Routledge Studies in Leadership Research Volume *Responsible Global Leadership*: *Dilemmas, Paradoxes, and Opportunities*

The role of inclusion in responsible global leadership

Chapter by (in alphabetical order):

Jonsen, Karsten	**IMD**
Levy, Orly	**SOAS University of London**
Toegel, Ina	**IMD**
Van Zanten, Josefine	**IMD**

Cite as follows:

Jonsen, K., Levy, O., Toegel, I., & Van Zanten, J. (2019, forthcoming). The role of inclusion in responsible global leadership. In M. E. Mendenhall, G. K. Stahl, R. Clapp-Smith, & M. Zilinskaite (Eds.*), Responsible Global Leadership: Dilemmas, Paradoxes, and Opportunities*. New York: Routledge

ROLE OF INCLUSION IN RESPONSIBLE GLOBAL LEADERSHIP

Karsten Jonsen, Orly Levy, Ina Toegel, and Josefine Van Zanten[1]

INTRODUCTION

Cultural inclusivity in global organizations is a topic of growing importance to scholars and practitioners alike (e.g., Gibson & Ross Grubb, 2005; Lester, Virick, & Clapp-Smith, 2016; Nishii & Özbilgin, 2007; Ozbilgin & Tatli, 2008) and the notion of inclusion has even recently become a very sensitive political topic extending beyond specific company departments and into the core soul of entire corporations and their ways of operating. As such, inclusion is finding its way into mainstream societal activities, debating and thinking.

Global organizations are inherently heterogeneous where employees and other critical assets are geographically dispersed and culturally and nationally diverse. In addition to cultural and national diversity, other visible forms of diversity such as gender and generation, as well as invisible forms of diversity such as differences in ideas or abilities further shape the daily realities and management processes of global organizations. While workforce diversity can bring net value added to organizational processes (Mor Barak, et al., 2016) and enhance its competitive advantage in important domains such as recruiting top global talent fostering innovation and creativity, improving relations with a diverse set of stakeholders, and generating a positive organizational reputation in local communities, these benefits are not realized routinely. Moreover, organizational diversity can be associated with negative outcomes (e.g. Stahl, Maznevski, Voigt, & Jonsen, 2010) such as high level of conflict, turnover, and stress. Thus, one of the most significant challenges faced

[1] Authors are listed in alphabetical order

by global organizations is capturing the positive outcomes and minimizing the negative outcomes associated with diverse workforce.

Consequently, global organizations that wish to fully realize the potential benefits of cultural diversity have gradually shifted attention from managing demographic diversity and ensuring nominal representation to engendering a sense of identification, belonging, and inclusion among diverse set of employees. Thus, diversity management efforts are increasingly focused on creating an organizational climate for inclusion that could generate positive outcomes of diversity such as job satisfaction, creativity, and retention across global operations and local communities while concomitantly reduce negative consequences such as mistrust and miscommunication (Gonzalez & DeNisi, 2009; McKay & Avery, 2015; Mor Barak, 2011; Nishii & Özbilgin, 2007). Furthermore, creating a culturally inclusive workplace where people from different walks of life can contribute and prosper is also considered morally imperative and socially responsible, as a means to promote global justice and cosmopolitan ethics (Held, 2010; Pogge, 1992).

However, managing a diverse workforce and creating an inclusive workplace in global organizations, across multiple cultures and territories, is a process fraught with complexity, conflicts, and contradictions. It requires the capacity to embrace the profound ethical, intellectual, and managerial challenges involved in managing dilemmas and paradoxes in a global context (Rhinesmith, 2001). Furthermore, it requires embracing the personal and ethical journey of becoming and being a responsible global leader who is capable of recognizing, respecting, and reconciling multiple cultural values and practices of a diverse workforce (Levy, Taylor, & Boyacıgiller, 2010; Maak & Pless, 2008; Schraa-Liu & Trompenaars, 2006). Thus, the influence of leaders on creating a globally inclusive climate is unquestionably significant, especially in highly complex environments where there are no

universal rules or ready-made solutions (Davidson & Ferdman, 2002; Wasserman, Gallegos, & Ferdman, 2008).

In this chapter, we seek to highlight the critical role of cosmopolitan leaders in promoting cultural inclusion in global organizations through mediating and reconciling the tensions between various cultural influences and between the individual and the group. Thus, our focus is on the role of cosmopolitan leaders in creating a work climate that fosters a sense of belonging among culturally diverse employees while concomitantly promoting their sense of individual uniqueness while mediating the apparent contradictions between various cultural influences and between group membership and self-identity (Ferdman, 2017; Shore, Randel, Chung, Dean, Holcombe Ehrhart, & Singh, 2011). Increasingly, cosmopolitan leaders are recognized as responsible global leaders who are committed to global justice and inclusive growth in an interconnected world (Maak & Pless, 2008). Therefore, we propose that leaders with a cosmopolitan disposition are more likely to view inclusion as ethically essential and managerially wise (Levy, Peiperl, & Jonsen, 2016), understanding both the moral obligations and business benefits associated thereto (Maak & Pless, 2009). We further suggest that cosmopolitan leaders are also more likely to effectively foster belongingness and uniqueness in a culturally diverse workplace because they have a distinctive ability to connect and communicate with employees from diverse cultural backgrounds (Levy, Lee, Jonsen, & Peiperl, 2018) and mediate the potential tensions between the local and the global (Levy, Beechler, Taylor, & Boyacigiller, 2007).

In this chapter, we first discuss the concepts of inclusion and inclusive leadership. We then explore the role of cosmopolitan leaders in fostering inclusion in global organizations. Finally, we discuss the implications for practice and offer brief conclusions.

THE CONCEPT OF INCLUSION

The growing recognition of the significance of inclusion has led to the proliferation of different and conflicting definitions and perspectives in the literature. Therefore, there is still conceptual confusion about what inclusion may mean for individuals and organizations, especially in a global context. Moreover, the terms “diversity” and “inclusion” are often applied interchangeably, further mudding the conceptual water (Jansen, Otten, van der Zee, & Jans, 2014; Jonsen, Maznevski, & Schneider, 2011; Shore, Cleveland, & Sanchez, 2018). Here are four of the many conceptual definitions of inclusion:

- The extent to which individuals can access information and resources, are involved in work groups, and have the ability to influence decision-making processes (Mor Barak & Cherin, 1998).

- The degree to which an employee is accepted and treated as an insider by others in a work system (Hope Pelled, Ledford, & Albers Mohrman, 1999: 1014).

- The individual’s sense of being a part of the organizational system in both the formal processes, such as access to information and decision-making channels, and the informal processes, such as ‘water cooler’ and lunch meetings where information and decisions informally take place (Mor Barak, 2011: 166).

- “…the degree to which an employee perceives that he or she is an esteemed member of the work group through experiencing treatment that satisfies his or her needs for belongingness and uniqueness” (Shore, et al., 2011: 1265).

In recent years, scholars have sought to study inclusion in work organizations more systematically and to clarify the distinction between diversity and inclusion. The notion of diversity mainly focuses on incorporating traditionally marginalized groups, particularly women and ethnic minorities into the workplace (see Vertovec, 2012 for an illuminating discussion on the various facets or goals of diversity). Therefore, diversity is often associated with targets and or measures. The notion of inclusion seeks to move beyond nominal representation and assimilation, focusing on creating a workplace that provides equal and fair access to decision-making, resources, and career opportunities to these groups, as well as engendering a personal or subjective sense of being included. Accordingly, inclusion is often reflected in feelings and behaviors at the individual level and organizational climate and culture at the firm level (see also Jonsen, et al., for a review). Furthermore, as diversity is often associated with less than beneficial outcomes such as conflict, turnover, job stress, and absenteeism (see Mor Barak, et al., 2016), the focus on inclusion is also meant to reduce the undesirable consequences and capitalize on the potential advantages stemming from a diverse workforce.

Gradually, the notion of an inclusive workplace has gained the status of 'public good' where "… individuals of all backgrounds-not just members of historically powerful identity groups are fairly treated, valued for who they are, and included in core decision making" (Nishii, 2013: 1754). As such, an inclusive workplace is based on a pluralistic value frame that respects all cultural perspectives represented among its employees (Nishii, 2013). In contrast, access to resources and opportunities in a more exclusionary workplace is based on conforming to pre-established "mainstream" organizational values and norms, as determined by the dominant group (Mor Barak & Daya, 2014: 393–394).

In conceptualizing inclusion, we follow the above mentioned definition by Shore et

al. (2011: 1265), who define inclusion as "the degree to which an employee perceives that he or she is an esteemed member of the work group through experiencing treatment that satisfies his or her needs for belongingness and uniqueness." This conceptualization is grounded in optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991) and suggests that for individuals to experience a sense of inclusion, two primary needs must be met simultaneously: the need to belong (the need to develop and maintain robust and stable interpersonal relationships) and the need for personal uniqueness (the need to preserve a distinctive sense of self) (Randel et al., 2018). Thus, inclusion occurs when an "individual is treated as an insider and also allowed/encouraged to retain uniqueness within the work group" (Shore et al., 2011: 1266). This view is consistent with important approaches to inclusion that conceptualize it in terms of social acceptance as a group member, as well as in terms of social recognition as an individual with distinct talents and views (e.g., Mor Barak, 2000; Hope Pelled, et al., 1999).

In summary, inclusion involves restructuring the workplace in such a way that would enable *both* members of socially marginalized and members of non-marginalized groups to participate, contribute, and be fully engaged at all levels and domains of the organization while concurrently cultivating their individual identity and authentic selves. Ahead we discuss the role of leadership and leaders in promoting an inclusive workplace and take stock of the main theoretical approaches and empirical findings.

INCLUSIVE LEADERSHIP

Many global corporations have learned through trial and error as they expanded across the world that leadership is central to many structural and processual aspects of an inclusive workplace. Yet scholars have only recently begun explicating the notion of inclusive

leadership across multiple levels of analysis (e.g., Boekhorst, 2015; Booysen, 2014; Gotsis & Grimani, 2016; Gallegos, 2014). Nembhard and Edmondson (2006: 947; emphasis in original), for example, defined leader inclusiveness as "words and deeds exhibited by a leader or leaders that indicate an *invitation* and *appreciation* for others' contributions. Leader inclusiveness captures attempts by leaders to include others in discussions and decisions in which their voices and perspectives might otherwise be absent. " Similarly, Nishii and Mayer (2009: 1413) suggest that through the "… acceptance of employees of various backgrounds through the establishment of high-quality relationships with them, group leaders can promote norms about equality and inclusion that will facilitate greater power sharing and improve reciprocal exchanges among group members." Scholars have also emphasized modelling openness and accessibility as the defining characteristics of inclusive leadership (e.g., Hirak, Peng, Carmeli, & Schaubroeck, 2012; Mitchell, Boyle, Parker, Giles, Chiang, & Joyce, 2015). Thus, central to the notion of inclusive leadership pertains to situations characterized by status or power differences where individuals who occupy lower social positions face significant barriers to full participation and are likely to be locked out of important group processes without the intervention of the leader (Nembhard & Edmondson, 2006).

Inclusive leadership competencies and behaviors

Scholars have explored the influence of leadership competencies and behaviors such as fostering empowerment (Brimhall, Mor Barak, Hurlburt, McArdle, Palinkas, & Henwood, 2014) and promoting participative decision making (Nishii, 2013) on inclusion. Pless & Maak (2004), for example, suggest that key competencies of inclusion include showing respect and recognition for others, showing appreciation for different voices, encouraging open and frank communication, cultivating participative decision making and problem solving

processes, showing integrity and advanced moral reasoning, and using cooperative leadership style. Similarly, Randel et al. (2018) have identified a set of behaviors consistent facilitating belongingness and uniqueness. Behaviors consistent with facilitating belongingness, including *supporting group members* and making them feel comfortable, *ensuring justice and equity* through fair treatment of group members, promoting *shared decision-making* with an emphasis on sharing power, participative decision making, and autonomy. According to Randel et al. (2018: 193-194), behaviors indicating value for uniqueness (e.g., recognizing the unique contribution of the individual to the work group) are equally important in fostering inclusiveness because they promote self-definition and self-worth, which would have been otherwise lacking if the leader was only encouraging a sense of belongingness (Brewer, 1991; Swann, Polzer, Seyle, & Ko, 2004). These include *encouraging diverse contributions* to the work group and *helping group members fully contribute* their unique talents and perspectives to enhance the work of the group are central behaviors to indicating value for uniqueness. Encouraging diverse contributions is enacted indirectly through creating a supportive environment that "…acknowledges, welcomes, and accepts different approaches, styles, perspectives, and experiences" (Winters, 2014: 206) and directly through soliciting different points of view and approaches. Helping group members fully contribute to the group entails encouraging members to formulate and voice their view and nurturing each group member individually so that he or she can bring their unique perspective and talent to bear on the group task. Finally, inclusive leadership also entails assuming moral responsibility and advocating ethical behaviors (Maak & Pless, 2006).

The paradoxes of inclusive leadership: Belongingness versus uniqueness

As inclusion involves experiencing a sense of interpersonal similarity, complete connection and participation combined with a seemingly contradictory sense of personal difference, uniqueness, and even distance, it can generate significant tensions and dilemmas (Ferdman, 2017). According to Ferdman (2017), the tensions inherent in inclusive leadership can be productively viewed through the lens of paradox. A paradox is understood as "contradictory, mutually exclusive elements that exist simultaneously and for which no synthesis or choice is possible nor necessarily desirable" (Cameron & Quinn, 1988: 2) or as "persistent contradiction between interdependent elements" (Schad, Lewis, Raisch, & Smith, 2016: 2). Key to the notion of paradox is that complexities and tensions are managed rather than solved using "both/and" rather than "either/or" approach (Smith, Lewis, & Tushman, 2016). Therefore, inclusive leadership involves mediating and reconciling between seemingly contradictory elements that coexist in paradoxical tension by meeting the competing demands of each element concurrently (Ferdman, 2017; Schad et al., 2016; Smith & Lewis, 2011). Further, by adopting a paradoxical perspective inclusive leadership can capitalize on the potential synergies between contradictory elements (Zhang, Waldman, Han, & Li, 2015).

Thus, inclusive leaders are faced with the challenge of managing the tension between inclusion as belonging and absorption of individuals into the group while concomitantly encouraging their distinct and unique contributions and safeguarding the benefits and rights available to other members. These contradictory paths can be described in terms of the paradox of collective action versus individual action. Collective action involves "…the subjugation of the individual for the benefit of the whole. Yet it is most successful when individuals identify with the whole and contribute their most distinctive personal strengths" (Smith & Lewis, 2011: 384). Further, the contradictory paths of

belonging versus uniqueness can also be described in terms of the paradox of consistency versus responsiveness where the former involves fostering full and equal membership based on consistent, uniform or standard treatment across group members and the latter involves fostering individuality, personal expression, and recognizing individual contribution. However, because the contribution of group members may vary and they are likely to perform at different levels, managing the belonging—uniqueness tension raises issues of equal versus equitable allocation of recognition, supports, and opportunities.

Typical inclusion dilemmas include:

- Underestimating the fear behind why under-represented groups need to be included; for example, men feeling left out when people talk about gender diversity, local employees feeling threatened by the influx of migrant works, and parent country nationals protecting their privileged position in global companies.
- Wanting to be part of the in-group, and yet seeing that there is inconsistency in how people are being treated and what to do about it
- Certain types of diversity can be in conflict. For instance, if you focus on gender in a country where the basic cultural systems and practices don't fully align with what the organization is trying to achieve
- Continuing to expect dominant behaviors to lead; even if values and beliefs are aligned, a different behavior may still not be embraced

THE ROLE OF COSMOPOLITAN LEADERS IN FOSTERING INCLUSION IN GLOBAL ORGANIZATIONS

In this section, we explore the capacity of cosmopolitans to act as responsible global leaders and foster inclusion in global organizations. Responsible global leadership entails

recognizing, respecting, and reconciling multiple values and demands of a diverse workforce, multicultural customers and suppliers, local and global communities, as well as all other relevant stakeholders (Schraa-Liu & Trompenaars, 2006). At an individual level, responsible global leaders are characterized by reflection, a set of competencies (such as sensitivity and responsiveness to cultural differences), global skills (such as cultural literacy), and mindset (such as comfort with cultural complexity and its contradictions) (e.g., Bird & Osland, 2004; Bonnstetter, 2000; Conger & O'Neill, 2012), as well as an ability to manage high complexity and cultural paradoxes (Mendenhall et al., 2013; Osland & Bird, 2000).

We suggest that the disposition of cosmopolitans enables them to assume the complex role of responsible global leaders and manage the multiplicity, interdependence, ambiguity, and flux of the global context (Mendenhall et al., 2012). Specifically, we focus on the ability of cosmopolitan leaders to foster inclusion in culturally diverse workgroups where group members collaborate across cultural and national boundaries (Hinds, Liu, & Lyon, 2011). A key aspect of such global work is that group members are culturally diverse and often also geographically distant and therefore are embedded in different national cultures and contexts. Consequently, group members embody different perspectives and approaches to work and may have different interests, identities, and practices (Salazar & Salas, 2013). Moreover, collaborating across cultural boundaries can surface not only tensions among group members, but also between the individual and the group. Specifically, collaborative work requires mutual adaptation, compromise, and submitting oneself to the whole (Smith & Berg, 1997). At the same time, to the extent that individuals forgo their unique and differentiated perspectives, their capacity to provide added value to the group is diminished, and therefore can paradoxically undermine the group's collective work (Ferdman, 2017). Fostering inclusion in such context requires leaders to truly value

variety of approach, opinion and insight to recognize that the expression of different perspectives can create learning opportunities as well as challenges (Thomas & Ely, 1996).

Our focus in on the role of cosmopolitan leaders in integrating and bridging across multiple cultural differences, thereby forming culturally inclusive workgroups in global organizations. We suggest that cosmopolitan leaders are uniquely positioned to act as a cultural bridge-makers because they have both the capacity to work effectively with people from diverse cultural backgrounds and a moral commitment to ensuring global justice and equity. Further, cosmopolitan leaders are also capable of mediating and reconciling the tensions and contradictions inherent in the process of inclusion, especially between individual group members and the group as a whole. Ahead we discuss the notion of leaders who are cosmopolitan in their state of mind and practice, or are characterized by a cosmopolitan disposition. We then illustrate the capacity of cosmopolitan leaders to foster inclusion by focusing on key collaboration processes and inherent tensions in culturally diverse workgroups (Ferdman, 2017; Hinds, et al., 2011; Levy, Lee, Peiperl, & Jonsen, 2015; Salazar & Salas, 2013).

Cosmopolitan disposition

We conceptualize cosmopolitanism as a reflective disposition characterized by high levels of *cultural transcendence* (the tendency to reflect on one's own cultural boundaries) and *openness* (the tendency to appreciate the cultural Other) (Lee, 2015; Levy, et al., 2018). These tendencies are the defining characteristics of cosmopolitan disposition and are mutually reinforcing (Lee, 2015; Levy et al., 2018). Cultural transcendence captures an individual's capacity to reflect on his or her own cultural tradition and, thus, explore it from a distance (Lee, 2014). Openness to other cultures reflects an appreciation of "people,

places, and experiences from other cultures" (Szerszynski & Urry, 2002: 468) and is considered to be a core property of cosmopolitan disposition (Hannerz, 1990; Lee, 2015; Levy et al., 2007; Skrbis, Kendall, & Woodward, 2004; Skrbis & Woodward, 2007). Moreover, these tendencies are enacted through a variety of transnational practices and activities, such as keeping abreast of world news, consumption of many places and environments, networking and interacting across borders, and transnational mobility (including physical, imaginative, and virtual), among others (Beck, 2002; Levy et al., 2018; Szerszynski & Urry, 2002, 2006).

Enacting multiple transcendence and openness experiences often results in the development of *cultural engagement* — a generalized capacity to interact across cultural boundaries and to "make one's way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting, and reflecting" (Hannerz, 1990: 239). While this capacity can range from "thin," "banal," or "consumerist" to "thick," "deep," or "reflexive" (Hannerz, 1990; see Levy et al., 2018 for extensive discussion), we focus on high or "thick" level of cultural engagement that reflects a deep openness, appreciation, and receptivity to other cultural, which goes beyond superficial or consumptive engagement, and therefore includes engagement with core cultural elements such as social customs, norms, and values (Hannerz, 1990: 239; Levy et al., 2018). Further, "thick" cosmopolitanism entails a political and moral commitment that transcends local affinities and interests (Skrbis et al., 2004) and hence associated with responsible global leadership. Thus, "thick" cosmopolitanism manifests itself as a willingness to engage with the cultural Other at deeper levels of meaning (Lee, 2014) and to explore people and places that are culturally distant (Kendall, Woodward, & Zlatko, 2009). Further, it often seeks to reconcile between different levels of meaning and multiple cultural elements, especially between the global with the local and mediate between the familiar

and the foreign (Levy, et al., 2007). Finally, "thick" cosmopolitanism can manifest itself as "social eloquence" (Pearce, 1994)—communication practices that facilitate bridging cultural boundaries in an inclusive way. These includes modified listening, asking the right questions, frame-shifting, recognition of biases, showing respect and interest in different people, and striving for meaningful and nonjudgmental interactions.

Fostering inclusive collaboration through cosmopolitan leadership

In this section we explore how "thick" cosmopolitan leaders may foster inclusion in culturally diverse workgroups where members collaborate across cultural and national boundaries (Hinds, et al., 2011). We suggest that cosmopolitan leaders are likely to enact an integration-and-learning perspective (Ely & Thomas, 2001) that places high value on cultural diversity and seeks to integrate cultural diversity throughout the collaborative work. We focus on key collaboration processes—aligning interests, managing conflicts, bridging cultural identities, and forming common practices—and demonstrate the unique capacity of cosmopolitan leaders to act as responsible global leaders by fostering inclusion and managing paradoxes in a global context (Levy et al., 2015). Table 1 summarizes key inclusion practices of "thick" cosmopolitan leaders.

Aligning interests and managing conflicts. Group members collaborating across cultural boundaries often have both shared and conflicting goals and must, therefore, align their interests and work through their conflicts to ultimately achieve their shared goal (Bedwell, et al., 2012). They can have disagreements because they do not share an understanding about the collaboration's goals, essential tasks, and appropriate processes (task and process conflicts), as well as due to an insufficient understanding of the culture and norms of other members (relational conflict). For example, they may have different

mental model on how joint work should be organized and on how performance should be evaluated and rewarded (Salazar & Salas, 2013). Furthermore, collaborations rarely take place in a power-free context and group members often use cultural differences to legitimize or delegitimize asymmetric power relations and hierarchical disparities (van Marrewijk, 2010). Importantly, there can also be significant conflict and misalignment between group and individual interests in additional to group conflicts. Therefore, group members from culturally diverse backgrounds can enter into collaboration with misaligned interests, conflicting goals, and unequal power—all of which can have debilitating consequences for the collaborative effort and performance (Hinds & Bailey, 2003; Stahl, et al., 2010).

Research has identified various roles (Wakefield, Leidner, & Garrison, 2008) and strategies (Montoya-Weiss, Massey, & Song, 2001) used to align interests and manage conflicts across cultural boundaries. We suggest cosmopolitan leaders are likely to align interests and manage conflicts in ways that would promote the inclusion of all group members. First, cosmopolitan leaders are likely to acknowledge divergent interests of different cultural groups and encourage group members to explore possible shared goals and underlying conflicts, while ensuring that the deliberation process is fair and participatory and that the voices of individual group members are heard and respected. By promoting a fair and open dialogue, cosmopolitan leaders ensure that group members express their views and interests and develop a mutual understanding and jointly reached solutions, which draws on and integrates the interests of all group member. Moreover, such process can also promote a superordinate group identify that can foster a sense of belonging. Second, cosmopolitan leaders are also likely to foster inclusion by bringing key cultural incompatibilities and power asymmetries between group members to the surface,

thus confronting the root cause of exclusionary dynamics and hierarchical disparities within the group. Finally, cosmopolitan leader can mediate potential tensions between individual and group interests by ensuring that individual interests are reflected in group-level solutions rather than discounted or suppressed (Levy et al., 2015).

In contrast, leaders who are less inclusive are likely to focus on readily identifiable common interests and similarities rather than engage in an ongoing dialogue between group members from different cultural backgrounds; they are also likely to ignore or discount any underlying complex cultural incompatibilities. Furthermore, they are also likely to manage conflict by taking a solution-focused approach rather than people-focused approach, often using a set of mechanisms that could streamline the collaborative effort and reduce friction (Wakefield, et al., 2008). However, these mechanisms are often presented as efficient, rational tools when in fact they are used to mask exclusionary dynamics within the group.

Bridging cultural identities. In collaboration across cultural boundaries, differences and distinctions between group members from different cultural backgrounds, between "us" and "them," are likely to be pronounced. Furthermore, each cultural group is also likely to engage in boundary setting practices as a way to establish and maintain its own collective identity, although creating a shared identity can foster successful collaboration. Previous research suggests that an inclusive or superordinate identity, where group members perceive themselves to be working together on the same team, creates a common vocabulary and framework for understanding collaborative tasks, thus, allowing members to collaborate despite different nationalities (Orlikowski, 2002) and geographic dispersion (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). Furthermore, shared identity can enhance performance through contributing to the formation of a "hybrid" culture (Earley & Mosakowski, 2000).

Therefore, cosmopolitan leaders are likely to promote a more inclusive identity as a way to facilitate collaboration between culturally diverse group members (e.g., Ellis & Ybema, 2010; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Ybema, Vroemisse, & van Marrewijk, 2012).

Thus, we suggest that cosmopolitan leaders are likely to foster inclusion by bridging over cultural identities and creating a superordinate group identity (Levy et al., 2015). Specifically, we suggest that cosmopolitan leaders acknowledge the "thickness" of cultural identities[2], thereby embracing their intricacies rather than discounting and trivialising cultural differences (Ybema, et al., 2012). They are therefore likely to facilitate an ongoing dialogue between group members that explores the "thick" aspects of their collective cultural identities such as cultural norms and history, as well as more personal experiences of their cultural identities. These conversations are aimed at building an inclusive multifaceted group identity based on mutual understanding and appreciation rather than on respectful disengagement. Furthermore, cosmopolitan leaders may also attempt to forge strong interpersonal relationships with individual members and between group members from different cultural backgrounds as a way to construct an inclusive "we," which would foster sense of belonging and blur cultural boundaries (Ybema, et al., 2012). Further, by promoting an inclusive multifaceted group identity, cosmopolitan leaders create a space that could accommodate diverse self-identities, allowing individual group members to embrace their particular take on group identity. In contrast, leaders who are not as cosmopolitan are likely to try and bridge cultural identities by under-communicating, discounting, and trivialising cultural differences (Ybema, et al., 2012). Rather than

[2] Thick identities are based on a shared culture and tradition and are used to articulate a strong sense of collective self and draw relatively rigid cultural boundaries (Ybema, et al., 2012).

encouraging diverse voices and contributions, they may try to forge a superordinate cultural identity by glossing over cultural differences.

Forming common practices. Group members from diverse cultural backgrounds often have different and sometimes incompatible work practices, which can hinder successful collaboration (Hinds et al., 2011; Jonsen, Maznevski & Davison, 2012). Therefore, facilitating a successful collaboration often entails forming a set of common practices that enable the coordination of work across cultural boundaries. These may take various forms, ranging from adopting the practices of the dominant cultural group (e.g., Boussebaa, Sinha, & Gabriel, 2014), to importing "best practices," maintaining multiple practices (Sidhu & Volberda, 2011), and converging on an emergent repertoire, which borrows elements from multiple cultures (van Marrewijk, 2011).

Cosmopolitan leaders are likely to encourage diverse contributions and cultivate an emergent amalgamation of practices drawn from all group members. Working toward an inclusive set of practices involves facilitating ongoing interactions, negotiations, and mutual learning (Shimoni & Bergmann, 2006), and creating a new shared language that is flexible, rich, complex, and nuanced. Furthermore, cosmopolitan leaders are also likely to strike a balance between forming a common set of practices, which enable collaboration, and preserving local and individual practices, which can enable innovation and flexibility (Sidhu & Volberda, 2011). All these inclusive behaviours on the part of cosmopolitan leaders require a relatively deep and dynamic engagement with group members. In contrast, leaders who are less cosmopolitan are more likely to rely on existing or "ready-made" practices or externally validated "global best practices" rather than attempt to incorporate diverse contributions from group members.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

In this section we explore briefly our thoughts on how "thick" cosmopolitan leaders can act as responsible global leaders through building a culture of inclusion in global companies at the organizational level. Thus far we have discussed the role of cosmopolitan leaders in fostering inclusion at the group-level. However, as workgroups are embedded in a wider organizational context, a key challenge for cosmopolitan leaders is to develop an organizational-wide inclusive culture that would allow people with multiple cultural backgrounds (including gender, nationality and ethnicity), as well as mindsets and ways of thinking to work effectively together and to perform to their highest (Pless & Maak, 2004). Cosmopolitan leaders themselves embody multiplicity of cultures and exemplify cross-culture respect; they therefore have the credibility and standing to initiate a transformative cultural change for global inclusion. Building on the work of Pless and Maak (2004), we discuss the following four transformation stages necessary for building a culture of inclusion: (1) Raising awareness, creating understanding, and encouraging reflection; (2) Developing a vision of inclusion; (3) Rethinking key management concepts and principles; and (4) Adapting HR systems and processes. Based on our conversations with practitioners aiming to create an inclusive organizational climate, we develop a set of recommendations on how cosmopolitan leaders can actively drive an inclusive cultural transformation in global organizations.

Phase 1: Raising awareness, creating understanding and encouraging reflection

At a fundamental level, creating an inclusive culture entails raising the awareness of different stakeholders about what an inclusive global culture may mean, including the role of unconscious biases, as well as to review structural and overt discrimination. "Thick"

cosmopolitan leaders emphasize that at the outset of this journey, it is important to clearly communicate the difference between diversity and inclusion, two concepts that employees often use interchangeably in practice. Thus, it becomes crucial to communicate that while the organization will look at diversity (often associated with targets and or measures), managers are encouraged to reflect on their practices of inclusion (associated with feelings and behaviors that ultimately impact corporate culture). Raising self-awareness occurs through facilitating an ongoing dialogue and encouraging reflection as a crucial step for fostering inclusion. The role of leaders and their ability and willingness to create an inclusive environment is pivotal to this. Finally, practitioners are advised to raise awareness and work on a shared understanding through experiential approaches. Too many trainings on unconscious biases fall short of achieving their learning objective due to a heavily didactic approach and lack of personalized insight generated through experiences.

Phase 2: Developing a vision of inclusion

Pless and Maak (2004) suggest that a clearly defined vision is another crucial step toward creating a culture of inclusion. A well-articulated vision provides a roadmap for change and for the future, essentially establishing which values, assumptions, and understandings are consistent with an inclusive culture and which are no longer acceptable. To create an inclusive culture in global organizations, the vision needs to address and incorporate the relative business strategy, as well as values and beliefs that align with inclusion. Some organizations like Zappos and IBM are known for involving their entire work force in defining the core values of the organization (and by extension, the values that relate to inclusion). This "IBMers *for* IBMers" approach is a powerful mechanism to create buy-in and engagement among leaders in an organization that will subsequently shape their collective

behaviors regarding inclusion. Thus, while developing a vision of inclusion should be inspired and driven by the top, “thick” cosmopolitan leaders seek input from all levels in the organization in order to shift from lip service to a full commitment to inclusion.

Phase 3: Rethinking key management concepts and principles

An essential element of the change process is the reflection on and the rethinking of key management concepts in the organization, as well as the principles they are a based on. Starting at the top, “thick” cosmopolitan leaders must role model how they constructively challenge each other on critically re-examining assumptions and principles. This can start by sharing reflections on the language they use, the behaviors they exhibit, and the practices they adhere to. Explicitly communicating that a change in mindset is underway is a critical element of empowering the entire organization to rethink its core practices regarding inclusion. This would entail revisiting HR processes and systems, and eliminating hidden hurdles for underrepresented groups regarding decision-making, career progression, glass cliffs and ceilings, to name a few. An illustrative example is organizations assigning an “inclusion check” role to a line manager during talent meetings. The role of this leader is to call out non-inclusive behavior and/or language, which may impact the development and/or promotion of people from under-represented groups. This role is shared among leaders and shown to raise the bar during key decision-making moments. Finally, to make tangible progress on changing the corporate culture, organizations typically embed the ability to create an inclusive environment as a core talent competency in their leadership competency framework.

Phase 4: Adapting systems and processes

Many global corporations learn through trial and error as they expand across the world and adapt their diversity and inclusion systems just like they adapt their financial, operational and sales ones. And while most multinational organizations feature targets for diversity, there is an ever greater need now for tangible progress on inclusion. Measures offer transparency and visibility of progress in organizations, where leadership behaviors (as described in competency frameworks), as well as the corporate culture plays a key role in the advancement of people from out-groups. "Thick" cosmopolitan leaders continuously create conditions for adapting HR practices in the areas of hiring, promoting, delegating, developing and additional talent initiatives in order to positively move the needle. To mark progress, organizations who strive towards an inclusive culture measure inclusion as an integral part of the overall employee engagement survey, followed by a thorough process to highlight inclusion results. In this phase, what is critical for organizational learning and adaptation is to share the results with organizational constituents, including executive board, and in some cases, with the supervisory board. This creates conditions for enhanced accountability and sets the stage for tangible follow-up actions to adapt systems and processes.

CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter, we sought to highlight the critical role of cosmopolitan leaders in promoting cultural inclusion in global organizations through mediating and reconciling tensions inherently present in organizations. We first discussed the concepts of inclusion and inclusive leadership, and then explored the role of cosmopolitan leaders in fostering

inclusion in global organizations. Finally, we discussed the practical implications for cosmopolitan leaders.

While today, many organizations feel compelled to prove the business case of inclusion when communicating the concept internally, there is an ever-greater need for cosmopolitan leaders to role model responsible leadership by continuously highlighting the moral imperative of promoting justice and ethics. At the workplace, “thick” cosmopolitan leaders create awareness through effective communication and encouraging empathy through shared experiences; they set the conditions for defining a vision, with the strong involvement and engagement of employees across the organization; they role model how to rethink concepts and principles through continuously challenging themselves and peers; and they create an environment for learning and adaptation.

REFERENCES

Aronson, D. 2002. Managing the diversity revolution: Best practices for 21st century business. *Civil Rights Journal, 6*: 46-66.

Beck, U. 2002. The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(1-2): 17-44.

Bedwell, W. L., Wildman, J. L., Diaz Granados, D., Salazar, M., Kramer, W. S., & Salas, E. 2012. Collaboration at work: An integrative multilevel conceptualization. *Human Resource Management Review*, 22(2): 128-145.

Bird, A., & Osland, J. 2004. Global competencies: An introduction. In H. Lane, M. Mendenhall, M. Maznevski, & J. McNett (Eds.), *Handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity*: 57-80. Oxford: Blackwell.

Boekhorst, J. A. 2015. The role of authentic leadership in fostering workplace inclusion: A social information processing perspective. *Human Resource Management, 54(2)*: 241-264.

Bonnstetter, B. J. 2000. The DNA of global leadership competencies. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 42(2): 131-144.

Booysen, L. 2014. The development of inclusive leadership practice and processes. In B. M. Ferdman and B. R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*: 296-329. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boussebaa, M., Sinha, S., & Gabriel, Y. 2014. Englishization in offshore call centers: A postcolonial perspective. *Journal of International business studies*, 45(9): 1152-1169.

Brewer, M. B. 1991. The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and social psychology bulletin, 17(5)*: 475-482.

Brimhall, K. C., Mor Barak, M. E., Hurlburt, M., McArdle, J. J., Palinkas, L., & Henwood, B. 2017. Increasing workplace inclusion: The promise of leader-member exchange. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 41(3): 222-239.

Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. 1988. Organizational Paradox and Transformation. In R. E. Quinn and K. S. Cameron (Eds.), *Paradox and transformation: Toward a theory of change in organization and management*: 1-18. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Co/Harper & Row Publishers.

Casper, W. J., Wayne, J. H., & Manegold, J. G. 2013. Who will we recruit? Targeting deep-and surface-level diversity with human resource policy advertising. *Human Resource Management, 52(3)*: 311-332.

Conger, J. A., & O'Neill, C. 2012. Building the bench for global leadership. *People and Strategy*, 35(2): 52.

Davidson, M. N., & Ferdman, B. M. 2002. Inclusion: What can I and my organization do about it. *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 39(4)*: 80-85.

Earley, C. P., & Mosakowski, E. 2000. Creating hybrid team cultures: An empirical test of transnational team functioning. *Academy of Management journal*, 43(1): 26-49.

Ellis, N., & Ybema, S. 2010. Marketing identities: Shifting circles of identification in inter-organizational relationships. *Organization Studies*, 31(3): 279-305.

Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. 2001. Cultural diversity at work: The effects of diversity perspectives on work group processes and outcomes. *Administrative science quarterly, 46(2)*: 229-273.

Ferdman, B. M. 2017. Paradoxes of inclusion: Understanding and managing the tensions of diversity and multiculturalism. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 53(2)*: 235-263.

Gallegos, P. V. 2014. The work of inclusive leadership: Fostering authentic relationships, modeling courage and humility. In B. M. Ferdman and B. R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*: 177-202. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gibson, C. B., & Ross Grubb, A. 2005. Turning the tide in multinational teams. In D. L. Shapiro, M. A. V. Glinow and J. L. C. Cheng (Eds.), *Managing multinational teams: Global perspectives (Advances in International Management)* 69-95: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Gonzalez, J. A., & Denisi, A. S. 2009. Cross-level effects of demography and diversity climate on organizational attachment and firm effectiveness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior, 30(1)*: 21-40.

Gotsis, G., & Grimani, K. 2016. The role of servant leadership in fostering inclusive organizations. *Journal of Management Development, 35(8)*: 985-1010.

Hannerz, U. 1990. Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory Culture & Society* 7: 237-251.

Held, D. 2010. *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and realities*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Hinds, P. J., & Mortensen, M. 2005. Understanding conflict in geographically distributed teams: The moderating effects of shared identity, shared context, and spontaneous communication. *Organization Science*, 16(3): 290-307.

Hinds, P., Liu, L., & Lyon, J. 2011. Putting the global in global work: An intercultural lens on the practice of cross-national collaboration. *The Academy of Management Annals, 5(1)*: 135-188.

Hirak, R., Peng, A. C., Carmeli, A., & Schaubroeck, J. M. 2012. Linking leader inclusiveness to work unit performance: The importance of psychological safety and learning from failures. *The Leadership Quarterly, 23(1)*: 107-117.

Hope Pelled, L., Ledford, J., Gerald E, & Albers Mohrman, S. 1999. Demographic dissimilarity and workplace inclusion. *Journal of Management studies, 36(7)*: 1013-1031.

Jansen, W. S., Otten, S., van der Zee, K. I., & Jans, L. 2014. Inclusion: Conceptualization and measurement. *European journal of social psychology, 44(4)*: 370-385.

Jonsen, K, Maznevski, & Schneider, S. 2011. Diversity and its not so diverse literature. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 11(1): 35-62

Jonsen, K., Maznevski, M., & Davison, S. C. 2012. Global virtual team dynamics and effectiveness. In G. K. Stahl, I. Björkman, & S. Morris (Eds.), *Handbook of research in international human resource management*, 2nd ed.: 363-392. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Kendall, G. P., Woodward, I., & Zlatko, S. 2009. *The sociology of cosmopolitanism: globalization, identity, culture and government*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Lee, H.-J. 2014. Identities in the global world of work. In B. Gehrke, & M.-T. Claes (Eds.), *Global leadership practices: Cross cultural management perspective*: 85-107. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lee, H.-J. 2015. Cosmopolitanism. In I. Vodosek, & D. D. Hartog (Eds.), *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management, Volume 6, International Management.* 3rd ed., Vol. 6. London Wiley

Lester, G. V., Virick, M., & Clapp-Smith, R. 2016. Harnessing Global Mindset to Positively Impact Advances in Global Leadership through International Human Resource Management Practices. In J. Osland, M. Li and M. Mendenhall (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership. Volume 9*: 325-349. Bingley, England: Emerald Group.

Levy, O., Beechler, S., Taylor, S., & Boyacigiller, N. 2007. What We Talk About When We Talk About "Global Mindset": Managerial Cognition in Multinational Corporations. *Journal of International Business Studies, 38(2)*: 231-258.

Levy, O., Taylor, S., & Boyacıgiller, N. A. (2010). On the rocky road to strong global culture. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 51*(4), 20-22.

Levy, O., Lee, H.-J., Peiperl, M., & Jonsen, K. 2015. Cosmopolitans: Brokering cultural and structural holes in international business. *Academy of Management Proceedings* 2015 (1), 10310.

Levy, O., Lee, H.-J., Jonsen, K., & Peiperl, M. 2018. Transcultural brokerage: the role of cosmopolitans in bridging structural and cultural holes. *Journal of Management*, *45*(2), 417-450.

Levy, O., Peiperl, M., & Jonsen, K. 2016. Cosmopolitanism in a Globalized World: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. In J. Osland, M. Li and M. Mendenhall (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership. Volume 9*: 279-321. Bingley, England: Emerald Group

Levy, O., Peiperl, M. A., & Jonsen, K. 2016. Cosmopolitanism in a Globalized World: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. In J. Osland, M. Li and M. Mendenhall (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership. Volume 9*: 279-321. Bingley, England: Emerald Group

Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. 2008. Responsible leadership in a globalized world: a cosmopolitan perspective. In A. G. Scherer and G. Palazzo (Eds.), *Handbook of research on global corporate citizenship*: 430-453. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. 2009. Business leaders as citizens of the world. Advancing humanism on a global scale. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(3): 537-550.

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

Mendenhall, M. E., Osland, J., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R., Maznevski, M. L., Stevens, M., & Stahl, G. K. (Eds.). 2013. *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Mazur, B. 2014. Building diverse and inclusive organizational culture-best practices: A case study of Cisco Co. *Journal of Intercultural Management, 6(4-1)*: 169-179.

McKay, P. F., & Avery, D. R. 2015. Diversity climate in organizations: Current wisdom and domains of uncertainty. In M. R. Buckley, A. R. Wheeler and J. R. B. Halbesleben (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management. Volume 33*: 191-233: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Miron-Spektor, E., Ingram, A., Keller, J., Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. 2018. Microfoundations of organizational paradox: The problem is how we think about the problem. *Academy of Management Journal, 61(1)*: 26-45.

Mitchell, R., Boyle, B., Parker, V., Giles, M., Chiang, V., & Joyce, P. 2015. Managing inclusiveness and diversity in teams: How leader inclusiveness affects performance through status and team identity. *Human Resource Management, 54(2)*: 217-239.

Montoya-Weiss, M. M., Massey, A. P., & Song, M. 2001. Getting it together: Temporal coordination and conflict management in global virtual teams. *Academy of Management journal*, 44(6): 1251-1262.

Mor Barak, M. E. 2000. The inclusive workplace: An ecosystems approach to diversity management. *Social work, 45(4)*: 339-353.

Mor Barak, M. E. 2011. *Managing diversity: Toward a Globally Inclusive Workplace* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mor-Barak, M. E., & Cherin, D. A. 1998. A tool to expand organizational understanding of workforce diversity: Exploring a measure of inclusion-exclusion. *Administration in Social Work, 22(1)*: 47-64.

Mor Barak, M. E., Cherin, D. A., & Berkman, S. 1998. Organizational and personal dimensions in diversity climate: Ethnic and gender differences in employee perceptions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 34(1)*: 82-104.

Mor Barak, M. E., & Daya, P. 2014. Fostering Inclusion from the Inside Out to Create an Inclusive Workplace. In B. M. Ferdman and B. R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*: 391-412. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mor Barak, M. E., Lizano, E. L., Kim, A., Duan, L., Rhee, M.-K., Hsiao, H.-Y., & Brimhall, K. C. 2016. The promise of diversity management for climate of inclusion: A state-of-the-art review and meta-analysis. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance, 40(4)*: 305-333.

Nembhard, I. M., & Edmondson, A. C. 2006. Making it safe: The effects of leader inclusiveness and professional status on psychological safety and improvement efforts in health care teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27(7)*: 941-966.

Nishii, L. H. 2013. The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56(6): 1754-1774.

Nishii, L. H., & Mayer, D. M. 2009. Do inclusive leaders help to reduce turnover in diverse groups? The moderating role of leader–member exchange in the diversity to turnover relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94(6)*: 1412.

Nishii, L. H., & Özbilgin, M. F. 2007. Global diversity management: towards a conceptual framework. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 18(11)*: 1883-1894.

Offermann, L. R., & Basford, T. E. 2014. Inclusive human resource management: Best practices and the changing role of human resources. In B. M. Ferdman and B. R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*: 229-259. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Orlikowski, W. J. 2002. Knowing in practice: Enacting a collective capability in distributed organizing. *Organization Science*, 13(3): 249-273.

Osland, J. S., & Bird, A. 2000. Beyond sophisticated stereotyping: Cultural sensemaking in context. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 14(1): 65-77.

Ozbilgin, M., & Tatli, A. 2008. *Global diversity management: An evidence based approach*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Pearce, W. B. 1994. *Interpersonal communication: Making social worlds*. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Pless, N., & Maak, T. 2004. Building an inclusive diversity culture: Principles, processes and practice. *Journal of Business Ethics, 54(2)*: 129-147.

Pogge, T. W. 1992. Cosmopolitanism and sovereignty. *Ethics, 103(1)*: 48-75.

Randel, A. E., Galvin, B. M., Shore, L. M., Ehrhart, K. H., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A.,& Kedharnath, U. 2018. Inclusive leadership: Realizing positive outcomes through

belongingness and being valued for uniqueness. *Human Resource Management Review, 28(2)*: 190-203.

Rhinesmith, S. H. 2001. How can you manage global paradox? *Journal of Corporate Accounting & Finance*, 12(6): 3-9.

Salazar, M., & Salas, E. 2013. Reflections of cross-cultural collaboration science. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(6): 910-917.

Schad, J., Lewis, M. W., Raisch, S., & Smith, W. K. 2016. Paradox research in management science: Looking back to move forward. *The Academy of Management Annals, 10(1)*: 5-64.

Schraa-Liu, T., & Trompenaars, F. 2006. Towards responsible leadership through reconciling dilemmas. In T. Maak and N. Pless (Eds.), *Responsible leadership*: 138-154. New York: Routledge.

Shimoni, B., & Bergmann, H. 2006. Managing in a changing world: From multiculturalism to hybridization—The production of hybrid management cultures in Israel, Thailand, and Mexico. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(3): 76-89.

Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. 2018. Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review, 28(2)*: 176-189.

Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K., & Singh, G. 2011. Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research. *Journal of Management, 37(4)*: 1262-1289.

Sidhu, J. S., & Volberda, H. W. 2011. Coordination of globally distributed teams: A co-evolution perspective on offshoring. *International Business Review*, 20(3): 278-290.

Skrbis, Z., Kendall, G., & Woodward, I. 2004. Locating cosmopolitanism: Between humanist ideal and grounded social category. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 21(6): 115-136.

Skrbis, Z., & Woodward, I. 2007. The ambivalence of ordinary cosmopolitanism: Investigating the limits of cosmopolitan openness. *The Sociological Review*, 55(4): 730-747.

Smith, K., & Berg, D. 1997. Cross-cultural groups at work. *European Management Journal, 15(1)*: 8-15.

Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. 2011. Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of management Review, 36(2)*: 381-403.

Smith, W. K., Lewis, M. W., & Tushman, M. L. 2016. Both/and" leadership. *Harvard Business Review, 94(5)*: 62-70.

Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. 2010. Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of international business studies*, 41(4): 690-709.

Sue, D. W. 2010. *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Thomas, D. A., & Ely, R. J. 1996. Making differences matter. *Harvard Business Review, 74(5)*: 79-90.

Swann Jr, W. B., Polzer, J. T., Seyle, D. C., & Ko, S. J. 2004. Finding value in diversity: Verification of personal and social self-views in diverse groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(1): 9-27.

van Marrewijk, A. 2010. Situational construction of Dutch–Indian cultural differences in global IT projects. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 26(4): 368-380.

van Marrewijk, A. 2011. Cross cultural management: Hybridization of Dutch-Indian work practices in geographically distributed IT projects. *International Journal of Business Anthropology*, 2(2): 15-35.

Vertovec, S. 2012. “Diversity” and the social imaginary. *European Journal of Sociology/Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 53(3): 287-312.

Szerszynski, B., & Urry, J. 2002. Cultures of Cosmopolitanism. *The Sociological Review*, 50(4): 461-481.

Szerszynski, B., & Urry, J. 2006. Visuality, mobility and the cosmopolitan: inhabiting the world from afar. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1): 113-131.

Waldman, D. A., & Bowen, D. E. 2016. Learning to be a paradox-savvy leader. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 30(3)*: 316-327.

Wakefield, R. L., Leidner, D. E., & Garrison, G. 2008. Research note-a model of conflict, leadership, and performance in virtual teams. *Information Systems Research*, 19(4): 434-455.

Wasserman, I. C., Gallegos, P. V., & Ferdman, B. M. 2008. Dancing with Resistance. In K. M. Thomas (Ed.), *Diversity resistance in organizations*: 175-200. New York: Taylor & Francis Group/Lawrence Erlbaum.

Winters, M.-F. 2014. From diversity to inclusion: An inclusion equation. In B. M. Ferdman and B. R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*: 205-228. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ybema, S., Vroemisse, M., & van Marrewijk, A. 2012. Constructing identity by deconstructing differences: Building partnerships across cultural and hierarchical divides. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 28(1): 48-59.

Zhang, Y., Waldman, D. A., Han, Y.-L., & Li, X.-B. 2015. Paradoxical leader behaviors in people management: Antecedents and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal, 58(2)*: 538-566.

Table 1

Inclusion Practices of highly engaged cosmopolitan leaders

Core collaboration processes	Inclusion practices
Aligning interests	▪ Acknowledging differences in interests ▪ Creating common interests ▪ Fostering a shared mental model that embraces different interests
Managing conflicts	▪ Surfacing key disagreements and power asymmetries ▪ Facilitating mutual understanding and jointly reached solutions
Bridging cultural identities	▪ Embracing a "thick" notion of cultural identity ▪ Facilitating an ongoing dialogue between parties ▪ Building a superordinate identity that is based on mutual understanding and appreciation
Forming common practices	▪ Cultivating hybrid practices drawn from different cultural groups ▪ Facilitating ongoing interactions, negotiations, and mutual learning ▪ Creating a new shared language

Source: Adapted from Levy, Lee, Peiperl, & Jonsen (2015).