

## CULTURE SPECIFIC AND CROSS-CULTURALLY GENERALIZABLE IMPLICIT LEADERSHIP THEORIES: ARE ATTRIBUTES OF CHARISMATIC/TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP UNIVERSALLY ENDORSED?<sup>1</sup>

This study focuses on culturally endorsed implicit theories of leadership (CLTs). Although cross-cultural research emphasizes that different cultural groups likely have different conceptions of what leadership should entail, a controversial position is argued here: namely that attributes associated with charismatic/transformational leadership will be universally endorsed as contributing to outstanding leadership. This hypothesis was tested in 62 cultures as part of the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) Research Program. Universally endorsed leader attributes, as well as attributes that are universally seen as impediments to outstanding leadership and culturally contingent attributes are presented here. The results support the hypothesis that specific aspects of charismatic/transformational leadership are strongly and universally endorsed across cultures.

Deanne N. Den Hartog  
Vrije Universiteit-Amsterdam  
Representing the Netherlands

Robert J. House  
University of Pennsylvania  
Principal Investigator

Paul J. Hanges  
University of Maryland  
Principal Investigator

S. Antonio Ruiz-Quintanilla  
Cornell University  
GLOBE Coordinating Team

Direct all correspondence to: Deanne N. Den Hartog, Free University, Work and Organizational Psychology, v.d. Boechorst straat 1, 1081 BT Amsterdam, the Netherlands; email: dn.den.hartog@psy.vu.nl.

Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 219-256.  
Copyright © 1999 by Elsevier Science Inc.  
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved.  
ISSN: 1048-9843

Peter W. Dorfman  
New Mexico State University  
GLOBE Coordinating Team and representing Mexico

and

Ikhlas A. Abdalla, Arab Fund for Economic & Social Development, representing Qatar

Babajide Samuel Adetoun, Appropriate Development Associates, representing Nigeria

Ram N. Aditya, Louisiana Tech University, Senior GLOBE Research Associate

Hafid Agourram, University of Quebec-Montreal, representing Morocco

Adebowale Akande, Potchefstroom University, representing South Africa

Bolanle Elizabeth Akande, Center for Sustainable Development and Gender Issues, representing Nigeria

Staffan Akerblom, Stockholm School of Economics, representing Sweden and member of the GLOBE Coordinating Team

Carlos Altschul, Universidad de Buenos Aires, representing Argentina

Eden Alvarez-Backus, Sony Electronics, representing the Philippines

Julian Andrews, University of Alberta, representing Canada

Maria Eugenia Arias, independent consultant, representing Costa Rica

Mirian Sofyan Arif, University of Indonesia, representing Indonesia

Neal M. Ashkanasy, University of Queensland, representing Australia

Arben Asllani, Bellevue University, representing Albania

Guiseppe Audia, London Business School, representing Italy

Gyula Bakacsi, Budapest University of Economic Sciences, representing Hungary

Helena Bendova, Jihoceske Univerzita, representing the Czech Republic

David Beveridge, Western Illinois University, representing Bolivia

Rabi S. Bhagat, University of Memphis, representing the USA.

Alejandro Blacutt, Universidad Catolica Boliviana, representing Bolivia

Jiming Bao, Fudan University, representing China

Domenico Bodega, University of Luigi Bocconi, representing Italy

Muzaffer Bodur, Bogazici University, representing Turkey

Simon Booth, University of Reading, representing England

Annie E. Booysen, University of South Africa, representing South Africa

Dimitrios Bourantas, Athens University of Economics and Business, representing Greece

Klas Brenk, Univerzita Ljubljana, representing Slovenia

Felix Brodbeck, University of Munich, representing Germany and member of the GLOBE Coordinating Team

Dale Everton Carl, University of Calgary, representing Canada

Philippe Castel, Université de Bourgogne, representing France

Chieh-Chen Chang, National Sun Yat-Sen University, representing Taiwan

Sandy Chau, Lingnam College, representing Hong Kong

Frenda Cheung, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, representing Hong Kong

Jagdeep S. Chhokar, Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad, representing India and member of the GLOBE Coordinating Team

Jimmy Chiu, City University of Hong Kong, representing Hong Kong  
 Peter Cosgriff, Lincoln University, representing New Zealand  
 Ali Dastmalchian, University of Lethbridge, representing Iran  
 Jose Augusto Dela Coleta, Centro Universitario do Triangulo, representing Brazil  
 Marilia Ferreira Dela Coleta, Universidade Federal de Uberlandia, representing Brazil  
 Marc Deneire, University of Nancy 2, representing France  
 Markus Dickson, Wayne State University, member of the GLOBE Coordinating Team  
 Gemma Donnelly-Cox, University of Dublin-Trinity College, representing Ireland  
 Christopher Earley, University of Indiana, representing China  
 Mahmoud A. E. Elgamal, Kuwait University, representing Kuwait  
 Miriam Erez, Israel Institute of Technology, representing Israel  
 Sarah Falkus, University of Queensland, representing Australia  
 Mark Fearing, Lincoln University, representing New Zealand  
 Richard H. G. Field, University of Alberta, representing Canada  
 Carol Fimmen, Western Illinois University, representing Bolivia  
 Michael Frese, University of Giessen, representing Germany  
 Pingping Fu, Chinese University of Hong Kong, representing China  
 Barbara Gorsler, University of Zurich, representing French Switzerland  
 Mikhail V. Gratchev, Institute of World Economy and International Relations, representing Russia  
 Vipin Gupta, Fordham University, Senior Globe Research Associate  
 Celia Gutierrez, Complutense University, representing Spain  
 Frans Marti Hartanto, Institut Teknologi Bandung, representing Indonesia  
 Markus Hauser, University of Pennsylvania, Senior Globe Research Associate  
 Ingalill Holmberg, Stockholm School of Economics, representing Sweden  
 Marina Holzer, Altschul Consultores, representing Argentina  
 Michael Hoppe, Center for Creative Leadership, representing the U.S.A.  
 Jon P. Howell, New Mexico State University, representing Mexico  
 Elena Ibrieva, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, representing Kazakhstan  
 John C. Ickis, INCAE, representing Costa Rica  
 Zakaria Ismail, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, representing Malaysia  
 Slawomir Jarmuz, University of Opole, representing Poland  
 Mansour Javidan, University of Calgary, representing Iran and member of the GLOBE coordinating Team  
 Jorge Correia Jesuino, Instituto Superior de Ciencias do Trabalho e da Empresa, representing Portugal  
 Li Ji, Hong Kong Baptist University, representing Singapore  
 Kuen-Yung Jone, Kaohsiung Medical College, representing Taiwan  
 Geoffrey Jones, University of Reading, representing England  
 Revaz Jorbenadse, Tbilisi State University, representing Georgia  
 Hayat Kabasakal, Bogazici University, representing Turkey  
 Mary Keating, University of Dublin-Trinity College, representing Ireland  
 Andrea Keller, University of Zurich, representing French speaking Switzerland  
 Jeffrey C. Kennedy, Lincoln University, representing New Zealand

Jay S. Kim, Ohio State University, representing South Korea  
 Giorgi Kipiani, Georgian Academy of Sciences, representing Georgia  
 Matthias Kipping, University of Reading, representing England  
 Edvard Konrad, Universiti Ljubljana, representing Slovenia  
 Paul L. Koopman, Vrije Universiteit-Amsterdam, representing the Netherlands  
 Fuh-Yeong Kuan, Shu-Te Institute of Technology, representing Taiwan  
 Alexandre Kurc, University of Nancy 2, representing France  
 Marie-Francoise Lacassagne, Universite de Bourgogne, representing France  
 Sang M. Lee, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, representing Albania and Kazakhstan  
 Christopher Leeds, University of Nancy 2, representing France  
 Francisco Leguizamon, INCAE, representing Costa Rica  
 Martin Lindell, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, representing Finland  
 Jean Lobell, AcXEL International, representing the Philippines  
 Fred Luthans, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, representing Albania and Kazakhstan  
 Jerzy Maczynski, University of Wroclaw, representing Poland  
 Norma Mansor, University of Malaysia, representing Malaysia  
 Gillian Martin, University of Dublin-Trinity College, representing Ireland  
 Michael Martin, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, representing Albania  
 Sandra M. Martinez, New Mexico State University, representing Mexico  
 Aly Messallam, Alexandria University, representing Egypt  
 Cecilia McMillen, University of San Francisco de Quito, representing Costa Rica  
 Emiko Misumi, Institute for Group Dynamics, representing Japan  
 Jyuji Misumi, Institute for Group Dynamics, representing Japan  
 Moudi al-Homoud, Kuwait University, representing Kuwait  
 Phyllis M. Ngin, Melbourne Business School, representing Singapore  
 Jeremiah O'Connell, Bentley College, representing Spain  
 Enrique Ogiastri, Universidad de los Andes, representing Colombia and member of the GLOBE Coordinating Team  
 Nancy Papalexandris, Athens University of Economics and Business, representing Greece  
 T. K. Peng, I-Shou University, representing Taiwan  
 Maria Marta Preziosa, Instituto para el Desarrollo de Ejecutivos en la Argentina, representing Argentina  
 Jose M. Prieto, Complutense University, representing Spain  
 Boris Rakitsky, Institute of Perspectives and Problems of the Country, representing Russia  
 Gerhard Reber, Johannes Kepler University, representing Austria  
 Nikolai Rogovsky, International Labor Organization, representing Russia  
 Joydeep Roy-Bhattacharya, Independent literary author, GLOBE Project Manager (1994-1998)  
 Amir Rozen, Israel Institute of Technology, representing Israel  
 Argio Sabadin, Universiti Ljubljana, representing Slovenia  
 Majhoub Sahaba, Groupe EFET, representing Morocco  
 Colombia Salon de Bustamante, Universidad de los Andes, representing Venezuela

Carmen Santana-Melgoza, Smith College, representing Mexico  
 Daniel Alan Sauers, Lincoln University, representing New Zealand  
 Jette Schramm-Nielsen, Copenhagen Business School, representing Denmark;  
 Majken Schultz, Copenhagen Business School, representing Denmark  
 Zuqi Shi, Fudan University, representing China  
 Camilla Sigfrids, Swedish School of Economics and Business Administration, representing Finland  
 Kye-Chung Song, Chungnam National University, representing South Korea  
 Erna Szabo, Johannes Kepler University, representing Austria  
 Albert C. Teo, National University of Singapore, representing Singapore  
 Henk Thierry, University of Tilburg, representing the Netherlands  
 Jann Hidayat Tjakranegara, Institut Teknologi Bandung, representing Indonesia  
 Sylvana Trimi, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, representing Albania  
 Anne S. Tsui, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, representing China  
 Pavakanum Ubolwanna, Thammasat University, representing Thailand  
 Marius W. van Wyk, University of South Africa, representing South Africa and member of the GLOBE Coordinating Team  
 Marie Vondrysova, University of South Bohemia, representing the Czech Republic  
 Jürgen Weibler, University of Hagen, representing German speaking Switzerland  
 Celeste Wilderom, Tilburg University, representing the Netherlands  
 Rongxian Wu, Suzhou University, representing China  
 Rolf Wunderer, University of St. Gallen, representing German speaking Switzerland  
 Nik Rahiman Nik Yakob, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, representing Malaysia  
 Yongkang Yang, Fudan University, representing China  
 Zuoqiu Yin, Fudan University, representing China  
 Michio Yoshida, Kumamoto University, representing Japan  
 Jian Zhou, Fudan University, representing China

Since its introduction over twenty years ago, charismatic leadership has been strongly emphasized in the US management literature (Bass, 1985; Bass, 1990a; Burns, 1978; House, 1977; Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993; Yukl, 1998). The benefits of charismatic/transformational leadership are thought to include broadening and elevating the interests of followers, generating awareness and acceptance among the followers of the purposes and mission of the group, and motivating followers to go beyond their self-interests for the good of the group and/or the organization (Bass, 1985; Bass, 1997; Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997; House, 1976). Charismatic or transformational leaders articulate a realistic vision of the future that can be shared, stimulate subordinates intellectually, and pay attention to the differences among the subordinates (e.g., Yammarino & Bass, 1990). Tichy and Devanna (1990) highlight the transforming effect these leaders can have on organizations as well as on individuals. It is often claimed that by defining the need for change, creating new visions, and mobilizing commitment to these visions, leaders

can ultimately transform organizations. According to Bass (1985) the transformation of followers can be achieved by raising the awareness of the importance and value of desired outcomes, getting followers to transcend their own self-interests, and altering or expanding followers' needs. Not all charismatic/transformational leadership, however, is positive. The "dark side of charisma" is also well documented (e.g., Conger, 1989; Howell, 1988) and evidenced by totalitarian, exploitive, and self-aggrandizing charismatics such as Hitler, Charles Manson, and David Koresh.

Transformational/charismatic leadership is usually contrasted with transactional leadership. Bass (1985) defined the transactional leader as one who recognizes what followers want to get from their work; tries to see that followers get what they desire if their performance warrants it; exchanges (promises of) rewards for appropriate levels of effort; and responds to followers' self-interests as long as they are getting the job done. A highly influential measurement-based perspective on transformational leadership theories has been developed by Bernard Bass and associates. Their "full range of leadership model" places transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership on an active—passive leadership continuum and describes how these types of leadership are related (e.g., Bass, 1985; Bass, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996; Hater & Bass, 1988; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Yammarino, Spangler, & Bass, 1993).

There is much research evidence—concerning different types of leaders and different outcomes—that transformational/charismatic leadership is more effective than transactional leadership (see Bass, 1996; 1997; House & Shamir, 1993 for overviews). Fiol, Harris, and House (1999) note that the theories of the (neo-) charismatic paradigm have been subjected to over one hundred empirical tests. Collectively, the empirical findings demonstrate that leaders described as charismatic, transformational, or visionary have positive effects on their organizations and followers, with effect sizes ranging from .35 to .50 for organizational performance effects, and from .40 to .80 for effects on follower satisfaction, commitment, and organizational identification (Fiol et al., 1999). Two recent meta-analytical studies of the literature support this conclusion (Fuller, Patterson, Kester, & Springer, 1996; Lowe, Kroek, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). In their meta-analysis, Lowe and associates (1996) find a .81 corrected correlation between charisma and subordinates' ratings of leader effectiveness and a .35 mean corrected correlation between such leadership and independent ratings of leader effectiveness.

Fiol and associates (1999) also note that such findings have been demonstrated at different levels of analysis and in a wide variety of samples, including dyads (e.g., Howell & Frost, 1989), small informal groups (Howell & Higgins, 1990), as well as formal work units (e.g., Hater & Bass, 1988); military units (e.g., Shamir, Zakay, Breinin, & Popper, 1998), major units of complex organizations (e.g., Howell & Avolio, 1993), organizations (e.g., Roberts, 1985), and U.S. presidential administrations (e.g., House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; Simonton, 1987). Studies have been carried out in many different countries (see Bass, 1997; Fiol et al., 1999 for overviews).

Research in this area also shows that transformational/charismatic leadership is closer to perceptions of ideal leadership than transactional leadership (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1989). As Lord and Maher (1991) note, being perceived as a leader is a prerequisite for being able to go beyond a formal role in influencing others. They

hold that leadership perceptions can be based on two alternative processes. First, leadership can be *inferred* from outcomes of salient events. Attribution is crucial in these inference-based processes. For example, a successful business "turnaround" is often quickly attributed to the high quality "leadership" of top executives or the CEO. Another example of an inference-based process is that the attribution of charisma to a leader is more likely when organizational performance is high, that is, charismatic leadership is inferred from business success (Shamir, 1992). Meindl's "romance of leadership" approach is an example of a perspective in which these inference-based processes are taken to be central to the conception of leadership (Meindl, 1990; Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985).

Alternatively, leadership can be *recognized* based on the fit between an observed person's characteristics with the perceivers implicit ideas of what "leaders" are. Such perceived leadership characteristics are of interest in this study. Research shows that perceivers use of categorization processes (cf. Rosch, 1978) and matching an observed person against an abstract prototype stored in memory play an important role in attributions of leadership by followers (Lord & Maher, 1991).

Cultural groups may vary in their conceptions of the most important characteristics of effective leadership. As such, different leadership prototypes would be expected to occur naturally in societies that have differing cultural profiles (Bass, 1990a; Hofstede 1993). In some cultures, one might need to take strong decisive action in order to be seen as a leader, whereas in other cultures consultation and a democratic approach may be a prerequisite. Furthermore, following from such different conceptions, the evaluation and meaning of many leader behaviors and characteristics may also strongly vary in different cultures. For instance, in a culture that endorses an authoritarian style, leader sensitivity might be interpreted as weak, whereas in cultures endorsing a more nurturing style, the same sensitivity is likely to prove essential for effective leadership.

The focus of our research is on leader behaviors and attributes that are reported to be effective or ineffective across cultures, especially where they are related to charismatic/transformational leadership. Implicit leadership theories, prototypes, and leadership categorization theory will be discussed briefly, focusing on charismatic/transformational leadership from a cross-cultural perspective. Next the GLOBE research program is introduced. This research program aims to identify universal as well as culturally contingent leadership attributes and behaviors in 60 countries. In the present paper we present GLOBE findings regarding perceived leader attributes. Leader attributes can be universally endorsed as positive, universally seen as negative, or be culturally contingent. Attributes associated with charismatic/transformational leadership are expected to be universally seen as contributing to outstanding leadership. Analyses testing this proposition are presented. Universal endorsement of an attribute does not preclude cultural differences in the enactment of such an attribute. We discuss this issue and present examples of how universally endorsed attributes are enacted in different countries. Next, a follow-up study is presented which addresses a possible limitation of generalization from the GLOBE findings based on responses from middle managers. This follow-up study explores whether implicit theories of leadership for top level managers are

different from those for lower level managers. Finally, the implications for theory and future research are discussed.

### LEADERSHIP AND PERCEPTION: IMPLICIT LEADERSHIP THEORIES

Leadership exists in all societies and is essential to the functioning of organizations within societies (Wren, 1995). Because individuals have their own ideas about the nature of leaders and leadership, they develop ideosyncratic theories of leadership. As such, an individual's implicit leadership theory refers to beliefs held about how leaders behave in general and what is expected of them (Eden & Leviathan, 1975). Using an information processing perspective, implicit theories are cognitive frameworks or categorization systems that people use during information processing to encode, process and recall specific events and behavior (Shaw, 1990). "While leadership perceptions may not be reality, they are used by perceivers to evaluate and subsequently distinguish leaders from non-leaders or effective from ineffective leaders. This type of attribution process provides a basis for social power and influence" (Lord & Maher, 1991, p.98).

Implicit Leadership Theories (ILT's) have been used in attempts to explain leadership attributions and perceptions (e.g., Lord, Foti, & Philips, 1982; Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984; Offermann, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994). Furthermore, ILT's have been shown to be a possible bias in the measurement of actual leader behavior (e.g., Gioia & Sims, 1985; Rush, Thomas, & Lord, 1977). Phillips and Lord (1981) demonstrated that implicit theories of leadership could best be understood in terms of cognitive categorization processes. Categorization involves the classification of non-identical perceived stimuli into categories or groups based on similarities with stimuli in the same category and differences with stimuli in other categories (Rosch, 1978). The process of categorization reduces the complexity of the external world by organizing information about an infinite number of stimuli into a smaller number of categories. It permits symbolic representation of the world in terms of the labels given to the categories and provides people with a system of shared names (labels) which allows for communication and exchange of information about the categorized entities (Cantor & Mischel, 1979).

Leadership perceptions are based on cognitive categorization processes in which perceivers match the perceived attributes of potential leaders they observe to an internal prototype of leadership categories (Foti & Luch, 1992). A prototype can be conceived as a collection of characteristic traits or attributes. The better the fit between the perceived individual and the leadership prototype, the more likely this person will be seen as a leader (Offermann et al., 1994; Foti & Luch, 1992).

Following categorization theory, Lord and associates (1982; 1984) propose a three level hierarchical organization of leadership categories. Most general is the category of "leaders" at the *superordinate* level holding attributes common to most leaders that should overlap little with those of the contrasting superordinate category of "non-leaders." The middle-range or *basic* level categories are less inclusive and refine the notion of leadership by including situational or contextual information. This implies leaders are differentiated into specific types of leaders, such as religious, military, political or business leaders. At the lowest or *subordinate* level, types of

leaders within a context are differentiated (e.g., left or right wing political leaders). These subordinate categories are the least inclusive. An example of such a distinction made within contexts is that between lower- and upper-level leaders, that is, the inclusion of hierarchical information as well as contextual information. Examples are the differentiation by rank for military leaders or by position in the organizational hierarchy for business leaders (see also Lord & Maher, 1991). This last distinction, level of position or hierarchical rank in the organization will be employed as the basis for a follow-up study that will add to the main GLOBE results.

### LEADERSHIP PERCEPTIONS ACROSS CULTURES

The way in which the social environment is interpreted is strongly influenced by the cultural background of the perceiver. This implies that the attributes that are seen as characteristic or prototypical for leaders may also strongly vary in different cultures. Hunt, Boal, and Sorenson (1990) propose that societal culture has an important impact on the development of super-ordinate category prototypes and implicit leadership theories. They hold that values and ideologies act as a determinant of culture specific super-ordinate prototypes, dependent on their strength. In strong or uniform cultures super-ordinate prototypes will be widely shared, whereas in a country with a weak culture or multiple subcultures, a wider variance among individual super-ordinate prototypes is expected.

The boundary between the superordinate categories of leaders and non-leaders is sometimes difficult to draw. Like other categories used to classify people, leadership can probably be seen as a 'fuzzy category' (Cantor & Mischel, 1979). A category is "fuzzy" when there are no signs that differentiate *all* members from *all* non-members. Rosch (1978) holds that in cases where this clear-cut boundary in stimuli does not exist, people will use abstract categorizations learned and transmitted through *culture* rather than rely fully on stimulus characteristics (see also Lord et al., 1982). Shaw (1990) emphasizes the relevance of cognitive categorization in the context of cross-cultural management and suggests that much comparative management research can be interpreted as showing culturally influenced differences in leadership prototypes.

### STUDYING LEADERSHIP IN DIFFERENT CULTURES

Yukl (1998) points out that most of the research on leadership during the past half century was conducted in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe. Hofstede (1993, p.81) states: "In a Global perspective, US management theories contain a number of idiosyncrasies not necessarily shared by management elsewhere. Three such idiosyncrasies are mentioned: A stress on market processes, a stress on the individual, and a focus on managers rather than workers." Similarly, House (1995) notes that almost all prevailing theories of leadership and most empirical evidence is North American in character, that is, "individualistic rather than collectivistic; emphasizing assumptions of rationality rather than ascetics, religion, or superstition; stated in terms of individual rather than group incentives, stressing follower respon-

sibilities rather than rights; assuming hedonistic rather than altruistic motivation and assuming centrality of work and democratic value orientation" (1995, p. 443). Cross-cultural psychological, sociological, and anthropological research shows that many cultures do not share these assumptions. "As a result there is a growing awareness of need for a better understanding of the way in which leadership is enacted in various cultures and a need for an empirically grounded theory to explain differential leader behavior and effectiveness across cultures" (House, 1995, p. 443-444; see also Bass, 1990a; Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991; Dorfman, 1996; Dorfman & Ronen, 1991).

Culture profiles as derived from, for instance, Hofstede's (1980; 1991) theoretical dimensions of cultures, yield many hypotheses regarding cross-cultural differences in leadership. As is well known, Hofstede's dimensions of culture are: uncertainty avoidance; power distance; masculinity-femininity; individualism-collectivism; and, more recently, future orientation. Jung, Bass, and Sosik (1995) speculate that transformational leadership emerges more easily and is more effective in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic cultures. According to Jung and associates (1995), the centrality of work in life and the high level of group orientation among followers should promote transformational leadership and the high respect for authority and the obedience in collectivistic cultures should enhance transformational processes. High uncertainty avoidance cultures, with the resulting emphasis on rules, procedures and traditions may place demands on leaders not expected in low uncertainty avoidance cultures. More innovative behaviors may therefore be expected in low uncertainty avoidance cultures. Also, more masculine cultures are probably more tolerant of strong, directive leaders than feminine cultures, where a preference for more consultative, considerate leaders seems likely.

Furthermore, preferences for a low power distance in societies could result in other desired leader attributes than a preference for high power distance. For instance, a less negative attitude towards authoritarian leadership will likely be found in high power distance societies. In such societies dominance and ostentatious displays of power might be appropriate for leaders. In contrast, in more egalitarian societies leaders should emphasize egalitarian leadership. In the strongly egalitarian society of the Netherlands, for instance, the former prime minister was known to ride to work on his bicycle, just like many other Dutch employees do. The story has a positive connotation in the Netherlands. "He/She's just like the rest of us" may be a positive comment about a leader in one society (such as the Netherlands), but have a negative connotation in another.

In addition, Smith, Peterson, & Misumi (1994), in their "event-management" research, show that managers in high power distance countries report more use of rules and procedures than do managers from low power distance countries. Several other studies also study leadership in different cultures. For instance, Dorfman and associates (1997) compare leadership in Western and Asian countries. They show cultural universality for supportive, contingent reward, and charismatic leader behaviors, and cultural specificity for directive, participative and contingent punishment leader behaviors. House Wright and Aditya (1997) and Peterson and Hunt (1997) provide comprehensive overviews of cross-cultural research on leadership.

## LEADERSHIP PROTOTYPES ACROSS CULTURES

Relatively few studies have focused explicitly on culture-based differences in leadership prototypes or implicit theories of leadership. Since implicit leadership theory, with its core construct of "leadership prototypes," has been found useful in understanding leader behavior in the United States, there seems no reason why this would not also be found in other countries. Bryman (1987), for instance, found strong support for the operation of implicit theories of leadership in Great Britain.

Lord and Maher (1991) also argue that culture plays a strong role in the content of leadership prototypes. To date, a study by Gerstner and Day (1994) is the most widely cited study focusing on cross-cultural comparisons of leadership prototypes. Respondents completed a questionnaire asking them to assign prototypicality ratings to 59 leadership attributes. Comparing the ratings from a sample of American students ( $n = 35$ ) to small samples ( $n =$  between 10 and 22) of foreign students from 7 countries, they found that the traits considered to be most, moderately, or least characteristic of business leaders varied by respondents country or culture of origin. This study has several limitations—small sample sizes, student samples, only foreign students currently in the US to represent other cultures in the sample, and employing a not cross-culturally validated English-language trait-rating instrument. Despite these limitations, presenting conservative biases, reliable differences in leadership perceptions of members of various countries were found. The GLOBE project further examines cross-cultural differences in leadership prototypes.

## CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP AND SOCIETAL CULTURE

Is charisma universally endorsed? One proposition is that differences in national culture could influence the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leaders. Managerial practices and motivational techniques that are legitimate and acceptable in one culture (or time period) may not be in another. Bass (1990a, p. 196) states: "Charismatics appear in societies with traditions of support for them and expectations about their emergence." This seems to imply charismatic leadership might easily emerge and be effective in some but not in other societies.

A perhaps somewhat more controversial proposition is that charismatic/transformational leadership may—to a certain extent—be universal (Bass, 1997). Bass bases his assertion of the universality of the transactional/transformational paradigm on the fact that evidence supporting the model has been obtained in many different countries. For instance, transformational leadership inevitably correlates more positively with a variety of positive outcomes than transactional leadership in countries as diverse as the United States, Canada, Japan, Taiwan, New Zealand, the Netherlands, and Austria (see Bass, 1997). There is also evidence that a preference for transformational leadership exists in different cultures (Bass, 1997; Bass & Avolio, 1989; Singer & Singer, 1990). We might caution, however, that charismatic leadership might have a very negative connotation in societies with a past history of autocratic and despotic leaders. The terms "charisma" and "leader" can evoke negative reactions by some Europeans who lived through World War Two. Nonetheless, based on substantial evidence, we propose that attributes associated with

transformational/charismatic leadership will be universally reported as facilitating "outstanding" leadership. The current study offers the first test of whether attributes associated with charismatic/transformational leadership are universally seen as effective.

## THE CULTURE SPECIFIC-ETIC DILEMMA

Cross-cultural researchers make a distinction between *culture-specific* and *cross-culturally generalizable* or universal aspects of behavior. Pike (1967) used the terms *emic* and *etic* in analogy with phonetics (general aspects of vocal sounds and sound production in languages) and phonemics (sounds used in a particular language). Berry (1969) transferred Pike's distinction to cross-cultural psychology, using the term "etic" analyses of human behavior for those that focus on universals. Thus, *etic* (or in our terms, cross-culturally generalizable) behaviors are those that can be compared across cultures using common definitions and metrics. An "emic" (or in our terms, culture specific) analysis of these behaviors would focus on behaviors unique to a subset of cultures or on the diverse ways in which *etic* activities are carried out in a specific cultural setting.

Usually, a culture specific analysis focuses on a single culture and employs descriptive and qualitative methods to study the behavior of interest. Culture specific behavior is studied within the cultural system or context. The researcher tries to develop research criteria relative to the internal characteristics or logic of the system. Meaning is gained relative to the context and therefore not transferable to other contextual settings. It is not intended to compare the observed behavior in one setting with behavior in other settings. On the other hand, a search for cross-culturally generalizable phenomena analysis would be comparative, examining many different cultures, using standardized methods.

The rationale behind the culture specific-cross-culturally generalizable distinction is the argument that behavior phenomena (in its full complexity) can only be understood within the context of the culture in which it occurs. The culture specific approach tries to investigate the phenomena and their interrelationships (structure) through the eyes of the people native to a particular culture. The primary goal of the culture specific approach is a descriptive idiographic orientation. It puts emphasis on the uniqueness of each unit. In contrast, the cross-culturally generalizable (a nomothetic) approach tries to identify lawful relationships and causal explanations valid across different units (cultures).

Thus, if one wishes to make statements about universal or cross-culturally generalizable aspects of social behavior, these statements need to be phrased in abstract ways. Conversely, if one wishes to highlight the meaning of these generalizations in culture specific ways, then we need to refer to more precisely specified events or behaviors.

On a conceptual level, cross-culturally generalizable statements about the role of charismatic leadership can be deduced based on empirical data evaluating important attributes of leaders across cultures. However, examples of how such generalizations are expressed in quite different ways in different national cultures can also be found (see also the forthcoming GLOBE Anthology of country specific descriptions of

fourteen cultures. House & Chhokar, in progress). The more detailed the description of the behavior, the greater becomes the likelihood of finding significant variations. If one looks at behaviors in a great degree of detail, it could turn out that many national cultures give *unique meanings* and/or enactment to *general principles*.

The focus in the present study is on attributes associated with charismatic/ transformational leadership. These are hypothesized to be important attributes for successful leaders worldwide. However, the behaviors indicative of such attributes and therefore of charismatic/ transformational leadership might be very different in different cultures. Thus, our proposition regarding universality is not meant to imply that there can not be marked differences across cultures in the *expression* of such transformational/charismatic attributes.

In the case of the transformational/transactional paradigm "universal" means a universally applicable conceptualization (Bass, 1997). Although concepts such as "transactional leadership" and "transformational leadership" may be universally valid, specific behaviors representing these styles may vary profoundly. For instance, "Indonesian inspirational leaders need to persuade their followers about the leaders' own competence, a behavior that would appear unseemly in Japan" (Bass, 1997, p.132). Bass also notes that contingent rewarding is more implicit in Japan than in the United States.

Bryman's (1992) model of the social formation of charisma includes prescriptions concerning how charisma will vary from culture to culture. As the meaning attached to a given leader behavior or managerial practice may vary across cultures (see e.g., Erez, 1994), differences in which behaviors invoke attributions of charisma may be expected. However, following Bass' (1997) line of reasoning, the concept of "charisma" itself can be seen as "universal."

### TYPES OF UNIVERSALS: SIMPLE VERSUS VARIFORM

The discussion of culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable elements could also be phrased in terms of different types of universals. A first type of universal that has been identified is the *simple universal*, referring to a phenomenon that is constant throughout the world. In terms of statistical inference, such simple universals focus on the mean level of a variable and the extent to which that mean *doesn't* vary across cultures (e.g., Bass, 1997; Hanges, Dickson & Lord, 1997). However, the current understanding of universality is more complex, incorporating different types of universals. A *variform universal* is one in which subtle modifications of a simple universal can be seen when one studies that principle over cultures. In such cases, a general statement or principle holds across cultures but the enactment of this principle differs across cultures. In contrast, for a simple universal both the principle and its enactment are the same across cultures (Dorfman & Ronen, 1991; Hanges et al. 1997). A third type is the *functional universal*, which concerns the stability of relationships between different variables. Functional universals are evidenced in patterns and relationships that are stable across cultures. In such cases, inferences can be made about the relationship without regard to situational factors (Hanges et al. 1997). An example, provided by Bass (1997), is the negative relationship between laissez-faire leadership and subordinate perceptions of the leader's effectiveness. This

relationship is found across cultures. Thus, regardless of culture, passive leaders who avoid responsibility and shirk duties are perceived to be ineffective.

In the present study the first two types of universals mentioned above are of interest. First, questionnaire data are analyzed to test the hypothesis that attributes associated with charismatic/transformational leadership will be seen as contributing to outstanding leadership world wide. Such analyses can be seen as a search for "simple universals." However, some of these simple universals may be enacted differently in different societies, are also presented. That is, some leader behaviors that are seen as universally effective or ineffective are "variform universals."

### CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON LEADERSHIP: PROJECT GLOBE

The idea for a global research program concerned with leadership and organizational practices was conceived in the summer of 1991 by Robert House and GLOBE and funded in October 1993<sup>2</sup>. Since then, GLOBE has evolved into a multi-phase, multi-method research project in which some 170 investigators from over 60 cultures representing all major regions in the world collaborate to examine the inter-relationships between societal culture, organizational culture and practices and organizational leadership. The international GLOBE Coordinating Team (GCT), led by Robert House, now coordinates the project<sup>3</sup>.

The 170 Co-Country Investigators (CCIs) are responsible for the project in a specific country or countries about which they have country-specific expertise. Most are natives of the country in which they conduct their research or reside there. Their activities include: questionnaire development (through item generation, translation, Q-sorts and pilot testing); collecting quantitative and qualitative data; writing descriptions of their cultures; and contributing insights from their unique cultural perspectives to the on-going GLOBE research. A more detailed overview of the GLOBE research program, including objectives, hypotheses and methods can be found in House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, Dorfman, Javidan, Dickson, Gupta, and 170 co-authors (1999).

The initial aim of the GLOBE project was to develop societal and organizational measures of culture and leadership attributes that are appropriate to use across cultures. This was accomplished in the first phase of the project. The results of two pilot studies support the reliability and construct validity of the questionnaire scales used in the second phase, which concerns hypothesis testing (Hanges, House, Dickson, Dorfman, et al., in press). The overall hypotheses that are to be tested concern relationships between societal culture dimensions, organizational-culture dimensions, and CLTs (culturally endorsed implicit leadership theories), as well as relationships specified by structural contingency theory of organizations (e.g., Donaldson, 1995). Data collection in this second phase is now completed and the analyses to test the hypotheses are currently being conducted. The results presented below are from this second phase.

In summary, the study presented here focuses on the hypothesis that charismatic/transformational leadership attributes will be universally endorsed as contributors to outstanding leadership. Besides universally endorsed attributes, analyses regarding attributes that are universally seen as impeding outstanding leadership and cultur-

ally-contingent attributes are also presented below. Furthermore, we have conducted a follow-up study to determine if CLTs vary according to the level of management within the organization.

**METHOD**

**Sample**

Sampling is a problematic issue in cross-cultural studies. As has been noted in cross-cultural research, using national borders as cultural boundaries may not be appropriate in countries that have large subcultures. In large, multi-cultural countries such as India, the U.S. and China it is not even clear which sample would be most representative. Nevertheless, the samples from all countries need to be relatively homogeneous within countries. In this study, for multi-culture countries, whenever possible, the subculture with the greatest amount of commercial activity was sampled. Also, in such multi-cultural countries more than one subculture was sampled when possible (for instance, East and West German subcultures in Germany; Black and White subcultures in South Africa, and Germanic and French subcultures in Switzerland).

At least three countries in the following geographic regions are represented in the GLOBE sample: Africa, Asia, Europe (Central, Eastern and Northern), Latin America, North America, Middle East, and the Pacific Rim. Table 1 lists the countries involved in the GLOBE research.

The unit of analysis for the GLOBE study consists of aggregated responses of samples of middle managers (with, whenever possible, at least two hierarchical layers below and above them) from three selected industries. While additional Phase 2 data are still being collected, the analyses reported in the present paper are based on 15,022 middle managers from 60 different societies/cultures. The number of respondents by country ranged from 27 to 1,790 with an average per country of 250.4 respondents. The middle managers represent a total of 779 different local (i.e., non-multinational) organizations from one of three industries (financial industry, food industry, and telecommunication industry). These industries were chosen because (1) they are fairly universal and thus, such organizations could be identified in participating countries and (2) these industries were believed to differ in terms of the rate of change they were experiencing. It was speculated that the rate of change experienced in an industry might moderate the type of leader desired in that industry. Hypotheses such as these will be tested at a later stage. Each CCI collected data from at least two of the three industries with at least three local organizations being sampled from each industry.

**Measures**

Middle managers in each of these three industries were asked to describe leader attributes and behavior that they perceived to enhance or impede outstanding leadership. They used a seven point scale indicating the extent to which each leadership attribute substantially impedes (score of 1) to substantially facilitates

**Table 1. Participating GLOBE Countries**

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

Note: \* Due to special data collection issues with the Iranian data, this country could not be included in the analyses reported in the present paper.



**Table 2. Sample CLT Questionnaire Items and Response Alternatives**

Sample leadership items:	
Sensitive:	Aware of slight changes in moods of others.
Motivator:	Mobilizes, activates followers.
Evasive:	Refrains from making negative comments to maintain good relationships and saves face.
Diplomatic:	Skilled at interpersonal relations, tactful.
Self-interested:	Pursues own best interests.
Response Alternatives:	
This attribute/characteristic impedes or facilitates unusually effective leadership	
1. Substantially impedes	
2. Moderately impedes	
3. Slightly impedes	
4. Neither impedes nor facilitates	
5. Slightly facilitates	
6. Moderately facilitates	
7. Substantially facilitates	

(score of 7) effective leadership. Examples of items and scale anchors are presented in Table 2.

Items were generated, Q-sorted and then tested in two pilot studies (see Hanges et al., under review). We identified 21 primary or basic leadership factors that were later grouped into 6 global leadership dimensions (by conducting a first-order and second-order factor analysis respectively). Six underlying dimensions of global leadership patterns that are viewed by managers as contributors or impediments to outstanding leadership were identified. The psychometric properties of these scales meet or exceed conventional standards (Hanges et al., under review). The scales were subjected to a series of empirical tests using both qualitative (e.g., q-sorts, item-evaluation reports) and quantitative (e.g., exploratory factor analysis, multilevel confirmatory factor analysis, reliability analysis) methodologies. A total of 21 primary leadership scales were created from 112 leadership items. These scales were found to be uni-dimensional, aggregatable to the country level of analysis, and to reliably differentiate countries from one another. Correlations among these 21 scales demonstrated that they were not empirically distinct. We subjected these primary scales to a second-order factor analysis. Six second-order factors were obtained. These higher order dimensions are shown in Table 3. Table 3 also shows which primary dimensions are part of these second order dimensions (see also Hanges et al., under review; House et al., 1999).

While the quantitative pilot studies of the questionnaires were carried out, CCIs also conducted qualitative research. Interviews and focus group meetings were held in the participating countries. After the pilot studies several items not included earlier were added to reflect findings from ongoing qualitative research.

**Analysis (Strategy)**

A procedure was developed to test the extent to which global leadership dimensions (and specific attributes within the dimensions) are universally endorsed as

**Table 3. Second Order Factors and the Scales/Items They Are Based On**

<i>Charismatic/Value Based</i>	<i>Team Oriented</i>
Charismatic 1: Visionary	Team 1: Collaborative Team Orientation
Charismatic 2: Inspirational	Team 2: Team Integrator
Charismatic 3: Self-sacrifice	Diplomatic
Integrity	Malevolent (reverse scored)
Decisive	Administratively competent
Performance oriented	<i>Participative</i>
<i>Self-protective</i>	Autocratic (reverse scored)
Self-centered	Non-participative (reverse scored)
Status conscious	Delegator
Conflict inducer	<i>Autonomous</i>
Face saver	Individualistic
Procedural	Independent
<i>Humane</i>	Autonomous
Modest	Unique
Humane orientation	

Note: These are Global CLT Dimensions. They are comprised of the 21 leadership subscales. The only exceptions are Autonomous which is comprised of questionnaire items, not subscales and Delegator which is also an item rather than a scale.

contributing to or inhibiting effective leadership. This procedure also identified which dimensions and corresponding attributes vary across cultures. These procedures were conducted to test the main hypothesis that charismatic/transformational leadership attributes will be universally endorsed as contributors to outstanding leadership.

First we determined whether the responses of the middle managers could be aggregated to the country level of analysis. We did this by calculating the intra-class correlation coefficient (i.e., ICC(1)) and James, DeMaree, and Wolf's (1984)  $r_{wg}$ . With respect to  $r_{wg}$ , we followed Lindell and Brandt's (1997) suggestion to use the maximum observed variance as the reference distribution in this statistic. After identifying items that can be aggregated to the country level of analysis, we examined the mean of the overall charismatic/transformational leader behavior to test our

**Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for the Second Order Leadership Factors**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Charismatic/Value based	4.51	6.46	5.83	.33
Team oriented	4.74	6.21	5.76	.26
Self-protective	2.54	4.55	3.45	.41
Participative	4.50	6.09	5.35	.41
Humane	3.82	5.61	4.87	.38
Autonomous	2.27	4.65	3.86	.45

Note: Descriptive statistics are based on the aggregated data from 60 countries. N = 60.

hypothesis. Criteria were established for items to be considered universally endorsed as contributors to outstanding leadership. These criteria are: (1) 95% of country scores had to exceed a mean of 5 on a 7 point scale for that item/attribute; and (2) the grand mean score for all countries had to exceed 6 for the item/attribute.

Besides identifying the universally endorsed attributes, the results presented here also show which attributes were found to be viewed universally as ineffective and which were found to be culturally contingent. Thus, criteria were established to view attributes as measured at the item level as universal impediments to outstanding leadership. Those items that could be aggregated to the country level of analysis were then regarded as universal impediments to effective leadership if (1) 95% of country scores on the item are less than three, and (2) items have a grand mean in all countries that is less than three. These criteria together indicate that a specific attribute is universally perceived as inhibiting outstanding leadership.

Finally, several attributes were perceived to enhance outstanding leadership in some cultures, but simultaneously to impede outstanding leadership in others. We refer to these as culturally contingent items. To be seen as culturally-contingent items should not only be aggregatable to the country level of analysis but also yield a score above and below the scale midpoint of 4, contingent on country specific responses.

## RESULTS

### Leadership Dimensions

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics of the global leadership (i.e., second order) dimensions. The country means on the charismatic/transformational, team oriented, and participative leadership dimension range from 4.51 to 6.46 on a 7 point scale, indicating a general belief that these dimensions are prototypical of outstanding leadership in all cultures. Country means on these six second order leadership factors and sample sizes are shown in Table 5.

### Universally Endorsed Attributes

To be seen as universally endorsed, items had to meet the criteria specified above. Table 6 presents the results of these analyses. The Intra-class correlation coefficients ICC(1) for all these items were statistically significant and the average ICC(1) for these items (.11) was close to the .12 median reported in the organizational sciences (James, 1982). Further, the  $r_{wg}$  of these items ranged from a low of .86 to a high of .91 with an average of .89. The level of the ICC(1) and the  $r_{wg}$ 's provides justification for aggregating responses to these items to the country level of analysis. Thus, these items can be aggregated to the country level of analysis. Most of the universally positively endorsed items/attributes are components of the charismatic/transformational and team oriented global dimensions (see Table 6).

A clear picture of a universally endorsed outstanding leader ensues from Table 6. Contributing to outstanding leadership in all cultures were several attributes reflecting integrity. Thus, such a leader is trustworthy, just, and honest. Many authors also see these elements as crucial for transformational leadership. Also, an

**Table 5. Means on the Second Order Leadership Dimensions and Sample Size per Country**

Country	N	Self-					
		Charisma	Team	Protective	Part.	Humane	Auton
Albania	109	5.70	5.87	4.55	4.51	5.15	3.81
Argentina	154	5.98	5.99	3.46	5.89	4.70	4.55
Australia	345	6.09	5.81	3.05	5.71	5.09	3.95
Austria	169	6.03	5.74	3.07	6.00	4.93	4.47
Bolivia	105	6.01	6.10	3.85	5.30	4.56	3.92
Brazil	264	6.01	6.17	3.50	6.06	4.84	2.27
Canada (English-speaking)	257	6.16	5.84	2.96	6.09	5.20	3.65
China	160	5.57	5.57	3.80	5.05	5.18	4.07
Colombia	290	6.04	6.07	3.37	5.51	5.05	3.34
Costa Rica	115	5.95	5.81	3.55	5.54	4.99	3.46
Denmark	327	6.01	5.70	2.82	5.80	4.23	3.79
Ecuador	50	6.46	6.21	3.63	5.51	5.13	3.53
Egypt	201	5.57	5.55	4.21	4.69	5.14	4.49
El Salvador	27	6.08	5.95	3.44	5.40	4.69	3.47
England	168	6.01	5.71	3.04	5.57	4.90	3.92
Finland	430	5.94	5.86	2.55	5.91	4.30	4.08
Georgia	268	5.65	5.86	3.90	4.89	5.61	4.57
Germany [Former FRG (WEST)]	414	5.84	5.49	2.97	5.88	4.44	4.30
Germany [Former GDR (EAST)]	44	5.87	5.51	3.33	5.70	4.60	4.35
Greece	234	6.02	6.12	3.49	5.81	5.16	3.98
Guatemala	116	6.00	5.94	3.77	5.45	5.00	3.38
Hong Kong	171	5.67	5.58	3.68	4.87	4.89	4.38
Hungary	186	5.91	5.91	3.24	5.23	4.73	3.23
India	231	5.85	5.72	3.78	4.99	5.26	3.85
Indonesia	365	6.15	5.92	4.13	4.61	5.43	4.19
Ireland	157	6.08	5.82	3.01	5.64	5.06	3.95
Israel	543	6.23	5.91	3.64	4.96	4.68	4.26
Italy	269	5.99	5.87	3.26	5.47	4.37	3.62
Japan	197	5.49	5.56	3.61	5.08	4.68	3.67
Kazakhstan	121	5.54	5.73	3.36	5.10	4.26	4.58
Kuwait	50	5.90	5.90	4.02	5.03	5.21	3.39
Malaysia	125	5.89	5.80	3.50	5.12	5.24	4.03
Mexico	327	5.66	5.75	3.86	4.64	4.71	3.86
Morocco	107	4.81	5.15	3.26	5.32	4.10	3.34
Namibia	32	5.99	5.81	3.36	5.48	5.10	3.77
Netherlands	289	5.98	5.75	2.87	5.75	4.81	3.53
New Zealand	184	5.87	5.44	3.19	5.50	4.78	3.77
Nigeria	419	5.77	5.65	3.90	5.19	5.48	3.62
Philippines	287	6.33	6.06	3.33	5.40	5.53	3.75
Poland	283	5.67	5.98	3.53	5.05	4.56	4.34
Portugal	80	5.75	5.92	3.11	5.48	4.62	3.19
Qatar	202	4.51	4.75	3.92	4.76	4.66	3.38
Russia	301	5.66	5.63	3.69	4.67	4.08	4.63
Singapore	224	5.95	5.77	3.32	5.30	5.24	3.87
Slovenia	256	5.69	5.91	3.61	5.42	4.44	4.28
South Africa (Black sample)	241	5.16	5.23	3.63	5.05	4.79	3.94
South Africa (White sample)	183	5.99	5.80	3.20	5.62	5.33	3.74

(continued)

**Table 5. (Continued)**

Country	N	Charisma	Team	Self-			Auton
				Protective	Part.	Humane	
South Korea	233	5.53	5.53	3.68	4.93	4.87	4.21
Spain	370	5.90	5.93	3.39	5.11	4.66	3.54
Sweden	1790	5.84	5.75	2.82	5.54	4.73	3.97
Switzerland (German)	321	5.93	5.61	2.93	5.94	4.76	4.13
Taiwan	237	5.58	5.69	4.28	4.73	5.35	4.01
Thailand	449	5.78	5.76	3.91	5.30	5.09	4.28
Turkey	301	5.96	6.01	3.58	5.09	4.90	3.83
USA	399	6.12	5.80	3.16	5.93	5.21	3.75
Venezuela	142	5.72	5.62	3.82	4.89	4.85	3.39
Zambia	80	5.92	5.86	3.67	5.29	5.26	3.43
Zimbabwe	46	6.11	5.97	3.21	5.58	5.18	3.37

Note: Data for the Czech Republic, France, and Switzerland (French) were not entered into computer files by press time.

**Table 6. Universally Positively Endorsed Leader Attributes**

Item	Corresponding 1 <sup>st</sup> Order Factor	5 <sup>th</sup>					$r_{wc}$
		Percentile	Mean	SD	ICC(1)	$r_{wc}$	
Positive	Charisma 2: Inspirational	5.07	6.03	0.45	0.11	0.86	
Trustworthy	Integrity	5.24	6.36	0.39	0.11	0.90	
Administratively Skilled	Administratively Competent	5.06	6.02	0.48	0.12	0.86	
Just	Integrity	5.18	6.02	0.37	0.08	0.87	
Win-win Problem solver	Diplomatic	5.23	6.05	0.36	0.08	0.87	
Encouraging	Charisma 2: Inspirational	5.26	6.14	0.30	0.06	0.90	
Intelligent	Malevolent	5.28	6.18	0.38	0.11	0.90	
Decisive	Decisiveness	5.36	6.20	0.33	0.08	0.89	
Informed	Team 2: Team Integrator	5.39	6.13	0.41	0.11	0.90	
Effective Bargainer	Diplomatic	5.10	6.10	0.39	0.10	0.89	
Foresight	Charisma 1: Visionary	5.22	6.02	0.33	0.08	0.90	
Plans ahead	Charisma 1: Visionary	5.14	6.17	0.37	0.10	0.91	
Motive Arouser	Charisma 2: Inspirational	5.27	6.22	0.50	0.19	0.90	
Communicative	Team 2: Team Integrator	5.03	6.02	0.48	0.18	0.90	
Excellence Oriented	Performance Oriented	5.25	6.16	0.43	0.13	0.89	
Confidence Builder	Charisma 2: Inspirational	5.33	6.13	0.34	0.09	0.91	
Honest	Integrity	5.19	6.11	0.45	0.12	0.87	
Dynamic	Charisma 2: Inspirational	5.55	6.28	0.34	0.11	0.91	
Coordinator	Team 2: Team Integrator	5.31	6.00	0.40	0.12	0.89	
Team Builder	Team 2: Team Integrator	5.36	6.15	0.39	0.11	0.90	
Motivational	Charisma 2: Inspirational	5.26	5.99	0.39	0.10	0.86	
Dependable	Malevolent (reverse score)	5.29	6.17	0.37	0.10	0.89	

Notes: Universal status of attributes are based on the following criteria:

1. Mean rating across country > 6.00.

2. 5<sup>th</sup> percentile > 5.

All ICC(1) are significantly greater than zero ( $p < 0.01$ ).

$n = 53$  countries.

**Table 7. Universal Negative (Undesired) Leader Attributes**

Item	1 <sup>st</sup> order Factor	95 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	Mean	SD	ICC(1)	$r_{wc}$
Ruthless		2.89	2.05	0.41	0.08	0.80
Asocial	Self-centered	2.98	2.05	0.47	0.13	0.86
Irritable	Malevolent	2.59	1.97	0.34	0.05	0.87
Loner	Self-centered	2.83	2.06	0.40	0.10	0.86
Egocentric*	—	2.97	2.01	0.39	0.08	0.86
Nonexplicit	Face Saver	2.94	2.29	0.34	0.08	0.85
Noncooperative	Malevolent	2.22	1.70	0.36	0.09	0.89
Dictatorial	Autocratic	2.83	2.05	0.41	0.12	0.83

Note: \* This item did not load on any of the factors.

outstanding leader has other attributes reflecting charismatic, inspirational, and visionary leadership. These universally endorsed attributes which embody a charismatic construct include "encouraging, positive, motivational, confidence builder, dynamic, and foresight."

To be seen as an outstanding leader, respondents also indicate team-oriented leadership as important. Endorsed attributes suggest this leader is effective in team building, communicating, and coordinating.

Other items that are universally endorsed include "excellence oriented, decisive, intelligent and win-win problem solver." Many such items have been described within the charismatic/transformational rubric by different authors. For instance, Locke and associates (1991) associate intelligence with effective leadership and House, Delbecq, and Taris (1998) include performance or excellence oriented as part of this type of leadership.

In summary, the results presented here support the idea that many charismatic/transformational leadership attributes are universally endorsed as contributors to outstanding leadership by the international sample of middle managers.

### Universal Negatives

Results for the analyses regarding attributes universally seen as impediments to outstanding leadership are presented in Table 7. Once again there was evidence supporting the aggregation of these items to the country level of analysis. The ICC(1)'s were significant and the average ICC(1) was .09. The  $r_{wc}$  for these items ranged from 0.80 to 0.89 with an average of 0.85. Attributes that are universally viewed as ineffective or impediments to outstanding leadership include being a loner, being non-cooperative, ruthless, non-explicit, irritable, and dictatorial.

### Culturally Contingent Items

Several attributes were found to be culturally contingent, i.e. in some countries they are seen as contributing to outstanding leadership, whereas in others they are seen to impede such leadership. These items are presented in Table 8.

The ICC(1)'s for these items were statistically significant with the average ICC(1) being .20. Consistent with our label of these items, the intra-class correlation coeffi-

**Table 8. Leadership Items That Vary Across Cultures**

Item	Min	Max	Mean	SD	ICC(1)	$r_{wg}$
Evasive	1.52	5.67	3.32	0.78	0.19	0.70
Intra-group competitor	3.00	6.49	4.69	0.68	0.17	0.72
Autonomous	1.63	5.17	3.77	0.77	0.15	0.68
Independent	1.67	5.32	3.95	0.67	0.11	0.66
Risk Taker	2.14	5.96	4.11	0.74	0.13	0.70
Sincere	3.99	6.55	5.83	0.60	0.19	0.83
Worldly	3.48	6.18	5.18	0.71	0.22	0.83
Intra-group conflict Avider	1.84	5.69	3.99	1.03	0.33	0.76
Provocateur	1.38	6.00	2.42	0.85	0.18	0.78
Unique	3.47	6.06	4.60	0.48	0.10	0.78
Orderly	3.81	6.34	5.59	0.43	0.08	0.87
Formal	2.12	5.43	4.35	0.63	0.18	0.82
Enthusiastic	3.72	6.44	5.72	0.54	0.16	0.85
Compassionate	2.69	5.56	4.62	0.65	0.18	0.81
Subdued	1.32	6.18	3.00	1.18	0.46	0.84
Cautious	2.17	5.78	3.73	0.77	0.23	0.75
Cunning	1.26	6.38	2.44	0.95	0.30	0.77
Logical	3.89	6.58	5.84	0.45	0.13	0.88
Status-conscious	1.92	5.77	4.52	0.73	0.22	0.82
Intuitive	3.72	6.47	5.72	0.51	0.14	0.87
Indirect	2.16	4.86	2.99	0.55	0.14	0.82
Habitual	1.93	5.38	3.17	0.64	0.20	0.83
Self-effacing	1.85	5.23	3.96	0.84	0.27	0.79
Able to Anticipate	3.84	6.51	5.98	0.40	0.11	0.89
Sensitive	1.96	6.35	4.83	0.90	0.29	0.81
Procedural	3.03	6.10	4.63	0.71	0.25	0.82
Class Conscious	2.53	6.09	4.13	0.77	0.20	0.76
Self-sacrificial	3.00	5.96	5.06	0.60	0.13	0.79
Domineering	1.60	5.14	3.17	0.75	0.19	0.75
Elitist	1.61	5.00	2.75	0.78	0.22	0.78
Ambitious	2.85	6.73	5.83	0.62	0.24	0.86
Micro-manager	1.60	5.00	2.83	0.79	0.24	0.78
Willful	3.06	6.48	5.50	0.83	0.27	0.82
Ruler	1.66	5.20	2.65	0.64	0.17	0.77
Individualistic	1.67	5.10	3.09	0.70	0.17	0.79

cients for the culturally-contingent items were twice the size of the intra-class correlations for the universally endorsed and universally negative leadership items. Table 8 also shows the  $r_{wg}$  for these items. The  $r_{wg}$  ranged from a low of .66 to a high of .89 with an average of .79. The magnitude of the intra-class correlations and the results of the  $r_{wg}$ 's clearly supports aggregation to the country level of analysis for these items. An attribute such as individualistic has a grand mean of 3.11 (slightly inhibits outstanding leadership) with country means ranging from 1.67 (moderately impedes) to a high of 5.10 (moderately contributes). The differences in country means are quite large in many of these cases. For instance, the lowest country mean for the attribute sensitive is 1.96, whereas the highest is 6.00. Other examples are ambitious (country means ranging from 2.85 to 6.73), status conscious

(country means ranging from 1.92 to 5.77) and cunning (country means ranging from 1.26 to 6.38).

Several of these culturally contingent items are associated with charismatic/transformational leadership. For instance, country means for the attribute enthusiastic range from 3.72 to 6.44. Even more striking in that respect is the attribute of risk taking. The country means for this item range from 2.14 to 5.96.

The findings of the GLOBE study presented here raise several important questions. The first concerns how attributes are enacted across cultures. Examples taken from the qualitative analyses undertaken in different countries participating in GLOBE (see House & Chhokar, in progress) illustrate the different enactment of certain general principles (variform universals) as well as the different meaning similar behaviors can take on in different cultures.

The second issue pertains to the GLOBE sample of middle level managers. Recall that GLOBE focuses on universals and culture-based differences in perceived effectiveness of leadership attributes by asking middle managers to rate whether showing certain leader characteristics and behaviors would help or hinder a person in being an outstanding leader. A possible limitation of the study stems from the fact that middle managers, when rating characteristics for effective leadership in their organization, are more likely to think of the upper echelon leaders. Top managers are the leaders within the organization from the middle management vantage point. A follow-up study of CLTs of top- and lower-level managers is discussed after first addressing the culturally specific enactment of charismatic leadership.

#### ENACTING CHARISMATIC/TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP: EXAMPLES FROM THE GLOBE STUDY

The results presented above show that several attributes associated with charismatic/transformational leadership are universally seen as contributing to outstanding leadership. A common preference for this type of leadership does not preclude differences in the observed ratings of actual leader behavior. In other words, a shared preference for transformational/charismatic leadership does not mean transformational/charismatic attributes will be enacted in exactly the same manner across cultures or that similar meaning would be attached to all exhibited behavior across all cultures.

The qualitative part of the GLOBE study yields examples of such behaviors. In-depth qualitative analyses have been carried out in many countries participating in GLOBE. These analyses include detailed media analyses as well as focus groups and interviews conducted to provide a rich description of leadership in the respective countries. Below, several conclusions and examples from these qualitative analyses are presented.

#### Charisma

Although many attributes associated with charisma are seen as contributing to outstanding leadership, the term "charisma" invokes ambivalence in several countries. Martinez and Dorfman (1998), for instance, note that in Mexico, charisma

is seen as a mixed blessing. A quote from a Mexican manager they interviewed is "I think that charisma is one of the most dangerous things that exist, because one pays the consequences." Negative evaluations of charisma are also found in several other countries.

This dual nature of charisma is also described in literature. Besides the aforementioned dark side of charisma, positive charismatic leadership may also have costs or negative consequences for followers (Yukl, 1998). For instance, Harrison (1987) describes the possibility that people lose their balance and perspective due to the focus on achievement created by charismatic leaders. Followers might willingly exploit themselves—with negative consequences for their health and quality of life—in the service of the organization's mission.

### Visionary Leadership

Visioning and communication of the vision is an important aspect of transformational/charismatic leadership. The media strongly emphasize the need for (and in many cases, the dearth of) visionary leadership in countries as diverse as Austria, India, Australia, and the Netherlands.

Chhokar (1999) observes that leadership is an important and popular topic of conversation in India. Whereas discussions of political leaders are often filled with cynicism and disdain due to the perceived self-serving actions, business leaders are mostly seen in a more positive light. Many founders of businesses are admired and respected. A recent article in an Indian newspaper proposed five leadership qualities and behaviors that CEOs should demonstrate, these were: vision, inspiration, influence, empowerment and expertise (see Chhokar, 1999). Similarly, in the Dutch media, visioning was seen as part of the job of CEOs. One CEO remarked that you need to know how your organization is positioned in the market, dream a little and then be tenacious like a terrier to achieve the vision (see Thierry, Den Hartog, Koopman & Wilderom, 1999).

Ashkenasy and Falkus (1999) note that Australians expect their leaders to show visionary qualities, but seem to have little conception of anything more than a short- to medium-term future. The media analysis in Austria also show an emphasis on vision. However, the portrayal in Austria is again not all positive; although many talk about vision, only few are able to translate it into action. The reasons for this are said to be threefold: the leaders themselves (being too "fearful" to pursue the vision), the followers (not being willing to go along), and/or structural constraints on realizing the visions (Szabo & Reber, 1999).

### Communication of the Vision

Charismatic leadership is often associated with powerful leader rhetoric (e.g., Den Hartog & Verburg, 1997; Shamir, Arthur, & House, 1994). However, there are different ways to communicate a vision ranging from the quiet, soft-spoken manner of Ghandi, Mandela, and Mother Teresa to the more 'macho' oratory of J.F. Kennedy, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Jack Welch.

Ping Ping Fu (1999), the Chinese GLOBE Co-Country Investigator, states that a vision in China is normally expressed in a non-aggressive manner. Fu holds that

explanation for this may lie in the influence of Confucian values (e.g., kindness, benevolence) that make people wary of leaders giving pompous talks without engaging in specific action and dislike leaders who are arrogant and distant. Chhokar (1999) shows that although Indian leaders must be flexible in this regard, bold, assertive styles are generally preferred to quiet and nurturing styles.

Communication skills are emphasized in the quantitative as well as the qualitative studies in GLOBE. However, what constitutes a good communicator is likely to vary greatly across cultures as there are profound differences in the (preferred) use of language as well as non-verbal cues. Trompenaars (1993), for instance, describes cross-cultural differences in patterns of verbal communication. In discussion, for instance, in an Anglo-Saxon country, it is considered polite and correct if person B starts speaking when A stops. Interrupting each other is usually impolite, whereas in most Latin cultures, interrupting conveys that one is interested in what the other person is saying. Also, according to Trompenaars, in Oriental cultures the pauses between speakers are generally much longer, which can make people from Western cultures nervous. Rhythm and pace of speech as well as the use of humor also vary across cultures. Also, cultural differences are found in the tone of voice, gestures and use of intonation. A strong voice with many "ups and downs" in tones is a Latin way of showing enthusiasm, whereas a monotonous tone is used in South East Asia as a way to display self-control. Frequently, the higher the position a person holds the flatter the voice (Trompenaars, 1993). Leadership communication seems a rich area to explore in relation to culture specific manifestations of leader behavior.

### Elevated versus Colloquial Style

Willner (1984) and Conger (1989) emphasize the ability of charismatic orators to gear their language to the audience at hand. Franklin D. Roosevelt, for instance, very effectively tailored his public talks to the "common people." This strategy likely induced a sense of equality between the president and his audience, as well as a high degree of affection for him. This sense of egalitarianism and affection may cause charismatic communicators to appear even greater than their formal status would indicate (Conger, 1989). Fu (1999) describes reactions to Zhou Enlai, the late Chinese prime minister, that illustrate this special positive reaction to an elevated leader showing his similarity to the "common" man. According to Fu, Zhou Enlai lived a simple life (a small house, old, mended clothes) and he was everything that Chinese want from an excellent leader. Among other things he was selfless, hard working, and approachable. He acted as a role model and always identified himself as an ordinary citizen wherever he went. For example, he refused having hotel doors opened for him. The sense of "being one of them" increased Chinese admiration for him considerably (Fu, 1999).

### Vision and Egalitarianism: A Difficult Balance

In countries such as the Netherlands and Australia, a high value is placed on egalitarianism. The Dutch media analysis, for instance, showed a strong emphasis on the need for consensus and acceptance of visions by lower level employees. This

is reflected in remarks by Dutch CEOs such as "ideas need acceptance, otherwise they will not be realized" and "consensus is an important prerequisite to realize goals" (Thierry et al., 1999).

Also, research on transformational leader behavior shows that, in the Netherlands, participative leadership can be seen as a component of transformational leadership. Den Hartog (1997) conducted a study among 654 employees from 6 organizations. In this study, subscales of charismatic/transformational leadership correlated highly with a measure of participation in decision making—ranging from .59 (with the vision subscale) to .79 (with both individualized consideration and demonstrating trust in subordinates). Similarly, Ashkenasy and Falkus (1999), state that studies on transformational leadership in Australia suggest that it is somewhat distinct from its American counterpart, based on the ubiquitous value placed on egalitarianism by Australians (Feather, 1994). Bass (1990b, 1996) holds that transformational leadership can take more as well as less participative forms. Thus, in strongly egalitarian societies, transformational leaders may (need to) be more participative than in high power distance societies.

In both the Netherlands and Australia there is a tendency to denigrate high achievers. Following Feather (1994), Ashkenasy and Falkus (1999) refer to this the as the 'Tall Poppy syndrome' (to cut down the tall poppy that absorbs the sun while depriving the shorter poppies of exposure to the sun). In line with this, both the Dutch and the Australian GLOBE researchers conclude there is considerable cynicism in their respective countries about promoting personalities to the status of heroes. An example of how heroes fall hard in the Netherlands is former CEO of Philips, Jan Timmer. Timmer is a physically as well as mentally impressive figure. One of the few to be portrayed as charismatic in the Dutch media. He masterminded the turnaround of Philips, for which he was praised and admired while in office. Within months of his stepping down he faced severe criticism, and both in the company and the media attributed charisma and admiration for him declined severely (Thierry et al., 1999).

Australian leaders are expected to inspire high levels of performance, but must do so without giving the impression of charisma or of not being anything more than "one of the boys" (Ashkenasy & Falkus, 1999). The concept of "mateship," the leader being "one of the boys" was one of the typically Australian leadership dimensions that reflect the high value placed on egalitarianism.

#### Examples of Culturally Contingent Elements of Charismatic/Transformational Leadership

Several of the culturally contingent attributes are also seen as part of charismatic/transformational leadership by different authors. Examples include risk taking, compassionate, unique, enthusiastic, and sensitive. In the current study we found that in some cultures these attributes are seen to contribute and in others to impede outstanding leadership. However, not only are these attributes culturally contingent, the behaviors reflecting them may also take on different meanings in different cultures. What is perceived as sensitive or compassionate in one country, may be seen as weakness in another. Similarly, behavior that is risk taking may be seen as reckless in one country, but may be perfectly normal, expected behavior in another.

#### Compassionate Leadership and Consideration

One of the Mexican entrepreneurs interviewed by Sandra Martinez as part of the GLOBE study displayed many aspects of transformational/charismatic leadership (Martinez & Dorfman, 1998). He was brilliant, humorous, enthusiastic, and a good speaker. He also brought the company through a severe crisis. A description of his behavior that might not be appropriate in other contexts is the following: He involves himself in the private lives of his employees as he feels is required because of their personal needs and expectations of him. For example, he takes care of employees in a manner that would be uncharacteristic of a high level manager in the US or many other countries. A secretary remarked that her husband was going into the hospital for an operation. This leader then objected; he then called the doctor and discussed the matter with the doctor to make sure that the operation was legitimate. Such behavior might be felt to be an invasion of privacy in other countries.

The importance of such a concern for the employees' family is also evident in other countries. Ping Ping Fu (1999) conducted interviews with Chinese managers. One manager told her that he had the utmost respect for his boss because "he does real things." When the manager's mother fell ill his boss went to the hospital to see her. The boss also told him to stay at the hospital and take care of his mother and the boss reduced his workload by taking on part of the manager's duties himself. Again, in many other countries, such as the Netherlands, employees would normally expect some consideration when their mother is seriously ill, perhaps in the form of a reduced workload, the leader inquiring after her welfare, or even some extra time off. However, few Dutch employees would expect or appreciate their boss coming to the hospital.

#### Risk Taking: Ignoring Status Boundaries

Many authors concluded that a certain amount of risk taking is part of charismatic/transformational leadership. However, the GLOBE results from the quantitative part of the study suggest that risk taking is not universally valued as contributing to outstanding leadership. Moreover, what is risk taking in one context may not be in another. The following example of behavior that in its context implied taking a risk is from the aforementioned interview of the charismatic Mexican entrepreneur conducted by Martinez and Dorfman (1998). The entrepreneur appointed a person from the Mexican lower class to be a member of the administrative staff, despite the objections of the stockholders. He did this on the basis of her hard work, education, and expertise. While in the US or many other countries one would not find anything particularly strange about this, a person's social status is extremely important in Mexico. The same behavior, namely appointing someone from a lower-class takes on a distinctly different meaning in different cultures.

These examples show that behaviors may take on different meaning in a different context. An in-depth study of both shared and unique features of leadership in different countries is being undertaken in the GLOBE study. The results are to be published as chapters in a series of anthologies. In these chapters the GLOBE

Country Co-Investigators (CCIs) will describe their countries' leadership and culture, starting from the historic roots and including both qualitative and quantitative data.

### TOP-MANAGEMENT VERSUS LOWER HIERARCHICAL LEVELS

The second issue that will be discussed in some more depth concerns the issue of how CLTs may vary according to managerial level. As stated previously, when middle managers rate characteristics for effective leadership they are most likely thinking of top management. However, 'the perceptual processes that operate with respect to leaders are very likely to involve quite different considerations at upper versus lower hierarchical levels' (Lord & Maher, 1991, p.97). As demands, tasks and responsibilities at different hierarchical levels are quite different, it seems likely that preferred leader attributes also differ for the different levels. Effectiveness of a pattern of behavior is in part dependent on the hierarchical level of leaders. In Etzioni's (1961) view, for instance, top-management is concerned with ends rather than means; middle management with means more than ends and supervisors are instrumental performers.

Thus, the implicit theory people hold regarding an effective top-manager or CEO is likely to differ from the implicit theory they hold for an effective supervisor (Den Hartog, 1997). A follow-up study using 22 leader characteristics was conducted in the Netherlands among a representative sample of the Dutch population to test this assumption (see Den Hartog, 1997; Den Hartog, Koopman, & Van Muijen, 1998). Below we will briefly present the expectations, method and results for this study.

#### Top versus Lower-Level: Expectations

The development and communication of an attractive vision are usually associated more with 'distant' (Shamir, 1995) or top level strategic leadership. Realization of goals ensuing from the vision call for a long-term perspective and redistribution of resources (Hunt, 1991; Mintzberg, 1989). Power and influence regarding long-term policies as well as distribution of resources is usually located at the upper levels of organizations. The expectation was that perceivers in this study would rate characteristics that have to do with the aforementioned, such as long-term orientation, an eye for innovation and vision as more important for top-managers than for lower-level managers. The more political nature of the job probably is also expected to lead to valuing characteristics such as diplomacy and persuasiveness as more important for top-level leaders.

In contrast, lower-level managers are usually responsible for daily operations and interact closely and often with their subordinates. As compared with top-managers an increased emphasis of operational skills and social interaction seem likely. Thus, characteristics such as compassionate, attention for the needs of subordinates, and orderliness were expected to be rated higher for lower-level managers than for top-level managers.

**Table 9. The Items and Instruction Used in Study 2**

Respondents were asked rate to the importance of the following characteristics twice, once for being a good top manager, that is a leader of an organization and once for lower level leaders, such as department supervisors. Items were judged on a five point scale ranging from 1—hardly important to 5—essential. The characteristics that were used are:

Inspirational	Orderly
Innovative	Compassionate
Formal	Long term oriented
Trustworthy	Team builder
Communicative	Integrating (viewpoints and interests)
Dominant	Participative, allowing room for subordinate's opinions
Vision	Confidence builder
Concern for subordinate's interests	Calm
Modest	Courageous, not afraid to risk his/her neck
Rational	Diplomatic
Persuasive/Convincing	Self Knowledge

#### Method

A total of 2,161 respondents participated in this study. Respondents were first asked to rate the importance of 22 characteristics for being a good or outstanding top-manager (manager of a company), and next to rate the importance of the same characteristics for being a good or outstanding lower level manager (a department manager or supervisor). The 22 items are presented in Table 9. A computerized method was used for data collection, with a panel of Dutch households as respondents. These panel members regularly complete questionnaires on a computer at home at a moment of their own choice. The completed questionnaires are automatically sent to the central computer. The sample for the current study consists of all those members of the households who were at least 19 years of age and had at least one year of (part-time) work experience. 1198 men and 963 women participated.

#### Results

First a multivariate analysis of variance was performed to assess overall differences for top and lower level. The within-subjects effect indicating overall differences was significant at the .00 level (Hotellings T equaled 1.24, with a corresponding F-value of 120.45). Next, for each pair of variables, univariate paired samples T-tests were done comparing the perceived importance of each characteristic for top and lower level leaders in the Netherlands. The results for these T-tests are reported in Table 10.

As expected, for top managers, characteristics such as being innovative, visionary, persuasive, long-term oriented, diplomatic and courageous are considered more important than for lower level managers. Attributes of effective lower-level managers are higher on characteristics such as attention for subordinates, team building and participative. Also as expected, such social and participative characteristics are

**Table 10. T-Tests on Differences in Rated Importance for Being a Good Top Manager or Lower-Level Manager of 22 Characteristics**

	<i>Top</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>T-Value</i>
Inspirational	3.73	3.81	-3.48**
Innovative	4.09	3.61	23.20**
Formal	2.64	2.50	6.23**
Trustworthy	4.35	4.31	2.26 ns
Communicative	4.00	4.02	-.83 ns
Dominant	2.46	2.19	12.13**
Visionary	4.15	3.49	30.73**
Concern for subord. Interests	3.81	4.36	-24.56**
Modest	2.26	2.69	-20.27**
Rational	3.41	3.26	8.27**
Persuasive	4.14	3.90	13.79**
Orderly	3.17	3.60	-20.92**
Compassionate	3.02	3.73	-32.75**
Long-term oriented	4.10	3.35	31.15**
Team builder	3.71	4.18	-20.12**
Integrating	3.77	3.55	10.89**
Participative	3.66	4.13	-21.92**
Builds confidence	4.00	4.13	-7.27**
Calm	3.60	3.59	.52 ns
Courageous	3.98	3.74	12.29**
Diplomatic	3.78	3.44	16.33**
Self-knowledge	3.87	3.72	8.53**

Notes: *n* = 2161. ns, not significant; \*\* difference significant at 0.001.

deemed more important to be an effective lower level manager than to be an effective top manager.

For three characteristics, namely trustworthy, communicative and calm, the differences are not significant. These characteristics are considered equally important for both types of managers. For several other characteristics the difference is significant but small, namely formal, inspirational, rational and confidence builder.

In general, the characteristics dominant, formal and modest score low, these are considered non-desirable characteristics for managers. Modesty, however, is considered less negative for lower than for higher level managers and dominance is considered less negative for higher than for lower level managers.

#### Conclusions from the Follow-up Study

This follow-up study supports Lord and Maher's (1991) aforementioned notion that the perceptual processes that operate with respect to leaders may involve different considerations at upper versus lower hierarchical levels. It also supports the idea that attributes associated with transformational/charismatic leadership are widely valued in leaders. Being communicative, inspirational and a confidence builder were endorsed almost equally for both top and lower level leadership. Several other transformational/charismatic qualities are also valued positively, but respondents indicated that their importance is somewhat different for the top and

lower level. Although the universally endorsed characteristics (from the GLOBE study) such as visionary and diplomatic were endorsed for both types of leadership in study 2, the importance of these attributes is seen as higher for top managers. Finally, the universally endorsed GLOBE attribute "team building" was seen as more important at lower levels.

Because only a Dutch sample was involved in study 2, it will be interesting to also conduct this study in other countries to see if these results are replicable. In addition, it might be interesting to extend the list of items or ask about other types of leaders. For instance, a comparison of implicit theories of male versus female leaders or political versus business leaders may be of interest to further explore preferred leadership attributes across cultures.

#### DISCUSSION

The combined results of the major GLOBE study and the follow-up study demonstrate that several attributes reflecting charismatic/transformational leadership are universally endorsed as contributing to outstanding leadership. These include motive arouser, foresight, encouraging, communicative, trustworthy, dynamic, positive, confidence builder, and motivational. Several other charismatic attributes are perceived as culturally contingent. These include enthusiastic, risk taking, ambitious, self-effacing, unique, self-sacrificial, sincere, sensitive, compassionate, and willful. None of the items universally perceived as impediments to outstanding leadership describe transformational/charismatic leadership. The results were supported in the second study of perceptions of top versus lower level leadership. Transformational/charismatic qualities are positively valued for leaders at both levels, although the importance of certain characteristics is seen to vary with hierarchical level. This study addressed a possible limitation of generalization from the GLOBE findings that stems from the use of top managers as referents for the questionnaire responses.

A next important step in the GLOBE study is to relate the items that were found to be culturally contingent to the different culture dimensions. For instance, some of the culturally contingent items describe a 'domineering' leader, a leader who exerts substantial power within the group. A viable hypothesis is that such behavior is more likely to be accepted and expected in high power distance societies. Tests of various hypotheses such as this one are reported in House, Hanges et al. (1999).

As stated, the first two phases of the GLOBE research have been completed and the data presented here are from the second phase. The projected third and fourth phases of the GLOBE study will examine the impact of actual leader behavior across cultures to complement the research on culturally-endorsed implicit leadership theories using (longitudinal) questionnaire studies as well as experiments. An interesting topic that can be studied in future GLOBE phases is whether leaders who are seen to act in accordance with their culturally-endorsed implicit theory are more effective than those that do not act accordingly. To our knowledge this has not been extensively examined. A related question is the effect of leaders acting in accordance with or going against cultural norms. Although generally leaders probably need to act within boundaries set by cultural norms, going against such



norms may in some cases increase attributions of charisma to leaders. The previously mentioned behavior of the Mexican entrepreneur appointing a lower class employee and of the late Chinese premier Zhou Enlai are examples of this. These examples suggest that judicious violations of CLTs may be useful in bringing about constructive change.

Qualitative analyses conducted as part of GLOBE yielded rich information that often portrays how the more abstract elements of leadership become enacted in real life. We believe that the examples of leader behavior ensuing from the qualitative analyses demonstrate that it is important to elucidate the culture specific enactment of transformational versus transactional leadership in different countries. How are labels like visionary, compassionate, motivational interpreted in different cultural contexts? What specific behaviors will reflect such attributes in a given culture but not in others? The qualitative analyses also show some paradoxes and tensions in the demands placed on leaders in different societies. For instance, Australian leaders must balance the competing demands of egalitarianism and well above average achievement, and at the same time appear to be "one of the boys." Similarly, Dutch leaders must balance vision and participation, without becoming "a hero." Such paradoxes and dilemmas will provide the research grist for studying the enigma of cross-cultural leadership.

## NOTES

1. The first five authors participated in the statistical analyses and the writing of this monograph. The Senior Research Associates provided general research support to the Principal Investigator and the GLOBE Coordinating Team, assisted country representatives in translation and back-translations of instruments and in data collection, and assisted in the coordination of the GLOBE data collection. The remaining authors represented their cultures as Country Co-Investigators, made suggestions concerning the design and execution of the GLOBE program, collected the data on which this monograph is based, and provided interpretations of research findings in their respective cultures.
2. Initial funding was provided by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education Dwight D. Eisenhower Leadership Development Program. Funding for the analysis of phase 2 data was provided by a grant from the U.S. National Scientific Foundation.
3. Current members of the Global Coordinating Team or GCT are: Staffan Akerblom (Sweden), Felix Brodbeck (Germany), Jagdeep Chhokar (India), Marcus Dickson (US), Peter Dorstman (US), Paul Hanges (US), Robert House (US), Mansour Javidan (Canada), Enrique Ogliastri (Colombia), Antonio Ruiz-Quintanilla (US), Marius Van Wyk (South Africa).

## REFERENCES

- Ashkenasy, N. M., & Falkus, S. (in progress) The Australian enigma. In R. J. House & J. Chhokar, J. (Eds.), *Cultures of the world. A GLOBE anthology of in-depth descriptions of the cultures of 14 countries* (vol. 1).
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990a). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990b). Editorial: Toward a meeting of minds. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1.

- Bass, B. M. (1996). *A new paradigm of leadership: An inquiry into transformational leadership*. Alexandria: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52 (2), 130-139.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1989). Potential biases in leadership measures: how prototypes, leniency and general satisfaction relate to ratings and rankings of transformational and transactional leadership constructs. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 49, 509-527.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., & Atwater, L. (1996). The transformational and transactional leadership of men and women. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 45, 5-34.
- Berry, J. W. (1969). On cross-cultural comparability. *International Journal of Psychology*, 4, 119-228.
- Boyacigiller, N., & Adler, N. (1991). The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 262-290.
- Bryman, A. (1987). The generalizability of leadership theory. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 127, 129-141.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and Leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypes in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 3-52). New York: Academic Press.
- Chhokar, J. S. (in progress). Leadership and culture in India: The GLOBE research project. In R. J. House & J. Chhokar (Eds.), *Cultures of the world. A GLOBE anthology of in-depth descriptions of the cultures of 14 countries* (vol. 1).
- Conger, J. A. (1989). *The Charismatic Leader: Behind the Mystique of Exceptional Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Den Hartog, D. N. (1997). *Inspirational leadership*. Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. KLI doctoral dissertations series, 1997 (2). Enschede: Ipskamp.
- Den Hartog, D. N., Koopman, P. L., & Van Muijen, J. J. (1998). *Implicit theories of leadership at different hierarchical levels*. Paper presented at the 24th International Congress of Applied Psychology, San Francisco, CA, August 1998.
- Den Hartog, D. N., Van Muijen, J. J., & Koopman, P. L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70 (1), 19-34.
- Den Hartog, D. N., & Verbarg, R. M. (1997). Charisma and Rhetoric: The communicative techniques of international business leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8 (4), 355-391.
- Donaldson, L. (1995). *American anti-management theories of organization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dorfman, P. W. (1996). International and Cross-Cultural Leadership Research. In B. J. Punnett & O. Shenkar (Eds.), *Handbook for international management research* (pp. 267-349). Oxford: Blackwell.
- 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. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8 (3), 233-274.
- Dorfman, P. W., & Ronen, S. (1991). *The universality of leadership theories: Challenges and paradoxes*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meetings, Miami, FL.
- Eden, D., & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 736-741.
- Erez, M. (1994). Toward a model of cross-cultural industrial and organizational psychology. In H. C. Triandis, M. D. Dunette, & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial*

- and organizational psychology (2nd ed., vol. 4: 559-607). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organisations*. New York: Free Press.
- 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.
- Fiol, C. M., Harris, D., & House, R. J. (1999). Charismatic Leadership: Strategies for effecting social change. *Leadership Quarterly*. In press.
- Foti, R. J., & Luch, C. H. (1992). The influence of individual differences on the perception and categorization of leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 55-66.
- Fu, P. P. (in progress). Chinese leadership and culture. In R. J. House & J. Chhokar (Eds.), *Cultures of the world, A GLOBE anthology of in-depth descriptions of the cultures of 14 countries* (vol. 1).
- Fuller, J. B., Patterson, C. P., Hester, K., & Stringer, D. Y. (1996). A quantitative review of research on charismatic leadership. *Psychological Reports*, 78, 271-287.
- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 121-134.
- Gioia, D. A., & Sims, H. P. (1985). On avoiding the influence of implicit leadership theories in leader behavior descriptions. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 45, 217-243.
- Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W., & Lord, R. G. (1997). *Trends, developments and gaps in cross-cultural research on leadership (1976-1996)*. Paper presented at the 12th annual conference of the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, St Louis, MO.
- Hanges, P. J., House, R. J., Dickson, M. W., Dorfman, P. W., et al. (under review). The development and validation of scales measuring societal culture and culturally shared implicit theories of leadership.
- Harrison, R. (1987). Harnessing personal energy: How companies can inspire employees. *Organizational Dynamics*, (Autumn), 4-21.
- Hater, J. J., & Bass, B. M. (1988). Superiors' evaluations and subordinates' perceptions of transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 695-702.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related beliefs*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: software of the mind*. London: MacGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7 (1), 81-94.
- House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge* (pp. 189-204). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- House, R. J. (1995). Leadership in the 21st century: A speculative enquiry. In: Howard, A. (Ed.), *The changing nature of work*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- House, R. J., Delbecq, A., & Taris, T. W. (1998). *Value based leadership: An integrated theory and an empirical test*. Submitted for publication.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., Gupta, V., et al. (1999). Cultural influences on leadership and organizations: Project GLOBE. In W. H. Mobley, M. J. Gessner, & V. Arnold (Eds.), *Advances in Global Leadership* (pp. 171-233). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic and visionary theories. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: perspectives and directions* (pp. 81-107). New York: Academic.
- House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., & Woyke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leadership effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364-396.
- 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. Early & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives on international industrial/organizational psychology*. (pp. 535-625). San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.
- Howell, J. M. (1988). Two faces of charisma: Socialized and personalized leadership in organizations. In: J. A. Conger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic Leadership: the Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness* (pp. 213-236). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control and support for innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 891-902.
- Howell, J. M., & Frost, P. J. (1989). A laboratory study of charismatic leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 43, 243-269.
- Howell, J. M., & Higgins, C. A. (1990). Leadership behaviors, influence tactics, and career experiences of champions of technological innovation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 249-264.
- Hunt, J. G. (1991). *Leadership: A new synthesis*. Newbury park, CA: Sage.
- Hunt, J. G., Boal, K. B., & Sorensen, R. L. (1990). Top management leadership: Inside the black box. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 41-65.
- James, L. R. (1982). Aggregation bias in estimates of perceptual agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67 (2), 219-229.
- James, L. R., DeMaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1984). Estimating within-group interrater reliability with and without response bias. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 85-98.
- 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.
- Lindell, M. K., & Brandt, C. J. (1997). Measuring interrater agreement for ratings of a single target. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 21, 271-278.
- Locke, E. A., Kirkpatrick, S. A., Wheeler, J. K., Schneider, J., Niles, K., Goldstein, H., Welsh, K., & Chah, D. O. (1991). *The essence of leadership*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Lord, R. G., Foti, R., & De Vader, C. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34, 343-378.
- Lord, R. G., Foti, R., & Phillips, J. S. (1982). A theory of leadership categorization. In J. G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, & C. A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership: Beyond establishment views* (pp. 104-121). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1991). *Leadership & Information Processing*. London: Routledge.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroek, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: a meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-425.
- Martinez, S., & Dorfman, P. W. (1998). The Mexican entrepreneur: An ethnographic study of the Mexican empresario. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 28(summer), 97-123.
- Meindl, J. R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (vol. 12; pp. 159-203). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78-102.
- Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg on management*. New York: Free Press.

- Offermann, L. R., Kennedy, J. K., & Wirtz, P. W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: content structure, and generalizability. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5 (1), 43-55
- Peterson, M. F., & Hunt, J. G. (1997). International perspectives on international leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8 (3), 203-231.
- Phillips, J. S., & Lord, R. G. (1981). Causal attributions and perceptions of leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 28, 58-83.
- Pike, K. L. (1967). *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Roberts, N. C. (1985). Transforming leadership: A process of collective action. *Human Relations*, 38, 1,023-1,046.
- Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.) *Cognition and categorization* (pp. 27-48). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rush, M. C., Thomas, J. C., & Lord, R. G. (1977). Implicit leadership theory: A potential threat to the validity of leader behavior questionnaires. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 20, 93-110.
- Shamir, B. (1992). Attribution of charisma and influence to the leader: The romance of leadership revisited. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22 (5), 386-407.
- Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: theoretical notes and an exploratory study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6 (1), 19-47.
- Shamir, B., Arthur, M. B., & House, R. J. (1994). The rhetoric of charismatic leadership: a theoretical extension, a case study and implications for research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5 (1), 25-42.
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4, 1-17.
- Shamir, B., Zakay E., Breinin E., & Popper M. Correlates of charismatic leader behavior in Military units-subordinates attitudes, unit characteristics, and superiors appraisals of leader performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41 (4), 387-409.
- Shaw, J. B. (1990). A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural management. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 435-454.
- Simonton, D. K. (1987) *Why presidents succeed: A political psychology of leadership*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Singer, M. S., & Singer, A. E. (1990). Situational constraints on transformational versus transactional leadership behavior, subordinates' leadership preference, and satisfaction. *Journal of Social psychology*, 130 (3), 385-396.
- 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.
- Szabo, E., & Reber, G. (1999). Culture, organizational practices, and leadership in Austria. In R. J. House & J. Chhokar (Eds.), *Cultures of the world: A GLOBE anthology of in-depth descriptions of the cultures of 14 countries* (vol. 1).
- Thierry, H., Den Hartog, D. N., Koopman, P. L., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (1999). Leadership, politics and culture in the Netherlands. In: R. J. House & J. Chhokar (Eds.), *Cultures of the world: A GLOBE anthology of in-depth descriptions of the cultures of 14 countries* (vol. 1).
- Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1990). *The transformational leader* (2nd ed), New York: Wiley.
- Trompenaars, F. (1993) *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business*. London: Nicholas Brealey.
- Willner, A. R. (1984). *The spellbinders: Charismatic political leadership*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Wren, T. J. (Ed). (1995). *The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Yammarino, F. J., & Bass, B. M. (1990). Long-term forecasting of transformational leadership and its effects among naval officers: some preliminary findings. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 151-170). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Yammarino, F. J., Spangler, W. D., & Bass, B. M. (1993). Transformational leadership and performance: A longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4 (1), 81-102.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.