Evaluation of Theories and Concepts on Global Leadership, Employee Self- Efficacy and Innovative Work Behavior

Ms. Ensejam Ibrahim Alkipsy[1], Assoc. Prof. Dr. Valliappan Raju[2]

[1] PhD Aspirant, Limkokwing University of Creative Technology, Malaysia
[2] Sr. Lecturer, Limkokwing University of Creative Technology, Malaysia
Corresponding author: Ms. Ensejam Ibrahim Alkipsy[1]

Abstract: *This study aims at conducting a comprehensive literature review on the theories and concepts of global leadership, employee's self- efficacy and innovative work behavior (EIWB). Based on the review, the conceptualization and operationalization of global leadership, ESE and EIWB are reviewed.A total of , 103 papers examining the concepts and theory of global leadership, employee self- efficacy and EWIB in various journals, including top management and hospitality journals, during the period of 1973-2017 were reviewed. About eleven theories explaining the concept and practice of leadership were reviewed. Three of these theories (Fielder's model, Vroom and Yetton- normative decision making model and Hersey's and Blanchard's situational leadership style were found to be the most prominent. In the same vein, most of the prominent theories explaining global leadership (Wre- Swatez, Hofstede's and GLOBE study theories) were also evaluated. This current study further shade more light on the earliest cognitive theory advanced by Bandura on self- efficacy, this help to create an understanding of utilizing self – efficacy as a foundation to human motivation, well-being and personal accomplishment. This study provides practitioners with an up- to- date paper to improve their comprehension of the underlying theories and concepts explaining global leadership, employee self – efficacy as well as EIWB.*
Keywords: *Global leadership, Employee self- efficacy, Innovative work Behavior*

I. Introduction

Global leadership is the one of the most important concepts in the current era. Global leadership historical background goes back to several decades because of its essential need in performing leadership. Global leadership can determine how a leader can be globally successful dealing with different cultures. Global leadership is a multidisciplinary achievement of key components that future leaders in all areas of individual expertise must earn to know adequately the psychological, physiological, topographic, geopolitical, anthropological and social effects of globalization (Mendenhall et al., 2017). Global leadership occurs when an individual or people explore the collective endeavors of various partners through the multi-faceted ecological nature towards a dream by taking advantage of a global mindset. Because of the patterns, ranging from expansionism and diffusion expansion to extensive communication, development, (realized by the Internet and various types of human cooperation in the light of the speed of the computer-mediation) a large array of important new concerns facing humanity; including modern unrestricted, global business planner, and critical moves in geopolitical ideal models (Bird, Mendenhall, Osland, Oddou, & Reiche, 2016). The capacity and understanding that the leaders will take to effectively explore humanity through these improvements have been all about the wonders of globalization with a definite end goal to understand and properly manage human progress by maintaining adherence to national reconciliation, finance and social systems.

The ability to continuously develop and strengthen elements, departments and business models is of importance to associations. Individual workers should be prepared and ready for improvement if a continuous range of developments e.g., Janssen (2000) is to be recognized. The possibility that the activities of individual actors are of great importance to continuous development and change is not only found in school writing about progress, but is also concerned about working on a few other public administrations, for example, quality management and business enterprises (Mittal & Dhar, 2015).

Innovative work behavior usually involves looking for opportunities and the age of new ideas (innovation behavior), but can also include coordinated behaviors towards implementing change, applying new learning, or strengthening actions to increase the level of individual or potential business execution. Much of the earlier work focused on the creation of workers and the age of fantasy at the end of the day on the early stages of development (Newman, Schwarz, Cooper, & Sendjaya, 2017). Few specialists have called for expanded construction and more logical reasoning for the implementation of ideas. Accordingly, it is usually observed that

---

the innovative work behavior includes extensive arrangements for behaviors identified with age of ideas, support for them, and assistance in their use. However, measures that are accessible by the innovative work behavior are generally short and dimension-specific and the empirical confirmation of the legitimacy of these measures is restricted. Many tests were based on single source information, with individual workers giving innovative work behavior ratings as well as partners (Demirtas, 2015). The main objective of this paper is to provide a review on the theories and concepts explaining global leadership, employee self- efficacy and innovative Work Behavior

II. Leadership Concept

Leadership is both an exploration area and a functional experience involving the ability of an individual or association to "lead" or guide different people, groups, or entire organizations (G. Yukl, 1989). A writing specialist writes about different perspectives, distinguishing between Eastern and Western ways of dealing with leadership, and moreover (within the West) US versus European methodologies. School attitudes in the United States define leadership as "a social impact on which men can record evidence and support others in carrying out a typical mission." The leadership seen from a European and non-scientific point of view includes the leader's view that can be conveyed through societal goals as well as through the search for individual power. Leadership can be obtained from a combination of a few factors (Hershey, 2017).

The leadership researchers have investigated speculations including characteristics, situational cooperation, action, behavior, power, vision, qualities, magic, insight, among other things (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2015). The direct definition is that leadership is the craft that constitutes a gathering of individuals to work towards a common goal. This leadership definition holds the basics of being able to overwhelm others and being created to do so. Strong leadership depends on ideas (regardless of whether they are unique or acquired), but will not happen unless those ideas can be conveyed to others in a way that draws them enough to go as the leader needs them to work(Bass & Riggio, 2006; Kirkpatick & Locke, 1991).

Putting just a lot more, the leader is the motivation and operational of the activity. He is a person who belongs to a pool that has a combination of identity and leadership abilities that affect others need to take after him or her influence. In business, the driving is welded into execution and any driving definition needs to be considered (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 2011). While it is not exclusively about interest, individuals who are seen as successful leaders are the individuals who increase their core interests of the organization - so much so that individuals with titles and leadership duties are often afforded if their endeavors do not meet the benefits of their paperwork, management or investors (Bass, 1995).

To further confuse the definition of leadership, we tend to use the term "leadership" and "management" similarly, referring to the organizational structure of the organization as its leadership, or to those who are truly supervisors as "leaders" of different administrative groups. This is not really a terrible thing but driving includes more. To be strong, the leader needs to deal with the assets available to her. To the extent that leadership can include, in addition, its transfer, management and management - to name but a few, the more basic capabilities a leader needs must be productive (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

The term leadership is generally late expansion into English dialect. It has been used for nearly two hundred years, despite the fact that the term leader, who drew it, appeared on schedule as A.D. 1300 (Stogdill, 1974). Analysts generally know the leadership as evidenced by their individual views and marvel parts of most of their enthusiasm. After a long-term study of command writing, Stogdill (1974) concluded that "there is almost the same number of driving definitions because there are people who have sought to define the idea." The flow of new definitions has begun unabated since Stogdill mentioned the reality of the goal. Leadership has been identified with regard to the qualities, practices, effects, collaboration designs, part connections, and position control.

Accompanying is the case of driving definitions from some of the leading scholarly articles and scholars: According to Janda (1960); leadership is "a certain type of energy relationship that is perceived by the assembly as acknowledging that another part of the assembly has the privilege of supporting actions to portray the former as part of a group". Tennenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik (1961); Leadership is "a relational effect, practiced in circumstance and coordinated, through correspondence, on the achievement of a predetermined goal or objectives".

Jacobs (1970); Leadership is "an association between people where one presents data of a kind in this way, so that the alternative ends convincingly that its results, will be enhanced in the event that it is carried as proposed or wanted". Stogdill (1974); Leadership is "the beginning and maintenance of the structure of desire and communication". Leadership is "the relationship that one individual, the leader, affects the others to easily cooperate in the relevant tasks to achieve what the leader wants" (Terry, 1990). Leadership is a "convincing addition that goes beyond mechanical consistency with standard states of assembly" (Katz & Kahn, 1978). According to Bray, Campbell, and Grant (1974), leadership is "access to recognized ideas and to the management of a group or person to achieve a task". Koontz, O'Donnell, and Weihrich (1984) define leadership

as "work or action that affects individuals in order to strive towards the goals". "Leadership is cooperation between individuals from the community; leaders are specialists in progress, people whose demonstrations affect more individuals than other people's demonstrations" (Bass, 1985). The relational effect exercised in circumstance and coordinated, through the conduct of correspondence, in the achievement of a specific objective or objectives" (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). "Leadership is the way to describe current circumstances and set goals for the future; reach important options to define conditions or achieve goals; and express dedication of individuals who need to implement these options" (Brache, 1983). Leadership is "the way to influence the assembly exercises that have been aligned towards the goal" (Rauch & Behling, 1984).

There is a wide and ever growing variety of theories to explain the concept and practice of leadership such as:

i.   Lewin's leadership styles.
ii.   Likert's leadership styles.
iii. Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership.
iv.   Vroom and Yetton's Normative Model.
v.   House's Path-Goal Theory of Leadership.
vi.   Fiedler's Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) Theory.
vii. Cognitive Resource Theory.
viii. Strategic Contingencies Theory.
ix.   Bass' Transformational Leadership Theory.
x.   Burns' Transformational Leadership Theory.
xi.   Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Participation Inventory.

2.1 Fielder's Model
It is the most accurate theoretical theory in time for the persuasive leader (Fiedler, 1967). Fiedler is known under the overwhelming reactions to his (Lake) "Kindred Minimal Favorites" system. The basic assumption is that portraying an individual leader who has the most turbulent work reflects the first type of leadership. The second premise is that any more commitment to the basic methods of leadership in the implementation of the assembly cannot help in the contradiction of "tendency to circumstance." This decision is resolved by weighting and joining the three parts of circumstances, the leader of the partial relations, the position of the band and its structure, , Is less important position of the leader when the relationship is part of the poor leader, the dynamic position, the undertaking is organized.

2.2 Vroom and Yetton - The Normative Decision-Making Model
The theory of other attitudes focuses on observation and generally on the criteria for determining whether a leader should include subordinates in different types of basic leadership (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). The importance of using appropriate selection methods for long-term progress has been considered (Heller, Pusic, Wilpert, & Strauss, 1998; G. Yukl, 1999) saw that the decision of the chief executive reflected regulations in a restricted officer and his subordinates and circumstances In addition, Meyer (1975) recognized leaders need to consider the quality requirements of Choice and tolerability of subordinate pre-selection strategy.

2.3 Herseys and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Style
Blanchard and Hersey (1970) model is one of the acclaimed models of driving style. It was produced in 1970 by teacher and author Paul Herssey and leadership master Ken Blanchard (Malherbe, 2008). Indeed, many investigations have cleared this model, with administrative leadership focusing on the only leadership style that colleagues should modify. The impression of the leadership style was based on how the leader prepared to rank colleagues to be at one level in any case discriminating among them, and researchers were concerned about capacity-building for leaders, regardless of what part of the administrative procedure he was talking to colleagues (Ardichvili & Manderscheid, 2008). The Harris model and the Blanchard model sought to include the collective capacity identified with their level of vision to frame a correct recipe for effective leadership, replacing the level of appreciation and upgrading the leadership to be more extensive by including the diverse level of peer learning (Marion & Gonzales, 2013)

2.4 Global Leadership Theory
Global leadership is a multidisciplinary achievement of the key components that future leaders in all areas of individual expertise must ensure to adapt adequately to the physiological, geological, geopolitical, anthropological and social effects of globalization. Global leadership occurs when an individual or people explore the collective activities of various partners through the multi-faceted ecological nature towards a dream by taking advantage of a global position. Because of the patterns, ranging from expansionism and further

expansion of wide communications, progress (achieved by the Internet and various types of humanitarian cooperation in the light of the speed of Bessie's intervention), a wide range of important new concerns facing humankind, consisting of humanitarian endeavors towards peace, And noteworthy movements in geopolitical standards. The capacity and understanding that the leaders will take to effectively explore humanity through these improvements have been all about the marvel of globalization, taking into account the ultimate goal of recognizing and managing human progress properly and of monetary and social techniques.

Many authors and researchers have defined the term global leadership theories differently. Crafted by Giddens (2003), Hofstede and Hofstede (2005), and The GLOBE Study (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004) gave mutual points of view on issues of globalization. Giddens' short discourse on the transformative parts of globalization displayed a brief definition and tended to issues of national entrenchment. While Hofstede and Hofstede countered Giddens' contentions that another world request is inescapable, they agreed with his perspectives on entrenchment, accentuating the significance of national characters to multifaceted communications.Dorfman, Hanges, and Brodbeck (2004) in The GLOBE Study upheld Hofstede and Hofstede's decisions on the significance of social character, asking adjustment of leadership style to meet societal requests. There were several theories regarding the global leadership, this evaluation will consist some of the most important theories, which are Wren-Swatez theory, Hofstede's theory, and The GLOBE Study theory.

2.5 Wren-Swatez model

Wren and Swatez (1995) give a visual model to understudies to conceptualize the relationship. Utilizing concentric circles, they outline how leader supporter associations happen inside three particular yet covering settings quick, contemporary, and authentic. The deepest circle is the prompt setting. It is here that leaders and supporters, with the majority of their eccentricities, go up against the miniaturized scale elements of the leadership circumstance hierarchical structure and objectives, authoritative culture, and particular assignments and issues. The quick setting sits inside the contemporary setting. This setting incorporates the current societal variables, for example, social esteems, social mores, and subculture standards that shape traditions and customs. It is the contemporary setting that produces particular desires of leader activities, practices, and styles. The peripheral circle speaks to the large-scale factors or chronicled setting, the long haul political, scholarly, financial, and social powers. These persevering impacts shape the principles supporters use to quantify leader achievement. Effective leadership approaches relate to the requests of the prompt setting and the desires of the contemporary setting while at the same time perceiving these requests and desires have their underlying foundations somewhere down in a general public's past. History and culture encompass the present leadership condition, embellishment and restricting leadership decisions and potential arrangements.

2.6 Hofstede's model

For Hofstede and Hofstede (2005) a man's nation is the person's social home from which the individual watches whatever remains of the world through a window. The oblivious programming or molding of the mind that characterizes national culture builds up societal standards for considering, feeling, and acting. Social programming begins in the family during childbirth and proceeds with first in school then at work. The essential social contrasts between countries are in their qualities. Hofstede and Hofstede portray five zones in which dissimilarities in values happen, bringing about a five dimensional model of contrasts between national societies. These measurements of contrasts are control remove, independence versus cooperation, manliness versus gentility, vulnerability evasion, and long haul versus here and now introduction. For each measurement, a nation falls some place along a continuum from solid to powerless when contrasted with different countries. In connection to these five measurements of national culture, the United States is a low power removes, nonconformist, manly, vulnerability tolerating, and here and now situated nation. Utilizing the United States as a benchmark, understudies can picture the connection between their societal esteems and those of different countries as they illuminate leadership.

2.7 The Globe Study Theory

The GLOBE Study (House et al., 2004), the most extensive to date on the cultural contingency of leadership, presumes that every general public has socially embraced leader practices marked leadership conviction frameworks. To control the exploration, the examination (House and Javidan, 2004) built up the socially embraced understood hypothesis of leadership (CLT). The GLOBE Study (House, et al., 2004) brought about nine measurements of significant worth contrasts between societies: execution introduction, future introduction, sex libertarianism, self-assuredness, institutional cooperation, in-gather community, control remove, others conscious introduction, and vulnerability evasion. Here the United States is a piece of the Anglo bunch that incorporates Australia, Canada, England, Ireland, New Zealand, and South Africa-White Samples. Understanding inside societies as to their convictions about leadership is substantial to the point that critical

contrasts between social orders are apparent. The GLOBE Study empowers understudies to look at the social contrasts in leadership.

III. Perspectives in Global Leadership

Leadership has been rising worldwide in recent decades in response to the need for global employers to develop global methodologies, engage in global markets, and compete in the global business center (Black, Morrison, & Gregersen, 1999; Mendenhall, Reiche, Bird, & Osland, 2012). Expanded power and development in 'global action', defined as the conditions in which workers work at the interview on national borders, is unusual (Hinds, Liu, & Lyon, 2011). Later, researchers began to visualize and create models that could Helping companies around the world to create managerial and leadership capacity around the world, while current endeavors have added to a superior understanding of the part of the capabilities and skills leaders must have around the world and how these can be effectively created for example, (Bird, Mendenhall, Stevens, & Oddou, 2010; Bücker & Poutsma, 2010), and definitions This fundamental flood of research is naturally curious in nature, is not explained unequivocally, or is particularly inadequate In the next section, we review and evaluate the current definitions of global leadership.

One dimension in which existing definitions change is the separation of leadership as a state (Quinn, 2005) or the procedure (G. A. Yukl, 1981). There are few definitions of leadership throughout the world as an explicit expression described by some of the tasks, exercises, and degrees of work, parts and commitments of world leaders. The identification of these qualities is useful because it enables the manual to identify and improve the capabilities and ranges of capabilities that are important to meet these parts and missions and break down the identification of test points. For example, few definitions and studies expect anyone with the title of global supervisor to be a global leader; others believe that world leaders should change specialists in relation to the improvement of Kotter (1999) among neighborhood leaders and leaders. This difference between the part and capabilities demands a different class of definitions that highlight the driving action component around the world. In these definitions of leadership around the world does not involve only expanding the local leader's attributions and drills to a more expansive situation. Instead, imagine leadership around the world to be an action that reflects how an individual participates in and meets parts and commitments around the world, and includes production of sense, nature and nature of communication carried by a leader with the general population around them worldwide and the tools through which the leader applies the effect. This induction approach has also been given attention in the literature on the trade of the leader (Malakyan, 2014) and the theory of social leadership (Uhl-Bien, 2006).

In the end, there are some definitions that promote understanding of global leadership as a state and as a procedure, a process involving a few focal points. To begin with, the categories of State and process are not intrinsically relevant. The previous view can be ascertained as to how individuals should meet the commitments, parts and duties that characterize the status of leadership around the world. For example, the implementation of collection obligations around the world does not take place in a vacuum, but instead requires the inclusion and support of other individuals, which essentially involves a procedural element. Thus, the conduct of leadership around the world cannot be assessed without considering your part of the necessities and characteristics of the individual assignment to initiate this procedure. Northouse (2015) seems to acknowledge this when he insists that "world leaders are those individuals who strongly influence global leadership actions." Second, the refinement between the state and the process is largely a matter of examination unit: The worldwide leadership procedures come to the individual past that involves parts of the world and take care of duties around the world and recognizes how they are implanted in a wider collective where it works Leaders around the world to achieve their goals. From this point of view, the coordination of country and process classifications adds to the link between the two, which includes the evolution of global leadership and global leadership.

The following table shows some of the most important definitions for global leadership:

Table 1: Some Popular Definitions for Global Leadership

Authors	Definitions
Spreitzer, McCall, and Mahoney (1997)	An executive who is in a job with international scope, whether in an expatriate assignment or in a job dealing with international issue more generally.
Gregersen, Morrison, and Black (1998)	Leaders who can guide organizations that span diverse countries, cultures and customers.
McCall and Hollenbeck (2002)	In a nutshell, a global executives are those who do global work with so many kinds of global work, again depending on the mix of business and cultural crossing involved, there is clearly no one type of global executive. Executives as well as positions, are more or less global depending upon the roles they play, their responsibilities, what they must get done, and the extent to which they cross- borders.
Suutari (2002)	Global leaders are managers with global integration responsibilities in global organizations.

Harris, Moran, and Moran (2004)	Global leaders are capable of operating effectively in a global environment while being respectful of cultural diversity.
Osland (2008)	Anyone who leads global change efforts in public, private or non- profit sector is a global leader.
Adler (1997)	Global leadership involves the ability to inspire and influence the thinking, attitude and behavior of people from around the world…[it] can be described as "a process by which members of the world community are empowered to work together synergistically toward a common vision and common goals resulting in an improvement in the quality of life on and for the planet. "Global leaders are those people who most strongly influence the process of global leadership.
(Petrick, Scherer, Brodzinski, Quinn, & Ainina, 1999)	Global strategic leadership […] consists of the individual and collective competence in style and substance to envision, formulate, and implement strategies that enhance global reputation and produce competitive advantage.
Osland and Bird (2005)	Global leadership is the process of influencing the thinking, attitude, and behavior of the global community to work together synergistically toward a common vision and common goal.
Beechler and Javidan (2007)	Global leadership is the process of influencing individuals, groups and organizations (inside and outside the boundaries of global organization) representing diverse cultural/political/ institutional systems to contribute toward the achievement of the global organizational goals.
Brake (1997)	Global leaders – what whatever level or location – will 1) embrace the changes of global competition 2) generate personal and organizational energies to confront those challenges, and 3) transform the organizational energy into a world- class performance.
Caligiuri and Tarique (2009)	Global leaders are high level professionals such as executives, vice- presidents, directors and managers who are in jobs with some global leadership responsibilities. Global leaders play an important role in developing and sustaining global competitive advantage.
(Mendenhall , Stevens, Bird, Oddou, & Osland, 2008)	Global leaders are individuals who effect significant positive change in organizations by building communities through the development of trust and the arrangement of organizational structures and process in a context involving multiple cross- boundary stakeholders, external sources of cross – boundary authority, and multiple culture under conditions of temporal, geographical and cultural complexity.

Hofstede (1984), opened the eyes of the business world to the importance of culture to management about 30 years ago. The later the Globe study (House et al., 2004) has broadened and refined the consequences of a leadership culture. Brodbeck, Hanges, Dickson, Gupta, and Dorfman (2004), concluded from the Globe study that societal strategies were the most important influence on leadership within associations. This conclusion reinforced the Wren (1995) calculated model that planted fast or authoritative components within larger settings of history and culture. De Mooij and Hofstede (2010), and the Globe Study in addition to illustrating how history and culture constitute leadership practices and the will of the devotee, House et al. (2004) created from the Globe Study comes about socially embraced leadership profiles to visualize leadership examples of 10 social groups investigated. They demonstrated that the qualities, ideas and convictions of a culture or culture group determined the emergence of successful leadership.

IV. Employee Self- efficacy

The cognitive theorist Albert Bandura defined Self-efficacy as "people's judgment of their capabilities to accomplish a certain level of performance."Santoso and Furinto (2018), often mistakenly written and spoken about as the ability of someone to complete a task or tasks, Self-efficacy specifically refers to the ability of on individual to self- efficacy whether or not he or she has the ability to accomplish something. While Self-efficacy makes up but a fraction of the overall human psyche, "Self-efficacy provides the foundation of human motivation, well-being, and personal accomplishment." (Susan and Nicola, 2011) With a competent understanding of how to utilize self-efficacy, managers can greatly improve the moral of their employees. One way leadership could accomplish this might be to clearly show that high- and mid-level management decisions are made and followed through with. "When employees have fair perception from implementing procedures and decision-makings it is clear that this will influence their self-efficacy and innovative job behavior." Mikail, Habib, Mohammad, (2014), of paramount importance, though, is the understanding of what a lack of self-efficacy looks like. For example, "the lack of employee self- efficacy results in increased expense of learning, low employee morale, and higher pressure to accomplish more in the workplace" (Gardner-Webb, OdusJolley, Hunter, 2016) Many negative ripple effects could transpire from this situation. Organization performance in general will be negatively impacted in the short and/or long term in unforeseen ways. The organization that employs the employee lacking in self-efficacy could possibly receive a negative reputation.

V. Innovative Work Behavior

Innovation has been seen as human behavior since the spread of innovation from organizational sciences, exchanges, and humanities to brain and human research in the 1980s (West & Altink, 1996). Beginning with a mental void away from innovation, he coined the phrase "imaginative behavior." It can be defined as intentional age, advancement and recognition of new ideas within the working group, working group or organization with a specific end goal for the implementation of the profit, assembly or organization (Kaiser, LeBreton, & Hogan, 2015). Although strictly defined with innovative creativity, fictional work behavior refers to more than being innovative. Without a doubt, Miron, Erez, and Naveh (2004) discovered that creative individuals are not usually exceptionally fanciful. Creative behavior is suggested to create a kind of advantage and its part is more clearly connected (Wang, Fang, Qureshi, & Janssen, 2015). Later, scientists agreed that the behavior of innovative work included creative innovation, namely, the age of new and useful ideas on elements, departments, procedures and methodology, and the implementation of the ideas presented (Anderson, De Dreu, & Nijstad, 2004). In particular, the behavior of innovative work consists of a hierarchy of behaviors: an open door investigation and a lifetime of thought integrating research into and perception of opportunities to improve and present ideas and answers to open doors. After that, the hero casts light on the progress of product thought to find support and coalition building. In the last past, the application makes the booster thought really happen. It involves the creation, testing, modification and marketing of thought.

Creative behavior can shift from incremental changes to original growing ideas that affect actions or elements across the organization (Perry-Smith & Mannucci, 2017). While the past is fairly uncommon and generally only representatives working in innovative work can contribute in such a way, recommendations on smaller scale and previous smaller promotions are much more typical and attention workers of all land. Situations of imaginative behavior at work include thinking about optional paths, looking for promotions, a better approach to achieving commitments, looking for new advances, applying new business strategies, and researching and securing assets for new ideas.

Overall, the behavior of creative work is not part of the normal occupation of representatives in general. This behavior describes an additional behavior, which indicates the optional behavior that has not been identified within the expected range of responsibilities (Katz & Kahn, 1978) so far through profit-seeking endeavors (Organ & Podsakoff). The imagination is urgent in many contemporary management standards, for example, continuous change (Fuller, Marler, & Hester, 2006), kaizen, corporate business (Xi, Kraus, Filser, & Kellermanns, 2015) and proposal programs (Cools, Stouthuysen, & Van den Abbeele, 2017).

Assuming that imaginative behavior adds to the results of the work, the vast majority of the remaining exploration of the behavior of innovative work has focused on recognizing its potential precursors. A variety of organizational and individual elements were considered critical elements of the behavior of creative work (Haynes, Hitt, & Campbell, 2015; Mumford & McIntosh, 2017).

Organizational elements contain the main pool of preconditions manages elements that organizations can decide. Analysts have given great attention to these variables. The researchers suggested, among other things, supervisory behavior as a major driving force. In particular, previous work has seriously considered the effects of transformational leadership and pilot experiences in imaginative behavior (Yuan & Woodman, 2010). It has been noted that other organizational elements explored by the exploration of the behavior of creative work, for example, the culture and atmosphere of the organization (Devloo, Anseel, De Beuckelaer, & Salanova, 2015) support innovation (Axtell et al., 2000). In addition, researchers have already studied factors, for example, independence of work (Axtell et al., 2000) and the challenge of work (De Jong & Kemp, 2003), as well as appointment and substantive relevance (Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003).

Individual differences can also affect the behavior of innovative work. As with organizational linkages, previous work has given careful consideration to these variables. Typical factors examined include individual traits, for example, the propensity to innovate (Bunce & West, 1995), intrinsic interest (Yuan & Woodman, 2010), and mastery orientation (Janssen & Van Yperen, 2004). Various examinations have explored the influence of individuals' intellectual thought, for example, critical thinking (Scott & Bruce, 1994) or problem ownership (Dorenbosch, Engen, & Verhagen, 2005). Further, scholars have suggested that self-efficacy plays an important role in innovative work behavior. For example, Bandura (1997) states "innovativeness requires an unshakable sense of efficacy". Similarly, Kleysen and Street (2001) claim that "Since change and innovation in a work role may involve both uncertainty about future outcomes as well as possible resistance from others affected by the change, the individual who does not possess a reasonable amount of self-efficacy faces considerable barriers. "

Given the calculated relationship of self-efficacy and results related to innovation, researchers began to test the exact accepted relationship. Two exploratory investigations have found that self-sufficiency-related condemnations are categorically determined by imagination (Redmond, Mumford, & Teach, 1993), and that the positive relationship between self-sufficiency and innovation also appears in a work environment. Later, Tierney and Farmer (2002) presented an innovative construct of self-sufficiency, indicating the convictions of

representatives that they could be fictional in the work environment, inventors suggest that innovative self-efficacy reinforces innovation, Using the information Gong, Huang, and Farh (2009) have provided further assistance in linking innovative self-efficacy with creative results.

Previous research on the possible consequences of the imaginative behavior was minimal. There are only two investigations that have managed the results of creative work behavior. Two of them focused on the negative effects that creative behavior might have. To begin with, and to accept that innovation is probably an unsafe undertaking, Van der Vegt and Janssen (2003) found that representatives who demonstrate the conduct of creative work are likely to risk clashes with collaborators who need to prevent creative change. That innovative work behavior is determined by pressure responses from representatives.

VI. Summary

Leadership has been rising globally in recent decades in response to the need for global employers to develop global methodologies, engage in global markets, and compete in the global business center (Mendenhall et al., 2012; Morrison, Gregersen, & Black, 1999) Expanded power and development in 'global action', defined as the conditions in which workers work at the interview on national borders, is unusual(Hinds et al., 2011). Later, researchers began to visualize and create models that could Helping companies around the world to create managerial and leadership capacity around the world, while current endeavors have added to a superior understanding of the part of the capabilities and skills leaders must have around the world and how these can be effectively created For example,(Bird et al., 2010; Bücker & Poutsma, 2010; Suutari, 2002), and definitions This fundamental flood of research is naturally curious in nature, is not explained unequivocally, or is particularly inadequate. Innovation has been seen as human behavior since the spread of innovation from organizational sciences, exchanges, and humanities to brain and human research in the 1980s (West & Farr, 1990). Beginning with a mental void away from innovation, he coined the phrase "imaginative behavior." It can be defined as intentional age, advancement and recognition of new ideas within the working group, working group or organization with a specific end goal for the implementation of the profit, assembly or organization(West & Farr, 1990). Although strictly defined with innovative creativity, fictional work behavior refers to more than being innovative. Without a doubt, Miron et al. (2004)discovered that creative individuals are not usually exceptionally fanciful. Creative behavior is suggested to create a kind of advantage and its part is more clearly connected (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2007). Later, scientists agreed that the behavior of innovative work included creative innovation, namely, the age of new and useful ideas on elements, departments, procedures and methodology (Amabile, 1988), and the implementation of the ideas presented(Anderson et al., 2004; Axtell et al., 2000).

VII. Conclusion

About eleven theories explaining the concept and practice of leadership were reviewed. Three of these theories (Fielder's model, Vroom and Yetton- normative decision making model and Hersey's and Blanchard's situational leadership style were found to be the most prominent. In the same vein, most of the prominent theories explaining global leadership (Wre- Swatez, Hofstede's and GLOBE study theories were also evaluated. This current study further shade more light on the earliest cognitive theory advanced by Bandura on self-efficacy, this help to an understanding of utilizing self – efficacy as a foundation to human motivation, well-being and personal accomplishment.

References

[1].   Adler, E. (1997). Seizing the middle ground: Constructivism in world politics. *European journal of international relations, 3*(3), 319-363.
[2].   Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. *Research in organizational behavior, 10*(1), 123-167.
[3].   Anderson, N., De Dreu, C. K., & Nijstad, B. A. (2004). The routinization of innovation research: A constructively critical review of the state-of-the-science. *Journal of organizational behavior, 25*(2), 147-173.
[4].   Ardichvili, A., & Manderscheid, S. V. (2008). Emerging practices in leadership development: An introduction: SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.
[5].   Axtell, C. M., Holman, D. J., Unsworth, K. L., Wall, T. D., Waterson, P. E., & Harrington, E. (2000). Shopfloor innovation: Facilitating the suggestion and implementation of ideas. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology, 73*(3), 265-285.
[6].   Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*: Macmillan.
[7].   Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*: Free Press; Collier Macmillan.
[8].   Bass, B. M. (1995). Leadership and performance beyond expectations, 1985. *New York: The Free Press. Bass BM. Theory of transformational leadership redux. Leadership Quart, 6*(4), 463-478.
[9].   Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*: Psychology Press.
[10].   Beechler, S., & Javidan, M. (2007). Leading with a global mindset *The global mindset* (pp. 131-169): Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
[11].   Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., Osland, J., Oddou, G., & Reiche, S. (2016). Global Leadership in Perspective. *The Routledge Companion to Leadership*, 348.
[12].   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*(8), 810-828.
[13].   Black, J. S., Morrison, A. J., & Gregersen, H. B. (1999). *Global explorers: The next generation of leaders*: Psychology Press.

[14]. Blanchard, K. H., & Hersey, P. (1970). A Leadership Theory for Educational Administrators. *Educ, 90*(4), 303-310.
[15]. Brache, A. (1983). Seven prevailing myths about leadership. *Training and development journal*.
[16]. Brake, T. (1997). *The global leader: Critical factors for creating the world class organization*: Irwin Professional.
[17]. Bray, D. W., Campbell, R. J., & Grant, D. L. (1974). *Formative years in business: A long-term AT&T study of managerial lives*: Wiley-Interscience.
[18]. Brodbeck, F. C., Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W., Gupta, V., & Dorfman, P. W. (2004). Societal culture and industrial sector influences on organizational culture. *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of, 62*, 654-668.
[19]. Bücker, J., & Poutsma, E. (2010). Global management competencies: a theoretical foundation. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 25*(8), 829-844.
[20]. Bunce, D., & West, M. A. (1995). Self perceptions and perceptions of group climate as predictors of individual innovation at work. *Applied Psychology, 44*(3), 199-215.
[21]. Caligiuri, P., & Tarique, I. (2009). Predicting effectiveness in global leadership activities. *Journal of World business, 44*(3), 336-346.
[22]. Cools, M., Stouthuysen, K., & Van den Abbeele, A. (2017). Management control for stimulating different types of creativity: The role of budgets. *Journal of Management Accounting Research, 29*(3), 1-21.
[23]. De Jong, J. P., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative behaviour. *European Journal of innovation management, 10*(1), 41-64.
[24]. De Jong, J. P., & Kemp, R. (2003). Determinants of co-workers' innovative behaviour: An investigation into knowledge intensive services. *International Journal of Innovation Management, 7*(02), 189-212.
[25]. De Mooij, M., & Hofstede, G. (2010). The Hofstede model: Applications to global branding and advertising strategy and research. *International Journal of Advertising, 29*(1), 85-110.
[26]. Demirtas, O. (2015). Ethical leadership influence at organizations: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Business Ethics, 126*(2), 273-284.
[27]. Devloo, T., Anseel, F., De Beuckelaer, A., & Salanova, M. (2015). Keep the fire burning: Reciprocal gains of basic need satisfaction, intrinsic motivation and innovative work behaviour. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 24*(4), 491-504.
[28]. Dorenbosch, L., Engen, M. L. v., & Verhagen, M. (2005). On-the-job innovation: the impact of job design and human resource management through production ownership. *Creativity and innovation management, 14*(2), 129-141.
[29]. Dorfman, P. W., Hanges, P. J., & Brodbeck, F. C. (2004). Leadership and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed leadership profiles. *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of, 62*, 669-719.
[30]. Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2015). The impact of Transformational Leadership.
[31]. Fiedler, F. (1967). *A Theory of Leader Effectiveness* New York: McGraw-Hill.
[32]. Fuller, J. B., Marler, L. E., & Hester, K. (2006). Promoting felt responsibility for constructive change and proactive behavior: Exploring aspects of an elaborated model of work design. *Journal of organizational behavior, 27*(8), 1089-1120.
[33]. Giddens, A. (2003). The globalizing of modernity. *The global transformations reader: An introduction to the globalization debate*, 60-66.
[34]. Gong, Y., Huang, J.-C., & Farh, J.-L. (2009). Employee learning orientation, transformational leadership, and employee creativity: The mediating role of employee creative self-efficacy. *Academy of Management journal, 52*(4), 765-778.
[35]. Gregersen, H. B., Morrison, A. J., & Black, J. S. (1998). Developing leaders for the global frontier. *Sloan management review, 40*(1), 21.
[36]. Harris, P. R., Moran, R. T., & Moran, S. V. (2004). Managing cultural differences: Global leadership strategies for the twenty-first century: Burlington, MA: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann.
[37]. Haynes, K. T., Hitt, M. A., & Campbell, J. T. (2015). The dark side of leadership: Towards a mid-range theory of hubris and greed in entrepreneurial contexts. *Journal of Management Studies, 52*(4), 479-505.
[38]. Heller, F., Pusic, E., Wilpert, B., & Strauss, G. (1998). *Organizational participation: Myth and reality* (Vol. 4): Oxford University Press Oxford.
[39]. Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1982). Leadership style: Attitudes and behaviors.
[40]. Hershey, P. (2017). *Leadership and personnel management : concepts, methodologies, tools, and applications*. Boston, Massachusetts: Information Resources Management, Association.
[41]. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (2011). *The motivation to work* (Vol. 1): Transaction publishers.
[42]. 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*(1), 135-188.
[43]. Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5): sage.
[44]. Hofstede, G., & Hofstede, G. J. (2005). *Organisationer och kulturer*: Studentlitteratur.
[45]. House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*: Sage publications.
[46]. Jacobs, T. O. (1970). *Leadership and exchange in formal organizations*. Retrieved from
[47]. Janda, K. F. (1960). Towards the explication of the concept of leadership in terms of the concept of power. *Human relations, 13*(4), 345-363.
[48]. Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and organizational psychology, 73*(3), 287-302.
[49]. Janssen, O., & Van Yperen, N. W. (2004). Employees' goal orientations, the quality of leader-member exchange, and the outcomes of job performance and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management journal, 47*(3), 368-384.
[50]. Kaiser, R. B., LeBreton, J. M., & Hogan, J. (2015). The dark side of personality and extreme leader behavior. *Applied Psychology, 64*(1), 55-92.
[51]. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations* (Vol. 2): Wiley New York.
[52]. Kirkpatick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: do traits matter? *The executive, 5*(2), 48-60.
[53]. Kleysen, R. F., & Street, C. T. (2001). Toward a multi-dimensional measure of individual innovative behavior. *Journal of Intellectual Capital, 2*(3), 284-296.
[54]. Koontz, H., O'Donnell, C., & Weihrich, H. (1984). Management. Eight Edition: Singapore: McGraw Hill International Company.
[55]. Kotter, J. P. (1999). *John P. Kotter on what leaders really do*: Harvard Business Press.
[56]. Malakyan, P. G. (2014). Followership in leadership studies: A case of leader–follower trade approach. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(4), 6-22.

[57]. Malherbe, J. (2008). *Investigating the relationship between transformational leadership style and organisational effectiveness.* Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.
[58]. Marion, R., & Gonzales, L. D. (2013). *Leadership in education: Organizational theory for the practitioner*: Waveland press.
[59]. McCall, M. W., & Hollenbeck, G. P. (2002). *Developing global executives: The lessons of international experience*: Harvard Business Press.
[60]. Mendenhall , M., Stevens, M., Bird, A., Oddou, G., & Osland, J. (2008). Specification of the content domain of the Intercultural Effectiveness Scale. *The Kozai monograph series, 1*(2), 1-22.
[61]. Mendenhall, M. E., Osland, J., Bird, A., Oddou, G. R., Stevens, M. J., Maznevski, M. L., & Stahl, G. K. (2017). *Global leadership: Research, practice, and development*: Routledge.
[62]. 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.
[63]. Meyer, M. W. (1975). Leadership and organizational structure. *American journal of sociology, 81*(3), 514-542.
[64]. Miron, E., Erez, M., & Naveh, E. (2004). Do personal characteristics and cultural values that promote innovation, quality, and efficiency compete or complement each other? *Journal of organizational behavior, 25*(2), 175-199.
[65]. Mittal, S., & Dhar, R. L. (2015). Transformational leadership and employee creativity: mediating role of creative self-efficacy and moderating role of knowledge sharing. *Management decision, 53*(5), 894-910.
[66]. Morrison, A., Gregersen, H., & Black, S. (1999). FEATURE EDITORIAL-SAVVY GLOBAL LEADERS-Successful global leaders are in short supply. Companies can change that, if they change their thinking. *Ivey Business Journal, 64*(2), 44-51.
[67]. Mumford, M. D., & McIntosh, T. (2017). Creative thinking processes: The past and the future. *The Journal of Creative Behavior, 51*(4), 317-322.
[68]. Newman, A., Schwarz, G., Cooper, B., & Sendjaya, S. (2017). How servant leadership influences organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of LMX, empowerment, and proactive personality. *Journal of Business Ethics, 145*(1), 49-62.
[69]. Northouse, P. G. (2015). *Leadership: Theory and practice*: Sage publications.
[70]. Organ, D., & Podsakoff, P. MacKenzie.(2006). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*.
[71]. Osland, J. S. (2008). Global leadership. *AIB Insights, 8*(1), 10.
[72]. Osland, J. S., & Bird, A. (2005). Global leaders as experts *Advances in global leadership* (pp. 123-142): Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
[73]. Perry-Smith, J. E., & Mannucci, P. V. (2017). From creativity to innovation: The social network drivers of the four phases of the idea journey. *Academy of management review, 42*(1), 53-79.
[74]. Petrick, J. A., Scherer, R. F., Brodzinski, J. D., Quinn, J. F., & Ainina, M. F. (1999). Global leadership skills and reputational capital: Intangible resources for sustainable competitive advantage. *The Academy of Management Executive, 13*(1), 58-69.
[75]. Quinn, R. E. (2005). Moments of greatness. *Harvard business review, 83*(7/8), 74-83.
[76]. Rauch, C. F., & Behling, O. (1984). Functionalism: Basis for an alternate approach to the study of leadership *Leaders and managers* (pp. 45-62): Elsevier.
[77]. Redmond, M. R., Mumford, M. D., & Teach, R. (1993). Putting creativity to work: Effects of leader behavior on subordinate creativity. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 55*(1), 120-151.
[78]. Santoso, H., & Furinto, A. (2018). The Role of Employee Self Efficacy and Perceived Leader's Proficiency to Innovative Work Behavior in Telecommunication Industry. *Advanced Science Letters, 24*(1), 254-256.
[79]. Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management journal, 37*(3), 580-607.
[80]. Spreitzer, G. M., McCall, M. W., & Mahoney, J. D. (1997). Early identification of international executive potential. *Journal of applied Psychology, 82*(1), 6.
[81]. Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*: New York, NY, US: Free Press.
[82]. Suutari, V. (2002). Global leader development: An emerging research agenda. *Career Development International, 7*(4), 218-233.
[83]. Tennenbaum, R., Weschler, I., & Massarik, F. (1961). Leadership and organization: New York: McGraw-Hill.
[84]. Terry, L. D. (1990). Leadership in the administrative state: The concept of administrative conservatorship. *Administration & Society, 21*(4), 395-412.
[85]. Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2002). Creative self-efficacy: Its potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance. *Academy of Management journal, 45*(6), 1137-1148.
[86]. Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The leadership quarterly, 17*(6), 654-676.
[87]. Van der Vegt, G. S., & Janssen, O. (2003). Joint impact of interdependence and group diversity on innovation. *Journal of management, 29*(5), 729-751.
[88]. Vroom, V. H., & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making* (Vol. 110): University of Pittsburgh Pre.
[89]. Wang, X. H. F., Fang, Y., Qureshi, I., & Janssen, O. (2015). Understanding employee innovative behavior: Integrating the social network and leader–member exchange perspectives. *Journal of organizational behavior, 36*(3), 403-420.
[90]. West , M., & Farr, J. (1990). Innovation at work West. *MA, Farr, JL Innovation and creativity at work*, 3-13.
[91]. West, M. A., & Altink, W. M. (1996). Innovation at work: Individual, group, organizational, and socio-historical perspectives. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*(1), 3-11.
[92]. Wren, J. T. (1995). The historical and contemporary contexts of leadership: A conceptual model.
[93]. Xi, J. M., Kraus, S., Filser, M., & Kellermanns, F. W. (2015). Mapping the field of family business research: past trends and future directions. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 11*(1), 113-132.
[94]. Yuan, F., & Woodman, R. W. (2010). Innovative behavior in the workplace: The role of performance and image outcome expectations. *Academy of Management journal, 53*(2), 323-342.
[95]. Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of management, 15*(2), 251-289.
[96]. Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The leadership quarterly, 10*(2), 285-305.
[97]. Yukl, G. A. (1981). *Leadership in organizations*: Pearson Education India.