Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions

Marcus W. Dickson[a,*], Deanne N. Den Hartog[b], Jacqueline K. Mitchelson[a]

[a]*Psychology Department, Wayne State University, 71 West Warren Street, Detroit, MI 48202, USA*
[b]*Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, The Netherlands*

Abstract

It is almost cliché to say that there has been an explosion in the amount of research on leadership in a cross-cultural context. In this review, we describe major advances and emerging patterns in this research domain over the last several years. Our starting point for this update is roughly 1996–1997, since those are the dates of two important reviews of the cross-cultural leadership literature [specifically, House, Wright, and Aditya (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 on international industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 535–625). San Francisco, CA) and Dorfman (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)]. We describe the beginnings of the decline in the quest for universal leadership principles that apply equivalently across all cultures, and we focus on the increasing application of the dimensions of culture identified by Hofstede [Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Abridged ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage] and others to describe variation in leadership styles, practices, and preferences. We also note the emergence of the field of cross-cultural leadership as a legitimate and independent field of endeavor, as reflected in the emergence of publication outlets for this research, and the establishment of long-term multinational multi-investigator research programs on the topic. We conclude with a discussion of progress made since the two pieces that were our departure point, and of progress yet to be made.
© 2003 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Cross-cultural; Universal; Multi-national; Globe; Leadership

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1-313-577-0753; fax: +1-313-577-7636.
E-mail address: mdickson@sun.science.wyne.edu (M.W. Dickson).

1. Introduction

To say that there has been an explosion in the amount of research on leadership that includes a cross-cultural component is at this point almost cliché. Simple comparisons show this explosion, such as the pages devoted to cross-cultural issues in leadership in the various editions of *The Handbook of Leadership*. In the first edition (Stogdill, 1974), cross-cultural leadership is barely mentioned. By the second edition (Stogdill & Bass, 1981), an entire chapter on cross-cultural issues in leadership had been added, spanning about 25 pages. By the third edition (Bass, 1990), that chapter had expanded to over 40 pages. Now, close to 15 years later, it would be essentially impossible to prepare a single chapter that presented an exhaustive account of the research on cross-cultural issues and leadership.

Instead, in this article we provide an update, rather than an exhaustive summation. Our starting point for this update is roughly 1996–1997, since those are the dates of two important reviews of the cross-cultural leadership literature. The first was a lengthy and wide-ranging review of issues related to cross-cultural leadership research, written by House, Wright, and Aditya (1997), which was accompanied by a particularly thoughtful commentary by Smith (1997). Both the chapter and the commentary appeared in *New Perspectives on International Industrial/Organizational Psychology*, edited by Chris Earley and Miriam Erez. The second review was a chapter by Peter Dorfman (1996), which has recently been updated (Dorfman, 2003). We thus intend to provide an update of advances in cross-cultural leadership research over the last 6 to 7 years, with occasional references to the House et al. and Dorfman reviews' propositions and recommendations for research.

We are certainly not the only researchers to review this literature in recent years. For readers interested in the issues surrounding the cross-cultural management of multinational corporations, we recommend the recent article by Miroshnik (2002), in which he presents the unique concerns of managing a multinational corporation, especially the challenges of effectively managing both national and corporate culture. For a very useful historical perspective of the role social issues, theories and methods have had in current international leadership, we recommend the excellent work by Peterson and Hunt (1997). In this review, presented in the International Leadership special issue of *The Leadership Quarterly*, Peterson and Hunt focus on the importance of studying leadership scientifically, and raise concerns about an American bias in our current leadership theories.

In structuring the current review, we do not present a simple chronology of articles, but instead have grouped the research we review into several themes. Our reading of the literature leads us to several conclusions about the current state of the field. Specifically, we have determined that:

1. The level of sophistication with which researchers think about etic or universal findings has advanced and become more complex, but also more realistic;
2. There have been advances and refinement in the definition of "culture" and the identification of dimensions of culture, with clear application of these dimensions to cultural variation in leadership; and

3. Cross-cultural leadership as a specific topic of study has been propelled forward by several specific events, including the two-issue special issue of *The Leadership Quarterly*, the advent of *Advances in Global Leadership* (an annual series edited by William Mobley and his colleagues), and several large multi-investigator, multination studies of culture and leadership.

Though it will be discussed in detail later, the primary example of the large research endeavors on cross-cultural issues in leadership is the GLOBE Project. As it will surface repeatedly throughout this article, a brief introduction to the project is warranted. Robert J. House is the Principal Investigator of GLOBE (the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Project), and along with several co-Principal Investigators and a multinational Coordinating Team, he leads a group of over 180 researchers from around the world in a study of the interacting effects of leadership, societal culture, and organizational culture. Data have been collected from over 60 countries, using surveys, unobtrusive measures, interviews, media analysis, and archival data (often from the United Nations). The first books from the GLOBE Project will be published in 2004 (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, in press) and 2005, and several articles based on the project have already appeared. As noted, many of these references to GLOBE appear throughout this article.

In the present article, we discuss these three developments, with examples of each. We intentionally have focused on research that is explicitly related to leadership. We have generally not included, for example, studies that could be tangentially related to leadership, but we have instead focused on studies that included leadership as a measured variable in the study. We conclude with a discussion of progress made (and not made) since the Dorfman (1996) and the House et al. (1997) reviews, and with suggestions for areas where targeted research could yield rapid advances in the field.

2. The cross-cultural research endeavor

Leadership research is a tricky endeavor. As many have noted (e.g., Bass, 1997; Chemers, 1997), there is no consistently agreed-upon definition of "leadership," and no clear understanding of the boundaries of the construct space (though in the organizational sciences, this is certainly not unique to the topic of leadership). Adding a cross-cultural component to the mix in leadership research makes the whole process even more complex. Without a workable framework to help narrow and guide cross-cultural leadership research, there is likely to be little coherence to the research being conducted.

Geert Hofstede is one of the people arguing for such a framework. Hofstede is a central figure in the development of literature on cultural variation and the dimension-based approach to assessing and classifying cultures. His book *Cultures' Consequences* (1980; 2001) was a major advancement in the application of the culture construct to organizations. Hofstede (1998b), among others, emphasizes that cultural differences are primarily encountered as differences in shared values, with values being defined as "broad tendencies to prefer certain states of affairs over others."

Hofstede has long argued that culture is often inappropriately applied in research settings, because too often there is little theoretical justification for expecting cultural differences, and no model to identify what differences should be expected (see, e.g., Hofstede, 1998b). In short, Hofstede says that in all cross-cultural research, there are three core questions that have to be addressed: "What are we comparing? Are nations suitable units for this comparison? Are the phenomena we look at functionally equivalent?"

Similarly, Drenth and Den Hartog (1998) posit that there are two basic questions to be addressed in cross-cultural organizational psychology. First, we have to determine whether organizations in different countries have consistently different characteristics or patterns of member behavior (or whether characteristics and behavior patterns interact consistently within cultures and differently between cultures). Second, we have to determine whether these differences are actually due to differences between the cultures, and this is largely determined by whether there is theoretical rationale for expecting the differences. In other words, these authors generally concur with Hofstede (1998b) about the importance of theory and solid design in cross-cultural leadership research.

Graen, Hui, Wakabayashi, and Wang (1997) note that cross-cultural research is essentially focused on comparability, and that etics and emics are the foci. "Emics are things that are unique to a culture, whereas etics are things that are universal to all cultures. Emics are by definition not comparable across cultures. One task of cross-cultural researchers, hence, is to identify emics and etics" (p. 162, for further explanation of the development of the etic and emic constructs, and the distinction between these two perspectives, see Peterson & Ruiz-Quintanilla, in press). Much, if not most, of the cross-cultural leadership research to date has been focused on the issue of equivalence—determining whether aspects of leadership and leadership theory are "universal" (etic) or are culturally contingent (emic). We thus begin with a review of recent research in this vein, particularly of research that has enhanced our understanding of the variety of ways to think about universality and cultural contingencies.

3. Exploring the nature of "universal" relationships

One of the primary questions in all cross-cultural research is whether phenomena are "universal" or culturally contingent and this is particularly true for the field of cross-cultural leadership research (Dickson, Hanges, & Lord, 2001). However, as Bass (1997) has pointed out, "universality" can mean a wide variety of things when applied to leadership. Thus, before addressing the question of the universality of leadership, we need to first understand what is meant by "universal." Work by Lonner (1980) and others is useful here. Specifically, Lonner identified several types of "universal" relationships, including:

- The *simple universal*, which is a phenomenon that is constant throughout the world. Specifically, a simple universal occurs when means do not vary across cultures;
- The *variform universal,* which refers to cases in which a general statement or principle holds across cultures but the enactment of this principle differs across cultures (i.e., culture moderates the relationship); and

- The *functional universal*, which occurs when the within-group relationship between two variables is the same across cultures. In other words, within-country correlations between variables are nonvariant across cultures.

Bass (1997) then introduced two other relevant conceptualizations of universality, including:

- The *variform functional universal*, which occurs when the relationship between two variables is always found, but the relationship's magnitude changes across cultures; and
- The *systematic behavioral universal*, which is a principle or theory that explains if–then outcomes across cultures and organizations. Systematic behavioral universals involve theories that claim either (a) a sequence of behavior is invariant over cultures, or (b) the structure and organization of a behavior or behavioral cluster is constant over cultures.

Several cross-cultural leadership researchers have approached the issue of universality. The framework above allows us to think more carefully about what their results mean, and whether their interpretations are consistent with each other.

Robie, Johnson, Nilsen, and Hazucha (2001) used Personnel Decisions International's (PDI) PROFILOR—a multisource managerial performance feedback system—to investigate whether various managerial skill dimensions were consistently seen as critical across a sample of seven European countries and the United States. Two of the managerial skill dimensions assessed by PROFILOR—"drive for results" and "analyze issues"—did in fact emerge as consistently endorsed, though several others did not. Thus, the universality of leadership skill dimensions was only very partially supported in this study.

In another study using a relatively small sample of countries, Silverthorne (2001a) was able to gather personality data on a sample of midlevel managers in the United States, China, and Thailand who had been identified as particularly effective or ineffective. Again, there was partial support for simple universality, in that effective leaders in all three countries tended to be low on neuroticism and high on extroversion. However, the relationship between effectiveness and the remaining three personality factors varied by culture, with high agreeableness and high conscientiousness both found in the more effective managers in the United States and China. High openness to experience was only significant for the effective U.S. managers.

Dorfman et al. (1997) also found partial evidence for universality—of leadership behaviors, in this case—and partial evidence for cultural contingency. This study had a more detailed theoretical base than many studies assessing the universality model, in that that the authors used House's (1971) Path–Goal Theory and Yukl's (1971) Multiple Linkage Model as guides for hypothesis development. The sample consisted of managers and professionals in Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Mexico, and the United States, who assessed the leadership behaviors of their supervisors. Leader supportiveness, contingent reward, and charismatic leadership were consistently endorsed in all five cultures, whereas participative leadership, directive leadership, and contingent punishment behaviors were culturally contingent, in different ways. In the United States, contingent punishment had positive effects but

undesirable effects in the other countries. Directive leadership behaviors had positive effects in Taiwan and Mexico, while participative leadership behaviors had positive effects in the United States and South Korea. Thus, simple universality was again only slightly supported.

One study in which simple universal effects related to leadership were found is a study that took a somewhat different approach to the topic. Mellahi (2000) built from Peterson and Hunt's (1997) concerns about an American bias in cross-cultural leadership research, and assessed the origins of leadership perceptions of Asian, Arab and African managers who had received a Westernized MBA education. Mellahi found that Western leadership values are emphasized as most important in the UK MBA programs while indigenous leadership values are neglected in the educational system and through this neglect, are interpreted by international students to be unimportant. This was proposed to potentially lead to increased consistency of perceptions by managers trained in Western-style business programs.

3.1. The decline in the quest for simple universality

Several factors have led to a decline in the volume of research focused on identifying simple universals. One reason that studies seeking to find characteristics or behaviors that are universally endorsed (in the sense of simple universality) seem to have declined over time appears to be that this is essentially the same as testing the null hypothesis. In other words, trying to find that the enactment or the importance of a characteristic does not vary is a difficult task, as it is the reverse of the way hypotheses are typically tested. As various dimensionalizations of culture have emerged and been refined, it is much more common now to see attempts to find differences between cultures on leadership traits, characteristics, and relationships that conform to or can be explained by the various cultural dimensions.

Additionally, the recognition that much leadership theory has a distinctly American bias has made some researchers particularly interested in unique ways in which leadership manifests itself in other cultures. An example of a non-Western style of leadership that is valued and found in many developing nations is paternalism (e.g., Dorfman & Howell, 1988), which will be described in more detail below. However, culture specific non-Western models are not always presented in international journals. In addition, much research assesses whether a model developed elsewhere is also applicable in a different context (e.g., Silverthorne, 2001b, who studied the path–goal model in Taiwan) or compares the effects of a set of behaviors in different cultures (e.g., Dorfman et al., 1997) rather than starting to build new models from the unique vantage point of a specific culture.

Clearly, we have begun to recognize that variform and variform functional universals can be simultaneously universal and culturally contingent in a predictable way, as when the variation in the enactment of a common characteristic or the strength of a common relationship is determined by measurable characteristics of the cultures. We turn now to the topic of those measurable characteristics, which are generally referred to as dimensions of culture.

Reflective of the trend toward examining forms of universality other than the simple universal (and particularly of exploring variform and variform functional universals), a small group of studies has emerged in the past year assessing the universality of one particular trait

for effective leadership—interpersonal acumen, or relational competence. While there are several trait variables that have been investigated in recent years (e.g., charisma, self-monitoring), for space reasons we use this one as an example of that body of research. We briefly turn to this topic now.

3.2. Interpersonal acumen

An emerging area of research investigates the universality of social intelligence levels in leaders. Aditya and House (2002) recently presented an integration of the research in the area of interpersonal acumen and implicit leadership theories within different societal cultures. Interpersonal acumen refers to the ability to decipher the underlying motives or intentions of other's behavior. Aditya and House, using data from the GLOBE Project, present evidence that the implicit leadership theories of members in different societies include characteristics related to interpersonal acumen.

For example, leaders in Colombia rated *cunning* as contributing to outstanding leadership, whereas in Switzerland cunning, or being sly and deceitful, is rated as inhibiting outstanding leadership. Because cunning includes being deceitful in its description, one can infer that this trait represents a discrepancy between one's public actions and one's private intentions, which creates a need for interpersonal acumen. Other characteristics of leaders that represented a need for interpersonal acumen were indirect communication, evasive behaviors and sensitivity. Each of these characteristics varied by societal culture with some cultures rating these characteristics as contributing to outstanding leadership and others as inhibiting outstanding leadership.

Javidan and House (2001) present arguments for the necessity of global managers to have cultural acumen or to be sensitive to cultural differences. Also using data from GLOBE, they present findings relevant to global managers regarding how to interact with members of various cultures. In short, they provide advice for creating effective cross-cultural communications. These lessons give examples of how specific societies may respond to communication styles. For example, in Russia and Thailand where hierarchical and status differentials (i.e., "power distance") are high, communication is mostly one-way, from the top down. Further, managers are expected to know more than subordinates, and input from subordinates is neither solicited nor appreciated (Javidan & House, 2001). The lessons presented may serve as a starting point for bolstering interpersonal and cultural acumen in global managers.

In the last study to mention in this section, Clark and Matze (1999) present a model of relational competence, defining it as the ability of a person or organization to effectively and appropriately manage relationships across diverse settings. Relational competence is focused on fostering development in the self and others through the quality of the interaction. As such, they argue that it should be a central characteristic across settings.

One seemingly related concept to interpersonal acumen is emotional intelligence (EI), in that EI is presumed to incorporate the ability to recognize and interpret the emotional states of others (Mayer, DiPaolo, & Salovey, 1990; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). Though there is little research to date explicitly addressing the effects of emotional intelligence on leadership

effectiveness in a cross-cultural context, a recent meta-analysis shows that emotions are recognized universally at better than chance levels (Elfenbein & Ambady, 2002). Further, the authors found an in-group advantage such that accuracy of emotion recognition increased when the emotion is expressed and recognized by someone of the same ethnic, national, and regional group.

More work is beginning to appear on this topic, as shown by several recent research presentations at major conferences. Two such examples are work by Shipper, Rotondo, and Hoffman (2003) and by Rahim et al. (2003) at the Academy of Management conference in August, 2003. Both studies find the self-awareness aspect of emotional intelligence is related to leadership effectiveness, and both note theoretically expected cultural differences in these effects.

Though there are to date relatively few studies of the importance of interpersonal competence or acumen for leadership across cultures, we see this as a potentially worthwhile topic of study. Given the recent interest in emotional intelligence and other aspects of interpersonal skills for leaders, it is a logical extension to consider the role this range of personal characteristics may play in cross-cultural leadership, and whether these effects are in some way universal or culturally contingent.

4. Dimensions of societal culture and leadership research

As stated earlier, one way to approach the study of culture is through the identification and measurement of dimensions of culture, and several different typologies of societal cultural value orientations or culture dimensions have been developed. In this section, we review research relating some such culture dimensions to leadership. Our goal is to illustrate research that provides more insight in culture dimensions to leadership. To introduce the various dimensions, we present examples of studies that help clarify the meaning of the dimension, and then move to studies that are more explicitly related to leadership in cross-cultural contexts.

The most widely recognized (as well as strongly criticized) culture dimensions are undoubtedly the ones described by Hofstede (1980, 2001). Hofstede's (1980) well-known original study was based on a survey among IBM managers and employees in over 40 countries. Later research also includes other countries and different samples (e.g., Hofstede, 2001). Hofstede originally found four culture dimensions (individualism–collectivism; masculinity–femininity; uncertainty avoidance; and power distance) and in later work, a fifth dimension (future orientation) was added.

Other dimensional frameworks include those by Schwartz (1999), Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997), Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), and those developed in the GLOBE study (e.g., House, Hanges, & Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1997; House et al., 1999) described in more detail below. In discussing the relationship between culture dimensions and leadership, we will focus primarily on the dimensions developed by Hofstede (referring to others when appropriate) as these have been studied most extensively to date.

It is important to note that, though widely used, Hofstede's work has received substantial criticism. For instance, according to critics, Hofstede presents an overly simplistic dimensional conceptualization of culture, the original sample came from a single multinational corporation (IBM), his work ignores the existence of substantial within-country cultural heterogeneity, his measures are not valid, and culture changes over time rather than being static as suggested by the dimensions (e.g., Sivakumar & Nakata, 2001). For other overviews or critiques of the Hofstede dimensional framework and research, see Kirkman, Lowe, and Gibson (2003), McSweeney (2002), Schwartz (1994), Smith (2002), and Smith and Bond (1999). Notwithstanding these points of criticism, Hofstede's work has had a major influence. Here we describe studies linking his culture dimensions to leadership.

4.1. Power distance

Leadership involves disproportionate influence, and all over the world, the leadership role is associated with power and status. Thus, the way in which power and status are divided in society is obviously relevant to the leadership role. Hofstede (1980, 2001) defines *power distance* (PD) as the extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally. In cultures with large differences in power between individuals, organizations will typically have more layers and the chain of command is felt to be more important.

In line with Hofstede, Schwartz (1999) contrasts hierarchical and egalitarian cultures. The first emphasize the chain of authority and hierarchical structures. An unequal distribution of power and status is legitimate and expected. Employees comply with directives without questioning them. In contrast, people in egalitarian cultures view each other as moral equals. Employees typically have their say in decisions affecting them and share in goal-setting activities (Den Hartog & Dickson, in press; Sagiv & Schwartz, 2000).

Power distance and a hierarchical orientation in society have an impact on management policies in organizations. For example, power distance in society is negatively related to having employee stock ownership plans in organizations and the accompanying decision-making authority (Schuler & Rogovsky, 1998). It also influences the preferences and attitudes of individuals. For instance, job level is less strongly related to job satisfaction in a low power distance context than in a high power distance context (Robie, Ryan, Schnieder, Parra, & Smith, 1998). Earley (1999) investigated the effects of cultural power distance and status characteristics on group efficacy and team performance on a managerial simulation task. In high power distance cultures, high status members' estimates of efficacy were more strongly related to collective efficacy measures and performance than low status group members' efficacy estimates. However, in low power distance cultures, group members' efficacy estimates were equally related to collective efficacy.

Power distance in society is also directly related to leadership. For example, subordinates in high (rather than low) power distance societies are more reluctant to challenge their supervisors and more fearful in expressing disagreement with their managers (Adsit, London, Crom, & Jones, 1997). Power distance has an impact on subordinates' expectations and preferences regarding leadership (e.g., people want and expect more guidance in societies

with more power distance) as well as on acceptable or typical patterns of leader behavior (e.g., autocratic leadership is more acceptable and effective in high PD societies). We will discuss some studies relating to this below.

A first impact of PD relates to the characteristics or behaviors leaders need to demonstrate to be recognized as effective leaders in a given context (Lord & Maher, 1991). People from different cultures associate different characteristics and behaviors with the leadership role and PD is one of the factors shaping such images of effective leadership. The GLOBE Project reports leadership attributes that are universally endorsed as contributing to outstanding leadership, and others which are universally seen as undesirable (Den Hartog et al., 1999). GLOBE also reports attributes that are culturally contingent. For instance, in all participating countries, an outstanding leader is expected to be encouraging, motivational, dynamic, and to have foresight. Similarly, in all participating cultures, outstanding leaders were expected not to be noncooperative, ruthless, and dictatorial. However, the perceived importance of many other leader attributes varied across cultures. Several of the leader attributes that were found to vary across cultures reflect high power distance versus egalitarianism in society. Examples are: "status-conscious," "class-conscious," "elitist," and "domineering." Such attributes are appreciated for leaders in high but not in low power distance cultures (see Den Hartog et al., 1999; Dorfman, Hanges, & Brodbeck, in press, for a full list of attributes).

The GLOBE study not only reports on specific item-level behaviors and attributes of leaders, but also combines the leadership items into first and second order factors (Hanges, Dickson, & Sipe, in press). An interesting result relating to PD is that the endorsement of participative leadership (one of the second-order dimensions) varies in different parts of the world (i.e., in different clusters of cultures). Empirically derived clusters of countries comprising Germanic, Anglo, and Nordic European cultures were each particularly attuned to participative leadership. In contrast, the Middle Eastern, East European, Confucian Asian and Southern Asian clusters did not endorse participative leadership as strongly. This cluster-level endorsement of Participative Leadership is significantly predicted by the degree of Power Distance in those clusters (Dorfman et al., in press). (The culture cluster approach is described in more detail below.)

The GLOBE data demonstrate that PD impacts the endorsement of participative leadership. Other studies focus on the effectiveness of actual leader behavior. The aforementioned study by Dorfman et al. (1997) compared actual leader behavior in five countries (United States, Mexico, Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea). The differences they found reflect differences in PD between these countries. For instance, directive leadership only had positive outcomes in terms of satisfaction and commitment in Mexico and Taiwan (cultures relatively high on Power Distance). Participative leadership only had positive effects in the United States and South Korea (cultures relatively low on Power Distance). In Mexico and the United States, the researchers were also able to collect job performance data. In the United States, only participative leadership had a direct and positive relationship with performance. In contrast, in Mexico, only directive and supportive leadership were directly and positively related to performance. This again illustrates the link between power distance and participative leadership.

In the study by Dorfman et al. (1997) described above, the combination of directive and supportive leadership was found to be highly effective in Mexico. Such a highly directive leadership style that is also high on status-orientation, support and involvement in nonwork lives is often referred to as a "paternalistic" style of leadership, a style that is prevalent in many developing nations (e.g., Dorfman & Howell, 1988; Dorfman et al., 1997; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996). Cultures of developing countries tend to share such characteristics as being higher on power distance, having strong family bonds and a sense of fatalism, and expecting organizations to take care of their workers as well as the workers' families. This is reflected in such a paternalistic style of leadership, which seems to be a particular manifestation of PD in combination with other dimensions (Aycan, in press; Den Hartog & Dickson, in press).

Power distance also plays a role in employees' willingness to accept supervisory direction, and on their emphasis on gaining support from those in positions of authority. Bu, Craig, and Peng (2001) compared the willingness to accept supervisory direction among Chinese, Taiwanese and U.S. employees through a vignette study. Overall, Chinese employees had the strongest tendency to accept direction and the US employees the least. Chinese employees were most sensitive to the consistency between the supervisory direction and company policies, and were less responsive to their own assessment of the merit of the directions they were given. These findings are in line with results from the more elaborate research on event management.

For example, Smith et al. (2002) and Smith, Peterson, and Misumi (1994) show that managers in countries characterized by high power distance report more use of formal rules and procedures set by the top in handling day-to-day events. They also report less reliance on subordinates and their own experience in dealing with everyday events than do managers from countries low in power distance. In their study on innovation, Shane, Venkataraman, and MacMillan (1995) also find that support from higher levels is emphasized more in high PD countries. In other words, the greater the power distance in a society, the more people prefer innovation champions to focus on gaining the support of those in authority (rather than building a broad base of support for new ideas among organization members) before other actions are taken on the innovation.

Eylon and Au (1999) compared the effects of empowerment for MBAs from high and low PD countries participating in a management simulation. Participants from both high and low PD cultures were more satisfied with their job in the empowered condition and less satisfied in the disempowered condition. However, participants from high PD cultures did not perform as well when empowered as when disempowered, whereas those from low PD cultures performed equally well regardless of the empowerment process. Thus, society-level PD moderated the relationship between leader style of empowerment and subsequent subordinate performance, suggesting a variform functional universal.

Recent research has also started to suggest that PD may play a role in the enactment of transformational leadership in different cultures. Preferences for and positive effects of transformational leadership have been found in many different cultures (Bass, 1997). However, the enactment of transformational leadership may vary. According to Bass (1990), transformational leadership may take more as well as less participative forms. This

seems likely to be linked to societal norms and values regarding power and status differentials.

In highly egalitarian countries such as The Netherlands and Australia, transformational leader behaviors are highly correlated with participation in decision making (Ashkanasy & Falkus, in press; Den Hartog, 1997; Feather, 1994). This suggests that transformational leaders may need to be more participative to be effective in highly egalitarian societies. In contrast, in high power distance societies, transformational leadership may take a more directive form (Den Hartog et al., 1999). Given the generally positive outcomes associated with transformational leadership across societies (Bass, 1997), further research on this is needed to better explicate the varying enactments of transformational leadership style.

Finally, though it is rarely considered in this way, it is important to note that the use of the various bases of power identified by French and Raven (1959) can be affected by the societal culture dimension of PD. Rahim, Antonioni, Krumov, and Ilieva (2000), for example, examined supervisor power base in a quest to understand subordinate job effectiveness. They drew on a matched sample from the United States (low PD) and Bulgaria (high PD). Among their findings were that supervisors' use of referent power (which is based on interpersonal attraction, identification, admiration and personal liking of a supervisor) was positively related to subordinate effectiveness in the United States. However, in Bulgaria, supervisor use of legitimate power (which is based on subordinates' beliefs that the supervisor has the right to control their behavior) was positively related to subordinate effectiveness. Thus, the leaders' enactment of differential power and the subordinates' response to that enactment can both be seen to be related to the societal culture dimension of Power Distance. Looked at from a different perspective, this is congruent with the aforementioned work of Shipper et al. (2003) who found that in low power distance cultures, the self-awareness of interactive skills aspect of emotional intelligence is more predictive of leader effectiveness, while in high power distance countries, self-awareness of controlling skills is the better predictor.

Summarizing, research shows that power distance in society has an impact on different aspects of leadership. People tend to prefer leadership that is more egalitarian when power distance is low. Where power distance is high, leaders tend to be less participative and more authoritarian and directive. Such directive leadership is also more effective in a high power distance context. In addition, a stronger emphasis on the use of rules and procedures is seen when power distance is high and people are more inclined to gain support from those in authority before carrying out new plans.

4.2. Uncertainty avoidance

Uncertainty avoidance (UA) is another dimension identified by Hofstede. UA refers to the degree to which members in a society feel uncomfortable with ambiguous and uncertain situations, and take steps to avoid them. It describes a society's reliance on social norms and procedures to alleviate the unpredictability of the future. Hofstede (1980) defined uncertainty avoidance as the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations by believing in absolute truths and the attainment

of expertise, providing greater (career) stability, establishing more formal rules, and rejecting deviant ideas and behaviors. This has several broad implications for societies. For example, Shane (1993) found that uncertainty-accepting societies are more innovative than uncertainty-avoiding societies.

As mentioned before, the GLOBE Project assessed the endorsement of leader attributes in different cultures. Some of the attributes that were found to vary across cultures reflect uncertainty avoidance. Being habitual, procedural, risk-taking, able to anticipate, formal, cautious, and orderly are leader attributes middle managers perceive as enhancing outstanding leadership in some countries, while impeding it in others (Den Hartog et al., 1999; Dorfman et al., in press). Further, in a separate study, Offermann and Hellmann (1997) looked at actual leader behavior, and found that managers from high uncertainty avoidance countries, compared to those from low uncertainty avoidance countries, tended to be more controlling, less delegating and less approachable.

UA in society is not only reflected in leader attributes but also in ways in which future leaders are prepared for the leadership role. In societies high on UA, such things as career stability, formal rules and the development of expertise tend to be valued, whereas in low UA cultures, more flexibility in roles and jobs, an emphasis on general rather than specialized skills and more job mobility is more typical. For instance, Stewart, Barsoux, Kieser, Ganter, and Walgenbach (1994) compared career management activities for young managers in Germany (high on UA) and the United Kingdom (low on UA) and found that the British managers typically placed more emphasis on career mobility and generalization, while the German managers spent more time in a single job and valued the development of specialized, task-related expertise.

Stewart et al. (1994) also found that British managers expected resourcefulness and improvisation from their subordinates, whereas German managers expect reliability and punctuality. This is in line with other studies comparing high and low UA contexts. For example, Shane (1995) found lower preferences for innovation championing roles (including the transformational leader role) in high UA societies. Also, Shane et al. (1995) found that the higher the level of UA in a society, the more people preferred innovation champions to work through the existing organizational norms, rules and procedures to promote innovation. The more uncertainty accepting a society was, however, the more people endorsed innovation champions' efforts to overcome organizational inertia by violating organizational rules and regulations.

In line with these studies, Rauch, Frese, and Sonnentag (2000) compared the success of planning for small business leaders in Germany (high UA) and Ireland (low UA). German business owners plan more and in more detail. Careful and detailed planning and on-time delivery are needed to meet customer expectations in their context. In Ireland, planning is less valued and customers expect high flexibility. Planning too much is seen as risky, as this may decrease the ability to rapidly respond to changing needs and demands of customers. In short, detailed planning by leaders was found to have a positive influence on small business success in the high UA context (Germany) but a negative influence in the low UA context (Ireland).

Thus, UA has an impact on the characteristics associated with outstanding leadership and leaders' typical career patterns. UA also influences the expectations leaders have of

subordinates and customers have of businesses. In high UA contexts, planning and detailed agreements are the norm, whereas in low UA contexts flexibility and innovation are more prominent.

4.3. Collectivism

Another well-known culture dimension is individualism versus collectivism (IC). Cultures characterized by individualism can be seen as loosely knit social frameworks in which people are supposed to take care of themselves and look after their own interests and those of their close family only. A tight social framework with strong and cohesive in-groups that are opposed to out-groups is a key characteristic of high collectivism. People expect their in-group to look after them and are loyal to it in return (Hofstede, 1980, 2001).

Schwartz (1999) takes a slightly different approach to this issue, describing it in general as the extent to which people in societies are autonomous versus embedded in the group. Individuals in autonomous cultures are perceived as autonomous entities that find meaning in life through their uniqueness. High embeddedness means that people are perceived as part of the collective and find meaning and direction in life through participating in the group and identifying with its goals. Organizations tend to take responsibility for their members in all domains of life and in exchange, loyalty and identification are expected.

This dimension is clearly related to overall societal functioning. Diener, Diener, and Diener (1995) showed that after controlling for income, human rights, social equality, and heterogeneity only individualism was positively related to the subjective well-being of nations. In a study among 47 nations, Schwartz and Sagie (2000) found that socioeconomic development as well as democratization increased the importance of independent thought and action, concern for the welfare of others generally (as opposed to specific others, like family members), openness to change, self-indulgence and pleasure and decreased the importance of conformity, tradition, and security. Martella and Maass (2000) found that IC moderated the relationship between being unemployed and having lower life satisfaction, self-esteem, and happiness, such that the relationship is stronger for individualists than for collectivists.

IC has been studied widely in organizational research at different levels of analysis. For example, IC has played a role in studies on reward allocation as well as evaluation. Gomez, Kirkman, and Shapiro (2000) found that collectivists gave more generous evaluations to in-group members than did individualists, and Kirkman and Shapiro (2000) found collectivism to be positively related to receptivity to team-based rewards. IC's effects are also found in research on teams. For example, a team collectivistic orientation was positively related to cooperation, which in turn mediated the collectivism–performance relationship (Eby & Dobbins, 1997). In addition, group efficacy and group performance were positively related when collectivism was high, but were not related when collectivism was low (Gibson, 1999). Thus, IC has been shown to be a meaningful dimension at the individual, team, organizational, and societal levels of analysis.

IC can also be linked to leadership. In the GLOBE study, several leader attributes that reflect differences in IC were found to vary across cultures. For instance, being autonomous,

unique, and independent are found to contribute to outstanding leadership in some, but to be undesirable in other cultures (Den Hartog et al., 1999). Other research suggests that collectivist values seem to fit well with some of the processes central to transformational leadership, such as the central role of the group and identification processes (Jung & Avolio, 1999). Collectivists are expected to be more prone to identify with their leaders' goals and the common purpose or shared vision of the group and organization and typically exhibit high levels of loyalty (Jung, Bass, & Sosik, 1995). Collectivists tend to have a stronger attachment to their organizations and tend to be more willing to subordinate their individual goals to group goals (e.g., Earley, 1989; Triandis, 1995). This is also central to the process of transformational leadership (e.g., Bass, 1985). People from individualist cultures, however, are expected to be more motivated to satisfy their own self-interests and personal goals. Individuals take care of themselves, and individual initiative, achievement, and rewards are central. As such, individualists may be more motivated by more short-term focused transactional leadership (Jung & Avolio, 1999).

To test these assumptions, Jung and Avolio (1999) manipulated transformational and transactional leadership styles. They compared the effects of these styles in individual and group task conditions to assess whether a different impact on individualists and collectivists performing a brainstorming task would be found. Collectivists with a transformational leader were found to generate more ideas, whereas individualists generated more ideas with a transactional leader. In another study, collectivism was positively related to the level of charismatic leadership, which in turn was positively related to supervisory ratings of work unit performance, job satisfaction, satisfaction with the leader, and leader effectiveness (Pillai & Meindl, 1998). In addition, collectivism was positively related to affective and noncalculative aspects of an individual's motivation to lead (Chan & Drasgow, 2001).

4.3.1. Horizontal and vertical aspects of IC

Individualism and collectivism are often treated as two distinct cultural patterns, existing at either end of a single continuum. However, Triandis (1995) argued that different kinds of individualism and collectivism exist. An important distinction is that between so-called "horizontal" and "vertical" patterns in individualism and collectivism based on the relative emphases on horizontal and vertical social relationships. "Generally speaking, horizontal patterns assume that one self is more or less like every other self. By contrast, vertical patterns consist of hierarchies, and one self is different from other selves" (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998, p. 119). These relative emphases combine with individualism and collectivism to produce four patterns: horizontal individualism (HI), vertical individualism (VI), horizontal collectivism (HC), and vertical collectivism (VC).

In the HI pattern, people typically want to be unique and distinct from groups and they are highly self-reliant. However, people desire to be unique among equal others and are not especially interested in becoming distinguished or in having high status. In the VI pattern, people do strive to become distinguished, acquire status or outperform others. To do so, they engage in competition with other individuals. In the HC pattern, people emphasize connectedness, common goals and interdependence and see themselves as being

similar to others. However, they do not submit easily to authority. In the VC pattern, people value the integrity of the in-group, and are willing to sacrifice their personal goals for the sake of in-group's goals. They support their in-group as it competes with out-groups. Traditionalism and respect for authorities are found. If in-group authorities want them to act in ways that they believe will benefit the in-group, people follow the will of these authorities even when they are not convinced of this course of action or would personally prefer to do something else (see Singelis, Triandis, Bhawuk, & Gelfand, 1995; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998).

Some recent studies have related this framework to other variables. For example, Nelson and Shavitt (2002) use the horizontal and vertical distinction within individualism and collectivism to predict differences in achievement values in Denmark and the United States. The United States was found to be more vertically oriented than Denmark and Denmark more horizontally oriented than the United States. These differences in cultural orientations corresponded to differences in the importance placed on achievement and the display of success as U.S. individuals discussed the importance of achieving goals more frequently and evaluated achievement values more highly than Danes did.

Some other interesting relationships between VC and respecting and following wishes of in-group authorities have been found. Ng and Van Dyne (1999) demonstrate in an experimental setting at the individual level that individualists and collectivists react differently to minority influence. For example, influence targets high on VC demonstrated higher quality decisions when the influence agent held a high status position in the group. Also, in a study among three groups of high school students, modesty was positively related to VC (Kurman & Sriram, 2002). Kemmelmeier et al. (2003) assessed the relationship between authoritarianism and Triandis' (1995) horizontal–vertical individualism–collectivism framework in samples from Bulgaria, Japan, New Zealand, Germany, Poland, Canada, and the United States. Both at the individual level and the societal level of analysis, authoritarianism was correlated with vertical individualism and vertical collectivism.

Triandis and Gelfand (1998) also found a relationship between VC and authoritarianism. In their research the vertical collectivists seemed to be more authoritarian and traditional, but also stressed sociability. Horizontal collectivists stressed sociability, interdependence, and hedonism. Also, vertical individualists stressed competition and hedonism more than horizontal individualists and the horizontal individualists stressed self-reliance. Thus, authoritarianism is related to collectivism, but especially to those elements of collectivism that have to do with hierarchy and submission to in-group authority and not to aspects of collectivism that emphasize closeness and interpersonal connection.

The strong deference to and respect for authority that seems to accompany high vertical collectivism suggests links to leadership. It seems interesting for future research to also more explicitly relate the differences in horizontal and vertical aspects of individualism and collectivism to leadership. Preferred and successful ways to lead people are likely to differ for these four groups, but to date there is insufficient research on the relationships between vertical and horizontal IC and leadership to draw any firm conclusions.

4.4. Masculinity and related dimensions

Hofstede (1998a, 1998c, 2001) also describes a culture dimension labeled Masculinity versus Femininity. According to Hofstede, masculinity implies dominant values in a society that stress assertiveness and being tough, the acquisition of money and material objects, and not caring for others, the quality of life or people. In feminine cultures, values such as warm social relationships, quality of life, and care of the weak are stressed.

Hofstede also explicitly links this dimension to gender differences. Research has shown that successful managers are stereotypically viewed as more similar to men than to women on attributes considered critical to effective work performance, such as leadership ability, self-confidence, ambition, assertiveness, and forcefulness. Though there is a substantial amount of within-culture research on this (primarily in the United States), Schein (2001) has found this both in the United States and in several other countries (e.g., China, Japan, Great Britain, and Germany). High societal masculinity characterizes societies in which men are expected to be assertive and tough and women are expected to be modest and tender. In contrast, low masculinity (or high femininity) characterizes societies where both men and women are expected to be modest and tender (Hofstede, 2001). Achievement motivation and an acceptance of "machismo style" management should be higher in countries high on masculinity than in those low on masculinity (Triandis, 1994).

Hofstede (2001) holds that masculine and feminine cultures create different leader hero types. The heroic manager in masculine cultures is decisive, assertive, and aggressive. In feminine cultures, the "hero" is less visible, seeks consensus, and is intuitive and cooperative rather than tough and decisive. However, studies do not always support this. For example, Helgstrand and Stuhlmacher (1999) compare leader prototypes of Danish and American participants. Danish and American cultures have been found to differ on masculinity and individualism. It was expected that individuals would rate a leader candidate that matched their own culture as more effective and more collegial than a leader that did not match. Unexpectedly, the highest leader ratings were not in conditions with a cultural match between participants and leader candidate. Rather, both cultures saw feminine leaders as most collegial and feminine–individualistic leaders as most effective. However, the research did not assess whether leaders with those traits/styles were actually more effective.

This dimension is probably the most heavily critiqued of Hofstede's dimensions. Hofstede has argued that the dimension as he conceived it is generally misunderstood, even going so far as to publish a separate book entitled *Masculinity and Femininity: The Taboo Dimension of National Cultures* (Hofstede, 1998c). Nonetheless, critics have asserted that it is not well measured and that the dimension includes too many very different topics that are not necessarily related. These potentially separate topics include gender role division, assertiveness, dominance and toughness in social relationships, being humane or focused on quality of life, and being performance or achievement oriented.

In an attempt to address these concerns, the GLOBE study measured these aspects of masculinity separately, and labeled them as "gender egalitarianism," "assertiveness," "performance orientation," and "humane orientation" (e.g., Den Hartog et al., 1999; House et al., in press). We now briefly highlight two of the main elements of Hofstede's conception of masculinity: gender role division/gender egalitarianism, and assertiveness.

As noted, the GLOBE study assesses the level of gender egalitarianism in society separately from other aspects of masculinity. Some societies are more gender egalitarian and seek to minimize gender role differences; whereas other societies are more gender differentiated and seek to maximize such differences (Emrich, Denmark, & Den Hartog, in press; House et al., 1999). Emrich et al. (in press) show that stereotypes of women are more positive in societies embracing gender-egalitarian values. In these societies, gender equality was also achieved to a greater degree in labor forces, governments, and national politics. GLOBE researchers assessed the extent to which culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership reflect gender egalitarianism. More gender egalitarian cultures were found to endorse charismatic leader attributes such as foresight, enthusiastic, and self-sacrificial as well as participative leader attributes such as egalitarian, delegator, and collectively oriented (Emrich et al., in press).

GLOBE defines assertiveness as the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies are assertive, tough, dominant, and aggressive in social relationships (Den Hartog, in press). Assertiveness can be seen as a style of responding that implies making one's wants known to others. Being direct and unambiguous in expressing oneself is associated with this. Research supports the idea that in some cultures conversational directness is valued, while in others it is rejected. For instance, in the United States, a negative relationship between assertiveness and indirect language use was found and conversational indirectness was negatively correlated with social desirability (Holtgraves, 1997). In other cultures, a less direct manner of expressing one's self and polite and subtle ways of conversing are valued. Koreans, for instance, were found to be more indirect in communication than Americans (Holtgraves, 1997). Such indirectness in communication can be linked to 'face management' (e.g., Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Thus, differences in preferred and typical conversational directness are found between cultures. The GLOBE results also show that attributes such as "indirect," "evasive" and "intuitive" were felt to contribute to outstanding leaders in some cultures, but not in others (Den Hartog et al., 1999). Related to this, societal norms also influence whether emotions are shown in public. For instance, the GLOBE study found that the appreciation of leader attributes such as "subdued" and "enthusiastic" varies across cultures, which reflect differences in cultural rules regarding the appropriate expression of emotion (Den Hartog et al., 1999). In affective cultures, people typically show their emotions. Effective leaders communicate through a vivid and temperamental expression of emotion. In more neutral cultures, people keep their emotions in check. The norm is to present oneself in a composed and subdued manner. Other research confirms that displaying emotion may be interpreted as a lack of self-control or weakness (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 1997).

In sum, there are several characteristics rolled together in Hofstede's conceptualization of masculinity. While these dimensions have been found in some cross-cultural studies to be correlated, it is not clear that they consistently form a cohesive factor (i.e., that the between subdimension relationships are consistent enough across cultures to be considered a functional universal). Given that there can be markedly different leadership implications for the varying subdimensions, the GLOBE approach of separating them seems most appropriate to us.

4.5. Conclusion to dimensions

Though we have treated the cultural dimensions one by one, it is of course true that different cultural dimensions can be simultaneously active in affecting leaders and followers. Offermann & Hellmann (1997) provide one example of this, in their empirical validation of Hofstede's (1980) initial culture study at IBM. They used the Survey of Management Practices (Wilson & Wilson, 1991) and Hofstede's original cultural values for midlevel managers in a multinational organization with citizenship from 39 different countries. Their findings indicate that managers from low PD countries tended to use more communication behaviors and were perceived as more approachable than managers from higher power distance countries. Additionally, managers with citizenship from high UA countries, compared to managers from low UA countries, tended to be more controlling, less delegating and less approachable.

A second conclusion to this section is that the boundaries between this trend (focusing on dimensions) and the prior one (looking for universals) are admittedly blurry. However, we see these as reflecting different emphases, if not different analytic methods, and we see them as having fundamentally different implications for the study of leadership. Both emphases are important—understanding what leadership behaviors, styles, and traits will be useful regardless of cultural setting provides important information. Understanding how the expected enactment of those behaviors, styles, and traits varies in systematic ways across cultures, and how the magnitude of the relationships between leader activities and subsequent performance and follower perceptions of the leader is dependent on broader aspects of culture, is at least equally as important.

Lastly, though we have focused on Hofstede's dimensions because of their prominence in the cross-cultural leadership literature, it is important to remember that there remains some disagreement about the dimensionality of culture. We have already alluded to Schwartz's dimensions, and to some aspects of the GLOBE dimensions, and others have different sets of dimensions, as well. Additionally, Smith, Dugan, and Trompenaars (1996) attempted to test the various dimensionalizations presented by Hofstede (1980), the Chinese Culture Connection (1987), Schwartz (1992), and Trompenaars (1993). Using an existing databank representing 43 countries, Smith et al. found two clear dimensions (conservatism vs. egalitarianism, and utilitarian involvement vs. loyal involvement), along with a third factor that was not clearly identifiable. Thus, there is still some ambiguity about the best way to implement the dimensional approach to culture, and this of course impacts the way these dimensions can be applied to the leadership domain.

5. Explicit recognition of cross-cultural leadership as a domain of study

One of the most important developments in the study of cross-cultural leadership in the past several years has been the recognition that this is a valid and appropriate field of study, rather than being seen simply as an adjunct to cross-cultural research, or to leadership research. Still today, few scholars publishing in the field would characterize themselves as "cross-cultural leadership researchers," and most cross-cultural leadership research has been conducted by leadership researchers who apply a cultural lens to extant leadership theories. Nonetheless, cross-cultural leadership seems to be clearly emerging as a distinct domain of study. Several events serve as evidence of this development, and we group them into two primary categories. First, publication outlets explicitly devoted to cross-cultural leadership have emerged, and second, large-scale multi-investigator multination studies of leadership and culture have begun to emerge.

The 1997 two-issue special issue of *The Leadership Quarterly* was a key example of the emergence of publication outlets, and the 2002 GLOBE-focused issue of *The Journal of World Business* is another. The establishment of the biennial series *Advances in Global Leadership* edited by William Mobley et al. has been remarkably well received, as well. To date, three volumes in the series have appeared, with the first edited by Mobley, Gessner, and Arnold (1999), the second by Mobley and McCall (2001), and the third by Mobley and Dorfman (2003). Among the several stated goals of the series are:

- Understanding the interplay among country and company cultures, corporate strategy, stage of company and business unit development, as well as individual differences;
- Evaluating the generalizability of models from Western cultures; and
- Understanding of multicultural and global leadership across national boundaries in nontraditional organizational structures, e.g., alliances and Joint Ventures (Mobley & McCall, 2001, pp. ix)

The series has brought together a wide range of authors and perspectives, is becoming an important resource for those interested in the study of leadership in a cross-cultural context, and contributes significantly to the decrease in the perception of cross-cultural leadership as a fringe topic.

A second, and in many ways related, development over the last few years has been the emergence of cross-cultural leadership studies that sample representatives from several cultures, rather than from two or three as had been more common in earlier cross-cultural leadership research. Such research has likely emerged because of newfound recognition of the importance of the field of cross-cultural leadership, and because of the emergence of outlets in which to publish this research and theory.

One of the primary advantages of these larger, multinational studies of leadership is that they move the field away from two-culture studies which, while often interesting and well-constructed in the choice of samples, can also end up providing a single data point that is unrelated (and unrelatable) to other literature. This may be because no one else has looked at the same set of variables using different countries, or perhaps because others did look at the

same variables but used different measures, or even because they used the same variables and the same measures, but different sampling strategies.

All of these concerns lead to an inability to integrate many two-culture studies into the broader cross-cultural leadership literature. Multination studies conducted by teams of researchers, all using the same instruments and construct definitions, are often better able to overcome these hurdles. For all of these reasons, the advent of larger cross-cultural leadership studies represents a major advance for the study of cross-cultural leadership. Additionally, by having multiple cases (cultures), we are better able to determine the degree of influence that a particular cultural dimension has on an outcome of interest, rather than simply being able to say that the means of two cultures differ. In statistical terms, this approach has allowed us to move away from ANOVA designs and into multiple regression designs.

An example of the typical two country assessment comes from Kuchinke's (1999) study, comparing the cultural work-values and transformational and transactional leadership of U.S. and German managers, engineers, and production employees of a telecommunications company. In this study, U.S. employees reported significantly higher levels of Charisma and Inspirational Motivation compared to the German employees; no significant differences were found for the other transformational and transactional measures. Cultural work-values also differed, with U.S. employees ranking higher in individualism and masculinity but lower in long-term orientation. Further, masculinity, long-term orientation, and individualism significantly predicted the two leadership styles of charisma and inspirational motivation, accounting for 7% of the variance in each leadership style.

Though these results are interesting, it is difficult to place these results in a larger context, or to relate them to those of other cross-cultural studies. We advocate larger samples of cultures, because this allows researchers to interpret the results in terms of theoretically relevant cultural dimensions, and to assess the variance accounted for by cultural dimensions, rather than simply saying whether the two cultures are significantly different on some measure of interest.

There are several avenues for conducting these larger multinational studies of leadership. Suutari (1996), for example, relied on a sample from a single multinational firm with facilities in five European countries (Denmark, Finland, Germany, Great Britain and Sweden). Another study assessing leadership patterns across several cultures was conducted by Ardichvili (2001). In this study, transformational leadership and work cultural values were assessed in a sample of large groups of managers and employees in the post-communist and former USSR countries of Russia, Georgia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgystan.

The Ardichvili (2001) study was particularly useful in that it responded to issues raised in Bass' (1997) article suggesting that transformational leadership is endorsed and has positive effects in many different cultures. However, the evidence Bass presents comes mostly from single country studies, comparing the effects of transformational to transactional leadership within a single cultural context. The Ardichvili study thus provided additional data to assess these assertions across multiple cultural contexts.

In the Ardichvili (2001) study, additional dimensions of fatalism and paternalism were considered alongside Bass' (1997) transactional–transformational leadership and Hofstede's

cultural values. Neither of the value dimensions of uncertainty avoidance and power distance demonstrated acceptable internal reliability, and they were thus not used in further analysis. All four countries were significantly different on the remaining cultural values, with the largest variance being explained by paternalism and masculinity. All four cultures were also significantly different on the leadership attributes, with the largest variance explained by contingent reward and individual consideration. When cultural values were regressed on leadership components, fatalism was the main predictor of most leadership dimensions in Georgia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyz Republic, while the long-term orientation was the main predictor of transformational leadership in Russia.

Morris et al. (1998) provide an additional example of how collecting data from multiple cultures allows for greater representation of the range of variation on cultural dimensions than do two-nation studies that can only treat cultural dimensions as dichotomies. Morris et al. assessed the conflict management style of MBA students in highly ranked programs in the United States, China, the Philippines, and India to further understand how cultural values effect managers' conflict style preferences. Using Schwartz's (1994) value dimensions, results suggested that Chinese managers relied on an avoiding style and U.S. managers relied more on a competing style.

Endorsement of cultural values differed by country with high social conservatism, meaning higher value on conformity and tradition values, in China and the Philippines compared to India and the United States. Achievement values were higher for U.S. managers than India, the Philippines and China and the value of power had the opposite pattern with significantly higher ratings by China, India and the Philippines compared to the United States. The U.S. managers rated openness to change higher than the other three countries managers did. A key aspect of the analyses was the discovery that the value dimension of social conservatism accounts for the greater use of an avoiding conflict style among Chinese managers. Individual achievement is most relevant to the country differences in the competing conflict style.

A second example of how even small samples of countries can allow for more in-depth analyses of the relationship between leadership and cultural values, Savicki (1999) investigated the relationship between national values and work values in six cultures (five countries). Findings in a sample of employees in child and youth care agencies indicate that national values of power distance and career success (masculinity) were related to work values. Power distance was positively related to control and negatively to peer cohesion, supervisor support, and work pressure. Career success was negatively related to peer cohesion and positively to supervisor support.

There are also some recent examples of cross-cultural leadership studies with larger samples of cultures. Geletkanycz (1997), for example, gathered survey data on leadership and corporate strategy from 1540 top managers in a variety of organizations in 20 countries. Individualism, uncertainty avoidance, power distance and long-term orientation were significantly related to executives' adherence to existing strategy and leadership profiles. In other words, executives from different cultural backgrounds were not equally open to change in leadership profiles and cultural socialization seemed more influential in this than professional experience where leadership profiles were concerned. Offermann and Hellmann (1997) (described earlier) also used survey methodology to gather data from a large sample

of cultures, ending with a sample of 425 midlevel managers from 39 distinct national cultures. We expect and advocate that these larger studies become more common in the next few years.

Despite the substantial advances these studies represent, there are still significant limitations present in the majority of them. Most consider relatively few cultures or focus specifically on one region of the world. Some measure culture, others simply apply the culture dimension scores found by Hofstede or others. The measures of leadership also vary. Some focus on a specific behavior or aspect, some on ideologies or preferred leadership and some test models developed in one region of the world in another world region. Still others do not refer to leadership as such, but test attitudes and behaviors that are relevant to the understanding of leadership in different cultures. Many studies rely on surveys as their sole method.

A few more extensive studies of leadership across cultures have been undertaken. An example is the research on event management that was described before (e.g., Smith & Peterson, 2000). However, the most extensive recent cross-cultural research project on leadership is the GLOBE study. We have referred to this study throughout this article, and we now focus in on this project.

5.1. Culture and the endorsement of leadership: project GLOBE

As has been noted throughout this review, the GLOBE research program is a long-term, multiphase, and multimethod project directed toward the development of systematic knowledge concerning how societal and organizational cultures affect leadership and organizational practices. Over 150 researchers from 61 countries from all major regions of the world participated in it, probably making it the most extensive investigation of cross-cultural aspects of leadership to date. The first phase of the study was aimed at developing research instruments. The second phase entailed quantitative as well as qualitative data collection and hypothesis testing. A third phase of data gathering is underway in 25 countries (see House et al., 1999; in press for a more detailed description of the project).

In the second phase, data were collected on nine culture dimensions. Hofstede's (1980, 2001) work served as an important source of inspiration for the dimensions, however, other work was also used to develop dimensions (e.g., Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; McClelland, 1985). In addition, all the measures for the culture dimensions were newly developed. The dimensions and their measures address several of the criticisms on Hofstede's work, including the conceptualization of the masculinity dimension (as noted above), and the issue of developing construct definitions prior to item development, rather than taking an existing item set and generating dimensions from it, as was done in the original work by Hofstede (1980). The dimensions assessed in the GLOBE Project are: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, in-group collectivism, institutional collectivism, gender egalitarianism, assertiveness, humane orientation, performance orientation, future orientation (for detailed descriptions of these dimensions, see House et al., 1999; in press).

For each of the nine dimensions, items were developed at two levels: societal and organizational. In addition, for all dimensions two measures were used. One taps the

participants' assessment of the extent to which a society engages in certain practices (items phrased in terms of the society or organization *as they are*). The other refers to *values* (i.e., the participants' evaluations of what practices *should be* enacted in society or the organization). Questionnaire items went through rigorous statistical procedures and the final scales were confirmed across all the countries in the GLOBE study (see Hanges & Dickson, in press). Responding managers filled out either the questionnaire measuring societal culture or the questionnaire measuring organizational culture, which eliminates the possibility of common source bias when relating societal and organizational scores to each other.

As mentioned above in the discussion of power distance, the cultures studied in the GLOBE Project can be meaningfully clustered into similar groups. Ten culture clusters were identified among the 62 GLOBE nations (e.g., Gupta, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002). These clusters include:

• Eastern Europe (Albania, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Poland, Russia, Slovenia);
• Nordic Europe (Denmark, Finland, Sweden);
• Germanic Europe (Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, German-speaking Switzerland);
• Latin Europe (France, Israel, Italy, Portugal, Spain, French-speaking Switzerland);
• Anglo [Australia, Canada (English-speaking), England, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa (White sample), USA];
• Sub-Saharan Africa [Namibia, Nigeria, South Africa (Black sample), Zambia, Zimbabwe];
• Confucian Asia (China, Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan);
• Southern Asia (India, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand);
• Middle East (Egypt, Iran, Kuwait, Morocco, Qatar, Turkey); and
• Latin America (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mexico, Venezuela).

The aforementioned special issue in the *Journal of World Business* published in 2002 presented descriptions of the GLOBE Project and the analyses leading to these clusters, as well as more detailed pictures of results in several of these country clusters. In this issue, Gupta, Surie, Javidan, and Chhokar (2002) describe Southern Asia; Ashkanasy, Trevor-Roberts, and Earnshaw (2002) cover the Anglo cluster; Kabasakal and Bodur (2002) review results for the Arab or Middle East cluster; Bakacsi, Takács, Karácsonyi, and Imrek (2002) cover the Eastern European cluster; Szabo et al. (2002) describe the Germanic European cluster; and Jesuino (2002) covered the Latin European cluster.

Additionally, the journal *Applied Psychology: An International Review* had a special issue in 2001 on leadership and culture in the Middle East in which several of the GLOBE countries in that region presented their findings (e.g., Abdallah & Al-Homoud, 2001 on the Gulf states; Dastmalchian, Javidan, & Alam, 2001 for Iran; Pasa, Kabasakal, & Bodur, 2001 for Turkey).

Besides culture, the second phase of GLOBE also measured perceptions of leadership. The leadership questionnaire items of the GLOBE study consist of 112 behavioral and attribute descriptors that were hypothesized to either facilitate or impede outstanding leadership.

Middle managers rated items on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from a low of 1 (this behavior or characteristic greatly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader) to a high of 7 (this behavior or characteristic contributes greatly to a person being an outstanding leader). Responses from some 17,000 middle managers of approximately 825 organizations in 62 nations are currently in the dataset (Dorfman et al., in press).

Den Hartog et al. (1999) presented evidence that several attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership are universally endorsed as contributing to outstanding leadership based on a study among approximately 15000 of these managers. In addition, they present evidence that the endorsement of many attributes varies across cultures (examples of such attributes were presented in the section on culture dimensions).

Dorfman et al. (in press) report similar findings as Den Hartog et al. (1999). Using the entire GLOBE dataset, Dorfman et al.'s analyses also revealed 21 dimensions and 6 second-order factors of leadership (see also Hanges et al., in press). These six include the highly correlated charismatic/value-based leadership and team-oriented leadership. The subdimensions comprising team-oriented leadership were universally endorsed, and this was also the case for two out of three parts of the charismatic/value-based dimension, namely *visionary* and *inspirational* attributes, but not for *self-sacrificial* attributes. The four other second-order dimensions vary more across cultures. Humane and participative leadership dimensions are generally viewed positively, but significant variability is found across cultures. Self-protective and autonomous leadership are generally viewed as neutral or negative but again this varies significantly by culture. For example, self-protective leader attributes (i.e., being *self-centered*, *status conscious*, *face saving,* and *inducing conflict*) is seen as extremely inhibiting to effective leadership in Nordic and Germanic European cultures, but far less so in Asian cultures. Regarding autonomous leadership, the Sub-Sahara African, Middle Eastern, Latin European, and Latin American clusters were strongest in rejecting autonomous attributes as contributing to outstanding leadership (see Dorfman et al., in press).

Charismatic/value-based leadership was best predicted by cultural values in the area of performance orientation and in-group collectivism. In relative terms, the Anglo, Germanic, and Nordic clusters score particularly high on the endorsement of Charismatic/Value-Based leader attributes. Members of societies high on in-group collectivism and humane orientation with high levels of uncertainty avoidance are likely to have leadership prototypes that emphasize team oriented leadership attributes. Relatively speaking, Southern Asian, Confucian Asian, and Latin American clusters find team-oriented leadership to be particularly critical for effective leadership. Uncertainty avoidance, assertiveness and power distance values were negatively related to the endorsement of participative leadership. Gender egalitarianism and the performance orientation were strong positive predictors of participative leadership. The Germanic, Anglo, and Nordic clusters were particularly supportive of participative leadership (Dorfman et al., in press).

For most of the GLOBE culture dimensions, cultural *values* predicted more variance in the GLOBE leadership dimensions than *practices*. Given the fact that people were asked to think of ideal typical leaders rather than actual leaders, this was expected. Both the values and the GLOBE leadership ratings reflect a desired state rather than an actual reality. Future research testing whether actual leader behavior is predicted more by the practices than the values is

interesting. In addition, the forthcoming GLOBE anthology book edited by Chhokar, House, and Brodbeck takes an in-depth look at different countries (through single country chapters). The qualitative elements of the study (such as interviews and media analyses) are reported in more detail there. In doing so, these chapters will present further insight on how different leadership behaviors are enacted in different cultures.

The analyses of the full dataset presented in the initial GLOBE book (House et al., in press) show that for several leadership dimensions, culture variables at the organizational level were at least as strong as those at the societal level in predicting perceptions of outstanding leadership. This is not surprising as middle managers were explicitly asked to rate whether characteristics would facilitate or impede outstanding leadership in their respective organizations. For example, Den Hartog (in press) addresses the role of the culture dimension of assertiveness. Cultural assertiveness reflects beliefs as to whether people are or should be encouraged to be assertive, aggressive, and tough or nonassertive, nonaggressive and tender in social relationships. The coefficients for assertiveness were stronger at the organizational level than at the societal level of analysis. Organizational assertiveness had a stronger relationship with team-oriented and participative leadership (negative), and humane-oriented and autonomous leadership (positive) than societal assertiveness.

In an article in *Sex Roles*, Bajdo and Dickson (2001) used the GLOBE organizational culture data to predict women's advancement into management from various organizational culture variables, after controlling for industry effects. Organizational culture values of humane orientation and gender egalitarianism were positively related to perceived percentage of women in management. Organizational culture practices of humane orientation, gender egalitarianism and performance orientation were positively and power distance negatively related to women's advancement. The culture dimension of gender egalitarianism was found to be the most important predictor of the perceived percentage of women in management.

Several studies have used the GLOBE data to look more closely at leadership and culture in specific regions. Using a European culture subset of the GLOBE data, Brodbeck et al. (2000) presented evidence that clusters of European cultures sharing similar cultural values also share similar profiles of "culturally endorsed implicit leadership theories." Using cluster analysis, a North/West and South/East European cluster emerged based on leadership prototypicality ratings, with France forming a distinctly unique cluster on its own. Leadership attributes that were important across all European countries, except for France, include being inspirational, visionary, integrity, performance orientation, decisiveness and a team integrator. Being self-centered and malevolent were attributes reported as impeding leadership in all countries, including France.

The endorsement of participation varied. It was ranked highly in France and the North/West European region, while ranking only slightly facilitative to leadership in the South/East European region. Brodbeck et al. (2000) then used multidimensional scaling (MDS) to create prototypical leadership dimensions. All European countries except France were included. They found that an interpersonal directness and proximity dimension distinguished the North/West European countries, where these attributes were more prototypical for outstanding leadership from the South/East European countries where this was less so. The Autonomy dimension distinguished the Germanic cluster, Georgia and the Czech Republic, where high

autonomy was perceived to be more prototypical of outstanding leadership, from the Anglo, Nordic, Central, Latin and Near East European countries, where this was less so.

Finally, the GLOBE Project provides a theoretical rationale for the cross-level effects under investigation, which is something that is too rarely done. Dickson, BeShears, and Gupta (in press) note that, while it is very common for researchers to assert that there is a link between societal culture and leadership or between societal culture and organizational culture (which is affected by leadership), there is little research or theory to date proposing the psychological means by which such effects occur. Dickson et al. propose several such mechanisms, and advocate more detailed examination of the relative importance of each. Some of the mechanisms for these effects are most directly assessed at an aggregate level (e.g., societal normative or coercive isomorphic pressures), while others are directly related to leaders and leadership (e.g., the cultural immersion of leaders with the dominant values system of their society, or the leaders' conscious response to mimetic isomorphic pressures). The variety of potential mechanisms for societal culture–leadership–organizational culture effects should be investigated further.

6. Progress in the field in the last several years

In the conclusion of their 1997 review, House, Wright, and Aditya advance three propositions for which they found theoretical and/or empirical support. In this brief section, we discuss each of these propositions—cultural congruence, cultural difference, and near universality of leader behaviors—and provide an update of the field's progress in supporting or disconfirming these propositions.

As originally presented by House et al. (1997), the cultural congruence proposition is based on the notion that leader behaviors that are accepted, enacted and effective within a collective are the behaviors that most clearly fit within the parameters of the cultural forces surrounding the leader. In other words, the cultural values surrounding the leader determine which leader behaviors tend to be most effective. Dorfman (2003) addresses this topic in more detail, and examples of this proposition can be seen in the research presented in this review.

Evidence for the cultural congruence proposition is demonstrated in the Morris et al. (1998) study. Morris et al. found that Chinese managers tended to rely on an avoiding conflict management style, possibly due to China's cultural values of conformity and tradition while U.S. managers relied more on a competing conflict management style, which is more congruent with their culture of achievement values. A similar cultural congruence was found in an investigation of the ability of cultural values to predict middle managers' reliance on sources of guidance in making managerial decisions (Smith et al., 2002). Specifically, it was found that managers in nations characterized by high individualism, cultural autonomy, egalitarianism, low power distance, harmony and femininity tended to favor more participative sources of guidance, such as experience and subordinates. However, managers in nations characterized by collectivism, cultural embeddedness, hierarchy, power distance, mastery, and masculinity tended toward a reliance on supervisors and rules. Together, these

studies demonstrate that those leader behaviors that are deemed effective tend to be those that are congruent with the cultural values of the collective.

House et al. (1997) also advanced the cultural difference proposition, which suggests that slight deviations of leader behavior from dominant cultural values will encourage innovation and performance improvement, precisely because they are nontraditional and unexpected. In other words, when the leader's behavior is somewhat different from what is commonly accepted within the collective, this will encourage growth and development, provided that the discrepancies are not so dramatically different from the norm as to disrupt the collective. Indeed, Conger and Kanungo (1987) argue that unconventional behavior by the leader is an important component of charismatic leadership. Unfortunately, as was found by House et al., we were unable to identify any explicit cross-cultural tests of this proposition.

The third proposition advanced by House et al. (1997) is the near universality of leader behaviors proposition. Specifically, some leader behaviors may be universally accepted and considered effective, regardless of the specific cultural values of the collective. Using data from GLOBE, Den Hartog et al. (1999) sought understanding of which attributes of charismatic or transformational leadership are universally endorsed as being related to either effective or ineffective leadership. Leader behaviors that reflect integrity, charisma, inspirational and visionary attributes were found universally endorsed as representing outstanding leadership. However, leadership attributes reflecting irritability, noncooperativeness, egocentric, being a loner, ruthlessness and dictatorial were associated with ineffective leaders. Also using GLOBE data, Brodbeck et al. (2000) studied the cultural variation in leadership prototypes among European nations and found that leadership attributes that were important across all European countries, except for France, included inspirational, visionary, integrity, performance orientation, decisiveness and team integrator. Further, leadership attributes of self-centeredness and malevolence were reported as impediments to effective leadership in all nations, including France.

Universally accepted and effective leader behaviors have also been discovered in studies other than those affiliated with the GLOBE project. In a study of US and European managers, Robie et al. (2001) found the managerial skills of a drive for results and analyzing issues to be universally effective leader behaviors as these two skills were the best predictors of managerial performance, as rated by supervisors. Lesley and Van Velsor (1998) found U.S. and European managers perceive effective leaders as valuing personal influence, cooperation and acceptance of rules and procedures set by an external authority.

Using fewer countries, Dorfman et al. (1997) found leadership behaviors of leader supportiveness, contingent reward and charisma were universally effective in Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Mexico, and the United States. Further, in a sample of leaders from the United States, Finland, and Poland, Mehta, Larsen, Rosenbloom, Mazur, and Polsa (2001) found a positive relationship between participative, supportive and directive leadership styles and levels of cooperation among followers. Finally, in an effort to understand the personality traits of effective leaders, Silverthorne (2001a) compared the personality correlates of managers deemed effective versus ineffective in samples from the United States, China, and Thailand. It was found that effective leaders in all three countries tended to be low on neuroticism and high on extroversion.

7. Conclusions: where the cross-cultural study of leadership is headed

Having reviewed this large amount and wide range of research conducted in such a short period, it becomes apparent that there has been systematic and incremental progress in our understanding of the leadership phenomenon in a cross-cultural context (e.g., in the explorations of cultural dimensions to leadership). Additionally, some avenues have emerged, leading to completely new areas of exploration (e.g., in the application of the information-processing literature to cross-cultural leadership). It is thus something of an exercise in fortune-telling to predict where the next major advances will come. Nonetheless, we'll attempt to be fortune-tellers for a moment, and identify some areas that we see as most ripe for further advancement in this domain.

7.1. Methodological issues

Several advances in the methods of cross-cultural leadership research have been alluded to in this review. These include the development of more specific delineations of cultural dimensions, the application of cluster analysis to develop statistically supported culture clusters, the use of Hierarchical Linear Modeling to assess cross-level effects in cross-cultural leadership research, and new emphasis on justifying aggregation based on statistical evidence such as the r_{wg} statistic, and ICC(1) and ICC(2). New research relying on the random group resampling technique advocated by Bliese (e.g., Bliese & Halverson, 2002) is likely to appear in print soon. However, this is only the proverbial tip of the iceberg compared to the range of issues where methodological advances in cross-cultural leadership research have occurred and are occurring.

Van de Vijver and Leung (2000) discussed several of these issues, including the extent to which methodological tools can help correct the overemphasis on fact finding and speed up the slow theoretical progress in cross-cultural psychology. In their analysis, they suggest that cross-cultural psychologists have created their own implicit biases and expectations, and that further, a variety of these have been inherited from mainstream psychology. They assert that, in the future, most cross-cultural studies will be carried out by researchers who have an interest in cultural variations on specific variables or instruments, whereas the group of researchers who spend their professional lives in cross-cultural psychology will remain small but influential. This has certainly been true in the research reviewed here—in the GLOBE Project, for example, few participating researchers would classify themselves primarily as "cross-cultural psychologists" or even "cross-cultural researchers," and most would describe themselves as researchers with an interest in leadership who are applying a cultural lens to that variable.

Van de Vijver and Leung (2000) go on to describe methodological issues arising in studies by both groups (i.e., researchers who are primarily cross-cultural researchers, and those who are researchers in other areas but apply culture to those topics). Important trends they identify include (a) the change from exploration to explanation of cross-cultural differences, which has implications for the design of cross-cultural studies (similar to the descriptions we have noted here, of the move away from the quest for simple universality towards more

comprehensive analyses relying on cultural dimensions); and (b) the so-far-hesitant usage of recently developed statistical techniques, such as item response theory, structural equation modeling, and multilevel modeling.

We anticipate continued advancement in cross-cultural leadership research, as in all forms of cross-cultural research, as measurement tools and analytical techniques improve. Issues still contested for which these advances could provide useful include:

• The problem of translation (i.e., what does it mean to say that "equivalent versions" of a survey across languages have been developed? How do we separate differences attributable to culture from differences attributable to language, especially given the arguments by linguistic anthropologists like Agar (1994) that language and culture are inseparable?)

• Various levels of analysis problems which arise because of the varying levels of measurement (i.e., societal culture is by definition an aggregate phenomenon, but leadership could be an individual, dyadic, team, organization, and/or society level phenomenon), and

• Enhanced understanding of the interrelationships and components of cultural dimensions (e.g., resolving the question of which subdimensions consistently interrelate sufficiently to be considered components of the masculinity dimension).

7.2. Definitional issues

The primary definitional question cross-cultural leadership researchers wrestle with is, quite simply, "What is a 'cross-cultural leader?'" The term "cross-cultural leadership research" is itself confusing, because of its ambiguity. It can refer to the study of people from one culture who find themselves in leadership situations in other cultures (e.g., the expatriate manager). It can also refer to the comparison of leadership research findings from one culture to those from a different culture.

Graen et al. (1997) have focused on the former definition, and have written about the type of person needed to conduct cross-cultural research and to be a cross-cultural leader. Graen et al. argue that the people involved in both of these endeavors need to be people who are not only open to the differences they encounter when interacting with other cultures. They must also show respect for cultures very different from their own, be able to overcome their own enculturation, and recognize what aspects of their personal values systems are a result of their own cultural experience.

In one such article, Graen and Hui (1999) argue that the perceptions of what it means to be a global leader are changing. No longer will "geocentric globetrotters" who are transferred from country to country to manage foreign operations be seen as the exemplars of the global leader. Instead, "transcultural creative leaders" will be required. These are people who can "learn to (1) transcend their childhood acculturation and respect very different cultures; (2) build cross-cultural partnerships of mutual trust, respect, and obligation; (3) engage in cross-cultural creative problem solving to resolve conflicts; and (4) help construct third cultures in various operations."

While we do not disagree with Graen et al. (1997) that such people are likely to be individually effective in cross-cultural leadership and research settings, we do not see these characteristics as becoming much more common in the marketplace to come than they are in the marketplace of today. Further, we do not believe that the data support the implied conclusion that increasing globalization of business will lead to a decrease in the importance of culture and its study—that as business becomes more international, there will cease to be meaningful differences between cultures and there will instead be a more broadly displayed, generic conglomeration.

For example, Drenth and Den Hartog (1998) examine the intriguing question in cross-cultural organizational psychology of whether the trend toward increasing internationalization leads to a more common organizational culture world wide (i.e., to increased cultural convergence). They conclude that, despite the increasing role of multinational firms, international supply chains, and other forces that could be seen to lead to homogeneity of cultural practices and values, these values and practices are still quite dissimilar. Research from the GLOBE study on leadership is an example. The authors contend that this research shows that although attributes associated with charismatic leadership are universally valued, this does not imply similar enactment of such characteristics across cultures.

Reading Scarborough (1998) leads one to a similar conclusion, following a different route. Despite the evidence that specific aspects of societal culture are related to increases in GDP, societal standard of living, and several other financial and business measures, many cultures continue to adhere to the values that they have embraced for decades. In other cases, societies have changed their business and leadership/management practices, but in ways that are congruent with their core cultural values. Leaders continue to lead in ways that reflect societal core values, despite external pressures to do otherwise.

We thus do not anticipate the emergence of a set of specific behaviors that will be universally effective (in the "simple universal" sense described earlier). Instead, we expect to see increasing results showing culture as a moderator of effects previously identified. Culture will continue to matter, and leaders will continue to face unexpected challenges when confronting cultural resistance.

7.3. Technological issues

As the first two of the present authors can testify, based on our experiences with GLOBE, advances in computer technology and the rapid growth of the Internet have had a major impact on the ability of researchers to conduct cross-cultural research of all sorts. Without email and the World Wide Web, it would be virtually impossible to coordinate the efforts of large teams of researchers all gathering data in different cultures and in different languages.

For example, a common experience in GLOBE was for researchers in one culture to raise a question about data collection process and email it to the project leadership. A decision could be made quickly through email or telephone conference call, and the answer to the question could then be distributed to all participating researchers worldwide within a couple of days at most, thus ensuring that everyone worked from the same understanding of the research

process. Had we had to rely on overseas postal services, the time delays in responding to questions would have led to significant variation in the data collection process. Many of us have said that the GLOBE Project could not have existed a decade earlier.

In the past few years, other technological advances have become more widespread, and we expect them to soon be applied to cross-cultural leadership research. Two in particular are the ability to collect data online, using web-based surveys, and the more widespread use of computer-mediated communication technology for video-conferencing or real-time chat. While online surveys will undoubtedly allow more researchers to collect data from several cultures, the simplicity of the process may also lead to researchers gathering data without sufficient background in cross-cultural issues to adequately interpret the data. This suggests to us that online data collection could eventually come to be seen as a mixed blessing.

Computer-mediated communication (CMC) is also a burgeoning field of research, with several researchers investigating the effects of (for example) different communications media, or of group gender ratios in decision-making groups (see Baltes, Dickson, Sherman, Bauer, & LaGanke, 2002, for a meta-analytic review of this research). Gelfand and Christakopoulou (1999) provide an example of this type of cross-cultural research in the field of negotiations— we expect to see more such research on leadership in the near future.

7.4. Theoretical issues

Earlier in this review, we had highlighted the need for a workable framework to help narrow and guide cross-cultural leadership research. Dorfman (2003) has presented the beginnings of such a framework in his culture enveloping model of leadership. This cross-cultural model of leadership was developed as a result of his recent review of cross-cultural leadership research. The model draws on both social cognitive information processing and the framework originally presented by Yukl (1989). Dorfman's model emphasizes cultures impact on leader power, personal characteristics of the leader, especially the leader's image, and interpersonal actions between the leader and followers or the leader and organizational groups. The cultural impact is felt via the schemas, scripts and prototypes of both leaders and followers. For example, leader power or potential to influence others is expected to vary depending upon cultural values such as power distance, with cultures considered high on power distance showing higher levels of leader power. Further, the image a leader crafts may be driven by the leader and followers prototype of the ideal and effective leader within their country or culture. This model provides a potential framework that may aid in narrowing and providing direction for future research in cross-cultural leadership.

Another theoretical consideration presented by Dorfman (2003) is the delineation of cultural caveats for leadership researchers. Dorfman describes important aspects of culture that may need to be considered by those interested in applying a cross-cultural lens on leadership research. Specifically, he describes four caveats that may warrant further investigation and consideration. The first caveat presented is the notion that "cultures are not static; they are dynamic and continually evolving." While Dorfman acknowledges the speed or rate of change in cultural values may not be great, he calls for researchers to consider potential

changes in the countries or cultures of interest. This concern for change in cultural values overtime has also been considered by Hofstede and Peterson (2000), who conclude that cultural values are relatively persistent and encourages researchers' use of prior ratings of countries. Support for this conclusion is found in d'Iribarne (1989, as cited in Hofstede & Peterson, 2000), who presents evidence that nations' values have shaped institutionalized business practices for more than 200 years.

Future research regarding the rate of change in cultural values will benefit our interpretation and practice of cross-cultural leadership research. As we await resolution of this issue, we suggest following the advice of both Dorfman (2003) and Hofstede and Peterson (2000), to consider any evidence of unusual social change within the culture or nation of interest and to support the conclusions drawn from sources such as GLOBE and Hofstede (1980) with supplemental data and information.

The second cultural caveat presented by Dorfman (2003) echoes a concern expressed originally by Triandis (1994) that, "although cultures may be characterized correctly as being high or low on a specific dimension (e.g., power distance), this orientation will not likely be characteristic for all issues or situations." In other words, expression of a cultural dimension within a culture may vary and seem contradictory at times. The third caveat is that individual differences will still exist in the adherence to cultural values and as such, not all individuals will display the cultural values of their indigenous culture. A final caveat is to not ignore significant differences within a country or culture, as well as significant differences between countries considered part of a country cluster. These caveats of research on cultural values need to be considered by those interested in cross-cultural leadership research.

In conclusion, we see significant progress over the last several years in the study of cross-cultural leadership research, and significant opportunities for further advancement in the near future. The issues we've discussed here are likely to remain important for the foreseeable future, and the combination of technological advances, larger multiculture samples, enhanced clarification of dimensions of culture, and better understanding and measurement of cognitive processes across cultures will allow us to better understand the role societal culture plays in the enactment and interpretation of the leadership role.

References

Abdallah, I. A., & Al-Homoud, M. A. (2001). Exploring the implicit leadership theory in the Arabian gulf states. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *50*, 506–531.

Aditya, R., & House, R. J. (2002). Interpersonal acumen and leadership across cultures: Pointers from the GLOBE study. In R. E. Riggio, & S. E. Murphy (Eds.), *Multiple intelligences and leadership* (pp. 215–240). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Adsit, D. J., London, M., Crom, S., & Jones, D. (1997). Cross-cultural differences in upward ratings in a multinational company. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *8*, 385–401.

Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock: Understanding the culture of conversation*. New York: William Morrow.

Ardichvili, A. (2001). Leadership styles and work-related values of managers and employees of manufacturing enterprises in post-communist countries. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *12*(4), 363–383.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Falkus, S. (in press). The Australian enigma. In J. Chhokar, F. C. Brodbeck, & R. J. House (Eds.), *Cultures of the world, A GLOBE anthology of in-depth descriptions of the cultures of 14 countries.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ashkanasy, N. M., Trevor-Roberts, E., & Earnshaw, L. (2002). The Anglo cluster: Legacy of the British empire. *Journal of World Business*, *37*(1), 28–39.

Aycan, Z. (in press). Managing inequalities: Leadership and teamwork in the developing country context. In H. Lane, M. Maznevski, M. Mendenhall, & J. McNett (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of global management: A guide to managing complexity.* London: Blackwell.

Bajdo, L. M., & Dickson, M. W. (2001). Perceptions of organizational culture and women's advancement in organizations: A cross-cultural examination. *Sex Roles*, *45*(5–6), 399–414.

Bakacsi, G., Takacs, S., Karacsonyi, A., & Imrek, V. (2002). Eastern European cluster: Tradition and transition. *Journal of World Business*, *37*(1), 69–80.

Baltes, B. B., Dickson, M. W., Sherman, M. P., Bauer, C. C., & LaGanke, J. S. (2002). Computer-mediated communication and group decision-making: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *87*, 156–179.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, *13*(3), 26–40.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and management 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.

Bliese, P. D., & Halverson, R. R. (2002). Using random group resampling in multilevel research. *Leadership Quarterly*, *13*, 53–68.

Brodbeck, F. C., Frese, M., Akerblom, S., Audia, G., Bakacsi, G., Bendova, H., et al. (2000). Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *73*(1), 1–29.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bu, N., Craig, T. J., & Peng, T. K. (2001). Acceptance of supervisory direction in typical workplace situations: A comparison of US, Taiwanese and PRC employees. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *1*(2), 131–152.

Chan, K. -Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 481–498.

Chemers, M. M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chinese Culture Connection (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *18*, 143–174.

Clark, B. D., & Matze, M. G. (1999). A core of global leadership: Relational competence. In W. H. Mobley (Ed.), *Advances in global leadership*, *vol. 1* (pp. 127–161). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*, 637–647.

Dastmalchian, A., Javidan, M., & Alam, K. (2001). Effective leadership and culture in Iran: An empirical study. *Applied Psychology: An International Review* (Special Issue: Leadership and culture in the Middle East: Norms, practices, and effective leadership attributes in Iran, Kuwait, Turkey, and Qatar), *50*(4), 532–558.

Den Hartog, D. N. (1997). *Inspirational leadership*. Amsterdam: Free University of Amsterdam (unpublished doctoral dissertation).

Den Hartog, D. N. (in press). Assertiveness. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Den Hartog, D. N., & Dickson, M. W. (in press). Leadership and Culture. In J. Antonakis, A. T. Cianciolo, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Den Hartog, D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., & GLOBE Associates

(1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly* (Special Issue: Charismatic and Transformational Leadership: Taking Stock of the Present and Future (Part I)), *10*(2), 219–256.

Dickson, M. W., BeShears, R. S., & Gupta, V. (in press). The impact of societal culture and industry on organizational culture: Theoretical explanations. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies, vol. 1*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dickson, M. W., Hanges, P. J., & Lord, R. M. (2001). Trends, developments, and gaps in cross-cultural research on leadership. In W. Mobley, & M. McCall (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership, vol. 2* (pp. 75–100). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Diener, E., Diener, M., & Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(5), 851–864.

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.

Dorfman, P. W. (2003). International and cross-cultural leadership research. In B. J. Punnett, & O. Shenkar (Eds.), *Handbook for international management research* (2nd ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Dorfman, P. W., Hanges, P. J., & Brodbeck, F. C. (in press). Leadership prototypes and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. (1988). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns. *Advances in International Comparative Management*, *3*, 127–150.

Dorfman, P. W., Howell, J. P., Hibino, S., Lee, J. K., Tate, U., & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *8*(3), 233–274.

Drenth, P. J. D., & Den Hartog, D. N. (1998). Culture and organizational differences. In W. J. Lonner, & D. L. Dinnel (Eds.), *Merging past, present, and future in cross-cultural psychology: Selected papers from the fourteenth international congress of the international association for cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 489–502). Bristol, PA: Swets and Zeitlinger Publishers.

Earley, P. C. (1989). Social loafing and collectivism: A comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *34*(4), 565–581.

Earley, P. C. (1999). Playing follow the leader: Status-determining traits in relation to collective efficacy across cultures. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *80*(3), 192–212.

Eby, L. T., & Dobbins, G. H. (1997). Collectivistic orientation in teams: An individual and group-level analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *18*(3), 275–295.

Elfenbein, H. A., & Ambady, N. (2002). On the universality and cultural specificity of emotion recognition: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*(2), 203–235.

Emrich, C., Denmark, F., & Den Hartog, D. N. (in press). Cross-cultural differences in gender egalitarianism: Implications for societies, organizations, and leaders. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies, vol. 1.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eylon, D., & Au, K. Y. (1999). Exploring empowerment cross-cultural differences along the power distance dimension. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *23*(3), 373–385.

Feather, N. T. (1994). Attitudes towards high achievers and reactions to their fall: Theory and research concerning tall poppies. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in social psychology, vol. 26* (pp. 1–73). New York: Academic Press.

French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150–167). Oxford, UK: University of Michigan.

Geletkanycz, M. A. (1997). The salience of 'culture's consequences': The effects of cultural values on top executive commitment to the status quo. *Strategic Management Journal*, *18*(8), 615–634.

Gelfand, M. J., & Christakopoulou, S. (1999). Culture and negotiator cognition: Judgment accuracy and negotiation processes in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *79*, 248–269.

Gibson, C. B. (1999). Do they do what they believe they can? Group efficacy and group effectiveness across tasks and cultures. *Academy of Management Journal*, *42*, 138–152.

Gomez, C., Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2000). The impact of collectivism and in-group/out-group membership on the evaluation generosity of team members. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*(6), 1097–1106.

Graen, G. B., & Hui, C. (1999). Transcultural global leadership in the twenty-first century: Challenges and implications for development. In W. H. Mobley (Ed.), *Advances in global leadership*, *vol. 1* (pp. 9–26). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

Graen, G. B., Hui, C., Wakabayashi, M., & Wang, Z. -M. (1997). Cross-cultural research alliances in organizational research. In P. C. Earley, & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 160–189). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gupta, V., Hanges, P. J., & Dorfman, P. W. (2002). Cultural clusters: Methodology and findings. *Journal of World Business*, *37*(1), 11–15.

Gupta, V., Surie, G., Javidan, M., & Chhokar, J. (2002). Southern Asia cluster: Where the old meets the new? *Journal of World Business*, *37*(1), 16–27.

Hanges, P. J., & Dickson, M. W. (in press). The Development and validation of the GLOBE culture and leadership scales. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies, vol. 1*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage.

Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W., & Sipe, M. (in press). Rationale for GLOBE statistical analyses: Scaling of societies and testing of hypotheses. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies, vol. 1*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Helgstrand, K. K., & Stulmacher, A. F. (1999). National culture: An influence on leader evaluations? *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *7*, 153–168.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Abridged ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1998a). Attitudes, values and organizational culture: Disentangling the concepts. *Organization Studies*, *19*(3), 477–493.

Hofstede, G. (1998b). A case for comparing apples with oranges—International differences in values. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, *39*(1), 16–31.

Hofstede, G. (1998c). *Masculinity and femininity: The taboo dimension of national cultures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G., & Peterson, M. (2000). Culture: National values and organizational practices. In N. Ashkanasy, C. Wilderom, & M. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. 401–416). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Holtgraves, T. (1997). Styles of language use: Individual and cultural variability in conversational indirectness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*, 624–637.

House, R. J. (1971). A path–goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *16*, 321–339.

House, R. J., Hanges, P., & Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A. (1997). GLOBE: The global leadership and organizational behavior effectiveness research program. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, *28*(3), 215–254.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.) (in press). *Leadership, culture, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., et al. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. In W. H. Mobley (Ed.), *Advances in global leadership, vol. 1* (pp. 171–233). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

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 on international industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 535–625). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Javidan, M., & House, R. J. (2001). Cultural acumen for the global manager: Lessons from Project GLOBE. *Organizational Dynamics*, *29*(4), 289–305.

Jesuino, J. C. (2002). Latin Europe cluster: From South to North. *Journal of World Business*, *37*(1), 81–89.

Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (1999). Effects of leadership style and followers' cultural orientation on performance in group and individual task conditions. *Academy of Management Journal*, *42*(2), 208–218.

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.

Kabasakal, H. E., & Bodur, M. (2002). Arabic cluster: A bridge between East and West. *Journal of World Business*, *37*(1), 40–54.

Kanungo, R. N., & Mendonca, M. (1996). Cultural contingencies and leadership in developing countries. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, *14*, 263–295.

Kemmelmeier, M., Burnstein, E., Krumov, K., Genkova, P., Kanagawa, C., Hirshberg, M. S., et al. (2003). Individualism, collectivism and authoritarianism in seven societies. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *34*(3), 304–322.

Kirkman, B. L., Lowe, K. B., & Gibson, C. B. (2003). *Two decades of culture's consequences: A review of empirical research incorporating Hofstede's cultural values framework.* Unpublished manuscript.

Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2000). Understanding why team members won't share: An examination of factors related to employee receptivity to team-based rewards. *Small Group Research*, *31*(2), 175–209.

Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961). *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

Kuchinke, K. P. (1999). Leadership and culture: Work-related values and leadership styles among one company's U.S. and German telecommunication employees. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *10*(2), 135–154.

Kurman, J., & Sriram, N. (2002). Interrelationships among vertical and horizontal collectivism, modesty and self-enhancement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *33*(5), 71–86.

Lesley, J. B., & Van Velsor, E. (1998). *A cross-national comparison of effective leadership and teamwork: Toward a global workforce*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Lonner, W. J. (1980). The search for psychological universals. In H. C. Triandis, & W. W. Lambert (Eds.), *PerspectivesHandbook of cross-cultural psychology*, *vol. 1* (pp. 143–204). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). *Leadership and information processing*. London: Routledge.

Martella, D., & Maass, A. (2000). Unemployment and life satisfaction: The moderating role of time structure and collectivism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *30*(5), 1095–1108.

Mayer, J. D., DiPaolo, M. T., & Salovey, P. (1990). Perceiving affective content in ambiguous visual stimuli: A component of emotional intelligence. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *54*, 772–781.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2000). Models of emotional intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of human intelligence* (2nd ed.) (pp. 396–420). New York: Cambridge.

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

McSweeney, B. (2002). Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith—A failure of analysis. *Human Relations*, *55*(1), 89–118.

Mehta, R., Larsen, T., Rosenbloom, B., Mazur, J., & Polsa, P. (2001). Leadership and cooperation in marketing channels: A comparative empirical analysis of the USA, Finland and Poland. *International Marketing Review*, *18*(6), 633–667.

Mellahi, K. (2000). The teaching of leadership on UK MBA programmes: A critical analysis from an international perspective. *Journal of Management Development*, *19*(4), 297–308.

Miroshnik, V. (2002). Culture and international management: A review. *Journal of Management Development*, *21*(7), 521–544.

Mobley, W., & Dorfman, P. W. (Eds.) (2003). *Advances in global leadership*, *vol. 3*. New York: JAI Press.

Mobley, W., Gessner, M. J., & Arnold, V. (Eds.) (1999). *Advances in global leadership*, *vol. 1*. New York: JAI Press.

Mobley, W., & McCall, M. (Eds.) (2001). *Advances in global leadership*, vol. 2. New York: JAI Press.

Morris, M. W., Williams, K. Y., Leung, K., Larrick, R., Mendoza, M. T., Bhatnagar, D., et al. (1998). Conflict management style: Accounting for cross-national differences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *29*(4), 729–747.

Nelson, M. R., & Shavitt, S. (2002). Horizontal and vertical individualism and achievement values: A multimethod examination of Denmark and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *33*(5), 439–758.

Ng, K. Y., & Van Dyne, L. (1999). Individualism–collectivism as a boundary condition for effectiveness of minority influence in decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *84*(2), 198–225.

Offermann, L. R., & Hellmann, P. S. (1997). Culture's consequences for leadership behavior: National values in action. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *28*(3), 342–351.

Pasa, S. F., Kabasakal, H. E., & Bodur, M. (2001). Society, organisations, and leadership in Turkey. *Applied Psychology: An International Review Special Issue: Leadership and culture in the Middle East: Norms, practices, and effective leadership attributes in Iran, Kuwait, Turkey, and Qatar*, *50*(4), 559–589.

Peterson, M. F., & Hunt, J. G. (1997). International perspectives on international leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *8*(3), 203–231.

Peterson, M. F., & Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A. (in press). Using emics and etics in cross cultural organizational studies: Universal and local, tacit and explicit. In K. Leung (Ed.), *Cross-cultural foundations: Traditions for managing in a global world.* Ashgate Press.

Pillai, R., & Meindl, J. R. (1998). Context and charisma: A "meso" level examination of the relationship of organic structure, collectivism, and crisis to charismatic leadership. *Journal of Management*, *24*(5), 643–671.

Rahim, M. A., Antonioni, D., Krumov, K., & Ilieva, S. (2000). Power, conflict, and effectiveness: A cross-cultural study in the United States and Bulgaria. *European Psychologist*, *5*(1), 28–33.

Rahim, M. A., Psenicka, C., Yu, C. -S., Zhao, J. -H., Yee, K. W., Polychroniou, P., et al. (2003). *A model of emotional intelligence and conlict management strategies: A study in seven countries.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Seattle, WA.

Rauch, A., Frese, M., & Sonnentag, S. (2000). Cultural differences in planning/success relationships: A comparison of small enterprises in Ireland, West Germany, and East Germany. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *38*, 28–41.

Robie, C., Johnson, K. M., Nilsen, D., & Hazucha, J. F. (2001). The right stuff: Understanding cultural differences in leadership performance. *Journal of Management Development*, *20*(7), 639–650.

Robie, C., Ryan, A. M., Schnieder, R. A., Parra, L. F., & Smith, P. C. (1998). The relation between job level and job satisfaction. *Group and Organization Management*, *23*, 470–495.

Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (2000). A new look at national culture: Illustrative applications to Role Stress and Managerial Behavior Conference presentations. In N. Ashkanasy, M. Peterson, & C. Wilderom (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational culture and climate* (pp. 417–437). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Savicki, V. (1999). Cultural work values for supervisors and managers: A cross-cultural look at child and youth care agencies. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, *28*(4), 239–255.

Scarborough, J. (1998). *The origins of cultural differences and their impact on management*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 675–688.

Schuler, R. S., & Rogovsky, N. (1998). Understanding compensation practice variations across firms: The impact of national culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *29*, 159–177.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *25*, 1–65.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Cultural dimensions of values: Towards an understanding of national differences. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theoretical and methodological issues* (pp. 85–119). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwartz, S. H. (1999). A theory of cultural values and some implications for work. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *48*, 23–47.

Schwartz, S. H., & Sagie, G. (2000). Value consensus and importance: A cross-national study. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *14*(2), 61–74.

Shane, S. A. (1993). Cultural influences on rates of innovation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *7*, 29–46.

Shane, S. A. (1995). Uncertainty avoidance and the preference for innovation championing roles. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *26*, 47–68.

Shane, S. A., Venkataraman, S., & MacMillan, I. (1995). Cultural differences in innovation championing roles. *Journal of Management*, *21*, 931–952.

Shipper, F. M., Rotondo, D. M., & Hoffman IV, R. C. (2003). *A cross-cultural study of linkage between emotional intelligence and managerial effectiveness*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Seattle, WA.

Silverthorne, C. (2001a). Leadership effectiveness and personality: A cross cultural evaluation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *30*(2), 303–309.

Silverthorne, C. (2001b). A test of the path–goal leadership theory in Taiwan. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *22*, 151–158.

Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and vertical dimensions of individualism and collectivism: A theoretical and measurement refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *29*, 240–275.

Sivakumar, K., & Nakata, C. (2001). The stampede toward Hofstede's framework: Avoiding the sample design pit in cross-cultural research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *32*, 555–574.

Smith, P. B. (1997). Cross-cultural leadership: A path to the goal? In P. C. Earley, & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 626–639). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, P. B. (2002). Culture's consequences: Something old and something new. *Human Relations*, *55*(1), 119–135.

Smith, P. B., & Bond, M. H. (1999). *Social psychology across cultures: Analysis and perspectives* (2nd ed.). London: Harvester Wheatheaf.

Smith, P. B., Dugan, S., & Trompenaars, F. (1996). National culture and the values of organizational employees—A dimensional analysis across 43 nations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *27*(2), 231–264.

Smith, P. B., & Peterson, M. (2000). How leaders handle work events: Individual and culture-level analyses. *International Journal of Psychology*, *35*(3–4), 300.

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.

Smith, P. B., Peterson, M. F., Schwartz, S. H., Ahmad, A. H., Akande, D., Andersen, J. A., et al. (2002). Cultural values, sources of guidance, and their relevance to managerial behavior—A 47-nation study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *33*(2), 188–208.

Stewart, R., Barsoux, J. L., Kieser, A., Ganter, H. D., & Walgenbach, P. (1994). *Managing in Britain and Germany.* London: St. Martin's Press/MacMillan Press.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.

Stogdill, R. M., & Bass, B. M. (1981). *Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (2nd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Suutari, V. (1996). Leadership ideologies among European managers: A comparative survey in a multinational company. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *12*(4), 389–409.

Szabo, E., Brodbeck, F. C., Den Hartog, D. N., Reber, G., Weibler, J., & Wunderer, R. (2002). The Germanic Europe cluster: Where employees have a voice. *Journal of World Business*, *37*(1), 55–68.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of collectivism and individualism. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 41–51). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*(1), 118–128.

Trompenaars, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business*. London: Economist Books.

Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (1997). *Riding the waves of culture: understanding cultural diversity in business* (2nd ed.). London: Nicholas Breale.

Van de Vijver, F. J. R., & Leung, K. (2000). Methodological issues in psychological research on culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31*(1), 33–51.

Wilson, C. L., & Wilson, J. L. (1991). *Teams and leaders: A manual for the Clark Wilson Publishing Company training and development programs*. Silver Spring, MD: Clark Wilson Group.

Yukl, G. (1971). Toward a behavioral theory of leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6*, 414–440.

Yukl, G. (1989). *Leadership in organizations* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.