# CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONS: PROJECT GLOBE

Robert J. House, Paul J. Hanges, S. Antonio Ruiz-Quintanilla, Peter W. Dorfman, Mansour Javidan, Marcus Dickson, and About 170 GLOBE Country Co-Investigators to be listed by name and institution

Running Head: Project GLOBE

Robert J. House
The Wharton School of Management
University of Pennsylvania

Paul J. Hanges
Department of Psychology
University of Maryland

S. Antonio Ruiz-Quintanilla
New York School of Industrial Labor Relations
Cornell University

Peter W. Dorfman
Department of Management
New Mexico State University

Mansour Javidan
Faculty of Management
Policy and Environmental Area
University of Calgary

Marcus Dickson
Department of Psychology
Wayne State University

Vipin Gupta
Faculty of Business Administration
Fordham University

Add list of 170 authors and their institutions here.

* The authors are indebted to Markus Hauser, University of Zurich, for his thoughtful comments and suggestions relevant to this monograph.

ABSTRACT

GLOBE is both a research program and a social entity. The GLOBE social entity is a network of 170 social scientists and management scholars from 61 cultures throughout the world, working in a coordinated long-term effort to examine the interrelationships between societal culture, organizational culture and practices, and organizational leadership. The meta-goal of the Global Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness (GLOBE) Research Program is to develop an empirically based theory to describe, understand, and predict the impact of cultural variables on leadership and organizational processes and the effectiveness of these processes.

This monograph presents a description of the GLOBE research program and some initial empirical findings resulting from GLOBE research. A central question in this part of the research concerns the extent to which specific leadership attributes and behaviors are universally endorsed as contributing to effective leadership and the extent to which the endorsement of leader attributes and behaviors is culturally contingent.

We identified six global leadership dimensions of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership (CLTs). Preliminary evidence indicates that these dimensions are significantly correlated with isomorphic dimensions of societal and organizational culture. These findings are consistent with the hypothesis that selected cultural differences strongly influence important ways in which people think about leaders and norms concerning the status, influence, and privileges granted to leaders.

The hypothesis that charismatic/value-based leadership would be universally endorsed is strongly supported. Team-oriented leadership is strongly correlated with charismatic/value-based leadership, and also universally endorsed. Humane and participative leadership dimensions are nearly universally endorsed. The endorsement of the remaining global leadership dimensions -- self-protective and autonomous leadership vary by culture.

We identified 21 specific leader attributes and behaviors that are universally viewed as contributing to leadership effectiveness. Eleven of the specific leader characteristics composing the global charismatic/value-based leadership dimension were among these 21 attributes. Eight specific leader characteristic**s** were universally viewed as impediments to leader effectiveness. We also identified 35 specific leader characteristics that are viewed as contributors in some cultures and impediments in other cultures. We present these, as well as other findings, in more detail in this monograph.

A particular strength of the GLOBE research design is the combination of quantitative and qualitative data. Elimination of common method and common source variance is also a strength of the design strategy. Future directions, research strategies, and anticipated contributions are presented in anticipation of continued GLOBE efforts.

# INTRODUCTION

To what extent is leadership culturally contingent? The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program (GLOBE), as well as a substantial amount of other empirical research (House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997), has demonstrated that what is expected of leaders, what leaders may and may not do, and the status and influence bestowed on leaders vary considerably as a result of the cultural forces in the countries or regions in which the leaders function. For instance, Americans, Arabs, Asians, English, Eastern Europeans, French, Germans, Latin Americans, and Russians tend to glorify the concept of leadership and consider it reasonable to discuss leadership in the context of both the political and the organizational arenas. People of the Netherlands and Scandinavia often have distinctly different views of leadership. Consider the following statements taken from interviews with managers from various countries:

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.

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.

Malaysians expect their leaders to behave in a manner that is humble, modest, and dignified.

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.

Does extant empirical research literature confirm the expectations that are implied in the above statements? Because we are just beginning to understand how the role of culture influences leadership and organizational processes, numerous research questions remain unanswered. What characteristics of a society make it more or less susceptible to leadership influence? To what extent do cultural forces influence the expectations that individuals have with respect to the role of leaders and their behavior? To what extent will leadership styles vary in accordance with culturally specific values and expectations? To what extent does culture moderate relationships between organizational processes, organizational form, and organizational effectiveness? What principles and/or laws of leadership and organizational processes transcend cultures?

We do not have comprehensive answers to these questions, but progress has been made in a number of areas (see House, Wright, & Aditya [1997] for an extensive review of relevant leadership literature). This essay describes a programmatic effort undertaken to explore the fascinating and complex effects of culture on leadership and organizational processes

## THE NEED FOR CROSS-CULTURAL LEADERSHIP THEORY AND RESEARCH

Given the increased globalization of industrial organizations and increased interdependencies among nations, the need for better understanding of cultural influences on leadership and organizational practices has never been greater. Situations that leaders and would-be leaders must face are highly complex, constantly changing, and difficult to interpret. More than ever before, managers of international firms face fierce and rapidly changing international

competition. The trend toward the global economic village is clear, and the 21st century may very well become known as the century of the "global world" (McFarland, Senen, & Childress, 1993). Since effective organizational leadership is critical to the success of international operations, this globalization of industrial organizations presents numerous organizational and leadership challenges. For instance, the cultural diversity of employees found in worldwide multinational organizations presents a substantial challenge with respect to the design of multinational organizations and their leadership. What practical knowledge and advice does the management literature provide to assist leaders in adapting to cultural constraints? Unfortunately, though the need for such information clearly exists, little if any help is available at this time (House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997; House & Aditya, 1997). Cross-cultural research and the development of cross-cultural theory are needed to fill this knowledge gap.

From a scientific and theoretical perspective, compelling reasons exist for considering the role of societal and organizational culture in influencing leadership and organizational processes. Because the goal of science is to develop universally valid theories, laws, and principles, there is a need for leadership and organizational theories that transcend cultures. There are inherent limitations in transferring theories across cultures. What works in one culture may not work in another culture. As Triandis (1993) suggests, leadership researchers will be able to "fine-tune" theories by investigating cultural variations as parameters of those theories. In addition, a focus on cross-cultural issues can help researchers uncover new relationships by forcing investigators to include a much broader range of variables often not considered in contemporary theories, such as the importance of religion, language, ethnic background, history, or political systems (Dorfman, 1996). Thus, cross-cultural research may also help to develop new theories of leadership and organizational processes and effectiveness, as well as to fine-tune existing

theories by incorporating cultural variables as antecedents and moderators within existing theoretical frameworks.

While the research literature on cross-cultural leadership has blossomed in the last fifteen years (House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997), it is often atheoretical, fraught with methodological problems, and fragmented across a wide variety of publication outlets (Dorfman, 1996). More important, far more questions than answers exist regarding the culturally contingent aspects of leadership. Project GLOBE is intended to contribute theoretical developments and empirical findings to fill this knowledge deficiency.

## THE GLOBE RESEARCH PROGRAM

The idea of a global research program concerned with leadership and organization practices (form and processes) was conceived in the summer of 1991. In the spring of 1993 a grant proposal was written that followed a substantial literature review and development of a pool of 753 questionnaire items. GLOBE was funded in October 1993, and the recruiting of GLOBE Country Co-Investigators (referred to hereafter as CCIs) began.[1] In this section, we present an overview of Project GLOBE.

GLOBE is a multi-phase, multi-method project in which investigators spanning the world are examining the interrelationships between societal culture, organizational culture, and organizational leadership. One hundred seventy social scientists and management scholars from 61 cultures representing all major regions of the world are engaged in this long-term programmatic series of cross-cultural leadership studies. Table 1 lists the countries in which cultures are being studied as part of the GLOBE research.[2]

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

GLOBE was conceived and initially designed by the first author of this monograph as the Principal Investigator. He was later joined by Michael Agar, Marcus Dickson, Paul Hanges, and S. Antonio Ruiz-Quintanilla as Co-Principal Investigators. Because cross-cultural research requires knowledge of all the cultures being studied, we have developed a network of approximately 170 CCIs who are social scientists or management scholars from around the world . The CCIs, together with the Principal Investigators and Research Associates, constitute the members of the GLOBE community.

The CCIs are responsible for leadership of the project in a specific culture in which they have expertise. Their activities include collecting quantitative and qualitative data, ensuring the accuracy of questionnaire translations, writing country-specific descriptions of their cultures in which they interpret the results of the quantitative data analyses in their own cultural context, and contributing insights from their unique cultural perspectives to the ongoing GLOBE research. In most cases, CCIs are natives of the cultures from which they are collecting data, and in most cases, they reside in that culture. Some of the CCIs are persons with extensive experience in more than one culture. Most cultures have a research team of between two and five CCIs working on the project. The activities of the project as a whole are coordinated by the GLOBE Coordinating Team (GCT).[3] The GCT is also responsible for designing quantitative measures and qualitative methods, performing cross-cultural statistical analyses, and coordinating efforts to present results of the project to the scholarly community. To date, CCIs have made over 80 presentations at professional meetings and over 30 papers and book chapters have been written.

An initial goal of the GLOBE Project was to develop societal and organizational measures of culture and leader attributes that are appropriate to use across all cultures. We have accomplished this in the first phase of the research project. Items were analyzed by conventional

psychometric procedures (e.g., item analysis, factor analysis, generalizability analysis) to establish nine dimensions of societal culture and nine isomorphic dimensions of organizational culture. In addition, as part of the first phase of the project, we were able to identify six underlying dimensions of global leadership patterns that are viewed by managers as contributors or impediments to outstanding leadership. The psychometric properties of these scales exceed conventional standards (Hanges, House, Dickson, Ruiz-Quintanilla, Dorfman & 103 co-authors, 1997, under review).

One of the major questions addressed by GLOBE research concerns the dimensions by which societal and organizational cultures can be measured. We identified nine dimensions of cultures that differentiate societies and organizations. That is, with respect to these dimensions, there is high within-culture and within-organization agreement and high between-culture and between-organization differentiation.

A second major question addressed by GLOBE concerns the extent to which specific leader attributes and behaviors are universally endorsed as contributing to effective leadership, and the extent to which attributes and behaviors are linked to cultural characteristics. We found that cultures can be differentiated on the basis of the leader behaviors and attributes that their members endorse. We also found high within-culture agreement with respect to leader attributes and behaviors that are viewed as contributors or impediments to effective leadership. These leader behaviors and attributes constitute **C**ulturally endorsed implicit **L**eadership **T**heories (CLTs).

We empirically identified six global leader behavior dimensions of CLTs. Two of these dimensions are universally viewed as contributors to effective leadership, one is nearly universally endorsed as a contributor, and one is nearly universally perceived as an impediment

to outstanding leadership. The endorsement of the remaining two dimensions varies by culture. In addition, we identified 21 specific leader attributes or behaviors that are universally viewed as contributors to leadership effectiveness and 8 that are universally viewed as impediments to leader effectiveness. Further, 35 specific leader attributes or behaviors are viewed as contributors in some cultures and impediments in other cultures. We present these, as well as other findings, in more detail below.

Project GLOBE also addresses questions relevant to how societal cultural forces influence organizational form and effectiveness. We describe the research questions, hypotheses, and research design relevant to both leadership and organizational aspects of GLOBE in some detail further on.

Project GLOBE employs both quantitative and qualitative methods to provide richly descriptive, yet scientifically valid, accounts of cultural influences on leadership and organizational processes. Quantitative aspects include measurement of societal culture, organizational culture, and leadership attributes and behaviors. Contemporaneous with the quantitative analysis, qualitative culture-specific research is being conducted in the same cultures. Qualitative culture-specific interpretations of local behaviors, norms, and practices are being developed through content analysis of data derived from interviews, focus groups, and published media.

The planned GLOBE research program consists of four phases. GLOBE Phase 1 was devoted to the development of research instruments. Phase 2 is devoted to assessment of nine dimensions of societal and organizational cultures and tests of hypotheses relevant to the relationships among these cultural dimensions and cultural-level implicit theories of leadership. Phase 2 also concerns relationships between organizational contingencies (size, technology,

environment, and strategy), organizational form and processes, and organizational effectiveness. Phase 2 data collection has been completed. A projected third phase of the research project will investigate the impact and effectiveness of specific leader behaviors and styles on subordinates' attitudes and job performance and on leader effectiveness. Phase 3 will also be directed toward the identification of emic (culture-specific) aspects of leadership and organizational practices, as well as the longitudinal effects of leadership and organizational practices and form on organizational effectiveness. A projected fourth phase will employ field and laboratory experiments to confirm, establish causality, and extend previous findings.

## GLOBE Objectives

The meta-goal of GLOBE is to develop an empirically based theory to describe, understand, and predict the impact of specific cultural variables on leadership and organizational processes and the effectiveness of these processes. Specific objectives include answering the following fundamental questions:

1. Are there leader behaviors, attributes, and organizational practices that are universally accepted and effective across cultures?

2. Are there leader behaviors, attributes, and organizational practices that are accepted and effective in only some cultures?

3. How do attributes of societal and organizational cultures affect the kinds of leader behaviors and organizational practices that are accepted and effective?

4. What is the effect of violating cultural norms relevant to leadership and organizational practices?

5. What is the relative standing of each of the cultures studied on each of the nine core dimensions of culture?

6. Can the universal and culture-specific aspects of leader behaviors, attributes, and organizational practices be explained in terms of an underlying theory that accounts for systematic differences across cultures?

## Construct Definitions of Leadership and Culture

Leadership has been a topic of study for social scientists for much of the 20th century (Yukl, 1994), yet there is no consensually agreed-upon definition of leadership (Bass, 1990). A seemingly endless variety of definitions have been developed, but almost all have at their core the concept of influence--leaders influence others to help accomplish group or organizational objectives. The variety of definitions is appropriate, as the degree of specificity of the definition of leadership should be driven by the purposes of the research. Smith and Bond (1993) specifically note: "If we wish to make statements about universal or etic aspects of social behavior, they need to be phrased in highly abstract ways. Conversely, if we wish to highlight the meaning of these generalizations in specific or emic ways, then we need to refer to more precisely specified events or behaviors" (p. 58). The GLOBE goals are both etic (investigating aspects of leadership and organizational practices that are comparable across cultures) and emic (examining and describing culture-specific differences in leadership and organizational practices and their effectiveness). We recognize and expect that the evaluative and semantic interpretation of the term *leadership*, and the ways in which leadership and organizational processes are enacted, are likely to vary across cultures, but we also expect that some aspects of leadership will be universally endorsed.

In August 1994 the first GLOBE research conference was held at the University of Calgary in Canada. Fifty-four researchers from 38 countries gathered to develop a collective understanding of the project and to initiate its implementation. In this meeting considerable time

was spent generating a working definition of *leadership* that reflected the diverse viewpoints held by GLOBE researchers. A consensus with respect to a 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.* Note that this is a definition of organizational leadership, not leadership in general. Simonton (1994:411), speaking of leadership in general, defines a leader as a "group member whose influence on group attitudes, performance, or decision making greatly exceeds that of the average member of the group." The GLOBE project concerns the phenomenon of organizational leadership, not leadership in general.

As with *leadership*, there is no consensually agreed upon definition among social scientists for the term *culture*. Generally speaking, *culture* is used by social scientists to refer to a set of parameters of collectives that differentiate the collectives from each other in meaningful ways. The focus is on the "sharedness" of cultural indicators among members of the collective. The specific criteria used to differentiate cultures usually depend on the preferences of the investigator and the issues under investigation, and tend to reflect the discipline of the investigator. For the GLOBE research program, we theoretically define *culture* as shared motives, values, beliefs, identities, and interpretations or meanings of significant events that result from common experiences of members of collectives and are transmitted across age generations. Note that these are *psychological* attributes and that this definition can be applied at both the societal and the organizational levels of analysis.

## GLOBE Operational Definition of Culture

The most parsimonious operationalizations of *societal* culture consist of commonly experienced language, ideological belief systems (including religion and political belief

systems), ethnic heritage, and history. Parallel to this, the most parsimonious operationalizations of *organizational* culture consist of commonly used nomenclature within an organization, shared organizational values, and organizational history. For purposes of GLOBE research, therefore, culture is operationally defined by the use of measures reflecting two kinds of cultural manifestations: (a) the commonality (agreement) among members of collectives with respect to the psychological *attributes* specified above; and (b) the commonality of observed and reported *practices* of entities such as families, schools, work organizations, economic and legal systems, and political institutions.

The common cultural attributes we have chosen to measure are indicators of shared modal values of collectives. These values are expressed in response to questionnaire items in the form of judgments of *What Should Be*. Emphasis on values grows out of an anthropological tradition of culture assessment (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). Another measure of culture, modal practices, is measured by indicators assessing *What Is*, or *What Are*, common behaviors, institutional practices, proscriptions and prescriptions. This approach to the assessment of culture grows out of a psychological/behavioral tradition, in which it is assumed that shared values are enacted in behaviors, policies, and practices. This assumption will be tested as part of Project GLOBE.

## The GLOBE Conceptual Model

The theoretical base that guides the GLOBE research program is an integration of implicit leadership theory (Lord & Maher, 1991), value/belief theory of culture (Hofstede, 1980), implicit motivation theory (McClelland, 1985), and structural contingency theory of organizational form and effectiveness (Donaldson, 1993; Hickson, Hinings, McMillan, & Schwitter, 1974). The relevant and essential features of each of these theories are briefly described in the following paragraphs. The integrated theory is then described. For a more detailed description of the integrated theory, see House, Wright, & Aditya (1997).

### Implicit Leadership Theory

According to this theory individuals have implicit theories (beliefs, convictions, and assumptions) about the attributes and behaviors that distinguish leaders from others, effective leaders from ineffective ones, and moral leaders from evil ones. Implicit leadership theories influence the values that individuals place on selected leader behaviors and attributes, and their motives relevant to acceptance and enactment of leader behavior. The following propositions express the major assertions of implicit leadership theory.

1. Leadership qualities are attributed to individuals, and those persons are 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.

2. Implicit leadership theories constrain, moderate, and guide the exercise of leadership, the acceptance of leaders, the perception of leaders as influential, acceptable, and effective, and the degree to which leaders are granted status and privileges. There is substantial experimental evidence in support of this theory (Lord & Maher, 1991; Hanges, Braverman, & Rentsch, 1991; Hanges, Lord, Day, Sipe, Smith, & Brown, 1997; Sipe & Hanges, 1997).

Value/Belief Theory

Hofstede (1980) and Triandis (1995) assert that the values and beliefs held by members of cultures influence the degree to which the behaviors of individuals, groups, and institutions within cultures are enacted, and the degree to which they are viewed as legitimate, acceptable, and effective. Hofstede's version of value/belief theory includes four dimensions of cultural values and beliefs: Individualism versus Collectivism, Masculinity versus Femininity, Tolerance versus Intolerance of Uncertainty, and Power Distance (Stratification) versus Power Equalization. We have substituted two cultural dimensions labeled Gender Egalitarianism and Assertiveness for Hofstede's Masculinity dimension. As explained below we also measured collectivism with two, rather than one, scale. Finally, we have added three additional dimensions: Humanistic, Performance, and Future Orientation. Collectively, the nine dimensions reflect not only the dimensions of Hofstede's theory but also David McClelland's theories of national economic development (McClelland, 1961) and human motivation (McClelland, 1985). The humanism, power distance, and performance orientation of cultures, when measured with operant (behavioral) indicators, are conceptually analogous to the affiliative, power, and achievement motives in McClelland's implicit motivation theory. We believe that the nine core GLOBE dimensions reflect important aspects of the human condition.

Implicit Motivation Theory

Implicit motivation theory is the theory of non-conscious 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 (non-conscious) 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 (a) motive arousal in the presence of selected stimuli, (b) spontaneous behavior in the absence of motive-arousal stimuli, and (c) long-term (as long as twenty years) individual *global behavior patterns*, such as social relationship patterns, citizenship behavior, child-rearing practices, and leadership styles. While McClelland's theory is an individual theory of non-conscious motivation, the GLOBE theory is a theory of motivation resulting from cultural forces.Structural Contingency TheoryThe central proposition of this theory is that the there is a set of demands that are imposed on organizations that must be met if organizations are to survive and be effective. These demands are referred to as organizational contingencies. It is asserted that these contingencies influence organizational form and practice and that congruence between the demands of the contingencies and organizational form and practice is associated with organizational effectiveness. While this is a popular theoretical perspective, its empirical verification is mostly limited to small sample studies of organizations in industrialized countries (Child, 1981). Hickson, Hinings, McMillan & Schwitter (1974) have asserted that the propositions of structural contingency theory are universal and culture-free. This assertion rests on the assumption that organizational contingencies impose demands on organizations that are so strong that it is imperative for all organizations to respond in essentially the same way to them in order to perform effectively and survive in competitive environments. We refer to this assertion as the *task environment imperative*. Child (1981) has presented a serious challenge to this assertion.

The Integrated Theory

A diagram of the integrated theory is presented in Figure 1.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

The Central Theoretical Proposition.

The central theoretical proposition of the integrated theory is that the attributes and entities that distinguish a given culture from other cultures are predictive of the practices of organizations and leader attributes and behaviors that are most frequently enacted, acceptable, and effective in that culture. The integrated theory consists of the following propositions, which are also shown in the system diagram in Figure 1:

1. Societal cultural values and practices affect what leaders do. Substantial empirical evidence supports this assertion (House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997). First, founders of organizations--the organizations' original leaders--are immersed in their own societal culture, and they are most likely to enact the global leader behavior patterns that are favored in that culture. Founders influence the behavior of subordinate leaders and subsequent leaders by use of selective management selection criteria, role modeling, and socialization. Further, the dominant cultural norms endorsed by societal cultures induce global leader behavior patterns and organizational practices that are differentially expected and viewed as legitimate among cultures. Thus, the attributes and behaviors of leaders are, in part, a reflection of the organizational practices, which in turn are a reflection of societal cultures (e.g., Kopelman, Brief, & Guzzo, 1990).

2. Leadership affects organizational form, culture, and practices. Founders of organizations establish the initial culture of their organizations (e.g., Schein, 1992; Schneider, 1987; Schneider, Goldstein, & Smith, 1995), and founders and subsequent leaders continue to influence the organizational culture (e.g., Bass, 1985; Miller & Droge, 1986; Schein, 1992; Yukl, 1994; Thompson & Luthans, 1990).

3. Societal cultural values and practices also affect organizational culture and practices. Societal culture has a direct influence on organizational culture, as the shared meaning that results from the dominant cultural values, beliefs, assumptions, and implicit motives endorsed by culture, results in common implicit leadership theories and implicit organization theories held by members of the culture (e.g., Lord and Maher, 1991; House, Wright, and Aditya, 1997).

4. Organizational culture and practices also affect what leaders do. Over time, founders and subsequent leaders in organizations respond to the organizational culture and alter their behaviors and leader styles (e.g., Schein, 1992; Trice and Beyer, 1984; Lombardo, 1983).

5, 6. Societal culture and organizational form, culture and practices both influence the process by which people come to share implicit theories of leadership. Over time, CLTs are developed in each culture in response to both societal and organizational culture and practices (e.g., Lord & Maher, 1991). CLTs thus differentiate cultures.

7. Strategic organizational contingencies affect organizational form, culture and practices and leader behaviors. Organizational contingencies (size, technology, environment) impose requirements that organizations must meet in order to perform effectively, compete, and survive. Organizational practices are largely directed toward meeting the requirements imposed on organizations by organizational contingencies (Burns & Stalker, 1961; (Donaldson, 1993; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967; Tushman, Newman, & Nadler, 1988).

8. Strategic organizational contingencies affect leader attributes and behavior. Leaders are selected and adjust their behaviors to meet the requirements of organizational contingencies.

9. Relationships between strategic organizational contingencies and organizational form, culture and practices will be moderated by cultural forces. For example, in low uncertainty avoidance cultures we expect that forces toward formalization will be weaker, and therefore the

relationship between such forces and organizational formalization practices will be lower. In low power distance cultures we expect that forces toward centralization of decision making will be weaker and therefore the relationship between such forces and decentralization and delegation practices will be lower. We specify such moderating effects in detail below when we discuss Phase 2 and 3 hypotheses.

10. Leader acceptance is a function of the interaction between CLTs and leader attributes and behaviors. Accordingly, leader attributes and behaviors that are congruent with CLTs will be more accepted than leader attributes and behaviors that are not congruent with CLTs.

11. Leader effectiveness is a function of the interaction between leader attributes and behaviors and organizational contingencies. Leaders who effectively address organizational contingencies will be more effective than leaders who do not.

12. Leader acceptance influences leader effectiveness. Leaders who are not accepted will find it more difficult to influence subordinates than those who are accepted. Thus, leader acceptance facilitates leader effectiveness.

13. Leader effectiveness influences leader acceptance. Leaders who are effective will, in the long run, come to be accepted by all or most subordinates. Subordinates will either be dismissed or voluntarily leave the organization led by leaders they do not accept.

In summary, the attributes and practices that distinguish cultures from each other, as well as strategic organizational contingencies, are predictive of the leader attributes and behaviors, and organizational practices, that are most frequently perceived as acceptable are most frequently enacted, and are most effective.

Cultural Change. Thus far, the theory does not accommodate or account for cultural change. For example, exposure to international media, cross-border commerce, international

political and economic competition, or other forms of cross-cultural interaction may introduce new competitive forces and new common experiences, which may result in changes in any of the culture or leadership variables described above.

Further, when strategic organizational contingencies change as a result of new technological developments or changes in the economic or political environment, new leader behaviors and/or organizational practices that violate cultural norms may be required. These new behaviors and practices, when enacted, will constitute new common experiences, which can in turn result in changes in psychological commonalties and consequently changes in any of the cultural variables described above.

While cultural change can be stimulated by external events and forces, the process of change is hypothesized to be governed by the set of relationships described in the above propositions. There will almost certainly be resistance to new leadership and organizational practices when such practices violate existing collectively shared norms and expectations for leaders (Gagliardi, 1986). Recent work by Hanges and his colleagues on person perception confirms this hypothesis by demonstrating that people resist new leaders when the new leader initially behaves in a manner inconsistent with perceivers' expectations or stereotypes (Hanges, Braverman & Rentsch, 1991; Hanges, Lord, Day, Sipe, Smith & Brown, 1997; Sipe & Hanges, 1997). These laboratory studies have shown that the resistance to acceptance of a new leader is so strong that the functional relationship between leadership perceptions and other variables is nonlinear and discontinuous in nature. Various individual difference variables (e.g., personality, stereotypical attitudes), as well as situational factors (e.g., mental workload, job-context), have been found to increase or diminish this resistance to accept new leaders (Hanges et al., 1997; Sipe & Hanges, 1997). This research suggests that newly introduced practices will often be

modified to accommodate existing norms in an emic manner, and there may be substantial lags in the rate at which changes in the variables of the theory take place.

Substantial additional theoretical development is required to reach a better description of the forces of resistance, the likely resulting conflicts within cultural entities, the time lags and the feedback processes that will occur among the relationships, and the functional form of the relationships depicted in Figure 1. Nevertheless, we advance the theory presented here as a framework to guide investigation of the major relationships and variables relevant to cultural influences on leadership and organizational practices and effectiveness. The theory is depicted in Figure 1 in the form of a systems model. The complexity of the model, however, mitigates against its being tested in its entirety. Rather, individual linkages or subsets of linkages can be tested, and the validity of the model can be inferred from such tests. For a more detailed, fine-grained elaboration of the relationships depicted in Figure 1, see House, Wright, and Aditya (1997).

## TWO FUNDAMENTAL CROSS-CULTURAL ISSUES

Two central aspects of cultures are frequently discussed in the cross-cultural literature: etic aspects and emic aspects. For Project GLOBE, we employ multiple methodologies to assess etic and emic issues.

Etic phenomena are common to all cultures, or at least to all cultures studied to date. A phenomenon is etic if all cultures can be assessed in terms of a common metric with respect to the phenomena. Thus cultures can be compared in terms of etic phenomena. In contrast to etic phenomena, emic phenomena are culture specific phenomena that occur in only a subset of cultures.

## Etic Issues: Cross-cultural Comparisons and Relationships

Project GLOBE employs a number of different methods to make etic comparisons among the cultures included in the GLOBE database. The primary method will be latent constructs that measure the nine core GLOBE dimensions. These constructs are developed from questionnaire responses obtained from middle managers and unobtrusive measures of the dimensions. The industries studied are food processing, financial services, and telecommunications services. Our sampling strategy for the collection of questionnaire data controls for nation, industry, occupation broadly defined (managers), and organizational level broadly defined (middle management). The samples for Phase II, in which hypotheses are tested, are described later on.

Sampling from middle managers permits us to generalize to the subcultures of middle managers in the countries and the three industries studied. This sampling strategy increases the internal validity of the study by ensuring that the units of analysis are well defined and internally homogeneous. We expect the findings to reflect some aspects of the national cultures of the countries represented. Strictly speaking, we are studying the cultures of middle managers in 61 countries. Thus, we must be cautious when making generalizations about national cultures or differences among them because of the specific nature of our sample. As we show below, however, the use of latent constructs each composed of two indicators to measure the nine core GLOBE *As Is* dimensions at the societal level, increases the generalizability of our findings beyond the culture of middle managers alone. And cross-industry analysis will enable us to assess the relative impact of strategic imperatives imposed by industry constraints as well as cultural influences.

## Emic Issues: Country-Specific Information

While the GLOBE quantitative data allow comparisons and contrasts among cultures, they do not allow for emic, or culture-specific, descriptions of the cultures studied. CCIs will describe selected emic attributes and entities of the national setting in which the middle management informants are embedded. The attributes and entities are those that the CCIs judge to have nontrivial influences on the interpretation and practice of leadership and organizational practices of the cultures studied.

CCIs have collected unobtrusive measures and conducted participant observations. They also collected and content-analyzed media and focus group interview transcripts. With these data CCIs are able to describe and interpret selected emic characteristics of their national cultures. Such interpretations will give cognizance to gender, ethnic, and religious diversity, generational differences, and other relevant complexities of the cultures. Thus the complexity and variability of complex cultures with two or more subcultures will be described. These qualitative interpretive analyses will be reported as chapters of a number of anthologies resulting from the GLOBE research program. These chapters will be authored by the local CCI teams.

## CONSTRUCT DEFINITIONS

The major constructs investigated in the GLOBE research program are nine attributes of cultures, which are operationalized as quantitative dimensions: (1) Uncertainty Avoidance, (2) Power Distance, (3) Collectivism I:  Societal Emphasis on Collectivism, (4) Collectivism II: Family Collectivisitc Practices, (5) Gender Egalitarianism, (6) Assertiveness, (7) Future Orientation, (8) Performance Orientation, and (9) Humane Orientation. These dimensions were selected on the basis of a review of the literature relevant to the measurement of culture in previous large-sample studies and on the basis of existing cross-culture theory.

Uncertainty Avoidance is defined as the extent to which members of an organization or society strive to avoid uncertainty by reliance on social norms, rituals, and bureaucratic practices to alleviate the unpredictability of future events.

Power Distance is defined as the degree to which members of an organization or society expect and agree that power should be unequally shared.

Collectivism I reflects the degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action.

Collectivism II reflects the degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty and cohesiveness in their organizations or families.[4]

Gender Egalitarianism is the extent to which an organization or a society minimizes gender role differences.

Assertiveness is the degree to which individuals in organizations or societiesare assertive, confrontational, and aggressive in social relationships.

Future Orientation is the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies engage in future-oriented behaviors such as planning, investing in the future, and delaying gratification.

Performance Orientation refers to the extent to which an organization or society encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence. This dimension is similar to the dimension called Confucian Dynamism by Hofstede and Bond (1988).

Finally, Humane Orientation is the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies encourage and reward individuals for being fair, altruistic, friendly, generous, caring, and kind to others. This dimension is similar to the dimension labeled Kind Heartedness by

Hofstede and Bond (1988). These definitions and examples of questionnaire items for each dimension are presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The first six culture dimensions had their origins in the dimensions of culture identified by Hofstede (1980). The first three scales are intended to reflect the same constructs as Hofstede's dimensions labeled Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance, and Individualism. The Collectivism I dimension measures societal emphasis on collectivism, with low scores reflecting individualistic emphasis and high scores reflecting collectivistic emphasis by means of laws, social programs or institutional practices. The Collectivism II scale measures group (family and/or organization) collectivism – pride in and loyalty to family and/or organization and familyand/or organizational cohesiveness. In lieu of Hofstede's Masculinity dimension, we developed two dimensions labeled Gender Egalitarianism and Assertiveness. Future Orientation is derived from Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) Past, Present, Future Orientation dimension, which focuses on the temporal mode of a society. Performance Orientation was derived from McClelland's work on need for achievement. Humane Orientation has its roots in Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) work on the Human Nature Is Good vs. Human Nature Is Bad dimension, as well as Putnam's (1993) work on the Civic Society and McClelland's (1985) conceptualization of the affiliative motive.

THE FOUR PHASES OF GLOBE

Four phases of empirical research are planned as part of Project GLOBE. Phase 1 has been completed and reported in a monograph by Hanges et al. (1997, under review). Phase 2 questionnaire data collection has also been completed. The analysis of scale properties of the

questionnaire administered to approximately 17,000 middle managers in Phase 2 is also completed. Unobtrusive measures for the nine dimensions have also been developed.

## Phase 1: Scale Development and Validation

In this section, we describe Phases 1 and 2 in modest detail. Phase 1 of GLOBE concerned the development and validation of the GLOBE questionnaire scales designed to measure societal and organizational culture variables as well as CLTs. The GLOBE scales have sound psychometric properties, and findings indicate justification for the use of the scales as aggregate measures of cultural phenomena. All 54 GLOBE scales demonstrated significant and nontrivial within-culture response agreement, between-culture differences, and respectable reliability of response consistency. Generalizability coefficients, which are joint measures of these psychometric properties, exceeds .85 for all scales. These coefficients indicate that the scales can be meaningfully used to measure differences between cultures in terms of societal, organizational, and leadership phenomena. In this section we provide a brief description of the questionnaire development process. Detailed descriptions of scale development and validation can be found in Hanges, et al. (1997, under review).

### Item Generation

Item generation for the culture scales was accomplished by the first author of this monograph with substantial help from Paul Koopman, Henk Thierry, and Celeste Wilderom of the Netherlands, and Phillip Podsakoff of the United States. The original item pool contained 753 items, of which 382 were leadership items and 371 were societal and organizational culture items.

In generating leadership items, our focus was on developing a comprehensive list of leader attributes and behaviors rather than on developing a priori leadership scales. The initial

pool of leadership items was based on leader behaviors and attributes described in several extant leadership theories. The theories are described in House and Aditya (1997). These leadership items consisted of behavioral and attribute descriptors. Examples of these items are presented in Table 3. Items were rated on a seven point Likert-type scale that ranged from a low of "This behavior or characteristic greatly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader" to a high of "This behavior or characteristic contributes greatly to a person being an outstanding leader."

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Organizational and societal culture items were written for the nine core GLOBE dimensions, described above, at both the societal and the organizational levels. We also wrote the items to reflect two culture manifestations: institutional practices reported "*As Is*" and values reported in terms of what "*Should Be*." The items were written as "quartets" having isomorphic structures across the two levels of analysis (societal and organizational) and across the two culture manifestations (*As Is* and *Should Be*).

The basic structure of the items comprising quartets is identical, but the frame of reference is varied according to the particular cultural manifestation and levels of analysis being assessed. Table 4 contains an example of a quartet of parallel culture items, showing essentially the same question in four forms: Organization *As Is*; Organization *Should Be*; Society *As Is*; and Society *Should Be*. Items were derived from a review of relevant literature and interviews and focus groups held in several countries, as well as from extant organizational and culture theory. Psychometric analyses indicated justification for grouping the items into scales relevant to nine core GLOBE dimensions of societies and organizations.

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

Item Screening

Societal and organizational culture items were screened for appropriateness by use of three procedures: Q sorting, item evaluation, and translation/back translation. Leadership items were screened by item evaluation and conceptual equivalence of the back translation. The Q sorting procedure consisted of sorting the culture items into theoretical categories represented by the a priori dimensions of culture described above, first by seven Ph.D. students in the Department of Psychology at the University of Maryland and subsequently by CCIs representing 38 countries. The sorters were not informed of the theoretical dimensions for which the items were intended. Items that were sorted by 80% of the sorters into the categories for which they were theoretically intended were retained for further analysis. There were no dimensions of societal or organizational culture for which a majority of items failed to meet this criterion. Thus a sufficient number of items was retained for the measurement of each dimension.

The ability of the sorters to agree on the allocation of items to dimensions indicates that the sorters were sorting according to common interpretations of both the theoretical dimensions and the items that they sorted into these dimensions. This level of agreement indicates that the scales comprising the retained items were interpreted to have the same meaning in all of the cultures represented by the CCIs. This is an especially important result because it strongly suggests commonalty of meaning of the questionnaire scales across cultures.

In addition to this sorting task, CCIs provided Item Evaluation Reports, in which they noted any items containing words or phrases that were ambiguous or could not be adequately translated in the target country's native language. CCIs also identified questions that might be culturally inappropriate. Most of the items that were problematic were dropped from further

consideration. In a few cases, we were able to rewrite items to eliminate potential problems but retain the intent and dimensionality of the original item.

In order to avoid any systematic bias that may be present when respondents complete a survey that is not in their native language (Brislin, 1986), CCIs were responsible for having the survey translated from English into their native language. This was done by the CCI, by some other person fluent in both languages, or by a professional translator. The translation was then independently translated again, from the native language of the culture back to English. This back-translation was then sent to the GLOBE Coordinating Team (GCT), where it was compared to the original English version of the survey to verify the veridicality of the translation. Through the process of deleting items based on sorting, item evaluation, and translation, the item pool was reduced to a total of 379 items, which were retained for further evaluation.

Pilot Studies

Two pilot studies were then conducted to assess the psychometric properties of the resulting a priori culture scales and to empirically develop leadership scales.

Pilot Study 1. The CCIs in 28 countries distributed the survey of retained items to individuals in their respective countries who had full-time working experience as a white-collar employee or manager. Because the survey was lengthy, it was divided into two parallel versions, A and B. Each version contained approximately half of the leadership items and half of the organizational and societal culture items. A total of 877 individuals completed the first pilot study survey.

Several different statistical analyses were performed to assess the psychometric properties of the scales. Specifically, we conducted a series of exploratory factor analyses, reliability analyses, and aggregability analyses (e.g., $r_{wg}$ analyses, intraclass correlations [ICC-

1], one-way analyses of variance) , and generalizability analyses (ICC-2) of the scales. These analyses were performed at the *ecological* level of analysis, i.e., on the means of the country item responses for each scale. We refined our scales on the basis of these analyses while trying to maintain, whenever possible, the isomorphic quartet structure of the culture scales described above and illustrated in Table 4. These statistical analyses, when considered together, provide useful information about the construct validity of the culture scales.

A separate factor analysis of each of the culture scales indicated that they were all unidimensional. A first-order exploratory factor analysis of the leader attributes items yielded 16 unidimensional factors that describe *specific* leader attributes and behaviors.

The $r_{wg}$ analyses (James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1984), demonstrated that the scales can be aggregated to either the organizational or the societal levels of analysis (average $r_{wg} = .73$, $n = 54$). Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC -1) and one-way analyses of variance for each of the scales indicated statistically significant within-culture agreement and between-culture differences. The societal culture scales exhibited low to moderate correlations with each other. Thus, they provide independent and unique information about societal cultures. The leadership scales substantially differed in their relationship to one another. The absolute correlation among the first-order leadership scales ranged from a low of .00 (e.g., Status-Conscious with Calmness) to a high of .86 (Status-Conscious with Procedural). Thus the leadership scales exhibited acceptable levels of unidimensionality and internal consistency. Overall, 20 percent of the interrelationships were statistically significant. A second-order factor analysis of the 16 leadership factors yielded 4 unidimensional factors that describe *classes* of leader behaviors that represent *global* leader behavior patterns.

It is interesting to note that some of the same culture dimensions were highly inversely correlated across the two *As Is* and *Should Be* scale orientations for particular dimensions of culture. The findings indicate that there are substantial differences in people's perceptions of how things *should be* as opposed to people's perceptions of how things *are perceived to be*. This raises an interesting and very important question: Are the most meaningful indicators of the cultures of collectives current practices reflected by *As Is* scales or values reflected by *Should Be* scales? We shall assess the relationship between (a) societal *As Is* and *Should Be* scores and (b) organizational *As Is* scores. The findings from this analysis will indicate which of the two ways of measuring cultural variation is most strongly associated with organizational practices as measured by the organizational *As Is* scores.

We ended Pilot Study 1 with 16 first-order factorially derived leadership scales that represent specific leader behaviors, 4 second-order factorially derived leadership dimensions that represent global leader behavior patterns, nine organizational culture *As Is* scales, nine organizational culture *Should Be* scales. The factor analyses conducted as part of Pilot Study 1 also demonstrated that the shared themes in all of the scales can be meaningfully identified and labeled.

Pilot Study 2. The purpose of the second pilot study was to replicate the psychometric analyses of the scales in a different sample to assess sampling robustness. Data for this study came from 15 countries that did not participate in the previous pilot study. In general, the psychometric properties of all of the scales were confirmed by replication. We replicated the ecological analyses conducted in Pilot Study 1 at the *individual level of analysis*. We used this level of analysis because there were too few countries in the replication sample to conduct an ecological-factor analysis. A total of 1,066 individuals completed one of the two versions of the

pilot study questionnaires. Using an individual-level analysis to replicate an ecological-level analysis is a conservative approach. If this analysis is found to correspond to the ecological analysis, the findings constitute strong evidence for the generality of the factor structure and evidence of *strong etic* phenomena (Leung & Bond, 1989). Pilot Study 2 confirmatory factor analyses yielded acceptable fit for the first- and second-order CLT factor structures and replicated the unidimensionality of the societal culture scales.

In summary, we developed 16 unidimensional leadership scales and 36 societal scales that exhibit acceptable levels of internal consistency. The aggregation tests indicated that we are justified in aggregating these scales to the societal level of analysis. Correlational analysis indicated that the leadership scales substantially differed in their relationship to one another. The leadership scales also exhibited acceptable levels of unidimensionality and internal consistency. We found sufficient agreement within societies and sufficient differences between societies to aggregate the scales to the society level of analysis. Further, the shared themes in all of the scales were replicated by the Pilot Study 2 factor analyses.

## Phase 2: Measurement and Hypothesis Testing

Phase 2 consists of assessment of scale properties and measurement of (a) the core societal and organizational *As Is* and *Should Be* dimensions, (b) the CLT dimensions, (c) the organizational contingencies in firms represented by middle mangement respondents, and (d) respondent demographic variables. Phase 2 also consists of tests of theoretical hypotheses presented below. Data collection for these aspects of Phase 2 is complete. In addition, Phase 2 involves the development of unobtrusive measurement scales to assess the societal-level cultural dimensions. These scales are described below.

The questionnaire data collected in GLOBE Phase 2 consist of (a) responses to approximately 17,000 questionnaires from middle managers of approximately 825 organizations in 61 countries, relevant to societal and organizational dimensions of culture, (b) unobtrusive measures of the societal dimensions (Table 5) and responses to four different executive questionnaires administered to separate top-level executives in the organizations from which the middle management data were collected. The executive questionnaires, described below, elicited responses relevant to organizational attributes, organizational contingencies, and performance. These responses will be used in Phase 2 to test hypotheses relevant to structural contingency theory of organizational form and effectiveness.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

Questionnaire data collection for Phase 2 is complete. Table 6 provides a summary and overview of the latent constructs used to test the GLOBE hypotheses and their indicators.

TABLES 6 ABOUT HERE

Based on the pilot studies and on focus groups and interviews conducted by CCIs, which were ongoing during the pilot studies, several additional CLT items were added to the middle manager questionnaires. These new items were written to ensure that the 16 leadership scales were not biased by including only western leadership behaviors. Further, we wrote several items that described autocratic, narcissistic, manipulative, and punitive behaviors, because it was suggested in interviews and focus groups that in some societies such behaviors would enhance leader effectiveness.

Finally, we added several new items to the survey to develop a second measure of collectivist cultural orientation because the collectivistic scale derived from the pilot studies did not include items relevant to family collectivism. The new items were adopted from Triandis'

work on collectivism (Triandis, 1995) and concerned several descriptors of family practices usually associated with collectivistic cultures: family pride, loyalty and cohesiveness. We confirmed the two Collectivism scales by factor analytically deriving two dimensions of Collectivism: Societal Emphasis on Collective Behavior and Family Collectivism. Thus, there were nine scales to measure the nine culture *as is* and nine *should be* culture dimensions--one scale for each of the dimensions except Collectivism, which had two scales.

Measurement of Organizational Attributes

The executive questionnaires referred to above were designed to measure several attributes and processes of the organizations from which middle manager data were collected. The questionnaire included scales to measure attributes of strategies, perceived organizational effectiveness and three organizational strategic contingency variables: size in terms of number of employees; the dominant technology of each organization in terms of the degree to which the work is repetitive, well understood, and controllable; environments in terms of competitiveness, hostility, and predictability/uncertainty. Organizational strategy was assessed in terms of strong versus weak customer orientation, incremental versus comprehensiveness of strategic decision making, consensus versus individual formulation, formality versus informality, adaptability versus rigidity and entrepreneurial/risk orientation. The strategic contingency scales were adapted from questionnaires used in several previous studies in which their construct validity was established (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Khandwalla, 1977). The executives reported the level of their firms' performance, relative to major competitors, during the previous five years with respect to sales and pretax profit. The executives also provided information relevant to the general market and economic conditions of the firms, frequency of organizational changes, degree of government regulation of firm activities, and demographic variables relevant to the

firm and to themselves. The psychometric properties of these scales and the impact of the strategic contingency variables on organizational practices and effectiveness remain to be assessed as part of the Phase 2 research.

Phase 2 Hypotheses

The results of Pilot Studies 1 and 2 set the stage for Phase 2 by providing the necessary questionnaire scales to test hypotheses. Hypotheses will be tested, concerning (a) relationships between societal culture dimensions, organizational culture dimensions, and CLTs, (b) relationships specified by structural contingency theory of organizational form and effectiveness, and (c) the moderating effects of societal culture dimensions on relationships specified by structural contingency theory. Tests of the first two GLOBE hypotheses are reported below. While we do not report tests of the remaining GLOBE hypotheses, we present these hypotheses here.

Hypotheses Concerning Relationships Between Societal Culture Dimensions, Organizational Culture Dimensions and CLTs.

Hypothesis 1: The global CLT dimension charismatic/value-based leadership will be universally endorsed.

The component subscales that constitute the global (second order factor) charismatic/value-based leadership dimension are visionary, inspirational, self-sacrifice, integrity, decisive, and performance orientation. We expect charismatic/value-based leader behavior to be universally endorsed because the visions articulated by, and the integrity enacted by, value-based leaders stress values that have universal appeal (House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997). Charismatic/value-based leaders articulate and emphasize end-values. Examples of end-values are dignity, peace, order, beauty, and freedom. End-values are values that are intrinsically

motivating, self-sufficient, and need not be linked to other values. Also, end-values are not exchangeable for other values and have universal appeal (Rokeach, 1973). Thus, the values stressed by charismatic/value-based leaders are more likely to be universally accepted and endorsed. Consequently the visions of charismatic/value-based leaders usually stress end-values that are congruent with the values stressed in the culture (House & Aditya, 1997). Similarly, we expect leader integrity to be universally endorsed because integrity is an end-value that is also universally held in all cultures. (Rokeach, 1973)

We recognize that Hypothesis 1 is controversial. Bass (1997) argues that transformational leadership, a form of charismatic/value-based leadership, is universally acceptable and effective. In contrast, it may be argued that some cultures may more highly value leaders who can find pragmatic accommodations with all influential parties. In such cultures, value-based leadership may be far less important than ability to achieve pragmatic effects, regardless of the means by which such effects are attained.

Regardless of whether it is supported or not, the test of Hypothesis 1 is of both theoretical and practical interest. Failure to support this hypothesis would result in identification of the specific cultures in which value-based leadership is and is not endorsed. Thus, the issue of universal endorsement of leadership dimensions, of necessity, needs to be answered on the basis of empirical evidence. The test of Hypothesis 1 is intended to contribute to clarification of that issue. The discovery of both universally endorsed and culture-specific leadership dimensions is of major importance to the development of cross-cultural leadership theory and of practical importance to individuals whose work involves cross-cultural interaction.

Hypothesis 2: There will be positive correlations between societal dimensions and CLT dimensions.

The rationale for this hypothesis is that the dimensions of societal culture will influence the legitimacy and acceptance of leader behaviors . More specifically, societal culture will influence the kind of attributes and behaviors that are reported to be expected, acceptable and effective. Further, dimensions of organizational culture are also expected to influence the legitimacy and acceptance of leader attributes and behaviors.

Hypothesis 3: There will be positive correlations between organizational culture dimensions and CLTs.

The rationale for this hypothesis is that shared organizational values and practices will influence the legitimacy and acceptance of leader attributes and behaviors.

Correlations between these dimensions constitute a test of the cultural influence proposition (Hofstede, 1980; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Triandis, 1995), which asserts that societal culture has a pervasive influence on the values, expectations, and behavior of its members. Therefore societal culture is expected to influence organizational values (Should Be measures) and practices (As Is measures), as well as expectations for leader behaviors that are expressed as CLTs in the form of questionnaire item responses.Hypothesis 4: The magnitude of relationships between organizational cultural dimensions and isomorphic CLT dimensions will be greater than the magnitude of relationships between societal culture dimensions and isomorphic CLT dimensions.

The rationale for this hypothesis is that organizational variables are more salient, more proximate, and more relevant to the tasks and behaviors of managers than societal cultural variables. Therefore organizational cultural variables will have a stronger influence on CLTs than societal cultural variables. Correlations between organizational culture dimensions and CLT dimensions constitute a test of the organizational influence proposition.

The cultural influence proposition asserts that societal culture has a pervasive influence on values, expectations and behavior and will therefore influence CLTs. Correlations between societal culture dimensions and CLT dimensions constitute a test of the cultural influence proposition. Thus, comparisons of the regression coefficients of the relationships between societal culture dimensions and CLTs with the regression coefficients of the relaitionshipsbetween organizational culture dimensions and CLTs constitute competitive tests of the cultural influence and the organizational influence propositions.

Hypothesis 5: Relative to organizations in the food-processing industry, organizations in the financial-services industry will have higher scores on the organizational cultural dimensions of gender egalitarianism, humanism, and future orientation, and lower scores on power distance practices.[5] The rationale for this hypothesis is that financial institutions need to be employee- and customer-service-oriented, future-oriented, and flexible in order to compete. Customer satisfaction depends on the degree to which financial institutions treat customers individually, design their services to meet customer preferences, and make investments that protect or enhance the future value of client and organizational assets. Such practices require employees with relatively high levels of education. Thus, financial institutions need to (a) minimize employee turnover to retain well-educated employees who would be costly to replace, and (b) maintain stability with clients. Therefore financial institutions need to adopt a more humane orientation toward their employees, more future orientation toward their clients and less centralization of decision-making in comparison with the food processing organizations.

## Hypotheses Concerning Relationships Specified by Structural Contingency Theory and the Moderating Effects of Societal Cultural Dimensions.

In addition to the research described above, we will also conduct tests of structural contingency theory of organizational form and effectiveness (Donaldson, 1993; Hickson et al., 1974), and tests relevant to the effects of culture on relationships between organizational contingencies, practices, and effectiveness.

Hypothesis 6 : Organizational contingency variables will be associated with relevant organizational practices as specified by Structural Contingency Theory (Hickson et al., 1974). However, these correlations will be moderated by societal dimensions of culture that are isomorphic with the contingency variables. The rationale for this hypothesis is that organizations are expected to have a tendency to align their practices with both strategic contingency variables and the cultural forces of the society in which they function. More specifically

Hypothesis 6a: Organizational size will be positively correlated with organizational formalization. Formalization is manifested by uncertainty avoidance practices such as establishment and enforcement of rules, procedures, and regulations.

Hypothesis 6b: Hypothesis 6a will be more strongly supported in high uncertainty avoidance societies.

Hypothesis 6c: Technological uncertainty will be negatively correlated with organizational uncertainty avoidance practices at the lower levels of organizations.

Hypothesis 6d: Hypothesis 6c will be more strongly supported in low uncertainty avoidance societies.

Hypothesis 6e: Environmental uncertainty and hostility will be positively correlated with organizational power distance and uncertainty avoidance practices. Under conditions of environmental uncertainty and hostility organizations are predicted to centralize and closely control decision making (Aldrich, 1979; Staw, Sandelands, & Dutton, 1981). This centralization

and control are expected to be manifested in increased organizational power distance and uncertainty avoidance practices.

Hypothesis 6f : Hypothesis 6e will be more strongly supported in high uncertainty avoidance and high power distance societies.

Hypothesis 6g: Future-oriented organizational strategies will be positively correlated with future orientation of organizational cultures and the future-oriented CLT dimension.

Hypothesis 6h: Hypothesis 6g will be more strongly supported in future-oriented societies.

Hypothesis 6i: Entrepreneurial orientation of organizational strategies will be positively correlated with the assertiveness and performance orientation dimensions of organizational cultures and the performance-oriented CLT dimension.

Hypothesis 6j: Hypothesis 6i will be more strongly supported in assertive and performance-oriented societies.

Hypothesis 6k: Consensually based strategy formulation practices described by high-level managers in response to questionnaires will be negatively correlated with middle manager endorsement of participative leadership and with organizational power distance practices.Hypothesis 6l: Hypothesis 6k will be more strongly supported in low power distance societies.

Hypothesis 6m: Flexible organic strategy formulation practices will be associated with organic organizational cultures. Organic organizational cultures are manifested by low organizational power distance and low uncertainty avoidance practices (Dickson, 1997).

Hypothesis 6n: Hypothesis 5m will be more strongly supported in low power distance and low uncertainty avoidance societies.

Hypothesis 7: The higher the correspondence between structural contingencies, societal culture dimensions, and organizational culture dimensions specified in Hypotheses 5a - 5n, the higher the economic performance of the organizations studied. The rationale for this hypothesis is that organizations that practice alignment of strategy, organizational culture and practices, and societal culture will be most effective.

Samples

National borders may not be an adequate way to demarcate cultural boundaries, since many countries have large subcultures. It is impossible to obtain representative samples of such multicultural nations as China, India, or the United States. Nonetheless, the samples drawn from such countries need to be comparable with respect to the dominant forces that shape cultures, such as ecological factors, history, language, and religion. The country samples also need to be relatively homogeneous within cultures. For multicultural countries, whenever possible we sampled the subculture in which there is the greatest amount of commercial activity. When possible we also sampled more than one subculture (indigenous and Caucasian subcultures in South Africa, French and German subcultures in Switzerland, and East and West subcultures in Germany).

The units of analysis for the GLOBE project consisted of cultural level aggregated responses of samples of typical middle managers in three industries: food processing, financial services, and telecommunications services. The food-processing industry is a relatively stable industry. The telecommunications and financial industries may be stable or unstable, depending on country and economic conditions. By including these industries, we have obtained a fair number of dynamic industries and high-technology industries in the overall sample.

Cultures in at least three countries in each of the following geographic regions are represented in the GLOBE sample: Africa, Asia, Europe (Eastern, Central, and Northern), Latin America, North America, North Africa, Middle East, and the Pacific Rim, as indicated in Table 1.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Middle managers in these industries were asked to use a seven-point scale to describe leader attributes and behaviors that they perceive to enhance or impede outstanding leadership. They were also asked to give their perceptions of the practices and values (in the form of *As Is* and *Should Be* responses, respectively) in the society in which they live, and of the organizations in which they are employed, using seven-point scales as illustrated in Table 4. Independent samples of middle managers completed one of two questionnaires. Half of the respondents in each culture completed the societal culture questionnaire (Sample 1), and the other half completed organizational culture questionnaire (Sample 2). All respondents completed the Leadership Attributes Questionnaire. Thus, the societal culture and the organizational culture questionnaires were completed by independent samples of respondents.

In addition, CCIs collected qualitative information about their societies and organizations in the industries they studied with respect to etic and emic dimensions of their cultures. Middle managers participated in interviews and focus groups and completed questionnaires. CCIs have also recorded archival information and participant observations, and have collected unobtrusive measures to be used to describe and interpret the cultures studied. CCIs also conducted content analyses of the dominant general and business media in their cultures. In this capacity, they provided both etic and emic information concerning the study dimensions described above.

Our design strategy consisted of obtaining responses of middle managers in two of the three target industries in each country studied. [6] This yielded samples from approximately 40

countries in each of the target industries. As stated above, data relevant to 54 countries were available at the time this paper was written.

The sample design also permitted us to relate the within-culture mean dimension responses to these two questionnaires to the within-culture mean dimension responses to the Leader Attribute Questionnaire. The means of the leadership item responses of Sample 1 and Sample 2 within each country were not significantly different. Thus the individual leadership scale scores for the two samples were averaged to produce means on the leadership scales for all cultures. As a result of the independent assessment of the organizational and societal variables, and because the mean CLT responses in each sample in each culture were not different, the responses are free of common source response bias.

Unobtrusive Measures [7]

All instruments are subject to potential unknown biases. One procedure for minimizing response bias contamination is to use multiple methodologies to measure the same constructs. Measuring a construct with multiple methodologies permits verification of the measurement of cultures on the latent construct of interest by triangulation. Latent construct measurement based on two or more manifest indicators allows one to reduce, if not eliminate, potential response bias associated with questionnaire responses. The latent constructs used to measure societal level responses consist of questionnaire responses and unobtrusive measures. As noted above, examples of unobtrusive measures are shown in Table 5.

The intercorrelations of the unobtrusive measures and the core *As Is* questionnaire scale scores for each dimension range from .37 to .73 (all significant, $p < .03$). These intercorrelations indicate validity of the GLOBE societal *As Is* questionnaire measures. They also indicate that the

middle manager responses to the societal questionnaire reflect the broader society in which the managers are embedded and not a more narrowly defined culture of middle managers.

Questionnaire Response Bias

Triandis (1995) has noted that the various cultures have different response patterns when responding to questionnaires. The presence of these different response patterns can bias cross-cultural comparisons. Thus several different statistical techniques have been developed to eliminate the contamination of survey responses. Using latent constructs composed of questionnaire response scores and unobstrusive measurement scales lessens the effects of questionnaire response bias on the between-country comparisons.[9]

Phase 2 CLT Scales

One of the objectives of GLOBE is to determine whether there are dimensions of CLTs that are universally endorsed and dimensions that are differentially endorsed across cultures. Recall that CLTs are culturally endorsed profiles of perceived effective or ineffective leader attributes or behaviors about which members within each culture agree. Profiles of CLT dimensions reflect what is commonly referred to as “leadership styles” in the leadership literature.

Shaw (1990) suggests that much of the cross-national literature indicating differences in managerial beliefs, values, and styles can be interpreted as showing culturally influenced differences in leader prototypes, which are analogous to CLTs as conceptualized for Project GLOBE. A study by O’Connell, Lord, and O’Connell (1990) supports the argument that culture plays a strong role in influencing the content of leader attributes and behaviors perceived as desirable and effective. Their study specifically examined the similarities and differences between Japanese and American CLTs. For the Japanese, the traits of being fair, flexible, a good

listener, outgoing, and responsible were highly rated in many domains, such as business, media, and education. For Americans, traits of intelligence, honesty, understanding, verbal skills, and determination were strongly endorsed as facilitating leader effectiveness in numerous domains. A study by Gerstner and Day (1994) also provides additional evidence that ratings of leadership attributes and behaviors vary across cultures. These investigators identified three dimensions relevant to distinct CLTs as expressed by university students from eight nations. These dimensions had rank order correlations with Hofstede's (1980) measures of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism of .81, 1.00, and .70, respectively. The GLOBE research project follows in the tradition of these studies. Following is a brief description of the development of the final Leader Attribute Questionnaire to identify CLTs.

Using the means of Phase 2 Leader Attribute Questionnaire subscales from 54 countries, we performed multilevel confirmatory factor analysis to confirm the 16-dimension factor structure of the leadership scales developed in the two pilot studies. This factor structure was confirmed. However, Phase 2 research included several additional items not included in the pilot study questionnaires that reflected the findings from ongoing interview and focus group research. We conducted a maximum likelihood exploratory factor analysis with a varimax rotation of these CLT items. This analysis resulted in 5 additional CLT subscales which exhibited sound psychometric properties. Thus, we have a total of 21 leadership subscales for Phase 2 analysis. These subscales and sample items are presented in Table 7.

TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

As with the pilot data, our analysis revealed significant interrelationships among the factors, hence the need to create a second-order factor structure. A second-order factor analysis produced four factors: (1) Charismatic/Value-Based Leadership that is Team-Oriented, (2)

Autonomous Leadership, (3) Humane Leadership, and (4) Non-Participative Self-Protective Leadership. Guided by prevailing theory, we divided Factor 1 into Charismatic/Value-Based Leadership and Team-Oriented Leadership to create two dimensions. We also divided Factor 4 into two dimensions: Self-Protective Leadership and Participative Leadership (the scores of the nonparticipative subscales were reversed to reflect participative leadership). These divisions of the empirically derived second-order factors were made to preserve conceptual clarity and to have dimensions that can be related to prevailing leadership theory and previous empirical studies.

The 21 subscales are grouped into six higher-order leader behavior/attribute dimensions, which are presented in Table 8. As stated above, we refer to the higher-order dimensions as *global* CLT dimensions because they represent *classes* of leader behavior rather than specific leader behaviors. We refer to the 21 first-order factors as CLT subscales. These subscales measure more-specific leader attributes and behaviors. Composite profiles of the six CLT dimensions represent what is generally referred to as leadership styles.

TABLE 8 ABOUT HERE

Test of Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 states that charismatic/value-based leadership and integrity attributes will be universally endorsed as contributors to outstanding leadership. From Table 8, it can be seen that the global CLT charismatic/value-based leadership dimension had culture scores ranging from 4.5 to 6.5 on the 7-point response scale, thus indicating positive endorsement by all cultures.

To test Hypothesis 1 more rigorously, we established the following criteria for Leader Attribute Questionnaire items to be considered universally endorsed as contributors to

outstanding leadership: (a) 95% of country scores had to exceed a mean of 5 on a 7-point scale for that attribute and (b) the world wide grand mean score for all countries had to exceed 6 for the attribute. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 9. Three of the positively endorsed items concern aspects of integrity. Note that most of the other universal positively endorsed items are components of the first-order Charismatic/Value-Based Leadership and Team-Oriented dimensions. The portrait of a leader who is universally viewed as effective is clear: the person should exhibit the integrity and charismatic qualities listed in Table 9 and build effective teams. Thus, Hypothesis 1 is strongly supported.

TABLE 9 ABOUT HERE

Universal Impediments to Leadership Effectiveness

The criteria for specific attributes, measured at the item level, to be considered universally viewed as impediments to effective leadership required that (a) an item grand mean for all countries be less than 3 and (b) 95 percent of country scores on the item be less than 3. These combined criteria indicate that the attribute was universally perceived as inhibiting outstanding leadership. Results are presented in Table 10, which shows that many items that made up the first-order subscales labeled Self-Protective, Malevolent and Face Saver are universally viewed as ineffective by the international sample of middle managers.

TABLE 10 ABOUT HERE

Culturally Contingent Endorsement of Leader Attributes

Most interesting, from a cross-cultural viewpoint, are the attributes that in some countries were considered to enhance outstanding leadership and in other countries were considered to impede outstanding leadership. We present in Table 11 those attributes (items) that yielded scores above and below the scale midpoint of 4, contingent on country-specific responses. Many

of these attributes fell into the leadership subscales entitled Self-Centered and Individualistic. For instance, while the attribute Individualistic had a grand country mean of 3.11 (slightly inhibits outstanding leadership), individual country scores ranged from a low of 1.67 (moderately impedes) to a high of 5.10 (moderately contributes). Similarly, the item Status Conscious ranged in value from a low of 1.92 (moderately impedes) to a high of 5.77 (moderately contributes). Even more striking was the Risk Taking item, which is a component of the Charismatic/Value-Based second-order factor. Risk Taking ranges in value from a 2.14 (moderately impedes) to a 5.96 (moderately contributes).

TABLE 11 ABOUT HERE

These findings raise several important questions. For instance, if some attributes (items) and some global CLT dimensions are differentially endorsed among nations, as indicated by our analyses thus far, are they equally compelling and influential? What psychological and sociological processes link the CLT dimensions to dominant cultural values? Are CLT dimensions more rigidly set for homogeneous societies, such as Japan, than for culturally diverse societies, such as the United States?

Test of Hypothesis 2

The “sine qua non” of the GLOBE project concerns the link between culture and leadership. While all of the analysis addressing this issue has not been completed, we do have positive preliminary findings. Hypothesis 2 states that there will be significant positive relationships between isomorphic societal culture dimensions and CLT dimensions.

TABLE 12 ABOUT HERE

Table 12 shows our predictions concerning the specific cultural dimensions that should predict cross-cultural differences in perceived effective leadership styles. We generated these hypotheses by examining each first order leadership scale and identifying the societal and organizational cultural dimensions which are isomorphic with each second order leadership dimension (for example, perceived effectiveness of Charismatic/Value-Based leadership was expected to be associated with the societal and organizational dimensions entitled Performance, Future, and Humane Orientation Table 12 shows these hypotheses

We tested Hypothesis 2 by using hierarchical linear modeling, a procedure that allows one to identify the amount of variance in a dependent variable that is accounted for by organizations as well as the societies in which the organizations function. The total amount of variance of CLTs accounted for is thus a joint function of the societal-level variables and the organizational-level variables in the societies in which the organizations are nested. Table 13 reveals that the endorsement of CLT global leader behavior dimensions are associated only with respondent value orientation (i.e., *Should Be* responses), and not with observed practices (i.e., *As Is* responses). The statistically significant relationships between societal and organizational culture dimensions and CLT dimensions presented in Table 13 are as follows:

TABLE 13 ABOUT HERE

1. Approximately 11 percent of the total variance in team-oriented leadership endorsement is accounted for by organizational collective value orientation and by the humane and collective value orientations of societies in which these organizations reside. It is important to realize, however, that some of the variance in team-oriented leadership is likely attributable to levels of analysis in which we are not presently interested (e.g., industry, individual levels). When only the portions of variance that are of direct interest were examined, the organizational

variable accounted for 37 percent of the variance in endorsement of all team-oriented leadership that occurred at the organizational level of analysis. The two society variables accounted for 32 percent of the endorsement of team-oriented leadership variance that occurred at the society level of analysis.

2. Approximately 27 percent of the total variance in participative leadership endorsement is accounted for by organizational-level power distance and uncertainty avoidance value orientation and by four societal-level variables: uncertainty avoidance, power distance, humane orientation, and assertiveness value orientations. The two organizational-level variables accounted for approximately 30 percent, and the societal-level variables accounted for approximately 82 percent of the variance in endorsement of participative leadership that occurred at their respective levels.

3. Approximately 7 percent of the total variance in endorsement of humane-oriented leadership is accounted for by organizational-level and societal-level humane value orientation. The organizational-level variable accounted for approximately 21 percent, and the societal-level variable accounted for approximately 32 percent, respectively, of the variance in endorsement of participative leadership that occurred at their respective levels.

4. Approximately 12 percent of the total variance in endorsement of charismatic/value-based leadership is accounted for by organizational-level and societal-level value placed on performance orientation. The organizational-level variable accounted for approximately 41 percent, and the societal-level variable accounted for approximately 14 percent, respectively, of the variance in endorsement of charismatic/value-based leadership that occurred at their respective levels.

5. The variance in endorsement of self-protective and autonomous leadership accounted for by organizational-level and societal-level variables is negligible and not reported in Table 13. This finding indicates that the variance in these two types of CLT endorsement is likely attributable to industry or individual differences, or other unmeasured situational variables.

Hypothesis 2 is supported with respect to endorsement of the above four global leader dimensions. These findings show that both societal and organizational cultural variables have nontrivial influences on CLTs and explain in part why there is variance across cultures with respect to what is expected of leaders and the influence and privileges they are granted.

Country-Level Uses of the Middle Manager Data

A profile shall be constructed for each nation consisting of the societal, organizational, and global CLT scores. In essence, for each culture CCIs shall construct a quantitative description of the attributes perceived as facilitating or impeding outstanding leadership, the culturally endorsed values (*Should Be* responses), and the common practices (*As Is* responses) in the societies and organizations studied. The CCIs can then interpret the results and compare the data from their culture to the data relevant to all other cultures. Fourteen of these interpretations have been included as part of the culture-specific chapters of the first of several GLOBE anthologies. The content of the anthologies is described below. Upon completion of Phase 2, we shall have profiles of the dominantly endorsed leader behaviors and attributes and of the societal and organizational dimensions of each culture. We shall also have substantially greater knowledge concerning cultural and organizational influences on endorsed leader attributes in the dominant cultures or subcultures of the 61 countries studied. This information shall be based on both the quantitative and the qualitative findings, and when published, it shall have substantial

practical value for leaders who practice management in the cultures studied or deal with individuals of these cultures.

In-Depth Country Specific Descriptions of Cultures

Country-specific qualitative research by the CCIs has been ongoing from the beginning of Phase 1 and will continue to the final phase of the project. Many of the CCI teams will write a qualitative description of the major cultural variables that are relevant to leadership and organizational practices in their particular culture. The in-depth description of each culture will incorporate the following topics: (a) an overall description of the culture in terms of its political and economic system and the major historical forces and leaders that have shaped that system; (b) a brief description of prevailing organizational practices in the industries and organizations studied by the CCIs in terms of the constructs that underlie the core study dimension (c) a description of the emic (culture-specific) manifestations of the core dimensions of the study at the societal, organizational, and leader levels of analysis; (d) a description of other emic characteristics of the society, industries studied, and leadership practices within these industries that have nontrivial implications for the practice of leadership and organizations; (e) the culture-specific semantic interpretation of the concept of leadership--what it means, the role and status of leaders in the culture, leadership functions, privileges, responsibilities, and the like; (f) identification of qualitative unobtrusive indicators of the importance assigned to leadership or leaders based on CCI participant observation; (g) an interpretation of the quantitative dimensions relevant to their cultures and in relation to other cultures; (h) an interpretative discussion of the kinds of leadership behavior required for effective leadership in the industries under investigation; and (i) prescriptive implications.

In essence, the CCIs will write a qualitative analysis of major variables relevant to leadership and organizational practices in the industries studied. The qualitative description and interpretation will be based on CCI participant observation, unobtrusive measures, and content analyses of media, interviews, and focus group discussions. CCIs have been provided with a set of self-instruction guides to ensure at least a moderate level of uniformity and quality of the qualitative research.

The completed chapters will be based on the combination of the quantitative survey data and the qualitative research findings produced by CCIs. An interpretive analysis of all of the findings will then be possible. It is hoped that this interpretation will lead to the development of a cross-cultural theory of leadership and organizational practices.

Projected Phase 3: Assessment of the Effectiveness of Culturally Endorsed Leadership Behavior

Phase 3 will consist of longitudinal tests of the following hypotheses Hypothesis 8: Societal culture dimensions assessed in Phase 2 will predict isomorphic organizational practices and leader behavior dimensions assessed in Phase 3.

Hypothesis 9: The correlations between organizational cultural dimensions measured in Phase 2 and isomorphic CLT dimensions measured in Phase 3 will be greater than the correlations between societal culture dimensions measured in Phase 2 and isomorphic CLT dimensions measured in Phase 3.

The rationales for Hypotheses 8 and 9 are specified following Hypotheses 2 and 3 above.

Hypothesis 10: The stronger the alignment among strategic organizational contingencies, societal culture dimensions, and organizational culture dimensions measured in Phase 2, as specified in Hypotheses 6a-n, the higher the economic performance of the organizations studied. The rationale for this hypothesis is specified following Hypothesis 7 above.

In addition, armed with Phase 2 measures of CLTs and the nine core GLOBE societal dimensions for 61 cultures, we will be able to test the following hypotheses with regard to leadership.

Hypothesis 11: CLTs measured in Phase 2 will predict observed leader behaviors in Phase 3.

Hypothesis 12: The more congruent the individual leader behaviors are with the CLTs, (a) the more readily leadership attempts by such individuals will be accepted and effective, (b) the more the individuals will be perceived as legitimate leaders, (c) the more highly motivated will be their subordinates/followers, (d) the more committed will be their subordinates/followers, and (e) the higher will be the leaders' performance and that of their subordinates.

Hypothesis 13: For purposes of introducing substantial organizational change, charismatic/value-oriented leadership will be the most effective leader behavior.

Hypothesis 14: Changes in organizational contingency variables measured from Phase 2 to Phase 3 will be correlated with changes in relevant organizational practices as specified by structural contingency theory.

Hypothesis 15: The correlations specified in hypotheses 6a-nwill be moderated by isomorphic societal dimensions of culture. The rationale is the same as that for Hypothesis 6a-n above. The tests of this hypothesis will replicate the tests of Hypotheses 6a-n above, using longitudinal rather than correlational data. For example, the correlation between changes in organizational size and changes in organizational formalization is hypothesized to be more strongly supported in high uncertainty avoidance societies. Because of space limitations, these longitudinal structural contingency hypotheses are not stated here.

Phase 3 Method

Based on the findings of Phase 2, a Multi-Culture Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (MCLQ) designed to capture respondents' perceptions of leaders with whom they are familiar shall be developed. The samples to be investigated will be similar to the samples of Phase 2. In countries in which it is not a violation of cultural norms, respondents will be asked to describe the leader behavior of their immediate supervisor.[8] Independent measures of the immediate supervisor's performance and work units will also be collected.

The MCLQ will be developed to reflect the leader behaviors identified in Phase 2, described above, and listed in Table 7. For example, since leader integrity is identified as a specific leadership attribute, the MCLQ will include several items describing behaviors that reflect leader integrity. Leader integrity items of the MCLQ will take the form "The leader deals with subordinates honestly . . . , fairly . . . , sincerely . . ., authentically." The MCLQ will be validated by the same process that was applied to the Phase 1 questionnaires.

Respondents will also be asked to express their emotional and evaluative responses to the leaders, their willingness to support the leaders, their willingness to go above and beyond the call of duty in the interest of the leaders' vision and direction, their confidence in the leaders, their commitment to the leaders' goals, and the like. Measures of leadership and work-unit effectiveness shall also be collected. As in Phase 2, high-level executives shall be asked to complete the organizational practices and structural contingency scales developed in Phase 1.

Search for Emic Leader Behaviors and Emic Manifestations of Etic Dimensions of Cultures

In addition to the etic research described above, we are also interested in identifying the specific behavioral manifestations and mannerisms employed in enacting CLTs. Since respondents in all countries could describe the degree to which the leader attributes included in

Table 7 contribute to or impede leader effectiveness, these dimensions are etic. They represent universal continua, along which leader behavior or attributes in all countries can be scaled. As mentioned above, the second-order CLT dimensions describe global etic leader behavior *patterns*. However, some important *specific behaviors* or attitudes by which these global etic dimensions are enacted will likely vary among cultures. For example, Smith, Misumi, Tayeb, Paterson, and Bond (1989) found that American managers are more likely to provide directions to subordinates on a face-to-face basis, while Japanese managers are likely to use written memos. In the United States, subordinates are usually provided negative feedback directly from their supervisors in face-to-face interactions. In Japan, such feedback is usually channeled through a peer of the subordinate. Thus, Smith et al. (1989) concluded that the global etic behavior dimension referred to as "performance-oriented leadership" is enacted with different specific emic behaviors in Japan and the United States. These differences in behaviors reflect the U.S. individualistic norm of "brute honesty" and the Japanese collectivistic norm of "face saving."

In order to search for cultural specific (emic) leader behaviors and mannerisms, CCIs will interview middle and high-level managers using the procedure established by Misumi (1985), which will provide substantial information concerning culture-specific aspects of leadership. GLOBE researchers will also search for emic organizational practices and forms. We expect to find emic organizational practices as well as emic organizational forms in several cultures. Family-founded and -managed firms in Hong Kong, and post-Soviet entrepreneurial firms managed by the "New Russians" in Russia are examples of such emic organizational practices. For each culture, items will be written describing emic organizational practices as well as emic leader behaviors.

Summary: Projected Phase 3 Results

In summary, respondents will describe their organizational cultures and their immediate superiors. Measures of leader and work-unit effectiveness and individual emotional and cognitive evaluative responses to leader behaviors will also be obtained. These measures will be used to test Phase 3 hypotheses and to determine the performance effectiveness of the leader behaviors described by the dimensions of the CLTs identified in Phase 2. Measures of organizational culture, structural contingencies, and effectiveness of organizations will also be collected. These measures will be used to conduct longitudinal tests of structural contingency theory. Measures of emic leader behaviors and organizational practices shall also be obtained to gain culture-specific knowledge about leadership in each of the cultures studied.. We shall eliminate the possibility of common source bias by collecting measures of organizational cultures and leader behavior from different subsamples within each culture studied.

## Projected Phase 4: Laboratory and Field Experiments

The research through Phase 3 will allow us to determine (a) those leader behaviors that are universally *perceived* as facilitators of or impediments to outstanding leadership, (b) whether there are any universally *practiced* leader behaviors and universal organizational practices, (c) leader behaviors and organizational practices that have positive or negative cognitive, affective, and performance consequences, and (d) leader behaviors and organizational practices that are culture-specific, i.e., those that are practiced in only some cultures and have positive or negative effects in only some cultures, (d) the effects of culture on the frequency, acceptability, and effectiveness of organizational practices, (e) whether the associations among organizational contingencies, organizational practices, and organizational effectiveness predicted by structural

contingency theory hold longitudinally, and (e) the moderating effects of societal culture on the associations predicted by structural contingency theory.

Phase 4 of the program will be designed to determine *experimentally* the effects of the various leader behaviors by cultures and thus determine *causal* relationships among leader behaviors and outcomes. Here we describe the conceptual fundamentals of the projected Phase 4 research. An operational research design will be specified when the results of Phase 3 are available.

Using the culture-specific endorsed leader profiles as guides, we will conduct controlled field and laboratory experiments in at least two cultures in each major region of the world. The leader behaviors to be studied will be those that were found in Phase 3 to be most relevant to leader effectiveness, either positively or negatively, in the 61 cultures studied. The experiments will be designed so that we will be able to assess the effects of various leader behaviors on follower affective responses, behavior, and effectiveness.

Phase 4 Hypotheses

Hypotheses 12 and 13 of Phase 3 concerning the moderating effect of CLTs on leader behavior-outcome relationships and charismatic/value-based leadership to stimulate organizational change will be tested experimentally as Hypotheses 16 and 17 to determine the *causal effect* of leader behaviors and CLTs on the dependent variables.

Hypothesis 18. Leader behaviors that are consistent with CLTs measured in Phase 2 will be more accepted and will have more positive cognitive, affective, behavioral, and performance effects on followers than leader behaviors that are inconsistent with CLTs measured in Phase 2.

Hypothesis 19. For purposes of introducing substantial organizational change in organizational practices, charismatic/value-based leadership will be the most effective leader behavior.

Phase 4 Method

Using the culture-specific endorsed leader profiles as guides, we will conduct controlled experiments in at least two cultures in each major region of the world. The cultures to be selected for the experiments will be those with well-defined and consensually agreed CLT profiles as indicated by low within-country variance of responses to Phase 2 CLT scales. The experiments will be designed so that we shall be able to assess the effects of various leader behaviors on follower affective responses, behavior, and effectiveness.

The laboratory setting in which Hypothesis 18 will be tested will be a realistic simulation of an organization. The independent variables will be three kinds of confederate leader behaviors. The dependent variables will be the affective responses, behavior, and performance effectiveness of individual followers and groups of followers.

In Treatment Condition 1, the effects of the leader behaviors endorsed by each culture will be assessed. That is, the experimental treatment will consist of leader behaviors endorsed by the CLT of the country in which the experiment is conducted. The leader behavior will be enacted by confederate leaders.

In Treatment Condition 2, the effects of those leader behaviors found in Phase 3 to have the most consistent positive effects on follower cognitions, affect, and performance across cultures will be assessed. Thus this treatment will consist of universally or near universally endorsed leader behaviors enacted by confederate leaders.

In Treatment Condition 3, confederates will enact leader behaviors that are in conflict with the CLT profiles of each culture.

The outcome of these experiments will be substantially increased knowledge concerning the following questions:

1. Are there any universally effective leader behaviors?

2. What is the effect of violating strongly held culturally endorsed preferences for selected leader behaviors?

3. Are behaviors that are consistent with culture specific preferences more effective than a select set of other behaviors that have been found in Phase 3 to be the most consistently positively endorsed leader behaviors across cultures? The answer to this question will tell us whether the behaviors specified in CLTs are also the behaviors that are more effective and will indicate whether leaders can make a difference by being different. More specifically, we will be able to determine whether a select set of behaviors can consistently have more positive effects than a set of culturally endorsed behaviors, even if the former behaviors are in conflict with culturally endorsed norms.

Hypothesis 19 will also be tested by using field experimental design. As one possible example, we may ask university business school students to respond to a proposed change in the system by which they are graded in their educational program. It will be proposed that the grading system be changed to grade subjects on the basis of their relative standing and a forced curve distribution. It will be explained that this system is consistent with competitive schools, will enhance the reputation of their school, and will enhance the amount of learning achieved by students.

In the first experimental treatment, the confederate leader, acting as a representative of the school's curriculum committee or in another relevant official capacity, will introduce and advocate the proposed change by enacting the leader behaviors most strongly endorsed by the CLT of the culture.

In the second treatment, the leader will introduce and advocate the proposed change by linking it to a vision that emphasizes increased international status and competitiveness of the school and appeals to the patriotism and to the values endorsed in the culture. The leader will also express high performance standards and strong confidence in the students and appeal to country loyalty by stressing international competition among business schools. These behaviors are part of the global dimension titled Charismatic/Value-Based Leadership.

In sum, in Phase 4 we hope to make a substantial contribution to knowledge concerning the behavioral and performance effects of leader behaviors and organizational practices as well as their cognitive and affective effects. The results of Phase 4 will be reported in a monograph or book relevant to leadership and organizational practices.

## UNIQUE STRENGTHS OF THE GLOBE RESEARCH DESIGN

Project GLOBE differs from previous cross-cultural research in several ways. The primary strength of this research is that we have not made assumptions about how best to measure cultural phenomena. Rather, we use multiple measurement methods in order to empirically test which methods are most meaningful. This is most evident in the development of three sets of measures assessing culture: a) those based on shared *values* of organizational or society members, b) those based on current organizational and societal *practices*, and c) unobstrusive measures In addition, we developed measures of leader attributes that differentiate cultures in terms of perceived effectiveness, as well as leader attributes that are universally

endorsed (or rejected) across cultures. Further, we have collected data relevant to organizational contingency variables.

We developed new measures and collected original data for our hypotheses and research questions, rather than collecting data on only some variables and relying on measures developed at other times in other places from other samples for the other variables. Since the organizational culture, societal culture, and leadership measures employed in Phase 2 were completed by different people, we were able to eliminate the frequently encountered problem of common source bias. By use of multiple indicators of societal culture, we were able to eliminate common method variance**.** The psychometric properties of the GLOBE scales and tests of their validity exceed normal empirical research standards and are described in the previously mentioned paper (Hanges et al., 1997, under review).

## CONTRIBUTIONS

The GLOBE research program is directed toward filling a substantial knowledge gap concerning the cross-cultural forces relevant to effective leadership and organizational practices. The research findings will be useful for resolving several important theoretical social science issues and for a wide variety of practical purposes. In this section, we briefly describe the various contributions we expect to result from the GLOBE research.

### Practical Relevance

The final product of the GLOBE research program, the books and articles in which the various cultures will be described and interpreted, will include practically useful information about the cultures studied.

It is expected that the quantitative findings resulting from the GLOBE research program will provide substantial enlightenment concerning the processes by which culture influences

leadership and organizational practices. In the GLOBE anthologies consisting of culture-specific chapters, cultures will be described in terms of the nine core dimensions as well as their unique (emic) attributes. A description will be provided concerning universal and culturally contingent leader attributes and behaviors, the commonly enacted and most favored leader behavior patterns and organizational practices found in the cultures studied, and the cultural influences on the effectiveness of leader behaviors and organizational practices. In addition, leader behaviors that are culturally offensive will be identified and described. As mentioned previously, fourteen chapters which will comprise the first anthology have been completed.

The qualitative research chapters in the GLOBE anthologies describe the most critical leader behaviors and organizational practices in each culture studied, the constraints imposed on leaders by cultural prescriptions and proscriptions, and unique norms of the cultures studied relevant to leadership and organizational practices. This information will be useful as case content for leadership training and career development programs and for the design of management and leadership education programs intended to prepare individuals who will manage and lead others in cultures other than their home cultures.

The descriptions of cultural prescriptions and proscriptions will be useful for the adjustment and effective interaction of individuals who work with others from the cultures studied. More specifically, this information will be useful to expatriates assigned to other than their native cultures, managers of diverse cultural and ethnic groups both domestic and abroad, individuals involved in the management of public and private international affairs, and those who conduct negotiations with commercial and political organizations in other cultures.

Knowledge of the culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership in each culture, and most and least effective leader attributes and behaviors, will be useful for selecting, counseling,

and training individuals who are to be assigned to, or who work with, members of the cultures studied. The resulting findings will be useful for informing potential managers of the kinds of behaviors and organizational practices that are acceptable and effective and unacceptable and ineffective in the cultures studied.

Information concerning the constraints imposed on leaders by cultural norms will be useful to decision makers who need to anticipate and respond to the actions of leaders of other cultures. Knowledge about cultural and organizational norms and practices in the cultures studied can inform the formulation of meaningful prescriptions for managing in other cultures--for strategy and policy formulation, organizational improvement interventions, human resource management practices, and the design of organization structures and incentive and control systems.

The industries studied are subjected to a wide variety of organizational contingencies. Many of the findings relevant to the effects of organizational contingencies on organizational practices and effectiveness in these industries are thus likely to be relevant to other industries and therefore useful to managers whose industries face similar organizational contingencies.

In sum, the findings of the study will provide a wide variety of information about 61 cultures, representing all major regions of the world, that can help managers and leaders in their adjustment, strategy and policy formulation, human resource management practices, and organizational practices.

## Beneficial Social and Economic Applications

The research program is expected to have several additional beneficial social and economic applications. Within regions, countries that share similar regional resources and backgrounds can make comparisons to determine similarities and differences among themselves

and share ways to improve inter-country relationships, economic productivity, and quality of life for their citizens. The research program is also expected to lead to increased intercultural communication among educators who normally would not have contact with each other, and thus it will result in greater intercultural awareness and cooperation among scholars. CCIs have been extremely active in practicing cross-cultural communications. As stated above, GLOBE related research has been presented in over 80 conference papers and over 30 working papers, chapters of books, or journal publications.

Many of the country co-investigators, being indigenous to their cultures, are influence and change agents within those cultures, at least with respect to those with whom they have contact in their roles as university faculty members, social scientists, and consultants. The intra-country social influence of the CCIs will most likely be substantially enhanced by participating in the GLOBE research. These CCIs, in turn, will serve as country boundary spanners and will facilitate importation and transfer of knowledge within their countries. Thirty five scholarly papers based on GLOBE data have been presented at national or regional conferences thus far.

CCIs in several nations have begun to translate the products of the research (which will be several books and scholarly articles) into other languages and thus increase the dissemination of this information to a wider number of countries. The chapters of the books will make reports on each of the cultures studied available in the public domain.

## Ancillary Social Science Contributions

The resulting data can be used for multiple purposes beyond the hypotheses of the study. For example, the worldwide Phase 2 data can be used to compare countries with their trading partners or their major competitors with respect to cultural, organizational, or leadership practices that are relevant to improving trade between them or with respect to practices that

facilitate harmonious and productive trade. We have already witnessed over 50 research projects and papers presented at scholarly conferences in which cultural and managerial practices have been compared among subsets of the GLOBE participating nations. An entire issue of the Polish Psychological Bulletin has been devoted to this research (Maczynski, 1997).

Relationships between the variables under study and economic practices and outcomes can also be subjected to analysis. The societal-level data can be used in econometric or sociological models and related to firm-level practices such as forms of production systems and organization, transfer of technology, pricing, risk taking with respect to entry into new markets, investment with respect to research and development, and foreign investment practices. With the exception of four studies we were able to locate concerning economic growth, little attention is given to cultural influences on economic practices and output. The four studies to which we refer are those authored by Schlomo; Hofstede & Bond; Franke; and House, Wright & Aditya.

The measures of culture can also be related to national levels of saving, distribution of wealth and social privileges, consumption levels and patterns, issues of economic growth and development, regulatory practices, and national productivity and efficiency. To date, cultural influences on such variables have gone largely ignored.

Indices of economic practices, adherence to norms of human rights, safety, and quality of life, by country, are either available in published form or can be collected by CCIs, other scholars, or interested government agencies or foundations. The GLOBE Phase 2 worldwide data can be analyzed in relation to these indices. Thus it will be possible to determine concurrent or predictive relationships between the GLOBE dimensions and such indices.

The worldwide data can also be analyzed to determine relationships between the variables under study and many indices of social and physical well-being. For example, the

GLOBE societal culture dimensions can be related to such outcomes as mortality rates, life expectancy rates, hygiene practices, preventive or remedial medical practices, stress levels, suicide rates, frequency of ethnic and border conflicts, indicators of social unrest, and violations of human rights. Following are some examples of expected relationships between GLOBE societal dimensions and socially and practically relevant variables:

Cultural tendencies toward power stratification and assertiveness are likely positively related to tendencies toward intra-country conflict among labor and management and possibly even to tendencies of nations to enter into aggressive ethnic border conflicts and military actions.

•Humane orientation is likely inversely related to the frequency and severity of hostile actions within cultures. Humane orientation is also likely positively related to such practices as the establishment and enforcement of human rights norms and laws, and inversely related to their violations.

•Assertiveness is likely positively related to the frequency and severity of hostile actions within cultures.

•Performance and future orientation are likely positively related to national competitiveness and economic development.

•Gender equalization is likely inversely related to female abuse and positively related to female literacy, education, and labor market participation

Following are three examples of findings that show how some of the cultural variables under study have been shown to relate to, or predict, important behavior. In The Achieving Society, David McClelland (1961) demonstrated rather convincingly that cultural indicators of achievement motivation were predictive of subsequent economic development in developing countries over a twenty five year period. Hofstede and Bond (1988) found that a measure of

cultural future orientation and delay of gratification referred to as the Confucian Dynamic was positively related to the economic growth of the Asian tigers from 1965 to 1985. Kogut and Singh (1986) have shown that the level of cultural uncertainty avoidance is inversely related to the level of risk taken by organizations when entering markets in foreign nations. Finally, one of the unobtrusive measures that correlate with the United Nations' measures of gender equalization is the United Nations index of female participation in labor markets.

## OUTCOMES

The outcomes of Phases 1 and 2 of the GLOBE project will consist of several books and a series of articles. The first book will report the comparative quantitative cross-cultural results and hypothesis tests of GLOBE Phase 2 research. Another book or article will report the research findings relevant to the tests of structural contingency theory of organizational form and effectiveness as well as other findings relevant to organizational culture and practices enacted cross-culturally. The remaining books will be the anthologies described above, consisting of country-specific descriptions of cultures and interpretations of the Phase 2 quantitative data. Two or more methodological monographs or articles will illustrate new quantitative methods of cross-cultural research and also illustrate how recently developed sophisticated cross-level statistical procedures can be applied in cross-cultural research. One such monograph is currently under review (Hanges et al., 1997). Measurement papers will present the development and validation of questionnaires, unobtrusive measurement, and participant observation scales.

Phase 3 will test relationships found in Phase 2 longitudinally and will investigate emic as well as etic phenomena. Phase 3 results will appear in at least one additional book and several articles. Phase 4 will also result in at least one book or monograph that will report the results of the laboratory and field experiments.

# CONCLUSION AND FUTURE ACTIVITIES

In summary, the GLOBE research is designed to contribute to the development of empirically based cross-cultural leadership and organizational theory by investigating the roles of societal and organizational values and institutionalized practices, organizational contingency variables, and implicit leadership theories as antecedents to cross-cultural variance in leader behavior, leader influence, leader effectiveness, and organizational practices and performance. GLOBE research is also designed to contribute to organizational theory and practice by exploring relationships between societal and organizational cultural variables and organizational effectiveness and by conducting cross-cultural tests of structural contingency theory. Based on the preliminary findings reported in this monograph, we are encouraged to believe that the GLOBE project has the potential of making a noteworthy contribution to the cross-cultural leadership and organizational literature.

# NOTES

1. Phases 1 and 2 of the GLOBE research program were funded by the Dwight D. Eisenhower Leadership Education Program of the Department of Education of the United States. Funds to support data collection in three African countries were provided by a grant from the Reginald Jones Center for Strategic Leadership.

2. While there are 61 cultures in the full Project GLOBE sample, the findings [reword?] reported here are based on data from only 54 countries. The data for the remaining countries were not yet entered into the computer files at the time this paper was finalized. The remaining cultures are Albania, China, Denmark, French-speaking Switzerland, Japan, Kazakhstan, and the United States.

3. Current members of the GCT are Staffan Akerblom, Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden; Felix Brodbeck, University of Munich, Germany; Jagdeep S. Chhokar, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, India; Marcus W. Dickson, Wayne State University; Peter W. Dorfman, New Mexico State University; Paul J. Hanges, University of Maryland; Robert J. House, University of Pennsylvania; Mansour Javidan, University of Calgary, Canada; Enrique Ogliastri, University of Los Andes, Colombia; Antonio Ruiz-Quintanilla, Cornell University; and Marius van Wyk, University of South Africa.

4. This hypothesis was suggested by Celeste Wilderome, Tilburg University, The Netherlands. The mean culture scores of the CLT dimensions from the two sub-samples in each culture were found not to be significantly different. Thus, the CLT scale mean scores were combined within each culture to yield culture-specific CLT scores.

5. CCIs were asked to collect data from organizations in only two industries per country because it was believed that CCIs would find collection of data from three industries to be

excessively burdensome. In fact, approximately two-thirds of the CCI teams collected data from all three target industries.

6. Interviews and focus groups revealed that in several of the cultures studied it would be a violation of cultural norms for subordinates to complete a questionnaire or answer interview questions that might be construed as evaluative with respect to individuals in positions of authority.

# Footnotes

1. Phases I and II of the GLOBE research program were funded by the Dwight D. Eisenhower Leadership Education Program of the Department of Education of the United States. Funds to support data collection in three African countries were provided by a grant from the Reginald Jones Center for Strategic Leadership.

2. While there are 61 cultures in the full Project GLOBE sample, the findings reported here are based on only 54 countries. The data for the remaining countries were not yet entered into the computer files at the time this monograph was finalized. The remaining cultures are Albania, China, Denmark, French-speaking Switzerland, Japan, Kazakhstan, and the United States.

3. Current members of the GCT are: Staffan Akerblom, Stockholm School of Economics, Sweden; Felix Brodbeck, University of Munich, Germany; Jagdeep S. Chhokar, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, India; Marcus W. Dickson, Wayne State University, U.S.A; Peter W. Dorfman, New Mexico State University, U.S.A; Mansour Javidan, University of Calgary, Canada; Enrique Ogliastri, University of Los Andes, Colombia; Antonio Ruiz-Quintanilla, Cornell University, U.S.A; Marius van Wyk, University of South Africa, South Africa;

4. Data relevant to organizational practices were collected using the organizational level questions. Data relevant to families and societal practices were collected using the societal level questions.

5. This hypothesis was suggested by Celeste Wilderom, Tilburg University, The Netherlands.

6. CCIs were asked to collect data from organizations in only two industries per country because it was believed that CCIs would find collection of data from three industries to be excessively

burdensome. In fact, approximately two-thirds of the CCI teams collected data from all three target industries.

7. Vipin Gupta idenditifed the specific unobtrusive measures based on a literature survey of information published by the United Nations and the World Bank and other relevant published information. Gupta also conducted the statistical analyses to develop and validate the unobtrusive measures.

8. Interviews and focus groups revealed that, in several of the cultures studied, it would be a violaion of cultural norms for subordinates to complete a questionnaire or answer interview questions that might be construed as evaluative with respect to individuals in positions of authority.

Table 1. GLOBE-Participating Countries

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Albania | England | Italy | Russia |
| Argentina | Finland | *Japan | Singapore |
| Australia | *France | *Kazakhstan | Slovenia |
| Austria | Georgia | Kuwait | South Africa (Black sample |
| Bolivia | Germany (former FRG) | Malaysia | South Africa (White sample) |
| Brazil | Germany (former GDR) | Mexico | Spain |
| Canada (English speaking) | Greece | Morocco | Sweden |
| China | Guatemala | Netherlands | Switzerland (French speaking) |
| Colombia | Hong Kong | New Zealand | Switzerland (German speaking) |
| Costa Rica | Hungary | Nicaragua | Taiwan |
| Czech Republic | India | Nigeria | Turkey |
| Denmark | Indonesia | Philippines | *United States |
| Ecuador | Iran | Poland | Venezuela |
| Egypt | Ireland | Portugal | Zambia |
| El Salvador | Israel | Qatar | Zimbabwe |

*The questionnaire data for these countries were not added to computer data files by press time.

Table 2. Culture Construct Definitions and Sample Questionnaire Items

| Culture Construct Definitions | Specific Questionnaire Item |
|---|---|
| **Power distance:** The degree to which members of a collective expect power to be distributed equally. | Followers are (should be) expected to obey their leaders without question. |
| **Uncertainty avoidance:** The extent to which a society, organization, or group relies on social norms, rules & procedures to alleviate unpredictability of future events. | Most people lead (should lead) highly structured lives with few unexpected events. |
| **Humane orientation:** The degree to which a collective encourages & rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, generous, caring & kind to others. | People are generally (should be generally) very tolerant of mistakes.<br><br>Aging parents generally live (should live) at home with their children. |
| **Collectivism I:** The degree to which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action | Leaders encourage (should encourage) group loyalty even if individual goals suffer. |
| **Collectivism II:** The degree to which individuals express pride, loyalty and cohesiveness in their organizations or families. | Aging parents generally live (should live) at home with their children. |
| **Assertiveness:** The degree to which individuals are assertive, dominant & demanding in their relationships with others. | People are (should be) generally dominant. |
| **Gender egalitarianism:** The degree to which a collective minimizes gender inequality. | Boys are encouraged (should be encouraged) more than girls to attain a higher education. (Scored inversely.) |
| **Future orientation:** The extent to which a collective encourages future-oriented behaviors such as delaying gratification, planning & investing in the future. | More people live (should live) for the present than for the future. (Scored inversely.) |
| **Performance orientation:** The degree to which a collective encourages & reward group members for performance improvement & excellence. | Students are encouraged (should be encouraged) to strive for continuously improved performance. |

Table 3. Sample CLT Questionnaire Items and Response Alternatives

| | |
|---|---|
| **Definition of Leadership** | Ability to influence, motivate and enable others to contribute to success of their organization. |
| **Sample CLT Items** | Sensitive: Aware of slight changes in moods of others.<br><br>Motivator: Mobilizes, activates followers.<br><br>Evasive: Refrains from making negative comments to maintain good relationships and save face.<br><br>Diplomatic: Skilled at interpersonal relations, tactful.<br><br>Self-interested: Pursues own best interests. |
| **Response Alternatives** | Impedes or facilitates unusually effective leadership<br>1. Substantially impedes<br>2. Moderately impedes<br>3. Slightly impedes<br>4. Neither impedes nor facilitates<br>5. Slightly facilitates<br>6. Moderately facilitates<br>7. Substantially facilitates |

Table 4. Example of Parallel Items for the Culture Scales

Organization As Is

The pay and bonus system in this organization is designed to maximize:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Individual Interests | | | | | | Collective Interests |

Organization Should Be

In this organization, the pay and bonus system should be designed to maximize:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Individual Interests | | | | | | Collective Interests |

Society As Is

The economic system in this society is designed to maximize:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Individual Interests | | | | | | Collective Interests |

Society Should be

I believe that the economic system in this society should be designed to maximize:

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Individual Interests | | | | | | Collective Interests |

Table 5. Sample Unobtrusive Measures*

| | |
|---|---|
| **Avoidance of uncertainty** | High number of information processing equipment items (e.g. fax machines, cell phones) per 1,000 people, indicating highemphasis on information availability.. |
| **Power distance** | Limited number of of scientists/GNP, indicating suppression of intellectual inquiry. |
| **Societal emphasis on collectivism** | Early time zone, indicating Eastern and South Eastern location where societal collectivism is predominant. |
| **Family collectivism** | Low divorce rates per marriage, indicating pressure for sustaining intimate relationships. |
| **Gender egalitarianism** | High proportion of females with earned income, indicating low discrimination against females and pressure for females contribution to work force.. |
| **Humane orientation** | Few retail outlets per capita, indicating low emphasis economic amenities and high emphasis on relationship orientation |
| **Future orientation** | High proportion of public education expenditure devoted to higher education, indicating public investment for future opportunities and future economic performance. |
| **Performance orientation** | Low share of government funded R & D, indicating free market competition and low government intervention. |

* There is no effect of GNP, per capita income, population size of country, or year of independence on the correlations between the unobtrusive measures and their isomorphic questionnaire based measures, for the total sample of 54 cultures. However, selected subsamples such as more or less welthy countries indicated differences in correlations suggesting boundary conditions for some of the unobtrusive measures. These boundary conditions are being further investigated.

Table 6. Latent Constructs and Manifest and Qualitative Indicators

| LATENT CONSTRUCTS | MANIFEST INDICATORS | QUALITATIVE INDICATORS |
|---|---|---|
| Societal cultural norms<br>Nine core dimensions (Phase 2) | Questionnaires<br>Unobtrusive measures<br>Quantified participant observations | Interviews<br>Media analysis<br>Focus groups<br>CCI participant observation |
| Organizational practices: nine core dimensions<br>(Phase 2) | Questionnaires by middle managers | |
| Organizational contingencies: technology, environment, size, strategy (Phase 2) | Questionnaires by top executives | |
| Societal culturally endorsed implicit leadership theories (CLTs) | Middle manager questionnaire ratings<br>Media indicators | Interviews & media analysis<br>Focus groups<br>CCI participant observation |
| Leader behavior (Phase 3) | Questionnaires<br>Media indicators | Interviews<br>Media analysis |
| Leader acceptance (Phase 3) | Questionnaires<br>Ratings based on media indicators | CCI participant observation<br>Interviews media |
| Leader effectiveness<br>(Phase 4) | Lab/field experiments | |

Table 7. Leadership Prototype Scales: First Order Factors and Leader Attribute Items

- **Administratively Competent**
  - orderly
  - administratively skilled
  - organized
  - good administrator
- **Autocratic**
  - autocratic
  - dictatorial
  - bossy
  - elitist
- **Autonomous**
  - individualistic
  - independent
  - autonomous
  - unique
- **Charismatic I: visionary**
  - foresight
  - prepared
  - anticipatory
  - plans ahead
- **Charismatic II: inspirational**
  - enthusiastic
  - positive
  - morale booster
  - motive arouser
- **Charismatic III: self-sacrificial**
  - risk taker
  - self-sacrificial
  - convincing
- **Conflict Inducer**
  - normative
  - secretive
  - intra-group competitor

**Decisive**

- willful
- decisive
- logical
- intuitive

- **Diplomatic**
  - diplomatic
  - worldly
  - win/win problem-solver
  - effective bargainer
- **Face Saver**
  - indirect
  - avoids negatives
  - evasive
- **Humane orientation**
  - generous
  - compassionate
- **Integrity**
  - honest
  - sincere
  - just
  - trustworthy
- **Malevolent**
  - hostile
  - dishonest
  - vindictive
  - irritable
- **Modesty**
  - modest
  - self-effacing
  - patient
- **Non-participative**
  - non-delegator
  - micro-manager
  - non-egalitarian
  - individually-oriented
- **Performance oriented**
  - improvement-oriented
  - excellence-oriented
  - performance-oriented
- **Procedural**
  - ritualistic
  - formal
  - habitual
  - procedural
- **Self-centered**
  - self-centered
  - non-participative
  - loner
  - asocial
- **Status consciousness**
  - status-conscious
  - class conscious
- **Team 1: Collaborative Team Orientation**
  - group-oriented
  - collaborative
  - loyal
  - consultative
- **Team II: Team Integrator**
  - communicative
  - team-builder
  - informed
  - integrator

Table 8. Global Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership (CLT) Dimensions.

1. *Charismatic/Value Based*, 4.5 - 6.5
*Charismatic 1: Visionary
*Charismatic 2: Inspirational
*Charismatic 3: Self-sacrifice
*Integrity
*Decisive
*Performance oriented

2. *Team Oriented*, 4.8 - 6.2
*Team 1: Collaborative Team Orientation
*Team 2: Team Integrator
*Diplomatic
*Malevolent (reverse scored)
*Administratively competent

3. *Self-Protective*, 2.6 – 4.6
*Self-centered
*Status conscious
*Conflict inducer
*Face saver
*Procedural

4. *Participative*, 4.5 - 6.1
*Autocratic (reverse scored)
*Non-participative (reverse scored)
**Delegator***

5. *Humane*, 3.8 - 5.6
*Modesty
*Humane orientation

6. *Autonomous*, 2.3 - 4.7
*Individualistic
*Independent
*Autonomous
*Unique

Note: The numbered, italicized topics are Global CLT Dimensions. They are comprised of leadership CLT subscales. The only exception is Topic #6 (Autonomous) which is comprised of questionnaire items, not subscales, and the item delegator (**) which is included in the participative dimension since it had a .81 correlation with the sum of the two subscales: autocratic and non-participative (scores revised).. Numbers represent worldwide mean values on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (substantially impedes) to 7 (substantially facilitates) effective leadership.

Table 9. Universal Positive Leader Attributes

| Questionnaire Items | Corresponding Leadership Scale (First Order Factors) |
|---|---|
| Trustworthy | Integrity |
| Just | Integrity |
| Honest | Integrity |
| Foresight | Charisma 1: visionary |
| Plans ahead | Charisma 1: visionary |
| Encouraging | Charisma 2: inspirational |
| Positive | Charisma 2: inspirational |
| Dynamic | Charisma 2: inspirational |
| Motive arouser | Charisma 2: inspirational |
| Confidence builder | Charisma 2: inspirational |
| Motivational | Charisma 2: inspirational |
| Dependable | Malevolent (reverse score) |
| Intelligent | Malevolent |
| Decisive | Decisiveness |
| Effective bargainer | Diplomatic |
| Win-win problem solver | Diplomatic |
| Administratively skilled | Administratively competent |
| Communicative | Team 2: team integrator |
| Informed | Team 2: team integrator |
| Coordinator | Team 2: team integrator |
| Team builder | Team 2: team integrator |
| Excellence oriented | Performance oriented |

Table 10. Universal Negative Leader Attributes

| **Questionnaire Attributes** | **Corresponding Leadership Scale (First Order Factors)** |
|---|---|
| Loner | Self-protective |
| Asocial | Self-protective |
| Noncooperative | Malevolent |
| Irritable | Malevolent |
| Nonexplicit | Face saver |
| Egocentric | * |
| Ruthless | * |
| Dictatorial | Autocratic |

*These items did not load on any factor.

Table 11. Culturally Contingent CLT Items

| | |
|---|---|
| Able to anticipate (3.84 - 6.51) | Intuitive (3.72 - 6.47) |
| Ambitious (2.85 - 6.73) | Logical (3.89 - 6.58) |
| Autonomous (1.63 - 5.17) | Micro-manager (1.60 - 5.00) |
| Cautious (2.17 - 5.78) | Orderly (3.81 - 6.34) |
| Class conscious (2.53 - 6.09) | Procedural (3.03 - 6.10) |
| Compassionate (2.69 - 5.56) | Provocateur (1.38 - 6.00) |
| Cunning (1.26 - 6.38) | Risk taker (2.14 - 5.96) |
| Domineering (1.60 - 5.14) | Ruler (1.66 - 5.20) |
| Elitist (1.61 - 5.00) | Self-effacing (1.85 - 5.23) |
| Enthusiastic (3.72 - 6.44) | Self-sacrificial (3.00 - 5.96) |
| Evasive (1.52 - 5.67) | Sensitive (1.96 - 6.35) |
| Formal (2.12 - 5.43) | Sincere (3.99 - 6.55) |
| Habitual (1.93 - 5.38) | Status-conscious (1.92 - 5.77) |
| Independent (1.67 - 5.32) | Subdued (1.32 - 6.18) |
| Indirect (2.16 - 4.86) | Unique (3.47 - 6.06) |
| Individualistic (1.67 - 5.10) | Willful (3.06 - 6.48) |
| Intra-group competitor (3.00 - 6.49) | Worldly (3.48 - 6.18) |
| Intra-group conflict avoider (1.84 - 5.69) | |

Note: Numbers represent worldwide minimum and maximum values on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (substantially impedes) to 7 (substantially facilitates) effective leadership.

Table 12

A priori hypotheses predicting effective leadership style from societal and organizational culture.

| Second Order Leadership Factor | | Predicted Culture Dimension |
|---|---|---|
| Charismatic/Value Based | 1. | Performance Orientation |
| | 2. | Future Orienation |
| | 3. | Humane Orientation |
| Team Oriented | 1. | Collectivism I: |
| | 2. | Collectivism II |
| | 3. | Humane Orientation |
| | 4. | Assertiveness |
| | 5. | Uncertainty Avoidance |
| Participative | 1. | Assertiveness |
| | 2. | Power Distance |
| | 3. | Humane Orientation |
| | 4. | Power Distance |
| Humane Orientation | 1. | Humane Orientation |
| | 2. | Gender Egalitarianism |
| Autonomous | 1. | Collectivism I |
| | 2. | Collectivism II |
| Self-Protective | 1. | Humane Orientation |
| | 2. | Power Distance |
| | 3. | Uncertainty Avoidance |

Table 13

Results for Hierarchical Linear Modeling Analyses Predicting Leadership Dimensions from Organizational and Societal Culture

Dependent Variable: Team Oriented Leadership

| | Coefficient |
|---|---|
| Constant | 5.89** |
| Organizational Level | |
| Collectivism Should Be | .28** |
| Societal Level | |
| Humane Orientation Should Be | -.13* |
| Collectivism Should Be | .40** |
| Organizational Variance Explained: | 37.4% |
| Societal Variance Explained: | 32.7% |
| Total Variance Explained: | 10.8% |

Dependent Variable: Participative Leadership

| | Coefficient |
|---|---|
| Constant | 4.79** |
| Organizational Level | |
| Power Distance Should Be | -.16** |
| Uncertainty Avoidance Should Be | -.13** |
| Societal Level | |
| Uncertainty Avoidance Should Be | -.46** |
| Power Distance Should Be | -.35** |
| Humane Orientation Should Be | .25* |
| Assertiveness Should Be | .12* |
| Organizational Variance Explained: | 29.7% |
| Societal Variance Explained: | 82.2% |
| Total Variance Explained: | 26.9% |

Table 13 (continued)
Dependent Variable: Humane Orientation

| | Coefficient |
|---|---|
| Constant | 4.83** |
| Organizational Level | |
| Humane Orientation Should Be | .37** |
| Societal Level | |
| Humane Orientation Should Be | .41** |
| Organizational Variance Explained: | 20.7% |
| Societal Variance Explained: | 31.6% |
| Total Variance Explained: | 7.0% |

Dependent Variable: Charisma

| | Coefficient |
|---|---|
| Constant | 5.88** |
| Organizational Level | |
| Performance Orientation Should Be | .22** |
| Societal Level | |
| Performance Orientation Should Be | .35** |
| Organizational Variance Explained: | 41.6% |
| Societal Variance Explained: | 14.2% |
| Total Variance Explained: | 11.9% |

$p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .0001$

Note:

The unit of analysis these regressions is the organization. The number of organizations is 391. The degrees of freedom are 390. All organizations existed in societies from which three or more organizations provided data.

Organizational variance explained is calculated by dividing the total variance accounted by the organizational predictors by the total amount of variance occurring at the organizational level of analysis. Society variance explained is calculated by dividing the total variance accounted by the society predictors by the total amount of variance occurring at the society level of analysis.

# REFERENCES

Ajzen, L., & Fishbein, M. (1970). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Aldrich, H. E. (1979). Organizations and environments. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? American Psychologist, 52(2), 130-139.

Brislin, R. W. (1986). The wording and translation of research instruments. In W. J. Lohner & J. W. Berry (Eds.), Field methods in cross-cultural research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications. (pp. 137-164).

Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). The management of innovation. London: Tavistock Publications, Tavistock Centre.

Child, J. (1981). Culture, contingency, and capitalism in the cross-national study of organization. In L. L. Cummings (Ed.), Research in organizational behavior (pp. 303-356).

Dickson, M. (1997). Universality and variation in organizationally cognitive prototypes of effective leadership. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, University of Maryland.

Donaldson, L. (1993). Anti-management theories of organization: A critique of paradigm proliferation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dorfman, P. W. (1996). International and cross-cultural leadership research. In B. J. Punnett & O. Shenkar (Eds.), Handbook for international management research (pp. 267-349). Oxford, UK: Blackwell,

Gagliardi, P. (1986). The creation and change of organizational cultures: A conceptual framework. Organization Studies, 7(2), 117-134.

Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. Leadership Quarterly, 5(2), 121-134.

Hanges, P. J., Braverman, E. P., & Rentsch, J. R. (1991). Changes in raters' impressions of subordinates: A catastrophe model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 878-888.

Hanges, P. J., Lord, R. G., Day, D. V., Sipe, W. P., Smith, W. C., & Brown, D. J. (1997). Leadership and gender bias: Dynamic measures and nonlinear modeling. In R. G. Lord (Chair), Dynamic systems, leadership perceptions, and gender effects. Symposium presented at the Twelfth Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology.

Hickson, D. J., Hinings, C. R., McMillan, J., & Schwitter. (1974). The culture-free context of organization structure: A tri-national comparison. Sociology 8, 59-80.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. London: Sage.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius connection. From cultural roots to economic growth. Organizational Dynamics, 16, 4-21.

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? Journal of Management, 23(3), 409-473.

House, R. J., Hanges, P., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., & Dickson, M. W. (1997). The development and validation of scales to measure societal and organizational culture. Under review.

House, R. J., Wright, N. S., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In P. C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), New Perspectives in International Industrial Organizational Psychology (pp. 535-625). San Francisco: New Lexington,

James, L. R., Demaree, [?] R. G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69(1), 85-98.

Khandwalla, P. N. (1977). The sign of organizations. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). Variations in value orientations. New York: HarperCollins.

Kopelman, R. E., Brief, A. P., & Guzzo, R. A. (1990). The role of climate and culture in productivity. In B. Schneider (Ed.), Organizational climate and culture (pp. 282-318). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). Organization and environment. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Leung, K., & Bond, M. H. (1989). On the empirical identification of dimensions for cross-cultural comparisons. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 20, 133-151.

Lombardo, M. M. (1983). I felt it as soon as I walked in. Issues and Observations, 3(4), 7-8.

Lord, R., & Maher, K. J. (1991). Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance. Boston: Unwin-Everyman.

Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance, Academy of Management Review 21(1), 135-172.

Maczynski, J. (1997). GLOBE: The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness research program. Polish Psychological Bulletin, 28(3), 215-254.

Marin, G., Triandis, H. C., Betancourt, H., & Kashima, Y. (1983). Ethnic affirmation versus social desirability: Explaining discrepancies in bilinguals' responses to a questionnaire. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 14, 173-186.

McClelland, D. C. (1961). The achieving society. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

McClelland, D. C. (1985). Human motivation. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

McClelland, D. C. & Atkinson, J. W. (1948). The projective expression of needs, I: The effect of different intensities of the hunder drive on perception. Journal of Psychology. 25, 205-222.

McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. (Eds.). (1953). The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

McFarland, L. J., Senen, S., & Childress, J. R. (1993). Twenty-first-century leadership. New York: Leadership Press.

Miller, D., & Droge, C. (1986). Psychological and traditional determinants of structure. Administrative Science Quarterly, 31(4), 539-560.

Misumi, J. (1985). The behavioral science of leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research program. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

O'Connell, M. S., Lord, R. G., & O'Connell, M. K. (1990, August). Differences in Japanese and American leadership prototypes: Implications for cross-cultural training. Paper presented at the meeting of the Academy of Management, San Francisco.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). Making democracy work. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human values. New York: Free Press.

Schein, E. H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership: A dynamic view (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. Personnel Psychology, 40, 437-454.

Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA Framework: An update. Personnel Psychology, 48, 747-783.

Shaw, J. B. (1990). A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural management. Academy of Management Review, 15(4), 626-645.

Simonton, D. K. (1994). Greatness: Who makes history and why. New York: Guilford Press.

Sipe, W. P., & Hanges, P. J. (1997). Reframing the glass ceiling: A catastrophe model of changes in the perception of women as leaders. In R. G. Lord (Chair), Dynamic systems, leadership perceptions, and gender effects. Symposium presented at the Twelfth Annual Conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology.

Smith, P. B., & Bond, M. H. (1993). Social psychology across cultures: Analysis and perspectives. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Smith, P. B., Misumi, J., Tayeb, M. H., Paterson, M., & Bond, M. H. (1989). On the generality of leadership style across cultures. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 30, 526-537.

Staw, B. M., Sandelands, L. E., & Dutton, J. E. (1981). Threat-rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis, Administrative Science Quarterly, 26(4), 501-524.

Thompson, K. R., & Luthans, F. (1990). Organizational culture: A behavioral perspective. In B. Schneider (Ed.), Organizational Climate and Culture (pp. 319-344). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Triandis, H. C. (1993). The contingency model in cross-cultural perspective. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions (pp. 167-188). San Diego: Academic Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism and Collectivism. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1984). The cultures of work organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tushman, M. L., Newman, W. H., & Nadler, D. A. (1988). Executive leadership and organizational evolution: Managing incremental and discontinuous change. In R. H. Kilman & T. J. Covin (Eds.), Corporate transformation: Revitalizing organizations for a competitive world (pp. 102-130). San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Yukl, G. A. (1994). Leadership in organizations (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.