

Database: ABI_INFORM

Query: kw: cross-cultural and kw: leadership

Comment:

Gibson (1995)

Full-text source: ABI_INFORM

An investigation of gender differences in leadership across four countries

Author: Gibson, Christina B **Source:** Journal of International Business Studies v26n2, (Second Quarter 1995): p.255-279 (Length: 25 pages) **ISSN:** 0047-2506 **Number:** 01070499 **Copyright:** Copyright Grayson Associates 1995

Significant changes have occurred over the last decade that bring into focus the importance of understanding differences between genders and cultures. These changes include: (1) increasing diversity of the labor force; (2) a shift in scope of the work environment from local to international markets; (3) increasing numbers of mergers and acquisitions among corporations from different countries; (4) organizational restructuring across national boundaries; (5) emergence of high technology and telecommunication systems facilitating international communication; and (6) an increasing number of females entering the work force worldwide [Erez 1993]. Each of these changes will have a profound impact on the psychology of individuals in organizations. Cross-cultural gender research in organizations is also critical at this point in the development of the field because most organizational studies to date have tended to focus more on events that occur within the individual (e.g., attitudes, cognitions), rather than on

GENDER INFLUENCES ON BEHAVIOR

We have recently witnessed a resurgence of interest among the general public in gender differences in various aspects of human functioning. As our organizations have experienced a huge influx of women into the workforce, researchers have been studying such gender differences. According to Adler and Izraeli [1988], there are basically two contrasting views regarding women in management. The equity view assumes similarity between male and female contributions and strives to provide equal access and identical norms for men and women. Effectiveness is based on a male referent and historical male norms. This view can be characterized by the "melting pot" metaphor commonly used to describe the United States. The complementary-contribution view, on the other hand, assumes differences between male and female contributions and strives to recognize the value of these differences. Effectiveness is based on norms that are unique to males and females and expected behavior is differentiated by gender. This se

According to Eagly [1987], the agentic dimension of behavior is primarily an assertive, goal directed, and controlling tendency. Agentic qualities include aggressiveness, ambition, dominance, independence, self-reliance, self-sufficiency, directness, and decisiveness. Various studies have demonstrated that, in general, males are more often characterized by agentic

qualities (e.g., Rosner [1990]; Werner & LaRussa [1985]; Spence & Helmreich [1978]; and Bem [1974]).

There are many theories as to why females and males are characterized by communal versus agentic qualities [Kanter 1977; Williams and Best 1982; Eagly & Steffen 1984]. Williams and Best [1982], for example, suggest that a division of labor assigning a disproportionate share of domestic activities (e.g., child rearing or responsibility for family cohesiveness) to females and of other activities to males is the cause of the stereotypes. These authors maintain that since communal qualities are important for effective performance of the domestic activities and such activities are performed by females more often than males, these qualities tend to be valued more and encouraged in females. The agentic qualities, on the other hand, tend to be more critical for survival outside the home while participating in paid employment. In most families, males still perform more work outside the home than do females [U.S. Department of Labor 1991], thus males are more often encouraged to develop agentic qualities. Male deve

Bass's [1990] research at the State University of New York's Center for Leadership Studies is consistent with Rosner's. His data, generated by male and female leaders' subordinates, suggest that women are more likely than men to be described as charismatic leaders, and are more likely to temper criticism with positive feedback.

Eagly and Johnson's [1990] meta-analytic review of gender and leadership serves as the proper capstone for this section. The authors reviewed 162 studies examining leadership styles across genders. Results indicated that the proportion of gender comparisons that were stereotypic in direction differed significantly from .50, the proportion expected under the null hypothesis.

According to Eagly and Johnson [1990: 255], "the strongest evidence we obtained for a sex difference in leadership style occurred in the tendency for women to adopt a more democratic or participative style and for men to adopt a more autocratic or directive style. Ninety-two percent of the available comparisons went in the direction of more democratic behavior from women than men. The results of this research suggest that gender influences leadership style. The following proposition summarizes this notion:

P1: Gender will demonstrate a significant main effect on the degree of emphasis placed on leadership behaviors and styles.

CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON BEHAVIOR

Societies often differ with respect to certain practices, characteristics and values. Such aspects of society are often referred to as "culture." The first major task of any attempt to study different cultures is to arrive at a more precise definition of the construct. The definition of culture to be utilized here was quoted by Kluckhohn [1951:86] as a consensus of anthropological definitions:

Culture consists in patterned ways of thinking, feeling and reacting, acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values.

Countries represent natural aggregates of individuals that often share culture; however, it cannot be assumed that a country constitutes a culture until one has evidence that the individuals share points of view or other unstated assumptions [Triandis 1993]. An important indicator of culture is the value orientations held by individuals within a given society. To say that a person has a value is to say "that he [or she] has an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end state of existence is personally and socially preferable to alternative modes of conduct or end states of existence" [Rokeach 1972: 159-60]. When individuals within a given group have similar value

orientations, that at the same time are distinct from the values held by other groups, then it is often assumed that the group constitutes a culture.

That cultural values influence a wide range of behaviors seems widely accepted [Dlugos and Weiermair 1981]; however, the particular mechanisms by which an array of cultural values impart an influence on the leadership behavior of a given individual is currently a topic of great interest. Authors such as Shweder and LeVine [1984], Wyer and Srull [1989], and Erez and Earley [1993] suggest that cultural values shape cognitive schemas, or sets of shared meaning among individuals. Erez and Earley [1993] have recently utilized this notion to develop a model that integrates cultural factors, managerial and motivational practices, and the self, in order to explicate employees' behaviors across cultures. By way of summary, their model suggests that information concerning leadership practices is processed by an employee in light of cultural values. The leadership practices are then evaluated in terms of the potential contribution the practice makes to that employee's sense of well-being and self-worth [Erez 1993].

P2: Country will demonstrate a significant main effect on the degree of emphasis placed on leadership behaviors and styles.

The Interaction of Gender and Culture

Turning back to the gender research, it should be noted that most of the studies investigating gender differences in leadership have been conducted in the United States (Rosner [1990] is a notable exception). Moving into the 1990s, there was still an unequal distribution of males and females in the U.S. labor force. In 1991, for example, the U.S. Department of Labor reported that nearly 80% of men were in the labor force, but under 60% of women were in the labor force. This indicates that in the U.S., males still work outside the home more often than females. According to theorists such as Williams and Best [1982], the result of this unequal distribution is that American males are still characterized by agentic qualities more so than American females. In the work place, American males and females may still emphasize different leadership styles.

However, this same set of circumstances may not be true in countries with different cultural values, characteristics, and practices. As a case in point, the Swedish Unit for Equal Opportunity Statistics [1991] reported that in Sweden, 90% of men and 85% of women are in the labor force. Because the percentage of men and women who work outside the home is so high in Sweden, perhaps both are equally characterized by agentic and communal qualities. In turn, males and females may tend to emphasize similar leadership behaviors and styles. If this is true, we would expect to find an interaction effect between country and gender on leadership behaviors and styles. The following proposition summarizes this notion :

P3: The interaction of country and gender will demonstrate a significant effect on the degree of emphasis placed on leadership behaviors and styles.

Cultural Clusters and Leadership

One of the most intriguing findings from studies that investigate culture is that national boundaries do not necessarily indicate distinct differences between cultures [Erez & Earley 1993]. Countries often group together into clusters that share similar cultural values, and leadership or managerial practices are often similar within each cluster. Hofstede [1980a], for example, utilized country scores on his four cultural value dimensions to develop profiles of the countries in his study, and then grouped the countries into clusters that shared similar value orientations. Hofstede [1980b] proposed that organizational and managerial practices are similar within these clusters, but quite different across clusters. He suggests, for instance, that in the cluster of countries that scored higher than average on masculinity, leaders will demonstrate competitiveness, equity, and

sympathy for the strong. On the other hand, he suggests that in the cluster of countries that scored lower than average in masculinity, I

In order to compare leadership in both similar and divergent cultures, leaders from four countries were investigated in this study: Norway, Sweden, Australia and the U.S. Although values were not specifically measured in the present study, numerous previous empirical investigations have demonstrated that Norway and Sweden have very similar cultural value orientations [Douglas & Douglas 1989; Polley 1988; Zemke 1988; Heller & Wilpert 1981; Hofstede 1980a] and that Australia and the United States have similar cultural value orientations [Adler, Brahm & Graham 1992; Reichel & Preble 1991; Triandis et al. 1988; Harris & Moran 1987; Limerick 1990; Jenner 1982; Hofstede 1980a]. At the same time, these two country dyads are very different with respect to each other.

Specific similarities and differences between the dyads will be outlined in the next section; however, it should first be noted that in addition to similarities and differences in value orientations, Norway, Sweden, Australia and the U.S. were also chosen for another reason. All four have gained attention in the global business arena. American organizations are somewhat accustomed to the global spotlight; innovation and prosperity continue to remain high in U.S. businesses. In addition, throughout the last decade, Scandinavian banks, airlines, and manufacturing companies such as Volvo and Saab have been increasingly recognized as front-runners in terms of global competition. In fact, many Scandinavian companies routinely deliver a quality of service most American companies only dream about [Zemke 1988]. And although typically thought of as the "land down under," Australia is fast becoming a key trading partner with Japan. As Australia increases ties to powerful and globally oriented Asian nations, Au

LEADERSHIP FRAMEWORK

The leadership framework drawn upon for this study was developed by Flamholtz [1986] and is comprised of five leadership behaviors and six leadership styles. The relative degree of emphasis placed on any of the behaviors or styles is expected to vary depending on the value orientation of the leader as elaborated upon below. The Flamholtz model was originally based on Bowers and Seashore's [1966] four-factor leadership model. Bowers and Seashore concluded that four behavioral dimensions seem to comprise the basic structure of leadership: (1) goal emphasis, (2) interaction facilitation, (3) work facilitation, and (4) support. After several factorial investigations, Flamholtz [1986] divided the support dimension into two dimensions (supportive behavior and personnel development), thus creating five behavioral dimensions of leadership. Goal setting represents the leader's degree of emphasis on setting and monitoring task goals and following up on performance against these goals. Interaction facilitation repre

P4: Male leaders will emphasize goal setting to a greater extent than female leaders.

P5: Male leaders will emphasize work facilitation to a greater extent than female leaders.

P6: Female leaders will emphasize interaction facilitation to a greater extent than male leaders.

P7: Female leaders will emphasize supportive behavior to a greater extent than male leaders.

P8: Female leaders will emphasize personnel development to a greater extent than males leaders.

Gender differences in emphasis placed on the six leadership styles are also expected. The evidence cited earlier suggests that due to agentic characteristics (e.g., decisiveness, assertiveness, dominance), males may tend to emphasize the directive leadership styles more often than females. Evidence suggests that as a result of communal qualities (e.g., concern with

others, nurturance, etc.), females may emphasize the group-oriented, non-directive leadership styles. This set of expectations concerning leadership styles can be summarized by the following propositions:

P9: Male leaders will emphasize directive leadership styles (autocratic, benevolent autocratic, and consultative) to a greater extent than female leaders.

P10: Female leaders will emphasize non-directive leadership (participative, consensus, and laissez-faire) styles to a greater extent than male leaders.

As previously mentioned, Norwegians and Swedes appear to have very similar cultures. Common heritage, similar language (most Swedes fully understand and speak Norwegian and vice versa) and close geographical proximity are probably the greatest impetus for the shared culture. Research suggests that in Norway and Sweden, identity is based on the social system, there is a common belief that involvement with organizations is moral, and a belief that expertise, order and security are provided by the organization or community. There is also a strong belief that inequality in society should be minimized, that all people should be interdependent, that superiors are "people like me" and should be accessible, and that uncertainty is inherent in life. In comparison with Australia and the United States, Hofstede [1980a] summarizes this profile of Norwegians and Swedes as relatively collectivistic, as having small power distance, low uncertainty avoidance, and very high femininity.

Other more recent studies of Norwegian and Swedish organizational behavior confirm the early studies conducted by Hofstede. For example, in Heller and Wilpert's [1981] analysis of decisionmaking across eight countries, Swedish managers and subordinates indicated higher levels of participation and power sharing than managers from six of the other countries. According to Polley's [1988] comparison of group dynamics in Norway and the U.S., Norwegians consider it inappropriate to stand out in a crowd. Thus, people who assert their individuality are likely to come in to conflict with Norwegian group norms, and there is a common belief that the unfortunate deserve sympathy. In a series of interviews in Scandinavia's most financially successful organizations, Zemke [1988] suggests that Sweden "is not burdened with the confrontational style of management and communications that characterizes relations between American managers and workers." In analyzing Swedish labor markets, Douglas and Douglas [1989]

P11: Norwegians and Swedes will emphasize interaction facilitation, supportive behavior, and personnel development to a greater extent than Australians and Americans (conversely, Australians and Americans will emphasize these dimensions to a lesser extent than Norwegians and Swedes).

P12: Norwegians and Swedes will emphasize non-directive leadership styles to a greater extent than Australians and Americans (conversely, Australians and Americans will emphasize these styles to a lesser extent than Norwegians and Swedes).

In contrast to Norway and Sweden, the Australian and American cultures foster a different approach to leadership. In Australia and the U.S., identity is placed in the individual, there is a strong belief that everybody is supposed to take care of himself, and an emphasis on individual achievement and initiative. Australians and Americans also tend to endorse clearly differentiated sex roles. In Hofstede's [1980a] terminology, Australians and Americans are highly individualistic, have larger power distance, moderate uncertainty avoidance, and tend toward masculinity.

Jenner's [1982] study of Australian and American leaders' attitudes, values, beliefs, and opinions over a twenty-one-year period demonstrates a striking similarity between the two nationalities. Limerick [1990] confirmed this characterization through a series of in-depth interviews in fifty

Australian organizations selected on the basis of their financial success over a number of years. His summary of the values held by members of these organizations is quite similar to the characterization provided by Hofstede's [1980a]. Limerick reports, for instance, that the CEOs in his study deliberately rejected interlocking group structures in favor of systems with high levels of individualism [1990: 23]. Studies conducted with American managers confirm the notion that the U.S. is a highly individualistic culture in which managers focus on individual accomplishment and self-interest (i.e., Adler, Brahm & Graham [1992]; Reichel & Preble [1991]; Triandis et al. 1988]; Harris & Moran [1987]). For example, in her overv

P13: Australians and Americans will emphasize goal setting and work facilitation to a greater extent than Norwegians and Swedes (and conversely, Norwegians and Swedes will emphasize these dimensions to a lesser extent than Australians and Americans).

P14: Australians and Americans will emphasize directive leadership styles to a greater extent than Norwegians and Swedes (and conversely, Norwegians and Swedes will emphasize these styles to a lesser extent than Australians and Americans).

METHOD

Instrumentation

Flamholtz [1986] developed the Leadership Effectiveness Questionnaire (LEQ) to measure the emphasis a leader places on each of the five behavioral dimensions and the six leadership styles. The questionnaire was designed for use in corporate settings in which leaders desire feedback concerning their leadership behavior and style, but at the same time, may not have the time to complete a lengthy measure. Because researchers have only recently begun to utilize the LEQ across cultures, the format, reliability and validity of the instrument is discussed at length in the next few paragraphs.

The LEQ has a forced-choice paired comparison format with thirty pairs of items. Each item on the questionnaire is designed to assess a combination of a key dimension of leadership behavior and a leadership style. An example of a typical pair of items is:

(A) I tend to use meetings to tell my subordinates what we are going to do rather than to make decisions.

(B) I tell my subordinates what I think they need to do to develop themselves, and get their opinions about my recommendations.

If a respondent chooses item (A) over item (B) this indicates that the individual tends to emphasize meetings more than personnel development [Randle & Flamholtz 1984]. It also indicates that the individual tends to use a fairly directive style in facilitating interaction. In scoring the instrument, the respondent receives a "1" for every item chosen and a "0" for every item not chosen. Each of the five behavior dimensions is measured by twelve items and therefore the range of scores for these dimensions is between 0 and 12. Each of the six style dimensions is measured by ten items so the range of scores for these dimensions is between 0 and 10. Higher scores indicate that the respondent has chosen to emphasize the dimension or style more often than other dimensions or styles.(2)

Due to the forced-choice paired comparison format, the correlation coefficient computed in order to test the reliability of the items was the positive matching dichotomy coefficient (PMDC) described by Gower [1985: 309]. This particular coefficient is designed specifically for dichotomous data and represents the proportion of cases for which a matching positive response is achieved across a set of items. Thus a .60 correlation between two items indicates that 60% of

the cases in the data set responded "yes" (coded as 1) to both items. The first column in Table 1 presents the mean PMDC for each of the eleven dimensions. (All tables omitted). The mean PMDC for all but one of the dimensions (personnel development) was above .50, the minimum reliability criteria suggested by Nunnally [1967] as adequate for research purposes.(3) Although these coefficients cannot be directly compared to Cronbach's alpha, the strength of the correlations between the items is encouraging.

In an effort to further explore the psychometric properties of the LEQ, a subset of the responses were also subjected to an analysis of construct validity. Respondents' scores on the eleven leadership dimensions were correlated with their scores on the Leadership Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire (LBDQ), an instrument that has been utilized extensively in leadership research and appears to be serviceable across cultures [Triandis 1993; Rosenstein 1985; Aymen & Chemers 1983]. The LBDQ consists of two dimensions: consideration, measuring the extent to which leaders emphasize relationships with people; and structure, measuring the extent to which leaders emphasize tasks. Scores on the structure dimension of the LBDQ correlated positively with emphasis placed on the benevolent autocratic style ($r = .46, p < .01$) and on personnel development ($r = .32, p < .05$). Scores on the consideration dimension of the LBDQ were positively correlated with emphasis placed on the participative style ($r = .28, p < .0$

Sample

Individuals in Norway, Sweden and Australia were selected by the personnel departments of between ten and twenty organizations within each country. These organizations were selected in order to represent a wide variety of industries, company sizes, and locations. The individuals in the American sample were practicing managers participating in a managerial assessment course. Qualifications for inclusion in the study were that the individual be in a leadership position, be willing to complete the LEQ, and be willing to participate in a forty-five minute interview. An average of one to two hours was spent with each individual. Because the Norwegians and Swedes were fully bilingual, the questionnaire and interview were administered in English in all four countries.

The total sample size is 209 participants. This includes 45 individuals from Norway, 55 individuals from Sweden, 64 individuals from Australia, and 45 from the United States. Across all four countries, the participants were 55% male and 45% female. The mean age of participants is 42 years. An analysis of the position levels occupied by the participants indicates that the majority (40.6%) are mid-level managers and the greatest percentage (34.3%) have occupied these positions for one to two years. Most of the leaders (30.9%) are responsible for between one and five employees.

The organizations in the four samples represent a broad array of sizes and industries. The majority (58.7%) employ more than 1000 people and 26.6% have annual revenues of over \$1 billion. The Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) system was utilized to code these industries into ten divisions, each of which is broken down into two-digit groupings. All ten divisions and a total of thirty two digit groupings are represented. The greatest percentage of participants (32.5%) are employed in the service division; however, within this division, participants represent a diversity of organizations - from health services, legal services and educational services, to membership organizations, engineering, and research organizations.

Tests for demographic differences are addressed in the results section with an analysis of covariance. It should be noted here, however, that in as much as the purpose in sampling the four countries was to obtain a wide and diverse range of participants, there was less concern about using convenience samples. As noted by Earley [1993], convenience samples are often necessary in intercultural research given the many obstacles in collecting such data.

RESULTS

A 2 x 4 MANOVA with eleven dependent variables was conducted. The analysis is a study of the role of gender (the first factor) and country (the second factor), on each of the five leadership behaviors and six leadership styles that comprise the Flamholtz [1986] framework. The gender factor is a two-level fixed effect contrasting males and females. The country factor is a considered a four-level fixed effect contrasting Norway, Sweden, Australia, and the United States. The means and standard deviations for each of the dependent variables for the eight cells of the design are presented in Table 1.

SAS General Linear Models Procedure was utilized to compute Wilks' Lambda, F-test approximations, degrees of freedom, and multivariate eta sup 2 associated with the gender main effect, the country main effect, the gender by country interaction. The results are presented in Table 2. The gender effect was significant beyond the .05 level and the country effect was significant beyond the .01 level; however, the interaction of gender and country was not significant.

Upon obtaining significant main effects, the next step in the analysis was to run univariate F-tests for gender and country to determine the relative contribution to each of the five leadership behaviors and six leadership styles. As indicated in Table 2, gender accounted for a significant portion of the variance in the degree of emphasis placed on goal setting ($F(1, 209) = 4.43, p < .05$) and in the degree of emphasis placed on interaction facilitation ($F(1, 209) = 6.33, p < .05$). Country accounted for a significant portion of the variance in the degree of emphasis placed on interaction facilitation ($F(3, 209) = 6.53, p < .001$), in the degree of emphasis placed on the benevolent autocratic style ($F(3, 209) = 2.96, p < .05$) and in the degree of emphasis placed on the laissez-faire style ($F(3, 209) = 3.83, p < .05$). Tests of post-hoc differences between the levels of the main effects were then performed for these leadership dimensions.

Utilizing the LSD option of the SAS General Linear Models Procedure, pairwise comparisons were conducted for males and females on the goal setting dimension and the interaction facilitation dimension (Critical value of $T = 1.97, df = 201, p < .05$). Males scored significantly higher on goalsetting ($M = 6.16$) than did females ($M = 5.64$) indicating that males tend to emphasize this dimension more than females. Females scored significantly higher on interaction facilitation ($M = 6.12$) than did males ($M = 5.46$) indicating that females tend to emphasize this dimension more than males.

Based on the analysis of the effect of country on leadership, group differences were examined for interaction facilitation, the benevolent autocratic style, and the laissez-faire style using the LSD option of the SAS General Linear Models Procedure. This procedure conducts pairwise comparisons between each country on the dependent variables (Critical value of $T = 1.97, df = 201, p < .05$). With regard to interaction facilitation, Australia scored significantly lower ($M = 4.92$) than any of the other three countries (M for Norway = 6.13, M for Sweden = 6.23, M for U.S = 6.00) indicating that Australian leaders place less emphasis on this dimension. An examination of country differences on the benevolent autocratic style dimension revealed that Australians scored significantly higher ($M = 5.84$) than any of the other three countries (M for Norway = 5.57, M for Sweden = 5.15, M for U.S. = 5.02). This indicates that Australian leaders place significantly more emphasis on this dimension. And finally, with rega

The MANOVA and post hoc analyses suggested that the leadership dimensions that varied across countries were goal setting, benevolent autocratic style, and laissez-faire style. The ANOVAs discussed above investigated potential demographic differences in goal setting; in order to investigate potential demographic differences on benevolent autocratic style and laissez-faire style, another series of ANOVAs was performed. In the first set, benevolent autocratic style was treated as the DV and each of the demographic variables were treated as IVs. Company size was the only demographic variable that accounted for a significant portion of the variance in emphasis

on benevolent autocratic style ($F(2, 209) = 5.13, p < .01$). In the second set of ANOVAs, laissez-faire style was treated as the DV and each of the demographic variables were treated as IVs. Size of company ($F(2, 209) = 5.45, p < .01$) and industry ($F(2, 209) = 3.19, p < .05$) were the only two demographic variables that accounted for a significant

DISCUSSION

The significant main effects revealed by the MANOVA indicate that certain dimensions of leadership behavior and style vary across genders and countries. The general propositions that gender and country would demonstrate significant main effects (P1 and P2) were thus confirmed. Based on previous empirical investigations of cultural values, practices, and characteristics, males and females in Norway and Sweden were expected to emphasize similar leadership dimensions. In Australia and the U.S, male and female leadership were expected to differ. The nonsignificant interaction effect indicates, however, that the differences that occur between genders in one country also occur between genders in all four countries, thus providing no support for P3. In other words, male and female leaders emphasize divergent leadership behaviors regardless of country of origin.

The specific dimensions that varied most across genders were goal setting and interaction facilitation, with males placing greater emphasis on goal setting, and females placing greater emphasis on interaction facilitation. These differences were in the direction predicted based on the male tendency to be characterized by agentic qualities and the female tendency to be characterized by communal qualities, thus confirming P4 and P6. However, no gender differences were obtained on any other behavior or style dimensions (thus P5, P7, P8, P9, and P10 were not confirmed).

These results present a mixed picture of gender differences. Males in all four countries emphasized goal setting more than females, but did not differentially emphasize other dimensions such as work facilitation and the directive styles that, at first glance, seem to "require" agentic qualities. Females emphasized interaction facilitation more so than did males, but did not differentially emphasize the other dimensions, such as supportive behavior, personnel development and the non-directive styles, that seem to "require" communal qualities.

These findings may indicate that the male tendency toward goal setting and the female tendency toward interaction facilitation are particularly resilient to any specific attempt to "equalize" the work place for men and women. Items that measured emphasis on goal setting focused on setting desired levels of achievement. On the other hand, items that measured emphasis on interaction facilitation focused on meeting frequently with subordinates and spending time and effort sharing ideas. Perhaps goal setting is the leadership dimension that best epitomizes agentic qualities, while interaction facilitation best epitomizes communal qualities. Emphasis on the other behaviors and styles may "require" both agentic and communal characteristics. For instance, emphasizing supportive behavior, as measured by the LEQ, requires that the leader both monitor whether subordinates are achieving objectives, and work out ways that subordinates can improve. Monitoring achievement seems to require an "a

To master the global challenges of the 1990s, our organizations and societies cannot do without the completeness and complementarity of the total human experience. Our organizations badly need whole, that is healthy and balanced, individuals to draw from the riches of both their male and female inheritance and experience [1991: 151].

As more women enter the workforce in all four of the countries in this study, recognition of possible gender differences can serve as a beneficial reminder of the contribution that all minds bring to the workplace. However, discussion and celebration of differences should not

overshadow the evidence that men and women appear to place equal emphasis on a vast majority of the leadership behaviors and styles.

The univariate analyses indicate that the specific dimensions of leadership that vary most across countries are the degree of emphasis placed on interaction facilitation, the benevolent autocratic style, and the laissez-faire style. As mentioned above, the interaction facilitation dimension measures the extent to which the leader facilitates group interaction and communication in order to develop an effective team. It is the leader's degree of emphasis on conducting successful and productive meetings. Based on the empirical evidence concerning cultural value orientations, it was expected that Australians and Americans would emphasize interaction facilitation less than Norwegians and Swedes. The post hoc group comparisons demonstrate that leaders from Australia indeed emphasized this dimension significantly less than leaders from other the countries; however, because no specific differences were found with regard to the American emphasis on this dimension, the analysis provides only partial support for P11

Although Australia shares a common migration from Great Britain with the United States, many factors relating to the geographic location of Australia may help to explain the lack of similarity between Australians and Americans in this sample. The geographic isolation of Australia provoked the British to consider the continent when their own national prison system was faced with a grave overcrowding situation in the late 1700s. Beginning in 1786, the British sent convicts serving seven-year terms to the unsettled, remote Australian continent. After their terms were served, the ex-convicts were given land grants and began to settle and raise families in Australia. These early settlers were rugged, steadfast individuals. The families that thrived were self-reliant and bold-spirited. In short they were survivors, better known in Australia as "Aussie battlers. In accordance with cultural models developed by anthropologists such as Whiting 1964], the geographic isolation in Australia gave rise to these histo

Also contrary to what was expected, few differences were obtained between Americans and Scandinavians. As suggested above, this may have been due to an increase in global interaction. The lack of differences may also have been an artifact of the sampling procedure. In the United States, the questionnaires were administered in a group setting to Americans who had interacted together for a period of one year. The Scandinavians were selected on an individual basis and were not part of any particular group setting. Scandinavians who agreed to participate may have been more achievement oriented, individualistic and domineering than the "typical" Norwegian or Swede. Thus due to self-selection bias, the Norwegians and Swedes in this sample may have been quite close to the Americans in terms of cultural values, and may therefore have endorsed leadership behaviors and styles that are similar to those endorsed by American leaders.

Limitations

The small sample size and the sampling procedure utilized in this study may raise concerns regarding potential differences between the groups. In order to address this issue, potentially important demographic variables were included in a series of ANCOVAs and MANCOVAs. It is important to note that even after controlling for a range of demographic covariates, gender and country still accounted for a significant portion of the variance in the emphasis placed on several of the leadership dimensions.

An additional concern is that the amount of variance explained in the MANOVA was relatively small, with country accounting for 25% of the variance in emphasis placed on leadership dimensions and gender accounting for 17% of the variance. Other factors that may account for emphasis placed on leadership dimensions include the stage of growth of the organizations in the samples, the specific jobs performed by the employees being supervised, and the personal characteristics of the employees being supervised. Furthermore, the lack of outcome or performance data limits the generalizability of the study. We have no way of knowing whether the

emphasis indicated by the leaders in these sample resulted in high performance or low performance within each country.

An additional limitation of the study lies in the fact that the LEQ was administered in English across the four countries. Although all of the respondents were bilingual, there is evidence that bilinguals will give more extreme answers in English than in their native language [Bennett 1977b], more socially desirable answers in English [Marin et al. 1983], and will show either ethnic affirmation (emphasizing their local values) or accommodation (move in the direction of the culture whose language they are using) depending on the nationality of the person administering the questionnaire [Bond & Cheung 1984]. Ideally, instruments utilized for cross-cultural research should be developed with the guidance of resources such as Osgood's [1964, 1977] Atlas of Semantic Meaning. Osgood [1964; 1977] sought to develop comparable instruments semantic differentials to measure semantic meanings across cultures [Erez & Earley 1993]. Osgood's general index might be used to interpret such constructs as direction, feedback,

CONCLUSION

The major contribution of this study is the evidence it provides concerning potential gender differences across countries. At least among this sample of leaders, country of origin does not appear to influence the divergence in male and female emphasis on at least two dimensions of leadership: goal setting and interaction facilitation. Equally intriguing were the results concerning Australian leadership. Australians indicated less emphasis on interaction facilitation and more emphasis on a directive style than did managers from the other countries in this sample. This may be due to Australia's geographic isolation. As Australia increases its ties in the global market, Australian leaders may be faced with a situation in which they are the "odd one out" and may need to adapt accordingly.

It should be noted, however, that the emphasis placed on many of the leadership behaviors and styles did not vary across genders or cultures and the percentage of variance explained was relatively small. With regard to the construct of leadership, these results may suggest that a simplified model of leadership with perhaps two behavior dimensions (goal setting and interaction facilitation) and two leadership styles (directive and non-directive) is most appropriate for examining gender and culture differences. In order to fully capture the impact of gender and culture upon leadership, subsequent explorations must involve a greater number of countries at extreme ends of the value dimensions, an increased number of observations within each country, and a measure of leadership effectiveness. In addition, gender characteristics and value orientations should be measured directly in order to confirm the research conducted by both Eagly [1987] and Hofstede [1980a]. The results of the current study suggest that su

1. This same line of reasoning could be applied to gender differences, in that members of a gender group also share cognitive schema, or sets of shared meaning. Just as with culture-based schema, gender-based schema could ascribe import and potency to motivational variables which then guide commitments and standards and serve as criteria for evaluating the contribution of behavior to the development of a sense of self. As such, culture and gender may both serve as criteria for evaluating the meaning of various managerial techniques and the valences of their behavioral outcomes.

2. The forced-choice comparison format of this version of the LEQ makes estimations of internal consistency difficult. As described above, in the forced-choice comparison format, the items are paired and respondents are asked to choose (i.e., say "yes" to) only one item in the pair. Thus in saying "yes" to one item in the pair, the respondent is automatically saying "no" to the other item in the pair even though the two items in the pair may be measuring different dimensions. In a manner of speaking, the dimensions "compete" against each other. Thus in order to obtain high internal reliability estimates, respondents must be simultaneously consistent with respect to both their "yes" and "no" choices across all the different possible pairings of items. This situation is

much more demanding than when a respondent is given a Likert-type scale. In this format, items that measure different dimensions or scales do not "compete" with each other

REFERENCES

Adler, Nancy J., Richard Brahm & John L. Graham. 1992. Strategy implementation: A comparison of face to face negotiations in the People's Republic of China and the U.S. *Scientific Management Journal*, 13(6): 449-66.

Adler, Nancy J. 1991. *International dimensions of organizational behavior*. Boston, Mass.: PWS-Kent.

-- & Dove N. Izraeli. 1988. *Women in management worldwide*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Adler, Nancy J. 1983. A typology of management studies involving culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14: 29-47.

Ayman, Roya & Martin M. Chemers. 1983. Relationship of supervisory behavior ratings to work group effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction among Iranian managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68: 338-41.

Baker, Robin. 1986. Test-retest reliability of the leadership effectiveness questionnaire. Working paper, Anderson Graduate School of Management, UCLA.

Bass, Bernard M. 1990 (third edition). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications*. New York: Free Press.

Bem, Sandra L. 1974. The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42: 155-62.

Bennett, Mick. 1977a. Testing management theories cross-culturally. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62: 578-81.

--. 1977b. Response characteristics of bilingual managers to organizational questionnaires. *Personnel Psychology*, 30: 29-36.

Bond, Michael H. & Man-King Cheung. 1984. Experimenter language choice and ethnic affirmation of Chinese trilinguals in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 8: 347-56.

Bowers, David G. & Stanley E. Seashore. 1966. Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 11: 238-63.

Broverman, Inge K., Susan R. Vogel, Donald M. Broverman, Frank E. Clarkson & Paul S. Rosenkrantz. 1972. Sex stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28: 59-78.

Burns, Laughton M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Deaux, Kay & Laurie L. Lewis. 1983. Components of gender stereotypes. *Psychological Documents*, 13(2): 25-50.

- Dlugos, Gunter & Klaus Weiermair. 1981. Management under differing value systems. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Douglas, Mary & James Douglas. 1989. Institutions of the third kind: British and Swedish labour markets compared. *Journal of General Management*, 14(4): 35-52.
- Eagly, Alice H. 1987. Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- & Blair T. Johnson. 1990. Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108(2): 233-57.
- Eagly, Alice H. & V.J. Steffen. 1984. Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Psychology*, 46: 735-54.
- Earley, P. Christopher. 1993. East meets West meets Mideast: Further explorations of collectivistic and individualistic work groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(2): 3 1 9-48.
- Erez, Miriam. 1993. Towards a model of cross-cultural I/O psychology. In H.C. Triandis, M.D. Dunnette & L. Hough, editors, *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 4. Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologist Press.
- & P. Christopher Earley. 1993. Culture, self-identity, and work. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1987. Comparative analysis of goalsetting strategies across cultures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72: 658-65.
- Fiedler, Fred E. 1978. The contingency model and the dynamics of the leadership process. In L. Berkowitz, editor, *Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press.
- Flamholtz, Eric G. 1986. How to make the transition from entrepreneurship to a professionally managed firm. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Foxall, Gordon R. & Adrian E Payne. 1989. Adapters and innovators in organizations: A cross-cultural study of cognitive styles of managerial functions and subfunctions. *Human Relations*, 42(7): 639-49.
- French, John R., Joachim Israel & Berit As. 1960. An experiment in a Norwegian factory: Interpersonal dimension in decision-making. *Human Relations*, 13: 3-19.
- Gibson, Cristina B. & George A. Marcoulides. In press. The invariance of leadership across four countries. *Journal of Managerial Issues*.
- Gower, J.C. 1985. Measures of similarity, dissimilarity, and distance. In S. Kotz & N.L. Johnson, editors, *Encyclopedia of statistical sciences*, Vol. 5. New York: John Wiley.
- Haire, Mason, Edwin E. Ghiselli, & Lyman W. Porter. 1966. *Managerial thinking: An international study*. New York: John Wiley.
- Harris, Philip R. & Robert T. Moran. 1987. *Managing cultural differences*. Houston, Tex.: Gulf Publishing.

Heller, Frank A. & Bernard Wilpert. 1981. Competence and power in managerial decision making: A study of senior levels of organization in eight countries. Chichester, N.Y.: Praeger.

Hofstede, Geert. 1980a. Culture's Consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

--. 1980b. Motivation, leadership, and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, Summer: 42-63.

--. 1983. The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories. *Journal of International Business Studies*, Fall, 75-89.

--. 1991. Culture and organizations: Software of the mind. London: McGraw-Hill.

-- & John Spangenberg. 1987. Measuring individualism and collectivism at occupational and organizational levels. In C. Kagitcibasi, editor, *Growth and progress in cross-cultural psychology*, 113-22. Lisse, Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger.

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

Jenkins, D. 1993. Hands across the ocean. *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 25: 15-18.

Jenner, Stephen R. 1982. Analyzing cultural stereotypes in multinational business: United States and Australia. *Journal of Management Studies*, 19: 307-25.

Joreskog, Karl G. & Dag Sorbom. 1992. LISREL VIII. Mooresville, Ind.: Scientific Software.

Kanter, Rosabeth M. 1977. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.

Kelley, Lane, Arthur A. Whatley & Reginald Worthley. 1987. Assessing the effects of culture on managerial attitudes: A three-culture test. *Journal of International Business Studies*,

Kluckhohn, Clyde C. 1951. The study of culture. In D. Lerner & H.D. Lasswell, editors, *The policy sciences*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Kanungo, Rabindra N. & Richard W. Wright. 1983. A cross-cultural comparative study of managerial job attitudes. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 14(2): 115-29.

Limerick, David C. 1990. Managers of meaning: From Bob Geldof's band aid to Australian CEOs. *Organization Dynamics*, 18(4): 22-33.

Marin, G., Harry C. Triandis, H. Betancourt & Y. Kashima. 1983. Ethnic affirmation versus social desirability: Explaining discrepancies in bilinguals' responses to a questionnaire. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 14: 173-86.

Misumi, Juji. 1985. The behavioral science of leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research program. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.

Nunnally, Jum C. 1967. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill.

--. 1978. Psychometric theory (second edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Olivares, Frederica. 1991. Ways men and women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, January-February: 151.
- Osgood, Charles E. 1964. Semantic differential technique in the comparative study of cultures. *American Anthropologist*, 66: 171-200.
- . 1977. Objective indicators in subjective culture. In L. Loeb Adler, editor, *Issues in cross-cultural research*. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 285: 435-50.
- Pedhazur, Elazar J. & Liora P. Schmelkin. 1991. *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Polley, Richard B. 1988. Intervention and cultural context: Mediation in the U.S. and Norway. *Journal of Management*, 14(4): 617-29.
- Randall, Donna M. 1993. Cross-cultural research on organizational commitment: A review and application of Hofstede's Value Survey Module. *Journal of Business Research*, 26: 9-110.
- Randle, Yvonne R. & Eric G. Flamholtz. 1984. Male and female leadership behavior: A comparison of manager and subordinate perception. Unpublished paper, Anderson Graduate School of Management, UCLA.
- Reichel, Arie & John E Preble. 1991. Cross-cultural management research: Israeli and American attitudes toward business ethics. *International Journal of Management*, 8: 631-41.
- Rokeach, Milton. 1972. *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Ronen, Simcha & Oded Shenkar. 1985. Clustering countries on attitudinal dimensions: A review and synthesis. *Academy of Management Review*, 10: 435-54.
- Rosenstein, Eliezer. 1985. Cooperativeness and advancement of managers: An international perspective. *Human Relations*, 38: 1-22.
- Rosner, Judy B. 1990. Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, November-December: 119-25.
- Ruble, Thomas L. 1983. Sex stereotypes: Issues of change in the 1970s. *Sex Roles*, 9: 397-402.
- Scalberg, E. & B. Doherty. 1993. Validity and reliability testing of leadership questionnaire. Working paper, Anderson Graduate School of Management, UCLA.
- Schmidt, Stuart M. & Rhy-Song Yeh. 1992. The structure of leader influence: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23(2): 25 1-64.
- Shweder, Richard A. Robert A. LeVine. 1984. *Culture theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Spence, Janet T.. & Robert L. Helmreich. 1978. *Masculinity & femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, & antecedents*. Austin, Tex.: University of Texas Press.
- Tannenbaum, Robert & Warren H. Schmidt. 1958. How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*. 36(2): 95-101.

Triandis, Harry C., Robert Bontempo, Marcelo J. Vilareal, Masaaki Asai & N. Lucca. 1988. Individualism and collectivism: Cross-cultural perspectives on self-ingroup relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 323-38.

Triandis, Harry C. 1989. The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96:506-20.

--. 1993. Cross-cultural industrial and organizational psychology. In Triandis, Dunnette & Hough, editors, *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 4. Palo Alto, Calif: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Unit for Equal Opportunity Statistics. 1990. *Women and men in Sweden: Equality of the sexes*. 1991. Stockholm, Sweden: Statistics Sweden.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1991. *Employment and earnings*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Vroom, Victor H. & Phillip W. Yetton. 1973. *Leadership and decision-making*. Pittsburgh, Penn.: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Werner, Paul D. & Georgina W. LaRussa. 1985. Persistence and change in sex-role stereotypes. *Sex Roles*. 12: 1089-110.

Whiting, John W.M. 1964. Effects of climate on certain cultural practices. In W.H. Goodenough, editor, *Explorations in cultural anthropology*, 496-544. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Williams, John E. & Deborah L. Best. 1982. *Measuring sex stereotypes: A thirty-nation study*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

Wyer, Robert S. & Thomas K. Srull. 1989. *Memory and cognition in social content*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Zemke, Ron. 1988. Scandinavian management: A look at our future? *Management Review*, July: 44-48.

*Cristina B. Gibson is an Assistant Professor of Management in the School of Business at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. Her research and professional interests include cross-cultural organizational behavior, international management, leadership, and team approaches to work.