range of constituents (e.g., fluctuating alliance partners, team members or suppliers across different markets).

By contrast, this ideal-typical role experiences low levels of task complexity. Even though specific exchange partners may be culturally, linguistically, functionally or institutionally diverse, the overall environmental variety is low; task conditions are focused, reducing the number of relevant elements (e.g., few business units, customer groups or regulatory bodies). The level of flux is also low because task requirements are recurring and/or stable (e.g., globally standardized products or services). An example is a leader of a globally distributed team that handles a company's back office. While this team's task is mainly internally focused, limiting the level of task complexity, the geographic dispersion of team members would require the global leader to engage in regular and close interactions across a wide

range of departmental, functional, cultural, linguistic and institutional boundaries, and maintain high levels of interdependencies with the constituents.

Global leaders in a connective global leadership role are expected to perform behaviors and actions that primarily concern fulfilling their relationship-related role requirements and therefore are mainly person-focused. Specifically, they need to familiarize themselves with distinct cultural, linguistic, functional, and organizational interaction contexts and continuously adapt and respond to different exchange partners' behaviors and expectations. They also need to develop and maintain both frequent and close interactions with their relevant constituents (Kostova & Roth, 2003). However, given the breadth and dispersion of their constituents, leaders need to use virtual communication technologies that include both synchronous means like telepresence and other asynchronous media (Miranda & Saunders, 2003). The latter is particularly important if contact time with each respective constituent is limited given wide geographical dispersion, and when cognitive resources are tied up with language processing in multilingual settings (Tenzer & Pudelko, 2016). Relationship maintenance demands may also elicit more face-to-face interactions, requiring more frequent travel. Existing challenges to develop and maintain frequent and close relationships with relevant constituents across boundaries further entail the potential for social frictions, which may reduce a leader's influence (Cramton, 2001; Gajendran & Joshi, 2012). Social frictions can, however, have both negative and positive effects (Shenkar, Luo, & Yeheskel, 2008). Indeed, distance has been shown to lead decision-makers to prepare and plan more extensively for foreign activities or to actively anticipate differences and potential misunderstandings (Evans & Mavondo, 2002). Global leaders in a connective role may similarly benefit from social friction. By crossing a wide array of boundaries, these individuals learn and become accustomed to continuously adapting their behavior, an activity called 'code-switching' (c.f., Molinsky, 2007) to exert culturally appropriate influence; they leverage cultural differences creatively in their influence attempts (Osland et al., 2013). Further, extrapolating from research on multicultural learning, previous boundary spanning may also increase creativity for effective problem solving (Maddux, Adam, & Galinsky, 2010).

Integrative global leadership role

Finally, we conceptualize the *integrative global leadership role* as involving high levels of both task complexity and relationship complexity. This ideal-typical role faces intense demands that arise from a need to respond to multifold, variable and changing task conditions while also constantly adjusting to exchange relationships across a wide and dispersed range of relevant constituents. As a result, the demands from the task and relationship contexts commingle to further raise the contextual embeddedness of this ideal-typical role. For example, an MNC may face a variety of institutional environments that encompass different regulations, cultural norms, labor standards and educational systems that each exert pressures for gaining local legitimacy. The potentially conflicting institutional pressures may exacerbate internal inconsistencies in the wider organization (Kostova & Zaheer, 1999). Global leaders in this role therefore need to reconcile and actively deal with potential tradeoffs between maintaining legitimacy with an MNC's respective external constituents, including customers, governments and other constituents, and internal legitimacy in terms of the acceptance and approval of an organizational unit by specific constituents in other parts of the organization. Similarly, high variation among the different elements in the task environment (e.g., followers, business units, countries, languages, suppliers, regulators, communities, etc.) may be reflected in necessary interactions with specific constituents related to each of these elements. For example, a global leader may need to maintain close personal contact with the same suppliers across different product categories and countries. At the same time, the breadth and dispersion of relevant constituents makes it more difficult to nurture such contact.

The integrative global leadership role will also experience higher levels of environmental flux and can be expected to operate across what Ancona, Okhuysen and Perlow (2001) refer to as different *types* of time. For example, the decision to search for a new supplier at the global level may coincide with different seasonal peak times across markets, different vacation times and staffing levels across local units, and different delivery bottlenecks on the supplier side. This will require increased and prolonged boundary crossing to search for and interact with potential new suppliers. Osland et al. (2013) also found

that expert global leaders emphasize boundary spanning to a large degree in describing critical incidents of global change efforts. The global leaders in their sample reported working across numerous boundaries, learning to influence multiple constituents, and engaging in continuous stakeholder dialogue. Examples of individuals in such a role are partners of global professional services firms or senior executives of global multi-unit firms, who regularly need to handle conflicting task conditions and coordinate across multiple and diverse groups of constituents.

Given their increased contextual embeddedness, leaders in an integrative global leadership role are expected to perform behaviors and actions that fulfill both their task- and relationship-related role requirements and therefore should entail both task- and person-focused behavioral sets. Compared to the other ideal-typical roles, global leaders in an integrative role need to constantly recognize and handle trade-offs in both task-oriented aspects (e.g., dealing with different needs for and pace of change across locations) and across different groups of constituents. This entails mediating conflict and finding synergistic solutions that address potentially opposing interests and needs. Specifically, while coordination and integration activities are important for any global leadership role, we would argue that they are particularly important for leaders in an integrative global leadership role for the following reason. Such behavioral sets help leaders to better respond to and leverage information from different task and relationship domains, for example when leading teams and supplier relations for different business units across geographic space and functional areas, or when leading cross-functional design teams that operate 24-7 around the world to develop a brand new technology in crisis mode while also handling a joint venture partner's cultural practice of close monitoring of progress. Moreover, global leaders in this role have to explicitly address resistance due to divergent expectations towards change across locations (Lane et al., 2004). This involves a greater need for contextualization in change implementation processes across settings, which refers to customizing aspects of the global change process to fit the local context, and requires knowledge and involvement of various local constituents (Osland, 2013b). Finally, the increased complexity demands, simultaneity of different task requirements, and limited opportunities for extensive direct contact with constituents in the integrative role also point to the need to actively share

responsibilities by way of empowering leadership (Bell & Kozlowski, 2002; Hill & Bartol, 2016) in different constituents such as followers, partners or suppliers.

SUMMARY AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Our typology has a number of implications for global leadership theory, modeling and testing, and practice.

Implications for Theory

First, our typology challenges scholars to more carefully define the independent variable of their study. In their multidisciplinary review of the global leadership literature that was published from 2010-2014, Mendenhall, Li and Osland (2016) located 181 journal articles, which represents a rapid increase in the publication rate from previous years. While research on global leadership is certainly fast growing and increasingly diverse, the global leadership construct is conceptually underdeveloped and theories of global leadership remain scarce (Osland et al., 2014). Specifically, the literature to date has lacked a coherent and agreed-upon classification scheme that helps scholars to clearly describe their research samples, compare and contrast their research contexts and findings with other studies, and contribute towards a cumulative and growing body of knowledge about the predictors, correlates and outcomes of global leadership. Our typology assists scholars in being more specific in their sampling criteria, thereby avoiding further fragmentation of construct operationalization and enabling future meta-analyses, as well as hopefully encouraging more scholars to engage with the global leadership field.

Second, we address calls for more typology-driven theorizing in the organization sciences that is particularly suitable for nascent academic fields (Delbridge & Fiss, 2013; Snow & Ketchen, 2014), as is the case for global leadership. Our theorizing suggests that task and relationship complexity serve as critical contingency factors along which global leadership roles differ. This, in turn, allows for making predictions about potential outcomes, and has implications for conceptualizing leadership effectiveness more broadly. Past research has used a wealth of different criteria to assess traditional leadership effectiveness (for a review see Hiller, DeChurch, Murase, & Doty, 2011), an approach reflected in the

global leadership field (e.g., Herman & Zaccaro, 2014). Our conceptualization of global leadership points to particular behaviors and activities that are expected of the individual in order to meet the requirements and set of responsibilities of a particular global leadership role (e.g., actions to achieve tangible performance objectives, social interaction frequency, specific developmental interventions regarding key constituents, etc.). Global leadership effectiveness should therefore involve an assessment of the extent to which leaders are able to influence different constituents given the particular contextual demands they face in their roles. For example, individuals in global leadership roles that face high demands from the task context and low demands from the relationship context will be less effective if they spend too much time and effort on activities related to nurturing constituent interactions across boundaries relative to addressing variable and changing task conditions.

Further, our theory of global leadership roles explicitly acknowledges variation within the focal construct and posits differing configurations of relationships among the four first-order constructs that can be empirically tested and blaze a trail for future research. For instance, to what extent does high task variety in the integrative ideal-typical role require more frequent or intense coordination and integration compared to the operational global leadership role, where relational demands are relatively lower? While both connective and integrative ideal-types entail a high number and variation of boundaries, how does increased task complexity change perceptions of these boundaries and their crossing, as an individual moves from a connective to an integrative global leadership role?

Third, our typology also helps to further conceptually unpack the process of engaging with the relevant global context. In this respect, the four first-order constructs of our typology provide several opportunities to theorize about the process of global leadership, which responds to recent calls for developing more process theories in the field of global leadership (Osland, 2013b) and international business more generally (e.g., Molinsky, 2013). It would be fruitful, for example, for research to conceptualize the relationship between identity-based boundaries (Butler et al., 2012; Herman & Zaccaro, 2014) and ideal-typical global leadership roles. Do the connective and integrative roles face the same potential identity threats from the multiple sources of identification they encounter and how do they

respond to these threats? It is also possible that the next generation of global leaders will be more comfortable with and skilled at geographically dispersed, technology-mediated interactions compared to previous generations. Given that leadership is a process that evolves and constitutes itself through interactions with other constituents (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Zaccaro et al., 1991), this will likely change the way in which individuals in particular global leadership roles engage with relevant contextual demands and may limit the generalizability of findings of prior research conducted in a less technologically-connected era with less technologically savvy leaders.[1]

Fourth, we contribute to the international business literature in various potentially useful ways. Specifically, our typology provides meaningful categories for the expatriate literature, which surprisingly lacks more detailed typologies despite the many different forms of international staffing. Four decades of research have contributed to a deep understanding of the relevant factors characterizing the expatriate experience and have studied an increasing number of concepts such as adjustment, effectiveness, engagement, identity, well-being and embeddedness (e.g., Shaffer et al., 2012; Takeuchi, 2010). Yet only recently has the field acknowledged that the conceptual ways in which the expatriate construct may be delineated are many and varied. While studies have moved beyond differentiating expatriates solely according to their demographic characteristics, the majority continues to distinguish among assignment direction (e.g., expatriation vs. inpatriation), assignment duration (short-term vs. long-term), locus of assignment initiative (organization- vs. self-initiated), and assignment goals (technical, developmental, functional or strategic) (see Reiche & Harzing, 2015).

While scholars have recently added more specific dimensions to classify global work experiences, including physical mobility, cognitive flexibility and non-work disruption (Shaffer et al., 2012), the existing dimensions are unable to sufficiently reflect the many task and relationship context factors that influence international assignees. For example, how many different fundamental elements, including business units, competitors, customers, regulatory regimes, languages, religions, do international assignees

[1] We are indebted to an anonymous reviewer for making this point.

encounter and need to deal with in their environment, and how variable and changeable are they? While strategic and long-term assignments can be generally assumed to demonstrate greater levels of task variety and flux, this may not necessarily be the case for rotational or commuter assignments. However, the level of task complexity that assignees encounter in their context may arguably be more relevant for many of the expatriate-related concepts such as adjustment, effectiveness or well-being than assignment direction or duration per se. Similarly, we would expect assignees who frequently cross physical and identity-based boundaries, or who need to maintain regular interactions with their international counterparts, to have a qualitatively different assignment experience than assignees who fill a particular technical role in a foreign organizational unit. To that end, our distinction between task and relationship complexity and our role theoretical explication of various roles and corresponding behavior sets should assist with conceptualizing in greater depth meaningful categories of global work.

Our typology also helps explain challenges during the repatriation process. The literature has pointed to a host of challenges that assignees experience when returning from their international relocation (see Lazarova, 2015). Our typology would suggest that reintegration challenges are also the result of moving from a global leadership role with high demands emanating from the task and relationship context to one with lower contextual demands. If a repatriate reintegrates to a role that encounters lower levels of task and relationship complexity, yet the repatriate continues to operate according to higher complexity demands faced during the international relocation—for example by maintaining previous boundary spanning activities—this may lead to a greater mismatch between demonstrated actions and behaviors and actual global leadership role requirements, with negative implications for leadership effectiveness.

Further, our typology has implications for the global strategy literature by highlighting not only the environmental factors that influence cross-border expansion, foreign market entry or international alliances (e.g., Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989), but also the relational needs underlying the interactions of those who drive and implement these strategic decisions. In doing so, we also contribute to the debate about how to manage the simultaneous pressures for local responsiveness and global integration. Specifically, rather than understanding the structural configurations for dealing with both pressures (Bartlett &

Ghoshal, 1989) or the conditions under which one pressure is relatively more salient (Rosenzweig & Singh, 1991), our typology offers specific constructs that help explain the role requirements and the processes through which the principal actors address these pressures.

Fifth, our typology contributes to the traditional leadership literature. By explicitly theorizing about the global context in which leadership occurs, we expand our understanding of how contextual conditions shape leadership (Liden & Antonakis, 2009). Specifically, our integration of role and complexity leadership theories provides a more fine-grained conceptualization of the various demands emanating from the task and relationship contexts of leadership and the resulting implications for effective leadership behavior. Further, while complexity leadership theory highlights that leadership reaches beyond the act of only one or a few individuals (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007), it is the emergence of global leadership research that has drawn specific attention to more broadly conceptualizing the context—in the form of geographically, culturally, institutionally, and economically diverse relationships or task environments—in which leadership occurs. Similarly, examining the context of global leadership allows traditional leadership scholars to test whether the assumptions and boundary conditions underlying our leadership theories remain valid or require further investigation and refinement. Hence, just like the increased heterogeneity and complexity inherent in the MNC context provides scholars with the opportunity to test, validate and expand existing organizational theories (Roth & Kostova, 2003), studying the global leadership context may equally advance traditional leadership theory. For example, our typology contributes to leader-member exchange theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) by conceptualizing additional dimensions that characterize the quality of global leader-member exchanges, including the number and variation of physical and identity-based boundaries that a global leader-member exchange involves.

Recently, scholars have called for research that seeks synergies between the fields of traditional leadership and global leadership (Herman & Zaccaro, 2014; Osland et al., 2014). To date, there has been limited theoretical and empirical cross-fertilization between these fields. Our typology builds upon the role of context in traditional leadership and relies upon leadership research and theory for justification,

drawing the two fields closer together and demonstrating how they can enrich one another in the process.

Finally, while our typology simplifies complex contextual conditions into a heuristic model (Doty & Glick, 1994) that scholars and practitioners can use to differentiate among global leadership roles, our theorizing does not take into consideration all possible contextual factors that influence global leadership or capture the dynamic nature of the leadership process. Future global leadership research could benefit from traditional leadership lessons such as the following. Context and leadership influence one another, to a degree that is situationally determined (Liden & Antonakis, 2009). We would encourage scholars to acknowledge this bi-directional influence process and determine whether and to what extent global leadership roles influence the global context. Further, the global leadership roles in our typology might be impacted by contextual factors within organizations. Transformational leadership, for example, is influenced by organizational structures, modes of governance, an emphasis on efficiency versus adaptation, and the relative dominance of the technical core versus its boundary-spanning units (Pawar & Eastman, 1997).

Implications for Modeling and Testing

Our typology has several implications for empirical modeling and testing. Specifically, it provides a testable classification schema along which global leadership roles may differ. High or low levels of task and relationship complexity can each be determined by the two constructs they comprise. For example, the level of task complexity can be calculated by measuring the levels of variety and flux a global leader encounters. The level of relationship complexity, in turn, is calculated by measuring the respective number and degrees of variation in the boundaries and interdependencies a global leader confronts. We further propose that the first-order constructs are multiplicative in nature in determining the degree to which a global leader fits an ideal-typical role. The multiplicative character of the various constructs reflects the notion that they all form an integral part of the two foundational dimensions and will therefore affect global leadership roles and responsibilities. Thus, to be considered any type of global leader requires minimum levels of variety, flux, boundaries, and interdependence. Our theorizing of the

four ideal-types has also demonstrated how the first-order constructs may interrelate. Specifically, while the two constructs per complexity dimension can be expected to correlate, relationships among constructs between the task and relational dimensions depend on the ideal-typical role and are greatest for the integrative role.

There are various ways to operationalize our four first-order constructs. Scholars have developed self-report measures at the dimensional level. For example, in the case of the construct 'complexity of a global role' (Story, Barbuto, Luthans, & Bovaird, 2014), items such as "My job requires me to manage ambiguity and uncertainty frequently" could be adapted to match our two first-order constructs of task complexity. The level of environmental flux could be operationalized through the number of change initiatives at a global level over the past five years. It is also possible to measure the number of physical and identity-based boundaries that need to be crossed regularly. Further, the level of interdependence could be measured by asking respondents about the number of relevant constituent exchanges that affect the global leadership role. Other measures could be adapted to assess how different interdependencies are across constituents, for example by accounting for tie strength (e.g., Granovetter, 1973).

We would encourage future research to develop and validate a complete set of measures that capture our proposed first-order constructs. In doing so, it would be important to draw on a sample of individuals with diverse global leadership responsibilities and measure their perceived levels of task and relationship complexity. These perception-based measures could be triangulated through subject matter expert judgments used to place a given global leadership role according to its corresponding level across the four constructs. Ultimately, this should result in a standardized set of scales that global leadership scholars can include as part of their demographic questions to gauge potentially varying global leadership roles among their respondents and further homogenize their research samples. Finally, for simplicity's sake we have assumed that the four constructs carry similar weights in defining a particular global leadership role. This is, however, an important empirical question for future research to clarify.

Implications for Practice

Our typology also has implications for global leadership development. Specifically, it provides a conceptual basis for the diagnosis of global leadership roles and developmental mandates. For example, global leadership roles expected to deal with low levels of task and relationship complexity arguably require less and different kinds of training than those at high levels of complexity. The competency sets required to match a particular global leadership role will therefore also differ. Research has derived a vast array of global leadership competencies (e.g., Black & Morrison, 2014; Bird, Mendenhall, Stevens, & Oddou, 2010; Caligiuri & Tarique, 2009). Although a discussion of each individual competency and its salience for the different ideal-typical roles is beyond our scope here, scholars' conceptualizations of these competencies appear to converge towards three overarching categories of competencies (Bird, 2013; Brake, 1997; Rosen, Digh, Phillips, & Rosen, 2000). These include (1) intrapersonal competencies directed at the internal psychological/emotional sphere of the leader, (2) interpersonal competencies associated with the management of people and relationships, and (3) business acumen competencies comprising both cognitive and behavioral abilities related to business and organizational realities.

Given that the competency domain has been largely delineated, our proposed typology provides competency scholars with the impetus to take the next step and study in more depth which competencies are relatively more salient to engage in behaviors thought to fulfill specific global leadership role requirements. For example, we might expect leaders in an incremental global leadership role (low task complexity/low relationship complexity) to primarily require competencies related to business acumen (e.g., technical expertise, results orientation). Leaders in an operational global leadership role (high task complexity/low relationship complexity) would mainly require competencies related to business acumen (e.g., responsiveness to change, environmental scanning) and intrapersonal domains (e.g., resilience, cognitive complexity), whereas those in a connective global leadership role (low task complexity/high relationship complexity) would focus relatively more on interpersonal competencies (e.g., intercultural communication, social flexibility) and intrapersonal competencies (e.g., open-mindedness, curiosity). Leaders in an integrative role (high task complexity/high relationship complexity) would require the full set of intrapersonal (e.g., thinking agility, tenacity, courage), interpersonal (e.g., cross-cultural negotiation,

sharing leadership), and business acumen (e.g., building partnerships, frame shifting) competencies. We would encourage future research to expand on and empirically test the differential value of competency sets for different global leadership ideal-types.

Further, as global leaders move from lower to higher levels of task and relationship complexity, it is possible to envision different developmental paths that would fruitfully accompany such movement. Depending on whether the growth in global leadership responsibilities occurs mainly through increased demands in the task context or requires more far-reaching, complex, and subtle interactions with manifold constituents, development interventions can be designed to selectively focus on one or another set of associated competencies (see Maznevski & Dhanaraj, 2014). In sum, the typology can provide conceptual guidance for fine-tuning global leadership training and measurement of training outcomes.

Conclusion

In this article we develop a typology of global leadership roles that advances this field of study. In line with the common differentiation between task and relationship context in traditional leadership and organizational behavior theory, our typology distinguishes among the significant and complex demands of the task and relationship contexts in which global leadership occurs. We further derive four ideal-types of global leadership roles by theorizing about a set of first-order constructs that form the building blocks used to characterize each ideal-type and articulate how the contextual demands relate to specific sets of leader behaviors and actions in delineating the four ideal-types. We believe that this typology has the potential to help global leadership scholars refine their theoretical propositions, match their operationalizations to their constructs, guide their sampling strategy, integrate their research findings, and enable further theory building in the global leadership domain.

REFERENCES

Adler, N.J. 2001. Global leadership: Women leaders. In M. Mendenhall, T. Kühlmann & G. Stahl (Eds.), *Developing global business leaders: Policies, processes and innovations*: 73-97. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Ancona, D.G., Okhuysen, G.A., & Perlow, L.A. 2001. Taking time to integrate temporal research. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 512-529.

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

Balkundi, P., & Kilduff, M. 2006. The ties that lead: A social network approach to leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 419-439.

Bartlett, C.A., & Ghoshal, S. 1989. *Managing across borders: The transnational solution.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Bedeian, A. G., & Hunt, J. G. 2006. Academic amnesia and vestigial assumptions of our forefathers. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 190-205.

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

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

Bell, B.S., & Kozlowski, S.W.J. 2002. A typology of virtual teams: Implications for effective leadership. *Group & Organization Management*, 27, 14-49.

Bennis, W. 1989. *On becoming a leader*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Biddle, B. J. 1986. Recent developments in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12, 67-92.

Biggart, N., & Delbridge, R. 2004. Systems of exchange. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 28-49.

Bird, A. 2013. Mapping the content domain of global leadership competencies. In M.E. Mendenhall, J.S. Osland, A. Bird, G. Oddou, M. Maznevski, G. Stahl & M. Stevens (Eds.), *Global leadership: Research, practice and development* (2nd ed.): 80-96. New York: Routledge.

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

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. 2014. *The global leadership challenge* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Blake, R.R., & McCanse, A.A. 1991. *Leadership dilemmas: Grid solutions.* Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Boeh, K.K., & Beamish, P.W. 2012. Travel time and the liability of distance in foreign direct investment: Location choice and entry mode. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 43, 525-535.

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

Butler, C.L., Zander, L., Mockaitis, A., & Sutton, C. 2012. The global leader as boundary spanner, bridge maker, and blender. *Industrial Organizational Psychologist: Perspectives on Research and Practice*, 5, 240-243.

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

Cramton, C.D. 2001. The mutual knowledge problem and its consequences for dispersed collaboration. *Organization Science,* 12, 346-371.

Day, D.V., & Antonakis, J. 2011. Leadership: Past, present, and future. In D.V. Day & J. Antonakis (Eds.), *The nature of leadership*: pp. 3-25. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Delbridge, R., & Fiss, P.C. (2013). Editors' comments: Styles of theorizing and the social organization of knowledge. *Academy of Management Review,* 38, 325-331.

Doty, D.H., & Glick, W.H. 1994. Typologies as a unique form of theory building: Toward improved understanding and modeling. *Academy of Management Review,* 19, 230-251.

Economist Intelligence Unit 2009. *Managing virtual teams: Taking a more strategic approach.* The Economist Intelligence Unit Limited.

Erdogan, B., Liden, R.C. & Kraimer, M.L. 2006. Justice and leader-member exchange: The moderating role of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Journal,* 49, 395-406.

Erez, M., & Gati, E. 2004. A dynamic, multi-level model of culture: From the micro level of the individual to the macro level of a global culture. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* 53, 583-598.

Evans, J., & Mavondo, F.T. 2002. Psychic distance and organizational performance: An empirical examination of international retailing operations. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 33, 515-532.

Fiedler, F.E. 1967. *A theory of leadership effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fleishman, E.A., Mumford, M.D., Zaccaro, S.J., Levin, K.Y., Korotkin, A.L., & Hein, M.B. 1991. Taxonomic efforts in the description of leader behavior: A synthesis and functional interpretation. *Leadership Quarterly,* 4, 245-287.

Friedman, R.A., & Podolny, J. 1992. Differentiation of boundary spanning roles: Labor negotiations and implications for role conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 37, 28-47.

Gajendran, R.S., & Joshi, A. 2012. Innovation in globally distributed teams: The role of LMX, communication frequency, and member influence on team decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 97, 1252-1261.

Ghemawat, P. 2012. Developing global leaders. *McKinsey Quarterly,* June 2012(3), 100-109.

Graen, G.B., & Uhl-Bien, M. 1995. Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly,* 6, 219-247.

Granovetter, M.S. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology,* 78, 1360-1380.

Gregersen, H.B., & Black, J.S. 1992. Antecedents to commitment to a parent company and a foreign operation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 65-90.

Gregersen, H.B., Morrison, A.J., & Black, J.S. 1998. Developing leaders for the global frontier. *Sloan Management Review*, 40, 21-32.

Herman, J., & Zaccaro, S. 2014. The complex self concept of the global leader. In J. Osland, M. Li, & Y. Wang (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership*, vol. 8. Bingley, UK: Emerald.

Hersey P., & Blanchard, K. 1982. *Management of organizational behavior* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hill, N.S., & Bartol, K.M. 2016. Empowering leadership and effective collaboration in geographically dispersed teams. *Personnel Psychology*, 69, 159-198.

Hiller, N.J., DeChurch, L.A., Murase, T., & Doty, D. 2011. Searching for outcomes of leadership: A 25-year review. *Journal of Management*, 37, 1137-1177.

Hinds, P., Liu, L., & Lyon, J. 2011. Putting the global in global work: An intercultural lens on the practice of cross-national collaboration. *Academy of Management Annals*, 5, 135-188.

Holt, K., & Seki, K. 2012. Global leadership: A developmental shift for everyone. *Industrial Organizational Psychologist: Perspectives on Research and Practice*, 5, 196-215.

House, R.J., & Aditya, R.N. 1997. The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23, 409-473.

House, R.J., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M., Hanges, P.J., & Sully de Luque, M.F. 2014. *Strategic leadership across cultures: The GLOBE study of CEO leadership behavior and effectiveness in 24 countries.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

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

Javidan, M., & Carl, D.E. 2004. East meets West: A cross-cultural comparison of charismatic leadership among Canadian and Iranian executives. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41, 665-691.

Johns, G. 2006. The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 386-408.

Jokinen, T. 2005. Global leadership competencies: A review and discussion. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 29, 199-216.

Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R.A. 1964. *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity.* New York: Wiley.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. 1978. *The social psychology of organizations.* New York: Wiley.

Koch, P.T., Koch, B., Menon, T., & Shenkar, O. 2016. Cultural friction in leadership beliefs and foreign-invested enterprise survival. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 47, 453-470.

Kostova, T., & Roth, K. 2003. Social capital in multinational corporations and a micro-macro model of its formation. *Academy of Management Review*, 28, 297-317.

Kostova, T., & Zaheer, S. 1999. Organizational legitimacy under conditions of complexity: The case of the multinational enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 64-81.

Kotter, J.P. 1990. *The leadership factor.* New York: Free Press.

Kotter, J.P. 2001. What leaders really do. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(11), 85-96.

Kotter, J.P. 2013. Management is (still) not leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, January 9. https://hbr.org/2013/01/management-is-still-not-leadership/, accessed April 20, 2016.

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

Lazarova, M. 2015. Taking stock of repatriation research. In D.G. Collings, G.T. Wood & P.M. Caligiuri (Eds.), *Routledge Companion to International Human Resource Management*, pp. 378-398. London: Routledge.

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.

Li, M., Mobley, W.H., & Kelly, A. 2013. When do global leaders learn best to develop cultural intelligence? An investigation of the moderating role of experiential learning style. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 12, 32-50.

Liden, R.C., & Antonakis, J. 2009. Considering context in psychological leadership research. *Human Relations*, 62, 1587-1605.

Maddux, W.W., Adam, H., & Galinsky, A.D. 2010. When in Rome… Learn why the Romans do what they do: How multicultural learning experiences facilitate creativity. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 731-741.

Maznevski, M., & Dhanaraj, C. 2014. *Global leadership and global teams.* IMD Discovery Event.

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

Mehra, A., Dixon, A. L., Brass, D. J., & Robertson, B. 2006. The social network ties of group leaders: Implications for group performance and leader reputation. *Organization Science*, 17, 64-79.

Mendenhall, M.E., Li, M., & Osland, J. (2016). Five years of global leadership research, 2010-2014: Patterns, themes, and future directions. In J. Osland, M. Li & M. Mendenhall (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership*, vol. 9. Bingley, UK: Emerald.

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

Meyer, K.E., Mudambi, R., & Narula, R. 2011. Multinational enterprises and local contexts: The opportunities and challenges of multiple embeddedness. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48, 235-252.

Miles, R.E., & Snow, C.C. 1978. *Organizational strategy, structure, and process.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Miranda, S.M., & Saunders, C.S. 2003. The social construction of meaning: An alternative perspective on information sharing. *Information Systems Research*, 14, 87-106.

Molinsky, A.L. 2007. Cross-cultural code-switching: The psychological challenges of adapting behavior in foreign cultural interactions. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 622-640.

Molinsky, A.L. 2013. The psychological processes of cultural retooling. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56, 683-710.

Morgeson, F.P. 2005. The external leadership of self-managing teams: Intervening in the context of novel and disruptive events. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 497-508.

Morris, S., Snell, S., & Björkman, I. forthcoming. An architectural framework for global talent management. *Journal of International Business Studies*, doi:10.1057/jibs.2015.25.

Mudambi, R., & Navarra, P. 2004. Is knowledge power? Knowledge flows, subsidiary power and rent-seeking within MNCs. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35, 385-406.

Osland, J.S. 2013a. The multidisciplinary roots of global leadership. In M.E. Mendenhall, J.S. Osland, A. Bird, G.R. Oddou, M.L. Maznevski, M.J. Stevens & G.K. Stahl (Eds.), *Global leadership* (2nd ed.): 21-39. New York: Routledge.

Osland, J.S. 2013b. An overview of the global leadership literature. In M.E. Mendenhall, J.S. Osland, A. Bird, G.R. Oddou, M.L. Maznevski, M.J. Stevens & G.K. Stahl (Eds.), *Global leadership* (2nd ed.): 40-79. New York: Routledge.

Osland, J.S. 2013c. Leading global change. In M.E. Mendenhall, J.S. Osland, A. Bird, G.R. Oddou, M.L. Maznevski, M.J. Stevens & G.K. Stahl (Eds.), *Global leadership* (2nd ed.): 183-214. New York: Routledge.

Osland, J.S. & Bird, A. (2006.) Global leaders as experts. *Advances in Global Leadership, 4:* 125-145.

Osland, J.S., Bird, A., & Oddou, G. 2012. The context of expert global leadership. In W.H. Mobley, M. Li & Y. Wang (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership,* vol. 7: 107-124. Oxford: Elsevier.

Osland, J.S., Bird, A., Osland, A., & Oddou, G. 2007. Expert cognition in global leaders. *NDM8 Conference Proceedings,* p. 1-6, Pacific Grove, CA. http://bss.sfsu.edu/kmosier/NDM8_Proceedings.pdf.

Osland, J.S., Li, M., & Wang, Y. 2014. Introduction: The state of global leadership research. In J. Osland, M. Li, & Y. Wang (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership,* vol. 8. Bingley, UK: Emerald.

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

Pawar, B.S., & Eastman, K.K. 1997. The nature and implications of contextual influences on transformational leadership: A conceptual examination. *Academy of Management Review,* 22, 80-109.

Pfeffer, J. 1993. Barriers to the advance of organizational science: Paradigm development as a dependent variable. *Academy of Management Review,* 18, 599-620.

Pierce, J.L., & Newstrom, J. W. 2011. On the meaning of leadership. In J.L. Pierce & J.W. Newstrom (Eds.), *Leaders and the leadership process: Readings, self-assessments, and applications* (6th ed.): 7-11. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Porter, L.W., & McLaughlin, G.B. 2006. Leadership and the organizational context: Like the weather? *Leadership Quarterly,* 17, 559-576.

Prahalad, C.K., & Doz, Y. 1987. *The multinational mission: Balancing local demands and global vision.* New York: Free Press.

PWC 2010. *Talent mobility 2020: The next generation of international assignments.* PricewaterhouseCoopers.

Reiche, B.S. 2015. *An integrative approach to cross-border expansion: The role of global leadership.* The Center for Global Enterprise.

Reiche, B.S., & Harzing, A.-W. (2015). International assignments. In A.-W. Harzing & A.H. Pinnington (Eds.), *International human resource management* (4th ed., pp. 145-190). London: Sage.

Reiche, B.S., Harzing, A.-W., & Pudelko, M. 2015. Why and how does shared language affect subsidiary knowledge inflows? A social identity perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies,* 46, 528-551.

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

Rosenzweig, P.M., & Singh, J.V. 1991. Organizational environments and the multinational enterprise. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 340-361.

Roth, K., & Kostova, T. 2003. The use of the multinational corporation as a research context. *Journal of Management*, 29, 883-902.

Saxe, J.G. 1878. The blind men and the elephant. In W.J. Linton (Ed.), *Poetry of America: Selections from one hundred American poets from 1776-1876*: 150-152. London: George Bell and Sons.

Shaffer, M.A., Kraimer, M.L., Chen, Y., & Bolino, M.C. 2012. Choices, challenges, and career consequences of global work experiences: A review and future agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1282-1327.

Shamir, B., House, R.J., & Arthur, M.B. 1993. The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4, 577-594.

Shenkar, O., Luo, Y., & Yeheskel, O. 2008. From "distance" to "friction": Substituting metaphors and redirecting intercultural research. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 905-923.

Shipilov, A., Gulati, R., Kilduff, M., Li, S., & Tsai, W. 2014. Relational pluralism within and between organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57, 449-459.

Snow, C.C., & Ketchen, D.J. 2014. Typology-driven theorizing: A response to Delbridge, R. and Fiss, P.C. 2013. Styles of theorizing and the social organization of knowledge. *Academy of Management Review*, 39, 231-233.

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

Stevens, M., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M.E., & Oddou, G. 2014. Measuring global leader intercultural competency: Development and validation of the Global Competencies Inventory (GCI). *Advances in Global Leadership*, 8, 115-154.

Stogdill, R.M. 1974. *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research.* New York: Free Press.

Story, J.S.P., Barbuto, J.E., Luthans, F., & Bovaird, J.A. 2014. Meeting the challenges of effective international HRM: Analysis of the antecedents of global mindset. *Human Resource Management*, 53, 131-155.

Story, J.S.P., Youssef, C.M., Luthans, F., Barbuto, J.E., & Bovaird, J. 2013. Contagion effect of global leaders' positive psychological capital on followers: Does distance matter and quality of relationship matter? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24, 2534-2553.

Suutari, V. 2002. Global leader development: An emerging research agenda. *Career Development International*, 7, 218-33.

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

Tangirala, S., Green, S.G. & Ramanujam, R. 2007. In the shadow of the boss's boss: Effects of supervisors' upward exchange relationships on employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 309-320.

Tenzer, H., & Pudelko, M. 2016. Media choice in multilingual virtual teams. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 47, 427-452.

Tichy, N.M., & Devanna, M. A. 1986. *The transformational leader.* New York: Wiley.

Tsai, W. 2002. Social structure of "coopetition" within a multiunit organization: Coordination, competition, and intraorganizational knowledge sharing. *Organization Science*, 13, 179-190.

Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. 2007. Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *Leadership Quarterly,* 18, 298-318.

Vora, D., & Kostova, T. 2007. A model of dual organizational identification in the context of the multinational enterprise. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 327-350.

Weick, K.E., & Quinn, R.E. 1999. Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50: 361-386.

Whitener, E.M., Brodt, S.E., Korsgaard, M.A., & Werner, J.M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 513-530.

Yukl, G. 2006. *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. 2012. Effective leadership behavior: What we know and what questions need more attention. *Academy of Management Perspectives,* 26(4), 66-85.

Zaccaro, S.J., Foti, R.J., & Kenny, D.A. 1991. Self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 76, 308-315.

Zaleznik, A. 1977. Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review,* 55(3), 67-78.

FIGURE 1
A Typology of Global Leadership Roles

High

Relationship Complexity

CONNECTIVE Global Leadership • *Task*: Low levels of variety and flux • *Relationship*: High number & variation of boundaries and high levels of interdependence ***Example role:*** • Leader of globally distributed team that handles firm's back office ***Example role behaviors:*** • Learn nuances of distinct interaction contexts • Continuously adapt and respond to different exchange partners' behaviors (code-switching) • Build interaction frequency and intensity through virtual communication and frequent travel • Leverage social frictions for problem solving	**INTEGRATIVE Global Leadership** • *Task*: High levels of variety and flux • *Relationship*: High number & variation of boundaries and high levels of interdependence ***Example role:*** • Senior executive of global multi-unit firm ***Example role behaviors:*** • Recognize and handle trade-offs and paradoxes across both task and relationship domains • Develop synergistic solutions • Engage in regular coordination and integration activities across tasks and constituent groups • Contextualize change implementation processes • Engage in distributive leadership processes
INCREMENTAL Global Leadership • *Task*: Low levels of variety and flux • *Relationship*: Low number & variation of boundaries, and low levels of interdependence ***Example role:*** • Export director in firm that operates internationally through licensing ***Example role behaviors:*** • Lead incremental change efforts • Focus on technical innovation • Create visions that are narrow in scope • Use routinized and standardized forms of communication	**OPERATIONAL Global Leadership** • *Task*: High levels of variety and flux • *Relationship*: Low number & variation of boundaries, and low levels of interdependence ***Example role:*** • Leader of product development in firm that provides financial services to global customers ***Example role behaviors:*** • Locally adapt task prioritization, allocation of resources, problem solving processes • Scan, process, attend to and continuously analyze disparate operational information • Lead varying operational changes at local levels

Low

Task Complexity

High