A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF LEADERSHIP SKILLS ACROSS THE

UNITED STATES, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND ITALY: A QUANTITATIVE

DESIGN USING INTERNET TECHNOLOGY

A Dissertation

by

FABIO MORO

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2005

Major Subject: Educational Human Resource Development

A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON OF LEADERSHIP SKILLS ACROSS THE

UNITED STATES, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND ITALY: A QUANTITATIVE

DESIGN USING INTERNET TECHNOLOGY

A Dissertation

by

FABIO MORO

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

| | |
|---|---|
| Chair of Committee, | Kenneth Paprock |
| Committee Members, | Walter Stenning |
| | Stephen Stark |
| | William Rupley |
| Head of Department | James Scheurich |

August 2005

Major Subject: Educational Human Resource Development

ABSTRACT

A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Leadership Skills across the United States, the United

Kingdom and Italy: A Quantitative Design Using Internet Technology. (August 2005)

Fabio Moro B.S., S.U.N.Y Brockport;

M.Ed., Texas A&M University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Kenneth Paprock

This study focused on cross-cultural leadership styles between the United States,

the United Kingdom and the Republic of Italy to determine if any significant statistical

differences in leadership style exist.  It is a common belief that leadership styles vary

according to cultural filters and expectations.  Yet, this study failed to find support for

this position.

Perceived Leadership Scales and the Leadership Needs Assessment survey were

adapted and modified to create a single online research instrument. The results, while

tentative, found no significant differences between leadership styles in the United States,

the United Kingdom and Italy.

Utilizing online electronic surveys and internet related technologies the

instruments were mailed to leaders of consulting firms engaged in poverty alleviation

efforts in their homeland as well as in third world areas.  Utilizing basic descriptive

statistics the results were analyzed using SPSS.

The conclusions from this study are drawn tentatively due to the small sample size and poor response rate as well as some methodological issues.  Notwithstanding these concerns, however, the central conclusion of the study is that while it may be politically correct to assume there is a significant difference between leadership styles based on cultural norms and expectations filters, the data, at least in this limited study, does not support this assumption.

DEDICATION

This culmination of my doctoral study is dedicated to the two most profound, wise and just people I have ever known, my parents.  I would like to thank my mother and my father for everything they have done for me, for literally giving me the clothes off their backs and making the incredible sacrifices they have made for me.

When I was a child, I failed to understand the depths of those sacrifices, but as I near middle-age myself, I realize that I can only hope to be half the man my father was to me.  The journey from a small, impoverished Italian town called Celano in the mountains of Italy to the United States has not been easy, but I hope that this document, in a small way, can bring my parents a sense of peace and a conviction that their sacrifice was worthwhile.  I cannot know what the future holds, but I hope that this stage of my career is only the beginning and that the better life my parents have always hoped and envisioned for their family will soon arrive.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been achieved without the support and assistance of a number of people. I would like to thank Dr. Kenneth Paprock, whom I consider not just my Committee Chair, but also my friend and a great source of the inspiration and incentive to explore outside the box and begin this research effort. He provided critical assistance along the way. His help was invaluable and his support strengthening.

In addition, I would like to thank my committee members: Dr. Walter Stenning, Dr. William Rupley, and Dr. Stephen Starke. Without their support this study could not have reached its conclusion.

I would also like to thank a very special friend by the name Arissa Hill. Arissa, you will never really know what your friendship meant to me, since chances are you will never read this, but if some day you should, I want you to know the kindness and respect you showed me will never be forgotten. It is extremely rare in this world to find a lady who is genuinely even more beautiful on the inside than she is on the outside. You helped me to get the confidence I needed to persevere in a time of great self-doubt. Arissa, with your beauty and brains, the sky is the limit for you, girl. I hope someday in the future, life brings our paths together again. I wish you love and happiness your whole life through.

I would also like to thank my three brothers (Aldo Moro, Giuseppe Moro and Guido Moro). Hey, you know our life growing up wasn't easy, but I hope this is the beginning of something special for us all.

Most especially, I would like to thank my parents, Arturo Moro and Michelina Moro, who immigrated to the United States from Italy in 1966 without literally two pennies and without a single word of English nor formal education.  However, they always believed in the power of education and always supported me by whatever means they could to allow me ultimately to reach this distinguished honor.  They often wore old clothes and sometimes went without food so they could afford to send me to the best private schools, and they used any savings they had to help fund my bachelor's degree. To my loving, honorable parents I owe a debt of gratitude that I can never repay. While they lack the formal education that many might possess, I have never known two more intelligent, more caring, more giving people.  I only wish that I could have realized the depths of their sacrifice when I was younger.

For self-assurance and sanctuary during this study, I every now and then looked to the simple prayer on the coin of the realm, "In God We Trust."  The constructive attributes of this study derive from those mentioned above and many other sources, while any errors, omissions or mistakes are attributable only to the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter outlines three overlapping themes that may influence the exploration of cross-cultural leadership and that are at the root of the present study: contemporary developments; the impact of multinational organizations and the cultural environment.

There is a growing interest in cross-cultural leadership research within human resource development (Kuchinke, 1995) as multinational organizations become commonplace. Human resource practitioners and scholars are in position to play a more significant role in shaping the leaders of tomorrow and, hence, the culture within multinational organizations (Shim & Paprock, 2002). As multinationals struggle to survive in the global marketplace and integrate diverse populations, enhancing the human asset becomes fundamental to achieving a sustainable competitive advantage and managing change (Porter, 1990). There is an emerging consensus that an organization's human resource function will supply the key competitive advantage to differentiate between firms (Tregaskis, Heraty, & Morley, 2001).

Numerous theorists agree that our understanding of leadership remains disintegrated and teeming with conceptual contradictions (Yiu, 2000). Furthermore, international human resource development experts generally concur that it is crucial for

_____

The style and format of this dissertation follow that of *The Journal of Educational Research.*

multinational corporations (MNC) to attract, select, develop, and retain employees who can work successfully outside of their provincial national limitations (Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985; Tung, 1988; Tung & Miller, 1990).

However, attempting to acquire and train such individuals may prove easier said than done since even in the highly capitalistic culture of the United States there exists a great skepticism toward recent managerial movements due in large measure to the downsizing movement of the 1980's and the more recent movement toward outsourcing. Therefore, if there is cynicism in the U.S. labor force toward concepts such as empowerment of employees and its related leadership principles, think for a moment about what reservations individuals from different backgrounds might have in accepting some of the current management and leadership concepts that principally emanate from the United States (U.S). At least in the U.S, since its earliest revolutionary period, there has been a cultural tradition consistent with the concept of individual empowerment. However, many cultures do not readily accept this notion and have a history of some form of hierarchical rule of their nation that run counter to the principles of empowerment.

According to Hofstede's (1980) cultural scales, the U.S. scores low in power distance, which implies uneasiness toward accepting an unequal distribution of power. Conversely, high power distance societies readily accept unequal distribution of power, and subordinates expect direction. For leaders and subordinates in high power distance societies, empowering individuals to accomplish tasks and roles customarily related to leadership is odd and perhaps even absurd.

Based on these cultural value differences, there needs to be awareness that some cultures have different expectations that may impede attempts at empowerment, thereby requiring a different type of leadership found in the U.S. Some multinational corporations are finding that a leadership strategy that works in one country may not work in another.

Italy's recent economic development provides support for the proposition that there is a need for leadership research in Italy. According to Cohen and Federico (2001) "Italy has managed, in spite of the odds, to become one of the world's richest and economically most advanced countries" (p. 107). Historically, Italian firms generally succeeded in adapting foreign technologies to their national context; however, Italy's most successful industries grew from small firms that clustered together in the countryside. These firms benefited from unique social interactions that resulted from shared values and belief systems (Cohen & Federico, 2001).

The Italian labor force is projected to experience radical change in the foreseeable future due to its current immigration pattern and its economic reforms designed to move away from its traditional socialistic model and closer to American capitalism. These economic changes will bring with it considerable cultural changes as new immigrants assimilate into the culture and labor force. These changes will understandably result in shifting expectation filters vis-à-vis the leader-follower relationship and will necessitate significant leadership development to manage and navigate through the complexities associated with organizational change.

At present, Italians suffer from the lowest birthrate in Europe (1.23 children per woman) and the second lowest in the world (Vietor, 2001). Furthermore, Vietor (2001) states that if Italy's present rate of reproduction continues Italians will slowly and steadily cease to survive as a people and be replaced by an amalgamation of cultural traditions. This has considerable implications for Italy's long-established cradle to grave political and economic structure, since many of these immigrants are unskilled and occupy lower rungs of the social and economic ladder.

Moreover, a significant portion of the Italian population is elderly, retired and on government pensions. The existing retirement age in Italy is currently set at a generous age of 55 (Vietor, 2001). The combination of all these factors could conceivably result in a long term shortage of experienced, indigenous leaders capable of navigating through this changing landscape as new immigrants bring important cultural changes (Eastland, 2004). In addition, Italy's Instituto Nazionale di Statistica predicts that by 2010, the population over age 57 will be approximately 61% of the working population. The corresponding figure for the United States is 20.4%.

A cultural transformation is occurring as the Italian labor force dramatically ages and Italy continues to assimilate into the European Union (Vietor, 2001). This transformation is inevitability accompanied by modifications in social relationships, in particular, the leader-subordinate relationship (Capra, 1982). How leadership is implemented simultaneously impacts and reflects society (Colins & Chippendale, 1995). As a result, innovative solutions and fresh approaches to leadership will be

required to successfully manage this transformation within the context of multinationals.

Successful leadership in multinational organizations requires adept cultural awareness on the organizational and individual level. However, it is thorny proposition to precisely measure culture since culture is by its nature in a constant state of change primarily because it is a learned behavior. Cultural awareness is related to a leader's ability to understand how they themselves impact the culture and their ability to become self-aware and recognize their role in the culture. Schein (2004) believed in the direct relevance and importance of understanding organizational culture as a byproduct of leadership, by succinctly stating that "leadership and culture are two sides of the same coin" (p. 1). Hence, we can gain insight into organizational culture by examining its leadership.

However, accurately describing leadership is problematic because of the complications associated with determining precisely what to measure. Furthermore, Clegg (1990) emphasized the difficulty involved in recognizing credible new approaches because of our theory dependence. Theory dependence is concept that we are only capable of becoming aware or recognizing what our current theories permit us to recognize. Additionally, culture sways our morality and ethics, which in turn influences leadership.

McLean (2001) asserts that cultural differences are a critical dynamic in shaping human resource development. Nevertheless, despite such proclamations within the field there exists in human resource development a lack of research that is specifically

connected to attempting to measure the impact cultural issues play upon the field

(McGuire et al., 2002).

A constructive theory, which may offer a conduit between human resource

development, leadership and cultural issues, is path goal theory for the reason that it

conceptualizes leadership as a multidimensional process contingent upon the situation.

Human resource professional by virtue of their role as change agents are intimately

involved in affecting the conditions or situation in which leadership id practiced.

Additionally, path goal theory is intimately related to expectancy theory (Vroom,

1995), which essentially attempts to align demonstrated behaviors with expected

behaviors. Fundamentally, human resource professional at their core attempt to

influence behavior to increase performance. In addition, path goal theory proposes that

effective leadership necessitates the alignment of the styles and expectations of the

leader with the styles and expectations of the followers--it requires the alignment of

leadership styles across cultural variables to minimize conflict and create optimal

performance (House and Dressler, 1974).

Problem Statement

Despite proclamations within the field of the importance of cultural issues upon the field, human resource development is seems to be sparse on research concerning effective cross-cultural leadership.  Hence, effective training and development programs cannot be facilitated for those engaged in cross-cultural assignments since knowledge seems to be lacking.  Yet, it is believed that a leader's initial six months in a new overseas assignment are decisive to a successful outcome. Furthermore, if momentum and personal credibility fail to be established during this critical period, then the prospect for achieving long-term success is severely diminished (Ciampa and Watkins, 1999).  Research is needed within the field of human resource development to facilitate effective cross-cultural leadership training.

The literature searches conducted failed to discern any significant research focused on leadership development in Italy within the field. That which does exists seems to stem from the more behavioral field of human resource management. In addition, neither path goal theory nor the LEADNA has been used in human resource development to develop competency profiles with respect to Italian leadership.

Purpose of the Study

The central purpose of this study is to identify leadership styles or characteristics in Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States in order to discern if there are noteworthy differences that might be explained by cultural differences. If important distinctions indeed exist, then the study may serve as a preliminary basis for future research to further identify and pinpoint competencies necessary to improve the training of leaders assigned to work cross-culturally between the United States and Italy.

Research Questions

This study sought to answer two fundamental questions:

1. What similarities and differences in leadership styles and behaviors exist between the United Kingdom, the United States and Italy?

2. Are the differences in perceived leadership styles and behaviors significant enough to warrant specific host country leadership training within the field of Human Resource Development?

Operational Definitions

Since definitions adopted by researchers often lack uniformity, some key terms are defined here to establish positions taken in this research. These terms and concepts are more fully explored as they appear in pertinent sections.

*Collectivism*: The opposite of individualism. In collectivism, people belong to in-
groups. This concept reflects a bipolar continuum and relates to the
individual's dependence on the group and to his or her self-concept of "I" or
"we." Collectivist cultures subordinate individual interests to group interests.
The group protects its members in exchange for loyalty and obedience. One's
personal identity is rooted in the social network in which one belongs, and
harmony is valued over speaking one's mind. The mechanism of social control
is the threat of losing face and the possibility of shame. The concept of
collectivism permeates Italian culture, although Italy ranks as relatively
individualistic when compared to other southern European countries such as
Greece and Spain.

*Competency*: A cluster of related knowledge, skills, and attitudes that affects a major,
job-related role or responsibility, that correlates with performance on the job,
which can be measured against well-accepted standards and that, can be
improved via training and development (Parry, 1996).

*Corporate Culture*:  A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group has learned

as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, and that

has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to

new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to these

problems (Schein, 2004).

*Directive or Instrumental Leadership*: A leadership style that is primarily procedural in

nature. It attempts to set the direction of the group or individual by focusing on

common tasks such as planning, task coordination, policy setting and

implementation, and other procedures intended to give specific guidance.  In

this type of leadership, the communication pattern is commonly one of being

problem centered, impersonal and goal oriented.  Directive leaders believe that

what is said, not how it is said, is of paramount concern.  The stress is on the

accuracy of communication rather than its appropriateness.

*Equality*:  A bias that certain cultures display in which inequality is seen as an

undesirable condition and, thus, attempts are made to rectify the condition

through legislative and political remedies. In cultures biased toward equality,

organizations tend to be flatter, and power is decentralized.  The organizational

structure is fashioned to attempt to encourage individual autonomy and

responsibility.  Generally, employees who operate in this sphere do not

conform to the notion that managers, by virtue of their positions, have an

automatic right to power and privilege. Rather, power ought to be earned and

shared.

*Femininity*:  The opposite of masculinity. A culture that values femininity, the

dominant values are caring for others and quality of life.  The anthropological

and societal issue to which this dimension relates is the choice of social sex

roles and its effects on one's self-concept.

*Human Resource Development*: A process of enhancing human expertise through

organizational development and through personnel training and development.

The purpose of this process is to improve performance at the organizational and

individual levels (Swanson, 1996).  is a set of systematic and planned activities

designed to provide its members with the necessary skills to meet current and

future job demands.  Learning is at the core of all human resource development

efforts (DeSimone, Werner, & Harris, 2002).

*Individualism*:  A philosophical stance that people should to look after themselves and

their immediate families.  It refers to the degree to which individuals are a

priority over the group.  In countries with high individualism, such as the

United States, the emphasis is on the self, and at most, the nuclear family.

Private life is highly valued, as are independence, initiative, and autonomy.

Individualistic cultures believe in such maxims as survival of the fittest and

buyer beware.

*Leadership Style*: Actions taken by an individual to influence and demonstrate for

others how to obtain the goals of the organization.  Sometimes this term means

the same as leadership orientation or leadership frame (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

*Masculinity*:  The opposite of femininity. The dominant values are success, money, and material possessions.  A masculine orientation gives priority to achievement over caring for others and quality of life.  In countries high in masculinity, companies place a high value on performance and growth. Individuals try to excel, and they value work as an end to itself.  In countries low in masculinity, companies display a people rather than a results orientation in their approach to life.  Individuals see work as a means rather than an end in itself, and they focus heavily on quality of life issues rather than the accumulation of wealth and material objects.

*Multinational Corporation*: An organization that has operations in multiple countries. These operations act independently of each other, conforming to local laws and regulations.

*Participative Leadership*: A style of leadership that is synonymous with influential leadership. This style solicits, encourages and seeks out the opinions and ideas of subordinates.

*Power Distance*: Refers to the extent that less powerful members are accepting of the unequal distribution of power.  This unequal distribution may be a relatively desirable or undesirable aspect of society.  In countries with high power distance, the mere holding of power requires less legitimization than in those with low power distance.  The basic anthropological and societal issue is that power distance relates to is social inequality and the amount of authority of one person over another.

*Supportive Leadership*: A style of leadership that attempts primarily to support

employees by showing concern and respect for their particular needs.  The

supportive leader exhibits strong interpersonal verbal and non-verbal

communication skills.

*Theory X*: The belief that employees are fundamentally lazy, undirected, lacking in

ambition, and indifferent to organizational goals (McGregor, 1966).

*Theory Y*:  The belief that employees are highly motivated to fulfill their potential for

the betterment of the organization and that they are eager to assume

responsibility (McGregor, 1966).

*Transactional or Authoritarian Leader*: A leader who is principally concerned with

accomplishing organizational objectives through rewards (Kouzes & Posner,

1999).

*Transformational Leader*: One who possesses the ability to inspire individuals within

the organization towards a shared vision and to demonstrate behaviors that

enable the organization to reach its goals (Bass, 1985).

*Uncertainty Avoidance*: The extent to which people feel threatened by ambiguity and

have created beliefs and institutions to try to avoid it.  Uncertainty is a threat,

and uncertainty avoidance relates to the protection of society from this

perceived threat through technology, rules, and rituals, and to the level of

anxiety regarding the future.  In high uncertainty avoidance countries, there is a

need for comprehensive rules and regulations, a deeply held belief in the power

of experts and a search for absolute truths and values.  Conversely, low

uncertainty avoidance countries exhibit little emphasis on rules and procedures and rather place greater reliance upon relativism and empiricism. In addition, they place a greater belief in the role of common sense and the use of generalization. Uncertainty avoidance is a way in which society deals with conflicts and aggression, and with life and death.

*URL*: Uniform resource locator, the addressing system of the World Wide Web.

## Assumptions

The following assumptions underlie the present study:

1. Individuals who respond to the survey will provide honest and accurate responses to all survey items.

2. The survey used for this study will accurately measure perceptions of leadership.

3. The survey used for this study will accurately measure perceptions of role conflict and ambiguity.

4. Translation of the surveys will be accurate.

5. The interpretations made in this study will accurately reflect the actual perceptions intended by those who surveyed.

Limitations

1. This study is limited to those individuals who have e-mail accounts listed in the

   Directory of Development Organizations (Wesselink, 2003) and have expressed

   implied consent to receive e-mails related to research. These individuals work

   in consulting firms which are engaged in poverty alleviation both domestically

   and abroad. Their principal area of overseas operations is in third world nations

   and they work closely with non-governmental organizations to achieve their

   aims.

2. This study reflects individual perceptions only and, therefore, the data may

   skew to the degree that an individual's perceptions may not be completely

   accurate or that subjective feelings and emotions may interfere with any

   rational appraisals. There may also be a degree of hesitancy on the part of

   certain participants to honestly and accurately report personal feelings related to

   their leader due to fear of reprisal.

3. Perceptions can vary significantly from day to day and even within a day.

   Depending on the individual, it may be more of a snapshot of the current

   situation, feelings and emotions.

Significance of the Study

Successful leadership requires an efficient leader-follower relationship. Without an understanding of expected leadership characteristics, a leader will fail to perform at his or her optimal level and inconsistency and conflict will inevitably result. As the review of relevant literature in Chapter II illustrates, the preponderance of research on leadership is from an American framework. The review of literature also suggests that culture plays a critical role is developing norms and expectation filters related to leadership.  Additionally, there is precious little if any research conducted within the field of human resource development with respect to the manifestation of leadership in Italy.

This study attempts to validate the hypothesis that there are differences in leadership styles and skills within countries because of cultural differences. The study is most concerned with identifying leadership differences between the United States and Italy.  The United Kingdom, while also important to this study serves as somewhat of a mitigating role due to its historical close relationship with the United States, yet its close proximity and ties with Western Europe.

Hence, the study addresses these issues by using a blending of the LEADNA survey as a needs assessment tool for developing training interventions and the Perceived Leader Behavior Scale as a measure of the overtly displayed behaviors of the leaders.  Taken collectively they may illustrate leadership in present day Italy.

Contents of the Dissertation

This introductory chapter, Chapter I, sets the dissertation's overarching foundation. Chapter II contains the results of the literature review that are deemed relevant to this study in order to situate the research problem within a wider body of knowledge and to clarify the research questions. The wider body of knowledge comes from the fields of leadership, management and, human resource development.

Chapter III presents the methodology used in this study by identifying the perspective that frames the research and the assumptions that underpin the choice of method used to conduct the research. Next, Chapter III outlines the research design and method, describing the research subjects; data collection procedures; steps taken to manage, record, and protect the data; data analysis techniques; and procedures to maintain the integrity of the research.

Chapter IV presents the research findings and relates them to the research questions. It presents the research findings about the participants' understandings of the leadership they exercise.

The final chapter, Chapter V, discusses interpretations of the data, draws conclusions about the research problem and presents implications of the research for both theory and practice within the boundaries of the limitations of the research. Chapter V shows the distinct contribution that the research findings make to the body of knowledge in a number of related disciplines.

Summary

This chapter has provided a rationale for researching leadership in Italian organizations as a possible source of new cultural understandings and practices of leadership. The majority of leadership research conducted in the past has been within the cultural framework of American capitalism. Effective leadership in multinational organizations requires cultural competency.

However, culture is in a constant state of alteration and change because it is predominately a reflection of learned behavior. Cultural competency is related to understanding how leaders at all levels impact culture and recognizing the leader's role in the cultural development process. By having this sense of self-awareness the leader is thereby more readily capable of transcending their cultural bias and expectation filters. Schein (2004) showed the direct relevance of understanding organizational culture related to leadership, stating that "leadership and culture are two sides of the same coin" (p. 1).

Research on Italian management and leadership is sparse, and the lack of such research in the field of human resource development suggests that the research problem provides a significant area for investigation.

CHAPTER II


REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE



This chapter presents a review of the literature deemed relevant to this study. Presented in Chapter II are three basic streams of literature connected with this study-- leadership development and cross-cultural training. A discussion of the European perception of human resource development, and the economic ambiance of Europe, is also included to offer a contextual framework.

Essentially, scholars who primarily focus on leadership development are essentially engaged in probing the cultures and climates in which interpersonal interaction takes place. Because culture is a complex and dynamic phenomenon it produces a nearly infinite assortment of variables and from which leadership can be investigated. Hence, researchers must necessarily limit themselves so that the scope of their study becomes workable. To this end, I have selected to investigate leadership characteristics within the confines of using the Perceived Leadership scale samples and the LEADNA samples. In addition, I have limited my sampling frame to consulting firms in the United States (U.S), the United Kingdom (U.K), and Italy.

A Global Perspective

The workplace is in a continuous state of change, as leaders maneuver in complex global environments in which employment has become detached and distant (Klien, et al., 1999).  In the past, organizations functioned in a business paradigm based on self-governing autonomous units.  However, today and in the foreseeable future, organizations must operate in dynamic environments characterized by globally interconnected events (Lissack & Roos, 1999).

In response, there is a managerial movement toward employee empowerment and flattened hierarchies (Shelton, 1997).  Pasternack and Viscio (1998) envision the future organizational hierarchy as one in which accountability and responsibility are decentralized, so that rapid response units can exploit the knowledge of their members to react creatively to worldwide and local needs.  The future successful leader will possess the capacity to balance an emphasis on change with a sense of constancy, as well as cultivate a sense communal identity.  To accomplish this, leaders must integrate the ethics, values and perceptions of those outside their own home country (Shim & Paprock, 2002).  Meindl (1998, p. 21) states, "modern leadership is about empowering others, and discretion, authority, and responsibility is pushed down and throughout the organization."  The challenge for international human resource development is to develop interventions that realize the home headquarters' goals, but simultaneously validate local values.

Leadership research suggests societal attitudes toward leadership behaviors differ across cultural borders and that leadership is chiefly a culturally based phenomenon (Yiu, 2000). For instance, successful leaders in the United States and the United Kingdom heavily weigh the profit motive into their decision making, while their Italian counterparts stress communal concerns in making decisions (Bigoness & Blakely, 1996; Yeung & Ready, 1995). In addition, Italians operate in a highly bureaucratic culture and consider bypassing the hierarchy a severe transgression (Laurent, 1983). Effective cross-cultural leadership program need to address such aforementioned issues so the assimilation process between leader and follower is as productive as possible.

Currently, there is little pre-departure training taking place within U.S based multinationals, the philosophical approach seems to be that an effective manager in the U.S will be an effective leader overseas, or more succinctly that leadership is leadership (Black, 1992). This philosophy could account for the relatively high failure rates seen among expatriate managers (Black, J. S., & Mendenhall, 1990). In countries where the degree of cultural differences are slight and there is relative cultural alignment, then such an approach may seem fruitful, however, the greater the divergence between cultures the less likely leadership behavior in one country will be able to be transferred to another country (Erez & Earley, 1993). Hence, understanding cultural value systems is essential in developing effective cross-cultural workforces (Tung & Miller, 1990). In fact, a leader's capacity to manage culture is the single most significant leadership action in determining successful leadership, since leadership and

culture flow from one another and are inextricably linked (Schein, 2004). Culture

determines the leadership deemed acceptable, however, that culture is a reflection of

the values that have been passed down by prior as well as current leaders (Fairholm,

1994).

Culturally based values play a fundamental role in determining and selecting

appropriate leadership styles because leadership not only mirrors corporate realities,

but also society's values, perceptions, expectations, and communication styles

(Dooley, L.; Paprock, K.E.; Shim, I.; and Gonzalez, E.M, 2000; Brodbeck, 2000).

Moreover, the extent to which leadership aligns with expectations determines the

acceptance of the leader and the leader's ability to motivate and influence followers

(Black, 1999). There seems to be a growing realization among heads of multinationals

that cross-cultural issues can impact the bottom as they search for ways to improve

their human resource capital in their overseas operations (Solomon, 1995)

This movement toward valuing cultural differences is not surprising

considering that the majority of failures in overseas assignments stem from a failure to

understand the country's traditions of thinking and performing (Shim & Paprock,

2002). Rosenzweig and Nohria (1994) suggest that training and development ought to

be context-specific and ebb and flow according to local situations. A one-size-fits-all

approach to training is insufficient and management practices and philosophies ought

to be culture specific (Dooley, L.; Paprock, K.E.; Shim, I.; and Gonzalez, E.M, 2000).

European Cultural Perspective

European organizations overall show fewer signs of adherence to free market concepts and instead assign greater value to their employee needs, rather than bottom-line requirements (Sparrow, P., Schuler, R., & Jackson, S., 1994).  European countries, for the most part, discouraged the free flow of capital in favor of socialist policies until as recently as the 1970's (Stiglitz, 2003).  Hence, in general the overall European value system is situated somewhere between the highly individualistic orientation of the United States and the highly collectivistic orientation of Japan (Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J. W., & Woodman, R. W., 2001).

Interestingly, Laurent (1983) found cultural differences become increasingly distinctive among foreign employees who work for the same multinational; the differences were less among employees who worked in different organizations but within the same nation. This implies that societal culture influences organizational culture to a larger degree than a mandate from corporate headquarters.  Furthermore, Cufaude (1999) found the values and attitudes of leaders in their personal life, which are a reflection of their society's culture, directly influences their leadership styles.  For instance, an American leader may value a certain measure of individuality and autonomous decision making (Laurent, 1983).

Environmental Context of Leadership

Europeans enjoy a cultural fluidity unseen in the United States.  People of a multiplicity of nationalities, who speak dissimilar languages and dialects, traverse borders and struggle to assimilate aspects of their neighboring identities, while preserving their own. Frequently, these identities have developed as a byproduct of historical events, such as war, rather than natural anthropological factors (Crainer, 2000).  Despite Europe's large-scale economic reforms intended to unify Europe into a single economic block capable of competing with the hegemony of the U.S., adherence to local traditions and a self-preservation mode has persisted, hence, Europe is likely to remain a hodgepodge of cultures well into the future (Crainer, 2000).

Consequently, leadership styles should be supple, adaptable, and reflective of its distinctive environmental context (Shim & Paprock, 2002).  For example, Porter (1990) found Italians benefited from, relative to other European nations, their refined and demanding buyers, strong distribution channels, and passionate local rivalries.

By examining differences in human resource development among nations one can gain some insight from a human resource development perspective on how leadership may also differ across cultures.  Hence, the following sections will identify some of the relevant differences in human resource development.

Valkeavaara (1998) found that human resource development in Italy primarily revolves around producing tangible quantifiable outputs.  The Italian perception of human resource development is a traditional approach, in the sense that human

resource development in Italy does not attempt any grand level of integration with an overall business strategy, nor do Italians, in general, implement comprehensive training and career development programs (Valkeavaara, 1998).

In contrast with Italy, the United Kingdom tends to conceptualize human resource development as part of the organizational strategy and the human resource function is seen as a conduit for corporate change initiatives, rather than merely an administrative function (Lee and Stead, 1998). Furthermore, human resource development is conceptualized largely through the lens of training and development, whereas in Italy human resource development is largely viewed through the lens of instructional design (Nijhof & de Rijk, 1997). Goodwin, Hills and Ashton (1999) found that in England in-house consultants are replacing the traditional centralized functions still found in Italy.

Furthermore, although the U.S and the U.K are in relative cultural alignment, the literature shows some differences in how human resource development functions within their respective organizations. For example, certain human resource development domains are conceptualized differently in the U.S. from the U.K. The U.S. domain of knowledge management, for example, is conceptualized in the U.K in terms of information technology specialists, whereas in the U.S. it is more deeply impacted by interpersonal relationships (Goodwin, Hills & Ashton, 1999).

In addition, the role of change agent is another illustration of the differing perspectives of human resource development. Although organizational change agents require analogous skills, Nijhof and de Rijk (1997) found that in the U.S, there is

greater reliance on facilitating the development of management personnel, whereas in the U.K there is greater emphasis on the overall organizational development.

In general, the U.K reveals a more humanistic, utilitarian and relationship-building orientation toward human resource development, whereas the U.S assigns greater significance to performance, intellectual and technical competencies (Nijhof and de Rijk, 1997).

## Defining International Human Resource Development

There is considerable debate surrounding a unifying definition of human resource development in the United States, which has led McLean & McLean (2001) to pose this rhetorical question: How can we define human resource development internationally when we cannot define it domestically? One of the chief difficulties in trying to define human resource development is the reality that labor trends, economic policies, and the global economy all influence human resource development because of its focus on improving work performance at the individual, group, and organizational levels (Marquardt & Engel, 1993). A byproduct of this difficulty is the proposal that any definition of human resource development ought to communicate environmental and contextual factors (Brewster, 1995).

Regrettably, because of to the historic hegemony of the United States, the American cultural point of view has dominated the field of human resource development (Dooley, L.; Paprock, K.E.; Shim, I.; and Gonzalez, E.M, 2000).

Weinberger (1998) states "The definitions that have been uncovered and consolidated represent the commonly held themes in the field today, from an American perspective" (pp. 75-76). This is probably an expected result if one bears in mind that American business models dominate the study of management (Crainer, 1998). However, Martin and Butler (2000) assert that it is no longer suitable to deem the United States as the definitive representation of organizational design. This may have been appropriate in the 1950's when the United States accounted for an estimated 75% of all global economic activity. At present, however, the United States counts for merely 17% (Martin and Butler, 2000). An interesting supplementary truth, which influences international human resource development, is that 1.2 billion inhabitants of the world are living on fewer than two dollars per day—this represents more than 45% of the world's population (Stiglitz, 2003).

Consequently, American perspectives and business models are less than optimal in an international context. American business perspectives are embedded in comparatively flexible, employer friendly labor laws as well as the typical American laborer's expectation and eagerness to work long hours, as compared with European workers (Crainer, 2000). Presently, in Europe, there is a movement towards the idea that the acceptance of American business models is detrimental to their future survival, since such they have gone beyond their demonstrable value, furthermore, they believe it is time to discriminate between distinctively American and European approaches (Brewster, 1995). For instance, even the word "management," according to Hofstede

(1993), has numerous meanings depending on the collective expectations and economic systems present within the nation.

Hofstede's (1993) cultural classifications serve as a useful and insightful starting point to appreciate a country's business structure. For example, Hofstede (1993) classifies the United States as being primarily equity based. That is, the emphasis in the United States is placed upon factors which promote concepts, such as; competition, profit making and capitalism. The concept of equity implies that compensation is considered fair or equitable when it is disseminated proportionately to the individual's own contribution (Miles & Greenberg, 1993). Conversely, equality based business systems intrinsically assume that compensation or rewards should be distributed equally and without regard to of the individual's own degree of effort or contribution—the emphasis here is placed upon satisfying the greater social good, rather than rewarding individual achievement (Miles & Greenberg, 1993).

Miles and Greenberg (1993) classify countries as equity based if they rank high on Hofstede's (1991) individualism/masculinity scale and low in Hofstede's (1991) power distance and uncertainty avoidance scale. The United States scored very high on the equity scale and very low on the equality scale. Similarly, the United Kingdom also scored relatively very high on the equity scale and very low on the equality scale. However, Italy scored high on equity and low on equality. Based upon these results one could conclude that Italians tend to view the workplace in less competitive terms than either Americans or British workers. Presumably, this would be an indication of a greater need within the Italian culture to proportion a greater sense of balance between

the declared organizational needs with the sometimes countering individual needs of

the employee.

Table 1 listed below illustrates how the countries in this study score on

Hofstede's scales.

Table 1. Cultures and Organizations

PDI: Power distance index
IDV: Individualism index
MAS: Masculinity index
UAI: Uncertainty avoidance index
LTO: Long-term orientation index

| | PDI | | IDV | | MAS | | UAI | | LTO | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | rank | score | rank | score | rank | score | rank | score | rank | score |
| Great Britain | 42/44 | 35 | 3 | 89 | 9/10 | 66 | 47/48 | 35 | 18 | 25 |
| Ireland | 49 | 28 | 12 | 70 | 7/8 | 68 | 47/48 | 35 | | |
| Italy | 34 | 50 | 7 | 76 | 4/5 | 70 | 23 | 75 | | |
| USA | 38 | 40 | 1 | 91 | 15 | 62 | 43 | 46 | 17 | 29 |

Source: Hofstede, G., (1991).

Leadership Literature

Like the definition of human resource development, leadership has taken numerous forms. It is critical to organizational success, yet it has so many variants that attempting to mark off a conclusive and definitive leadership construct has proved fruitless (Stodgill, 1974). The quandary has grown worse as new theories emerge creating practically as many definitions as people attempting to define it. Leadership theory is beleaguered with conceptual weaknesses and lacks firm empirical support (Yukl, 1989). Against this background of perplexity and ambiguity, the following section provides a description of leadership theory to serve as a backdrop for the present investigation.

The leadership literature serves as a key adjunct to the human resource development literature, principally because human resource development cannot function successfully and execute change in an organizational situation without leadership. Like human resource development, leadership functions in multifaceted dynamic systems. Thus, no one definition of leadership has garnered widespread support (Shepard, I. S., Farmer, R. F., & Counts., 1997). Yukl (1989) found leadership theories beset with conceptual weaknesses, inconsistencies, and contradictions. In addition, the conclusions of many leadership theories lacked empirical support as many were based on assumptions, anecdotal evidence or supposition. Bass (1990) noted a possible reason is that the study of leadership rivals in age the emergence of civilization itself.

At its core, leadership is an interpersonal process that occurs, for the most part, by means of face-to-face verbal and non-verbal interaction intended to consciously or unconsciously persuade the individual, rather than overtly coerce him or her (Kaplan, 1988). Influencing a subordinate or peer to action is qualitatively different from ordering someone to complete a task.  Influence skills are becoming progressively more decisive in leadership effectiveness as firms shift to flatter organizational structures in an attempt to foster learning (Church & Waclawski, 1999).  Furthermore, Kouzes and Posner (1999) assert that motivating people to attain increasingly higher levels of performance is the essence of effective leadership.

A crucial caveat ought to be noted in any discussion of leadership, that is, that leadership and management are not identical constructs, but, rather, intimately interrelated functions. Management facilitates efficiency through regulations, practices, and measures, while leadership attacks the issue of effectiveness exclusively by means of influencing or persuading employees toward organizational objectives, primarily through face-to-face interactions (Schoorman & Schneider, 1988).  However, Wells (1997) asserts that no absolute distinction between management and leadership necessarily exists, since leadership opportunities arise from performing daily managerial duties.  In addition, Zaleznik (1992) argues that the managerial mindset is frequently preoccupied with defusing potential conflict and ensuring that daily objectives and tasks are accomplished. Conversely, leaders distinguish objectives from personal values and ethics, and encourage the development of creative solutions beyond the daily objectives.

Normally, leadership theory is presented chronologically. For instance, the great man theory of the 1920s is often followed in turn by trait theory from 1930s to the 1950s, behavioral theories from 1950s to the 1960s, situational theories in the 1960s and 1970s, and finally transformational theories from the 1980s to the present day. A review of the leadership literature reveals, however, that in reality leadership theories tend to overlap and to rematerialize later. However, this section of the literature review takes the customary approach. I briefly discuss the major historical trends in the leadership literature, beginning with trait theory, which stems from the original conception of the great man; continuing with contingency and situational theories, which are rooted in behaviorism; and concluding with transformational theory, which is rooted in systems and learning perspectives.

*Trait Theory*

Studies on trait research often refer to traits as characteristics; hence, this study uses traits and characteristics synonymously (Bass, 1990; Stodgill, 1974). Studies conducted throughout 1900-1920 were attempts to identify as innate the traits that differentiated leaders from followers (Stodgill, 1974). The prevailing theory during this era was the great man theory (Stodgill, 1974). This theory emphasized control and centralization, whereby successful leaders would impose their will via their strength of character on others to induce compliance, respect and loyalty (Yukl, 1989). In essence, the theory held that only people with distinct intrinsic traits had the capacity to impose their resolve on others. Fundamentally, this perspective assumed that leaders were born, not made (Yukl, 1981). Interestingly, the label affixed to this paradigm, Great

Man, reflected the frame of mind in society throughout this era that only men produced

leadership characteristics, since women inherently lacked the capacity to lead (Bryman,

1992).

Stodgill (1974) investigated 287 research projects between 1904 and the early

1970s.  Stodgill (1974) concluded that it required more than traits to be a leader and

identified overall six leadership categories:

1. Capacity (intelligence, alertness, verbal ability, originality),

2. Achievement (scholarship, knowledge, athletic),

3. Responsibility (dependability, initiative, persistence, desire to excel),

4. Participation (activity, social skills, cooperation, sense of humor),

5. Status (position, socioeconomic), and

6. Situation (mental, needs and interest of followers).


Contrary to the conventionally accepted perception, several universal personal

traits and skills have been linked with leadership (Bass, 1990). In addition, Lord,

DeVader, and Allinger (1986) found that when leaders were asked to evaluate each

other's leadership ability; there was an explicit correlation identified between their own

evaluation and certain traits.  The most significant correlation found was between

identified perceptions of intelligence and leadership ability.  The results of their study

are consistent with other research (Stodgill, 1974) supporting the notion that perceived

intelligence is a key and fundamental trait amongst leaders.

In addition, Kenny and Zaccaro (1983) found that certain people possess identifiable traits that may lead followers to choose them as their leader.  This suggests people have the aptitude to perceive inherent traits in others that inevitably differentiate them as leaders.  Hence, their study provides confirmation supporting the notion that leaders indeed have intrinsic traits that are exceptional among the masses, which does perhaps suggest an element of the great-man theory.

Yukl (1989) cautioned, however, that there is no guarantee that an individual will necessarily function as a successful leader merely by possessing identified traits. It is the implementation or execution that is crucial. Traits alone are insufficient to the achievement of successful leadership. Nonetheless, Bass (1990) counters by pointing out that while merely having these identifiable traits alone fails to guarantee the practice of successful leadership, possessing these traits does increase the probability that successful leadership will occur.

Yukl (1989) identified traits and skills that are most commonly associated with successful leaders. The relative of importance of each trait depends upon the situation in which the trait is being manifested.  That is to say that the value of a particular trait is relative to the conditions under which it is practiced. Table 2 illustrates these traits and skills.

Table 2. Traits and Skills

| Traits | Skills |
| --- | --- |
| Adaptable to situations | Clever (intelligent) |
| Alert to social environment | Conceptually skilled |
| Ambitious in achievement-oriented | Creating |
| Assertive | Diplomatic and tactful |
| Cooperative | Fluent in speaking |
| Decisive | Knowledgeable about group task |
| Dependable | Organized (administrative ability) |
| Dominant (desire to influence others) | Persuasive |
| Energetic (high activity level) | Socially skilled |
| Persistent | |
| Self-confident | |
| Tolerant of stress | |
| Willingness to assume responsibility | |

Source: Yukl, G.A,, ( 1989).

In addition, Northouse (2001) identified several traits and characteristics as desirable in leaders. The fundamental concept here is to understand that these traits, while desirable are not necessarily critical to success, moreover they reflect a deeply embedded American influence. Nevertheless, the research is useful to our greater understanding of leadership since one can readily see that there are common traits identified by various leadership studies. Table 3 displays these traits and characteristics.

Table 3. Studies of Leadership Traits and Characteristics

| Stodgill (1948) | Mann (1959) | Stodgill (1974) | Lord, DeVader, and Alliger (1986) | Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intelligence | Intelligence | Achievement | Intelligence | Drive |
| Alertness | Masculinity | Persistence | Masculinity | Motivation |
| Insight | Adjustment | Insight | Dominance | Integrity |
| Responsibility | Dominance | Initiative | | Confidence |
| Initiative | Extroversion | Self-confidence | | Cognitive ability |
| Persistence | Conservatism | Responsibility | | Task knowledge |
| Self-confidence | | Cooperativeness | | |
| Sociability | | Tolerance | | |
| | | Influence | | |
| | | Sociability | | |

Source: Northouse, P., (2001).

Historically, trait research has been utilized to help determine how individuals might assimilate within the overall organization a team concept. It has also been used as a predictor with regard to the potential effectiveness, or efficacy of the leader within the organization. Definitions of effective leadership vary considerably, but most seem to involve identifying the extent to which the leader's subordinates successfully attain and implement organizational goals and values as prescribed by the leader (Yukl, 1981). As previously stated, however, scholars commonly agree that leadership involves more than merely traits because traits are essentially and fundamentally only about the leader rather than the actual dissemination and practice of effective leadership--that is, the process involved in the execution of leadership (Northouse, 2001).

Historically, trait leadership theories evolved from research studies that primarily focused on the leader's innate yet identifiable traits (Northouse, 2001). The fundamental assumption of trait theory is that all successful leaders are born. This assumption, however, has been largely discredited in the body of literature and the assertion that specific leadership traits are imperative for success has failed to be substantiated in the trait research (Yukl, 1989).

*Behavioral Theory*

An extremely critical strain of research in the leadership literature is commonly referred to as behavioral theory. After nearly 25 years exploring trait theory, scholars slowly began to explore leadership styles or behaviors as an alternative explanation to effective leadership.  In simplistic terms, a leadership style is essentially a behavioral method of leading either individuals or groups to accomplish a predetermined goal. This stream of research ultimately shifted attention from asking the fundamental question of who leaders are (traits) to asking the more practical question of what leaders do (behavior).

The behavioral approach is synonymous with the stylistic approach and this study uses these terms interchangeably.  In unambiguous distinction to trait theories, the behavioral approach primarily focused on two principal types of behavior: task behaviors and relationship behaviors.  Task behaviors are commonly associated with the performance of leadership actions relative to the creation of production (the task), while relationship behaviors are commonly associated with a leader's concern for the individual.  It is, in essence, a more humanistic behavior. Hence, behavioral research often views these to concerns as being in opposition to each other and essentially attempts to ascertain how leaders balance their concern for task with concern for individuals (Northouse, 2001).

Blake and Mouton (1964) developed what is commonly referred to as the Managerial Grid.  The Managerial Grid is a useful construct that describes five basic

types of leadership that are essentially based on the degree to which the leader shows

or displays a concern for production (task) versus concern for people (relationship):

1. *The Impoverished Leader*:  This type of leader exerts minimum effort to accomplish the required tasks. This type of leader is generally seen as weak and ineffective.  Commonly, this type of leader does not advance in today's modern multinational organization.

2. *The Country Club Leader*:  This type of leader gives thoughtful attention to the needs of people to create satisfying relationships that lead to a comfortable, friendly organizational atmosphere.  The difficulty is that often this type of leader does so at the expense of productivity.  This leader runs the risk of being viewed as a push-over or someone with no backbone by others.

3. *The Task Leader*:  This leader promotes efficiency resulting from creating work conditions where interactions between individuals are minimal.  The difficulty with this type of leader is the converse of the country-club leader.  The value the completion of task at the expense of any positive relationship.  The result can be a very negative environment that can ultimately create conflict.

4. *The Middle-of-the-Road Leader*:  This type of leader believes that adequate performance is achievable principally through effectively balancing the necessity to get work accomplished with the notion that this needs to be achieved while maintaining the morale of the people at an adequate level.  This leader recognizes that employees may be very happy, yet produce very little, yet also recognizes that a very unhappy employee will produce very little as well.

5. *The Team Leader*:  This type of leader essentially believes that goal attainment is ultimately facilitated through the coordinated movement of dedicated people and the formation of a sense of common interdependence.  The team leader often seeks to create a "common stake" among organizational members that ultimately and ideally would yield mutually beneficial relationships that are built on trust and mutual respect (Hersey & Blanchard, 1998, p. 100).

The Ohio State University in what was considered at the time a groundbreaking study in behavioral leadership research isolated two key factors that were believed at the time to fundamentally differentiate between effective and ineffective leadership practices. The factors--initiating structure (i.e., regard for task) and consideration (i.e., regard for people)—were investigated by researchers. The results of the study left many unresolved issues that were principally attributed to conceptual and methodological weaknesses in the study (Hersey & Blanchard, 1998). Nevertheless, the researchers produced a four-quadrant model to help illustrate leadership behavior. This four-quadrant model is illustrated below in table 4.

Table 4. Four Quadrant Model of Leadership

| | | INITIATING STRUCTURE | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | LOW | HIGH |
| CONSIDERATION | HIGH | High Consideration And Low Structure | High Consideration And High Structure |
| | LOW | Low Structure And Low Consideration | High Structure And Low Consideration |

Source: Hersey & Blanchard, (1998).

*Situational Approaches*

The idea that special traits in combination with certain behaviors lead to effective leadership under positive conditions but not under negative conditions led to the formulation of the situational approach. Situational approaches propose that leaders ought to act as situations permit and that the situation in which leadership operates is more important than traits and behaviors. Situational theorists suggest that leaders develop a broad array of skills and styles that might be deployed in specific situations according to the circumstances. Essentially, situational theory proposes that no single leadership style is correct and that circumstances will dictate whether a style will be successful or unsuccessful (Daniels, Spiker and Papa, 1997).

Fiedler's (1967) contingency model is skeptical that the same individual can navigate successfully in disparate situations. Hence, Fiedler argues that either leadership ought to change when conditions change, or the leader should change the situation so that the leadership style becomes appropriate. Relationships with subordinates via interaction and knowledge of organizational objectives enhance a leader's effectiveness. However, leaders may also achieve influence by virtue of their positions within an organization (Hackman & Johnson, 1996). Contingency theory differs from other situational leadership approaches because other situational approaches rely on the leader recognizing the situation and adapting the leadership style to meet the situation.

*Path Goal Theory*

Path goal theory is an alternative contingency theory. It proposes that the leader ought to find a way for subordinates to achieve the organization's goals. The leader, by virtue of a given situation, determines what course of action is necessary to facilitate the successful completion of a task (Northouse, 2001).

Path goal theory (House & Mitchell, 1974) is particularly well suited for cross-cultural studies because it is rooted in expectancy theory, and because it sets forth the proposition that followers, as well as leaders, work from rational estimations of the relationship between three principal variables: effort, performance and outcome.  In this model, leaders vary their style in combination with their followers' level of satisfaction and perception of their own ability.  Inherent in this approach is the concept of value. That is, followers ask themselves, how much do I value this task? The response, at least in part, determines the amount of effort exerted, which in turn relates to performance. How one chooses to answer this fundamental question is based upon cultural norms, values and expectation filters.

House (1971) has suggested that the styles of leadership correspond with different and varying situations.  First, he posited the concept known as directive leadership, which is fundamentally procedural in scope.  This primarily behavioral style of leadership includes such mundane tasks as planning and organizing, task coordination, policy setting, and other forms of detailed direction.  This type or style of leadership often pays particular attention to details. When leaders operate in this capacity they often stress the completion of task and the expense of more subjective

quality measurements, which can sometimes be difficult to measure depending on the types of tasks being performed.  Hence, a leader who adopts this perspective innately provides explicit instruction to the group or individual and establishes rules and regulations to insure that the tasks are appropriately implemented to the satisfaction of the leader or to the satisfaction of the organization as a whole (Hackman & Johnson, 1996).

The second type of leadership identified in the literature is supportive leadership. Supportive leadership is primarily used to inspire employees to achieve particular goals and is applied in situations where the leader believes that adopting a more supportive rather than directive role would be more fruitful in achieving the aims of the organization or individual. An important principal is that although the aims of the organization are of course critical, a supportive leader focuses on the desires of his or her employees and has authentic concern for their welfare.

A third leadership style is participative.  In this style, the leader solicits opinions and thoughts from subordinates.  In essence, the leader attempts to get every person involved in the decision-making.  Concluding this model, House (1971) identified the achievement oriented leadership style.  Achievement oriented leaders display an elevated level of confidence in their employees with the expectation that they will attain performance goals.

*Transformational Theory*

Relatively recently, leadership scholars have focused their awareness on leadership as occurring within the scope of transformational change (Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership theory is, at its core, an overriding attempt to develop positive working relationships with and amongst employees at all levels of the organization (Northouse, 2001).

The encouragement of change is the primary vehicle used by the transformational leader to foster the achievement of organizational and individual objectives. Transformational leaders focus on the individual and encourage personal self-development through educational programs (Bass, 1985) as they simultaneously seek to inspire others to think differently and outside the box (Kouzes & Posner, 1999). Ackoff (1999) defines a transformational leader as an individual with the unique skill to either create or facilitate the creation of an organizational vision in an idyllic state, that is to say that while the conditions may not be ideal in the present environment, they are able to foster an overarching vision in which individuals strive to achieve that ideal. According to Schuster (1994), the prevalent use of total quality management principles, flattened hierarchies, and empowered staffs are all tangible signs of the transformational leadership paradigm in action in modern organizations.

It should be noted that while the ideal transformational leader has the capacity to transform an organization's vision, strategy and culture (Burns, 1978), it seems that this idea leader is a rare breed of individual for despite all the time, money, and enthusiasm that organizations put into corporate change efforts only a precious few

succeed, yet these change efforts are held as the exemplars of transformational

leadership (Coutu, 2002).

Perhaps one reason for the lack of success is the dynamic cultural landscape in

which organizations, particularly multi-national organizations operate.  Avolio and

Jung (1999) found indications that effective organizational leadership techniques

change among cultures.  Perhaps counter intuitively, they found that under a

transformational leadership style, collectivist cultures, such as Japan, generate more

ideas than individualist cultures, such as the United States.  Ironically, however, it

seems that it is within the more individualistic United States that transformational

concepts are most heavily promoted. Additionally, their research also found the

outcome was reversed under a principally transactional leadership style.  Moreover,

they found members of collectivist cultures enjoy a greater connection to their

organization and tend to subordinate their individual goals to the group's goal.  The

clear inference is that transformational leaders ought to be cognizant of cultural

diversity and its potential ramifications on change efforts.  Furthermore, the study

implies that leadership styles require the proper alignment of behavioral outputs with

cultural identity (Avolio and Jung, 1999).

These results have obvious implications for the leader charged with the training

and development of human resources through a culturally diverse philosophy of work,

family life, money and the like, since acceptable leadership behavior is a function of

the influence of culture (Schein, 2004; Bass, 1990).  Additionally, Schein (2004, p. 15)

asserts that human resource development ought to recognize neither leadership nor

organizational culture independently from one another:

> …leaders first create cultures when they create groups and
> organizations.  Once cultures exist, they determine the criteria
> for leadership and thus determine who will or will not be a
> leader. But if cultures become dysfunctional, it is the unique
> function of leadership to perceive the functional and
> dysfunctional elements of the existing culture and to manage
> cultural evolution and change in such a way that the group
> can survive in a changing environment.

Schein (1992) saw cultures as having three levels: artifacts, values and basic

assumptions. He believed the first step to understanding is to learn the basic

assumptions. From this understanding, a leader could easily interpret and understand

the artifacts and values levels of the organization's culture (Schein, 1992).

Understanding the levels of culture could have a profound effect on an organization's

ability to change. The development of shared values played an important role in the

organization's ability to change. After studying thousands of managers Kouzes and

Posner (1999) discovered that when there is congruence between individual values and

organizational values, there is a significant payoff for leaders and their organizations.

Furthermore, the literature on transformational leadership suggests some

common threads through business and learning. Senge (1990) perhaps best articulates

this perspective, suggesting that an organization's learning capacity is a function of the

degree to which its leadership is transformational.  Senge (1990) outlines five

disciplines of a learning organization: shared vision, personal mastery, mental models,

team learning, and systems thinking.  Leaders developed naturally from the

professional application of these disciplines.

Peters and Waterman (1982) were the principal founders of transformational leadership as a means of achieving corporate excellence. This movement, however, was short-lived principally because companies originally held as exemplars no longer qualified as excellent after only five years (Peters, 1987). Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that transformational leadership can devolve into sophisticated attempts at coercion rooted in the concept of scientific management (Hitt & Ireland, 1987, Coutu, 2002).

In conclusion, there is little indication that transformational leadership in fact translates to behavioral change among followers in organizations. Possibly the most noteworthy assessment was made by House and Aditya (1997). They found little evidence that charismatic, transformational, or visionary leadership does indeed transform individuals, groups, large divisions of organizations, or total organizations.

Furthermore, it may be that such leaders are capable of inducing changes in psychological states, but these changes in psychological states do not continue after the separation of leader from the follower. In layman terms this is simply known as doing what the boss wants you to do when they are around and doing something different when they are gone. Hence, there is little to no evidence that demonstrates stable and long-term effects of leaders on a follower's self-esteem, motives, desires, preferences, or values.

A summary of the key images in the leadership literature is presented in table 5. These images reflect western culture--predominantly American cultural values.

Table 5.  A Summary of Key Images of the Leadership Literature.

| Dominant Image | Leadership Focus | Follower Style | Purpose Of Leadership |
|---|---|---|---|
| Great Man | Traits<br>Born Leader<br>Hierarchy<br>Personal power<br>Rewards and<br>Punishment<br>Privilege | Submission<br>Dependence<br>Passivity<br>Compliance<br>Obedience | Order<br>Stability<br>Control<br>Prestige<br>Power<br>Control<br>Benevolent Caretaking |
| Behaviorism | Organizational Goals<br>Follower Needs<br>The Situational Context | Participative<br>March-in-step<br>Goal-focused | Productivity<br>Efficiency<br>Control<br>Management |
| Transformation | Excellence<br>Charisma<br>Transformation<br>Vision | Self Interest<br>Ambition<br>Excellence<br>Loyalty<br>Commitment<br>Motivation | Organizational transformation to achieve excellent performance and profits=PROGRESS<br>Extraordinary performance and profits =TRANSFORMATION |

Leadership and Culture

The ability of a leader to simultaneously and effectively analyze, interpret and appreciate organizational culture at its core level—that is to say, the level at which it creates conflict within the organization, is a critical component to effective and lasting leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1998). Scholars such as Schein (2004) have gone so far as to define the very essence of leadership as the capacity to identify limitations imposed by the culture and the competence to facilitate an action plan to mold the culture to achieve organizational goals.

Furthermore, Schein (2004) suggests that the creation of a shared vision is the optimal means of managing organizational culture and that, furthermore, the leader must proactively manage the culture or risk the culture managing the leader. According to Schein (2004), an understanding of a culture is discoverable through knowing the underlying assumptions or expectations present in that culture. From there, a leader can interpret and understand the values of the culture. Conversely, Shea (1999) argued that leadership styles dramatically shaped organizational culture.

According to Schein (2004), the cultural formation process begins with the decisions made by the organization's founders who implant their assumptions and values by setting priorities and making decisions that filter throughout the organization. Schein (2004) even suggests that the most imperative function of a leader is the creation, dissemination and management of organizational culture.

Similar to societal culture, organizational culture evolves from the sum total of the individual beliefs and interactions of its members (James, James, & Ashe, 1990). In both societal culture and organizational culture, the process of forming a culture is an evolution that incorporates shared values, mutual beliefs, mutual understandings and common behaviors (Rousseau, 1990). This sum total has a pervasive and all encompassing impact on life (Trice & Beyer, 1993). It is a manifestation of the fundamental decisions, modes of interaction, and behavioral norms of the leaders that permeates and filters downward, shaping the creation and development of the culture (Schein, 2004).

While organizational culture can be specific and relatively unique to the organization, countries have overarching methods of conducting business called business systems. Fligstein and Freeland (1995) suggested that three primary factors can determine a country's business system: (1) the history of industrialization; (2) the level of economic government intervention in terms of levels of property rights and rules of competition; and (3) the social organization of the elite class, such as families, politicians and even managers. Although all three have an effect on corporate governance, the last characteristic directly reflects on the corporate governance structure.

Clearly, Fligstein and Freeland (1995) view managers as part of the social elite—who, by virtue of their position power, are deemed as formal leaders. This assumes that leaders acquire power by virtue of their position within an organization

(Hackman & Johnson, 1996).  How leaders amass and wield their power largely determines the efficacy of the change initiative (Burns, 2003).

For example, in United States, and to a lesser extent in United Kingdom, the role of the state has never been predominately interventionist.  The governments have traditionally exhibited various levels of resistance toward unionization of their labor force throughout their economic development.  In contrast, continental Europe has a long history of interventionism on behalf of labor.  The state has played a proactive and oftentimes critical role in the unionization of the labor force and has used legislative tools to promote universal benefits to the working class (Bean, 1994a).

In addition, Uchitelle (2001) argues that theory x management is prevalent in American culture despite the calls for empowerment and the creation of learning organizations.  Capitalism has fashioned an American corporate environment in which downsizing has become the norm. This in turn has produced an environment of apprehension of losing one's job—resulting in the creation of nervousness, mistrust and conflict (Uchitelle, 2001).  Because of calls for the democratization and empowerment of the workplace the method of coercion in corporate America has grown to be subtle and sophisticated, and yet it nevertheless remains. For example, indoctrination centers of the past have evolved to education centers and corporate campuses (Coutu, 2002).

Summary of the Review of the Literature

Human resource development operates within a larger contextual setting of organizational culture.  Because of the historical economic and political hegemony of the United States, American definitions of human resource development and leadership have strongly influenced various international definitions. Hence; attempts to define international human resource development, as well as leadership, are problematic.

Any functional definition needs to reflect the differences in national cultures, including the influence of the economy, government legislation, and professional organizations.  Therefore, any unifying definition of human resource development as well as leadership must be simultaneously descriptive enough to render meaning, yet vague enough to account for the myriad of cultural perspectives around the world.

There is lively disagreement among academics over which theories should serve as the foundations of human resource development, since human resource development borrows from many disciplines. Swanson (2001) argues human resource development should be supported by three underlying disciplines: systems theory, economics and psychology, all resting on a foundation of ethics.  However, McLean (2001) has countered this position by arguing that limiting the field of human resource development to three basic disciplines is extremely simplistic.  McLean (2001) argues that rather than focus on which theories should form the foundation of human resource development, the more pertinent question to ask is, what are the foundational principles of human resource development?

Critics ask why there seems to be an allegiance to human capital theory, which seemingly reduces humans into an inanimate resource in the name of productivity. These critics argue that when human resource development aligns itself with the exploitative goals of the corporation, then the field exploits the worker.

Similarly, the leadership literature has inconsistencies and contradictions and exploitive elements. Yet, as global organizations expand their reach in society it becomes necessary to better understand leadership through the prism of economic and cultural values apart from the United States. Leadership development is fundamental component of human resource development because attempts to change an organization's culture are fundamentally attempts to manage leadership.

Effective leadership theories ought to account for the distinctive cultural landscape in which companies operate. Europe has a strong tradition of a centralized, highly regulated, heavily taxed system of economic and political governance. They have a belief that a strong, centralized humanistic government that works on behalf of its people is preferable to the capitalistic, relatively decentralized, less regulated, less taxed form of governance typified by the United States. Generally speaking, Europeans prefer to emphasize quality of life issues over the financially driven issues seen in the United States.

Yet, generalizations are complicated, since Europe remains a fragmented map in terms of cultural differences, economic activities, historic backgrounds, and regional distinctions. There are enormous differences even within individual countries. These differences stem from historically divergent peoples with unique languages and

customs trying to assimilate into their new and sometimes artificially formed nations. Examples include the controversies and animosities between the Scottish, the English and the Irish, and the acute differences between Northern Italy, Naples and Sicily.

The leadership literature primarily reflects Western thoughts and values, in particular those of the United States. This is certainly understandable given America's economic dominance and the spread of capitalism. Nevertheless, leadership in an era of globalization must begin to look at the culture-specific context in which it operates. To accomplish this end, greater efforts at integration of theories and expanding research to accommodate cultural differences is necessary. This will require a framework with enough breadth to incorporate differing cultural values, but with enough economy of scale to make the theory plausible.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

The preceding chapter addressed the literature that was relevant to this dissertation and refined the research questions in the light of that review. The purpose of this research is to explore the social phenomenon of leadership from the perspective of leaders working in Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States who work in the non-profit sector and are involved in poverty alleviation both in their native country's and in the third world.

The following chapter describes the research methodology utilized to reach an enhanced understanding of how leadership differs amongst American, English and Italian consultants engaged in poverty alleviation via non-governmental organizations. To that end, the subsequent sections discuss the population, procedures, instrumentation and data analysis techniques used in this study.

The term methodology has several definitions. In the social sciences, however, the term typically refers to how research is conducted (Taylor and Bogdan, 1984). Hence, the following methodological section describes how the research for this study was conducted.

Basis for Selection of Quantitative Design

A quantitative survey design provided the best means to collect numerical data via the internet. The data collected from this sample enabled this researcher to gather information on leadership perceptions and may serve as a foundation for future cross-cultural leadership research.

Situational leadership theory is the underlying theoretical framework of this study. Consequently, the Perceived Leadership Behavior Scales (House and Dressler, 1974) was the instrument used to discover what styles or behaviors leaders display in their respective countries. Upon reviewing the relevant literature and carefully considering various options with the committee chair, it was determined that the most appropriate method to gather data was to attempt to measure cross-cultural skills and behaviors exhibited by leaders via a web-based survey. The initial inspiration for this study stems from the work of Robert House (2002) and his Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness Research Program (GLOBE).

GLOBE (House, 2002) is a comprehensive cross-cultural study of leadership started in 1993. On the whole, cross-cultural research concludes that different cultures are apt to have different understandings of leadership. The stated meta-goal of GLOBE is to develop empirically based theory to explain, understand, and predict the impact of cultural variables on leadership and organizational processes and to quantify the efficacy of these processes. The specific objectives of GLOBE include answering the following questions:

- Are there leadership behaviors, attributes and organizational practices that are universally accepted and effective across cultures?

- Are there leadership behaviors, attributes, and organizational practices that are accepted and effective in only select cultures and do these cultures have any commonalities as well?

- How do attributes of societal and organizational cultures affect the kinds of leadership behaviors and organizational practices that are accepted or deed as effective?

- What is the effect of violating the identifiable cultural norms relevant to the exhibited leadership and organizational practices?

- What is the relative standing of each of the cultures' studies on each of the nine core dimensions of culture?

- Can a universal underlying theory account or help to explain for any systematic differences across cultures as well as its universal aspects?

Method of Delivery

Web-based surveying is becoming more widely used and accepted in educational research. The Web offers multiple and significant advantages over traditional techniques; however, there are still some methodological challenges with this approach. Currently, the fact that significant numbers of people lack accessibility to a computer, or choose not to use the internet is of paramount concern to researcher. Of note, several studies have found internet surveys have significantly lower response rates than mailed surveys (Soloman, 2001).

The internet has significantly influenced survey research as the number of electronically administered surveys continues to climb. As Watson (1998) suggests, "using electronic mail to conduct survey research is a natural result of the phenomenal growth in private and public electronic networks as well as increased accessibility of the internet" (p. 43). Yet, because of its relative newness it is unclear what guiding principles ought to be used in the creation and execution of electronic survey research. The initial research indicates that several principles applicable to traditional pencil and paper surveys also apply to electronic surveys (Dillman, 2000).

Website surveys offer an assortment of options, including check boxes, likert scales, and pull-down menus (Bowers, 1999; Dillman, 2000; Watt, 1997) to gather data. The major advantage, however, of designing surveys electronically is the ease of data collection and retrieval that it provides. Of course, as with any medium, there are also disadvantages. These disadvantages include, but are not limited to, limited access

to the network, risks to anonymity and confidentiality, complexity of the instrument and the inevitable technical problems (Watson, 1998).

Despite these concerns, e-mail surveys offer advantages that are difficult to ignore. They are extremely cost-effective because materials as stamps, paper, long distance charges and printing charges are virtually eliminated (Thach, 1995).

Dillman (2000) suggests that e-mail survey protocols are often very similar to those that are used in other forms of surveying. He believes, for example, that multiple contacts are often essential in all forms of surveying and he argues that a respondent's penchant or inclination to respond is essentially the same as if the respondent receives a traditional pen and paper survey. However, an important caveat is that potential respondents can more easily and more quickly choose not partake in the survey by merely using their delete button. Dillman (2000) suggests that researchers who are contemplating using electronic mail as a survey tool "must contemplate how the benefit, cost, and trust elements are revealed to the respondent in a situation in which less time is likely to be devoted to their consideration" (p. 372).

Procedures

*Introduction*

Because of the technical awareness and proficiency needed to develop web surveys, the path to internet-based research has largely come from technology-oriented individuals. As a case in point, I have a master degree in educational technology. The challenge is to transfer to a relatively new medium the same solid principles of survey design and implementation of traditional methods (Dillman, 2000; Dillman & Bowker, 2001).

*Instruments*

As stated in the literature review there is little consensus on exactly what to measure in the effort to understand and explain leadership. According to Rothwell (1994) competency assessments are obtainable by an assortment of techniques, such as merging a list of generic management leadership competencies to create an executive success profile. Hence, in addition to the perceived leadership scale, the LEADNA survey is also used. The LEADNA survey is free for public use and is readily available (Keeley, 1997). The perceived leadership scale is also available for public use and was adapted from House and Dressler (1974).

*Population*

To maintain the anonymity of the participants, the names, e-mails and addresses of the participants have not been included in the data for the study, nor included in this report. The sample derived from the directory of developmental organizations (Wesselink, 2003). The expressed intention of the directory is to

encourage and facilitate international cooperation, knowledge sharing and cross-cultural international research. The directory is a compilation of contact data of the main sources available to assist private sector development. The directory lists 29,000 contacts of organizations that offer (non-) financial support, market access, information and advice to the enterprise of poverty alleviation in low-income countries. This figure includes 114 consulting firms in the United Kingdom, 162 in the United States and 21 in Italy. After discussion with my committee chair, I decided to investigate only those organizations classified as consulting firms, which work toward poverty alleviation at home and internationally. This decision was made to keep as much homogeneity in the sample as possible, so that I would not be comparing research firms with consulting firms, but also because my personal interests lie in the field of international consulting.

*Web Page Development*

I developed and produced online web pages using the web development editor Microsoft FrontPage (Appendixes A, B). Each web page received its own unique URL for tracking purposes. There are numerous HTML development packages, which provide HTML editing capabilities and automate the process of developing the CGI scripts necessary to capture data from the HTML forms developed with the package. Two widely used examples are Microsoft's FrontPage and Macromedia's Cold Fusion (Solomon, 2001).

Consultation took place with computer programmers regarding the selection of the appropriate software to develop the online surveys. In the summer of 2003, a dynamic interface was created using Microsoft Access as a database and Microsoft

Active Server Page (ASP) programming. There were three separate web pages

created--one for each country. I utilized identical layouts for all three web pages in

order to avoid any possible issues of the web page possibly influencing the level and

nature of responses across geographical boundaries. However, to facilitate data

collection I linked each website to a separate database to prevent any cross filtration of

data and thereby preserve the integrity of the responses. Separate and distinct URLs

were assigned to each site. These were needed to track the responses by geographical

origin. The websites were then transferred onto the Texas A&M University (TAMU)

web server using file transfer protocol (FTP). The TAMU server is a secure server.

Each website also contained a front page, or homepage, containing a description of the

study, a consent form, login instructions, and a basic demographics section.

The validity of gathering data electronically through the internet was

considered in the research design. An additional consideration was issues of response

rates and cultural bias in favor of or against the release of information via the web. Of

chief importance was the issue of access. After consultation with the committee chair,

it was decided that, since the subjects freely provided their electronic addresses for

public access and research purposes, there was reasonable assurance that access in this

circumstance would be a minimal concern.

No practical method to gauge an expected response rate was available, since

there was no prior research to provide an estimate for this particular combination of

methodology and demographic profile. Therefore, with little prior evidence of success,

the process would go forward and an auxiliary purpose of the study would be to

contribute to future research a gauge of the feasibility of conducting future cross-cultural leadership studies utilizing a methodology dependent wholly on internet related technologies.

*Translation*

The surveys themselves were adapted from existing instruments available to the public.  In order to provide ease of use to the potential respondent it was determined that the surveys should be uniform in their layout and appearance. Hence, modifications to the original pencil and pen layout of the LEADNA to provide uniformity were implemented to make it more suitable for electronic delivery.  The original layout and appearance of the pencil and paper version of the perceived leader behavior scales remained without modification.

I developed the preliminary translation of the instruments into Italian.  Dr. Raymond Petrillo, of the department of classical languages at Texas A&M University in College Station reviewed the initial translation for further enhancement and more expert translation.  The appropriate grammatical corrections were made in order to facilitate and enhance comprehension.  Next, the instruments were provided to Dr. Federica Ciccolella, also from the department of classical languages, for reverse translation.  Again, any prescribed changes were implemented; however, these revisions were more a matter of grammatical preference, rather than a reflection of grammatical errors.

The perceived leader behavior scales instrument focuses on the subordinates' perceptions of their leader with respect to the following three aspects of leadership style: instrumental leadership, supportive leadership, and participative leadership.

The leadership development needs assessment (LEADNA) tool was used to delineate further the roles and skills displayed by leaders, by gathering data related to specific skills displayed by leaders. The LEADNA survey originated as a pencil and paper needs assessment. As such, the questions are very specific in assessing leadership needs. Kaplan (1988) serves as the intellectual foundation for the survey.

This original instrument was designed by volunteers with the federal government and Westinghouse Electric Corporation, is free to be used by the public and can be found the department of energy's Carlsbad area office website http://www.t2ed.com in its original format.

*Pilot Test*

To improve the instrument, a pilot test was implemented as defined by Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996). They identify a pilot test as "a small scale, preliminary investigation that is conducted to develop and test the measure or procedure that will be used in the research study" (p. 766). To achieve this end, a group of 10 graduate students, four of whom were Italian and spoke fluent Italian, evaluated the surveys and interface. This pilot group evaluated wording, meaning, color scheme, sequencing, and navigation. Dillman (2000) notes that the pilot test should follow the procedures proposed in the study. This step will verify if all the aspects of the survey function properly and avoid the wasting of resources. Furthermore, Dillman (2000) found that

pilot studies "frequently result in substantial revisions being made in the survey design, from adding additional contacts or an incentive to improve the response rates, to eliminating or adding survey questions" (Dillman, 2000, p. 147).

*Mailings*

To alleviate some concerns described by Solomon (2001) relating to web based surveys, several steps were implemented to help assure the integrity of the mailing process:

- The website home page (Appendix C) assured subject anonymity as prescribed by the Institutional Review Board, as well as providing detailed instructions for completing the surveys.

- Pre-survey notification letters were e-mailed on January 7, 2003. These notification letters had the dual purpose of creating awareness among potential participants that a survey would be arriving in their e-mail, and informing participants to expect a follow-up letter with a URL to the survey within five business days. This is an approach recommended by Dillman (2000) as a way to prevent the accidental disposal of the survey.

- As recommended by Dillman (2000), the actual survey e-mail containing the URL was mailed after 2-3 days to ensure mental connection with the pre-notification letter. (Appendix D)

- An additional follow up e-mail (Appendix E) asked for participation from those individuals who had not responded to the first request after three additional business days.

- A second follow up e-mail to non-respondents was sent after an additional five business days.

- After three attempts, the committee chair was consulted and it was determined the data gathering phase of the research would be concluded for three primary reasons:

    1. Some addresses wrote back that they considered the e-mails to be SPAM and did not participate.

    2. The research on web-based surveys indicates that repeated follow-ups have diminishing returns and risk irritating potential respondents without substantially increasing response rates (Soloman, 2001).

    3. It seemed clear that, because the response rate was diminishing, further attempts would only serve to irritate potential respondents.

Summary of Analysis of the Data

*Introduction*

The results of the analyses will be elaborated upon in the next chapter, following quantitative techniques outlined in Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996). The data were analyzed with the statistical analysis computer software SPSS on a personal computer. Multiple displays such as tables and graphs were used to present findings.

The following descriptive, inferential, and validity analyses were conducted. First, sample frequencies or descriptives, as appropriate, were obtained for respondent demographic variables: gender, age, nationality, position within the company, date on which the questionnaire was completed. The frequencies presented were simple counts, since the small sample size made these values understandable without percentages. The descriptives presented were the mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum.

Next, validity analyses were conducted. Item descriptives were the first validity results obtained. These descriptives included item means, standard deviations, and skew and kurtosis values, along with minima and maxima. Standard errors of the skewness and kurtosis were also obtained. Item descriptives were presented separately for each subtest.

Next, the three-component structure posited for the data was assessed using principal component analysis. The nonorthogonal technique Promax was used to rotate the data. Corresponding to prior research, three components were extracted and evaluated for psychometric soundness. Item communalities were obtained, along with the following measures: before rotation, the percent of variation accounted for and the

sums of squared coefficients; and at rotation, the sums of squared coefficients. Pattern and structure coefficients were also obtained. The final validity results obtained were intercorrelations among the components extracted.

The main analyses followed. Separate ANOVA models were tested with the results of the three subtests as dependent variables. In each analysis, nationality was the independent variable. The results included *F* values, *p* values, and eta squared values for each analysis. For any model producing statistically significant results, covariates were tested to assess whether the results could be attributed to the dependent variable or to some other variable. To compare results for separate pairs of nationalities, Sheffe tests were conducted. Sheffe test results included mean differences between nationalities, standard errors of the difference, *p* values, and 95% confidence intervals. Like the validity results described above, the results of the main analyses were presented separately by subtest.

Finally, standard scores were obtained, and the relative standing of each nationality on the dependent variables was evaluated by using paired-samples *t* tests. For each *t* test comparison, descriptive statistics for the groups being compared were first obtained. Descriptives included subtest means and standard deviations; mean differences; standard deviations and standard errors around the differences; and 95% confidence intervals. Finally, *t* and *p* values were obtained. Paired samples results and the corresponding descriptives were presented separately by nationality.

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

This descriptive study identifies the leadership roles and characteristics exhibited by leaders in Italy, the United States and the United Kingdom. The study is limited to consulting firms engaged in the field of poverty alleviation both domestically and abroad. These consulting firms are non-profit in nature and work closely with non-governmental organizations such as the United Nations.

The results presented in this chapter should not be generalized to other sorts of organizations, particularly profit motivated organizations, since the very dynamics induced the profit motive may impact behaviors.

The following is a presentation of the results of this cross-cultural study. This study is primarily descriptive in nature and the study that utilized a web based quantitative design and utilized various associated internet related technologies to achieve its aims. Hence, sample descriptives are first, followed by validity indices for the measuring instrument, including item descriptives and principal component results. A series of ANOVA results and multiple comparisons make up the final part of this chapter.

Sample Descriptives and Frequencies

Descriptive statistics for the sample are an essential part of any quantitative study. For this study, respondent characteristics elicited by the questionnaire provided descriptives. For categorical variables, frequencies alone are presented, because these results are small enough to be understood without percentages.

Respondents were about evenly divided by gender, with 9 being male and 8 being female. One respondent did not indicate a gender. When asked to categorize their ages, 5 respondents indicated that they were between 21 and 30 years of age; 3, between 31 and 40 years; 7, between 41 and 50 years; 2, between 51 and 60 years; and 1, between 61 and 70 years.

When asked their nationality, 12 respondents indicated the U. S. An additional 3 respondents indicated the U. K. and Italy, respectively. Similarly, 12 respondents indicated that they were completing the questionnaire about themselves as managers. Another 5 respondents indicated that the manager they were describing was their superior. Only 1 respondent indicated that the manager was a subordinate.

The respondents were about equally divided as to their positions with the company, with 6 indicating that they were upper management; 4, middle management; and 5, lower management. An additional 3 respondents gave some other response to this item. Finally, the date on which the questionnaire was completed was obtained automatically. The arithmetic mean date was January 17, 2004, and the standard

deviation was 5.43 days.  All copies were completed between January 8 and January 23, 2004.

Validity Analysis of Measuring Instrument

Descriptive statistics were obtained for all items.  These statistics were not broken down by nationality because of the small sample sizes, particularly for U. K. and Italian respondents.  After a brief explanation, the obtained statistics are presented below.

For a survey questionnaire or other measuring instrument, effective items are those that allow large numbers respondents to obtain differing scores.  Item descriptives may be interpreted with this standard in mind.  For survey items, a mean response that is about in the midrange of possible scores is considered desirable.  This result allows individual responses to vary widely on both sides of the mean.  Thus, the items differentiate effectively among respondents.  By contrast, a very high mean response indicates that individual responses are clustered near the top of the score range, with little room for high scoring respondents to obtain differing scores.  A very low mean response presents the opposite limitation.

Although middling item means are desirable, means should also vary somewhat.  If they are nearly identical, all items are focused on the same group of average respondents.  The test does not differentiate effectively among individuals who obtain high or low scores.  With middling but somewhat variable means, the test

differentiates best among the large group of average respondents but also differentiates reasonably well among respondents scoring high or low.

For measuring instruments, large item standard deviations are desirable because the standard deviation is an estimate of variability and therefore a reflection of score differences. By contrast, skew should be small. A skew is a small number of responses that are extremely high or low, extending outward from the peak of the distribution in one direction. In measurement, differentiation should be greatest in the midrange but reasonably consistent across the range of scores. When a skew is present, differentiation tends to be greatest in the direction of the skew. Other patterns are also possible with a large skew, but in general, differentiation is inconsistent across the range of responses. Kurtosis is less important than skew, but in general, a large kurtosis value tends to increase any problems with skewness. Finally, a low minimum value and a high maximum value are desirable; because they indicate that the higher and lower possible scores are being obtained.

For each subtest, item descriptives are presented here, after a brief, one-sentence description of omitted values. For Participative Leadership items, no respondent omitted any item, missing $N = 0$. Although the mean responses were high, the skewness and kurtosis values were very small, a highly satisfactory result. The small standard deviations of the items, however, suggested that the high average responses may have reduced the item variation. The minimum and maximum values indicated that respondents had used all response options, with the exception of the lowest value. These results are illustrated in table 6.

Table 6. Descriptives for Participative Leadership Items Statistics

| Statistic | Item 1 | Item 2 | Item 3 | Item 4 | Item 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid $N$ | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| Missing $N$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Mean Response | 3.71 | 3.59 | 3.76 | 3.53 | 3.53 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.05 | 1.12 | .90 | .87 | .94 |
| Skewness | -.44 | -.85 | -.05 | -.10 | -.44 |
| Kurtosis | -.82 | .38 | -.77 | -.37 | -.61 |
| Minimum | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Maximum | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

*Note.* For all variables, standard error of skewness = 0.55, and standard error of kurtosis = 1.06.

For Instrumental Leadership items, no respondent omitted more than one item, missing $N$ = 0-1. The mean responses were high, but as before, the skewness and kurtosis values were small. The small item standard deviations again suggested that the high average responses may have reduced the item variation. The minimum and maximum values indicated that respondents tended to leave the lower response options unused (See table 7).

Table 7. Descriptives for Instrumental Leadership Items

| Statistic | Item 1 | Item 2 | Item 3 | Item 4 | Item 5 | Item 6 | Item 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid $N$ | 18 | 18 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 18 |
| Missing $N$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Mean Response | 3.72 | 3.72 | 3.71 | 3.33 | 3.76 | 3.59 | 3.33 |
| $SD$ | .89 | .83 | .92 | 1.03 | .90 | 1.23 | 1.19 |
| Skewness | -.49 | .59 | -.42 | -.41 | -.05 | -.46 | -.74 |
| Kurtosis | -.12 | -1.25 | -.29 | .33 | -.77 | -.52 | -.14 |
| Minimum | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Maximum | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

*Note.* For all variables, standard error of skewness = 0.54, and standard error of kurtosis = 1.04.

*Statistics*

For Supportive Leadership items, no respondent omitted any item but Item 9, missing $N = 0$-1. The mean responses were high, but the skewness and kurtosis values were very small. The small item standard deviations, however, again suggested that the high average responses may have reduced the item variation. As before, the minimum and maximum values indicated that respondents tended to leave the lower response options unused. Table 8 listed below illustrates these results.

Table 8. Descriptives for Supportive Leadership Items

| Statistic | Item 1 | Item 2 | Item 3 | Item 4 | Item 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Valid $N$ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Missing $N$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mean[a] | 3.78 | 3.28 | 3.61 | 3.67 | 3.50 |
| $SD$ | 1.21 | 1.32 | 0.92 | 1.45 | 1.20 |
| Skewness | -0.63 | -0.06 | -0.63 | -0.63 | -0.46 |
| Kurtosis | -0.26 | -1.42 | -0.25 | -0.95 | -0.58 |
| Minimum | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Maximum | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Statistic | Item 6 | Item 7 | Item 8 | Item 9 | Item 10 |
| Valid $N$ | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 18 |
| Missing $N$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Mean[a] | 2.67 | 3.72 | 4.06 | 4.18 | 3.78 |
| $SD$ | 1.09 | 1.32 | 0.73 | 1.01 | 1.11 |
| Skewness | -0.17 | -0.63 | -0.09 | -1.21 | -0.66 |
| Kurtosis | -1.19 | -0.83 | -0.90 | 0.68 | -0.81 |
| Minimum | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Maximum | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |

*Note.* For all variables, standard error of skewness = 0.54, and standard error of kurtosis = 1.04. [a] Mean response.

Principal Component Analysis

To assess validity, a principal components analysis was used, because this procedure is appropriate for most test data and because the determinant of the correlation matrix was near zero.  Principal components analysis allows researchers to separate the variation of the data into linear components.  Items that are measuring these components ineffectively can then be omitted from the questionnaire, increasing the quality of the questionnaire and the efficiency of administration.

After a given number of components are extracted from the data, results often indicate that the items are all sampling primarily one component.  That is, a first component appears to account for most of the variation among item responses, with the remaining components accounting for very little.  This outcome can be spurious.  A technique called rotation redistributes the variation among responses, sometimes indicating that additional components account for more response variation than was initially apparent.  In addition, rotation improves the results of the analysis for a particular data set and number of components.

Some rotation techniques, called *orthogonal* techniques, assume that the components being sampled are orthogonal, that is, uncorrelated. Others, called *nonorthogonal* techniques, allow for the possibility that the components are nonorthogonal or correlated, as they generally are. For this study, the rotation technique selected was the nonorthogonal technique Promax. When the components to be measured are correlated, nonorthogonal and orthogonal techniques give accurate

results. When they are uncorrelated, only a nonorthogonal technique is appropriate. Therefore, a nonorthogonal technique was selected as being appropriate for either correlated or uncorrelated components. Prior research had indicated that the data fit a three-component solution. Therefore, three components were extracted and evaluated for psychometric soundness.

Communalities indicate the amount of variation of the components that may be accounted for by each of the items, or more accurately, by responses to each item. For a three-component solution, the communalities were typically high, with a range of .61-.92. The amount of item variation that may be accounted for by the components was examined next. Before rotation, the first three components together accounted for 80% of the variation in item responses. The components separately accounted for 57%, 13%, and 10% of this variation, indicating a strong first component. Correspondingly, the sums of squared coefficients before rotation were 12.533, 2.804, and 2.213. At rotation, the sums of squared coefficients were 10.732, 10.136, and 2.981. Thus, the variation in item responses was redistributed somewhat, so that the second component accounted for nearly as much variation as the first. Little variation, however, was redistributed to the third component.

Pattern and structure coefficients are also estimates of the item variation accounted for by the components, but each coefficient represents the association between a particular item and component. Pattern coefficients can change markedly if important items are omitted from the measuring instrument, or if unneeded items are included. By contrast, structure coefficients tend to be stable under these conditions.

In addition, pattern coefficients do not allow for shared variation when components are correlated. That is, if item variation is shared among several components, pattern coefficients assign it to only one component, and not necessarily the one that accounts for most of it. For the present results, the pattern and structure coefficients were similar. Therefore, the structure coefficients are emphasized here, and both sets of coefficients are presented.

For the first component, structure coefficients were largely high. Seven were above .80. Participative Leadership items tended to have high coefficients on this component, with Supportive Leadership items also playing a strong role. For the second component, structure coefficients were again high, with six being above .80. Instrumental Leadership items dominated this component. For the third component, structure coefficients were smaller. Only one was above .80. The lower coefficients on this component made interpretation difficult, but on inspection, Supportive Leadership items produced the highest positive coefficients. Supportive Leadership item 6 produced the highest coefficient, followed consecutively by Supportive Leadership items 1, 7, 4, and 5. These results are discussed further in Chapter IV. The presence of complex items was noted and is also discussed in Chapter IV.

Finally, the first and second components were highly intercorrelated, $r = .590$, indicating that a nonorthogonal rotation was needed for the data. The first and third components were slightly intercorrelated, $r = .119$. The second and third components had a somewhat higher correlation at $r = 0.164$.

Results of Main Analyses

*Introduction*

The following presents a review of the results of the main analysis. The following paragraphs and tables describe the ANOVA results as well as the Scheffe test results.

The next step in the analysis was to obtain ANOVA results. Three separate analyses were conducted with the three subtests as dependent variables. Missing values for the subtests were replaced with subtest means. For each analysis, nationality was the independent variable. Among the results obtained were $F$ values, $p$ values, and eta squared ($\varsigma^2$) values. The $p$ value accompanying an $F$ value or other inferential statistic indicates whether the results are statistically significant. The eta squared value is an estimate of the size of the association between the independent and dependent variables. Thus, eta squared is similar to a squared correlation coefficient $r$. Both eta squared and $r^2$ range from 0.00 to 1.00, as do eta and $r$.

Even if ANOVA results are statistically nonsignificant, differences between two particular samples may be statistically significant. Therefore, Sheffe test results were also obtained, including mean differences between nationalities, standard errors of the difference, $p$ values, and 95% confidence intervals. A mean difference is simply the difference between two groups, expressed here in raw score points. For the Sheffe test, a positive mean difference indicates that the group in the first column obtained a higher mean score than the group in the second column.

The standard error of the difference indicates the representativeness of a difference as an estimate of the corresponding difference in the population, under the assumption that the sample is unbiased.  A small standard error indicates that the population value is similar to the sample value. A $p$ value indicates whether the difference is statistically significant. Finally, a 95% confidence interval is a range of values within which the population value is likely to fall. More rigorously, a 95% confidence interval of -1.533 to +3.756—given for illustration—indicates that, if all possible samples the size of the existing sample were drawn from the population, 95% of the differences obtained would fall between -1.533 and +3.756.

With Participative Leadership scores as the dependent variable, the $F$ test results for nationality were statistically nonsignificant, $F(2,18) = 0.228, p = .80$.  The observed association was small, $\varsigma^2 = .029$.  Similarly, differences between specific nationalities were small and statistically nonsignificant. In the sample, the largest difference was between the U. S. and Italy, with Participative Leadership scores being higher in Italy.

Tables 9 and 10 on the following page graphically show these results.

Table 9. ANOVA Results with Participative Leadership as the Dependent Variable

| Source | $SS$[a] | $df$ | $MS$[b] | $F$ | $p$ | $\eta^{2}$[c] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 7.830 | 2 | 3.915 | .228 | .799 | .029 |
| Intercept | 3841.551 | 1 | 3841.551 | 223.403 | .000 | .937 |
| Country | 7.830 | 2 | 3.915 | .228 | .799 | .029 |
| Error | 257.934 | 15 | 17.196 | | | |
| Total | 6174.249 | 18 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 265.765 | 17 | | | | |

*Note.* For the corrected model, $R^2 = \varsigma^2 = .029$, adjusted $R^2 = -.100$.
[a] Type III sum of squares. [b] Mean square. [c] Partial eta squared.

Table 10. Scheffe Test Results with Participative Leadership as the Dependent Variable

| Country 1 | Country 2 | Mean Difference[a] | $SE$ | $p$ | 95% $CI$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U. S. | U. K. | -0.324 | 2.68 | .99 | -7.588 - 6.941 |
| | Italy | 1.676 | 2.68 | .82 | -5.588 - 8.941 |
| U. K. | U. S. | 0.324 | 2.68 | .99 | -6.941 - 7.588 |
| | Italy | 2.000 | 3.39 | .84 | -7.188 - 11.188 |
| Italy | U. S. | -1.676 | 2.68 | .82 | -8.941 - 5.588 |
| | U. K. | -2.000 | 3.39 | .84 | -11.188 - 7.188 |

*Note.* U. S. = United States, U. K. = United Kingdom.
[a] Country 1 minus Country 2. [b] Lower and upper bounds of 95% confidence interval.

With Instrumental Leadership scores as the dependent variable, the $F$ test results for nationality were again statistically nonsignificant, $F(2,18) = 2.678$, $p = .720$. Nevertheless, the observed association was large, $\varsigma^2 = .263$. Differences between specific nationalities were considerably larger than for the previous dependent variable, although they were statistically nonsignificant. In the sample, the largest difference was between the U. S. and Italy, with Instrumental Leadership scores being notably higher in the U. S. Tables 11 and 12 show these results.

Table 11. ANOVA Results with Instrumental Leadership as the Dependent Variable

| Source | $SS^a$ | $df$ | $MS^b$ | $F$ | $p$ | $\eta^{2c}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 150.744 | 2 | 75.372 | 2.678 | .10 | .263 |
| Intercept | 6507.110 | 1 | 6507.110 | 231.189 | .00 | .939 |
| Country | 150.744 | 2 | 75.372 | 2.678 | .10 | .263 |
| Error | 422.194 | 15 | 28.146 | | | |
| Total | 11879.258 | 18 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 572.937 | 17 | | | | |

*Note.* For the corrected model, $R^2 = \varsigma^2 = .263$, adjusted $R^2 = .165$.
[a] Type III sum of squares. [b] Mean square. [c] Partial eta squared.

Table 12. Scheffe Test Results with Instrumental Leadership as the Dependent
Variable

| Country 1 | Country 2 | Mean Difference[a] | *SE* | *p* | *CI*[b] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U. S. | U. K. | 2.839 | 3.42 | .71 | -6.455 - 12.132 |
| | Italy | 7.818 | 3.42 | .11 | -1.476 - 17.111 |
| U. K. | U. S. | -2.839 | 3.42 | .71 | -12.132 - 6.455 |
| | Italy | 4.979 | 4.33 | .53 | -6.776 - 16.735 |
| Italy | U. S. | -7.818 | 3.42 | .11 | -17.111 - 1.476 |
| | U. K. | -4.979 | 4.33 | .53 | -16.735 - 6.776 |

*Note.* U. S. = United States, U. K. = United Kingdom.
[a] Country 1 minus Country 2.  [b] Lower and upper bounds of 95% confidence interval.


With Supportive Leadership scores as the dependent variable, the *F* test results

for nationality again were statistically nonsignificant, $F(2,18) = 1.551$, $p = .24$. The

observed association was moderate, $\varsigma^2 = .171$.  As with the previous dependent

variable, differences between specific nationalities were substantial, though statistically

nonsignificant. In the sample, the largest difference again occurred between the U. S.

and Italy, with Supportive Leadership scores being notably higher in the U. S. Tables

13 and 14 show these results.

Table 13. ANOVA Results with Supportive Leadership as the Dependent Variable

| Source | $SS$[a] | $df$ | $MS$[b] | $F$ | $p$ | $\eta^{2}$[c] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Corrected Model | 215.090 | 2 | 107.545 | 1.551 | .24 | .171 |
| Intercept | 14396.873 | 1 | 14396.873 | 207.677 | .00 | .933 |
| Country | 215.090 | 2 | 107.545 | 1.551 | .24 | .171 |
| Error | 1039.851 | 15 | 69.323 | | | |
| Total | 25818.651 | 18 | | | | |
| Corrected Total | 1254.941 | 17 | | | | |

*Note.* For the corrected model, $R^2 = \varsigma^2 = .171$, adjusted $R^2 = .061$.
[a] Type III sum of squares.  [b] Mean square.  [c] Partial eta squared.

Table 14. Scheffe Test Results with Supportive Leadership as the Dependent Variable

| Country 1 | Country 2 | Mean Difference[a] | $SE$ | $p$ | $CI$[b] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U. S. | U. K. | 4.912 | 5.37 | .67 | -9.673 - 19.497 |
| | Italy | 8.912 | 5.37 | .28 | -5.673 - 23.497 |
| U. K. | U. S. | -4.912 | 5.37 | .67 | -19.497 - 9.673 |
| | Italy | 4.000 | 6.80 | .84 | -14.449 - 22.449 |
| Italy | U. S. | -8.912 | 5.37 | .28 | -23.497 - 5.673 |
| | U. K. | -4.000 | 6.80 | .84 | -22.449 - 14.449 |

*Note.* U. S. = United States, U. K. = United Kingdom.
[a] Country 1 minus Country 2.  [b] Lower and upper bounds of 95% confidence interval.

Finally, standard score means and standard deviations, followed by paired-samples *t* test results, were obtained to evaluate the standing of the three groups on the Participatory, Instrumental, and Supportive Leadership subtests.  The *t* test results included mean differences for each pair of subtests, standard deviations of the difference, standard errors of the difference, 95% confidence intervals, and *t* and *p* values.  The mean difference is simply the average difference between scores on the two subtests being analyzed.  The standard deviation reflects the variation among score differences within the sample or samples.  The standard error indicates the representativeness of the mean difference as an estimate of the population difference. The 95% confidence interval is a range of values within which the population value is likely to fall.  The *p* value accompanying the *t* value indicates whether the results are statistically significant.

For these analyses, standard scores were obtained so that any observed differences would not be artifacts of the raw means.  That is, respondents of one or more nationalities could score higher on one subtest than another simply because the first subtest in itself has a higher mean score than the second.  After standardization, each subtest has an identical mean, so that any difference for a particular nationality is not due to means that were different to begin with.  For respondents of each nationality, standardized subtest means and standard deviations were obtained prior to the analyses.

For U. S. respondents, the standardized Instrumental Leadership subtest had the highest mean, *M* = 53.06, *SD* = 9.48, followed consecutively by Supportive

Leadership, $M = 52.68$, $SD = 8.85$, and Participatory Leadership, $M = 50.57$, $SD = 9.90$. For Instrumental and Supportive Leadership scores, the mean difference was visibly very small, particularly considering the large standard deviation of the difference. For Instrumental and Participatory Leadership scores, the mean difference was larger but still small, again with a comparatively large standard deviation. For Supportive and Participatory Leadership scores, the results were similar. All results were statistically non-significant (See Table 15).

Table 15. Paired Samples $t$ Tests Comparing Leadership Styles among U. S. Respondents

| Pair | Mean Difference | $SD$[a] | $SE$[b] | 95% CI | $t$ | $p$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Instrumental Supportive | 0.378 | 9.20 | 2.66 | -5.468 - 6.224 | 0.142 | .889 |
| Instrumental Participatory | 2.489 | 10.33 | 2.98 | -4.074 - 9.052 | 0.835 | .422 |
| Supportive Participatory | 2.111 | 8.39 | 2.42 | -3.217 - 7.440 | 0.872 | .402 |

*Note.* All $df = 11$.
[a]Standard deviation of the difference. [b]Standard error of the difference.

For U. K. respondents, the standardized Participatory Leadership subtest had

the highest mean, $M = 51.39$, $SD = 1.72$, followed consecutively by Instrumental

Leadership, $M = 48.17$, $SD = 1.72$, and Supportive Leadership, $M = 46.96$, $SD = 7.01$.

Means and standard deviations tended to be small in comparison with U. S. results.

For Instrumental and Supportive Leadership scores, the mean difference was small,

particularly considering the standard deviation.  For Instrumental and Participatory

Leadership scores, the mean difference was larger, nearly one-third of a subtest

standard deviation.  The standard deviation of the difference was somewhat small.  For

Supportive and Participatory Leadership scores, the difference was still larger, but the

standard deviation of the difference was also fairly large. As with the U. S. sample, all

results were statistically non-significant (See Table 16).

Table 16. Paired Samples *t* Tests Comparing Leadership Styles among U. K. Respondents

| Pair | Mean Difference | $SD^a$ | $SE^b$ | 95% CI | $t$ | $p$ |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Instrumental Supportive | 1.205 | 5.30 | 3.06 | -11.970 - 14.380 | 0.394 | .732 |
| Instrumental Participatory | -3.219 | 2.26 | 1.30 | -8.828 - 2.391 | -2.469 | .132 |
| Supportive Participatory | -4.424 | 7.30 | 4.21 | -22.562 - 13.714 | -1.049 | .404 |

*Note.* All *df* = 11.
[a]Standard deviation of the difference.  [b]Standard error of the difference.

For Italian respondents as for their U. K. counterparts, the standardized

Participatory Leadership subtest had the highest mean, $M = 46.33$, $SD = 16.84$,

followed consecutively by Supportive Leadership, $M = 42.31$, $SD = 14.97$, and

Instrumental Leadership, $M = 39.59$, $SD = 11.34$. Means tended to be smaller than for

the other two nationalities, and standard deviations were larger. For Instrumental and

Supportive Leadership scores, the mean difference was small, particularly considering

the large standard deviation. For Instrumental and Participatory Leadership scores,

however, the mean difference was fairly large, about two-thirds of a subtest standard

deviation. The standard deviation of the difference was large as well. For Supportive

and Participatory Leadership scores, the difference was again somewhat large, as was

the standard deviation of the difference. As with the other two nationalities, all results

were statistically non-significant (See Table 17).

Table 17. Paired Samples $t$ Tests Comparing Leadership Styles among Italian Respondents

| Pair | Mean Difference | $SD^a$ | $SE^b$ | 95% CI | $t$ | $p$ |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Instrumental Supportive | -2.716 | 10.87 | 6.28 | -29.732 - 24.299 | -0.433 | .707 |
| Instrumental Participatory | -6.737 | 7.28 | 4.21 | -24.831 - 11.356 | -1.602 | .250 |
| Supportive Participatory | -4.021 | 7.50 | 4.33 | -22.642 - 14.600 | -0.929 | .451 |

*Note.* All $df = 2$.
[a]Standard deviation of the difference. [b]Standard error of the difference.

Summary of Findings

Chapter IV addressed the study's findings, which because of the small sample and low response rate ought to be regarded as very tentative. Based upon Hofstede's (1991) cultural scales, and the work of Miles and Greenberg, it was hypothesized that there would be greater difference in leadership characteristics between Italy and the United States than between the United Kingdom and the United States. The survey suggests that there are in fact differences in leadership behaviors. However, much more research is needed to further delineate and define these differences to the point where we can pinpoint competencies based on cultural variations.

As expected, the Sheffe test results indicated larger differences between Italian and American leaders than between British and American Leaders. However, these differences were not statistically significant in the present study. Confidence intervals were large, indicating that the sample results were not close estimates of the population results. In addition, confidence intervals tended to overlap considerably, indicating that the differences occurring in the sample could not be generalized with confidence to the population.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to (a) identify leadership differences between leaders who work in consulting firms in Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States and (b) to identify commonalities between Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States among leaders involved in poverty alleviation in third world nations. The internet was selected as the method to distribute the survey and collect data.

Summary of the Study

Given the current mystifying state of leadership theory, it becomes difficult to determine exactly what to evaluate, because of the obvious questions over determining which of the myriad of theories is "accurate." Moreover, there is the question of should leadership be separated from management. The literature review associated with this study leads this writer to conclude that there exists an artificial disconnect between leadership and management. In practice, the behaviors and mindsets involved are mutually interconnected variables, of which several or even all may, or may not, be indispensable when evaluating effective leadership and management in either in a single culture or across cultures. A practical conclusion is the simple premise that as soon as a capable manager desires a leader to achieve organizational objectives, he or

she finds one capable of doing so.  Likewise, when a capable leader desires a manager to achieve organizational objectives, he or she finds one.

<div align="center">Summary of Data Presentation and Analysis</div>

This study attempted to identify characteristics in leadership behavior using path goal leadership theory in the Republic of Italy, the United States of America and the United Kingdom among employees of consulting firms associated with working in the field of developing the resources of third world nations.  It expanded on the limited research available on cultural leadership differences between Italy and the United States that is available to trainers and experts in the field by analyzing perceptions of the exhibited roles and skills in these organizations.

This study utilized the Perceived Leader Behavior Scales and the Leadership Needs Assessment Survey to identify differences in leadership roles and skills that may be attributable to cultural differences.  Utilizing internet related technologies and electronic-mail, data regarding leadership perceptions was collected.  Limited time and financial resources in conjunction with geographically dispersed subjects necessitated the use of a methodology that would allow the collection of data in a cost-efficient and timely manner.

Conclusions of the Study

Fundamentally, the main conclusion to be drawn from this study is that the prevailing wisdom that there are in fact fundamental differences in leadership behaviors due to cultural differences may be untrue at least within the scope of this study.

The scope of this research was limited, and due to its flawed methodological design this conclusion is tentative.  However, the study does suggest there is reason to believe, that at least in western societies the differences in leadership behavior, while undoubtedly present based on the leadership literature may not be sufficient enough to present itself using this sort of methodological design or may not be sufficient enough to answer the question of weather human resource professionals engaged in the training and development of leaders in multi-national organizations should in fact develop unique training programs specific to the host country.

It may very well be that the current cross-cultural training which expatriates receive prior to there departure may be sufficient. Clearly, additional research in this area needs to be carried out by human resource professionals to ascertain if there are specific leadership skill sets that expatriates should possess prior to their departure so as to maximize their effectiveness in their new environment.

Recommendations

The primary focus of this chapter is to make recommendations for researchers seeking to conduct web-based surveys such as this one and to draw scientifically sound inferences from the findings. Empirical research is replete with attempts to exaggerate the reliability and importance of small, statistically non-significant results. Rather than add to this continuing problem, I decided to help resolve it by making recommendations for sound future research.

Based on the methodological issues encountered in the study, I offer the following recommendations for those interested in conducting cross-cultural research via the internet. These recommendations address the broad issue of logistically creating a viable system of data collection for Web-based surveys, with the intention of improving the rate of response.

*Recommendation 1*

As a result of this study, I believe future studies should be conducted using a multi-method design that includes qualitative and quantitative techniques. In the future, VoIP software may make a Delphi type of study possible without the necessity to be onsite or incurring international long distance charges. VoIP software offers the researcher a cost-effective communication tool that incorporates the ability to text message, verbal chat, use PowerPoint and present websites. It also provides powerful conferencing ability. This software is only now reaching the marketplace and was not available at the time that this study was originally designed.

Furthermore, Conger (1998) asserts that qualitative research plays a pivotal role in leadership studies because leadership is a rich and complex phenomenon best studied with the richness of data a qualitative lens provides. In particular the critical incident technique may be employed as a method of data collection. This technique involves asking participants to recall a specific event and to explain the circumstances surrounding the incident in rich graphical detail (Erlandson, 1993).

*Recommendation 2*

Two respondents reported an inactive gateway link, raising concerns over technological issues. I eventually determined that this was a result of using America Online (AOL) or some other internet service provider (ISP), which requires separate coding in the e-mail text in order to ensure an active link. There is no way to know how many potential respondents failed to complete the survey due to a lack of access to an active link. Hence, researchers should take care to account for various ISP systems, such as AOL. One possible means to accomplish this is to identify the top ISP providers in the country of interest and inquire with those providers to determine if their services have any unique configuration features or system incompatibilities.

*Recommendation 3*

Although the e-mail addresses were freely provided by the directory of development organizations for research purposes, a significant number of the addresses were invalid or incorrect. I recommend that researchers consider purchasing from a reputable e-mail list broker a compilation of e-mail addresses that have been double opted to avoid spam and compliance with their ISP regulations. It appears there was an

over-reliance on the notion that the e-mail addresses were, in fact, current addresses because they were provided by the Department of Energy.

*Recommendation 4*

Because of the low response rate, I recommend that researchers should consider using very large sample sizes to account for technological problems and invalid or full mailboxes. A sufficiently large sample size reduces random error but may permit unacceptable levels of systematic error, as may occur with technical problems associated with Web-based surveys. Statistical significance levels and margins of error do not account for systematic error.

*Recommendation 5*

Web-based surveys ought to be piloted to a degree beyond that to which traditional surveys are normally piloted. The accessibility to the survey ought to be well-established as a result of thorough testing of the instrument on every possible type of browser, network, platform, and email program, as well as tested on foreseeable combinations of hardware and software. Pilot testing in the study was attempted, but, upon reflection the pilot was disorganized and perhaps lacked the rigor necessary for a web-based study. The researcher tested the instrument on the most popular browsers in United States and on the recent versions (primarily those available in the Texas A&M Student Computing Center), but upon reflection, perhaps older browser versions should have also been tested given that notion that other end users may or may not have the latest technology.

*Recommendation 6*

Future designs of online surveys should allow respondents to respond with the same degree of confidence and convenience as a traditional pencil-and-paper survey. For instance, they should be given the ability to pause, save their work, and complete the survey at a later time. This would require the use of logins and passwords, which could present their own problems. However, it is theorized that the convenience of being able to start-stop and re-start the online survey would outweigh any potential pitfalls of using a login procedure. Additionally, the respondent should have the option of simply downloading the form and mailing it in.

*Recommendation 7*

An overarching issue in all web based designs is the issue of accessibility. In close proximity to this is the issue of privacy. While there may be accessibility the end user might lack privacy. Hence, appropriate alternatives should be available to the respondents which not only provide a vehicle for responding should they lack accessibility to the internet, but also should they lack privacy. Many organizations use shared computers or they monitor the activities of their employees via the internet. One such alternative would be to provide a version that might be printed, completed, and faxed or mailed back to the researcher. By doing so, the individual could complete the form in private and not be concern with the long hand of the corporation.

Implications for Future Research


Because of the low response rates of this study and the small sample size, no overarching generalizations or overarching conclusions can be drawn regarding the effect or impact of culture on leadership styles or observable competencies. However, one might conclude from this study that the notion of culture playing a statistically significant role in the dissemination and practice of leadership may be exaggerated or perhaps even unwarranted. The results of this study leads this researcher to conclude at least relative to the confines and parameters of the study, that leadership is simply leadership irrespective of the culture in which it is practiced. In fact, the literature supports this conclusion, in so far as the leadership literature seems to be all over the map.

Perhaps the greatest implication of this research stems from the unexpected difficulties associated with this study as a result of the employed methodology. The unexpected difficulties encountered with this study led the researcher to infer that there is a tremendous need for further research on the feasibility of cross-cultural web-based surveys as a viable research methodology. I would encourage future human resource professionals, especially those engaged in international human resources to adopt and refine internet related methodologies into their research as this study brought to light some important methodological issues, such as accessibility and technological compatibility. In general, further research to determine the benefits and barriers of collecting data cross-culturally using web-based instruments is needed.

REFERENCES

Ackoff, R. L. (1999). Transformational leadership. *Strategy & Leadership, 27*(1), 20-25.

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

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stodgill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (3rd ed.) New York: Free Press.

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

Bean C. R. (1994a). European unemployment: A survey. *Journal of Economic Literature, 32*, 573–619.

Bean C. R. (1994b). European Unemployment: A Retrospective. *European Economic Review, 38,* 523-534.

Becker, E. B., Huselid, A. M., & Ulrich, D. (2001). *The HR Scorecard: Linking people, strategy, and performance.* Boston: Harvard Business School.

Bigoness,W., & Blakely, G. (1996). A Cross-National Study of Managerial Values. *Journal of International Business Studies, 27*, 739-752.

Black, B. (1999). National Culture and High Commitment Management. *Employee Relations, 21*(4), 389-404.

Black, J. S. (1992). Coming home: The relationship of expatriate expectations with repatriation adjustment and job performance. *Human Relations 45*(2), 177-192.

Black, J. S., & Mendenhall, M. (1990). Cross-cultural training effectiveness: A review and a theoretical framework for future research. *Academy of Management Review, 15*(1), 113-136.

Blake, R., & Mouton, J. (1964). *The managerial grid.* Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Bolman, L.G., & Deal, T.E. (1997). Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership (Second Edition). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bowers, D. K. (1999). FAQs on online research. *Marketing Research, 10*(1), 45-48.

Brewster, C. (1995). Towards a European model of human resource management practice. *Journal of International Business Studies, 26*(1), 5-21.

Brodbeck, F. C. (2000). Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73,* 1-29.

Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, J. (2003). *Transforming leadership: A new pursuit of happiness*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Bryman, A. (1992). Charisma and Leadership in Organizations. London, Sage.

Capra, F. (1982). *the turning point: Science, society and the rising culture*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ciampa, D., & Watkins, M. (1999). *Right from the start: Taking charge in a new leadership role.* Boston: Harvard Business School.

Clegg, S. R. (1990). *Modern organizations: Organization studies in the postmodern world*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Church, A. H., & Waclawski, J. (1999). Influence behaviors and managerial

    effectiveness in lateral relations. *Human Resource Development Quarterly,*

    *10*(1), 3-41.

Cohen. J., & Federico, G., (2001). *The Growth of the Italian Economy, 1820–1960.*

    New York: Cambridge University Press.

Colins, C. J., & Chippendale, P. J. (1995). *New wisdom II: Values-based development.*

    Brisbane, Australia: Acorn Publications.

Conger, J. A. (1998). Qualitative research as the cornerstone methodology for

    understanding leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 9*, 107-121.

Cook, C., Heath, F., & Thomson, R. (2000). A meta-analysis of response rates in web-

    or internet-based surveys. *Educational & Psychological Measurement, 60*(6),

    821-826.

Coutu, D. (2002). Edgar Schein: The Anxiety of Learning. *Harvard Business Review,*

    *58*, 100-106.

Crainer, S. (1998). *The ultimate book of business gurus: 110 thinkers who really made*

    *a difference.* New York: AMACOM.

Crainer, S. (2000). *The management century: A critical review of 20th century thought*

    *and practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Cufaude, J. (1999). The character of your leadership. *Association Management, 51*, 40-

    46.

Daniels, T. D., Spiker, B. K., & Papa, M. J. (1997). Perspectives on organizational

    communication (4th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.

Deshpande, S. P., & Viswesvaran, C. (1992). Is cross-cultural training of expatriate managers effective? A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 16,* 295-310

DeSimone, R. L., Werner, J. M., & Harris, D. W. (2002).  (3rd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Dillman, D. A., & Bowker, D. K. (2001). The Web questionnaire challenge to survey methodologists. In U. D. Reips and M. Bosnjak (Eds.), *Dimensions of internet science* (pp. 159-178). Lengerich: Pabst Science Publishers. [Online]. Available: http://sesrc.wsu.edu/dillman/papers.htm

Dillman, D. A., Tortora, R. D., & Bowker, D. (1998). Principles for constructing web surveys. *SESRC Technical Report 98-50.* Pullman, WA: SESRC. [Online]. Available: http://survey.sesrc.wsu.edu/dillman/papers/websurveyppr.pdf

Dooley, L.; Paprock, K.E.; Shim, I.; and Gonzalez, E.M. (2000). Differences in priority for competencies trained between U.S. and Mexican trainers, presented at the annual conference of the Academy of Human Resource Development, Tulsa, OK, March 8-12.

Eastland, T. (2004, April 29). If Italians don't have more babies, they will disappear. *The Dallas Morning News,* p. 23A.

Erez, M., & Earley, P. C. (1993). *Culture, self-identity and work.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Erlandson, David A. (1993). Doing naturalistic inquiry: a guide to methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fairholm, G. W. (1994). *Leadership and the culture of trust.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fligstein, N., & Freeland, R., (1995). Theoretical and comparative perspectives on corporate organization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *21*. 21-43.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational Research*: *An Introduction* (6th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Goodwin, J., Hills, K., & Ashton, D. (1999). International briefing 2: Training and development in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Training and Development, 3*, 167-179.

Hackman, M. Z., & Johnson, C. E. (1996). *Leadership: A communication perspectiv*e (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J. W., & Woodman, R. W. (2001). *Organizational Behavior* (9th ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Thomson Learning.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1998). *Management of organizational behavior*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hitt, M. A., & Ireland, R. D., (1987). Peters and Waterman revisited: The unended quest for excellence. *Academy of Management Executive, 1*, 91-98.

Hofstede, G. (1980), *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G. (1986). Cultural differences in teaching and learning. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*(3), 301-320.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive, 7*(1), 81-94.

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leadership effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *16*(3), 321-337.

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

House, R. J., & Dressler, G. (1974). The path goal theory of leadership. In Hunt, J. G., and Larson, L. L. (Eds.), *Contingency approaches to leadership*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, R. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3, 81-97.

James, L. R., James, L. A., & Ashe, D. K. (1990). The meaning of organizations: The role of cognition and values. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (pp. 40-84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Kaplan, R. E. (1988). The warp and woof of the general manager's job. In F.D.

   Schoorman and B. Schneider (Eds.), *Facilitating work effectiveness* (pp. 183-

   211). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books/D.C. Heath and Company.

Keeley, W. A. (1997). Leadership Development Needs Assessment

   Retrieved April, 2003 from http://www.civid3.com/leadna.htm

Kenny, D. A., & Zaccaro, S. J. (1983).  An estimate of variance due to traits in

   leadership. J*ournal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 678-685.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1995). Leadership: Do traits really matter? In J. T.

   Wren, *The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages* (pp.

   133-143). New York: The Free Press.

Klein, H. J., Wesson, M. J., Hollenbeck, J. R., &, Alge, B. J. (1999). Goal commitment

   and the goal setting process: Conceptual clarification and empirical synthesis.

   *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*, 885-896.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1999). *Encouraging the heart: A leader's guide to

   rewarding and recognizing others*. San Franciso: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Kuchinke, K. P. (1995). Managing learning for performance**.** *Human

   Resource Development Quarterly, 6*(3), 307-317.

Laurent, A. (1983). The cultural diversity of Western conceptions of management.

   *International Studies of Management and Organization, 13*(1), 75-96.

Lee, M., & Stead, V. (1998). Human resources development in the United Kingdom.

   *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 9*(3), 297-308.

Lissack, M., & Roos, J. (1999). *The next Common sense: Mastering corporate complexity through coherence.* London: Nicholas Brealey.

Lord, R. G., DeVader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 402-410.

Marquardt, M., & Engel, D. (1993) *Global Human Resource Development.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall

Martin, G., & Butler, M., (2000). Comparing managerial careers, management education development and management education in the U. K. and the U. S. A.: Some theoretical considerations. *International Journal of Training and Development, 4*(3) 196-207.

McGregor, D. (1966). *Leadership and Motivation.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McGuire, D., O'Donnell, D., Garavan, N. T., Saha, K. S., & Murphy, J. (2002). The cultural boundedness of theory and practice in human resource development. *Cross-Cultural Management, 9*(2), 25-44.

McLean, G. N. (2001). Research Needs in International human resource development. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12*(3), 219-221.

McLean, G. N., & McLean, L. (2001). If we can't define human resource development in one country, how can we define it in an international context? *International, 3*(4), 313-326.

Meindl, J. R. (1998). Invited reaction: enabling visionary leadership. *Human Resource*

*Development Quarterly, 9*(1), 21-24.

Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (1985). The dimensions of expatriate acculturation. *Academy of Management Review, 10*, 39-47.

Miles, J., & Greenberg, J. (1993). Cross-national differences in preferences for distributive justice norms: The challenge of establishing fair resource allocations in the European community. In J. B. Shaw, P. S. Kirkbride, and K. M. Rowland (Eds.). *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Suppl. 3, pp. 133-156). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Nijhof, W. J., & de Rijk, R. N. (1997). Roles competencies and outputs of human resource development practitioners: A comparative study in four European countries. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 21*(6), 247-255.

Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Osman-Gani, M. A. (2000). Developing expatriates for the Asia-Pacific region: A comparative analysis of multinational enterprise managers from five countries. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *11*(3), 213-236.

Parry, S. B. (1996). The quest for competencies: Competency studies can help you make HR decisions, but the results are only as good as the study. *Training, 33*, 48-56.

Pasternack, B. A., & Viscio, A. J. (1998). The centerless corporation: a new model for transforming your organization for growth and prosperity. New York: Fireside.

Peters, T. J. (1987). *Thriving on Chaos*. London: Pan Books, Ltd.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence: In search of America's best-run companies*. New York: Harper & Row.

Porter, M. E. (1990). *The competitive advantage of nations.* New York: The Free Press.

Rosenzweig, P. M., & Nohria, N. (1994). Influences on  practices in multinational corporations. *Journal of International Business Studies, 25*(2), 229-251.

Rothwell, J. W. (1994). *Effective succession planning: Ensuring leadership continuity and building talent from within.* New York: AMACOM.

Rousseau, D. M. (1990). Assessing organizational culture: The case for multiple methods. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (pp. 153-192). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership.*  San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Schoorman, F. and Schneider, B. (1988). *Facilitating work effectiveness*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books/D.C. Heath and Company.

Schuster, J. P. (1994). Transforming your leadership style. *Association Management*, *46*(1)*,* 39-42.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York: Doubleday/Currency.

Shea, C. M. (1999). The effect of leadership style on performance improvement on a manufacturing task.  *Journal of Business*, *72*(3)*,* 407-422.

Shelton, K. (Ed.). (1997). *A new paradigm of leadership: Visions of excellence for 21st century organizations.* Provo, UT: Executive Excellence.

Shepard, I. S., Farmer, R. F., & Counts, G. E. (1997). Leadership definitions and theorists: Do practitioners and professors agree? *Journal of Leadership Studies, 4*(1), 26-45.

Shim, I., & Paprock, K. (2002). A study focusing on American expatriates' learning in host countries. *International Journal of Training and Development, 6*(1) 13-24.

Solomon, C. (1995). Learning to manage host-country nationals. *Personnel Journal, 74*(3) 60-66.

Solomon, D. J. (2001). Conducting web-based surveys. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 7*(19). [Online.] Available: http://ericae.net/pare/getvn.asp?v=7&n=19

Sparrow, P., Schuler, R., & Jackson, S. (1994). Convergence or divergence: Human resource practices and policies for competitive advantage worldwide. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 5*(2), 267-299.

Stiglitz, J. (2003). *Globalization and its discontents.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

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

Swanson, R. A. (1996). Training for performance system field handbook. St. Paul, MN: Swanson & Associates, Inc.

Swanson, R. A. (2001). Human resource development and its underlying theory. *International Journal of Human Resource Development, 4*(3), 299–312.

Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meanings*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Thach, E. (1995) 'Using Electronic Mail to Conduct Survey Research', *Educational Technology*, March-April 1995, pp. 27-31.

Tregaskis, O., Heraty, N., & Morley, M. (2001). Human resource development in multinationals: The global/local mix. *Human Resource Management Journal, 11*(2), 34-56.

Trice, H. M., & Beyer, J. M. (1993). The cultures of work organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Tung, R. (1988). *The new expatriate.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Tung, R. L., & Miller, E. L. (1990). Managing in the twenty-first century: The need for global orientation. *Management International Review, 30*, 5-18.

Uchitelle, L. (2001, August 19). These days of layoffs compete with loyalty. *New York Times,* p.4C.

Valkeavaara, T. (1998). Human resource development roles and competencies in five European countries*. International Journal of Training and Development*, *2*(3), 171-189.

Vietor, R. (2001). Italy's economic half-miracle. *Strategy & Business*, *12*(2), 69-79.

Vroom, V. H. (1995). *Work and Motivation.* San Franciso: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Watson, S.C. (1998). A primer in survey research. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *46*(1), 31-40.

Watt, J. H. (1997, June). Using the internet for quantitative survey research. *Marketing Research Review*, Article 0248. [Online.] Available: http://www.Quirks.com

Weinberger, L. A. (1998). Commonly held theories of human resource development. *International Journal of Human Resource Development, 1*(1), 75-93.

Wells, S. (1997). From sage to artisan: The nine roles of the value-driven leader. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.

Wesselink, B. (2003). *Directory of Development Organizations.* Retrieved April, 2003 from http://www.devdir.org/

Yeung, A. K., & Ready, D. A. (1995). Developing leadership capabilities of global corporations: A comparative study in eight nations. *Human Resource Management*, *34*(4), 529-547.

Yiu, L. (2000). Determining the impact of cognitive styles on the effectiveness of global managers propositions for further research. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 11*(3) p. 319-324.

Yukl, G. A., (1981). *Leadership in organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Yukl, G. A., (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management, 15,* 251-289.

Zaleznik, A. (1992). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*, *70*(2), 126-135.

APPENDIX A

ENGLISH SURVEY

# LEADERSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

This survey is intended to facilitate a better understanding of the leadership characteristics required to be an effective leader.

 When completing this survey, please think of a specific manager in your organization to assess.  It is preferred, if possible, that you assess your immediate superior.

The information will be used only for research.  All responses are confidential.

*Please note a score of 5 indicates that you believe your manager ideally exemplifies the particular characteristic, while a score of 1 would indicate you feel your manager is lacking in this characteristic.

Thank you for your time.

When filling out this survey, I am filling it out for

- ▣ Myself
- ▣ My superior
- ▣ My subordinate

I would describe my position as:

- ▣ Upper management
- ▣ Middle management
- ▣ Lower management
- ▣ Other:

My age is between:

☐ below 21
☐ 21-30
☐ 31-40
☐ 41-50
☐ 51-60
☐ 61-70

My gender is:

☐ Male
☐ Female

## Strategy

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager demonstrates the ability to think long-term | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager demonstrates a vision for the organization | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager spends time setting the direction for the organization/department | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

## COMMUNICATION

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager demonstrates good communication skills | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ |
| My manager is out and about in the organization | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ |
| My manager demonstrates the ability to communicate across organizations or departments | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ |
| My manager demonstrates the ability to communicate frequently | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ |

## KNOWLEDGE

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager demonstrates a deep-rooted understanding of the functions of his/her organization | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ |
| My manager demonstrates an understanding of the functions of other organizations or | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ | ▢ |

departments

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager exhibits a sense of "being close to the business." | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager displays the ability to take a broad view | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**LEARNING**

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager shows a curiosity to learn | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager demonstrates an ability to promote change | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager demonstrates the ability to learn quickly | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

**INFLUENCE**

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager has the ability to gain support for ideas | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager demonstrates the ability to sell concepts | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager exhibits the | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

ability to get people on
board

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager can motivate people | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager displays a democratic style | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager is assertive | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

## RELATIONSHIPS

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager demonstrates the ability to talk to people | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager is a good listener | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager displays good interpersonal skills | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager shows the ability to deal with people | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

## DELEGATION

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager demonstrates good delegation skills | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager is detail-oriented | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager is a nitpicker | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager can deal with important issues | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager delegates | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

## PRIORITIES

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager is able to prioritize properly | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

## INTEGRITY

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager demonstrates integrity | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager is trusted | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager is political when needed | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager takes personal responsibility rather than blame others | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager admits mistakes | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager is honest | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

## CONFIDENCE

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager is secure | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager has guts | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager is willing to make enemies to defend what is right | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager is decisive | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager communicates confidence | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager is willing to make the tough decisions | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

## INSTRUMENTAL LEADERSHIP

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My Manager lets group members know what is expected of them. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager decides what shall be done and | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

how it shall be done

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager schedules the work to be done | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager maintains definite standards of performance | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager asks that the group members follow standard rules and regulations | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager explains the way any task should be carried out | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

## SUPPORTIVE LEADERSHIP

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager is friendly and polite | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager puts suggestions made by the group into operation | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager treats all group members as equals | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My manager gives advance notice of changes | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager keeps to himself | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager looks out for the personal welfare of group members | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager is willing to make changes | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager helps me to overcome problems which stop me from carrying out my task | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| My manager helps me make working on my tasks more pleasant | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

## PARTICIPATIVE LEADERSHIP

| | Never | Seldom | Occasionally | Often | Always |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| When faced with a problem, my manager consults with subordinates | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Before making decisions, my manager gives serious consideration to what subordinates have | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

to say

---

My manager asks subordinates for suggestions concerning how to carry out assignments

⊙    ⊙    ⊙    ⊙    ⊙

---

Before taking action my manager consults with subordinates

⊙    ⊙    ⊙    ⊙    ⊙    ⊙

---

My manager asks subordinates for suggestions on what should be done

⊙    ⊙    ⊙    ⊙    ⊙    ⊙

Submit

Click Here to Conduct Your Own Survey

APPENDIX B

ITALIAN SURVEY

# VALUTAZIONE DI DIREZIONE IN ITALIA

Questa indagine e' intesa a facilitare una comprensione migliore delle competenze di leadership in Italia.

Nel completare questa indagine, pensi ai noti responsabile specifico nella vostra organizzazione da valutare.  E' preferito, se possibile, che Lei valuti il suo superiore immediato.

Le informazioni sarranno usate soltanto a scopo di ricerca.  Tutte le risposte sono confidenziali.

*Un punteggio di 5 indica che lei crede che il suo risponsabile esemplifichi idealmente la caratteristica particolare, mentre un punteggio di 1 indica che il suo risponsabile manca in questa caratteristica.

Grazie per il suo tempo.

Sto compilandolo questa indagine per:

Descriverei la mia posizione come:

La mia eta' e' compresa fra:

Il mio sesso e':

**STRATEGIA:**

| | Mai | Raramente | Occasionalmente | Spesso | Sempre |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Il mio responsabile dimostra la capacita' di pensare a lungo termine. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile dimostra di avere | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

una visione
d'insieme
dell'organizzazione.

Il mio responsabile
dedica tempo alla
ricerca di linee
guida per la
compagnia/il
departimento.

## COMMUNICAZIONE:

|  | Mai 1 | Raramente 2 | Occasionalmente 3 | Spesso 4 | Sempre 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabilie dimostra buone capacita' di comunicazione. | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile e' visibile spesso nell'organizzazione | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile dimostra la capacita' di comunicare attraverso organizzazioni o dipartimenti. | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile dimostra la capacita di comunicare frequentemente. | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

**CONOSCENZA:**

| | Mai<br>1 | Raramente<br>2 | Occasionalmente<br>3 | Spesso<br>4 | Sempre<br>5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile dimostra una profonda e radicata comprensione delle funzioni della sua orgaizzione. | ⦿ | ◌ | ◌ | ◌ | ◌ |
| Il mio responsabile dimostra una comprensione delle funzioni di altre organizzazioni o dipartimenti. | ⦿ | ◌ | ◌ | ◌ | ◌ |
| Il mio responsabile mostra una spiccata sensibilita' commerciale. | ⦿ | ◌ | ◌ | ◌ | ◌ |
| Il mio responsabile dimostra di essere di ampie vedute. | ⦿ | ◌ | ◌ | ◌ | ◌ |

**IMPARARE:**

| | Mai<br>1 | Raramente<br>2 | Occasionalmente<br>3 | Spesso<br>4 | Sempre<br>5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile dimostra curiosita' | ⦿ | ◌ | ◌ | ◌ | ◌ |

di imparare.

| Il mio responsabile dimostra la capacita' di apportare cambiamenti. | ⊙ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Il mio responsabile dimostra la capacita' di impare rapidamente. | ⊙ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**INFLUENZA:**

| | Mai | Raramente | Occasionalmente | Spesso | Sempre |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Il mio responsabile ha la capacita' di ottenere sostegno per le idee proposte. | ⊙ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile dimostra la capacita' di valorizzare concetti. | ⊙ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile dimostra la capacita" di coinvolgere le persone. | ⊙ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile e' in grado di motivare la gente. | ⊙ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile dimostra uno stile | ⊙ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

democratico.

| | Mai 1 | Raramente 2 | Occasionalmente 3 | Spesso 4 | Sempre 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile riesce as imporsi. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile è assertivo. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

## RAPPORTI:

| | Mai 1 | Raramente 2 | Occasionalmente 3 | Spesso 4 | Sempre 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile dimostra la capacita' di comunicare con la gente. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile e' un buon ascoltatore. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile dimostra buone capacita' nei rapporti interpersonali. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile mostra di sapare trattare con la gente. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

## DELEGAZIONE:

| | Mai 1 | Raramente 2 | Occasionalmente 3 | Spesso 4 | Sempre 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | Mai 1 | Raramente 2 | Occasionalmente 3 | Spesso 4 | Sempre 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile dimostra buone abilita' di delegazione. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile e' attento ai dettagli. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile cerca il pelo nell'uovo. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile e' in grado di occuparsi questioni importanti. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile e' uno che delega. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

**PRIORITA':**

| | Mai 1 | Raramente 2 | Occasionalmente 3 | Spesso 4 | Sempre 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile e' in grado di gestire correttamente le priorita'. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

**INTEGRITA':**

| | Mai 1 | Raramente 2 | Occasionalmente 3 | Spesso 4 | Sempre 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile dimostra integrita'. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| | Mai 1 | Raramente 2 | Occasionalmente 3 | Spesso 4 | Sempre 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile e' una persona che gode di fiducia. | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile sa essere un politico, se necessario. | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile si assume le sue responsabilita' piuttosto che scaricarle sugli altri | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile ammette gli errori. | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile e' onesto. | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

**FIDUCIA:**

| | Mai 1 | Raramente 2 | Occasionalmente 3 | Spesso 4 | Sempre 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile e' una persona fidata. | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile ha fegato. | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile e' disposto a farsi dei nemici per difendere cio' che e' guisto. | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

e'risoluto.

| Il mio responsabile comunica affidabilita'. | ◉ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile e' disposto a prendere decisioni dure. | ◉ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |

**DIREZIONE STRUMENTALE:**

| | Mai | Raramente | Occasionalmente | Spesso | Sempre |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Il mio responsabile fa sapere ai membri del gruppo cio' che si aspetta da loro. | ◉ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| Il mio responsabile decide che cosa si dovra' fare e come si dovra' fare. | ◉ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| Il mio responsabile si assicura che il suo ruolo nel gruppo sia capito. | ◉ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| Il mio responsabile programma il lavoro che deve esser fatto. | ◉ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |
| Il mio responsabile mantiene certi standard nelle prestazioni. | ◉ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ | ◯ |

| | Mai 1 | Raramente 2 | Occasionalmente 3 | Spesso 4 | Sempre 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile chiede che i membri del gruppo seguano norme e regolamenti standard. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile spiega come ogni compito debba essere portato a termine. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

## DIREZIONE DI SUPPORTO:

| | Mai 1 | Raramente 2 | Occasionalmente 3 | Spesso 4 | Sempre 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile e' amichevole e gentile. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile cura le piccole cose per rendere piacevole l'appartenenza al gruppo. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile rende operativi i suggerimenti del gruppo. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile considera eguali tutti i membri del gruppo. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

comunica in anticipo i cambiamenti.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Il mio responsabile e' un tipo solitario. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile ricerca il benessere personale dei membri del gruppo. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile e' disposto a fare cambiamenti. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile mi aiuta a superare i problemi che mi impediscono di adempiere ai miei doveri. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile mi aiuta ad adempiere alle mie mansioni in maniera piu' piacevole. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

**DIREZIONE PARTICIPE:**

| | Mai | Raramente | Occasionalmente | Spesso | Sempre |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quando messo di fronte ad un problema, il mio responsabile consulta i subalterni. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Prima di prendere decisioni, il mio responsabile prende in seria considerazione cosa i subalterni hanno di dire. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile chiede ai subalterni suggerimenti riguardo a come svolgere gli incarichi.. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Prima di agire il mio responsabile consulta i subalterni. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Il mio responsabile chiede ai subalterni suggerimenti su che cosa dovrebbe essere fatto. | ◉ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Invio questionario

APPENDIX C

HOME PAGE COVER SHEET

You understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review board-Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, I can contact the Institutional Review Board through Dr. Michael W. Buckley, Director of Research Compliance, Office of the Vice President for Research at (979) 458-4067 (mwbuckley@tamu.edu)."

You may contact the author of this study or his Committee Chair at:

Fabio Moro
fabio-moro@tamu.edu

Dr. Kenneth Paprock
kpaprock@tamu.edu

Before clicking the link below, you have read and understand the explanation provided. You have had all questions answered to your satisfaction, and you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.


CLICK HERE TO PROCEED TO THE SURVEY

APPENDIX D

PRE-NOTIFICATION LETTER

Dear Sir/Madam

Your consulting firm has been selected to participate in a unique leadership research survey. Your company's e-mail was obtained from the Directory of Development Organizations. The purpose of this research is to provide a better understanding of the unique role that culture plays on leadership.

The goal of this project is to determine your perception of a given competency or skill of either your own personal leadership or that of your superior. This is an opportunity for you to identify traits that distinguish leadership across cultures. The study will be conducted at Texas A&M University through web based applications and will be open for approximately six weeks.

There will be a minimal time commitment required in participating in the completion of this study. I realize that time is a scarce commodity, but I believe that the focus of this project is both valuable and functional.

Your Participation is this project is greatly appreciated.

- There will be approximately 300 participating consulting firms.
- It is estimated the survey should take only approximately 15-20 minutes of your time.
- You are free to answer any or all questions.
- There are no negative consequences from participating in the survey.
- Your anonymity is protected. Responses are automatically forwarded to a database with no way of knowing who responded.
- Participation is completely voluntary.

All participants may request an electronic summary of the findings – preliminary results should be ready by spring, 2003. You must be 18 years or older to participate.

Please click below to proceed to the survey to begin.

http://www.leadership-in-the-United-States.com

Sincerely,
Fabio Moro
Fabio-moro@tamu.edu

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP E-MAIL

Dear Sir/Madam,

Last week I sent you an invitation to participate is a unique cross-cultural research project.  It would be of tremendous benefit to the project if you can find time within your busy schedule to participate in the project.  Your perceptions are highly valuable. Please accept my invitation to participate in this study.

Please go to http://www.leadership-in-the-United-States.com

Thank you again

Fabio Moro


Dear Sir/Madam

Your consulting firm has been selected to participate in a unique leadership research survey.  Your company's e-mail was obtained from the Directory of Development Organizations. The purpose of this research is to provide a better understanding of the unique role that culture plays on leadership.

The goal of this project is to determine your perception of a given competency or skill of either your own personal leadership or that of your superior.  This is an opportunity for you to identify traits that distinguish leadership across cultures.  The study will be conducted at Texas A&M University through web based applications and will be open for approximately six weeks.

There will be a minimal time commitment required in participating in the completion of this study.  I realize that time is a scarce commodity, but I believe that the focus of this project is both valuable and functional.

Your Participation is this project is greatly appreciated.

- There will be approximately 300 participating consulting firms.
- It is estimated the survey should take only approximately 15-20 minutes of your time.
- You are free to answer any or all questions.
- There are no negative consequences from participating in the survey.
- Your anonymity is protected.  Responses are automatically forwarded to a database with no way of knowing who responded.
- Participation is completely voluntary.

All participants may request an electronic summary of the findings – preliminary results should be ready by spring, 2003. You must be 18 years or older to participate.

Please click below to proceed to the survey to begin.

http://www.leadership-in-the-United-States.com

Sincerely,
Fabio Moro
Fabio-moro@tamu.edu

APPENDIX F

PRINCIPAL COMPONENT RESULTS

FOR THE MEASURING INSTRUMENT

Table A-1

Communalities

| Instrumental Leadership | | Supportive Leadership | | Participative Leadership | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item | Communality | Item | Communality | Item | Communality |
| 1 | .788 | 1 | .851 | 1 | .764 |
| 2 | .818 | 2 | .861 | 2 | .914 |
| 3 | .884 | 3 | .816 | 3 | .819 |
| 4 | .735 | 4 | .911 | 4 | .631 |
| 5 | .795 | 5 | .921 | 5 | .909 |
| 6 | .792 | 6 | .706 | | |
| 7 | .640 | 7 | .760 | | |
| | | 8 | .610 | | |
| | | 9 | .865 | | |
| | | 10 | .760 | | |

*Note.* The extraction procedure was principal component analysis.

Table A-2

Pattern Coefficients

| Item | Component | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | I | II | III |
| Participative leadership 2 | .999 | -.403 | .181 |
| Supportive leadership 2 | .991 | -.159 | .128 |
| Participative leadership 5 | .967 | -.069 | .140 |
| Supportive leadership 5 | .868 | .153 | -.191 |
| Participative leadership 3 | .723 | .062 | .403 |
| Participative leadership 4 | .719 | .052 | .181 |
| Supportive leadership 7 | .688 | .260 | -.280 |
| Supportive leadership 1 | .684 | .152 | -.606 |
| Supportive leadership 4 | .591 | .487 | -.236 |
| Supportive leadership 10 | .524 | .463 | -.076 |
| Instrumental leadership 2 | -.723 | .999 | .111 |
| Instrumental leadership 3 | -.113 | .999 | -.023 |
| Instrumental leadership 5 | .144 | .804 | -.039 |
| Supportive leadership 9 | .202 | .793 | .019 |
| Supportive leadership 8 | -.047 | .769 | .149 |
| Instrumental leadership 6 | .215 | .756 | -.074 |
| Instrumental leadership 4 | .252 | .626 | .203 |
| Instrumental leadership 7 | .189 | .553 | .320 |
| Supportive leadership 3 | .481 | .527 | .028 |
| Supportive leadership 6 | .055 | -.003 | -.844 |
| Participative leadership 1 | .204 | .240 | .718 |
| Instrumental leadership 1 | .357 | .371 | .511 |

*Note.* The extraction procedure was principal component analysis. The rotation procedure was Promax with Kaiser normalization. Rotation converged in seven iterations.

Table A-3

Structure Coefficients

|  | Component | | |
| Item | I | II | III |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Participative leadership 5 | .943 | .524 | .244 |
| Supportive leadership 5 | .935 | .634 | -.063 |
| Supportive leadership 2 | .912 | .446 | .220 |
| Participative leadership 2 | .889 | .278 | .246 |
| Supportive leadership 4 | .850 | .797 | -.086 |
| Supportive leadership 7 | .808 | .620 | -.155 |
| Participative leadership 3 | .808 | .554 | .499 |
| Supportive leadership 10 | .788 | .760 | .062 |
| Participative leadership 4 | .772 | .506 | .275 |
| Supportive leadership 1 | .701 | .456 | -.500 |
| Instrumental leadership 3 | .477 | .935 | .128 |
| Supportive leadership 9 | .672 | .915 | .173 |
| Instrumental leadership 5 | .614 | .883 | .110 |
| Instrumental leadership 6 | .652 | .870 | .075 |
| Supportive leadership 3 | .795 | .815 | .172 |
| Instrumental leadership 4 | .645 | .807 | .335 |
| Supportive leadership 8 | .425 | .766 | .270 |
| Instrumental leadership 7 | .554 | .717 | .433 |
| Instrumental leadership 2 | -.066 | .684 | .204 |
| Instrumental leadership 1 | .637 | .665 | .614 |
| Supportive leadership 6 | -.047 | -.108 | -.838 |
| Participative leadership 1 | .431 | .478 | .782 |

*Note.* The extraction procedure was principal component analysis. The rotation procedure was Promax with Kaiser normalization. Rotation converged in seven iterations.

VITA

Fabio Antonio Moro

712 Wellesley CT A
College Station, Texas 77840
fabio-moro@tamu.edu

Education:

- <u>Doctorate of Philosophy</u>, Human Resource Development—August, 2005
  GPA: 3.9
  College of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development
  Texas A&M University—College Station, Texas

- <u>Master of Education</u>, Educational Technology—May 2000
  GPA: 3.9
  College of Educational Psychology
  Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas

- <u>Bachelor of Science</u>, Political Science and Global Studies
  State University of New York