

# VU Research Portal

## National culture and leadership profiles in Europe: Some results from the GLOBE study.

Koopman, P.L.; den Hartog, D.N.; Konrad, E.

### ***published in***

European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology  
1999

### ***DOI (link to publisher)***

[10.1080/135943299398131](https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398131)

### ***document version***

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

### ***citation for published version (APA)***

Koopman, P. L., den Hartog, D. N., & Konrad, E. (1999). National culture and leadership profiles in Europe: Some results from the GLOBE study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 503-520.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398131>

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

### **E-mail address:**

[vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl](mailto:vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl)

## **National Culture and Leadership Profiles in Europe: Some Results From the GLOBE Study**

Paul L. Koopman, Deanne N. Den Hartog, Edvard Konrad,  
and

S. Akerblom, G. Audia, G. Bakacsi, H. Bendova, D. Bodega,  
M. Bodur, S. Booth, D. Bourantas, N. Boyacigiller, K. Brenk,  
F. Broadbeck, M.G. Donelly-Cox, M. Frese, M. Gratchev,  
C. Gutierrez, I. Holmberg, S. Jarmuz, J. Correia Jesuino,  
G. Jones, R. Jorbenadse, H. Kabasakal, M. Keating, G. Kipiani,  
M. Kipping, L. Kohtalainen, A. Kurc, C. Leeds, M. Lindell,  
F. Luthans, J. Maczynski, G. Martin, M. Martin, J. O'Connell,  
A. Papalexandris, N. Papalexandris, J. Prieto, B. Rakitski,  
G. Reber, N. Rogovski, A. Sabadin, J. Schramm-Nielsen,  
M. Schultz, C. Sigfrids, E. Szabo, H. Thierry, M. Vondrysova,  
J. Weibler, C. Wilderom, S. Witkowski, R. Wunderer

Different cultural groups may have different conceptions of what leadership should entail, i.e. different leadership prototypes. Several earlier studies revealed that within Europe various cultural clusters can be distinguished (Hofstede, 1991; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985). Using recent data from the GLOBE project, this article discusses similarities and differences on culture and leadership dimensions among 21 European countries. The results show that two broad clusters or patterns of cultural values can be distinguished, contrasting the North-Western and South-Eastern part of Europe. Within these clusters, differences in leadership prototypes to a certain extent mirror differences in culture. On the basis of these results it is hardly possible to speak of a single typically European culture or one distinct European management style. However, on some dimensions European scores are different from at least some other regions in the world.

---

Requests for reprints should be addressed to P.L. Koopman, Department of Work and Organizational Psychology, Vrije Universiteit, Van de Boechorststraat 1, 1081 BT Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

We would like to thank Peter Dekker for his expert advice on the statistics of this article.

Different cultural groups may have different conceptions of what leadership in organizations should entail, i.e. different leadership prototypes or culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership (CLTs). In some cultures, one might need to take strong decisive action to be seen as a leader, whereas in other cultures consultation and a participative approach may be a prerequisite. And, following from such different conceptions, the evaluation and meaning of various leader behaviours and characteristics may also strongly vary across cultures. For instance, in a culture endorsing an authoritarian style, leader sensitivity might be interpreted as weak, whereas in cultures endorsing a more nurturing style, the same sensitivity is likely to prove essential for effective leadership (Den Hartog et al., 1999).

Implicit leadership theories have been used in explaining different leadership attributions and perceptions. An implicit leadership theory refers to beliefs held about how leaders behave in general and what is expected of them (Lord & Maher, 1991). Culture is supposed to have an important impact on the formation of CLTs (Hunt, Boal, & Sorensen, 1990). Culture profiles as derived from Hofstede's (1980, 1991) theoretical dimensions of cultures yield many hypotheses regarding cross-cultural differences in leadership requirements. Hofstede's dimensions of culture are: uncertainty avoidance, masculinity–femininity, individualism–collectivism, and, more recently, future orientation. For example, Jung, Bass, and Sosik (1995) hypothesize that transformational leadership emerges more easily and is more effective in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic cultures. High uncertainty avoidance cultures, with the resulting emphasis on rules and procedures, may place other demands on leaders than low uncertainty avoidance cultures, with the resulting attitude of tolerance of ambiguity and innovative behaviour. Also, more masculine cultures are probably more tolerant of strong, directive leaders than feminine cultures, where a preference for more consultative, considerate leaders seems more likely. Further, preferences for low power distances in societies could result in other desired leader attributes than a preference for high power distance, for instance, a less negative attitude towards authoritarian leadership may be found in high power distance societies. In such societies dominance and strong displays of power might be appropriate for leaders. In contrast, in more egalitarian societies leaders should perhaps emphasize their equality to others (Den Hartog et al., 1999).

Until recently, many theories of leadership and most empirical evidence was rather North American in character, that is, according to House (1995, p. 443), “individualistic rather than collectivistic; emphasizing assumptions of rationality rather than ascetics, religion, or superstition; stated in terms of individual rather than group incentives, stressing follower responsibilities rather than rights; assuming hedonistic rather than altruistic motivation and assuming centrality of work and democratic value orientation”. However, in the 1990s there has been a growing interest in both similarities and differences in leadership across cultures

(Bass, 1990; Smith & Peterson, 1988; Smith, Peterson, & Misumi, 1994; House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997b). A basic assumption in this interest is, in the words of Steers, Porter, and Bigley (1996, p. 423), that "no nation or culture has a monopoly on the best ways of doing something. This is especially so when it comes to understanding motivation and leadership at work." The critical question in cross-cultural analyses of managerial influences is whether individuals' responses to organizational practices are more or less universal. Steers et al. state that research evidence to date does not provide a clear-cut answer to this question.

## THE GLOBE PROJECT

The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program (GLOBE) is a cross-cultural research project, conceived by Robert House and funded in October 1993. Since then, GLOBE has evolved into a multiphase, multimethod research project in which some 170 investigators from over 60 nations representing all major cultural regions in the world collaborate to examine the inter-relationships between societal culture, organizational culture, and organizational leadership. The international GLOBE co-ordinating team (GCT), led by Robert House, now manages the project.<sup>1</sup>

The objectives of GLOBE are to answer five fundamental questions (House, Hanges, & Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1997a, p. 215): Are there leader attributes and behaviours, and organizational practices, that are universally accepted and effective across cultures? Are there leader attributes and behaviours, and organizational practices, that are nation or culture specific? In what way do cultural differences affect the kinds of leader and organizational practices that are effective? What is the relative standing of each of the nations studied on each of nine core dimensions of culture? Can the nation-specific and universal aspects of leadership and organizational practices be explained in terms of an underlying theory that accounts for systematic differences among cultures?

The initial aim of the GLOBE project was to develop societal and organizational measures of culture and leadership attributes that could be used across cultures. This was accomplished in the first phase of the project (see Hanges et al., 1999; House et al., 1999). The results of two pilot studies provided the questionnaire scales needed in the second, hypothesis testing phase. The central theoretical proposition in this second phase is: "Attributes and practices that distinguish a given culture from other cultures are predictive of the leader attributes and behaviours, and organisational practices, that are most frequently perceived as acceptable and are effective in that culture, and most are enacted in that culture" (House et al., 1997a). Phase 2 also concerns relationships between

---

<sup>1</sup>Current members of the Globe co-ordinating team are: R. Aditya, S. Akerblom, F. Brodbeck, J. Chhokar, M. Dickson, P. Dorfman, P. Hanges, R. House, J. Javidan, E. Ogliastri, A. Ruiz-Quintanilla, and M. van Wyk.

organizational contingencies (size, technology, environment, and strategy), organizational practices, and organizational effectiveness. Data collection in this second phase is now completed and analyses are currently being conducted. The results presented here are from this second phase. A projected third phase will investigate the impact and effectiveness of specific leader behaviours on subordinate's attitudes and job performance as well as on leader effectiveness in different cultures. A projected fourth phase will employ field and laboratory experiments to confirm, establish causality, and extend previous findings (House et al., 1999). One interesting issue that can be studied in these future phases is whether leaders who are seen to act in accordance with the culturally endorsed implicit leadership theory are more effective than those who do not act accordingly (Den Hartog et al., 1999). On the *organizational* level, Vinkenbureg (1997) found some evidence supporting this proposition. Middle managers who conform to behaviours seen as effective by top managers of their organization (represented in a panel of experts), were found to have a higher salary and a quicker growth of salary than those who did not conform. Behaving in ways the organization values as effective, literally "pays off".

## METHOD

The GLOBE project employs multiple methods. Besides the aforementioned questionnaires, (individual and group) interviews, unobtrusive measures, observation, and media analysis are also used to create a data set from which culture-specific aspects as well as culture-general dimensions of implicit leadership theories can be derived (Den Hartog et al., 1999). An anthology book, which includes chapters of several participating countries, is in preparation. Several country reports are available already (e.g. Ashkenasy & Falkus, 1999; Chhokar, 1999; Dorfman & Martinez, 1999; Fu, Wu, Yang, & Ye, 1999; Thierry, Den Hartog, Koopman, & Wilderom, 1999). In this article we will concentrate on some ethics relating to dimensions of society culture and prototypes of leadership on the basis of the results from the survey in 21 European countries.

## Measures

There is no definition of culture that is consensually agreed upon by social scientists. In the GLOBE research program culture was defined 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" (House et al., 1999, p. 182). Culture is operationally defined by the use of measures reflecting two kinds of manifestations: (1) the communality (agreement) among members of collectives (societies or organizations) with respect to *values*, in the form of judgements of what *Should be*; and (2) the commonality of observed and reported *practices* of entities such as families, schools, work organizations, economic and legal

systems, and political institutions, measured by indicators assessing *What is* or *What are* common behaviours, institutional practices, and prescriptions (House et al., 1999). Parallel instruments for societal level and organizational level have been developed. Here we will rely upon the culture measures on societal level, in the *As is* version.

The culture dimensions as used in GLOBE and examples of questionnaire items are presented in Table 1. The dimensions Uncertainty avoidance, Power distance, Collectivism, Gender egalitarianism, and Assertiveness have their origins in the dimensions of culture identified by Hofstede (1980). Besides the original collectivism dimension, several new items were added to develop a second measure of collectivistic in-group phenomena (Family collectivism). The new items were adopted from Triandis (1995). In lieu of Hofstede's Masculinity dimension, two dimensions were developed, labelled Gender egalitarianism and Assertiveness. Future orientation is derived from Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961). The Achievement/performance and Humane orientations have their roots in McClelland's (1985) work (House et al., 1999).

In the GLOBE study leadership was defined as "the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute towards the effectiveness and success of the organisation of which they are members". This rather abstract definition was acceptable to representatives of a wide range of cultures (House et al., 1997a, p. 220). In generating leadership items, the focus was on developing a comprehensive list of leader attributes and behaviours rather than on developing a priori leadership scales. The initial pool of items was based on leadership behaviours and attributes in several extant leadership theories, as described in House et al. (1997b). The items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale that ranged from a low of "This behaviour or characteristic greatly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader" to a high of "This behaviour or characteristic contributes greatly to a person being an outstanding leader". Through factor analyses on the pilot data, 21 dimensions of leadership were identified (see Table 2 for leadership dimension and sample items). Second-order factor analysis revealed six underlying factors: (1) Charismatic/value-based, (2) Team oriented, (3) Narcissistic, (4) Non-participative, (5) Humane, and (6) Autonomous leadership (Hanges et al., 1999).

Culture and leadership items were screened for appropriateness through Q-sorting, item analysis, and translation-back translation. The ability of the sorters from different cultures to allocate items to the dimensions indicates that the scales of the retained items were interpreted to have more or less the same meaning in all of the cultures represented by local investigators. Items that were found to be difficult to be translated, or that were problematic in some cultures were dropped from further consideration. Through the process of deleting items based on sorting, item analysis, and translation, the item pool was reduced from a total of 753 to 379 items, which were retained for further evaluation (House et al., 1999). Two extensive pilot studies confirmed that the psychometric properties of

TABLE 1  
Society culture scales and sample items (House et al., 1999)

Scale		Low Rank (L)	High Rank (H)
ACH = Achievement, performance orientation	Encouraging and rewarding performance improvement and excellence <i>(In this society ... ) students are encouraged to strive for continuously improved performance.</i>	High achievement	Low achievement
FUT = Future orientation	Such as planning, investing in the future, and delaying gratification <i>... more people live for the present than for the future.</i>	High future orientation	Low future orientation
ASS = Assertiveness	The degree to which individuals are assertive, dominant, and demanding in their relations with others <i>... people are generally dominant.</i>	Less assertive	More assertive
COLL I = Collectivism	The degree to which individuals are integrated into groups within a collective <i>... leaders encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer.</i>	Collective	Individualistic
GEN = Gender egalitarianism	The degree to which a collective minimizes gender inequality. <i>... boys are encouraged more than girls to attain a higher education.</i>	Female oriented	Male oriented
HUM = Humane orientation	Such as being fair, altruistic, generous, caring, kind to others <i>... people are generally very tolerant of mistakes.</i>	More humane	Less humane
POW = Power distance	The extent to which power in a society is unequally shared. <i>... followers are expected to obey their leaders without question.</i>	Greater power stratification	Less power stratification
COLL II = Family collectivism	The degree of integration of the individual within the family <i>... children generally live at home with their parents until they get married.</i>	Greater collective orientation	Less collective orientation
UNC = Uncertainty avoidance	The extent to which society relies on social norms and procedures to alleviate the unpredictability of future events <i>... most people lead highly structured lives with few unexpected events.</i>	Greater uncertainty avoidance	Less uncertainty avoidance

TABLE 2  
GLOBE leadership scales and sample items

Visionary	foresight, prepared, anticipatory, plans ahead
Inspirational	enthusiastic, positive, morale booster, motive arouser
Self sacrificial	risk taker, self-sacrificial, convincing
Integrity	honest, sincere, just, trustworthy
Decisive	wilful, decisive, logical, intuitive
Performance oriented	improvement-oriented, excellence-oriented
Collective team orientation	group-oriented, collaborative, loyal, consultative
Team integrator	communicative, team-builder, integrator
Diplomatic	win/win problem solver, effective bargainer
Malevolent	hostile, dishonest, vindictive, irritable
Administrative competent	orderly, organized, good administrator
Self-centred	non-participative, loner, asocial
Status consciousness	status-conscious, class-conscious
Conflict inducer	normative, secretive, intra-group competitor
Face saver	indirect, avoids negatives, evasive
Procedural	ritualistic, formal, habitual
Autocratic	dictatorial, bossy, elitist
Non-participative	non-delegator, micro-manager, non-egalitarian
Modesty	self-effacing, patient
Humane orientation	generous, compassionate
Autonomous	individualistic, independent, autonomous, unique

the scales are good (see Hanges et al., 1999 for a report on the development of these items and scales).

## Sample

Sampling is problematic in cross-cultural studies. Using national borders as cultural boundaries may not be appropriate (Den Hartog et al., 1999). Many countries have large sub-cultures. In large, multicultural countries as India, the US, and China it is not even clear what a “representative” sample is. Nevertheless, the samples from all countries need to be relatively homogeneous within countries. In this study, where possible, more than one sub-culture was sampled (for instance, former East and West German sub-cultures). At least three countries in the following geographic regions are represented in the GLOBE sample: Africa, Asia, Europe (Central, Eastern, Northern), Latin America, North America, Middle East, and the Pacific Rim (see House et al., 1999).

Within Europe, 21 countries participated in the study. (As we will see later it makes sense to cluster them in a North/West–South/East distinction. In doing so we follow the taxonomy by Ronen and Shenkar, 1985 and Brodbeck et al., in press). Within the North/Western cluster we have the Anglo sub-cluster of England and Ireland; the Nordic sub-cluster of The Netherlands, Sweden, Denmark, and Finland; and the Germanic sub-cluster of Germany (former West and East), Austria, and Switzerland. Within the South/Eastern cluster we find the



Latin European countries—France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal; the Near Eastern sub-cluster of Greece and Turkey; and the Central and East European countries—Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Poland, Russia, Albania, and Georgia.

The unit of analysis for the GLOBE study consists of aggregated responses of samples of middle managers from three selected industries (food processing, financial services, and telecommunication). The food processing and financial services sectors were available sectors in almost all countries, and seemed to be accessible for research. Investigators from each country sampled middle managers from different companies in at least two of these three industries. Most of the European countries (15 of 21) collected data in the food and financial sector, 8 countries collected data in the telecommunication sector. Within Europe, a total number of 6052 middle managers were involved in the second phase of GLOBE.

## RESULTS

In this article we concentrate on the profiles of the European countries on the societal culture and the leadership dimensions. First, the culture dimensions are described to see whether earlier results regarding culture differences within Europe (Hofstede, 1980; Ronen & Shenkar, 1985; Smith, 1997) are again found in the GLOBE data. After that we will try to answer the question to what extent preferences for specific leader behaviours or characteristics in Europe follow patterns of national cultures.

### Culture dimensions

Table 3 presents the rankings for each country, ranging from 1 to 61 (the total number of countries in the global sample). In this article we use mostly ranking scores (instead of means and standard deviations) for reasons of table readability. For the general conclusions this does not seem to make a difference (when the current results are compared with Brodbeck et al., in press). From this table the distinction between North/West and South/East becomes apparent for most of the culture dimensions, in particular on the Achievement orientation, Future orientation, Assertiveness, Collectivism (I and II), Power distance, and Uncertainty avoidance. For the Gender egalitarianism dimension, the main distinction line seems to be different. Here the main differences are found between the Nordic and the Central and Eastern European countries on the one side, and the rest of Europe on the other.

Table 4 gives the mean ranking scores for the North/West versus the South/East cluster. It can be concluded that the North/West cluster has significant higher scores on the Achievement orientation, Future orientation, Collectivism I, and Uncertainty avoidance (Kruskal-Wallis test of differences, on basis of a priori contrasting of groups with  $N=10$  and  $13$ ). The South/East cluster shows significantly higher scores on Assertiveness, Power distance, and Collectivism II

TABLE 3  
Ranking scores of North/Western and South/Eastern European countries  
on society culture dimensions

	<i>Dimension</i>								
	<i>ACH</i>	<i>FUT</i>	<i>ASS</i>	<i>COLL I</i>	<i>GEN</i>	<i>HUM</i>	<i>POW</i>	<i>COLL II</i>	<i>UNC</i>
North/West:									
England	34	11	32	30	14	48	36	53	13
Ireland	17	21	15	10	39	3	37	39	22
Netherlands	19	4	18	20	27	43	58	57	12
Sweden	48	9	1	1	9	30	50	59	2
Denmark	21	6	13	5	5	14	60	60	4
Finland	46	14	10	9	31	38	47	54	8
Germany	22/33	12/24	49/52	53/59	44/47	61/56	29/14	55/46	5/7
Austria	14	7	41	27	45	46	44	42	6
Switzerland	1	2	36	37	53	53	46	56	1
South/East:									
France	31	47	42	45	19	57	28	49	19
Italy	55	56	28	56	37	51	20	41	42
Spain	37	45	46	49	52	60	15	30	37
Portugal	54	37	11	46	15	41	18	26	39
Greece	61	51	60	61	29	59	21	35	57
Turkey	45	35	51	40	55	40	10	5	49
Hungary	58	58	54	60	3	58	12	37	60
Czech Rep.	30	39	22	58	10	26	61	61	18
Slovenia	51	43	24	34	6	45	23	31	43
Poland	43	59	34	16	4	52	40	25	50
Russia	59	61	35	22	2	37	13	15	61
Albania	4	29	55	23	17	10	56	19	14
Georgia	44	50	29	41	24	25	31	2	55

See Table 1 for dimension explanations.

(Family collectivism). Not visible in the table is that for the dimension Gender egalitarianism the combination of Nordic and Central and Eastern European countries has a significantly higher score (indicating more equal treatment of men and women) than the remaining countries in Europe.

On most culture dimensions there is considerable variance within Europe, in other words, there is no typically European pattern. Exceptions are: From a global perspective, Family collectivism seems to be a typical "Eastern" dimension, with high scores found mostly in Asia; only a few countries in Europe (Russia, Georgia, Turkey) have (relatively) high scores on this dimension. The Humane orientation also has predominantly high scores in Asian countries; this may partly be a matter of operationalization.

The results found here are partly in line with earlier research by Hofstede (1980, 1991), in particular where the Power distance dimension (Hofstede, 1991,

TABLE 4  
Mean differences on society culture scales between North/West and South/East Europe

	Scale								
	ACH	FUT	ASS	COLLI	GEN	HUM	POW	COLL II	UNC
North/West	25.5*	11.0*	23.0*	25.1*	31.4	39.2	42.1*	52.1*	7.4*
South/East	44.0	44.1	37.8	42.4	21.0	42.5	26.8	28.9	41.8

See Table 1 for scale explanations and countries included in each sector.  
\*Significant difference at 5% level, two-sided; minimal 14.7 points (Kruskal-Wallis test with planned contrasts).

p. 26) is concerned. Where the Individualism/collectivism and Masculine/feminine dimensions are concerned, comparison is difficult as a result of differences in conceptualization and operationalization of these dimensions. On Uncertainty avoidance, the GLOBE shows markedly different results: Where in Hofstede’s study (1991, p. 113) most of the Southern European countries had higher scores on Uncertainty avoidance than the North/West countries in Europe, in GLOBE we see the opposite pattern. We cannot fully compare the results, because Central and Eastern Europe were not included in Hofstede’s data set and again there are differences in operationalization of the dimensions. In GLOBE, typical items for Uncertainty avoidance were: In this society, orderliness and consistency are stressed; societal requirements and instructions are spelled out in detail; rules and laws cover almost all situations. On this dimension Russia had the lowest score and western countries had rather high scores.

Leadership prototypes

Regarding leadership, Table 5 presents both the range of the 61 country scores on a 7-point scale and the mean ranking scores for North/West and South/East Europe. In terms of the country scores we can see, for instance, that Administrative competence is perceived as an important asset for effective leadership in all participating countries: The overall range in means runs from 4.5 to 6.4. In contrast, in most countries Autocratic behaviour is seen as (to some extent) inhibiting effective leadership, with scores ranging from 1.9 to 4.1. On the right side of the table, we can read the mean ranking scores in Europe. A lower ranking indicates positive endorsement of this behaviour or characteristic as contributing to outstanding leadership. A good interpretation of the data requires that both aspects (absolute scores and relative differences) are taken in consideration. First, we will discuss the differences in rankings.

In relative terms, middle managers in the countries of South/East Europe show high scores on the following aspects: Administrative competence, Autocratic,

TABLE 5  
Range of country means (on 7-point scale) and means of rankings in  
North/West and South/East Europe

	<i>Range of Means</i>	<i>North/West</i>	<i>South/East</i>
Inspirational	5.0–6.6	19.5	40.4*
Administrative competence	4.5–6.4	49.0	24.9*
Integrity	4.8–6.8	18.7	37.0*
Visionary	4.6–6.5	25.2	34.4
Performance orientation	4.5–6.6	25.2	36.4
Diplomatic	4.5–6.0	43.6	20.1*
Collective team orientation	4.4–6.0	42.4	29.4
Team integrator	4.1–6.4	31.3	27.5
Modesty	4.1–5.8	43.0	35.1
Self sacrificial	4.0–6.0	35.0	37.8
Decisive	3.6–6.3	25.8	27.2
Humane orientation	3.3–5.7	38.2	41.1
Conflict inducer	3.1–5.0	52.2	30.7*
Procedural	2.8–4.9	54.1	32.3*
Status consciousness	2.4–5.9	47.0	27.0*
Autonomous	2.3–4.6	21.2	30.6
Face saver	2.0–4.5	46.3	33.1
Non-participative	1.9–3.7	44.8	28.5*
Autocratic	1.9–4.1	50.2	28.9*
Self-centred	1.5–3.4	44.2	30.4*
Malevolent	1.3–2.7	45.4	29.8*

\*Significant difference on 5% level (Kruskal-Wallis test with planned contrasts); low rankings indicate high importance.

Conflict inducer, Diplomatic, Face saver, Non-participative, Procedural, Self-centred, and Status consciousness. In the countries of North/West Europe characteristics such as Inspirational and Integrity are seen as more important.

These results must, where Central and Eastern Europe is concerned, be placed in the context of recent history. Managers from Central and Eastern Europe show a considerably less negative attitude towards autocratic behaviour than do Western managers. Also, perhaps as a result of their long experience in a command economy that fostered formal and obedient behaviour through its highly bureaucratic practices and traditions, managers from this part of Europe developed a more positive attitude towards administrative skills and procedural behaviours. Further, managers from the South/East part of Europe value diplomacy in leaders more than managers from the North/West part do. This may be a result of the careful balancing act Eastern managers had to perform under the previous command economy (Den Hartog et al., 1997a, b). The managing director of an Eastern European enterprise was simply an officer in implementing

the political and strategic decisions of the communist party and authorities until the end of the 1980s (Maczynski, Lindell, Motowidlo, Sigfrids, & Jarmuz, 1997).

However, this does not explain the relatively high scores from Southern European countries on these dimensions. It must be noted, however, that in the Latin or Southern European countries (Portugal, Hungary, Spain, Italy) and in Greece, participative leadership is perceived to be more important in facilitating excellent leadership than in the East European countries (Russia, Georgia) and in Poland (Brodbeck et al., 1998).

Our results provide some evidence for the assumption that preferred leadership varies by culture. In particular, clusters of European countries that share similar cultural values according to prior cross-cultural research were shown to also share similar leadership prototypes (Brodbeck, et al., in press). On basis of multidimensional scaling, Brodbeck et al. made clear that leadership perceptions (as well as most of the culture dimensions, as presented in Table 3) in Europe are empirically clustered along the North/West versus South/East division line. However, within these broad clusters some smaller differences can be found (Brodbeck et al., in press). For instance, within the North/West cluster managers in the Germanic countries (Austria, Switzerland, former West and East Germany) perceive self-centredness as less strongly inhibiting excellent leadership than in the Nordic and the Anglo countries, whereas the last group perceives a team orientation as more strongly facilitating excellent leadership than do Germanic managers (Brodbeck et al., 1998). Furthermore, splitting up the leadership data between West and East would also reveal some significant differences (the North/West cluster seems to represent typically "western" attitudes). However, for most of the dimensions the distinction North/West versus South/East gives the best results. Brodbeck et al. (in press) conclude that "these results strongly support the hypothesis that leadership prototypes vary as a function of cultural differences in accord with the Ronen and Shenkar (1985) clustering for European countries".

## Universals versus specifics

To answer the question which leader attributes and behaviours are universally accepted and seen as effective, and which ones are nation or culture specific, we look at the results of the second-order factor analysis. This analysis revealed 6 factors (for a more extensive discussion see Hanges et al., 1999):

- (1) *Charismatic/value-based leadership*, with the sub-scales visionary, inspirational, self-sacrificial, integrity, decisive, and performance orientation.
- (2) *Team-oriented leadership*, with the sub-scales team orientation, team integrator, diplomacy, malevolent (reversed score), and administrative competence.

- (2) *Narcissistic leadership*, with the sub-scales self-centred, status-conscious, conflict inducer, face saver, and procedural.
- (4) *Participative leadership*, with the sub-scales autocratic and non-participative (both reversed scores).
- (5) *Humane leadership*, with the sub-scales modest and humane orientation.
- (6) *Autonomous leadership*, with the *items* individualistic, independent, autonomous, and unique.

Two of these are more or less universally endorsed (not only in Europe, but even globally) as contributing to effective leadership,<sup>2</sup> namely: Charismatic/value-based leadership, with a range of country means of 4.5–6.4; and Team-oriented leadership, with a range of 4.8–6.3. The other four factors can be seen as more “cultural contingent”: The mean scores are less extreme, more evenly spread over the dimension. Narcissistic leadership: 2.1–4.5; Participative leadership: 3.4–5.0; Humane leadership: 3.6–5.4; and Autonomous leadership: 2.3–4.7 (House et al., 1999).

Universal endorsement of an attribute does not preclude difference in the enactment of such an attribute. Den Hartog et al. (1999) show, using qualitative data, that the attribution of charisma in different societies can be associated with different behavioural aspects. Another conclusion that can be drawn from these results is that in forming multicultural organizations (e.g. joint ventures) some aspects of leadership need special attention, because different leadership prototypes can be expected in the different cultural sub-groups. Examples are participative leadership and conflict management.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The data from the GLOBE study support the assumption that countries in Europe can be systematically clustered within culture clusters that are similar to earlier research (Ronen & Shenkar, 1985) and allow for meaningful interpretations. A second conclusion is that we can not speak of a single typically European culture: On most dimensions we see large differences within Europe.

Our findings with respect to attributes associated with leadership effectiveness are largely consistent with findings reported for differences in cultural dimension scores. Attributes such as an autocratic style, diplomacy, face saving, procedural, administrative skills, and status consciousness are more strongly endorsed by middle managers from the South/East part of Europe, who also describe the culture in their societies as higher on power distance, and lower on achievement and future orientation.

---

<sup>2</sup>The criteria were that (1) 95% of country scores had to exceed a mean of 5 on a 7-point scale for that attribute, and (2) the grand mean score for all countries had to exceed 6 for that attribute (House et al., 1999).

House et al. (1999) report that the endorsement of the leadership prototypes is more associated with respondent value orientation, i.e. *Should be* responses, than with observed practices, i.e. *As is* responses. Results from hierarchical linear modelling analysis, predicting leadership dimensions from culture dimensions showed that: (1) collectivistic values in society are predictive of preference for team-oriented leadership, (2) values relating to power distance and uncertainty avoidance predict (a lack of) required participative leadership, (3) humane orientation on societal level predicts the same preferred dimension in leadership, and (4) performance orientation is predictive of preferred charismatic behaviour (House et al., 1999).

Differences found between North/West and South/East can at least partly be explained through looking at recent history. Lower scores on future orientation and performance orientation, and higher scores on power distance of certain countries, might partly reflect the ongoing experience with the transition from a command economy to a free market economy (Koopman & Heller, 1999). Western managers have the opportunity to plan further ahead at this time, because their social and organizational circumstances allow them enough stability to formulate long-range strategies and plans. Even though their organizational environments might be changing at an increasing rate and becoming more and more unpredictable as part of a global trend towards increasing complexity and uncertainty in business and economic environments, they can still at least develop and work towards long-range organizational objectives. Managers from Central and Eastern Europe, however, might find themselves too preoccupied with coping with the immediate and difficult day-to-day demands of the transition to a market economy (Den Hartog et al., 1997a).

However, more factors may be relevant here. Peterson and Smith (1997) proposed model with 10 categories of culture predictors that can be helpful in our interpretation of the observed differences between North/West and South/East clusters in Europe. We must be aware, however, that the structures of relations between these predictors are very complex and that many of them are confounded. Nevertheless, tentative considerations related to various culture predictors are the following:

(1) Language separates cultural by influencing the ease of communication. In our case, most languages in the North/West cluster are of English and Germanic origin, those in the South/East cluster of Latin and Slavic origin.

(2) Proximity and topography affects exchange by influencing the frequency of interaction between groups. Both clusters in our case are comprised of geographically proximal countries.

(3) Colonization can promote the spreading of culture by increasing the interaction between distant cultures. Spreading of the Soviet block after the Second World War could be considered a form of colonization. Perhaps as a

consequence an increased power distance orientation is found in the whole region.

(4) Religion has separated groups by influencing the ease or difficulty of synergistic, value-based interaction. In the North/West cluster, the Protestant religious tradition is most prominent, whereas the South/East cluster is traditionally more Catholic and Orthodox. Keeping the famous Weber thesis about the relationship between modern capitalism and Protestant ethics in mind, the higher achievement orientation that is observed in the North/West region of Europe makes sense.

(5) Economic systems influence the ease of exchange. North/West European countries clearly have a long tradition of having a capitalistic system. Many South/East European countries have recently left behind their socialist systems (or are still in the process of doing so). According to Smith (1997) that "footprint of history" has enormous consequences. In the former socialistic countries it is reasonable to expect lower achievement orientation, lower future orientation, higher power orientation and higher family collectivism.

(6) Economic development affects both exchanges and hence intercultural contact, and also directly influences values. The South/East cluster is comprised largely of relatively underdeveloped countries in Europe.

(7) Technological development, closely linked to economic development, has an additional effect. Economic exchanges between technologically similar countries tend to be different from those between technologically dissimilar countries. South/East countries are to a larger extent rural and, to date, still use more classical industrial production techniques.

(8) Political boundaries, or national borders, typically mark areas within which there is more interaction than there is across borders. That was very important in the Europe of the past but also has some implications for the Europe of future. Interactions within the European community will be greatly facilitated; interaction with countries outside the community will probably be less easy.

(9) Prevailing industry types produce practices that come to be institutionalized on the basis of historical period of industry emergence and subsequent institutional learning. In the North/West cluster of European countries, industry emerged earlier in history.

(10) Climate, topography, and the indigenous economy affect traditions linked to behaviours and practices that are functional in primitive agrarian versus hunter-gatherer societies. Van de Vliert and Van Yperen (1996), for example, found that the ambient climate is related to work stress. Peterson and Smith (1997) further established that this relationship is mediated over cultural dimension of power distance. Our data confirm this picture as North/West and South/East clusters of countries differ both in power distance and average temperature.



As the Globe research was conducted in only three industrial sectors (food processing, financial services, and telecommunications), we have to mention a possible restriction of the generalizability of the conclusions. There remains some room for speculation whether, for instance, data obtained from hospitals or schools would have shown different results (compare the contributions by De Witte and Van Muijen et al. in this Special Issue). On the other hand, in the GLOBE project it has been shown that for most of the culture dimensions rather strong correlations exist between questionnaire data and unobtrusive measures, ranging from .35 to .55, all significant at the .05 level or better (House, internal communication). The unobtrusive measures are country specific, not sector specific. This seems to indicate that our results indeed reflect more national than organizational or sectorial differences. In later publications ensuing from the GLOBE project the role of organizational culture will be discussed more deeply. Data analysis is going on now.

Some of the results presented here have important implications for cross-cultural management. For instance, dimensions that show significant discrepancies in leadership prototypes between nations or regional cultures require attention in joint ventures and other international organizations. A general assumption of the GLOBE project (to be tested in a later stage) is that leader acceptance is a function of the interaction between the local leadership prototypes and the actual leader attributes and behaviour (House et al., 1999). A fit between leader characteristics or behaviour and the dominant culture is seen as a prerequisite for success. Thus, with the Europe of the future in mind, further research into national culture and leadership seems interesting as well as useful to build better relationships and increased understanding.

## REFERENCES

- Ashkenasy, N.M. & Falkus, S. (1999). The Australian enigma. In R.J. House & J.S. Chhokar (Eds), *Managerial cultures in 12 countries: A project GLOBE anthology, Vol. I*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (3rd edn). New York: Free Press.
- Brodbeck, F.C., Frese, M., & 44 European co-authors. (1998). *Leader perceptions in Europe: A 21 nations study based on the GLOBE project*. Paper presented at the 14th EGOS colloquium. Maastricht, The Netherlands.
- Brodbeck, F.C., Frese, M., & 44 European co-investigators. (in press). Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*.
- Chhokar, J.S. (1999). Leadership and culture in India. In R.J. House & J.S. Chhokar (Eds), *Managerial cultures in 12 countries: A project GLOBE anthology, Vol. I*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Den Hartog, D.N., House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dorfman, P.W., & other Globe Country Investigators. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 219–256.

- Den Hartog, D.N., Koopman, P.L., Thierry, H., Wilderom, C.P.M., Maczynski, J., & Jarmuz, S. (1997a). Dutch and Polish perceptions of leadership and culture. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 6, 387–413.
- Den Hartog, D.N., Maczynski, J., Motowidlo, S.J., Jarmuz, S., Koopman, P.L., Thierry, H., & Wilderom, C.P.M. (1997b). Cross-cultural perceptions of leadership: A comparison of leadership and societal and organizational culture in The Netherlands and Poland. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 28, 255–267.
- Dorfman, P.W., & Martinez, S. (1999). Globe: Mexican anthology chapter. In R.J. House & J.S. Chhokar (Eds), *Managerial cultures in 12 countries: A project GLOBE anthology, Vol. I*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Fu, P.P., Wu, R., Yaung, Y.Y., & Ye, J. (1999). GLOBE: Chinese culture and leadership in China. In R.J. House & J.S. Chhokar (Eds), *Managerial cultures in 12 countries: A project GLOBE anthology, Vol. I*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Hanges, P., House, R.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dickson, M.W., & 170 co-authors. (1999). The development and validation of scales to measure societal and organizational culture. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- House, R.J. (1995). Leadership in the 21st century: A speculative enquiry. In A. Howard (Ed.), *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- House, R.J., Hanges, P.I., & Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A. (1997a). GLOBE: The Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness research program. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 28, 215–254.
- House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S.A., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M.W., Gupta, V., & 159 co-authors. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. In W. Mobley, J. Gessner, & V. Arnold (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership* (pp. 171–233). Stamford, CN: JAI Press.
- House, R.J., Wright, N.S., & Aditya, R.N. (1997b). Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In P.C. Early & M. Erez (Eds), *New perspectives in international organizational psychology* (pp. 535–625). San Francisco: New Lexington.
- Hunt, J.G., Boal, K.B., & Sorensen, R.L. (1990). Top management leadership: Inside the black box. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 41–65.
- Jung, D.I., Bass, B.M., & Sosik, J.J. (1995). Bridging leadership and culture: A theoretical consideration of transformational leadership and collectivistic cultures. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2, 3–18.
- Kluckhohn, F.R., & Strodtbeck, F.L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Koopman, P.L., & Heller, F.A. (1999). Privatization and transformation in Central Europe: Lessons from six cases in Hungary. In L.A. ten Horn, B. Sverko, & I.L. Zinovieva (Eds), *Organizational psychology and transition processes in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 13–38). Rijeka, Croatia: Express Digitalni Tisak.
- Lord, R., & Maher, K.J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. Boston: Unwin-Everyman.
- Maczynski, J., Lindell, M., Motowidlo, S.J., Sigfrids, C., & Jarmuz, S. (1997). A comparison of organizational and societal culture in Poland and Finland. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 28, 269–278.
- McClelland, D.C. (1985). *Human motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Peterson, M.F., & Smith, P.B. (1997). Does national culture or ambient temperature explain cross-national differences in role stress? No sweat! *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 930–946.

- Ronen, S., & Shenkar, O. (1985). Clustering countries on attitudinal dimensions: A review and synthesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 435–454.
- Smith, P.B. (1997). Leadership in Europe: Euro-management or the footprint of history? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 6, 375–386.
- Smith, P.B., & Peterson, M.F. (1988). *Leadership, organizations and culture*. London: Sage.
- Smith, P.B., Peterson, M.F., & Misumi, J. (1994). Event management and work team effectiveness in Japan, Britain and the USA. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 33–43.
- Steers, R.M., Porter, L.W., & Bigley, G.A. (1996). *Motivation and leadership at work* (6th edn). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Thierry, H., Den Hartog, D.N., Koopman, P.L., & Wilderom, C.P.M. (1999). Culture and leadership in a flat country: The case of The Netherlands. In R.J. House & J.S. Chhokar (Eds), *Managerial cultures in 12 countries: A project GLOBE anthology, Vol. I*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Triandis, H.C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Van de Vliert, E., & Van Yperen, W.N. (1996). Why cross-national differences in role overload? Don't overlook ambient temperature! *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 986–1004.
- Vinkenburg, C.J. (1997). *Managerial behavior and effectiveness: Determinants, measurement and effectiveness*. Amsterdam: Dissertation Tinbergen Institute.

Copyright of European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology is the property of Psychology Press (T&F) and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.