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Consider the following statements taken from interviews with members of various countries.

The Dutch place emphasis on egalitarianism and are skeptical about the value of leadership. Terms like leader and manager carry a stigma. If a father is employed as a manager, Dutch children will not admit it to their schoolmates.

Arabs worship their leaders—*as long as they are in power!*

Iranians seek power and strength in their leaders.

The Malaysian leader is expected to behave in a manner that is humble, modest, and dignified.

*Note:* This chapter was written while the first author was the Unilever Visiting Professor at the Australian Graduate School of Management, The University of New South Wales, from June through August 1996. The authors are indebted to Tracey Dourley and Michelle Garcia-Navaro for searching for and obtaining references and obscure manuscripts to assist in the preparation of this chapter, and to Geoffrey Eagleson for his intellectual contributions to many of the substantive topics discussed in this chapter.
The French appreciate two kinds of leaders. De Gaulle and Mitterand are examples. De Gaulle is an example of a strong charismatic leader. Mitterand is an example of a consensus builder, coalition former, and effective negotiator.

The Americans appreciate two kinds of leaders. They seek empowerment from leaders who grant autonomy and delegate authority to subordinates. They also respect the bold, forceful, confident, and risk-taking leader as personified by John Wayne.

Clearly, what is expected of leaders, what leaders may and may not do, and the influence that leaders have vary considerably as a result of the cultural forces in the countries or regions in which the leaders function.

In this chapter we present a review of the scope and domain of cross-cultural leadership research. We begin with a review of the concept of culture and the definition of leadership. We then present a review of cross-cultural leadership research findings to date and advance three empirical generalizations. Following the literature review we turn to a discussion of several theoretical issues relevant to the study of cross-cultural leadership. We then present a preliminary theoretical framework intended to be a basis for guiding future cross-cultural leadership research. Finally, we advance some methodological suggestions for the improvement of cross-cultural leadership research and theory.

Definitions

As we shall show, in the extant literature, definitions of the terms culture and leadership are varied and problematic. In the following sections we define these terms as they are used throughout this chapter.

Culture

The following list contains the definitions of culture advanced by several prominent social scientists. From this list it can be seen that there is no consensually agreed-upon definition of culture. In the most general sense, culture is a term used by social scientists to refer to a set of parameters for social collectivities that differentiates among them in meaningful ways. Collectivities thus differentiated are regarded and referred to as cultures.

Selected Definitions of Culture

1. A patterned way of thinking, feeling, and reacting, acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts (Kluckhohn, 1951).
2. The collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one human group from another (Hofstede, 1980).
3. The part of the environment that is created or modified by human beings (Herskovits, 1955).
4. Systems of shared meanings placed upon events (Smith & Peterson, 1994).
5. Norms, roles, belief systems, laws, and values that form meaningful wholes and that are interrelated in meaningful ways (Triandis, 1972).
6. A historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life (Geertz, 1973).
7. A learned, shared, compelling, interrelated set of symbols whose meanings provide a set of orientations for members of a society (Terpstra & David, 1991).
8. The cumulative deposit of knowledge; experience; meanings; beliefs; values; attitudes; religions; concepts of self, the universe, and self-universe relationships; hierarchies of status; role expectations; spatial relations; and time concepts acquired by a large group of people in the course of generations through individual and group striving (Samovar & Porter, 1976).

Culture is variously defined in terms of a number of commonly shared processes: shared ways of thinking, feeling, and reacting; shared meanings and identities; shared socially constructed environments; common ways in which technologies are used; and
commonly experienced events including the history, language, and religion of their members. Definitions of culture are generally so broad that they include almost anything and everything in the environment of human beings that is not immutably determined by nature. For example, Herskovits (1955) defines culture as that part of the environment of humans that is made (or modified) by human beings. Hofstede (1980) anthropomorphizes culture as the collective software of the mind. Such broad definitions virtually preclude consensus among scholars on the way cultural variables can and cannot be appropriately operationalized. As a consequence, the empirical culture literature is inconsistent and confusing with respect to what has been discovered or verified and quite incoherent with respect to theoretical generalizations.

Some Essential Parameters of Culture

Despite lack of consensus among scholars, there are several essential common threads that run throughout the various conceptualizations and definitions of the construct generally referred to as culture.

First, culture represents some form and degree of collective agreement—cultures are collectively oriented phenomena. Second, culture refers to sharing of important interpretations of entities, activities, and events, that is, shared meanings. Third, cultural norms (agreed-upon values and beliefs that have prescriptive or proscriptive implications) and cultural forces are manifested linguistically, behaviorally, and symbolically in the form of artifacts. Fourth, common member experiences, most notably history, language, political and economic experiences, and religion are inherent in the notion of culture. Fifth, cultural variables take on the force of social influence largely because members of collectivities identify with an agreed-upon specific set of values and common social identities. Sixth, common experiences and agreed-upon norms have powerful socialization effects on the members of collectivities referred to as cultures. Seventh, cultural interpretations, symbols, artifacts, and effects are transmitted across generations. Eighth, the social influence of cultural forces is assumed to provide a set of compelling behavioral, affective, and attitudinal orientations for members of cultures. Finally, members of specific cultures are presumed to abide by a set of norms that reflect the above-mentioned commonalities.

Two Ways of Defining Culture

In the literature we discern at least two implicit ways of defining culture. First, as can be seen from the list of existing definitions, culture often refers to collectivities in which the members share several psychological commonalities—assumptions, beliefs, values, interpretations of events (meanings), social identities, and motives—and abide by a set of shared norms in a common manner. For simplicity we refer to these kinds of definitions as normative definitions of culture.

Normative definitions are difficult to operationalize. What is the standard by which one determines when there is sufficient commonality among assumptions, beliefs, values, interpretations of events (meanings), social identities, and motives to assert that a collectivity indeed has a culture or that members of a collectivity are of a common culture?

Alternatively, culture can be defined in terms of distinctive common experiences and environmental forces. Many such experiences and forces are tangible, measurable, and objective, that is, empirically verifiable and not expressed as subjective opinions, beliefs, assumptions, perceptions, interpretations, or values. We refer to definitions of this kind as experiential definitions. Distinctive common experiences and environmental forces consist of, but are not limited to, a common history, physical climate and environment, ethnic origin, language, and religion. De facto, very many if not most cross-cultural studies operationalize culture on the basis of common experiences, using nations, geographic regions, religions, or ethnic origins as the units of analysis, assuming that the psychological commonalities included in normative definitions follow from such operationalizations.

Two Proposed Definitions of Culture

After consideration of the foregoing arguments, we propose two definitions of culture, in an effort at introducing clarity into the operationalization of the construct in cross-cultural research designs.

A normative definition of culture:


cultures are distinctive normative systems consisting of model patterns of shared psychological properties among members of collectivities that
result in compelling common affective, attitudinal, and behavioral orientations that are transmitted across generations and that differentiate collectivities from each other.

The shared psychological properties are those referred to previously: assumptions, beliefs, values, interpretations of events (meanings), social identities, and motives. When shared among collectivities, these psychological properties constitute cultural norms, that is, agreed-upon behavioral proscriptions and prescriptions.

An experiential definition of culture:

Cultures are distinctive environments of collectivities about which members share meaning and values, resulting in a compelling model pattern of common affective, attitudinal, and behavioral orientation that is transmitted across generations and that differentiates collectivities from each other.

Because our normative definition is consistent with traditional culture theory (Hofstede, 1980; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Triandis, 1994), we do not elaborate on it here. We do elaborate on our experiential definition because it has some implications not explicitly recognized in the literature.

According to the experiential definition culture is neither the members of the collectivity nor the investigator. It is a select set of variables experienced by members of collectivities that provides compelling individual and group member orientations. To the extent that these variables are interpreted and valued in a common manner, they distinguish collectivities from each other. According to this definition the components of normative definitions—psychological commonalities such as shared values, beliefs, identities, and such—are viewed as consequences of the common external variables to which members of cultures respond and not as defining attributes of cultures.

This definition assumes that the reactions of the vast majority of members of collectivities to the common variables to which they are exposed are, though not uniform due to individual differences, very similar. The precise proportion of common experiences and common reactions required to declare that a “common culture" exists is of course an empirical issue. And that issue need not be posed as all or nothing. Whether a culture does or does not exist or whether the individuals in a group belong to a common culture is often not the main concern of researchers or practitioners. Rather the proportion of members who have common experiences and the intensity of their reactions may be considered indicators of strength of culture. A collectivity of newly arrived immigrants in Country X from n different ethnic and national backgrounds would thus form a very weak culture, having only the common experience of being immigrants and all that goes with that experience. However, several years after settlement this same collectivity would likely have more common experiences—political, economic, climatic, and the like—and similar reactions to such experiences. Thus they would be members of a stronger, or more intensive, culture.

The experiential definition can be objectively operationalized once one specifies the components of the environment that are relevant. For example, common history, religion, language, ethnic heritage, political experiences, and ecological variables are candidates for the operationalization of this definition of culture. The definition does not need to rely on individuals’ subjective reactions, such as opinions, values, or beliefs. Further, the experiential definition can be quantified in terms of both commonality (scope or percentage of individuals subjected to the common external variables) and strength (intensity of these experiences). If individuals react to common experiences differently, they will likely become members of subcultures within a larger pluralist culture. (We discuss pluralist cultures and subcultures further on.)

The experiential definition also allows for, accounts for, and is likely to more readily reflect cultural change—changes in specific environmental variables that have pervasive effects, such as changes in laws, the introduction of international competition, or widespread increase in the use of such technologies as television and electronic mail. Witness the change in Russia following the fall of Russian communism. Although substantial cultural change did not occur overnight, within a very few years a new subculture emerged—referred to as the New Russians—a class of entrepreneurs who take advantage of Russia’s newly established free market. Also witness the change in the definitions of haves and have
The haves are now the economically advantaged; whereas before the haves were those politically favored by their position in the Communist Party. Clearly the political and economic systems, two external variables that can be objectively operationalized and verified, are strongly implicated in the changes that have taken place in Russia during the last several years.

Normative and experiential definitions of culture are not incompatible or mutually exclusive. In fact, veteran cross-cultural researchers will see these two definitions as two sides of a single coin. However, it is likely that different topics of investigation and different research settings will focus on one or the other of these definitions.

**Monolithic Versus Pluralist Cultures**

Cultures may be monolithic or pluralist. *Monolithic* cultures provide approximately common experiences for members of collectivities. The basic meaning of monolithic is "having a massive uniform structure that does not permit individual variations" (*Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary*, 1958). This concept of culture is problematic for complex and diverse societies comprising multiple subgroups, commonly referred to as *subcultures*. Members of such societies experience *pluralist* cultures (Ronen & Shankar, 1985). According to the experiential definition, a pluralist culture contains two or more subgroups that share some common experiences but not others. For example, they may share the experience of a common form of government, common national borders, a common currency, and a common economic system but not share the same ethnic origin, religion, language, or history.

Members of pluralist cultures are influenced not only by the common norms and institutions of the pluralist culture (to which all subcultural entities are subjected) but also by normative pressures of other subcultural units of which they are not members. Thus one cannot speak of a single source of cultural influence in pluralist cultures.

Social influences emanating from multiple subcultural entities are complex, diverse, fragmented, and overlapping rather than monolithic because they originate from multiple experiences. These social influences may or may not be universally experienced or accepted by all members of pluralist cultural entities.

In our later review of cross-cultural theory and research on organizational leadership, because the overwhelming preponderance of studies is based on collectivities assumed to be cultural units, not subcultures, we will refer to these units of analysis as *cultural units* or *cultural entities* unless it is clear that the investigators consider them subcultural units. In that case we refer to them as *subcultural units* or *subcultural entities* as well as by their proper names. For ease of communication, we refer to the shared social influences in monolithic or pluralist cultures as *cultural influences* or *cultural forces*. We also use the terms *cultural values*, *cultural norms*, and *cultural effects*. When we do so, we explicate the source of the social influences, forces, values, and effects to which we refer. We eschew the use of the noun *culture* and substitute more precise terms (particularly the proper names, when possible) that refer specifically to the cultural or subcultural units under discussion. Finally, also for convenience and ease of interpretation, we refer to the body of literature on which this chapter is based as *cross-cultural leadership literature*.

**Operationalization of the Culture Construct**

The vast majority of cross-cultural leadership studies operationalize cultures by using national or regional political borders as proxies for the boundaries of cultures. This approach ignores the possible existence of subcultural units within political borders, extensions of cultural influences across national boundaries, the influence of international media, the effect of cross-border trading and mobility, and the increased globalization of markets and technology. However, it provides a quick and easy way of operationalizing culture. Of course, one can code several aspects of culture separately in the same study, as demonstrated by Mejia (1984). He found that in three measures of work orientation—job involvement, task related, and contextual scales—culture accounted for 25 percent, 27 percent, and 31 percent of the variance, respectively.

Another prominent approach to operationalizing cultural boundaries focuses on normative differences due to location of residence versus expatriates’ country, ethnic heritage, or other origin. This approach involves selecting managers from two countries, the United States and China for example, and comparing them to
each other as well as comparing them with a third group of immigrants (Chinese-American managers of Chinese descent, for example). Using this research design, Huo and Randall (1991) demonstrated that location of residence often has a more powerful effect on individuals than does Chinese heritage. They also found that Chinese living in Taiwan, Beijing, Wahan, and Hong Kong reported both similarities and differences in work values despite their common Chinese heritage. Similar effects of the local residence of expatriates were reported in studies by Kelly and Worthley (1981) with respect to Japanese working in the United States and by Zurcher, Meadow, and Zurcher (1965) and Zurcher (1968) with respect to Chicanos working in the United States. Conversely, Shackleton and Ali (1990) found no effect of relocation on Pakistani employees of a Pakistani-owned company in Britain.

A third approach to operationalizing cultural boundaries is to classify nations, groups, or other units of analysis that serve as proxies for cultures into empirically similar clusters. Ronen and Shenkar (1985) synthesized eight prior studies using this approach and concluded that the nations of the world can be clustered into eight distinct groups, each of which share many cultural similarities concerning work, personal, and interpersonal values and leadership practices. Four countries (Brazil, Japan, India, and Israel) did not fall into any cluster and were therefore considered “independents.” The Eastern European countries were not included in the clustering scheme. As was consistent with the experiential definition of culture, geography, history, religion, technological development, and language strongly influenced the clustering.

On the one hand, using clusters of similar cultural units has at least five advantages. First, the effects of unique and irrelevant variables within any given collectivity are likely to be muted as a consequence of aggregating to the cluster level of analysis. Second, aggregation of cultural units minimizes the effects of outliers in the distribution of data. Third, comparison of clusters yields more parsimonious conclusions than does comparison of individual units. Fourth, the higher the level of aggregation, the more likely the indices reflecting independent clusters are to correlate with other indices. Fifth, as a consequence of the previous features, conclusions are more likely to be useful for inductive theory building.

On the other hand, clustering has the disadvantage of suppressing subtle differences among cultural units that might be of theoretical or practical importance. For example, clustering Chinese-speaking countries together would have muted the differences among the countries studied by Huo and Randall (1991).

A fourth approach to operationalizing cultural boundaries consists of identifying groups of individuals who have been exposed to common institutions, institutional practices, or institutionalized norms within specific nations. For example, Gallino (1975) identified among Italian managers distinct leadership orientations that depended on whether the managers worked in older private firms, newer private firms, or state-run organizations.

In the next section we describe the various methods of analysis used in cross-cultural research.

Three Methods of Cross-Cultural Analysis

Hofstede, Bond, and Luk (1993) argue forcefully that it is necessary to be clear about the level of analysis employed in quantitative comparisons among cultural entities. They distinguish four types of analysis based on the work of Leung and Bond (1989). We chose to refer to these types as levels of analysis, and we distinguish between levels and methods of analysis. In the following section we describe three basic methods of analysis that may be carried out at one or more levels of analysis.

Comparison of Group Means

The first and most frequently used method is comparison of group means, either in simple, descriptive form or through more formal procedures using tests of significance. The vast majority of comparative quantitative studies of cultural units examines mean scores of groups of individual scores based on numerical responses to questionnaires. Most frequently such mean data are taken to represent “cultural”-level variables defined a priori on the basis of theoretical or conceptual definitions. These group
means scores are then compared across cultural units, generally using rank ordering and statistical methods, such as analysis of variance or paired comparisons. We refer to all such comparisons of means scores collectively as group mean analyses. The level of analysis here is the cultural group.

Correlations

A second method of analysis is the computation of correlations between variable. Correlations can be computed at several levels of analysis. One can obtain a correlation between two variables taking all individual observations regardless of the cultural unit to which the observation belongs. Following Hofstede, Bond, and Luk (1993), we refer to this as pan-cultural analysis.

A set of within-group correlations can also be computed between two variables. This results in as many correlations of the two variables as there are cultural units in the sample. Hofstede, Bond, and Luk refer to this as within-group analysis. The level of analysis here is the group. Since the correlations specify the relationships between variables within a group, we refer to such correlations as within-group correlations.

Correlations can also be computed between the two variables using group means scores (where the groups are cultural units) instead of individual scores. This has the effect of dampening individual variations and enabling one to work with scores that function as cultural indicators. Therefore, in this analysis we again obtain a single correlation for each pair of variables. The unit of analysis here, as in the previous case, is the cultural group, but in this case we obtain information on the relationships between variables across groups. Following Hofstede, Bond, and Luk, we refer to this as ecological analysis.

Finally, there is individual analysis, in which all individual scores are taken together but the cultural component of the score is eliminated by subtracting the group mean from each individual score or by standardizing the scores over the entire sample. This results in a mean of zero and standard deviation of 1.0. In either case, the result is a single correlation for a set of two variables. The level of analysis here is the individual.

Dimensionalization

A third method of analysis is aimed at extracting cross-cultural dimensions or factors and is based on some form of statistical procedure, such as factor analysis or multidimensional scaling. Dimensions may be extracted from individual-level as well as aggregate-level data. This method presupposes a large number of variables but is again based on correlations, thus the various levels of analysis discussed in relation to method two are applicable to this method as well. If all individual scores are used in the factor analysis in a pan-cultural approach, the factors extracted concern dimensions of individual character. If groups of individual scores are analyzed separately, we obtain dimensions of individual character within each cultural unit, but this does not tell us anything about the unit as a collective. That information can be obtained by using group means scores as individual observations; in short, groups are treated as individuals in the analysis.

It is worth noting that whereas the aforementioned first method is exclusively at the group (ecological) level of analysis, the second and third methods can be applied at any of the four levels. Ecological and individual analyses produce entirely separate and different information, and the correlations between the same two variables may differ, not only in magnitude by also in sign at these two levels.

Hofstede, Bond, and Luk (1993, p. 486) use the example of a study conducted by Lincoln and Zeitz (1980) to illustrate the differences in results of ecological and individual levels of analysis. Lincoln and Zeitz collected responses of 500 employees in twenty different social-service departments in a U.S. city. They found that the relationship between employees’ professional accreditation and their amount of supervisory duties was positive across all employees but negative across departments. This finding is explained by the facts that employees with higher professional accreditation tended to be given more supervisory duties within departments and that departments with a higher overall level of accreditation have a smaller proportion of supervisory personnel.

Hofstede, Bond, and Luk (1993) further illustrate the difference between ecological and individual levels of analysis by comparing
the results of data collected from twenty organizational units using the two method of analysis. Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohay, and Sanders (1990) had previously shown that at the ecological level of analysis, respondent values correlated with other values, organizational practices correlated with other organizational practices, and the mean level of within-unit values rarely correlated with organizational practices. Organizations differed primarily in their practices. Organizational membership per se did not account for much variance in values.

At the individual level of analysis, Hofstede, Bond, and Luk found a mirror image of this conclusion. After eliminating aggregate effects uniquely associated with organizational units, they found that practices have a strong unit-level component, leaving less variance or difference in perceptions of practices among individuals within units. Thus practices that provided common member experiences differentiated “organizational cultures” at both the ecological and the individual level of analysis. Differences in practices thus are strong etic phenomena. If culture is taken to mean a concept that differentiates across large numbers of collectivities, we believe that the findings of Hofstede, Bond, and Luk meet this requirement and support the experiential-based definition of culture we stated earlier.

Leadership

At present there is no consensually agreed-upon definition of leadership among scholars. Definitions vary in terms of emphasis on leader abilities, personality traits, influence relationships, cognitive versus emotional orientation, individual versus group orientation, and appeal to self-versus collective interest (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 1994).

As part of the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) international cross-cultural research project, a meeting of eighty-four scholars representing fifty-six countries from all regions of the world was conducted. In that meeting a consensus and universal definition of organizational leadership emerged: “the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members.” Simonton (1994, p. 411), speaking of leadership in general defines a “leader” as “that group member whose influence on group attitudes, performance, or decision making greatly exceeds that of the average member of the group.” In keeping with the scope of this chapter, we address the phenomenon of organizational leadership, and not leadership in general.

We now turn to a review of prior empirical leadership literature. We take as our point of departure the review of cross-cultural leadership research that appears in Bass and Stogdill’s Handbook of Leadership Research (Bass, 1990). After briefly summarizing Bass’s review, we discuss two large sample studies conducted prior to that review, and then we summarize the major topics that emerged from our review of the cross-cultural leadership research conducted to date.

Empirical Research Reviewed by Bass

Bass (1990) reviews over 100 studies concerned with the effects of differences in cultural or subcultural units on managerial behaviors, attitudes, preferences, and motivations. National boundaries specify cultural units in almost all of these studies, and the method of analysis for almost all is the within-group mean of individual responses.

The review reveals two major trends in the cross-cultural leadership literature. First, substantial research has examined the applicability of Western leadership theory in multiple national settings. Second, a great deal of effort has been made to compare the leadership styles and requirements of small groups of nations. Usually the comparisons are made between the United States, Western European nations, Latin American nations, and/or Asian nations. Consequently, more is known about leadership in these regions than in South Pacific, African, Arab, and Eastern European countries.

Bass’s review also reveals a number of shortcomings in the literature. First, the studies cited lacked theoretical cohesiveness. Although some investigators draw from well-established theories of leadership, many merely describe national differences and draw on rather atheoretical and unsystematic intellectual frameworks. Second, there was a dearth of studies based on more than three or four countries. As we shall show, this situation has improved
considerably since Bass’s review. Third, many studies made use of existing standardized U.S. instruments, which may not fully capture non-Western or non-U.S. conceptualizations of leadership.

Two studies that examined cross-cultural leadership based on twelve or more countries were reported before Bass’s review. We review these studies here in some detail because of their substantial contribution.

Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter (1966) studied responses from 3,641 managers from fourteen countries: eight European countries and Argentina, Chile, England, India, Japan, and the United States. Sample sizes ranged from 92 to 101 managers per country. Although the study is not based on matched samples, respondents were drawn from a large number of industries, and controls for numerous individual demographic characteristics were included. Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter found that country differences accounted for an average of 28 percent of questionnaire response variance when calculated as the ratio of individual differences to national differences. They also found that countries could be clustered into five groups: a Nordic-European group, a Latin-European group, an Anglo pair, a developing countries group, and Japan, which stood alone. The number of managers in these groups ranged from 187 to 399. Within clusters (excluding Japan) the average correlation between countries was .57, and the average correlation of any one cluster with countries outside that cluster was —.39. Countries within clusters spoke similar languages, had similar religions, and had “many common elements in their cultural background” (Haire, Ghiselli, & Porter, 1966, p. 11).

Differences and similarities among cultures were identified by the method of within-group individual mean comparisons of questionnaire responses. Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter found some universal characteristics of managers. Across all countries studied, managers favored democratic styles of management. They also rather consistently felt that subordinates lacked the abilities necessary to be led democratically. Managers in all countries also endorsed egalitarian organizational structures and yet also responded in ways that indicated they saw themselves as a part of an elite group. Managers in all countries indicated that it is better to direct than to persuade. This conviction was much stronger among managers in Germany, Norway, Denmark, and Sweden. The general impact of country citizenship or cluster membership outweighed the effects of managers’ age and the size of their firms. However, there was a modest tendency for younger high-level managers in large firms to endorse more democratic practices and to recognize the need for satisfying employee needs. Consequently it is possible that there is more emphasis on democratic practices today than there was in the 1960s when Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter collected their data. Managerial need fulfillment was very similar in all countries. Two needs stood out as unsatisfied, regardless of country: need for autonomy and need for self-actualization.

The second large sample study (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979) was based on multiple measures of observed behavior and questionnaire responses of 8,566 middle managers. The data were collected between 1966 and 1973. The samples consisted of middle managers from Austria, Belgium, Britain, France, Germany, Iberia, India, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Scandinavia, and the United States. The managers were in government and in private businesses representing several industries. The sample sizes ranged from 104 to 235 per country; the samples were not matched and consisted almost exclusively of men. The managers completed a series of simulation exercises as part of a management training program and a series of introspective exercises relevant to their own behavior and their careers. They also provided observational data relevant to each other’s behavior. The dependent variables consisted of a host of managers’ responses to questionnaires, self-reports of their behavior in the exercises, and observations of each other’s behavior. As in the Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter study, differences and similarities among cultures were identified by within-group individual mean comparisons of questionnaire responses. Mean scores on the dependent variables for the national samples were compared. Interactions of rate of advancement with mean country scores language groupings were also computed. Thus it was possible to detect differences in responses due to country citizenship. It was also possible to determine how rapidly advancing managers differed from less rapidly advancing managers in each country group.

There were strong main effects of national citizenship and modest main effects of rate of advancement on many of the dependent variables. These two variables also interacted in their effects on the dependent variables. Bass, Burger, Doktor, and Barrett (1979) present findings for each of thirty-four dependent
variables. The relevant means and standard deviations are presented throughout that book, so one can analyze the data further if one wishes. In addition, profiles are presented for each nation.

The major contribution of this research is not only that it demonstrates that a large number of dependent variables are affected by national citizenship, which is a proxy for a host of "cultural" variables, but also that it demonstrates how cross-cultural research based on controlled observation of behavior and responses of subjects to controlled stimuli can be conducted. The findings are potentially useful for managerial assessment and for the design of management training programs in each of the countries studied.

**Topics Studied**

Investigators in cross-cultural leadership examine a number of topics. A computerized search identified seventy studies on cross-cultural leadership published since 1989, presumably the year in which Bass and Stogdill's *Handbook of Leadership* (1990) went to press. These seventy titles included approximately twenty empirical studies and Ph.D. dissertations. Approximately fifteen additional studies were identified by scanning fifteen relevant journals from January of 1989 to June of 1996. Space limitations prevent a thorough review of the empirical evidence revealed by all of these studies. Therefore in this section we briefly state the conclusions we have drawn after conducting an exhaustive review of the empirical evidence relevant to cross-cultural organizational leadership.

For illustrative purposes, selected studies are summarized in Table 20.1. These studies met one or more of the following criteria:

1. They are based on ten or more cultural units of analyses.
2. They address important issues.
3. They assess conventional organizational behavior dependent variables such as satisfaction, performance, stress, turnover, or degree of conflict.
4. They introduce important moderators of relationships between cultural dimensions or attributes and dependent variables.
5. They cover cultural units (countries, geographic regions, ethnic groups) not covered in the studies reviewed by Bass (1990).
6. They illustrate new, innovative, and especially useful methodology.

Prior to 1989, few studies reported in the social science literature met the criteria just listed. Unless otherwise indicated, the studies reviewed here and described in Table 20.1 were based on the second method of aggregation described earlier: within-group (cultural entities) means were compared across groups.

In order to review the relevant issues we call upon both the studies reviewed by Bass (1990) and selected studies published since then. We also discuss several selected studies published prior to 1990 and not reviewed by Bass that concern the measurement of cultural variables.

In the remainder of this section, we organize the discussion of our findings by the most frequent topics addressed in the cross-cultural leadership literature.

**Leader Prototypes.** Leadership prototypes are profiles of presumed typical or preferred leader attributes or behaviors (Lord & Maher, 1991). Prototypes may include leader behaviors, values, attitudes, and personality traits. Gerstner and Day (1994) identified three dimensions relevant to distinct leadership prototypes as expressed by university students from eight nations. These dimensions had rank-order correlations with Hofstede's measures (1980) of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism .81, 1.00, and .70, respectively. Several studies have also identified prototypical work-related preferences and value differences among managers from different countries. These include the importance placed on being systematic, careful, logical, resourceful, and sociable (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979); the value given to strength, intelligence, and supportiveness (Bigoness & Blakely, 1989); views as to what ought to be determined (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979; Beatty, McCune, & Beatty, 1988); the degree of trust placed in coworkers (Senner, 1971); and the attitude toward taking risks and the emphasis on precedence over written rules (Terry, 1979).

**Leadership Behavior Patterns.** Modal leader behavior patterns differ widely across countries in their emphasis on individualism versus team orientation, particularism versus universalism (Dorfman & Howell, 1988; Smith, Dugan, & Trompenaars, 1996); performance versus maintenance orientation (Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Paterson, & Bond, 1989, Smith, Peterson, Misumi, & Bond, 1992); authoritarian versus democratic orientation (Al-Hajieh, 1984;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Author(s) &amp; Year Published</th>
<th>Method Employed</th>
<th>Units of Analysis &amp; Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>Psychometric Properties</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Culture Connection (1987)</td>
<td>Measure of values (Chinese Value Survey, CVS) developed to reflect unique cultural values of the Chinese administered to university students in 22 countries, of which 20 overlapped with Hofstede’s sample (1980). Ecological factor analysis followed by non-metric multidimensional scaling (MDS) to extract dimensions in the CVS.</td>
<td>Ecological factor scores. Subjects recruited from psychology undergraduate program, with at least 50 men and 50 women from any one class level.</td>
<td>None reported for reliability of the measures. Confirmed dimensions through ecological factor analysis and MDS, both of which produced closely matching dimensions (average correlation of the four MDS dimensions-factor scores judged to be corresponding was .68).</td>
<td>Found new dimension, Confucian work dynamic, which reflects cultural support for entrepreneurial behavior. Four dimensions extracted from study data (collected from a different type of sample than were Hofstede’s data) were asserted to reflect Hofstede’s dimensions (see text for counterargument). CVS moral discipline correlated .55 with PD, .56 with UA, .54 with IC. This correlation is opposite from Hofstede’s interpretation of masculinity. CVS integration correlated -.58 with PD, .65 with individualism. CVS human heartedness correlated .67 with masculinity. CVS Confucian work dynamic correlated .52 with IC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gebert &amp; Steinkemp (1991)</td>
<td>Economic success of firms identified through three questionnaire responses: total number of staff, turnover, and profit. Leader behavior described using two dimensions: patriarchal and production orientation.</td>
<td>21 Nigerian and 24 Taiwanese small- and medium-sized manufacturing firms with 20 to 200 employees. Samples described as “similar”—a variety of manufacturing firms in each sample.</td>
<td>Construct validity inferred through performance-maintenance (P-M) correlations between the expectations of leader behavior and the dimensions of general entrepreneurship behavior.</td>
<td>Patriarchal care-taking (both within and outside the firm) was inversely related to economic success (r = -.59 for Nigeria; r = -.67 for Taiwan).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerstner &amp; Day (1994)</td>
<td>Questionnaire with 59 attributes relevant to leadership given to students enrolled in a U.S. university.</td>
<td>University students representing eight countries: U.S., 35; China, 35; France, 22; Germany, 16; Honduras, 15; Japan, 10; Taiwan, 11; India, 18.</td>
<td>No psychometric properties reported. Used three dimensions derived by multidimensional scaling.</td>
<td>Results indicate that business leader prototypes vary systematically as a function of a particular country. Significant correlations between Hofstede’s dimensions of culture and the present study dimensions for rank ordering of countries: r PD—dimension 1 = .81; r UA—dimension 2 = 1.00; r IC—dimension 3 = .76. Demonstrated usefulness of Hofstede PD, UA, IC dimensions. Hofstede’s masculinity scores correlated with dimension 1 = .64 and dimension 2 = .41. Several masculine items failed to cluster yield an independent dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Author(s) &amp; Year Published</td>
<td>Method Employed</td>
<td>Units of Analysis &amp; Sample Characteristics</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede, Bond, &amp; Luk (1993)</td>
<td>Used data obtained from an earlier survey of organizational cultures (Hofstede, Neuwen, Ohays, &amp; Sanders, 1990).</td>
<td>Comparison of individual and ecological levels of analysis. Sample in original study consisted of responses from nearly 1,500 employees from 20 organizational units in Denmark and the Netherlands; samples consisted of 33 percent managers, 33 percent college-educated nonmanagers or professionals, and 33 percent others, with about 25 of each category randomly selected from each organizational unit.</td>
<td>Psychometric properties not reported.</td>
<td>By reanalyzing the data from Hofstede, Neuwen, Ohays, &amp; Sanders at the individual level, showed that the dimensions of organizational culture found in the previous study completely disappeared at the individual level, and a new set of dimensions (termed psychological culture) emerged. These results focus attention on the importance of defining one's level of analysis to avoid ecological and reverse ecological fallacies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Davis, &amp; Allen (1994)</td>
<td>Questionnaires consisting of 24 items on IC and 15 on entrepreneurship, administered to executives in a variety of industrial firms in the U.S., South Africa, and Portugal. Portuguese version back-translated and pretested; other two samples responded in English.</td>
<td>Organizational unit of analysis. Senior marketing executives and heads of personnel/human resource departments and production/operations departments. In the case of Portugal, only one senior official from each firm. 225 surveys obtained from 75 firms in South Africa, 252 from 84 firms in the U.S., and 25 from 25 firms in Portugal.</td>
<td>Individualism scale (IND1) consisting of 9 items adapted from Hofstede’s Value Survey Module (VSM) (Cronbach alphas ranging from .67 to .81 for the three samples); second individualism scale (IND2) developed from Earley’s measures (1989) of collectivism and social loafing (Cronbach alphas ranging from .68 to .76 for the three samples). Entreprenuership scale (IND3) (12 items) derived from three variations of Miller &amp; Friesen’s scale (1983) (Cronbach alphas of .65 to .74 for the three samples).</td>
<td>Although Hofstede’s country scores differed widely among the three countries, organizational scores showed negligible difference. Also, an exploratory analysis revealed a curvilinear relationship (as hypothesized) between levels of organizational individualism and entrepreneurship, with entrepreneurial activity peaking at moderate levels of individualism (whether measured by IND2 or IND3) and lower at the extremes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson et al. (1995)</td>
<td>House, Schuler, &amp; Leventhal’s role conflict and ambiguity measure (1983) and Pareek’s role overload measures (1976) were used. Translated and back-translated. Data collected during training programs.</td>
<td>100 middle managers from each of 21 nations: Western and Eastern European nations and Japan, Brazil, India, South Africa, Nigeria, and Uganda.</td>
<td>Reliability coefficient for role conflict measure is less than 0.7, and for other measures coefficients are generally satisfactory, with a few exceptions. Used exploratory and LISREL confirmatory factor analysis.</td>
<td>Addressed what role stress issues are likely to arise in cultures that vary along Hofstede’s cultural dimensions. Role stress varied more by country than by demographic or organizational characteristics. Contrary to the implications of Hofstede’s UA measure, role stress was not associated with high UA. In ecological analysis high PD was related to high role overload and low role ambiguity. Although role stress appeared to be a universal (etic) feature, the study pointed to an emic quality in the interpretation of the construct across cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Author(s) &amp; Year Published</td>
<td>Method Employed</td>
<td>Units of Analysis &amp; Sample Characteristics</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahim, Kim, &amp; Kim (1994)</td>
<td>Rahim’s Leader Power Inventory and the Job Description Index (JDI) &amp; compliance scale. Translated and back-translated.</td>
<td>Managers in U.S., 459, and S. Korea, 629.</td>
<td>Independence of constructs established in subsequent study of Bangladeshi respondents (Rahim &amp; Magner, 1995). Factor structure invariance found for U.S. managers. Alphas ~ .73; test-retest r ~ .82; low r with Crown-Marlow Social Desirability scale.</td>
<td>Power bases of both samples remarkably similar. U.S. managers had greater position power; Korean managers had greater personal power bases. In both samples, referent power base explained highest percent of variation in satisfaction. Performance contingent coercive power least effective. Managers in both individualist and collectivist cultures most effective in inducing subordinate’s compliance and satisfaction by enhancing personal power bases, such as expert and referent. Legitimate power may be used to gain compliance from subordinates, but may lead to reduction in satisfaction with supervisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralston, Gustafson, Elsasser, Cheung, &amp; Terpstra (1992)</td>
<td>Chinese Culture Connection’s CVS administered to practicing managers in the U.S., Hong Kong (H.K.), and People’s Republic of China (P.R.C.). Manova and WABA analysis performed.</td>
<td>Ecological factor scores. Sample of 36 men and 25 women from the U.S., 145 men and 37 women from H.K., and 75 men</td>
<td>Not reported. Used existing scales and translations developed by the Chinese Culture Connection (1987).</td>
<td>U.S. and H.K. managers scored equally but significantly higher than the P.R.C. sample on integration. All three scored about the same on moral discipline. In Confucian work dynamism, P.R.C. scored the highest, followed by H.K. and U.S., in that order. All ps based on paired comparisons ~ .05. With human heartedness, U.S. scored highest, followed by H.K. and then by P.R.C. (all ps ~ .05). This last finding is consistent with Hofstede’s ranking of the U.S. and H.K. on the masculinity dimension. Explored structure of leader influence behavior toward subordinates. Results compared with results of the U.S. sample used in developing POIS. Interpretable 7-factor solution obtained for all nations except Australia, for which an interpretable 6-factor solution emerged. English leaders placed greater emphasis on appealing to higher authorities and assertiveness in subordinate relationships than did U.S. managers. Australians were more similar to U.S. managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt &amp; Yeh (1992)</td>
<td>POIS (Profiles of Organizational Influence Strategies) used. In Australia and U.K., data collected during a training program. In Taiwan, a survey was conducted. Japanese data collected in prior study. Translated into Chinese and Japanese and back-translated.</td>
<td>In Australia, 126 supervisors and managers; U.K., 121 supervisors; Taiwan, 234 managers; Japan, 355 managers. Samples belonged to different industries.</td>
<td>Alpha reliability coefficients and factor loadings reported by nations. Approximately 80 percent of alpha coefficients &gt; .60.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Author(s) &amp; Year Published</td>
<td>Method Employed</td>
<td>Units of Analysis &amp; Sample Characteristics</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shackleton &amp; Ali (1990)</td>
<td>Parts of Hofstede’s VSM measuring PD and UA used. Translated and back-translated. Part of the sample was given questionnaires to take home to complete; the remainder was given questionnaires during a training program. PD and UA subscales of Hofstede’s country scores were plotted on PD and UA dimensions.</td>
<td>Managers of 7 firms in Sudan, Pakistan (operating in U.K.), and U.K.; n = 214. All subjects male, with mean age of 34 years and 12 to 14 years of education.</td>
<td>No psychometric properties reported. VSM assumed to be valid.</td>
<td>in their emphasis on reasoning and bargaining with subordinates. U.S., U.K., and Australian leaders used friendliness in combination with reason. The leader influence processes used in Taiwan and Japan are more similar to each other than to those in Australia and U.K., that is, they reflect assertiveness and reasoning tactics. Although both Taiwan and Japan tend toward high PD, the Japanese emphasize sanctions less and bureaucratic channels more than the Taiwanese do. Scores consistent with Hofstede’s PD scores. Pakistan’s managers, in spite of being in U.K., exhibited a substantial effect of country of origin rather than current country values. As hypothesized, Sudanese scores on PD and UA were found to lie between the scores of African and Arab nations reported by Hofstede, and the British scores were very close to those obtained by Hofstede. These results provided support for the relative rankings of Hofstede’s UA and PD dimensions. Examined the effects of traditional and modern ideologies and economic conditions influencing the importance of work goals. Results suggest shared cultural traditions of Chinese societies on one hand and variations due to modern ideologies and economic conditions on the other, especially between China and others. Findings suggest the emergence of 2 new concepts—cultural pluralism and cultural disjunction, that is, existence of multiple cultures in a society and differences in culturally derived expectations and economic, political, social, and organizational relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenkar &amp; Ronen (1987)</td>
<td>Hofstede’s 14-item work goals questionnaire was modified and administered during a training program. Translated and back-translated.</td>
<td>All Chinese societies: China, Taiwan, Singapore, and H.K.; 163 managers—officials of government and administrative staff. Samples for other countries taken from Hofstede’s study.</td>
<td>No psychometric properties reported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Author(s) &amp; Year Published</td>
<td>Method Employed</td>
<td>Units of Analysis &amp; Sample Characteristics</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith et al. (1994)</td>
<td>Questionnaire translated and administered to middle managers in 14 countries. Scores standardized within subjects. Items required managers to rate each of 8 sources of meanings for each of 8 organizational events, on 5-point rating scales.</td>
<td>Country-level analysis, although adjustments for demographic differences made on individual scores. Middle managers drawn from several public- and private-sector organizations in the 14 countries; CEOs and frontline supervisors excluded.</td>
<td>Related sources of meaning of critical incidents in each country to Hofstede’s rankings of countries in terms of his four dimensions. Managers in countries Hofstede classified as high individualism and low PD report greater reliance on their own experience and their subordinates, whereas managers in low individualism and high PD countries report greater reliance on formal rules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Dugan, &amp; Trompenaars (1996)</td>
<td>Values of managers studied using many instruments originally collected by Trompenaars although not for this study. Convenience sampling; Translated and back-translated. Transformations of individual-level data to derive ecological measures analyzed through multidimensional scaling and regression analysis.</td>
<td>Data collected mostly during training programs. Anglo, European, Latin American, East Asian, S.E. Asian, and Middle Eastern nations. Nonrandom sample; sizes range from 29 to 1,212. Ecological (country) unit of analysis, derived from questionnaires with 39 items administered to 8,841 employees (at least 24 percent lower-level workers, 54 percent managers or professionals, and 22 percent not known) in 43 countries. One-third were females.</td>
<td>Country-level coefficient alpha for the 6-item achievement-ascription scale was .83; for the 4-item universalist-particularist scale, .91; for the individualism-collectivism scale, not reported.</td>
<td>Sample heterogeneity did not influence results. Two interpretable dimensions emerged: egalitarianism vs. conservatism and loyalty. These correlated with each other −.83. The first correlated .36 with Hofstede’s IC dimension and −.30 with PD dimension. The second correlated −.51 and .44 with Hofstede’s IC and PD dimensions. Results generally consistent with Hofstede’s country scores on these dimensions. Found support for national culture as source of variation in PD and Egalitarian Commitment, and Confucian Work Dynamism. UA and MF were included in study hypotheses without being included in measures. Emerged dimensions were associated with life expectancy, per-capita income, and socioeconomic status of subjects in samples. Derived 3 factors describing managers’ various combinations of reliance on rules and procedures, beliefs, unwritten rules, advice from subordinates, colleagues, and superiors, and own experience. Leading event management processes were consistently related to the differences in national cultures Hofstede identified. Relationships consistent with Hofstede’s dimensions of PD, IC, UA, MF. No culturally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20.1. Empirical Cross-Cultural Leadership Studies Conducted Since 1989, Cont'd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Author(s) &amp; Year Published</th>
<th>Method Employed</th>
<th>Units of Analysis &amp; Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>Psychometric Properties</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Paterson, &amp; Bond (1986)</td>
<td>Questionnaire, partly adapted from Misumi’s performance (P) and maintenance (M) scales and partly developed for this study, assessed employees' perceptions about their supervisors in electronics industry in Britain, U.S., Japan, and H.K. Translated and back-translated.</td>
<td>Electronic plant shop-floor supervisors within a number of similar electronics assembly plants. Respondents predominantly young and middle-aged women, except in Japan. Demographics not indicated for U.S. N in U.K., 280; U.S., 197; H.K., 168; and Japan, 532. Ecological factor</td>
<td>Substantiated 2-factor structure of the general measure of leadership style through factor analysis. Alphas for all scales in all countries ~.72, except U.S., which was .62.</td>
<td>Consistent variation in event management is seen as more effective than another. Samples high on IC and low on PD reported great reliance on their own experience, training, and subordinates. Samples low on IC and high on PD relied on formal rules and procedures. Similarly, countries labeled high on dimensions of masculinity and UA were also found to be consistent with Hofstede's study. These results are consistent despite convenience sampling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Yeh & Lawrence (1995) | Reanalyzed Franke, Hofstede, & Bond’s data (1991) purporting to link cultural factors to economic growth; used regression analysis as used by Franke, Hofstede, & Bond but paid particular attention to outliers. | Data from Franke, Hofstede, & Bond. | Not applicable. | Production orientation significantly correlated with economic success ($r = 0.35$ for Nigeria and $r = 0.51$ for Taiwan). Link between cultural dimensions and economic growth predicted by Franke, Hofstede, & Bond did not hold for Pakistan. Reanalysis after removing Pakistan from the data set found (1) the correlation between individualism and Confucian work dynamism changed from $-0.46$ to $-0.70$, becoming highly significant. The authors argue that in light of this correlation, the link between Confucian work dynamism and economic growth is suspect. (See chapter text for different interpretations.) |

PD = power distance; IC = individualism-collectivism; UA = uncertainty avoidance; MF = masculinity-femininity.
Stening & Wong, 1983); paternalism (Dorfman & Howell, 1988); reliance on personal abilities, subordinates, or rules (Smith, Peterson, & Misumi, 1994); leader influence processes (Rahim, Kim, & Kim, 1994; Schmidt & Yeh, 1992); and consensual decision making and service orientation (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979).

**Differential Effects on Followers.** Followers differ by nation in their preferences for and acceptance of different levels of communication intensity and different kinds of communication with leaders (Earley, 1984) and in their task versus person orientation (Blake & Mouton, 1970; Misumi, 1974), responses to organizational development efforts (Deyo, 1978), acceptance of close versus general supervision and democratic versus autocratic leader behavior, and performance responses to the use of participatory practices (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett).

**Origins of Leaders.** Individuals gain leadership through ascription or achievement. Differences in education, class, occupation, ownership, and technical expertise have all been cited as influential factors in determining who fills leadership roles in different countries (Boyd, 1974; Harbison, 1965; McClelland, 1961; Lee & Schwendiman, 1982). Leaders’ origins also influence their behavior as expatriates. Shackleton and Ali (1990) found that managers of Pakistan origin working in England were differentiated from English managers by a substantial effect of origin. The effect of origin does not overwhelm the contexts of expatriate managers, however. Huo and Randall (1991), for instance, found that location of residence also often has a powerful effect on individuals.

**Dependent Variables.** Finally, few studies have examined the effects of culture on the generally accepted dependent variables in the discipline of organizational behavior (a U.S.-based discipline). One area of interest generating research is cultural influences on organizations’ or nations’ economic success. McClelland (1961) found that cultural emphasis on achievement motivation is predictive of country industrial development and economic success twenty-five years later. Gebert and Steinkamp (1991) found that manager patriarchal care-taking was inversely related to economic success and manager production orientation was positively related to economic success of firms in both Nigeria and Taiwan. Hofstede and Bond (1988) showed that the Confucian work dynamic (discussed later in this chapter) is related to Asian nations’ economic growth. Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996) found that their three dimensions of culture (also discussed later) are related to national per-capita income and the socioeconomic status of country samples.

Scholars have also examined the effect of cultural influences on employee satisfaction, general welfare, and ability to perform effectively.

Dorfman and Howell (1988) found no relationships between Mexican and Taiwanese employees’ cultural values and the dependent variables of work satisfaction, satisfaction with superiors, organizational commitment, and performance. However, employee identification with dominant societal values turned out to be a variable that influenced the relationship between leaders’ directiveness and selected reward and punishment practices and also influenced the dependent variables just mentioned: the relationships were significantly higher for those employees who identified with the dominant values than for those who did not. This study nicely deals with one of the limitations of interpreting countries as monolithic cultures and shows the effect of differential degrees of socialization within countries.

There is some empirical evidence for cultural influences on employee stress. Hofstede (1980) found that questionnaire reports of employee stress are associated with uncertainty avoidance. Smith and Peterson (1994) found that role stress experienced by managers varies more across than within countries and is positively related to power distance and collectivism.

**Antecedents to Preferred Leader Behavior**

We now turn to a discussion of the antecedents to the differences in preferred leader behaviors among cultural entities.

**Dominant Norms and Religion**

Differences among cultural entities relevant to preferences for leader behaviors have been shown to result from the entities’ dominant norms (Dorfman & Howell, 1988; Stening & Wong, 1983).
and religious or ideological values such as Confucianism (Hofstede & Bond, 1988), Catholicism (Pelletier, 1966), and the Protestant work ethic of saving, sacrifice, hard work, and investment (Weber, [1924] 1947).

**The Dominant Elite**

McClelland (1961) and Boyd (1974) noted the role that the landed gentry played in the development of leadership traits in Confucian China and Victorian England. Specifically, leaders in both countries were expected to possess good manners, good physical conditioning, and classical training. Interviews conducted in France by the first author of this chapter indicate that French leaders are generally well educated and expected to be “cultivated,” that is, classically educated.

**Historical Leaders**

Leaders considered to have made a major contribution to society are often not only revered but also often emulated, especially in societies with a highly stratified distribution of power. Qualitative research by the first author of this chapter disclosed a proliferation of public commemorations of macho-like military leaders in France and Russia and a marked absence of such commemorations in Australia, Canada, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the German regions of Switzerland. Hofstede (1980) reported no data on Russia but found France to be in the eighth highest country on power distance. The remainder of these countries were ranked twenty-eighth or lower on power distance among the forty countries Hofstede reported on in 1980.

Of course, a nation may also have strong norms against leaders who represent countercultural values. Lord Nelson’s statue in Dublin was destroyed by the IRA and never replaced because of its pro-British symbolism. The statue of King Edward VII was removed from public view in Toronto due to resentment at its imperialist implications. Most of the statues in Moscow and Budapest of high-level communist leaders have been retired to “cemeteries of statues,” where they are preserved for posterity but no longer revered or in public view. The institutions, streets, and cities renamed for communist leaders and events have reverted to their historical names in almost all former Soviet Union nations except Russia. Even in Russia, Leningrad is once again Saint Petersburg and Stalingrad is now Volgograd. In Budapest the former Karl Marx Institute of Economics is now the Hungarian Institute of Economics.

Highly assertive leadership is generally viewed as undesirable by individuals in societies previously dominated by dictators. Interviews and focus groups in the GLOBE research program revealed strong reservations, suspicions, and distaste for authoritarian leadership among German, Mexican, Spanish, and Portuguese managers and rather widespread distrust of managers in general in many of the countries of the former Soviet Union. This distaste for leadership and distrust of management are likely the results of their historical association with despotic leadership in these countries.

**Modernization**

Modernization also appears to be associated with differential expectations of and preferences for specific leader behaviors. For example, merit is more often expected to be the basis of performance evaluation and compensation in modernized nations. Leaders in the relatively tradition-bound countries more often take factors other than merit into account when deciding on salary increases (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979; Ryterbrand & Thigagarajan, 1968; Ulri, 1976). Managers in tradition-bound countries are also more likely to find bribery acceptable and to relegate women to lower-status positions (Davis, Ming, & Brosnan, 1986). In contrast, leaders from modern societies tend to focus more on issues of merit, orderliness, punctuality, intended rationality, and progress (Inkeles, 1966; Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979).

Indices of modernization such as literacy rates and amount of electrical power used per capita are publicly available for most nations of the world and can be used by cross-cultural investigators as either control or explanatory variables.

**Unique Role Demands on Leaders**

The varying demographic composition of organizations and of national or regional political systems and the varying strategic requirements of organizations often place differential role demands on leaders (Anzizu & Nuenos, 1984; Bass, 1990; Granick, 1960;
Heller, 1958). In India, China, and Hong Kong, for example, management practices in small- and medium-sized organizations are often based on kinship relationships and involve obedience to elders, based on deference to the wisdom of experience. Many of the same behaviors can also be found in the management of large firms. Even today, for example, five of the largest business organizations in India—Reliance (managed by the Ambani family), Birla, Goenka, Kirloskar, and Tata—remain family managed (Chowdhry 
&Tarneja, 1961).

Cultural Convergence

It is often suggested that there may be a substantial amount of cross-national convergence of management practices, values, and beliefs as a result of the interactions between organizations engaged in cross-border trading and the widespread proliferation of management education programs that reflect Western assumptions, values, and practices.

The lack of historical baseline data makes it difficult to assess the extent of international convergence that may be taking place in leadership practices. However, a limited number of studies support the convergence hypothesis. Ralston, Gustafson, Elsas, Cheung, and Terpstra (1992) found that responses of Hong Kong managers reflected more Western values than did responses of Chinese managers and more Eastern values than did responses of American managers, suggesting cultural convergence as a result of Hong Kong managers’ exposure to both Western and Eastern societies. Although studies that compare longitudinal data for a large number of cultural units are not available, two comprehensive, exhaustive studies based on historical analyses demonstrated that management practices in multiple industries in Korea (Amsden, 1989) and Taiwan (Wade, 1990) had become more similar to Japanese practices in the preceding decade.

It appears that global management practices may be converging, but not necessarily toward U.S. management styles (Alpander, 1973; Beechler & Yang, 1994; Craig, Douglas, & Grein, 1992). Further, some U.S. authors have proposed U.S. adoption of Japanese management practices (Ouchi, 1981; Pascale & Athos, 1981). There is no evidence of a single model of management practices or cultural values toward which all nations are converging. It is most likely that there is some convergence toward U.S. practices, some toward Western European practices, and some toward Japanese practices.

Although some convergence in management practices is likely taking place, there is also a great deal of stability in the fundamental cultural practices and psychological commonalities within cultural entities. Studies in many geographic regions show consistent results between earlier and subsequent studies even when as many as twenty years have elapsed between studies. As shown in Table 20.1, Hofstede’s country rankings based on data collected between 1967 and 1973 have been replicated by several studies of selected countries conducted in the late 1980s and 1990s. Thus changes in the fundamental cultural values such as those studied by Hofstede (1980) appear to be very slow and likely resistant to convergence forces.

Cultural Influences on Leadership: Conclusions

Our review of empirical research clearly shows that cultural forces influence many aspects of the leadership phenomenon. These aspects include prototypical requisites for leadership positions, the degree to which leadership roles are filled by ascription or achievement, modal leader behavior patterns, preferences for and expectations of leaders, and followers’ and subordinates’ reactions to different kinds of leader behavior. Several antecedents to preferred leader behaviors were revealed, including dominant norms, dominant elites, religious values, modernization, unique role demands, and historical experiences with leaders.

Issues Studied

In this section we look at the issues predominantly studied by cross-cultural leadership scholars.

Measurement of Cultural Dimensions: Some Problems of Inconsistency, Interpretation, and Labeling

The seminal study of cultural dimensions is Hofstede’s work. Hofstede (1980) analyzed data collected between 1967 and 1973 by IBM headquarters staff to measure employee morale in forty
nations distributed widely throughout the world. Sample sizes ranged from 37 to 4,691 respondents per country. Subsequently Hofstede added ten countries and three geographical regions to his data bank. The country scores on each cultural dimension for the fifty-three cultural units are reported in Hofstede and Bond (1988). The data sets consist of questionnaire responses relevant to the following four theoretical constructs.

**Power distance** is the degree to which less powerful members of a society accept a hierarchical or unequal distribution of power in organizations and in the society. **Uncertainty avoidance** is the degree to which members of a given society feel uncomfortable in unstructured, ambiguous, and uncertain situations and have created beliefs, norms, and institutions that are intended to minimize the occurrence of or cope with such situations. Individualism versus collectivism describes at its individualist pole the degree to which individuals function independently of each other and are expected to look after themselves and their immediate families and at its collectivist pole the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups that are expected to look after these individuals in exchange for loyalty to the group. **Masculinity versus femininity** is the final scale. High scores on this scale indicate an individualist orientation in cultural entities. **Masculinity versus femininity** is the final scale. High scores on this scale indicate the degree to which members of cultural entities look favorably on assertive, aggressive, competitive, and materialist behavior and striving for success. Low scores indicate the degree to which members value supportive behavior, nurturance, care, and service and endorse gender role differentiation and discrimination.

Hofstede selected these four dimensions because of their theoretical implications and relationships to organizational behavior phenomena. More specifically, the power distance construct was derived from prior research on power sharing and participative management. The uncertainty avoidance construct was derived from prior organizational studies that dealt with bureaucratization and formalization of organizational practices. The individualism-collectivism and masculinity-femininity constructs have a long-standing history in the theoretical, anthropological, and cross-cultural psychology literature (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Triandis, 1995) and are fundamental to anthropological inquiry.

Hofstede formulated the power distance and uncertainty avoidance constructs on the basis of theoretical reasoning. The individualism-collectivism and masculinity-femininity constructs were derived statistically from ecological factor analysis of fourteen items drawn from the IBM questionnaire. Because the IBM morale survey had of course not been designed to provide measures of these four theoretical constructs, some compromises were necessarily made in the development of the scales.

Ecological factor analysis assumes that the mean of the individual responses is representative of the population studied in the respective cultural unit. Further, both the individual scores and their means are assumed to be normally distributed. Ecological factor analysis also assumes that the variance of individual scores within cultural units will be significantly lower than the variance of all individual scores and lower than the variance of the mean scores of the cultural units. To our knowledge, investigators who have used ecological factor analysis have not demonstrated that their data have met these assumptions.

Hofstede's power distance and individualism scales correlated −.7 (p < .01) Uncertainty avoidance correlated with power distance and individualism .28 and −.35, respectively (p < .05). Despite the fact that his scales were not independent, he chose to retain them as indicators of conceptually different constructs. He noted (1980, p. 316) that correlations among his scales varied widely depending on whether the countries sampled were wealthy or poor. These differential correlations support the argument for distinguishing between the constructs.

In *Culture's Consequences*, Hofstede (1980) reviewed thirteen survey studies that included between five and nineteen countries. The findings from each of these studies were shown to be significantly correlated, in the theoretically expected direction, with at least one of the four Hofstede dimensions. Hofstede also lists thirty country-level indicators such as country economic growth and population size. Many of these correlated significantly with at least one of his four dimensions. He showed that studies that dealt with constructs similar to those he measured were consistent with his findings, thus attesting to the validity of his measures. Subsequently Hofstede and Bond (1988) reported mean data relevant to the original four dimensions from another ten countries and three geographical
regions as well as data relevant to a fifth dimension for nineteen of the countries in his fifty-three-country data set.

Hofstede advanced several theoretical interpretations that went well beyond mere description of his findings. With respect to leadership, Hofstede and Bond (1988) state:

Both Power Distance and Individualism affect the type of leadership most likely to be effective in a country. The ideal leader in a culture in which power distances are small would be a resourceful democrat; on the other hand, the ideal leader in a culture in which Power Distances are large is a benevolent autocrat (or “good father”). In Collectivist cultures, leadership should respect and encourage employees’ group loyalties; incentives should be given collectively, and their distribution should be left up to the group. In Individualist cultures, people can be moved around as individuals, and incentives should be given to individuals [p. 14].

Thus, in total, the major findings of Hofstede’s first (1980) and subsequent (Hofstede and Bond, 1988) research concern the relative rankings of the fifty-three nations according to their scores on each of the four theoretical dimensions.

Hofstede’s research has not escaped criticism. Although we do not agree with all of the criticisms, we review them here for the sake of completeness. First, the scales are criticized because of their item composition, because they are not independent, and because some critics believe they are inappropriately labeled (Dorfman & Howell, 1988; Jaeger, 1986; Robinson, 1983; Triandis, 1982).

Second, the face validity of the items is not always apparent, that is, some of the items do not appear to measure the constructs to which they were assigned. Dorfman and Howell (1988) note that the uncertainty avoidance (UA) scale is composed of items that reflect seemingly disparate constructs: level of perceived stress, length of time the individual believes he or she will work for the present company, and beliefs regarding whether rules should be broken. We see little relationship between stress and uncertainty avoidance as a parent construct—perhaps as a consequence, but not as a descriptor.

In our opinion the item composition of the individualism-collectivism scale is also suspect. This scale includes physical conditions, use of skills, and training opportunities as valued work goals. Because these items are not stated explicitly as group goals they reflect individualist more than collectivist job attributes, yet they are negatively related to individualism and used as indicators of collectivism. Consequently, it is difficult to determine what is measured by this scale.

Interestingly, the individualism-collectivism scale contains only items relevant to respondents’ preferred job goals. The remaining three scales contain items describing employees’ intentions of continuing in the company, fear of their supervisors, concerns about their job environment, or attitudes about various aspects of their organization or their work. It is not clear how these different questionnaire referents affected employee responses or whether they elicited unknown response biases, such as lenient, central, or extreme response tendencies.

A third criticism is that because the data are based on responses of predominantly middle-class male employees from one international firm, the representativeness and generalizability of the findings may be limited. The findings may tell us more about IBM than about the countries studied, more about IBM organizational practices than about the cultures of the nations in which the data were collected. Further, no tests of between-county functional equivalence of items or scales are reported.

However, the socioeconomic and organizational homogeneity of the sample is also a strength in that it provides some control for variations in organizational practices, assuming that IBM organizational practices are relatively uniform throughout the world. However, to attribute differences in national cultures to differences in scores based on IBM employee responses is to ignore the non-organizational components of national populations and possibly differences in the way the IBM units varied across nations. It is possible that presumed sample homogeneity may have been gained at the expense of having country score differences that do not represent true country differences. Thus Hofstede’s findings are ambiguous due to possible inappropriate item composition of his scales and to data collected from a single firm.

Independent replications of Hofstede’s country rankings would attest to the robustness of the four dimensions. This has been achieved to some extent by a number of studies (some of which are described in Table 20.1: Morris, Davis, & Allen, 1994; Ralston,
Hofstede’s theory asserts that behavior of individual members of nations will usually be congruent with the values endorsed by the members as a group. Several independent studies conducted at approximately the same time or shortly after Hofstede’s data were collected show that individuals in countries ranked high by Hofstede on power distance and collectivism accept and respond more positively to authoritarian leadership styles than do individuals from low power distance and high individualism nations (Al-Hajeh, 1984; Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979; Deyo, 1978; Dorfman & Howell, 1988; Kennis, 1977; Stening & Wong, 1983).

Members of countries that scored as collectivist have subsequently been shown in independent studies to engage in collectivist behavior, placing a high value on group maintenance, paternalism, in-group loyalty and harmony, treatment of in-group members with dignity, face saving among in-group members, and nonconfrontational and peaceful resolution of conflict (Beatty, McCune, & Beatty, 1988; Castaldi & Sorrentino, 1988; Leung, 1985; Smith, 1984; Weiss & Bloom, 1990). Of particular interest is the heavy emphasis placed by Asian managers on group maintenance activities (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979; Bolon and Crain, 1985; Fukuda, 1983; Ivancevich, Schweiger, & Ragan, 1986).

Hofstede’s uncertainty avoidance scores are associated with less risky entry into foreign markets (Kogut & Singh, 1988). Zarzeski (1996) has shown countries ranked by Hofstede as low on uncertainty avoidance publish higher disclosure of financial data in general, even for domestic firms. Countries scoring high on Hofstede’s individualism have been shown in independent studies to prefer individual- rather than group-based compensation practices (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979; Beatty, McCune, & Beatty, 1988; Dorfman & Howell, 1988) and to exhibit greater willingness to take risks (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979; Hornstein, 1986; Ronen, 1986). Finally, several recent studies also have findings consistent with theoretical predictions given Hofstede’s ratings (Gerstner & Day, 1994; Peterson et al., 1995; Smith et al., 1994; Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Paterson, & Bond, 1989; Smith, Peterson, & Misumi, 1994; Smith & Peterson, 1994). Their findings not only replicate Hofstede’s country rankings with relatively small samples of selected countries and selected dimensions but indicate substantial temporal stability (over more than twenty-five years) of the ranking of countries by cultural dimensions.

Two reasons are likely to account for the robustness of Hofstede’s findings. First, the theoretical variables are well conceived and relate to four of the fundamental social problems of human beings. Second, the data are aggregated to the level of within-country means. The higher the level of aggregation the more likely scores are to have significant and high correlation with other aggregated variables such as those employed by almost all of the studies cited in this connection. Further, the higher the level of aggregation, the lower the effects of fluctuations of single environmental forces on the aggregated scores.

**Some Lingering Doubts**

Three studies have failed to demonstrate consistency with Hofstede’s dimensions even though they included multiple items relevant to those dimensions (Ng et al., 1982; Chinese Culture Connection, 1987; Gerstner & Day, 1994). And the first two of these studies identified dimensions that correlate with Hofstede’s dimensions in a manner opposite to theoretical expectations. Gerstner and Day (1994) failed to find a dimension analogous to the masculinity-femininity dimension, despite the fact that their questionnaire included many items that would be expected to form an independent dimension. Ng et al. (1982) used a modified form of the Rokeach Value Survey to obtain ratings of values endorsed by fifty female and fifty male psychology students in each of ten “cultural groups” in nine counties representing six languages. A discriminate function analysis of the students’ responses yielded four functions.

Hofstede and Bond (1984) used the Ng et al. data in an attempt to validate the Hofstede dimensions. Taking the six countries in the Ng et al. data that overlapped with Hofstede’s 1980 sample, they first examined the correspondence between the two
studies. Three of the four discriminant functions found by Ng et al. correlated highly with Hofstede’s four dimensions. Function 1 correlated with power distance, and function 3 correlated with individualism. However, function 2 correlated with uncertainty avoidance as well as masculinity. Function 4 did not correlate with any of the Hofstede dimensions. Thus, although Hofstede and Bond (1984) could show some support for individualism and power distance, the other two dimensions did not emerge as separate dimensions. Next, Hofstede and Bond performed several factor analyses on the Ng et al. data, and found a five-factor solution to be the most interpretable. Four of the five factors correlated strongly with Hofstede’s four dimensions, serving to partially replicate Hofstede’s extraction of those four dimensions.

The concurrence of Ng et al.’s data with Hofstede’s dimensions is not without problems. First, in the discriminate analysis, the high correlation of function 3 with two of Hofstede’s dimensions could be explained by a sizable correlation between these two dimensions ($r(MAS \times UAI) = .64$ for the six countries, Hofstede & Bond, 1984, p. 423). This finding may be sample specific. However, it does suggest some possible ambiguity and confounding in the distinction between masculinity-femininity and uncertainty avoidance scales. Second, as Hofstede and Bond note, the positive loading of the item “independence” on a factor they label “femininity” is inconsistent with the theoretical expectation and prior findings that indicate that this item should load negatively on this factor. Hofstede and Bond (1984) attribute this anomalous finding to inaccurate translation. No evidence of faulty translation is provided however.

The most interesting contribution of Ng et al., however, is that their data consistently pointed to something beyond four dimensions, even though they had stopped with extraction of four discriminate functions. Hofstede and Bond’s analysis (1984) showed that three of those four functions correlated with the Hofstede dimensions. What was the fourth? It is plausible that they would have found a four-factor solution to be the most interpretable, had it not been for the fact that the uncorrelated factor emerged as the first, and not the fifth, factor. The following values had high loadings on this factor: world of peace, equality, pleasure, accomplishment, self-determination, and freedom.

Because this factor is different from any of the four Hofstede dimensions, Hofstede and Bond (1984) suggested social desirability bias as an explanation—albeit not a satisfactory one—for its emergence. They observe correctly that turning a ranking task into a rating instrument, as Ng et al. did with the Rokeach Value Survey, makes response set bias possible, and they argue that a social desirability bias would come to the fore. They ignore the possibility that the same bias would likely be present in the other factors as a result of similar item formatting—ratings rather than rankings. If the items that loaded on the first factor are susceptible to response set bias, then why not “courageous,” “capable” (second factor), “self-controlled,” “self-respect” (third factor), “cheerful,” “polite,” “comfortable life” (fourth factor), and “world of beauty” (fifth factor) as well? In addition, Hofstede and Bond’s explanation (1984) that social desirability bias may be reflected particularly in the case of the first factor establishes that factor as a legitimate dimension demanding a label, because as Hofstede (1980, p. 20) previously argued, social desirability is “part and parcel of the phenomena studied in cross-cultural research.” The first factor, then, cannot be dismissed as a result of social desirability bias.

A third study relevant to the measurement of cultural entities is reported by the Chinese Culture Connection (CCC) (1987), organized by Bond. The CCC is a network of twenty-two social scientists interested in cross-cultural research. Bond’s concern was that the Hofstede dimensions might not capture important values held by Asians because the IBM questionnaire that supplied Hofstede’s data was developed by IBM headquarters staff who might have had a strong Western bias. Bond asked a number of social scientists to prepare a list of at least ten “fundamental and basic values for Chinese people.” These social scientists were presumably China scholars, but this is not so indicated in the CCC’s 1987 article. After substantial translation, review, editing, and rewording, a forty-item questionnaire was settled on. Entitled the Chinese Value Survey (CVS), it was administered to fifty male and fifty female students in each of the twenty-two countries represented by members of the CCC. Factor analyses of the responses produced four factors: integration, humanheartedness, moral discipline, and Confucian work dynamic (CWD). Hofstede and Bond (1988) interpret the first
Table 20.2. Associations Among the Hofstede Dimensions; the Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars Dimensions; and the CVS Dimensions Across Twenty Nations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Beta (Direction Cosines)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. (CVS-I) integration</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. (CVS-II) Confucian work dynamism</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (CVS-III) human heartedness</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (CVS-IV) moral discipline</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (Hofstede) power distance</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. (Hofstede) uncertainty avoidance</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (Hofstede) individualism-collectivism</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. (Hofstede) masculinity-femininity</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. (Smith) conservative-egalitarian</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. (Smith) utilitarian-loyal commitment</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. (Smith) dimension_{III} (not labeled)</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
period from 1965 to 1985 across all twenty-two countries in the CCG sample. Four of the Five Asian Dragons—Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea—held the top positions on the CWD scale, and these countries also enjoyed the most economic growth over the period under consideration. The CWD scale consists of eight items: persistence, ordering relationships by status and observing the order, thrift, having a sense of shame, personal steadiness and stability, protecting one's face, respect for tradition, and reciprocation of favors, gifts, and greetings. The first four items load positively on the CWD scale and the last four items load negatively. Thus for samples scoring high on this scale the positively loaded values are of most importance, and for samples scoring low the negatively loaded values are of most importance.

Although recognizing that the CWD values are also found in Brazil and India and are therefore not exclusively Confucian, Hofstede and Bond (1988) label this scale the Confucian Work Dynamic scale because the values expressed in the items can be traced back to the teachings of Confucius. They argue that this scale reflects support for entrepreneurship in the countries scoring high on it and that Westerners would find the values expressed in this scale foreign.

Hofstede and Bond (1988) go on to explain how each positively loaded item reflects cultural support for entrepreneurial behavior. Persistence and thrift facilitate entrepreneurial effectiveness, ordering relationships by status and observing the order makes it easier to be entrepreneurial, having a sense of shame supports interrelatedness through sensitivity to social contacts. They also argue that the items loading negatively on the CWD scale impede entrepreneurial behavior. Reciprocation of greetings, gifts, and favors places manners and politeness over business performance. Saving face inhibits business-oriented behavior, and stability and steadiness inhibits innovation and change. Respect for tradition inhibits innovation and change. This last item appears to contradict the assertion that ordering relationships by status and observing order facilitates entrepreneurial behavior.

Other than this latter apparent contradiction, their explanation is quite plausible. It is very likely that the CWD scale does reflect societal support of entrepreneurial behavior in the societies that score high on it. However, Hofstede and Bond do not report the correlation between CWD and annual growth of gross national product: rather, they show that the top few countries on the CWD scale also have high growth rates.

We computed this correlation. Taking CWD scores from Exhibit 2 in Hofstede and Bond (1988) and GNP and growth rate figures in their Exhibit 1, we first computed the rank order correlation between CWD score rankings and annual GNP growth rate (1965 to 1985) rankings. The rank order correlation is .69 (p < .01). This correlation is based on the thirteen countries for which Hofstede and Bond provided adequate data. However, growth rates are also influenced by baseline figures: high growth rates are easier to obtain when baseline values are low. The rank order correlation between baseline GNP (1965) and country economic growth rate is a significant −.52, as expected (p < .05). Also, the correlation between baseline GNP (1965) and CWD is −.74. To measure the association between CWD and GNP growth rate, we therefore need to partial out the association between CWD and the GNP base (1965). The semipartial correlation of growth rate with CWD, with the effect of base rate removed, is .45 (p slightly greater than .10). In other words, the incremental variance in annual GNP growth rate explained by CWD scores is about 21 percent (correlation squared).

McClelland (1961) found a very similar phenomenon—the achievement motive—which is also related to economic growth. Southwood has examined a host of variables and found four to be significantly related to economic growth, and a reanalysis of McClelland’s original data by Southwood (McClelland, 1976) demonstrated that the achievement motive remains significantly predictive of economic growth even when these four additional variables are included in a prediction regression equation. The four variables are the population of the country in 1961, percentage of the population against which discrimination is practiced, occupational opportunity, and an index of open political competition. Achievement motivation enters the regression first and remains significant through the final step when other variables fail to contribute additionally to the variance accounted for in rates of growth. In the light of this evidence, it is interesting to explore the association between achievement motivation and CWD.

The achievement motive is characterized by the behavioral expression of setting challenging goals, risk taking, being persistent, and using feedback in the interest of performance. Highly
achievement-motivated individuals tend to be entrepreneurial and not to be concerned with tradition or convention, protection of face, or social reciprocation. Thus the behavioral expression of achievement motivation is quite similar to the value syndrome described by the CWD scale. This similarity suggests that achievement motivation and CWD are tapping a similar phenomenon, an entrepreneurial societal orientation.

The achievement motive has traditionally been assumed to be a highly individualist motive reflecting constructive self-interest and described by Weber ([1924] 1947) as the Protestant work ethic. However, interestingly, CWD is not associated with the individualism pole of Hofstede’s individualism-collectivism scale. In fact a recent study by Yeh and Lawrence (1995) rather strongly suggests that the opposite is true. These investigators related the CWD scores reported by Hofstede and Bond (1988) to economic growth data, paying particular attention to outliers. They found that the link between cultural dimensions and economic growth did not hold for Pakistan. After Pakistan was removed from the data set, the original correlation between individualism and CWD of −.47 was found to increase to a highly significant −.70 (p < .01). The CWD and GNP relationship must be considered with caution due to the limited sample size of thirteen countries. This finding does suggest, however, that CWD may be measuring a particular kind of societal achievement orientation—one that is collectively rather than individually based. This interpretation is intriguing in that it allows for diverse manifestations of achievement motivation: individualist in Western individually oriented societies and collectivist in Eastern collectively oriented societies.

Although the findings reported by Hofstede remain somewhat ambiguous due to the item composition of his scales and the three contradictory studies reviewed above, Culture’s Consequences is a major contribution to the cross-cultural organizational behavior and leadership literature. Despite the criticisms of Hofstede’s scales and their psychometric and interpretative limitations, the consistency of the findings reviewed here cannot be dismissed.

The facts that the findings of many independent studies are consistent with Hofstede’s rankings, that several studies are consistent with his theoretical predictions, and that his findings have temporal stability are remarkable. The theoretical robustness of his constructs and the fact that he used aggregated scores of country values largely overcomes the interpretive and item composition limitations of his scales. As can be seen in Table 20.1 and from our review, despite the limitations discussed here his findings continue to have long-term predictive validity in a substantial number of studies conducted as long as twenty-five years after the IBM data were collected.

Hofstede is perhaps the most widely cited author in the cross-cultural organizational behavior literature. For example, he is the fourth most frequently cited in the Journal of International Business Studies from 1983 through 1993 (Chandy & Williams, 1994). Hofstede’s research has stimulated many additional studies, so many in fact that his theoretical formulations and his research have stimulated the emergence of a new and important literature.

The Nature of Collectivism: The Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars Forty-Three-Country Study

Another study that has relevance for the measurement of cultural values is that of Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996). This study is described here in modest detail because of its substantial contribution. This study is based on questionnaire responses of employees from forty-three countries. Sample sizes ranged from 29 to 1,212. Twenty-four percent of the employees studied were clerical or manual workers. Fifty-four percent were managers or professional employees, predominantly the former. The remainder could not be categorized for lack of information, making the sample composition ambiguous. In addition to many of the nations included in Hofstede’s original work, this sample includes several Eastern European countries. The country samples were not matched; however, statistical analyses indicated that demographic heterogeneity of samples did not influence the findings.

The first set of questionnaire items was intended to measure various phenomena expected to yield information about individualist versus collectivist nations: universalist versus particularist obligations, status-based versus ascriptive achievement, paternalism versus nonpaternalism, utilitarian versus affective commitment to groups or organizations, and collectivist versus individualist ways in which individuals relate to work organizations and superiors.
The items took the form of dilemmas in a forced-choice format, except for the achievement-ascription items, which had a Likert-type format.

A second set of forty items referred to four additional dimensions postulated by Trompenaars (1985) to differentiate cultural units: locus of control, time perspective, affectivity-neutrality, and preference for specific versus diffuse social relationships. The dimensionality and psychometric properties of these items were not assessed.

Thirty-nine items were subjected to multidimensional scaling based on pooled individual responses. The results revealed two readily interpretable dimensions and a third dimension that is less interpretable though correlated with measures from previous research. The first dimension, egalitarianism versus conservatism, measures a tendency toward low paternalism, status based on achievement, and universalism. Countries that value ascription, particularism, and paternalism lie at the low end of the scale. The second dimension is utilitarian versus loyal involvement. Items composing this dimension describe contrasting bases of individual involvement in a group or organization: instrumental considerations versus affective considerations of loyalty. High scores on this dimension indicate high loyal-affective involvement and commitment to groups or organizations. These first and second dimensions correlated −.85. The third dimension, which is not labeled, consists predominantly of items that had high loadings on the other two dimensions and consequently is not interpretable and is not a psychologically sound or useful dimension.

Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996) report multiple regressions in which their three dimensions are regressed on several variables. They find that life expectancy, literacy, per-capita income, socioeconomic status, percentage of agricultural workers, percentage of Christians, mean age, and percentage of men are country sample variables that have multiple correlations with the three dimensions ranging from .51 to .80. Clearly, mean country responses to the Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars questionnaire are rather strongly associated with a number of important other variables.

Referring again to Table 20.2, it can be seen that countries scoring toward the egalitarian end of Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars's first dimension enjoy a high degree of integration (CVS-1)—harmony, solidarity, trust, noncompetitiveness, and friendship. They also tend to be conservative, though not committed to family or ancestral piety, patriotism, or enforcement of female chastity. Egalitarian countries also tend to be somewhat low on CVS-II, the Confucian work dynamic. They do not endorse being thrifty, persistent, and steady, having a sense of shame, and maintaining orderly relationships, and they do endorse being concerned about tradition, face saving, and social reciprocation. Further, egalitarian countries are moderately low on CVS-IV, moral discipline—showing moderation, purity, suppression or avoidance of desires, and disinterest and being nonadaptable and not concerned with prudent judgment.

These associations suggest that people in countries with high egalitarian scores are likely to have less life stress because of the supportiveness and harmony likely found in their environments, the freedom from authoritarian control over their lives, and the lack of compulsion and rigidity likely associated with their low scores on the moral discipline dimension. Consistent with this speculation, Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996) found that the following variables had small but positive relationships with egalitarianism, as revealed by their multi-dimensional scaling solution: life expectancy (beta coefficient: .25), log of per-capita income (.32), literacy rate (.22), and percentage of sample having high socioeconomic status (.34).

On the whole, Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars conclude that their results indicate a great deal of replicability in previous cross-cultural studies. They are referring to the recurring findings of various operationalizations of individualism versus collectivism, and they conclude that the greatest yield of cross-cultural research concerns the individualism-collectivism distinction. The uncertainty avoidance and masculinity dimensions were not revealed in their analysis, but that is not surprising given that their measures were not designed to tap these dimensions, though the dimensions had, curiously enough, been included in their hypotheses.

The major contribution of this study is that it provides information with which to better understand the nature of collectivism. It suggests that seven rather important constructs on which individually oriented collectivities are likely to differ from collectively
oriented collectivities are integration, utilitarian versus affective commitment based on loyalty, Confucian work dynamism, status-based versus ascriptive achievement, particularism versus universalism, power distance, and collectivism. Smith, Duggan, and Trompenaars’s findings suggest an integrative reconceptualization of the individualism-collectivism dimension that includes a number of constructs not previously incorporated in the same research design. We suggest that measures of these constructs be included in future large-sample studies and that for the sake of precision and parsimony second-order ecological factor analyses be conducted to determine the most appropriate grouping of these constructs into higher-order constructs.

**Emic Versus Etic Leader Behaviors**

Most cross-cultural leadership studies operationalize leadership with a set of questionnaire items. These items are assumed to reflect genotypic leader behaviors, that is, behaviors assumed to be genetic to leadership and to vary across cultural entities. Such behaviors are referred to in cross-cultural literature as *etic*—they are to some extent common to all cultural entities.

Misumi (1985) has argued that different genotypic behaviors need to be operationalized differently, according to the manner in which they are expressed in each culture. Thus he argues for both genotypic (*etic*) and phenotypic (*emic*) behaviors. Research by Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Paterson, and Bond (1989) demonstrates the efficacy of following Misumi’s suggestion with respect to leader behavior constructs oriented toward performance (P) and maintenance (M). These constructs concern task- and person-oriented behavior and are similar to the Ohio State Leader Initiating Structure and Consideration constructs, respectively. The study is based on questionnaire responses of supervisors from six electronics-producing companies in Britain, Hong Kong, Japan, and Korea. Smith, Peterson, Misumi, and Bond (1992) demonstrated that a select set of questionnaire items were etic in the sense that similar factor structures representing the P and M constructs emerged in each of the four countries. Several other items reflected emic (culture-specific) manifestations of the more general etic P and M constructs. Different emic items were shown to correlate differentially across countries with the etic P and M factors.

For example, these two questions were found to be etic M items in the sense that they were shown to load on M factors in all four countries: Does your superior try to understand your viewpoint? Does your superior treat you fairly? Specific items associated with the etic M factor in Japan described supervisors as speaking about a subordinate’s personal difficulties with others in his or her absence rather than face to face and as sending written memos. In contrast, specific emic items associated with the etic M factor in the U.S. described supervisors as being consultative and participative and as not sending written memos. From these examples it can be seen that the specific behaviors viewed as person oriented (M) differ markedly but in ways that are understandable within each setting. Avoidance of direct confrontation by use of third parties and written memos reflect the emphasis in Japanese culture on harmony and face-saving. Consultation, participation, and avoidance of written memos reflect the egalitarian and informal culture of the United States. Smith, Peterson, Misumi, and Bond (1992) found both etic and emic items for the performance orientation (P) as well.

Using both etic constructs and emic measures has the advantage of more precise measurement. It allows investigators to relate emic items to etic constructs and to describe leadership as it is uniquely manifested in each cultural unit studied. Therefore it should be appropriate for applied purposes such as training or organizational development efforts.

**Some Theoretical Propositions**

Our review suggests three theoretical propositions that enjoy considerable empirical support.

**The Cultural Congruence Proposition**

The *cultural congruence* proposition asserts that cultural forces affect the kind of leader behavior that is usually accepted, enacted, and effective within a collectivity. Accordingly, behavior that is
consistent with collective values will be more acceptable and effective than behavior that represents conflicting values. This hypothesis is taken as an article of faith among culture theorists. The empirical evidence strongly supports this hypothesis. Here are several examples.

As shown in our discussion of measuring cultural dimensions, when nations have high power distance and collectivism scores, individuals in those nations experience a tendency toward behaviors that are consistent with these high national scores. Highly collectively oriented cultures place a high value on group maintenance, paternalism, in-group loyalty and harmony, treating in-group members with dignity, and engaging in face-saving among in-group members and nonconfrontational peaceful resolution of conflict. Of particular interest is Asian managers’ heavy emphasis on paternalism (Dorfman & Howell, 1988; Farmer & Richman, 1965) and group maintenance activities (Bass, Burger, Doktor, & Barrett, 1979; Bolon & Crain, 1985; Ivancevich, Schweiger, & Ragan, 1986). These findings are consistent with Hofstede’s rankings of countries on individualism-collectivism.

Hofstede’s uncertainty avoidance scores are associated with less risky entry into foreign markets and fuller disclosure of accounting information. The level of achievement motivation reflected in grammar school books was found to be predictive of entrepreneurial behavior twenty-five years later. In individualist societies, people prefer individual rather than group-based compensation practices and exhibit greater willingness to take risks. Thus the cultural congruence proposition is well supported.

A corollary of the cultural congruence proposition is that violation of cultural norms by leaders or managers will result in dissatisfaction, conflict, and resistance on the part of followers or subordinates and, at times, lower performance of leaders, their work units, and their subordinates. Anecdotal examples from the literature on expatriate adjustment illustrate lower productivity and satisfaction when collective norms and expatriate values conflict (Lindsay & Dempsey, 1985; Weiss & Bloom, 1990). An illustration of this line of research concerns leadership requirements for implementing quality-control teams in the United States as compared to Japan. Japanese managers emphasize socioemotional orientation, involvement, loyalty, and cooperation. In contrast, U.S. managers are less inclined toward these behaviors and at times violate cultural norms to implement quality control practices (Miskin & Gmelch, 1985).

The Cultural Difference Proposition

Juxtaposed to the cultural congruence proposition is the cultural difference proposition. According to this proposition, increased task performance of followers, organizations, and institutions in societies will be induced by the introduction of selected values, techniques, and behavior patterns that are different from those commonly valued in the society. The rationale for this hypothesis is that by being different with respect to some behaviors, leaders introduce more changes of the kind required for innovation and performance improvement.

Several examples of minority groups leading the way to industrialization, business development, and entrepreneurship illustrate this hypothesis: consider the Methodists in England, the Protestant Huguenots in France prior to the Edict of Nantes, and the Cubans in the United States who fled from Cuban communism. These groups and their leaders acted and behaved in ways that were largely outside the cultural norms of their respective larger societies but were also effective in business development.

Thus it appears that leaders make a difference by being different with respect to some leader behaviors. No research has been conducted to determine the precise leader behaviors associated with such improvement. We hypothesize that the leader behaviors associated with breakthrough improvement in organizations and societies are often those also associated with the introduction of constructive change, such as articulating a vision of a different way of life and communicating high performance expectations and confidence in followers.

The Near Universality of Leader Behaviors Proposition

The near universality of leader behaviors proposition asserts that some leader behaviors are universally or nearly universally accepted and effective. Despite wide-ranging differences in cultural norms across countries studied, there is some support for this proposition.
Bass, Burger, Doktor, and Barrett (1979) found that managers from twelve culturally diverse countries indicated a desire to get work done while using less authority. Similarly, Smith and Peterson (1994) found that managers in twenty-five countries reported satisfaction with events for which they were delegated substantial discretion. Transformational leadership has been found to be acceptable and effective in Canada (Bass & Avolio, 1995; Howell & Frost, 1989), India (Pereira, 1987), Japan (Bass, 1997), the Netherlands (Koene, Pennings, & Schreuder, 1991), and Singapore (Koh, Terborg, & Steers, 1991) as well as the United States (Bass & Avolio, 1993). And Bass (1997) argues that the three components of transformational leadership are near universal: charisma, intellectual stimulation of followers, and individualized consideration toward followers. Bass reports that although some fine tuning may be required, on all continents people’s ideal leader is transformational, not transactional. He asserts that transformational leadership is more effective than contingent reward which in turn is more effective than managing by exception, and that laissez faire leadership is contraindicated. It should be noted that Bass’s measures operationalize leader behaviors as rather etic items. It is likely that his constructs will be enacted differentially in an emic manner from one cultural entity to another. For example, charismatic leadership may be enacted in a highly assertive manner, as in the case of John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King Jr., Theodore Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill, or in a quiet, nonaggressive manner, as in the case of Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, and Mother Teresa. All these leaders, however, displayed charisma, in that they articulated an ideological message, set a personal example of the values inherent in their message, conveyed a high sense of confidence in self, and were in turn highly respected and trusted by their followers.

Support for the near universality of future-oriented and inspirational leader behaviors is provided by interpretative interview and focus group research in thirty-eight countries and by questionnaire pilot study samples from fifty countries involved in the GLOBE study. The universality or near universality of these leader behaviors remains to be established with more rigorous research, larger samples, and emic as well as etic measures, however.

There is reason to suspect that several leadership behaviors that might be universally acceptable and effective have never been widely introduced to the members of many societies. When individuals have never experienced such leader behaviors, it may be difficult for them to express a preference for these behaviors and unrealistic of researchers to expect such preferences. This conclusion is supported Bass, Burger, Doktor, and Barrett (1979), who showed that despite the relatively high power distance orientation of the French (Hofstede, 1980), French managers who experienced democratically oriented management by their superiors expressed a desire to work for such managers again.

Some Unresolved Issues

In this section we discuss several controversial issues yet to be resolved.

Magnitude of Cultural Effects

The first issue concerns the magnitude of the effect of cultural influences. In traditional culture theory, differences in psychological commonalities between cultural entities are believed to account for significant amounts of variance in a wide range of individuals’ behaviors (Hofstede, 1980; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Triandis, 1995) and organizations’ practices (Hall & Hall, 1987; Hofstede, 1980; Schein, 1985). Although the studies reviewed here provide support for this position with respect to leadership, it is not clear just how much variance is accounted for by differences in such psychological properties as assumptions, values, beliefs, meanings, social identities, and motives (Dorfman, 1996). A meta-analysis to address this question would be a useful contribution.

Further, despite the abundance of evidence in support of the cultural congruence proposition, there remains the question of how external forces such as international competition, military aggression, international political conflict, economic environment, technology, and physical climate influence cultural norms, artifacts, beliefs, individual behaviors, organizational practices, and other variables assumed to be reflections of cultural differences. It may well be that after controlling for such external variables,
psychological commonalities may account for much less variance in other relevant variables such as leader attributes and behavior than is commonly assumed.

There also remains the question of how much variance in organizational practices and leader behaviors is accounted for by specific task and environmental influences. The strategic contingency theory of organizations asserts that organizational form is strongly influenced by the size of organizations, their technologies, their strategies, and the stability of their environments (Donaldson, 1999). Accordingly, it may well be that such variables directly influence leaders’ strategic decision-making processes as well as their day-to-day behavior without influencing cultural norms, identities, motives, and shared meanings. The relative amount of variance in the emergence, acceptance, and effectiveness of leader behavior accounted for by psychological commonalities versus strategic contingency variables remains to be determined. Further, military, economic, technological, political, and competitive forces possibly influence organizations as much as psychological commonalities. Such forces may enhance, dampen, or nullify the influence of psychological commonalities among members of cultural units on some important organizational practices and leadership-related variables.

**Relationships Among Critical Variables**

A second issue to be resolved concerns the relationships between within-unit psychological commonalities, organizational structure and management practices, and leader behavior. There is substantial evidence that organizational structure and practices influence the behavior of organizational members (Mintzberg, 1979). We found only two studies that investigated the relationship between psychological commonalities and organizational structure, practices, form, or effectiveness: Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohay, and Sanders (1990) and Morris, Davis, and Allen (1994). Neither revealed a significant relationship between country or organizational unit scores on Hofstede’s dimensions of culture and respondents’ descriptions of organizational practices. The possibility that externally imposed variables or strategic contingency variables mute the effects of shared cultural beliefs and values as measured by Hofstede’s scales is given some credence by these two studies. It remains unclear how and for what kinds of management practices psychological commonalities within cultural entities have a non-trivial influence. It is also not clear how organizational structure and practices and psychological commonalities interact to influence leadership-related variables. Clearly, cross-cultural explanations of leadership and organizational behavior need to include consideration of the possibility that external forces directly affect behavior without the intervening influence of shared cultural psychological variables.

**Culture and Leadership**

A third issue requiring attention concerns the influence of cultural forces on local conceptions of leadership, the social status of leaders, and the amount of influence granted to leaders. In some nations, leaders are romanticized and glorified. For example, in the Arab countries and in France, Germany, Russia, and the United States one finds frequent public symbols such as statues and pictures of leaders or buildings and streets named in recognition and commemoration of leaders. Qualitative research conducted by the first author of this chapter suggests that in these countries leaders and managers are granted substantial influence over a wide variety of political and economic policies and practices. In contrast, in the Netherlands, Sweden, Austria, and German-speaking Switzerland, there is a marked absence of public symbols that attest to the greatness of leaders. In these countries, leaders and managers are granted relatively little influence. Thus within cultural entities psychological commonalities very likely enhance or constrain leaders and their influence and leadership-related variables differentially. Unfortunately, there is little systematic evidence that shows how such commonalities might evolve or the mechanisms by which cultural entities might enhance or constrain the exercise of leadership or the effectiveness of leaders.

**Cultural Processes**

The fourth issue concerns many scholars’ assertion that cultural entities influence the values of their members and that these
values, once internalized, influence members’ behavior. However, the processes by which cultural entities affect member psychological states and behavior are not clear. Values are cognitively based judgments of the appropriateness or worth of entities, events, behaviors, and outcomes. As such, they are very similar to attitudes. In fact, Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996) refer to values as attitudes. However, there is little substantial systematic evidence that demonstrates relationships between attitudes and generalized global behavior patterns such as leadership styles, friendship patterns, or child-rearing practices. Attitudes specifically related to specific behaviors are predictive of such behavior in the short term in response to very specific stimuli and incentives but often not predictive of generalized stable global behavior patterns such as leadership styles (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1970). For example, several interviewees expressed to the first author of this chapter the sentiment that “leadership” is a phenomenon that conflicts with Dutch egalitarian values and that charismatic leadership would be especially suspect and ineffective in the Netherlands. Despite these sentiments, Koene, Pennings, and Schreuder (1991) found in a longitudinal study of large supermarkets that charismatic leadership had positive effects on employee performance and more pervasive effects than either considerate or directive leadership.

It could be argued that research on attitudinal-behavioral relationships casts serious doubt on the assertion that values expressed in interviews or questionnaire responses influence behavior. There are at least three competing processes that might have produced the findings we reviewed for the cultural congruence and cultural difference propositions.

One explanation of the effects of cultural forces on individual behavior is that psychological commonalities influence the valence individuals place on behaviors and events. Valences in turn influence behavioral intentions, which influence manifest behavior. There is some evidence to support this explanation. Bond and Leung (1993) showed that country differences accounted for significant variance in the valence individuals place on selected outcomes and that valences in turn influence their behavioral intentions. Lee and Green (1990) found similar effects of country differences on behavioral intentions. This explanation is somewhat weak, however, because it is well established that behavioral intentions predict behavior primarily in the short run and that myriad circumstances can attenuate the relationship between behavioral intentions and enacted behavior. Further, as stated earlier, behavioral intentions predict discrete behaviors and not global behavior patterns such as leadership styles. Additionally, as the length of time between the formulation of behavioral intentions and action increases, or when environmental conditions change or interfere with behavioral enactment of intentions, the intention-behavior relationship is also attenuated (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1970).

A second explanation of the effects of cultural forces on individual behavior is that expressions of values in responses to questionnaires represent agreed-on norms rather than respondent attitudes. Thus it may be that important common experiences result in agreed-upon norms and that members are influenced by norm enforcement, resulting in the tyranny of the majority rather than individual volition. For example, at one time in Polynesian villages, individuals who had violated cultural norms were forced to stand before members of the village, who collectively decided the appropriate remedial action or punishment. The offender subsequently complied but as a result of the coercion of the majority, not as a result of internalized values.

A third explanation of the effects of cultural forces on individual behavior may be that common experiences affect nonconscious motivation and that it is such motivation that influences behavior rather than conscious values. As we stated, McClelland (1961) demonstrated that expressions of achievement motivation in children’s literature are predictive of economic development of nations. Achievement motivation thus expressed was assumed by McClelland to be a collectively stressed nonconscious motive. Thus there is the question whether cognitive value orientation, coercive norm enforcement, nonconscious motivation, or all three of these processes are affected by cultural influences and account for differential behavior across cultural entities.

Sampling

The fourth unresolved issue concerns sampling. Of necessity most cross-cultural research uses convenience sampling rather than some form of systematic sampling. This often results in unmatched
samples and samples of varying sizes, with, for example, as few as thirty-seven and twenty-nine respondents in countries studied by Hofstede (1980) and Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996), respectively. Heterogeneous samples and samples of unequal size reduce a study’s ability to identify differences in cultural entities. We urge cross-cultural investigators to at least attempt to obtain comparable samples in terms of size and demographic variables. Smith and his associates in their large-sample country studies have successfully used demographic variables to control for cultural heterogeneity.

Unmatched samples may be affected by a host of possible confounds: informant demographic variables; subcultural variations; informants socialized to different degrees in cultural values and beliefs; varying exposure to international communication and competition; disparate organizational settings, industry types, and sectors (profit versus nonprofit); and different government regulations imposed on organizations. Although it is impossible to control for all of these confounding variables by matched sampling, it is advisable to attempt to randomize their effect by collecting data from a large number of cultural units and also by collecting data that can be used to statistically control for such confounds.

Surprisingly, when the number of samples is relatively large, unmatched samples appear to be sufficiently robust to overcome a nontrivial amount of variance due to differential confounding influences. Table 20.1 describes several studies based on unmatched samples that yielded significant country effects despite their sample heterogeneity. Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996) demonstrated that the substantial demographic heterogeneity of the forty-three samples they studied did not affect their results. Evidently, confounding variables due to nonmatched samples and external influences can be canceled out in large-sample studies. Studies with smaller samples, in contrast, are especially susceptible to such confounds, and differences in dependent variables found by studies that compare only two cultural entities can never be attributed to cultural differences.

**Limitations of Informants’ Ability**

The final unresolved issue concerns respondents’ ability to provide valid interview or questionnaire information if they have not had relevant experiences. In some cultures it is likely that most individuals have experiences with only a limited range of leader behaviors. Asking them to select their preferences from broad range of leader attributes or behaviors may yield responses that have little to do with how these informants will actually respond to these kinds of leader behaviors. In contrast, it is possible that unobtrusive measures and aggregated measures of nonconscious motives may be better predictors of the kinds of leader behavior that will be commonly expected, accepted, and effective. We speculate that culturally different preferences for selected leader behaviors might diminish once the broad range of such behavior is introduced. We are reminded of this observation from Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer movie studio founder Louis B. Mayer: “The public cannot tell you what they want in a movie until they see it.” Recall that a study by Koene, Pennings, and Schreuder (1991) showed that despite proclamations that charismatic leadership is not welcome in the Netherlands, charismatic leadership had greater positive effects on organizational performance than did leader support or initiating structure behavior.

**Theoretical Perspectives**

This section proposes a theoretical framework that we hope will be useful for investigators of cross-cultural leadership phenomena. The framework is an integration of several theoretical perspectives: implicit leadership theory (Lord & Maher, 1991), value/belief theory of culture (Hofstede, 1980), implicit motivation theory (McClelland, 1985), and strategic contingency theory of organizations (Donaldson, 1993). The relevant and essential features of each theory are briefly described in the following paragraphs. We then present an integration of selected aspects of each theory as our theoretical framework.

**Implicit Leadership Theory**

According to implicit leadership theory, individuals have implicit theories (stereotypes, beliefs, convictions, and assumptions) about the attributes and behaviors that distinguish leaders from non-leaders, moral from evil leaders, and effective from ineffective leaders. Implicit theories influence the values individuals place on
selected leader behaviors and attributes and the motives of individuals relevant to acceptance and enactment of leader behavior. Implicit leadership theory asserts that individuals are attributed leadership qualities and then accepted as leaders on the basis of the degree of fit, or congruence, between the leader behaviors they enact and the implicit leadership theory held by the attributers. The better the fit, the more leadership ability is attributed to the individual and the more the leader is accepted by the attributers.

Implicit leadership theories jointly held by members of cultural entities are hypothesized to constrain, moderate, or facilitate the exercise of leadership, the acceptance of leaders, and the perception of leaders as influential, acceptable, and effective. There is substantial evidence in support of this hypothesis (Lord & Maher, 1991). Because members of cultural entities share values, beliefs, assumptions, social identities, meanings, and motives, they are likely to have very similar implicit theories of leadership. To the extent that implicit leadership theories vary across cultural units, they are likely to differentially constrain, moderate, or facilitate all aspects of leadership, including the status granted to leaders, the influence leaders are perceived to have, what is expected of leaders, the degree of compliance with leaders’ influence attempts, and the general acceptance of the leaders and their behavior.

**Value-Belief Theory**

Value-belief theory is the theory favored by most cross-cultural scholars (Hofstede, 1980; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Triandis, 1995). It asserts that the values and beliefs held by members of collectivities influence the behavior of individuals and the degree to which selected behaviors are viewed as legitimate, acceptable, and effective. Value-belief theory implies that external cultural forces influence individual values, which in turn influence behavioral intentions, which are then enacted behaviorally (Leung & Bond, 1993).

**Implicit Motivation Theory**

Implicit motivation theory is the theory of nonconscious motives originally advanced by McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, and Lowell (1953). In its most general form the theory asserts that the essential nature of human motivation can be understood in terms of three implicit (nonconscious) motives: achievement, affiliation, and power (social influence). In contrast to behavioral intentions and conscious values, which are predictive of discrete task behaviors for short periods of time under constant situational forces (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1970), implicit motives are predictive of motive arousal in the presence of selected stimuli, spontaneous behavior in the absence of motive arousal stimuli, and long-term (as long as twenty years) individual global behavior patterns such as patterns of social relationships, citizenship behavior, family practices, and leadership styles.

Substantial evidence supports these assertions (McClelland, 1985; McClelland & Boyatzis, 1982; McClelland, Koestner, & Weinberger, 1989; Spangler, 1992). Further, McClelland (1961) has demonstrated the cross-cultural relevance of implicit motivation theory. And as already described, he has found that expressions of achievement motivation stressed in children’s literature are predictive of the long-term economic development of nations measured twenty-five years later.

In addition to considerable supporting evidence concerning individual motivation (McClelland, 1985), the theory’s relevance to leadership also has empirical support. Three concurrent correlational studies (House, Delbecq, & Taras, 1996; McClelland & Burnham, 1976; Messalum & House, 1996) and four longitudinal studies (House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; McClelland & Boyatzis, 1982; Winter, 1978, 1991) show that implicit motivation theory is predictive of managerial effectiveness or success. (The studies by McClelland and Boyatzis, 1982, and Winter, 1991, are based on the same sample.)

**Strategic Contingency Theory of Organizations**

The strategic contingency theory of organizations (Donaldson, 1993) asserts that four strategic contingencies affect organizational form. They are the strategy, size, and technology of an organization and the environment in which that organization functions. According to this theory organizational structure must be adapted to the demands of the organization’s strategic contingencies.
Accordingly, for effective performance, structure must reflect the degree to which these strategic contingencies call for flexible or inflexible behavior, an integrated or fragmented response to environments, and a short- or long-term orientation. The choices made here become the strategic requirements of organizational behavior. Organizational forms that do not provide the resources and coordination needed by their strategic requirements will be ineffective. Further, according to strategic contingency theory, organizational formalization inevitably increases with size.

We integrate strategic contingency theory with the other leadership theories we have discussed by asserting that leader behaviors must be in accordance with the strategic requirements of organizations. Thus organizations with long-term, high-risk strategies require leaders with long-term orientation who take high-risk decisions. Organizations such as churches, political organizations, and organizations producing goods and services with implications for the welfare of their constituencies require strategies with strong ideological orientations and require leaders who behave in accordance with the value implications of these strategies. For example, pharmaceutical producers and producers of medical supplies require leaders whose behavior reflects the values inherent in health services. National military organizations require leaders whose behavior reflects national patriotism. Political organizations require leaders whose behavior reflects the values of their constituencies.

**An Integrated Theoretical Framework**

We have integrated the theoretical perspectives presented here into a theoretical framework intended to facilitate future cross-cultural development of theory and empirical investigation. Figure 20.1 shows the integrated framework in the form of a systems causal loop diagram. Our integrated theory describes the process by which cultural variables, leader behavior, and organizational practices interact to influence organizational effectiveness. Following are the major assertions of the theory.

1. Important common experiences involving history, religion, ethnic heritage, international competition, or physical climate result in common assumptions, values, beliefs, meanings, social identities, and motives shared by members of cultural entities.
These are the shared variables we refer to as psychological commonalities (arrow A in Figure 20.1).

2. These psychological commonalities result in socialization of members and provide incentives, cues, guidance, constraints, and reinforcements for selected behaviors and organizational practices.

3. Joint psychological commonalities endowed by members of cultural entities bestow shared meaning on leader attributes and behaviors and on organizational practices. They provide meaning in the sense that selected leader behaviors and organizational practices are understood in a particular way in each collectivity.

4. Psychological commonalities take on the status of collective norms, which are socially learned, communicated, and enforced by members of cultural entities. These norms are macro- (collectivity-) level variables that guide individual behavior and the evaluation of such behavior (arrow B).

5. The collective norms result in implicit theories of organizing and leadership held by members of the cultural entities (arrows C and D).

6. These implicit theories are predictive of differential organizational practices and global leader behavior patterns that are favored or disfavored within cultural entities. Cultural entities that favor achievement motivation, for example, will favor the patterns and practices that emphasize performance excellence, choice of challenging tasks, intermediate risk taking, use of information to measure progress toward goal attainment, and persistence in pursuit of goals (McClelland, 1985).

7. The leader behavior patterns and organizational practices favored in a collectivity will be those most frequently enacted and reinforced in that collectivity (arrows E and F).

8. Leaders will influence organizational practices by adjusting such practices to their preferred global leader behavior pattern and to the role demands imposed by organizational contingencies (arrow G).

9. Organizational practices will influence global leader behavior patterns by providing incentives, reinforcements, and constraints for selected leader behaviors (arrow H).

10. Strategic organizational contingencies will influence leader behavior by imposing role demands on leaders (arrow I).

11. The shared norms will be enforced by members of the collectivity (arrows J and K).

12. The greater the fit between leader behaviors enacted by persons in positions of authority and the implicit theory of leadership held by organizational members, the more the members will accept the leader (indicated by the joint interaction of arrows L and M).

13. The greater the fit between leader behaviors enacted by persons in positions of authority and the role demands of the strategic organizational contingencies these leaders manage, the more organizationally appropriate will be the leaders’ behavior (indicated by the joint interaction of arrows N and O).

14. The greater the acceptance of the leader (in interaction with the appropriateness of the leader’s behavior), the more the leader will be effective (indicated by the joining of arrows P and Q).

15–21. A similar process occurs with respect to organizational practices (indicated by arrows R through W).

22. Acceptance of leaders is in part a function of the acceptability of organizational practices because leaders represent their organizations to organizational members and enforce organizational practices (arrow X).

23. Acceptance of organizational practices is in part a function of the acceptability of the leader also because leaders represent their organizations to organizational members and enforce organizational practices (arrow Y).

24. Effectiveness of organizations is a function of the interaction of the organizational practices effectiveness and leader effectiveness (indicated by the joining of arrows Z and Z').

Some Further Comments on Methodology

Research methodology for cross-cultural research has been discussed competently by a number of authors (Adler, 1986; Adler, Campbell, & Laurent, 1989; Brislin, 1970; Brislin, Lonner, & Thorndike, 1973; Deutscher, 1973; England & Itzhak, 1983; Green & White, 1976; Hofstede, Bond, & Luk, 1993; Leung & Bond, 1989; Mitchell, 1973; Nasir, Al-Daeij, Ebrahimi, & Thibodeaux, 1991; Nath, 1969; Peng, Peterson, & Shyi, 1991; Roberts & Boyacigiller, 1984; Ueno & Sekaran, 1992). Following is a brief discussion of...
some methodological issues that are relevant to cross-cultural investigations but that have been given little attention in the cross-cultural leadership literature.

Cross-cultural comparisons are greatly assisted when the variables under investigation are quantified. There are six measurement instruments designed specifically for this purpose: the Value Survey Module (VSM) (Hofstede, 1980), the Chinese Value Survey (CVS) (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987), the Culture Perspectives Questionnaire (CPQ) (Maznevski & DiStefano, 1995), the instrument used by Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996) and discussed previously, the Culture Dimension Questionnaire (Dorfman, 1988), and the GLOBE questionnaire designed to measure dimensions of values, beliefs, and practices at the societal and organizational levels of analysis and also valued leader attributes and behaviors.

In the study by Chinese Culture Connection (1987), the CVS yielded four factors, as described previously. As can be seen from Table 20.1, this scale discriminates between cultural entities (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987; Ralston, Gustafson, Elsass, Cheung, & Terpstra, 1992). The PD and UA scales of the VMS have been shown to discriminate between country samples (Shackleton & Ali, 1990). Although these two instruments appear to have face validity, to our knowledge to date no other psychometric properties relevant to them have been reported. Of course there may be reports we could not find or that are as yet unpublished.

The CPQ is designed to measure the dimensions of culture advocated by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) at the organizational level of analysis. Maznevski and DiStefano (1995) argue that various combinations of cultural dimensions suggested by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck can be combined to yield Hofstede’s four dimensions. After substantial pilot testing and revision Maznevski and DiStefano administered a seventy-eight-item questionnaire to 355 respondents in four countries. They found that within each scale different configurations of items make the most internally consistent set for different countries. Nevertheless their most recent version of the questionnaire yielded promising within-country Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients, generally exceeding .60. They also found that thirty-three out of forty-four comparisons of eleven scales administered in each of the four countries significantly discriminated between countries. Finally, factor analyses showed that most of their scales were unidimensional. Thus these scales, although still in the developmental stage, show substantial promise for the measurement of cross-cultural phenomena and will likely become useful to predict organizational and leader-related phenomena cross-culturally.

Dorfman and Howell (1988) developed a questionnaire called the Culture Dimension Survey, which measures at the individual level respondents’ identification with Hofstede’s four cultural dimensions as well as a fifth dimension—paternalism. Successive refinements of the questionnaire have resulted in a twenty-nine item instrument with alphas over .70 for all subscales. The usefulness of this questionnaire is demonstrated in the study reported by Dorfman and Howell (1988).

The instruments developed as part of the GLOBE program measure Hofstede’s four dimensions plus humane orientation, performance orientation, and long versus short-term orientation. The humane orientation scale is likely to measure the same phenomena as the CVS human heartedness scale. The performance and long versus short-term orientation scales combined are likely to be analogous to the CVS Confucian work dynamic scale, that is, measures of cultural support for entrepreneurship. Additionally, GLOBE scales were developed to measure the same constructs at the organizational and the leader levels of analysis. These scales measure practices as well as values and beliefs. Finally, several additional dimensions of leader attributes and behavior are also measured by the GLOBE questionnaire.

Extensive psychometric analyses based on samples of respondents in thirty-two countries were used to develop the scales. The findings were replicated on samples of respondents in an additional eighteen countries. Several goodness-of-fit indices demonstrated congruence between the first and second sample dimensions. These findings indicate that use of the scales as aggregate measures of cultural phenomena is justified. With the exception of three scales that require further development, all the GLOBE scales have been demonstrated to be unidimensional and to be scalable with generalizability coefficients (interclass ICC-KK correlations) of .80 or greater. The generalizability coefficients indicate combined inter-item scale reliabilities, within-country
response agreement, and between-country differences. The psychometric properties of the GLOBE scales indicate that they can meaningfully measure differences between cultural units in terms of leadership behavior and societal and organizational practices, values, and beliefs.

Although additional instrument development is still required, it is clear that the study of cross-cultural leadership is becoming more rigorous and that psychometrically sound instruments are now available to measure many of the constructs we have discussed here.

The Need for Triangulation

Qualitative data can be collected through focus groups, interviews, participant observation, and unobtrusive measures based on cultural artifacts or media narratives. When such information is systematically content analyzed and coded into quantitative categories, or levels, it can either validate other measures or, with other measures, form an index of the dimensions under study.

One problem with existing cross-cultural comparisons is that most studies are based on a single measure of each of the variables investigated. With single variable measurement researchers can never be sure what biases are associated with a measure. The findings may be due to biases inherent in the method of data collection rather than to true variation of the variables under investigation. Further, reliance on a single method may make findings method bound, that is, reproducible only when the same method is used. To avoid these problems we strongly suggest that investigators use at least two and preferably three or more methods to assess the variables they investigate. Interview, questionnaire, focus group—and participant observation—based data are subject to the biases of those who provide information and those who collect it. Unobtrusive measures are measures that do not rely on people to report data (Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, & Sechrest, 1966). When adequately operationalized, unobtrusive measures can be relatively free of such biases. Following are some interesting examples of unobtrusive measures of selected dimensions of cultures.

Individualism is likely indicated by the proportion of individuals in a society who are left-handed. This proportion varies across cultural units from about 8 to 15 percent (Triandis, 1995). Presumably, the lower percentages reflect less tolerance in parents for a child’s individualism. Compared to parents in individualist countries, parents in collectivist countries are hypothesized to put more pressure on left-handed children to make them right-handed.

Power distance might be measured by the number of titles and hierarchical levels among domestic help hired by wealthy individuals. For example, researchers might find such titles as head cook, kitchen helper, butler, handyman (or woman), chief housekeeper, housekeeper or maid, and the like in highly powered stratified societies and few such titles in societies characterized by low power distance.

An unobtrusive measure of tolerance of uncertainty might be the average age of top executive officers in the industries studied. In organizations and societies that have low tolerance for uncertainty one would expect the average age of high-level managers to be quite high because age is revered and assumed to be associated with long experience and wisdom.

Three possible candidates for unobtrusive measures of achievement motivation are the proportion of entrepreneurial firms in each collectivity studied, the number of new business start-ups, and the relative amount of resources devoted to occupational education. Two unobtrusive measures of gender discrimination might be the percentage of women who drive automobiles and the percentage of women in high-level organizational positions in each cultural entity.

An unobtrusive measure of any major variable might be the number of words used in the cultural entity to describe that variable. This number might indicate the dimension’s cultural importance. In Iran there are forty different words indicating different kinds of rice, for example. To measure some cultural dimensions, a researcher could select three or four key words for each one. For example power, authority, control, and dominance might be used as key words for the measurement of power distance. Uncertainty, vagueness, equivocality, and ambiguity might be used as key words for uncertainty avoidance. The investigator could consult a
culture's two most prominent thesauruses and count the number of synonyms and antonyms for each key word. The total number of synonyms and antonyms could then be used to indicate the prominence of the dimension under consideration.

These few speculative examples give a flavor of how unobtrusive measures might be used to measure theoretical cultural dimensions. Some other candidates for unobtrusive measures of cultural dimensions appear in the following list.

**Candidates for Unobtrusive Measures**

- Intolerance of uncertainty
  - Mean age of chief executive officers
  - Existence and enforcement of rules
  - Life insurance penetration controlling for level of disposable income
  - Eating practices (advance preparation and announcements)
  - Public transportation (adherence to schedule, publication of schedules)
  - Work practices (adherence to schedule, existence and enforcement of rules)

- Power stratification
  - Distribution of wealth
  - Number of job titles
  - Centralization of decision making
  - Public symbols of leaders
  - Eating practices (status-related eating places, who eats with whom)
  - Public transportation (reserved places for selected minorities)
  - Work practices (number of hierarchical levels, span of control, work space allocation, perquisite allocation, differential attire according to status, use of titles)
  - Modes of address reflecting status equality or differences

- Individualism-collectivism
  - Left-handedness (reflecting pressure toward conformity)
  - Prevalence of extended families

- Sports and entertainment practices
  - Last child predominantly male (except China)
  - Eating practices (collective food purchasing, communal dishes, and sharing)
  - Transportation practices (shared versus individualized)
  - Work practices (job design—team versus individual, allocation of responsibilities, collaborative effort)

- Gender-role differentiation
  - Percentage of females in high positions
  - Characteristics of national heroes
  - Characteristics of heroes in myths and stories
  - Work practices (gender distribution for high- and low-status positions, gender differentiation and discrimination, tolerance of sexual harassment)
  - Female versus male literacy

- Humane orientation
  - Treatment of minorities
  - Prison practices
  - Treatment of poor
  - Quality of food and eating places for the elderly, poor, imprisoned
  - Public transportation (affordability or reduced rates for poor, elderly)
  - Work practices

- Future orientation
  - Research and development expenditures
  - Planning practices (short- versus long-term)
  - Investment practices
  - Tax incentives for investment
  - Eating practices (inverse of fat, sugar, alcohol consumption)
  - Work practices (planning, preparation, employee development)

- Performance orientation
  - New business start-ups per year
  - Tax incentives for new businesses
Some Criteria for the Use of Unobtrusive Measures

For unobtrusive measures to be useful they must reflect the construct for which they are considered to be an indicator. Thus it is necessary to validate such measures. Validation can be conducted by asking members of collectivities to interpret the meaning of the candidates for unobtrusive measures. Structured and coded (quantified) interviews and focus groups are appropriate for such investigation. Expert informants can also be asked to sort candidates for unobtrusive measures into theoretical classifications of cultural entities, a procedure known as Q sorting. In the GLOBE study approximately 80 percent consensus on the allocation of twenty-seven such measures was attained with respect to all of the cultural dimensions previously described except uncertainty avoidance. Expert informants agreed on only three indicators of uncertainty avoidance.

Another requirement for the use of unobtrusive measures is availability. Publicly available information is the most easily obtained. Unfortunately some countries do not make public the information necessary to operationalize a given unobtrusive measure.

A third requirement is that researchers must verify that unobtrusive measures reflect the current situation or the recent past. For example, using the number of public symbols that commemorate or recognize leaders as an indicator of power distance is valid only when these symbols reflect current sentiments toward leaders.

Other Sources of Information: Cultural Leaks

A major source of useful information is symbols. Language consists of symbols. Words, phrases, aphorisms, titles, or slogans can be used to gain cultural insights. Difficulties in word or phrase translations are also clues to unique aspects of cultural units. Words unique to a cultural entity say something about that collectivity. Words from one cultural unit that have no equivalent in another cultural unit say something about the differences between the two. Recurring incidents, routines, or commonly practiced activities that present difficulties or surprises to an outsider or that take on a different meaning in different cultural entities convey useful information for interpreting cultural norms and forces. Unique rituals, symbols, myths, and ceremonies also reveal differences. Another source of useful information, is history—history of leaders, history of the economy and political system, history of the industries studied, history of dominant organizations, and history of words, especially words that are unique to the particular society, industry, or organization studied.

Linguistic anthropologist Michael Agar refers to all these sources of information about collectivities as "cultural leaks." The meanings embedded in a cultural entity leak through in the form of unobtrusive measures, critical incidents, difficulties of translation, symbols, and history, making that entity understandable.

Conclusion

Cultural differences in societies and in organizations are asserted to account for significant amounts of variance in individuals' expectations and assumptions about their environment, attitudes toward others, modes of social interaction, expressions of emotions and global behavior patterns, and reactions to others. We refer to this assertion as the cultural pervasiveness proposition. It is this bedrock assumption on which the enterprise of cross-cultural research and theory building rests. In this chapter, we reviewed the evidence relevant to this proposition, with specific reference to individuals in positions of leadership and individuals who exert or try to exert leadership.

As we have shown, the evidence in support of this proposition is rather massive, even though the existing research to identify the variables and dimensions of cultures is far from complete and many unresolved issues remain. To start with, the construct of culture has eluded precise definition. Further, it is even arguable whether the construct known as culture is viable for the study of large complex social-economic-political collectivities consisting of multiple ethnic or religious subgroups with different histories, ethnic backgrounds, and languages. The processes by which cultural forces influence the members of collectivities, the appropriate
ways of measuring cultural phenomena, the scope and domain of
cultural effects, and the moderating influence of such external
variables as international competition, military aggression, politi-
cal pressures, and technological forces remain to be explicited theo-
retically and investigated empirically.

Our first conclusion with respect to the effects of cultural in-
fluences on leadership is that the magnitude of cultural influences
varies by kind of leader behavior under consideration. As shown
earlier, there are some classes of leader behaviors that are diffe-
rentially influenced by cultural forces and some that are rather
universal with respect to the frequency of their enactment (Smith,
Misumi, Tayeb, Paterson, & Bond, 1989) and their effectiveness
(Dorfman, Howell, Hibino, Lee, Tate, & Bautista, 1997). Addition-
al research is needed to determine which leader behaviors are
etic, which are emic, and how etic behaviors are manifested
emically.

In this chapter we have suggested a theoretical framework to
guide cross-cultural leadership theory and investigation. We have
advanced a set of competing hypotheses and believe that tests of
these hypotheses will shed light on many currently unresolved is-
ues. We have also argued for a particular methodological ap-
proach for future empirical investigation—triangulation through
multiple measures of cultural phenomena.

We are interested in both etic and emic phenomena. With re-
spect to etic phenomena we seek to identify falsifiable nomothetic
(law-like) statements on which theories of cross-cultural phenom-
ena can be built. Nomothetic research is directed toward the dis-
cov ery of behavioral regularities, global behavior patterns, and
law-like relationships among important variables. We believe this
approach will help explain and predict such phenomena and be
useful in resolving many of the issues we have specified here.

We recognize the difficulties in establishing functional equiva-
lences among meanings of words, symbols, and cultural artifacts.
However, we chose to view these difficulties as challenges rather
than insurmountable obstacles, believing that the recently devel-
oped statistical modeling methods we have discussed make it pos-
sible to assess degrees of convergence of meaning.

We recognize that not everything is subject to quantification
and that there are other ways of knowing—poetry, ascetic appre-
ciation, wisdom, experience, intuition, and empathy, for example.
However, we choose the nomothetic approach because we believe
it is a scientifically defensible way of understanding cross-cultural
phenomena. We also believe that case studies, ethnographic re-
search, and other qualitative research approaches can provide use-
ful insights, enhance understanding of specific cultural entities, and
generate theoretical hypotheses and prescriptive assertions to be
tested qualitatively. And we have proposed both emic- and etic-
directed research to further understanding of cultural differences.
This issue is currently being investigated as part of the GLOBE re-
search program. Finally, we believe that if cultural entities are un-
derstood, explained, and described in terms of both etic and emic
variables it will be possible for researchers and practitioners to as-
sist individuals in adjusting to cultural units other than their own
and it will also be possible to make useful prescriptive contributions
to the improvement of the quality of the human condition.

Note
1. The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness
Program (GLOBE) is a cross-cultural research program involving
154 investigators in research teams in sixty nations from all major
geographical regions of the world. Although the present chapter is
not a product of GLOBE, some of its contents will appear in subse-
quent GLOBE publications.
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