

Mohammad Moharram¹, Abdullah Hussein Salem², Yasser Nasr Eldin³, Wael Ahmed Abdalla⁴ (corresponding author*)1-Academic Director, Business Wheel Academy, Cairo - Egypt. Email: Academy@BsnsWheel.com2-Senior Researcher, Business Wheel Academy, Cairo - Egypt. Email: Academy@BsnsWheel.com3-Managing Director, Business Wheel Academy, Cairo - Egypt. Email: Academy@BsnsWheel.com4-Associate Professor of Philosophy of Science, Faculty of Arts, Sohag University, Sohag- Egypt. Email: waelahmed@art.sohag.edu.eg**1. Abstract:**

In increasingly complex global environments, the ability to adapt leadership practices to diverse local contexts has become a strategic necessity. This paper defines *Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA)* as a core leadership competence within the Visionary Management Dimension of the VFC Competence Framework. GLMA reflects a leader’s capacity to harmonize global priorities with local realities through behavioral agility, cultural intelligence, ethical discernment, and stakeholder co-creation. Despite its relevance, GLMA remains under-theorized, with limited attention to its developmental trajectory or integration into broader leadership systems.

Using a conceptual methodology grounded in literature synthesis and theoretical modeling, this paper develops a progression-based GLMA framework aligned with the KSAH model (Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, Habits). It situates GLMA within and across the three visionary subdomains—Leadership, Management, and Business Scaling and Development—highlighting its role as a meta-competence for organizations operating across institutional, cultural, and regulatory diversity. The study also proposes learning outcomes, identifies enablers and constraints, and offers practical implications for leadership pipelines, organizational systems, and global foresight strategies.

By positioning GLMA as both a behavioral and systemic competence, the paper contributes to emerging scholarship on adaptive leadership and provides a foundation for future empirical validation and application.

Keywords: Global–Local Market Adaptation - Visionary Management - Leadership Competency - Cultural Intelligence - Adaptive Strategy.

2. Introduction:

In the contemporary environment of cultural diversity, institutional dissonance, and global instability, it is important to adjust one’s leadership style to local conditions within the scope of a general strategic planning. This issue has been particularly acute in emerging economies in the last couple of decades – the states that are largely new to having strong independent economies and competitive markets, and manifest an unprecedented level of legislative disarray, stakeholder mess, and cultural differentiation. Under such conditions, adaptation becomes a strategic and ethical imperative.

This paper introduces and defines Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA) as a core leadership competence situated within the Visionary Management Dimension of the VFC Competence Framework. GLMA refers to the leader’s capacity to harmonize global ambitions with local realities through behavioral agility, cultural intelligence, ethical discernment, and stakeholder co-creation. It is not a binary choice between global standardization and local responsiveness, but rather a dynamic orchestration of strategy, values, and contextual fluency.

Despite its centrality to international leadership, GLMA remains underdeveloped in the literature. Most treatments focus on macro-strategic models or organizational mechanisms, with limited integration of behavioral, ethical, and developmental perspectives. Furthermore, few existing models articulate how this competence evolves across a leader’s developmental journey or interacts with broader leadership functions such as vision-setting, systems thinking, or business scaling.

To address this gap, this paper adopts a theory-building methodology to (1) define GLMA as a progression-based competence using the KSAH model (Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes, Habits); (2) map its behavioral expression and strategic value across the three visionary subdomains—Leadership, Management, and Business Scaling and Development; and (3) propose a conceptual framework for embedding GLMA within leadership development and organizational systems.

3. Methodology:

This study adopts a qualitative, conceptual methodology aimed at defining and modeling *Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA)* as a core leadership competence within the Visionary Management Dimension of the VFC Competence Framework. Given the exploratory nature of the research, a theory-building approach was employed to synthesize literature, construct developmental pathways, and generate an integrative model based on the KSAH structure, encompassing knowledge, skills, attitudes, and habits.

The research design is grounded in interpretivist logic, emphasizing the role of meaning-making in leadership behavior across complex cultural and institutional systems. Instead of relying on empirical data collection, the study is informed by a structured literature synthesis of over 40 peer-reviewed sources across global leadership, cross-cultural management, dynamic capabilities, and organizational development. Foundational theoretical models—such as Cultural Intelligence (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008), the GLOBE leadership dimensions (House et al., 2004), Dynamic Capabilities Theory (Teece, 2007), and responsible global leadership frameworks (Miska et al., 2013)—were selected to ensure conceptual robustness and multi-level relevance.

The analysis proceeded in three stages. First, thematic patterns in the literature were identified to uncover recurring features of global–local leadership adaptation. Second, these themes were mapped onto the three Visionary Management subdomains—Leadership, Management, and Business Scaling and Development—to contextualize the GLMA construct. Third, the competence was modeled developmentally through the KSAH framework, using a progression logic from novice to expert to reflect how GLMA can be cultivated over time.

While the absence of primary data is acknowledged, this methodological choice is appropriate for early-stage competence modeling. The study is positioned as a theoretical contribution, laying the foundation for future empirical validation, psychometric development, and real-world application in global leadership development programs.

4. Literature Review:**4.1 Historical Evolution of Global–Local Tensions in Market Strategy:**

For a long time, the question about the extent of global standardization and local adaptation has been of particular importance in the framework of international business strategy. According to Theodore Levitt (1983), globalization preconditions the unification of consumer interests, commending the increasing need for a product to be offered as a standardized entity independent of its country of origin. This vision

* Correspondence: Wael Ahmed Abdalla, Associate Professor, Faculty of Arts, Sohag University, Sohag - Egypt. Email: waelahmed@art.sohag.edu.eg

of the “globalization of markets” laid the theoretical foundation of the enhancement of managerial attention to cost efficiency, scale economics, and global brand availability. However, such conclusions experienced immediate critique for the lack of attention to cross-national cultural, institutional, and consumer diversity.

However, in contrast to Levitt’s universalist view, Kenichi Ohmae came up with the idea of the “borderless world” in 1989, meaning that national boundaries would become less and less strategically important. Nonetheless, the abundant empirical evidence suggested that local identities, preferences, and regulatory environments remained highly relevant. Due to this, the tradeoff between the need for global integration and local responsiveness became a formal concept a few years later. Specifically, Bartlett and Ghoshal (1989) developed the concept of the Integration–Responsiveness Grid that illustrates how multinationals must respond to both global efficiency and local differentiation pressures. This became one of the most basic models in international strategic management, consolidating both organizational structure and leadership behavior.

In business and marketing literature, the term **glocalization** was a novel and radical strategic concept. The earliest definition of glocalization is defined by Robertson (1995), who identified it as a term that described the global system’s co-existence of universalizing and particularizing trends. This division formed the premise for a subsequent, more practically applicable definition provided by Ghemawat (2007), who posited that acumen-based strategies, which entwine global integration and local responsiveness, are the most successful. Recent academic sources, such as Zhang et al. (2023), have firmly demonstrated a strong positive connection between glocal marketing strategies and financial performance, especially when the locale-oriented brand identification did not conflict with global strategic coherence.

This historical trajectory underscores that global–local market adaptation is not merely a structural concern but a dynamic leadership and organizational competence.

4.2 Strategic Ambidexterity and Dynamic Capabilities:

For leaders in organizations in volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) global environments, the requirement to balance competing demands has become the defining difficulty for strategic leadership. Strategic ambidexterity is a term that has emerged to describe this capacity. It is defined as “the capability to engage in parallel exploitation (efficiency through standardization) and exploration processes (innovation through adaptation)” (Birkinshaw & Gibson, 2004). When it comes to global–local market adaptation, ambidextrous capabilities allow leaders to create global consistency while also developing local responsiveness. This achieves a strategic synergy rather than a compromise.

Strategic ambidexterity builds upon the dynamic capabilities framework proposed by Teece (2007), which refers to the organization’s deliberate ability to reconfigure its resources in the environment in response to complex environments. The three core dynamic capabilities – **sensing, seizing, and reconfiguring** – underpin adaptive leadership. For example, sensing involves the discovery of emerging local market opportunities, seizing involves the mobilization of resources to pursue these opportunities, and reconfiguring is the adaptation of existing processes to local circumstances. These capabilities are important for adaptively leading the multinational enterprises (MNEs), which operate within culturally and institutionally diverse environments.

Recent contributions, such as Zhang and Lahiri’s (2024) study on dynamic capability reconfiguration in cross-border environments, reinforce the argument that responsiveness must not be reactive but should be strategically designed as an embedded leadership orientation. Their findings indicate that firms that institutionalize dynamic routines for local adaptation, while preserving global coherence, perform significantly better in customer trust, brand equity, and innovation diffusion across geographies.

In sum, strategic ambidexterity and dynamic capabilities offer a robust theoretical lens through which global–local market adaptation can be understood, not merely as a tactical maneuver, but as a core component of visionary leadership and organizational agility.

4.3 Cultural Intelligence, Intercultural Competence, and Leadership:

Multinational organizations should thus develop leadership competencies, including strategic rationality across culturally diverse markets. However, they should also have cross-cultural agility and emotional nuance. In this respect, Cultural Intelligence or CQ becomes a critical dimension of enabling global–local adaptation (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008), defined as the capability to operate in national, ethnic, and organizational cultures. It has four dimensions, including cognitive (knowledge of cultural norms), metacognitive (awareness and reflection), motivational (interest in interacting across cultures), and behavioral (capacity to adjust conduct accordingly). Leaders with higher CQ adjust their communication, decision-making, and negotiation styles to the local environment while maintaining organizational coherence. Intercultural communication competence is another critical dimension of ensuring strategic intentions are contextually adapted. Spitzberg and Cupach (1984) define intercultural communication competence as the ability to manage contextual communication dynamics scientifically. More specifically, it involves empathy, adaptability, and interaction management. Communication for global leaders is not only a way to exchange information but is also a symbol to transmit relational, cultural, and leadership positions.

The GLOBE leadership framework further highlights the cultural contingency of effective leadership. House et al. (2004) identify leadership dimensions—such as charismatic/value-based and participative leadership—that vary significantly across cultural clusters. Leaders who succeed globally are those who internalize such variance, aligning their behaviors with local expectations without sacrificing organizational identity.

Recent research corroborates these theoretical linkages. Miska et al. (2013) argue that intercultural competence is a foundational antecedent of responsible global leadership, linking it not only to market adaptation but also to ethical sensitivity and social legitimacy. Therefore, cultural agility is not merely an interpersonal skill; it is a strategic resource for visionary leadership operating at the interface of global markets and local systems.

4.4 Conceptual Models of Global Leadership and Market Responsiveness:

In response to the complex demands of globalization, several conceptual models have emerged to frame how leadership can strategically mediate between global standardization and local responsiveness. These frameworks provide structural lenses for understanding the behavioral and organizational requirements of global–local market adaptation.

One of the most widely cited is Ghemawat’s AAA Framework (2007), which proposes three distinct strategies for multinational firms: Adaptation (adjusting to local conditions), Aggregation (achieving economies of scale through standardization), and Arbitrage (exploiting differences between locations). Among these, adaptation stands out as a central pillar for market responsiveness, requiring not only product modifications but also culturally attuned leadership.

Yip’s (2003) Drivers of Global Strategy model offers a complementary perspective by categorizing global forces into four domains: market, cost, government, and competitive drivers. His framework suggests that global–local alignment depends on the interplay of these drivers, particularly in industries with high cultural sensitivity or regulatory variability.

In terms of Leadership capabilities, Bird and Osland’s (2004) Global Competency Leadership Model has been used to depict global leadership as a series of competencies. These are relationship skills, business skills, and personal effectiveness – vital when planning strategic culture-

specific decisions. For instance, Jokinen's (2005) model highlights central traits including cognitive complexity, cosmopolitanism, and emotional resilience, underlining the need for psychological and relational agility in global contexts.

Collectively, these models contribute to a nuanced understanding of the competencies needed for global–local market adaptation. However, most fall short of articulating how these frameworks translate into a competency-based, developmental model, which this paper seeks to construct through the VFC's KSAH framework (Abdelmohiman&Salem,2025).

4.5 Critical Gaps and Rationale for the Present Study;

While the reviewed frameworks offer valuable insights into global strategy and leadership in intercultural contexts, they fall short in several critical dimensions that justify the need for this study. First, despite extensive theoretical treatment of global integration and local responsiveness, **there remains a lack of behavioral and developmental clarity** regarding how leaders acquire, exhibit, and evolve the competencies required for market adaptation. Models such as Ghemawat's (2007) AAA framework and Bartlett & Ghoshal's (1989) I-R Grid are largely structural and strategic but do not articulate the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral traits necessary for adaptive leadership.

Second, leadership scholarship often compartmentalizes **intercultural agility** as a personal attribute or communication skill, without sufficiently integrating it into broader frameworks of strategic capability. For instance, while Cultural Intelligence (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008) and global leadership models (Jokinen, 2005; Bird & Osland, 2004) underscore critical traits, they do not comprehensively map them onto functional market decisions or cross-border adaptation strategies.

Third, empirical studies often neglect leadership experiences in **emerging markets**, particularly in the Global South and MENA regions, where local legitimacy, institutional ambiguity, and relational trust carry different strategic weights. This oversight limits the cultural applicability of many global leadership frameworks.

Therefore, this study advances the literature by proposing a **KSAH-based competency model** of Global–Local Market Adaptation, anchored in the Visionary Management Dimension of the VFC Framework, which holistically integrates strategic, cultural, emotional, and behavioral domains. This integrative approach offers a more actionable and context-sensitive blueprint for preparing leaders capable of thriving across diverse, multi-scalar environments.

5. Theoretical Framework:

5.1 Defining Global–Local Market Adaptation as a Competence

In an increasingly interdependent and culturally diverse global economy, leaders must navigate the paradox of aligning with global strategic imperatives while adapting responsively to local market demands. Within this context, **Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA)** is defined in this paper as:

“The capacity of an individual or organization to continuously and strategically recalibrate operations, leadership behaviors, and decision-making processes to align with both global organizational priorities and localized cultural, market, or regulatory environments.”

Unlike functional expertise or operational flexibility, GLMA is conceptualized here as a **multidimensional leadership competence**—an adaptive capability that is activated in volatile, uncertain, and pluralistic environments. Its essence lies in dynamic calibration: the ability to maintain strategic coherence while honoring local specificity in stakeholder expectations, social norms, institutional logics, and consumer behaviors.

Crucially, GLMA is not a fixed trait nor a singular decision-making skill. Rather, it is a **repeatable behavioral capability**, often exercised under ambiguity, that requires a leader to synthesize cultural intelligence, contextual awareness, and systemic foresight. It reflects a developmental maturity that is built over time through exposure, experience, and reflection—qualities aligned with the **Visionary Management Dimension** of the VFC Competence Framework.

This study positions GLMA not only as a driver of competitive differentiation but also as a **core enabler of ethical and sustainable leadership** in multi-scalar systems. It bridges the macro-level challenges of globalization with micro-level demands of local legitimacy, thus requiring a competence model that extends beyond technical skills into the realms of emotional, cognitive, and intercultural agility.

5.2 Theoretical Lenses Integrated:

To conceptually ground Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA) within a scientifically rigorous framework, five theoretical lenses were integrated to reflect its psychological, strategic, cultural, and adaptive dimensions. These lenses articulate how GLMA operates as a dynamic leadership competence embedded in real-time decision-making across transnational and multicultural environments.

5.2.1. Dynamic Capabilities Theory:

Tece's (2007) dynamic capabilities framework establishes the leader's role in sensing, seizing, and transforming resources to remain competitive in volatile environments. In the GLMA context, this translates to sensing local institutional signals, seizing opportunities through tailored strategies, and reconfiguring systems to bridge global mandates with localized expectations (Tece, 2007).

5.2.2. Strategic Ambidexterity:

Strategic ambidexterity (Birkinshaw & Gibson, 2004) refers to an organization's ability to simultaneously explore new opportunities while exploiting existing strengths. GLMA expands this notion by including cultural ambidexterity: leaders must fluidly shift between global logics and local cultural expectations, maintaining performance and legitimacy in diverse market ecosystems.

5.2.3. Cultural Intelligence (CQ):

Ang and Van Dyne (2008) define CQ as comprising cognitive, metacognitive, motivational, and behavioral dimensions. These are essential for leaders managing cross-cultural interfaces. CQ underpins GLMA by enabling leaders to interpret cultural cues and align their strategies and behaviors with contextually relevant practices, especially in high-context or collectivist societies (Rockstuhl et al., 2011; Thomas et al., 2008).

5.2.4. GLOBE Leadership Dimensions.

The GLOBE study (House et al., 2004) provides empirical grounding for cross-cultural leadership efficacy by identifying cultural moderators such as power distance, institutional collectivism, and uncertainty avoidance. GLMA requires leaders to internalize these dynamics and act adaptively—for instance, balancing participatory leadership in low power-distance cultures with authoritative decision-making in high-context ones (Dorfman et al., 2012).

5.2.5. Visionary Management within the VFC Framework.

The Visionary Management Dimension of the VFC Competence Framework integrates foresight, systems thinking, and moral purpose (Abdelmohiman & Salem, 2025). GLMA is situated within this dimension because it requires leaders to engage in paradox navigation, strategic anticipation, and influence-building across cultural and institutional boundaries. Visionary leadership in GLMA is less about abstract foresight and more about the **real-time orchestration of global strategies with local narratives**, thereby catalyzing alignment without homogenization.

5.3 Integrated Conceptual Model of GLMA Competence.

Synthesizing the theoretical perspectives discussed in the previous subsection, this study proposes a multidimensional conceptual model of **Global-Local Market Adaptation (GLMA)** as a strategic leadership competence. The model is structured around three dynamic layers: **Inputs, Enablers, and Outcomes**, each aligned with adaptive functioning in volatile, cross-cultural business environments.

- **Inputs** include macro-level forces such as global market trends, institutional diversity, cultural values, regulatory demands, and customer expectations. These inputs form the contextual pressures to which leaders must respond with agility and foresight.
- **Enablers** are the internal capabilities and behaviors that mediate effective adaptation. These include:
 - **Cultural Intelligence (CQ)** for decoding local norms and stakeholder expectations (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008);
 - **Strategic Ambidexterity** to balance global consistency with localized responsiveness (Birkinshaw & Gibson, 2004);
 - **Systems Thinking** for identifying causal loops between global decisions and local reactions (AbdelMohiman & Salem, 2025);
 - **Visionary Foresight** to anticipate future market configurations and preemptively align both strategic and relational assets.
- **Outcomes** of GLMA include improved local legitimacy, sustained global brand integrity, cross-border innovation, and long-term organizational resilience.

The conceptual model serves not only as an analytical framework but also as a **developmental pathway** for building the behavioral and strategic agility required of future-ready leaders under the VFC Visionary Management Dimension.

5.4 Positioning GLMA within the Visionary Management Dimension:

The **Global-Local Market Adaptation (GLMA)** competence is best situated within the **Visionary Management Dimension** of the VFC Competence Framework due to its systemic, anticipatory, and relational nature. While GLMA draws upon both **cognitive awareness** and **functional expertise**, its strategic significance lies in how leaders orchestrate adaptation not just reactively but **proactively and ethically** across diverse and evolving contexts (Teece, 2007; Miska, Stahl, & Mendenhall, 2013).

The Visionary Management Dimension emphasizes capacities such as **strategic foresight, systems thinking, and transformational influence**—all central to sustained and responsible adaptation (AbdelMohiman & Salem, 2025). Unlike the **Functional Expertise Dimension**, which focuses on task-specific mastery, or the **Cognitive Psychology Dimension**, which explores internal regulation and resilience, Visionary Management equips leaders to **navigate paradox, enact purpose, and scale transformation** across cultural, institutional, and temporal boundaries (House et al., 2004; Jokinen, 2005).

GLMA thus operates as a **meta-competence**—one that enables alignment between long-term global vision and short-term localized execution. It integrates adaptive intelligence (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008), moral sensitivity (Thomas et al., 2008), and stakeholder fluency to manage complexity without succumbing to rigid uniformity or chaotic decentralization.

Positioned within Visionary Management, GLMA becomes not just a tactical advantage but a **strategic imperative** for cultivating ethical, scalable, and context-responsive leadership in multi-scalar systems.

6. What It Means to Be Adaptively Competent in Global-Local Markets:

Adaptive competence in global-local market contexts transcends the binary logic of either global standardization or local customization. Instead, it reflects a leader's capacity to **navigate competing pressures, translate strategic vision across cultural boundaries, and modulate behaviors** in response to dynamic, multi-scalar realities (Teece, 2007; Ghemawat, 2007). Being adaptively competent in this domain involves an integrated expression of **cognitive complexity, cultural humility, ethical discernment, and situational fluency**.

6.1 Strategic Framing Across Scales.

Adaptively competent leaders possess the ability to **frame issues and opportunities at both global and local levels simultaneously**. This requires **cognitive ambidexterity**—the ability to understand systemic implications while acting in specific contexts. For instance, a global expansion strategy must be sensitive to local distribution norms, linguistic nuances, and consumer psychographics. Leaders demonstrate this through **contextual reframing**, adjusting messaging and resource flows without compromising core strategic intent (Birkinshaw & Gibson, 2004; Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989).

6.2 Behavioral Agility in Culturally Diverse Settings:

In operationalizing adaptation, leaders draw upon **cultural intelligence** to adjust leadership and communication styles. A participatory leadership approach may be celebrated in low power-distance societies but perceived as weak in more hierarchical cultures (House et al., 2004). Adaptively competent leaders exhibit **behavioral agility**, understanding how to **modulate authority, pace, tone, and engagement** to maintain relational credibility. Such fluency is not performative; it stems from a genuine respect for cultural difference and a **flexible internalized identity** (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008; Mendenhall et al., 2017).

6.3 Ethical Adaptation and Local Legitimacy:

Adaptive competence is also grounded in **ethical intentionality**. Not all local norms are ethically neutral—some may conflict with global organizational values, especially regarding gender equity, environmental responsibility, or corruption. Competent adaptation involves making **principled decisions under ethical tension**, choosing to engage, challenge, or resist certain practices while preserving the dignity of local stakeholders (Miska, Stahl, & Mendenhall, 2013). Thus, adaptive competence is not about cultural relativism but **culturally sensitive moral leadership**.

6.4 Empathic Stakeholder Engagement:

Effective adaptation is relational, not just procedural. Leaders who demonstrate this competence **actively listen to local voices**, co-create with community and customer stakeholders, and involve host-country nationals in decision-making. This participatory orientation builds **institutional trust** and mitigates perceptions of foreign imposition. It aligns with emerging literature on **inclusive global leadership** (Rockstuhl et al., 2011) and **networked influence** across boundaries (Maznevski et al., 2012).

6.5 Anticipatory and Reflexive Practice:

Finally, adaptive competence requires a **future-oriented mindset**. Leaders not only react to change but also **anticipate future divergences** in regulation, demography, or consumer behavior. This involves engaging in **continuous learning, self-reflection, and iterative experimentation**. Adaptively competent leaders use feedback loops—not just KPIs—as tools for calibration. They recognize that what works in one market may only partially transfer elsewhere, and they build **learning systems that reward adjustment over rigidity** (AbdelMohiman & Salem, 2025; Thomas et al., 2008).

In sum, being adaptively competent in global-local markets means being capable of holding paradoxes—efficiency and responsiveness, ethics and pragmatism, vision and nuance—and **transforming them into informed, relationally grounded, and strategically aligned actions**. It is not a static trait but a **developmental achievement**, cultivated through experience, failure, and deep engagement with

complexity. As such, GLMA should be regarded not merely as a competency for international business but as a **keystone leadership trait** for organizations operating in an increasingly interconnected, diverse, and contested global economy.

7. Data Analysis and Findings:

7.1 Emergent Thematic Patterns in Global–Local Adaptation.

A synthesis of contemporary research on global leadership, intercultural dynamics, and dynamic capabilities reveals several recurring thematic patterns that characterize adaptive competence in global–local contexts. These themes highlight the **behavioral, ethical, and strategic complexity** that distinguishes Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA) as a multidimensional leadership competence.

7.1.1 Cultural Modulation:

One of the most dominant patterns is the ability to **modulate leadership behaviors** based on local cultural expectations. As the GLOBE Study (House et al., 2004) illustrates, societal cultural norms strongly influence which leadership behaviors are perceived as effective. For example, assertive or participatory leadership styles may gain traction in individualistic or egalitarian contexts but may backfire in hierarchical, collectivist cultures. Leaders demonstrating GLMA competence show agility in recalibrating authority, communication, and decision-making frameworks to maintain legitimacy while advancing corporate objectives (Rockstuhl et al., 2011).

7.1.2 Ethical Mediation:

Another critical theme is the **mediation of ethical tensions** between global corporate standards and local social norms. Miska, Stahl, and Mendenhall (2013) emphasize that responsible global leadership requires cultural sensitivity without compromising universal ethical commitments. Adaptively competent leaders avoid cultural relativism by engaging in **moral reflexivity**, deliberating which local practices to accommodate and which to resist, especially in cases involving corruption, labor conditions, or gender equity.

7.1.3 Strategic Coherence under Diversity:

A third recurring pattern relates to having strategic coherence in a variety of markets. Managers who are good at GLMA reconcile the global protocol against local delegation paradox (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989; Teece, 2007). This entails the integration of local adaptations into a coherent strategic narrative, with the core values and positioning being maintained, while tactical flexibility is provided for.

7.1.4 Stakeholder Dialogics:

Finally, effective adaptation is dialogic and participatory. Leaders with high GLMA competence engage in **multistakeholder dialogue** to co-create meaning with local partners, employees, and institutions. This relational approach not only fosters local buy-in but also enriches the organization's adaptive intelligence (Thomas et al., 2008; Maznevski et al., 2012).

These themes reveal that GLMA is less about technical decision-making and more about **interpersonal fluency, ethical discernment, and strategic orchestration** across cultural, temporal, and organizational boundaries.

7.2 Mapping Competency Enablers and Constraints.

While the preceding section framed the central behavioral themes of the GLMA, it is necessary to achieve a deeper understanding by identifying its enablers, those factors favoring its generation, and constraints, those impairing its execution. These enablers and constraints are at the individual, organizational, and system levels and influence the way in which leaders are able to respond to global–local complexity.

7.2.1 Enablers of GLMA Competence:

For the individual, research has emphasized that CQ is a key driver (Ang Van Dyne, 2008; Rockstuhl et al., 2011). Leaders with effective CQ can 'think' about their experiences in other cultures, and hence engage in metacognitive control, feel it is worth doing so, and can be flexible on behaviour. The capacity to read one's surroundings in a culture and respond with appropriate humility is critical, and metacognition is obviously necessary.

At the organizational level, enablers include cross-functional integration, distributed leadership structures, and localized autonomy. Firms that encourage local teams to experiment and adapt tend to generate faster, more authentic responses to cultural expectations and market shifts (Teece, 2007; Maznevski et al., 2012).

At the systems level, feedback loops and adaptive learning mechanisms—including reflective reviews and context-specific performance indicators—are critical. These structures help firms iterate on global strategies while continuously refining local applications (Thomas et al., 2008).

7.2.2 Constraints to GLMA Competence:

Constraints include rigid global policies, headquarters-centric decision-making, and lack of contextual training. Additionally, institutional misfit—where global norms directly conflict with local regulations or customs—can paralyze leaders without proper support mechanisms (Miska et al., 2013).

Another constraint is the overreliance on universal KPIs, which can suppress local experimentation and stifle the adaptive process. In such environments, even culturally agile leaders may be structurally limited in their capacity to act.

Understanding these enablers and constraints is critical to designing leadership development initiatives and organizational architectures that can cultivate GLMA as a system-wide capability, not just an individual trait.

7.3 Observations from Micro–Cases or Contextual Examples:

To further substantiate the behavioral dimensions of Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA), this subsection presents illustrative micro-cases that demonstrate how adaptive competence is enacted—or hindered—across cultural and market contexts. These examples are drawn from empirical literature and composite professional observations in global leadership practice.

Case 1: Leadership Tone Modulation in East Asia:

In a U.S.-based multinational's expansion into South Korea, the regional director's attempt to implement a participatory decision-making structure was initially met with resistance by the local team. Hierarchical expectations embedded in Korean business culture conflicted with the flat team model promoted by headquarters. The director eventually recalibrated his approach, offering **consultation behind closed doors** while preserving public hierarchical structures. This behavioral shift—anchored in cultural intelligence—restored trust and improved engagement without compromising global values (House et al., 2004; Rockstuhl et al., 2011).

Case 2: Navigating Institutional Contradictions in North Africa:

A European energy firm operating in North Africa faced tensions between its anti-corruption code and informal local procurement practices. The local manager, trained in both corporate compliance and regional negotiation norms, successfully introduced a **hybrid transparency mechanism**, which engaged local suppliers in compliance training while adapting reporting procedures to local expectations. This strategy enhanced both **local legitimacy** and global alignment (Miska et al., 2013).

Case 3: Product Strategy Localization in Southeast Asia:

An FMCG company adapted its advertising content in Thailand by shifting from direct appeals to family- and community-based narratives. This small yet deliberate change demonstrated **cultural signaling sensitivity**, enhancing brand resonance and consumer loyalty.

These vignettes emphasize that GLMA is not a theoretical abstraction—it is **practiced fluency**, developed through intentional, context-responsive actions.

7.4 Cross-Domain Synthesis: GLMA's Role Across Visionary Management Domains:

The Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA) competence is not an isolated construct within the Visionary Management Dimension of the VFC Framework. Instead, it operates interdependently across the three key domains of this dimension—Leadership, Management, and Business Scaling and Development—serving as a unifying capability that enables strategic alignment in diverse and dynamic environments.

7.4.1 GLMA and the Leadership Domain:

Within the Leadership domain, GLMA reflects a leader's ability to translate vision across cultures, align global values with local realities, and maintain trust in transnational contexts. Visionary leaders demonstrate cultural humility, ethical mediation, and adaptive influence—core behaviors of GLMA (Miska et al., 2013; House et al., 2004). These leaders are not merely vision creators but narrative translators, shaping aspirational direction that resonates across heterogeneous stakeholder groups.

7.4.2 GLMA and the Management Domain:

From a management perspective, GLMA supports strategic orchestration, enabling resource allocation, performance management, and structural design that remain responsive to both global efficiency demands and local institutional variation. It informs key managerial decisions such as local delegation, compliance calibration, and knowledge transfer, promoting adaptive execution without compromising systemic coherence (Teece, 2007; Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989).

7.4.3 GLMA and the Business Scaling & Development Domain:

In the domain of Business Scaling and Development, GLMA becomes indispensable. Sustainable market growth requires not only operational replication but also cultural integration and institutional legitimacy. GLMA enables firms to navigate market entry complexities, respond to evolving stakeholder ecosystems, and scale innovations through context-sensitive trust-building strategies (AbdelMohiman & Salem, 2025; Maznevski et al., 2012).

In sum, GLMA is not just a competency situated within Visionary Management—it is a convergence capability, activating the behavioral, structural, and relational demands of all three subdomains in a cohesive, ethically grounded, and culturally attuned manner.

8. Learning Outcomes – KSAH Model & Progression Levels:

8.1 Knowledge:

Developing adaptive competence in global–local market contexts begins with building a deep and integrative knowledge base. This includes not only an abstract understanding of global business strategy but also contextual awareness of institutional logics, cultural systems, stakeholder expectations, and adaptation mechanisms. The Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA) competence draws upon multi-disciplinary theoretical knowledge spanning international management, cultural psychology, and systems thinking.

At early stages, individuals must understand the basic global-local tension, such as the trade-offs between standardization and customization (Ghemawat, 2007; Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1989). As they progress, learners become familiar with frameworks for navigating cultural diversity, such as Hofstede's cultural dimensions or the GLOBE study's leadership clusters (House et al., 2004). Mastery of strategic models, such as the AAA Framework (Adaptation–Aggregation–Arbitrage) and Dynamic Capabilities Theory (Teece, 2007), further allows individuals to situate adaptation decisions within broader organizational goals and market systems.

At the expert level, the knowledge domain encompasses integrative insight: the ability to forecast institutional friction, anticipate value misalignments, and design culturally embedded strategies. This includes understanding how regulatory systems, informal norms, and market narratives co-evolve across regions. Conceptual mastery in GLMA enables leaders to construct anticipatory mental models and strategically align internal systems with external realities.

Progression of Knowledge – GLMA Competence:

- **Novice:** Recognizes the global-local dilemma and basic cultural variation
- **Developing:** Understands fundamental frameworks (e.g., GLOBE, AAA, Hofstede)
- **Proficient:** Applies strategic and cultural knowledge to contextual scenarios
- **Expert:** Synthesizes diverse knowledge domains into foresight-driven, locally grounded global strategies

8.2 Skills:

Behavioral mastery of Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA) is grounded in the development of nuanced, responsive, and context-sensitive skills. These skills allow leaders to navigate ambiguity, engage cross-cultural stakeholders, and adapt systems and strategies in real time. Unlike technical competencies that are task-specific, the behavioral capabilities in GLMA involve a sophisticated orchestration of strategic action, interpersonal influence, and adaptive modulation.

One foundational skill is cultural modulation—the ability to vary one's leadership, communication, and decision-making style in accordance with local norms without compromising core values (Rockstuhl et al., 2011). Leaders must also develop strategic framing skills, enabling them to present global objectives in locally resonant narratives that secure alignment and commitment (House et al., 2004). In environments of institutional plurality or ethical tension, leaders must exercise ethical mediation, adjusting operational practices while upholding principle-driven leadership (Miska et al., 2013).

Other core skills include relational fluency, adaptive negotiation, and stakeholder co-creation—especially in contexts where legitimacy is earned through trust, not authority. These skills are not just responsive; they are anticipatory and iterative, requiring the ability to read weak signals and adjust behavior proactively.

Progression of Skills – GLMA Competence:

- **Novice:** Adjusts behavior when guided; limited situational flexibility
- **Developing:** Initiates adaptations in familiar or single-market settings
- **Proficient:** Applies context-aware behaviors across complex, multicultural scenarios
- **Expert:** Mentors others; institutionalizes adaptive behavior; handles high-stakes adaptation under systemic pressure.

8.3 Attitudes:

The attitudinal level of Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA) captures the internal dispositions and value orientations that determine how individuals perceive, prioritize and act on complexity in different environments. Where knowledge and skills are what a leader knows and does, attitudes form how and why they interact, especially when faced with moral muddiness, cultural divergence, or institutional resistance.

Shaping GLMA's approach to the world is an attitude of cultural humility – the awareness that no one culture is universal and that effective leadership requires a willingness to learn from others (Thomas et al., 2008). A paramount facility in relations of leaders to other people and in perception are those of the leaders' humbleness, which could comprehend the connection between the global and local level, through which leaders can express what is of strategic importance and speak to the different stakeholders keeping to their diverse interests at the same time (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008).

A further fundamental orientation is ethical self-understanding. Adaptively competent leaders do not simply capitulate to global codes nor merely parrot local customs; rather the virtues of the adaptively competent leaders lead them to critically reflect upon the ethics of their actions and give their teachings a finer grain analysis that takes into account what judgment calls are being made and how to make those judgments were they to maintain an ethos of integrity and trust (Miska et al., 2013). They are also characterized by a willingness to embrace ambiguity, seeing fluidity and uncertainty as part and parcel of global leadership rather than obstacles to be overcome.

Such attitudinal attributes are not in the least static. They are developed through ongoing exposure, feedback, and reflective practice and are characteristics that are present in the psychological maturity of the kind of visionary, context-sensitive leaders demanded today.

Progression of Attitudes – GLMA Competence:

- **Novice:** Curious but culturally self-centered; avoids ambiguity
- **Developing:** Shows openness; begins ethical reflection and tolerance
- **Proficient:** Acts with cultural empathy and adaptive integrity
- **Expert:** Embodies principle-driven humility and ambiguity resilience across systems.

8.4 Habits:

Habits represent the consolidated, routine expressions of competence that emerge from repeated practice and reflection. Within the GLMA framework, habits signal the internalization of knowledge, skills, and attitudes into enduring, adaptive behaviors that manifest across global–local interactions. These are not circumstantial actions but systemic ways of thinking, sensing, and acting that enable consistency, resilience, and responsiveness in diverse market environments.

A foundational habit is continuous cultural scanning—a proactive practice of sensing local signals, social norms, and institutional changes. This scanning extends beyond episodic learning to become part of the leader’s day-to-day strategic engagement (Teece, 2007). Adaptively competent leaders also embed reflection and feedback loops, regularly reassessing their assumptions and recalibrating behavior based on lived experience (Thomas et al., 2008).

Another key habit is relationship cultivation across contexts. Rather than relying solely on formal channels, GLMA-strong leaders invest in sustained, trust-based relationships with diverse stakeholders—practices critical for legitimacy, knowledge flow, and informal influence (Maznevski et al., 2012).

At the expert level, these habits evolve into organizational patterns, where leaders design cultures, systems, and norms that encourage adaptive learning, local ownership, and continuous innovation. Habits, therefore, are the visible legacy of internalized competence, anchoring GLMA as a lived reality rather than a theoretical construct.

Progression of Habits – GLMA Competence:

- **Novice:** Relies on routine; limited reflection or contextual engagement
- **Developing:** Builds awareness of adaptive practices; begins feedback integration
- **Proficient:** Regularly practices adaptive routines; cultivates trust systems
- **Expert:** Institutionalizes adaptive culture; mentors others in building market-responsive ecosystems

9. Implications for Visionary Management:

Positioning Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA) as a key competence within Visionary Management redefines leadership for complex, pluralistic, and globalized environments. It urges a shift from abstract foresight to **translational leadership**, where leaders act as interpreters aligning global vision with local realities (House et al., 2004; Mendenhall et al., 2017).

Traditional leadership models must evolve. Performance systems and talent strategies should reward **adaptive capacity**—valuing cultural sensitivity, ethical engagement, and stakeholder co-creation over uniform global standards or short-term metrics (Teece, 2007; AbdelMohiman & Salem, 2025).

GLMA should be central to **leadership pipelines**, guiding identification, training, and succession planning, especially in emerging markets where adaptability is critical for survival.

Finally, GLMA reframes Visionary Management as a **systems competence**—not just about having a vision, but about embedding foresight, ethics, and contextual intelligence into decision-making structures. Organizations that cultivate GLMA will be better equipped to scale trust, foster inclusive innovation, and remain legitimate across global systems.

In essence, the future of visionary leadership lies in the **capacity to adapt vision**—ethically and contextually—across the diverse realities it seeks to transform.

10. Conclusion and Further Research Directions.

This paper has conceptualized **Global–Local Market Adaptation (GLMA)** as a core leadership competence situated within the **Visionary Management Dimension** of the VFC Competence Framework. GLMA is re-contextualised not as an adaptive response, but rather as an adaptive strategic, ethical, and developmental capability to negotiate institutional complexity, cultural multiplicity, and transnational uncertainty, informed by a systematic literature review, embedded theoretical modelling, and competency analysis.

In this way, GLMA allows leaders to transcend the opposing extremes of global standardisation and local specialisation by fostering sensitivity, relational intelligence, and behavioural flexibility. The **KSAH model**—encompassing knowledge, skills, attitude, and habits—illustrates how this competency grows from basic awareness to expert-level system leadership. Findings from the literature and our professional practice enrich the conceptualization of GLMA as a meta-competence that interrelates the leadership, management, and business growth domains based on contextual sensitivity and ethical decision-making.

The implications for future management are significant. The research discussed in this paper is intended to help by transforming how we develop leaders, how we integrate adaptive behaviors into the fabric of our institutions, and how we understand vision not as direction per Internet and Society 8/24/04sé, but as impact and context. It asks international groups to create for moral complexity, not operational simplicity.

Further Research Directions.

Several promising avenues emerge from this inquiry:

1. **Empirical Validation:** Future studies should operationalize the GLMA competence through psychometric tools and behavioral assessments to validate its developmental progression and impact on organizational outcomes.
2. **Cultural Contingency Mapping:** Comparative research across regional clusters (e.g., MENA, Southeast Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa) can uncover how GLMA is differentially expressed, constrained, or institutionalized in culturally specific ways.

3. **AI-Driven Competency Diagnostics:** Investigating how AI and data analytics can detect and nurture GLMA traits in leadership pipelines can bridge theory with scalable implementation, particularly in education, talent management, and executive development.
4. **Organizational Design for Adaptation:** Further research could explore how organizational structures, incentive systems, and governance models can be redesigned to institutionalize GLMA behaviors across global–local interfaces.

In closing, GLMA is not just a theoretical refinement. It is a **strategic necessity** for leading in a world where coherence is a challenge, and contextual resonance is the new currency of trust and transformation.

Acknowledgments:

Not applicable

Authors' contributions:

Mohammad Moharram conceived the main idea of the paper and outlined its core themes. Abdullah Hussein Salem developed the full manuscript based on the proposed framework. Wael Ahmed Abdalla reviewed, revised, and expanded the manuscript. Yasser Nasr Eldin provided additional support, verification, and final proofreading of the paper.

Funding:

Not applicable.

Competing interests:

Not applicable.

Data availability statement:

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Informed consent:

Obtained.

Provenance and peer review:

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement:

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement:

No additional data are available.

Copyrights:

Copyright for this article is retained by Business Wheel Academy, with first publication rights granted to the journal, and The content of this paper, or any part thereof, may not be copied, republished, or used in any way without the written permission of the company.

References:

- AbdelMohimam, M. M., & Salem, A. H. (2025). *The VFC Competence Framework as a human resources development framework: A qualitative study of competency-based teaching and learning theories. International Journal of Contemporary Education*, 8(2), 49–62. <https://doi.org/10.11114/ijce.v8i2.7521>
- Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008). *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory, measurement, and applications*. Routledge.
- Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1989). *Managing across borders: The transnational solution*. Harvard Business School Press.
- Bird, A., & Osland, J. (2004). Global competencies: An introduction. In H. Lane, M. Maznevski, M. Mendenhall, & J. McNett (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of global management* (pp. 57–80). Blackwell.
- Birkinshaw, J., & Gibson, C. (2004). Building ambidexterity into an organization. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 45(4), 47–55.
- Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Hanges, P. J., Dastmalchian, A., & House, R. J. (2012). GLOBE: A twenty-year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 504–518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2012.01.004>
- Ghemawat, P. (2007). *Redefining global strategy: Crossing borders in a world where differences still matter*. Harvard Business Press.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. SAGE.
- Jokinen, T. (2005). Global leadership competencies: A review and discussion. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 29(3), 199–216. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590510591085>
- Levitt, T. (1983). The globalization of markets. *Harvard Business Review*, 61(3), 92–102.
- Maznevski, M., Stahl, G., & Mendenhall, M. E. (2012). Global leadership: A developmental shift. In *Advances in global leadership* (Vol. 7, pp. 11–39). Emerald Group Publishing.
- Mendenhall, M. E., Reiche, B. S., Bird, A., & Osland, J. S. (2017). Defining the ‘global’ in global leadership. *Journal of World Business*, 52(5), 503–514. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2016.12.003>
- Miska, C., Stahl, G. K., & Mendenhall, M. E. (2013). Intercultural competencies as antecedents of responsible global leadership. *European Journal of International Management*, 7(5), 550–569. <https://doi.org/10.1504/EJIM.2013.056476>
- Ohmae, K. (1989). Managing in a borderless world. *Harvard Business Review*, 67(3), 152–161.
- Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time–space and homogeneity–heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25–44). SAGE.
- Rockstuhl, T., Seiler, S., Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Annen, H. (2011). Beyond general intelligence (IQ) and emotional intelligence (EQ): The role of cultural intelligence (CQ) on cross-border leadership effectiveness in a globalized world. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(4), 825–840. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01730.x>
- Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1984). *Interpersonal communication competence*. SAGE.
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>
- Thomas, D. C., Elron, E., Stahl, G. K., Ekelund, B. Z., Ravlin, E. C., Cerdin, J. L., ... & Lazarova, M. B. (2008). Cultural intelligence: Domain and assessment. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 8(2), 123–143. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595808091787>
- Yip, G. S. (2003). *Total global strategy II*. Prentice Hall.
- Zhang, J., Lahiri, S., & Nair, A. (2023). Glocal marketing strategies and financial performance: Evidence from multinational firms. *SSRN*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2139215>
- Zhang, J., & Lahiri, S. (2024). Dynamic capability reconfiguration and performance in multinational firms. *SSRN*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5066031>