

The Cross-cultural Leader:

A Comparative Study of Leadership Behaviours in China and New Zealand

(August, 2008)

Candidate's name: Xiang Ao

AUT Business School

Supervisor: Dr Romie Littrell

**A thesis submitted to Auckland University of Technology in fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Philosophy**

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	5
ABSTRACT.....	6
1 INTRODUCTION.....	7
1.1 RESEARCH BACKGROUND	7
1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS.....	9
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
2.1 LEADERSHIP IN CROSS-CULTURAL STUDIES.....	11
2.1.1 <i>Review of leadership theory</i>	11
2.1.2 <i>Global leadership qualities</i>	17
2.2 CULTURAL VALUES AND EFFECTS ON LEADERSHIP	20
2.2.1 <i>Chinese cultural expectations and leadership</i>	23
2.2.2 <i>New Zealand cultural expectations and leadership</i>	28
2.3 CRITIQUE OF LITERATURE REVIEW	31
3 METHOD AND FINDINGS	33
3.1 GLOBE RESEARCH MODEL.....	33
3.1.1 <i>Initial conceptualization and development</i>	33
3.1.2 <i>GLOBE leadership theoretic background and research</i>	36
3.1.3 <i>Criticisms of GLOBE and reasons for using GLOBE</i>	43
3.1.4 <i>The GLOBE leadership survey and hypotheses</i>	45
3.2 PILOT TEST.....	47
3.3 ETIC AND EMIC APPROACH	48
3.4 DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURES.....	49
3.5 PARTICIPANTS.....	50
3.6 RESULTS OF GLOBE LEADERSHIP.....	52
3.6.1 <i>Previous GLOBE research vs. present study</i>	52
3.6.2 <i>China vs. New Zealand data (21 leadership scales)</i>	62
3.6.3 <i>Scales ranked by mean</i>	68
3.6.4 <i>Leadership dimensions</i>	69
3.6.5 <i>China vs. New Zealand data</i>	71
3.6.6 <i>Leadership dimension ranked by mean</i>	75
3.6.7 <i>One-way ANOVA for gender</i>	76
3.6.8 <i>Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (Multivariate ANCOVA)</i>	78
4 DISCUSSION	80
4.1 EXPLANATIONS AND ANALYSIS	80
4.2 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS	85
4.3 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH	87
5 CONCLUSION.....	89
6 REFERENCES.....	91

7	FURTHER READING	99
8	APPENDIX	100

List of tables

Table 1: Comparison of individualistic and collectivist culture.....	23
Table 2: Summary of nine GLOBE cultural dimensions	35
Table 3: First -order leadership scales and compositions	39
Table 4: The components of six leadership attributes	40
Table 5: GLOBE leadership dimensions.....	42
Table 6: China and New Zealand by gender	51
Table 7: Leadership results compared with GLOBE study (21 first -order scales)	53
Table 8: Six second-order results compared with GLOBE study	55
Table 9: Leadership results compared with GLOBE study (21 scales).....	58
Table 10: Six second-order results compared with GLOBE study	60
Table 11: Multivariate Tests	62
Table 12: Results of leadership scales in China × New Zealand data	63
Table 13: The six largest differences across 21 leadership scales	64
Table 14: Scales with the six smallest differences	66
Table 15: Comparisons of ranked means across leadership scales	68
Table 16: Correlation results	70
Table 17: Multivariate Tests	71
Table 18: Results of leadership dimensions	72
Table 19: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects	73
Table 20: Comparative dimensions by ranked means	75
Table 21: ANOVA for gender (China)	76
Table 22: ANOVA for gender (New Zealand)	77
Table 23: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (China)	78
Table 24: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (NZ).....	79

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge my appreciation to my supervisor, Associate Professor Romie Littrell (PhD) who has helped me tremendously in completing this research paper in a timely manner. Dr Littrell has always been thorough and prompt in reviewing my drafts. His supervision has made my research more enjoyable. His useful comments absolutely contribute to the completion of the project.

In addition, I would like to extend my thanks to all the respondents who were involved in this research. I appreciate their time and effort in helping me gather the data by answering the questions on the GLOBE leadership questionnaires.

Above all, I would like to thank my parents who have been giving me, though far away, their support, both emotionally and materially. For that, I am eternally grateful to their effort and assistance.

Abstract

National cultures play a critical role in effective leadership and organisational success in international businesses. Contemporary organisations are therefore challenged by cross-cultural leadership needs to address increasing diversity. In the past decades, there has been a growing interest in studies of non-Western leadership. Recent papers have focused particularly on leadership in the Asia-Pacific region. This paper compares leadership in China and New Zealand, based on the data collected by using the GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness) project leadership questionnaire. In addition, the paper reviews the main findings of previous research in order to investigate the similarities and differences in preferred leadership behaviours/characteristics in both cultures, while attempting to examine the consistency of current findings against the previous GLOBE studies. Significant differences of leadership behaviours between China and New Zealand have been identified.

This paper generally supports the findings of previous GLOBE studies that charismatic/value-based leadership is the universally contributing factor towards outstanding leadership and self-protective leadership is the universally negative factor against leadership excellence. Findings in this paper may contribute to further understanding of leadership practice in these two countries. Future research should be undertaken to examine the effects of cultural differences on organisational practice by a more comprehensive research method.

Keywords: Cross-cultural leadership, China, New Zealand, GLOBE

Paper type: Research paper

1 Introduction

1.1 Research background

According to Vandenberg and Lance (2000), in 1999, inward investment into the OECD achieved more than \$680 billion, and outward investment reached approximately \$760 billion, and the growth continues. In this growth environment, many businesses in developing countries have concentrated on absorbing foreign investment by corporate mergers and acquisitions. For example, *The Economist* states that in 1999 in the United States (U.S) alone, American corporations owned more than \$20 billion worth of Asian companies and over \$40 billion in Latin America. To date, more than half of the world's top 100 economies are multinational organisations (Melloan, 2004). The dynamics of world business has been restructured not solely by the U.S. As a consequence, this effect on the global business landscape cannot be overlooked.

Globalization and global effect are terms widely used in today's business world to explain the new phenomenon of combination and interdependence of capital flows, information, people and ideas in the 21st century. Globalization also pushes organisations to develop innovative mindsets to cope with uncertain and constantly changing environments. Governments throughout the world are seeking more cooperation with other nations to enhance their economic competitiveness. To date, business is confronting unprecedented challenges and competitions for international information, resources and people.

Under this rapid development, Asia-Pacific regions have grown gradually in absolute terms and rapidly in percentage terms, making significant changes in business practices. Their economic effects on global business cannot be ignored. In China, since Deng Xiaoping's initiative in the late 1970s of opening of the Chinese economy to outside development assistance, there has been a gigantic growth in its economic and diplomatic power in the world. China has become the economic centre of Asia. After its entry to the

World Trade Organisation (WTO), with a corresponding trade increase between China and some of the developed nations, China will integrate its economy into the global business system of the future. According to the study by Dietz et al (2008), Chinese industries have been realized the importance of business globalization as a strategic priority and attempt to further the process of being global within ten years.

Among these developed nations, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region, New Zealand seeks more comprehensive relationships with China and intends to pursue more business cooperation due to China's economic growth; it is a source of less expensive goods with a large domestic market. Hence, it can be predicted that there will be more and more commercial interactions between China and New Zealand. For instance, China and New Zealand have established a Free Trade Agreement (FTA). The two sides carried out extensive consultations and increased their consensus on the trade of products and services, technical barriers and other issues. As the bilateral relationships in business go further, in the near future more and more organisations with Chinese backgrounds will be established in New Zealand, and Chinese business people will be working together with New Zealand superiors, subordinates and colleagues.

Many companies are now in global alliances that rely heavily on flexibility and adaptability in national markets, and thus expect their managers to implement leadership to deal with different value systems in both a global and a local sense. A survey of Fortune 500 CEOs indicates that having global leaders is the most important factor to business success and growth. Over 80% of current top executives believe that they have not had adequate effective global leaders, and 67% of the organisations believe their managers' current skills and knowledge are insufficient to deal with management practices in the future (Javidan & House, 2001).

Due to the trend of globalization and increasing diversity, there will be interactions between people in these countries. Therefore, there is a need to undertake cross-cultural studies to assist managers in organisations to meet new challenges by thoroughly understanding the main aspects of globalization. They need to be aware of its impact on

global leaders and know how to obtain some knowledge and skills to respond opportunities in a culturally appropriate manner.

Leadership has been paid a large amount of academic attention all over the world, since appropriate leadership analysis contributes to organisational competitive advantage and company performance improvement. Although most previous research and literature addressing leadership approaches and issues are limited to organisational practice in the West (Littrell, 2002), it is important to also examine the effects of leadership in non-Western world. Undertaking Chinese leadership studies not only assists understanding of Asian leadership approaches but also contributes to study of global leadership.

1.2 Research objectives and questions

This study, therefore, investigates how leadership behaviour is different in China and New Zealand. The primary purpose is to conduct a comparative study and explore the knowledge of effective leadership in the global sense by identifying similarities and differences in perceptions of leadership effectiveness among managers in China and New Zealand. Moreover, it attempts to guide global managers who invest overseas in how to conduct cross-cultural management behaviour in an effective manner.

This study also compares results of previous GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness) studies by Fu et al (2002) and Kennedy (2000). It proposes to confirm that fundamental aspects of national culture, associated with endorsed leadership behaviours are valid beyond the industries the GLOBE project studied. The study addresses the following research questions:

- 1) Are there some significant differences in outstanding leadership behaviours between China and New Zealand?

- 2) What differences of perceptions on leadership behaviours exist between China and New Zealand?
- 3) What are the universal leadership behaviours across China and New Zealand societies?

To properly answer these proposed questions, this study relies on previous GLOBE studies of China and New Zealand leadership styles, and data collection using GLOBE surveys (discussed later) to identify the different perceptions on outstanding leadership behaviours.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Leadership in cross-cultural studies

Undertaking cross-national research contributes to further understanding of culture. Child (1981) presents the idea of convergent and divergent issues in cross-cultural studies and contends that it is important to acknowledge cultural differences when undertaking cross-cultural business and addressing management issues. This indicates that national culture does matter in perceiving different preferences regarding outstanding leadership styles. However, leadership itself is a complex terminology. Before addressing leadership in cross-cultural studies, an understanding of leadership theory seems to be very necessary.

2.1.1 Review of leadership theory

The word 'leadership' can be traced back to Greek and Latin classics and studies of ancient Asian philosophies. From the perspectives of business, leadership is related to essential organisational components such as vision generation and strategic decision making. It contributes to future directions of company growth and development. Therefore, it is of great interest in management and organisational studies with high research value. The domain of leadership research has had many theories proposed over the last decades; earlier leadership focused on transactional exchange behaviours and methods of changing behaviours has often been addressed. Leadership is one of the most intricate and challenging issue faced by business organisations, and a many studies were conducted to address how individuals accomplish organisational success, and to discuss the issue of the practice of leadership (Quinn, 1996). Tait (1996) reviews the nature of leadership introduced by Bass in 1990 as an interaction between group members associated with structuring expectations of those members. Leaders function as change agents by initiating change plans or breaking the status quo, restructuring organisational systems to a new level and achieving the overall business objectives by utilizing their influence.

According to Badaracco (2002), leadership is a product of feelings and thoughts, action and visible behaviour. More importantly, it is the core of performance effectiveness. Traditional leadership perspectives mainly emphasize the dominant roles/functions of leaders such as “heroic leadership bias” (Yukl, 1999). More specifically, leadership is explained as a problem solver or grand coordinator. The relationship between leaders and their followers is a unidirectional flow from leaders to their subordinates. Leadership influence or power utilization is the key factor in stereotypical leadership-centred approaches.

By contrast, participative leadership expects employees/followers to get involved in the organisational decision-making process: thus leaders listen to employees’ feedback, discuss issues together, obtain their advice and take their suggestions into account before final decision making. This participation makes employees believe that like their leaders, they also have some opportunities to discuss problems and influence decision making of organisations (Emery, 1995). Many previous researchers have suggested that this interdependence and participation by involving employees with different views in decision making was demonstrated to have a positive association with work outcomes, performance enhancement and reducing staff turnover.

The behaviour approach. Fleishman was recognized as the pioneer in the study of leadership models in early 1960’s. Similar studies undertaken by Ohio State University introduced leadership approaches at an earlier time (Misumi & Peterson, 1985). These studies basically identify two dimensions of leadership based on behaviour. One is initiating structure, referring to getting work completed, and the other is leadership actions based on developing trust and excellent ties with their subordinates. It argues that leadership is an act of behaviour instead of a personal trait. The focus is on leaders’ actions rather than who are the leaders. Leaders behave differently against non-leaders; it aims to explore leaders’ behavioural frameworks.

The situational approach. This leadership approach emphasizes the importance of situational impact on leadership processes and considers the context of leader-member relations. It argues that effective leadership needs to vary based on different circumstances so there is no universally effective leadership pattern (Yukl, 1999). House's Path-Goal theory (Avery, 2004) linked this with the expectancy of motivation to identify leadership practice, and then observed the impact on employees' job satisfaction. Leaders are thus able to achieve the goal of motivation by rewarding and identifying their own expectations. Later, the situational leadership developed as a changed theory from concentrating on individual leadership behaviours, moving towards leadership implementation within a broader environment.

Transformational leadership approach. Previous traditional leadership perspectives mainly focused on leadership behaviour being a good tactician; they would simply direct their subordinates, manage their performance, and attain their desired outcomes. Recent research paid more attention to the impact of functions of employees and dynamic relationship between leaders and their subordinates. In other words, leaders start to raise the consciousness of their subordinates by appealing to greater performance.

In the review of leadership theory today, transformational leadership is identified as the most highly valued approach even though the concept is not brand new.

Transformational (charismatic) leadership approaches argue that leadership is a more complex process, by recognizing the importance of collective identity (Jung, 2001). Jung (2001) comments that followers' cognitions are important in understanding the nature of a leadership dynamic process, thus some leadership theories take a follower-based approach.

Transformational leadership aims to fulfil the intrinsic needs of subordinates, bringing together individual expectations that can lead to the achievement of overall business objectives. Furthermore, transformational leaders attempt to increase the level of followers' awareness, engaging with their motivations. The four essential components

of transformational leadership are outlined as idealized impact, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration (Judge & Bono, 2000).

Idealized impact means leaders behave in an effective and unique way to make employees follow on an emotional level, with high standards of ethical conduct (Avery, 2004). Inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation means leaders have articulated their future goals with strong vision, building up confidence and enthusiasm in their followers. Leaders persuade followers to take innovative actions by divergent thinking. Individual consideration refers to accommodating the personal needs and expectations of individuals so that their performance can be effectively improved.

The transformational leadership approach contends that leaders behave beyond ordinary expectations, pursuing higher needs and transforming followers' self-concepts to fit organisational objectives by generating a vision of developing employees' collective identity. In other words, transformational leaders articulate visions that resonate with their subordinates, and encourage them on to broader organisational goal attainment. Personal qualities such as strong motivation, persistence, willingness, outstanding communication abilities and high levels of self-confidence, all contribute to the success of generating such a vision. This approach aims to alter subordinates' behaviours to achieve performance effectiveness by steering their own actions towards greater-than-expected outcome attainment.

Asian leadership approach. By comparison with Western leadership approaches, Asian theories of leadership have a dominant perspective of traits. The first accepted explanation of leadership is Misumi's (1985) performance-maintenance theory from Japan. This presents four types of leaders based on two fundamental roles of performance and maintenance. Performance here refers to leaders' capabilities of planning, directing and developing work procedures, giving encouragement and putting pressure on their followers so that they can work more effectively to reach their desired goals. Maintenance means leaders promote group stability and keep good social networking. The main idea of performance-maintenance leadership theory is very

similar to task-oriented and people-focused leadership approaches. This leadership theory is widely used in Japan.

Wang and Satow (1994) developed a leadership framework of four functional dimensions to examine the effects of ideal leadership styles/behaviours in Chinese-Japanese joint ventures. The four dimensions consist of expectancy, sentiment, informative and trustworthiness in leadership styles. More specifically, expectancy refers to a leader's expectations towards their subordinates' performance and competence in carrying out direct instructions. The sentiment style involves a leader's emotional support to subordinates' feelings, viewpoints and interpersonal relations. It is a follower-oriented and respected pattern. The informative dimension consists of leaders' giving direction and providing technical skills and knowledge to subordinates, sharing important and essential information during operational activities. Lastly, trustworthiness emphasizes the leaders' own abilities towards organisational management and control of followers' performance. Effective leaders should have personal characteristics that inspire their organisational members to follow the proposed instructions willingly. They endeavour to gain the trust of their subordinates and impart sufficient skills to make their own decisions and solve problems in a constantly changing environment.

As the two-factor leadership theory suggests, Chinese leadership added one more factor: the moral attribute in the P-M Asian leadership approach (Ling, 1989). Ling (1989) identified four characteristics of the moral factor, including commitment to obeying the law and regulations, establishing a positive attitude towards the CCP (Chinese Communist Party) and following the CCP commands even when personal expectations conflict with the Party's interest and fairness to all employees. Littrell (2002) develops a new character of responsiveness to feedback from workers. Ling and Fang (2003) present a Chinese implicit leadership theory that emphasizes four attributes consisting of personal morality, effective goal attainment, interpersonal capacity and versatility in addressing the issues of Chinese leadership practices.

Based on the previous research, leadership in business practice comes from the perceptions of behaviours and personal characteristics that can achieve performance enhancement. Discussion of leadership theory contributes to further understanding its effects on cross cultural background.

2.1.2 Global leadership qualities

A question that is frequently asked is why leaders are able to succeed in domestic operations but are not necessarily performing well in a global context. One possible response is that the skills and knowledge to be global leaders are different from those needed in domestic contexts. Another response is that leaders need to develop and enhance their competencies to a higher level. Globalization effects make organisations realize the important role of organisational factors. Business performance improvement is not solely dependent upon leaders, as effective individuals, groups and teamwork are also needed. At this stage, leaders are expected to share the power and responsibility of managing organisational activities (Bradford & Cohen, 1998). Based on this, Dalton (1998) presents the four essential competencies of global leadership roles, which include high levels of cognitive perceptions, outstanding communication and interpersonal skills, an ability to learn from mistakes and experience, and moral vigilance.

Similarly, Pearce and Sims (2000) state that compared to vertical, directive leadership approaches, post-heroic leadership is a shared approach. Since subordinates have become working partners of leaders, the mutual impact of leaders and their followers cannot be overlooked in pursuing organisational success. Interestingly, questions are raised to answer what sort of desirable leadership abilities are expected under the globalization influence today. Do they have to obtain some skills that are totally different from their domestic context or they just need to upgrade their existing qualities to a broader level (McCall & Hollenbeck, 2002)?

Globalization generates many opportunities but brings many challenges as well. One of the challenges is how to understand diverse cultural values and practices in the world. Cultural differences will impact on most of the organisational performance elements, such as leadership behaviours, management systems and effectiveness. Baruch (2002) claims that global leadership competencies are regarding those universal skills and

qualities that make people perform well outside their own culture no matter what positions they have and what ethical background they are from.

According to Harris and Moran (1987), who focus on cross-cultural research, the key point of cross-cultural study is interaction, and leaders can be successfully selected by cross-cultural training on openness, persistence, respect for others and mutual communication skills. Srinivas (1995) also identifies some components of global mindsets for people entering the global environment. These elements are concerned with context, diversity awareness and cultural sensitivity. Furthermore, Brake (1997) presents a Global Leadership Triad model with four categories, including network management, business acumen, self-transformation and personal effectiveness. This research is consistent with Goldsmith and Walt's (1999) desired leadership characteristics for the future, namely global thinking, cultural diversity, attention, building partnerships and sharing leadership.

The cross-cultural study of leadership has developed as a research main stream since 1990's (Dickson et al., 2003). The key developments are global leadership, leadership across nations and leadership in multinational organisations (Connerley & Pederson, 2005). These research findings of cross-cultural leadership studies reveal that leadership practice is culturally impacted. This idea is supported by Miroshnik (2002) which says that leaders in a global sense have to note the cultural factor effects that can influence business practice. There is abundant literature addressing cross-cultural management and leadership (Ralston, Gustafson, Cheung & Terpstra, 1993). Parry (1996) states that leaders in multicultural organisations need to make sure that employees understand their approaches and functions so that they can work in a harmonious context.

Similarly, Morrison (2000) indicates that global leaders should share information about their own culture and know how to adapt to other cultures. Moreover, they need to identify the gaps between cultures and learn how to bridge them. Overall, the nature of effective global leadership can be summarized as the ability to influence their followers from different cultural backgrounds. They need to have a global outlook, tolerate high

levels of conflict and pursue an appropriate balance to reach their desired objectives as they move from one cultural background to another.

Based on the previous studies, most of the suggestions for global leaders are relatively brief and generalized, such as understanding and respecting other cultures or fulfilling the cultural gaps. They fail to guide leaders in detail on how to behave and achieve these responsibilities. With the acceleration of business globalization in the 1990s, more and more academics have growing concerns about the way cultural differences impact on leadership behaviours (Littrell, 2002).

Hofstede (1998) identifies five cultural components and illustrates their influences on leadership in different countries. According to this preliminary study, national culture colours most aspects of human behaviours, such as leaders' behaviours, knowledge of culture and its cultural influence. In addition to this, cultural adaptability is introduced by House et al. (2001) as an ability not only understand other cultures at the conceptual level but also to behave in a way that is able to achieve objectives and establish a positive network in other cultural contexts.

Culture has been explained as a set of shared values about desirable behaviours and patterns. If leaders' behaviours or patterns are congruent with values shared by the societies, leadership will be viewed to be effective and successful. To date, non-Western cultures such as Confucianism have been changed in the globalization process, since Western cultures expect management philosophies to influence them in many aspects of trade, education and information sharing. Meanwhile, Western cultures also start to experience some cultural challenges throughout the globalization (Jensen Arnett, 2002). To responsively cope with people from different cultures, global leaders are expected to incorporate cross-cultural knowledge and skills, so as to consider the impact of international factors on their business and understand that the nature of leadership is different across nations. The GLOBE studies (discussed later) demonstrate that outstanding leaders are viewed as encouraging confidence builders, motivational, inspirational, having extra foresight, as well as encouraging teamwork and having

excellent communication skills. Echoing these findings, effective cross-cultural leaders are supportive and supposed to make decisions and behave in a culturally sensitive way.

Following this review of the existing literature, it is clear that previous studies propose many components or behaviours that global leaders need to perform; they need to bring out the best for their followers, build up trust through emotional connection with people from different cultural backgrounds and pursue a win-win situation of mutual benefit. In general, their behaviour can be summarised as having three main dimensions.

Firstly, technical skills. These refer to universal management skills that are consistent with leadership in a domestic context such as experience, tangible knowledge and self-management.

Secondly, emotional competencies. These refer to having the mental ability to guide concrete actions, accept complexity, and build confidence under differing circumstances such as optimism and self-regulation. In addition, they build up trust by emotionally connecting with people from different backgrounds, and establish an emotional identification with their subordinates.

Thirdly, personal drive. Technical skills and emotional competencies are insufficient criteria of being effective global leaders. Personal drive has been described as individual competencies such as being proactive, self-awareness, and acceptance of taking risks, motivation, and ambition in international work environment. Leaders are expected to have a strong desire to experience and learn new things. These three dimensions outline the essential qualities of effective leaders working either in a culture different from their own or in a diverse circumstance. In essence, global leaders need to align and adapt leadership processes with cultural expectations.

2.2 Cultural values and effects on leadership

Culture and leadership are directly relevant in organisational issues. Many researchers have argued that culture has a tremendous impact on leadership behaviours. National

culture influences the application of management practices in different societies. Global management has undertaken cross-cultural research based on the assumption that there is a relationship between national culture and leadership practice. Numerous comparative studies have examined the correlations between culture and leadership (House et al, 2007). In reviewing previous studies, there is increasing concern that national culture is able to influence leadership efforts and behaviours in the workplace.

With regard to a definition of culture in management research, Kempton et al. (1995) suggest that cultural patterns shape the issues that people view as critical, influencing their perceptions and reactions to them. Culture is a value and belief system that influences what people believe to be acceptable and not acceptable. People from one culture naturally share common values, and thus interpret things in a basically similar way, while people from different cultures are more likely to interpret things in different ways. According to Hofstede (1998), culture is not solely an individual characteristic. As a system for shared meaning and mental programming, culture reflects the collective cognitive perceptions and traditions of people in an environment. Rapid technological improvement and development has extended the impact of Western culture to the rest of the world. Meanwhile, the process of globalization also introduced non-Western values to individuals and societies in the West. The mutual effects of cultural value have influenced leadership practices today.

There has been a growing research interest in how national culture impacts on leadership practices in organisational studies. Many theorists and researchers have demonstrated how cultural factors and values influence the perceptions and behaviours of leadership (Hofstede, 1998; House, 1998; House et al., 2001). The most important study on culture and organisational leadership was Geert Hofstede's (1980)'s work on IBM based on his 40-country study of 88,000 organisational members (Hofstede, 2006). He introduced the concept of individualism (the extent to which people are oriented towards their own interests against the interests of the society that they belong to), power distance (the extent to which how close the relationships between leaders and followers), uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation (the extent to which a culture programs its

members to accept shared norms and emotional needs). Consistent with this study, Hofstede (2001) further established the empirical foundations of two factors for national cultures consisting of individualism-collectivism and power distance. According to his work, power distance refers to the extent to which the members accept power and its distribution in organisations.

In a Western culture that values individualism, peoples are able to define and evaluate their actions independently; seldom do they use social class, work or religious background to link with performance. The individual self is considered to be the basic unit and source of purpose and goals. The relationship between leaders and followers is based on the assumption of mutual well-being. This cultural pattern is characterized by emotional independence from groups and organisations. In individualistic cultures such as New Zealand, a person's own ability is much more important than their social background or group membership. Management practices concentrate on the individual needs of employees by distinct performance assessment and motivation strategies.

By contrast, in most collectivist cultures people prefer to use organisations instead of individuals to assess their performance; they always emphasize the importance of group membership and interpersonal relations with group members. Their identity is based on the strong and cohesive in-groups they come from. Cooperation becomes extremely important under this cultural pattern. As a consequence, maintaining harmony within group members becomes necessary and essential. Activities that can potentially threaten group harmony are not welcomed. The relationship between leaders and followers is linked by the moral components of any in-groups networks.

Personal values shape the main aspects of national culture, national cultural values and characteristics in which organisations operate, thus further influencing leadership understanding and other issues in business practice. With regard to leadership, effective leaders in most cultures are usually expected to have both emotional attributes (care, friendly, or supportive characteristics) and task-oriented attributes (emphasis on production, performance enhancement, sufficient knowledge). Hofstede (1998)

re-presents some aspects of distinctions between individualistic and collectivistic cultures as shown in the following table.

Table 1: Comparison of individualistic and collectivist culture

Individualistic culture	Collectivist culture
Identity is based on individual	Identity is based on social network
Self-interest of each individual is the ultimate goal	Harmony and consensus are the ultimate goals
Manager-employee relationship is based on the mutual benefits.	Manager-employee relationship is based on moral terms such as a family network
Decision making is based on individual skills and rules only	Decisions making have to take in-group account

2.2.1 Chinese cultural expectations and leadership

Confucianism, introduced by Kong Zi (551-479 B.C.), forms the main root of Chinese culture: it was developed by Meng Zi and highly promoted in dynasties throughout Chinese history. In the Song Dynasty (960-1126), a royal scholar named Dong Zhongshu particularly advocated the importance of Confucianism and to encourage this, other schools of thoughts were absolutely forbidden. Even though there were two major schools of thought in ancient China (Buddhism, introduced from India in the Tang Dynasty, and traditional Taoism), it is Confucianism that continuously influences Chinese society and individuals up to the present time (Farth & Cheng, 1999).

The primary tenet of Confucianism was understanding people and life, to establish a moral social order that would advise people on how to behave properly, thus it is mainly based on human activities. Basically, Confucianism ideas are some moral disciplines of right behaviours that are universally accepted and expected by the society (Xu, 1991). The key components encompass the class system, obedience and Renqing (see below).

These ideas were highly promoted by some classical textbooks such as “Four Books” earlier in Spring-Autumn and Warring states periods.

Obedience. The order of the hierarchical relationship is fixed from the higher classes to the lower classes. Therefore, people should unconditionally obey the orders from the top. Interestingly, the meaning of word “country “or Guojia is different from western definitions of state. The social relationships between emperor- minister, father-son, husband-wife and brother-brother shape interesting phenomena that state and family are closely linked each other (Wong, 2001). More specially, in a dynasty, the Emperor is the top class; other followers are regarded as his children. Children (particularly male) must obey his orders no matter what he says. This relationship also can be applied in a small family scenario, so that children and wives must listen to their fathers/husbands no matter what they say. If fathers die, the oldest brothers take over fathers’ roles. This relationship of father-son is always important. According to Confucianism, the older you are, the more experience you get. Young people should respect elderly people. The oldest male represents the absolute power in a family. The high power distance combines with this obedience, as Farth and Cheng (1999) suggest, leads to deep-rooted paternalistic leadership and it still has huge influence in many overseas Chinese corporations. They also observe that Chinese society has a tremendous impact of personalism, which allows human factors to get involved in decision making. This strong collective orientation results in Chinese leaders preferring to use indirect forms of influence to enhance organisational performance.

Class system (social status). In Feudal society, there were two main classes in China, landlords and farmers. According to Confucianism, the existence of class cannot disappear. The social status is given at birth, no matter what position you have. Everyone is not equal, so some people’s lives are extremely precious and others’ lives are small and cheap. People in higher positions are able to control those in lower social status. China’s emperors, representatives of higher classes, have the absolute authority to control everything. Hence, Chinese leadership values bureaucracy (Yeung & Tung, 1996).

Renqing. Confucianism ideas mainly guide people to do something ethically right. They believe that moral virtues are more powerful than laws. Law can force people to do something in a short term, but sense of shame and honour can guide people in what to do and what not to do at any time, rather than enforcing punishments. Renqing expects people to be kind, warm-hearted and righteous (Tom, 1989). In leadership, Chinese leaders believe friendliness is absolutely useful to business growth and development.

It has been suggested that Confucian ideas place an emphasis of consciousness of mind, not telling people good or bad things, but advising people how they should do things properly. On the other hand, the cultural effect influences leadership behaviours and thus results in a unique and stiff image of leadership practice in certain cultural backgrounds. Chinese leadership is heavily influenced by Confucian ideas such as high performance focus, high institutional orientation and high in-group collectivism (Fu, Chow & Peng, 2002). Therefore emotional attention, group membership, morality, duty and obligations shaped the early elements of Chinese leadership theory.

Compared to other cultures, Chinese culture particularly emphasizes the importance of “Guan Xi” or networking in the English explanation. It suggests that relationships with other people or communities are essentially important to success. Guanxi is a personal quality relationship that decides the relevant behaviour and the way people treat each other. In other words, it could be explained as a friendship with implications of favour exchange. As Bian and Ang (1997) described it, Guanxi can be used to exchange promises for each other. The closer Guanxi you have, the more possible it is that you will be easily forgiven and not for making mistakes, while being able to achieve goals quicker than competitors. Guanxi relates to “who (somebody) you know instead of what you know”.

For instance, if you do not have a good relationship with your local business government agencies, it is highly unlikely that you could set up your own business in the area even though you met all their requirements. Also, despite the fact that you are an excellent

staff member with many skills, it is not easy to get promoted if you do not know how to keep a good relationship (Guanxi) with your colleagues and your boss. In most cases, this relationship can be successfully built by gifts. Gift giving in China is a common tradition for maintaining long-term relationships and seeking favours. This again demonstrates the importance of “People” in Chinese culture (Dorfman, 1998).

In a business enterprise context, leadership is normally replaced by another word called “headship” which means treating people such as friends instead of bosses. This cultural effect indicates that leaders and members should be concerned and considered even outside work. Ideal heads (leaders) show their respect and know not only their employees’ performance at work but also other non-work issues such as their families. It could be said that Chinese leaders and leaders are encouraged to develop a harmonious interpersonal relationship.

Before the policy of reforming and opening the country in the late 1970s, the Chinese government used socialism ideology from when the new China was founded in 1949, after the Civil War between KMT (Kuo Min Tang) and the Communist Party (1946-1949) was over. Before this, the government operated a highly centralized planned economic system. Under this institutional framework, the state council was the absolute authority with several sub-councils or commissions underneath. Local governments could do nothing but obey the orders from central government agencies. As a consequence, there was no leadership concept at organisational level at that time; all the organisations including business enterprises just fulfilled the needs of the state government without any other managing or leading ideas.

The economic reform and opening policies terminated the centralized planned economic system and introduced the idea of market economy from the west. Simultaneously, many western values that may be inconsistent with traditional ideas, such as promotion of effectiveness, performance orientation and competition, were also introduced in Chinese business. It also took several decades for the Chinese government to adjust its function and separate state government from business practices so that real business

could be established. Thus the top authorities became less reliable and organisations had to be economically independent and follow the rules to survive and develop. Under this background, organisational leaders started to realize their functions had been changing from simply following the orders of top agencies to considering how to keep their own business running (Fu & Wu, 2000).

To sum up, Confucianism has been the predominant cultural heritage in the Chinese culture pattern. Under the firm influence of Confucian philosophies, Chinese leadership shaped three important features.

Firstly, leaders have overwhelmingly authoritarian impacts and control over their subordinates, they pursue unquestionable obedience. Leaders value status and hierarchy, they stress the importance of differences among group members, with inequality as the core of this cultural pattern and they place an emphasis on people.

Secondly, to successfully implement this, leaders simultaneously show their individualized concern with followers' personal well-being to illustrate of their superior self-disciplines and unselfishness.

Thirdly, Guanxi as well as other cultural elements in Chinese patterns, is viewed as extremely important in the business setting of a weak legal environment. In this context, leadership implementation and success is more likely to rely on individual relationships based on cultural values.

Overall, Chinese leadership values hierarchy and people prefer certain leadership behaviours such as careful supervision, high loyalty, strong reliance of interpersonal networks, trust and unconditional obedience/respect because they believe these practices are disciplines with socially desirable characteristics.

2.2.2 New Zealand cultural expectations and leadership

New Zealand culture owes much to its European roots, stemming from Great Britain in the mid-nineteenth century. At the current time, New Zealand leadership still tends to be deeply influenced by British philosophies. However, despite the heritage of British culture, New Zealand native Maori makes the country bicultural. Due to its close tie with Australia and more recent cooperation with other countries in the Asia-Pacific area, modern New Zealand society is comprised of three key elements including transplanted British culture, native Maori traditions and contemporary immigration mainly from Asia-Pacific region, forming the multicultural New Zealand society of today.

Individualist cultures such as New Zealand promote the importance of self-reliance. People stress the values of equality and independence (Trevor-Roberts & Kennedy, 2003). Compared to the importance of social status and power difference in Chinese culture, New Zealand still presents a typical Anglo-Saxon style and features low power distance and high individualism (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998). They believe that we are all independent and equal in status, making individual decisions, and that achievements should be much more important than class or social background. According to Lok and Crawford (2004), authority is legitimized mainly based on performance instead of a formal position.

Hines (1973) suggests that New Zealand leaders place a greater weight on the interpersonal networks than European and U.S. counterparts do. This may be attributed to the small and medium sizes of New Zealand organisations. When people start to work in New Zealand organisations, nine out of ten training sessions would occur face-to-face. The leaders cannot be easily identified as they work with their colleagues without any position difference. Leadership in New Zealand is called “mateship” meaning we are all working mates without anything special. Organisational members are able to interact one another at all levels in companies. As Inkson and Henshall (1990) state, New Zealand society does not have a class difference, and individuality and independence are valued.

Compared to the importance of status consciousness or bureaucracy in Chinese leadership, New Zealand leadership cares more about business performance. Similar to this, Irving and Inkson (1998) contend that in small organisations, employees and leaders know each other personally, decisions are made face-to-face and problems are easily found and paid attention. Unlike the CEOs in U.S. and Europe, subordinates can have dinners and conversations with their leaders whenever they need to and leaders also can get the feedbacks on their work attitudes and performance quickly and easily. It can be said that New Zealand leadership places a high value on information sharing and achievement, as they believe it contributes to their organisational success and growth. Hence, the role of communication cannot be overlooked.

Because of the small size of most organisations, New Zealand leadership is conservative regarding changes to existing rules and norms, and does not take risks. On the contrary, it prefers the stability and security consistent with the New Zealand high level of uncertainty avoidance (Singer, 1985). Based on Inkson's findings, Campbell-Hunt and Corbett (1996) further comment that leadership in New Zealand highlights the importance of interaction amongst people. Naturally, the role of teamwork is viewed as important. They also point out that New Zealand leaders do not give sufficient attention to some long-term issues, such as career development and strategic planning, as they are overwhelmed with day-to-day and short-term issues within their enterprises. In brief, leadership in New Zealand is not highly future-oriented.

According to the survey results on testing managerial effectiveness of New Zealand leaders, by Cammock, Nilakant and Dakin (1995), effective leaders should be positive, quick to learn, honest, trustworthy, supportive and approachable. Also, they need to have some less demonstrable and soft skills such as valuing staff, crediting, motivating and generating vision. Based on this, effective leaders are likely to be transformational people-oriented characters. This finding is consistent with Rippin's (1995) notion that interpersonal skill is a critical component in New Zealand leadership, in that it concentrates on working with a team rather than individuals and advises how to

effectively manage people. Further, Rippin's (1995) study also found that effective leaders are considered to be consultative, sensitive, impassionate and just (treating people at their equal without any bias). All of these key words are directly associated with transformational leadership behaviours or human-oriented approach.

Kennedy (2000) contends that the ideal New Zealand leaders are supposed to build up confidence and conviction; they are able to arouse enthusiasm and passions of performance, enhance employees' morale in order to stimulate people's unexceptional work efforts. The study also confirms that New Zealand leaders place a particular emphasis on relations between leaders and employees and performance effectiveness. As previous GLOBE study of New Zealand suggest, leaders who are inspirational, visionary and performance-oriented are viewed as effective leaders.

In contrast to Confucianism in Chinese culture, the New Zealand counterpart is characterized by Maori themes emerging from diversity of New Zealand societies (Tapsell, 1997). In Tapsell's study, he presents a Maori leadership model dominated by women. Elder-mothers hold the absolute power in families and mothers usually lead the whole family from behind. The leadership style from family situations can be applied to organisational contexts as well. Maori decision-making aims to reach a consensus because of the communal nature of Maori tradition. Sometimes it takes some days or even weeks to reach an agreement, so patience is important to facilitate this process. Excellent oral communication skills are vital for motivation and persuasion. In relationship management, Maori leaders mainly integrate with their subordinates and play roles of spokespeople, being trusted by their staff and treating them such as co-workers instead of employees. This illustrates the importance of teamwork.

In brief, New Zealand Maori leadership emphasizes some people-related traits such as inspiration, performance and teamwork. The leadership dimension of team-based style is widely accepted in the New Zealand context. It can be predicted that the Maori cultural theme will have influenced mainstream of business leadership models in the future.

As New Zealand pays more attention to its geographical location as part of the Asia-Pacific region, its philosophies start to absorb more diverse ideas and became gradually different from its British origins. A survey based on comparisons of China and New Zealand leaders, developed by Akoorie and Leung (1994), indicates that western management could be an inappropriate way to discuss New Zealand leadership. According to their study, China and New Zealand share more similarities than differences in some management and leadership styles. More specifically, leaders in both countries would give sufficient autonomy to their followers and place a particular emphasis on participation throughout the decision-making process. Other Asian management approaches such as loyalty (China), effectiveness/Just-in-time (Japan) and teamwork can be easily found in today's New Zealand leadership patterns.

2.3 Critique of literature review

Previous studies conducted in China and New Zealand indicate that culture represents a way of thinking and innate patterns from the start of societies. It values certain expectations and influences individual perceptions of things. Therefore, it has important implications to people's attributes and actions. Leadership characteristics in China and New Zealand were bred and developed in dissimilar cultural contexts with different assumptions on outstanding leadership. To link with proposed research question 1, significant differences between outstanding leadership behaviours should be identified. China and New Zealand each interpret ideal leadership patterns from their own worldviews. Leaders could prefer certain leadership practices as they believe these characteristics are perceived as socially desirable and acceptable criteria.

For instance, in a culture that values bureaucracy, power distance and decisiveness such as China, leaders would prefer to have control and obedience, whereas in a culture that promotes egalitarianism such as New Zealand, leaders would be expected to be consultative. Kenis (1977) has a theory of environmental factors. He points out political, cultural, educational and economic environments are all able to influence management

practices and ideologies, making them different from nation to nation. The degree of influence and prestige given to leaders varies in different societies.

Conversely, to answer the third research question, I believe that China and New Zealand leadership styles have something in common. Even China and New Zealand hold different cultural values, yet human nature is basically the same regardless of national culture. This point is also supported by early study of Kenis (1977). He states that managerial philosophies are universally acceptable with similar outcomes regardless of country and culture. General supervision and participation will lead to performance enhancement and desired goal attainment across cultures. Paternalistic leaders control but support to their subordinates and morally emphasize the importance of personal role model building. This is consistent with New Zealand characteristics of teamwork, personal charisma and image generating. I believe that leaders with high level of motivation, communication and personal charisma are viewed to be effective and acceptable in these two cultures.

In Sum, both countries have some transnational perceptions on outstanding leadership across cultures and also retain other characteristics that are unique to particular contexts. The key goals of cross-cultural leadership research involve searching for universally acceptable characteristics and/or attributes and exploring the etic and emic nature of their theoretical elements. Despite the fact that there are some similarities of cultural effects on leadership practices, actual leadership practice does vary from culture to culture (Dorfman, 1998). This paper tries to answer three proposed research questions, it provides a deeper and comprehensive understanding of how different and similar on perceptions of outstanding leadership under each cultural context so as to explore which attributes are universally acceptable and which are not.

3 Method and findings

Based on the discussion of literature review, this study aims to specify how outstanding leadership behaviours differ under different cultural contexts. More importantly, it attempts to explore the effects of national culture towards perceptions of outstanding leadership. To answer the research questions, GLOBE research program is applied in this study.

3.1 GLOBE research model

GLOBE is the acronym for the Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness project, the name of a cross-cultural research study. It is a multi-phased research instrument designed to develop systematic knowledge of the way national cultures affect perceptions of leadership (House, Javidan & Dorfman, 2001). The research program, involving over 170 academics, is an important source of data on cultural values and practices as well as leadership attributes in more than 62 countries (House, Javidan & Dorfman, 2001).

GLOBE is a large research effort offering useful tools for understanding cultural effects and developing the sensitivity to achieve leadership effectiveness in a global context. It was designed to investigate the intricate effects of culture on business leadership and effectiveness, and the human impacts of societies studied. It aims to fulfil the substantial gap on cross-cultural factors affecting organisational and leadership practices, by examining the roles of societal and organisational values. The GLOBE findings are very useful for analyzing some theoretical social issues in business and societies

3.1.1 Initial conceptualization and development

The original idea for GLOBE generated by House was traced back to the summer of 1991. At this time, a large amount of research had been undertaken and published regarding the validity of the neo-charismatic leadership framework. Based on the

research of leadership charisma in India, Singapore and Netherlands, it suggested charismatic leadership behaviour may be a universally acceptable factor in achieving leadership excellence. After reading Hofstede's book and other cross cultural literature, the GLOBE research design was planned without doing a literature review. In the earlier stage of the project, House spent nearly one year looking at factors pertaining to methodological issues on GLOBE (House, 1998a).

The preliminary research design was drafted in the summer of 1992 by many business scholars. Based on the work of Hofstede's four cultural dimensions and five additional dimensions (gender, assertiveness, performance, humane and future concentration), a questionnaire item pool was drafted with roughly 300 questions: later items were added, up to 735 in total. The GLOBE research design was finalized in mid-May, 1993 (House, 1998b).

With regard to scale development, country co-investigators (CCIs) undertook focus groups and interviews between 1994 and 1995 to assess the questionnaire items. These items were translated and translated back and then sorted into the theoretical categories for which they were intended. During the focus groups and interviews, CCIs ensured that items were not rude or offensive in any particular culture, and were readily understandable and interpretable. Eventually, after deleting or rewriting some problematic items, 536 items were retained in the questionnaire. It was tested and administered to small samples of 15-30 individuals in each of 30 nations, most of whom had some working experience, ideally but not necessarily business managerial.

Extensive quantitative and qualitative researches of 62 societies were conducted worldwide. There are three key sections in the GLOBE project. Section 1 involves the development of research instruments. Section 2 evaluates nine key dimensions in both societal and organisational cultures, with six critical leadership dimensions dealing with how these nine cultural dimensions impact on leadership behaviours. Section 3 focuses on the studying the effectiveness of specific leadership behaviours on subordinates'

performance (House et al., 2004). The following table gives a summary of the nine GLOBE cultural dimensions.

Table 2: Summary of nine GLOBE cultural dimensions

<i>No.</i>	<i>Cultural Dimensions</i>	<i>Explanation</i>
1	Power Distance	Refers to the degree to which societal members expect power to be distributed equally
2	Uncertainty Avoidance	Refers to the extent to which a society relies on its given norms, values to alleviate unpredictability of future
3	Humane Orientation	Refers to the degree to which a society encourages and rewards individuals for being fair, altruistic, generous and caring
4	Institutional Collectivism	The degree to which society institutional practices advocate collective distribution of resources and collective action
5	In-Group Collectivism	Individuals express pride, loyalty and cohesiveness in their families
6	Assertiveness	Individuals are assertive, dominant and demanding in their relationships with others
7	Gender Egalitarianism	The degree to which a society minimises gender inequality
8	Future Orientation	The extent to which a society encourages future-orientated behaviours such as delaying gratification, planning and investing in the future
9	Performance Orientation	Refers to the degree to which a society encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence

Source: House & Javidan (2004).

With regard to leadership, the GLOBE project identified leadership characteristics that are universally viewed to be effective across cultures, specified particular leadership attributes in some cultures and discussed their results for business leaders in a global sense. The findings contribute to improvement of leadership practices. The research summarized universally positive and culture-specific leadership attributes from

geographical areas around the world, with some practical and academic implications for management and leadership studies. The questions the GLOBE program originally attempted to answer were:

- ❖ What cognitive processes impact on which cultural effects of organisational practices and leadership implementation?
- ❖ Whether there are universally accepted leadership behaviours/attributes and regarded as effective factors (Are there some leadership characteristics/behaviours/attributes that are/are not commonly accepted across cultures?)
- ❖ Identification of culture specific leadership attributes and organisational practices that are viewed as effective in countries investigated (Are there some leadership characteristics/ behaviours/attributes that are only effective in some particular culture?)

Because of limited time and resource in this study, I only used the leadership part of the survey to conduct my research.

3.1.2 GLOBE leadership theoretic background and research

As the GLOBE research describes, leadership behaviours differ across cultures in their different emphasis on individualistic or team orientation; authoritarian or democratic focus (Dorfman, 1998). In addition, Dorfman and colleagues (1997) present three contingency leadership behaviours that are universally effective (leadership supportiveness, contingent reward and personal charisma). The findings of GLOBE reveal that leadership concepts and behaviours as well as prototypes are culturally associated with cultural dimensions. As the cross-cultural studies research further, task-oriented and relationship-oriented leadership dimensions seem to be increasingly important leadership behaviours in many cultures. Yukl (1999) also contends that transformational leaders are more effective and accepted than transactional leaders in

most countries. This point generally supports the potential impact of transformational leadership across cultures.

An agreed leadership definition was clearly explained at the Calgary meeting in 1995. The GLOBE project agreed on the consensus of leadership as the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute towards the effectiveness and success of the organisations of which they are members (House et al., 2004, p15). According to this definition, the importance of leadership behaviours is emphasized. Explicit leadership behaviours are easily observable whilst implicit behaviours are implied, not directly performed, and normally via perceptions, values/ attitudes about leadership. As one of the theoretical bases in the GLOBE project, implicit leadership theory (House & Javidan, 2004) believes that individuals have some common characteristics such as assumptions, beliefs, stereotypes and behaviours that are identified as effective, moral and outstanding leaders. It distinguishes leaders from non-leaders and effective leaders from ineffective leaders, by their knowledge, cognition and assumptions. These implicit values/beliefs and assumptions are used in information recall and processing to interpret specific events and activities as well as in choosing effective leaders.

As the theory suggests, effective leaders strongly depend on how they can match these criteria held by their subordinates. The perception of leadership behaviour has been addressed in terms of classifying certain attributes and characteristics that shape a cognitive prototype. This cognitive prototype is viewed to be the core element of implicit leadership theory in that it comes up with an abstract concept and generates some expectations against actual leadership actions thus influences philosophies of leadership effectiveness and reactions on outstanding leadership achievement (Lord & Maher, 1991). When social members have a similar and shared idea of what attributes and behaviours are desirable and which outstanding leaders have them, it represents a culturally endorsed theory of effective leaders. Previous research revealed that the closer the match between the participants' prototype and attributes/characteristics of outstanding leaders, the more possible the leader was rated as effective and successful.

The implicit leadership theory facilitates the leadership practice and influence of culture because leadership is about networking and managing people who have values and beliefs in a society, and are influenced by the culture of that society. It defines leadership behaviours as a process in which people identify outstanding leaders based on their own criteria and perceptions. Nonetheless, this theory also indicates that leadership behaviours are not necessarily always different across cultures. Previous GLOBE studies found some universal leadership attributes across societies to examine leaders' roles. A possible reason for these universals may be attributed to other forces beyond cultural influence such as basic and fundamental human nature.

Data collection for hypothesis testing in this study started in June 1995; the objective was to generate data from at least three corporations in each of two industries in each nation. The proposed industries were targeted as food processing, telecommunications and financial services. For targeted respondents, the GLOBE used middle leaders to complete the survey by rating certain designed leadership behaviours and characteristics. According to Hofstede (2006), the reason why the respondents are middle leaders rather than employees or top executives is that middle leaders are both producers and customers of leadership. On the one hand, they directly report to top-level executives, experiencing leadership as recipients. On the other hand, they direct operational levels subordinates and exert their influence thus performing such as leaders. By the end of May 1998, data were collected from 60 countries consisting of 17,000 middle manager questionnaire responses. The GLOBE project presents 21 first-order leadership scales and further develops 6 second-order leadership dimensions. The following table gives the summary of first-order leadership scales and composition for each scale.

Table 3: First -order leadership scales and compositions

<i>Leadership scales</i>	Compositions (example key items)
Administratively competent	Orderly, administratively skilled, organised, good administrator
Autocratic (reverse-scored)	Autocratic, dictatorial, elitist, ruler, domineering
Autonomous	Individualistic, independent, autonomous, unique
Collaborative team	Group-oriented, collaborative, loyal, consultative, mediator, fraternal
Conflict inducer	Normative, secretive, and an intra-group competitor
Decisive	Wilful, decisive, intuitive
Diplomatic	Diplomatic, win/win problem-solver, effective bargainer
Face-saver	Indirect, avoiding negatives, evasive
Humane	Generous, compassionate
Inspirational	Enthusiastic, positive, encouraging, motivational, morale booster
Integrity	Honest, sincere, just, trustworthy
Malevolent (reverse-scored)	Hostile, vindictive, cynical, non-cooperative, egotistical
Visionary	Future-oriented, anticipatory, visionary, intellectually stimulating
Nonparticipative (reverse-scored)	Non-delegator, micro-manager, non-egalitarian, individually-oriented
Performance-orientation	Improvement, excellence, performance-oriented
Procedural	Ritualistic, formal, habitual, cautious, procedural
Self-sacrifice	Risk taker, self-sacrificial, convincing
Self-centred	Self-interested, non-participative, loner, asocial
Status consciousness	Status-conscious, class conscious
Team-integrator	Communicative, team-builder, integrator, coordinator
Modesty	Modest, self-effacing, calm, patient

The fundamental research questions that the GLOBE project presented covered both etic (universally accepted) and emic (culture-specific) approaches as mentioned earlier. It aimed to answer whether there are some leader behaviours/attributes that are universally accepted and effective across cultures and whether there are some leader behaviours/attributes that are particularly highlighted and accepted in only some cultures.

Moreover, country co-investigators (CCIs) conducted qualitative analysis of focus

groups and interviews to explore the views of excellent leadership under each specific culture.

GLOBE findings revealed that successful and effective leaders in international firms have some similar leadership attributes such as a willingness/desire to communicate, supportive attitude, followers-concerned behaviours and negotiation skills. In etic research, the GLOBE study across 62 societies discovered that effective leaders usually were regarded as dynamic, encouraging, supportive, concerned, confidence building and having extra foresights. They were focused on followers’ development and involvement in teamwork. The GLOBE project thus presented six global leader behaviour traits: namely charismatic/ value-based leader, team-oriented, self-protective, participative, humane orientation and autonomous leaders. The following table presents the global culturally endorsed leadership scales.

Table 4: The components of six leadership attributes

<p>1. <u>Charismatic / Value-based</u></p> <p><i>Visionary</i> <i>Inspirational</i> <i>Self-sacrifice integrity</i> <i>Decisive</i> <i>Performance-focused</i></p>	<p>2. <u>Team-oriented</u></p> <p><i>Collaborative teamwork</i> <i>Team integrator</i> <i>Diplomatic</i> <i>Malevolent (reverse-scored)</i> <i>Administratively skilled</i></p>
<p>3. <u>Self-protective</u></p> <p><i>Self-cantered</i> <i>Status conscious</i> <i>Conflict inducer</i> <i>Face saver</i> <i>Procedural</i></p>	<p>4. <u>Participative</u></p> <p><i>Autocratic(reverse-scored)</i> <i>Non-participative(reverse-scored)</i></p>
<p>5. <u>Humane-oriented</u></p> <p><i>Modesty</i> <i>Humane focus</i></p>	<p>6. <u>Autonomous</u></p> <p><i>Autonomous</i></p>

As previously hypothesized, the value-based leadership dimension (formerly referred to as charismatic leadership) with visionary, inspirational, performance-oriented, decisive and integrity was viewed as effective and acceptable in almost all countries. Three other dimensions were found to be culturally contingent, including power orientation, bureaucratic and humane orientation. In addition, bureaucratic- collectivist and autocratic leadership were viewed unacceptable and unfavourable in cultures with high score on future orientation .With regard to leadership, the following table shows further interpretations of each leadership dimension and some preliminary findings.

Table 5: GLOBE leadership dimensions

Leadership dimensions	Definition	GLOBE China Study	GLOBE NZ Study
1: Charismatic/Value-based leader	refers to leaders' ability of inspiration, motivation and expectation of enhanced or excellent performance. Charisma means to encourage enthusiasm to common goals.	Chinese culture indicated this dimension as being a major contributor to being outstanding leader.	New Zealand culture viewed this dimension as the most strongly associated with outstanding leadership.
2: Team-oriented leader	emphasizes the teamwork, synergy and team-building.	It was demonstrated to be a contributing factor of leadership excellence.	It was also demonstrated to be a contributing factor of leadership excellence.
3: Participative leader	means that leader should get their followers involved throughout the process of leadership implementation and decision-making	It was demonstrated to be positively associated with outstanding leadership.	It was demonstrated to be positively associated with outstanding leadership.
4: Humane orientation	supposed to be compassionate and generous, show their concern and care on individual needs. They need to be people-focused.	The study explored this as a strongly contributing dimension.	The study explored this as a moderately contributing dimension.
5: Self-protective leader	caring about their own interests and thinking how to protect themselves and please themselves without considering their colleagues as well as organisations.	It was viewed as an inhibiting/not contributing factor to outstanding leadership.	It was viewed as the most negative factor to outstanding leadership.
6: Autonomous leader	refers to some leadership traits such as independence and individualism.	It was demonstrated to be a not contributing factor to outstanding leadership.	This dimension was also demonstrated to be a not contributing factor to outstanding leadership.

3.1.3 Criticisms of GLOBE and reasons for using GLOBE

Graen mainly criticizes GLOBE research as having a large number of self-reported, culturally biased studies. He also argues that GLOBE questionnaires were developed improperly without collaboration by scholars from many different societies. Therefore, the program itself failed to provide evidence of construct validity; in sampling, GLOBE just used convenience sampling to generate data for the study. With regard to GLOBE's studies on China, it comments that even though the new generation of business leaders has an emphasis of individuality, they are based on other studies of east coastal China. This cultural pattern may fit in old Chinese societies but definitely not in the new generation of Chinese societies (Graen, Hui & Gu, 2004). In Hofstede's (2006) critique of the GLOBE program, with regard to targeted participants, he points out that leaders were used in leadership research, measuring leadership from designed surveys by leaders themselves.

The GLOBE program combined over 160 scholars from 62 societies to conduct cross cultural research. 145 of these are identified as Country Co-Investigators (CCIs) who represent the societies they attempted to research and were directly involved in collecting data and facilitating the project. As described earlier, scales in the questionnaires were developed prudently and seriously to avoid negative impacts. All scales had reliabilities of 0.85 based on reliability analysis. In addition to this, the GLOBE used a wide range of qualitative analysis such as media analysis, focus groups and interviews to properly understand and measure culture and leadership. (House et al., 2004). In regard to convenience sampling, the industries selected were financial services, telecommunications and food processing. All the industries that GLOBE selected were domestic rather than multi-national corporations, from Asia, Asia-pacific, Europe, North and South America, North and South Africa, and the Middle East. Some countries/societies, they were sampled separately (in Chinese societies, GLOBE sampled four regions including China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore to explore deeper differences and similarities). Responding to Hofstede's critique on leadership measurement by leaders themselves, GLOBE just asked leaders' opinions on

outstanding leadership by rating on a seven-point scale rather than asking them to do self-assessments. The GLOBE aimed to explore implicit leadership across national cultures as opposed to evaluating leaders' leadership performance.

The reasons why I choose to use GLOBE model to complete my methodology mainly involved the following points:

Firstly, GLOBE research program has a reliable and valid data set. The construction process of GLOBE involved major effort by many business scholars. More importantly, GLOBE has a sufficient data set on cross cultural studies concerning relationships between societal level variables, organisational practices and leadership behaviour. Taking the Chinese leadership study as an example, GLOBE undertook research not only in mainland China but also in other Chinese societies including Hong Kong, Taiwan and Singapore (Fu, Li, Chow & Peng, 2002)

Secondly, the GLOBE research program made a key contribution to bridging the gaps between leadership literature and organisational studies, social science studies and business research.

Thirdly, the GLOBE program gives leaders a good starting point to explore the knowledge of cross-cultural leadership. More importantly, it helps leaders to know effective behaviours in leadership implementation and how to behave properly across cultural contexts. All of these are consistent with my proposed research objectives.

Last, to date more than 90% of management and leadership research is US-based theory and literature: this research project will be able to break the US research hegemony and extend business and leadership research into a broader worldview.

3.1.4 The GLOBE leadership survey and hypotheses

As noted earlier, in order to specify the meanings of these six global leadership dimensions in the GLOBE leadership survey, under each one there are three or more scales or attributes listed as further interpretations. They measure the characteristics of leaders who contribute to the achievement and success of business organisations. There are 112 behavioural and trait descriptors (56 items in part 1 and 56 items in part 2) in the questionnaire, ranging from greatly inhibit (1) to (7) contribute greatly for a person being an outstanding leader.

Based on the study by Fu et al.(2002), even though Chinese culture is changing rapidly, the key elements of culture (respect for authority, high supervision and collectivism) that were firmly influenced by Confucianism still remain the same as 2,000 years ago. Chinese leaders carry these values and apply them to business practice. Specifically, Chinese leadership patterns basically have two roles. The one is to keep a good order through a system of inequalities in which they have distinct obligations to enforce the social structure; the other is to pursue harmony by adhering to moral and social norms or standards in a given system. As a consequence, employee reliability, personalism and harmony could all be features of Chinese leadership. Chinese leaders rate high scores on bureaucracy, based on the ideas of class system; low scores are expected in individualism because of the high value of family and group. Previous studies revealed that Chinese leaders prefer personal attributes that easily reflect group and family values.

In contrast, leaders in New Zealand are more concerned with interpersonal skills of working together as a team and dealing with people, without a given social hierarchy, so they rate high scores on teamwork. According to a study by Kennedy (2000), influenced by native Maori culture, leadership traits such as communication and performance are expected to be high. Their perceptions of outstanding leadership reflect the importance of motivation, inspiration and equality with followers. With regard to combinations of two cultures, even though they both value individuals, people would have different

interpretations in each context. The assumption of differences in participative and humane orientation will be made.

Outstanding leadership is a social symbol given to individuals. Either the descriptions of leadership behaviours/attributes match the observers' value on outstanding leaders or the researchers' attributes the success or failure to the activities of perceived leaders (Lord & Maher, 1991). Existing cross-cultural research has revealed that perceptions of effective leadership behaviours vary dramatically across cultural contexts.

The findings of GLOBE indicate some leadership attributes such as trustworthy, visionary, and intelligent are endorsed universally positive for leaders being outstanding and effective. Other personal traits such as compassionate, team worker, risk taker, humane-based are found different across cultures. In Chinese and New Zealand data in particular, Fu and Kennedy already concurred. My work attempts to confirm their findings of the GLOBE project by using the GLOBE leadership survey with different samples, and endeavours to provide some explanations if the results are found to be significantly different after data analysis. Based on their work, four hypotheses are developed here to test.

- H1 Both China and NZ participants will rate highest mean scores in charismatic/value-based leadership.*
- H2 Both China and NZ participants will rate lowest mean scores in self-protective leadership.*
- H3 New Zealand participants will rate relatively higher mean scores in team-oriented than those from China.*
- H4 Chinese participants will report higher cognitive humane-oriented means than those from NZ.*

To link with research questions, H1 and H2 are consistent with research question of similar perceptions of outstanding leadership behaviours. H3 and H4 are based on universal leadership dimensions in both cultural contexts.

As the previous GLOBE results identified some universal and culturally different leadership items. In my study, the key purpose is to confirm the previous findings and investigate whether these results will differ significantly in different cities and times but in the same society. As dimension of Autonomous leader was viewed to be not a significant factor on outstanding leadership, proposed hypotheses do not cover this item.

3.2 Pilot test

From personal communications with GLOBE project leaders Mansour Javidan, Peter Dorfman, Paul Hanges, and Fu Ping Ping (all in 2007), we determined that the Chinese language versions of the GLOBE surveys had been lost. Hence, an English to Chinese translation of the survey was necessary.

Even though all tested items were developed and investigated from existing measures and their validity was tested by previous studies, it is important that all the measures were appropriate for China data collection. Therefore, questionnaires originally written in English were translated into Chinese for targeted participants use and were re-checked by being translated back to English to confirm its conceptual consistency. The task of translation and back-translation were undertaken by two PhD students in Chinese universities majoring in Linguistics and English Education, so they should have been sufficiently educated in Chinese and English - as suggested by Bracken and Barona (1991).

The first English version was translated by the first language student and translated back by another independent PhD student in China. After translation, a few words such as “diplomatic” and “methodical” were rephrased so that Chinese participants could easily respond to each question in the three parts of the leadership survey. A pilot-test of the translated Chinese version questionnaire was conducted by 16 Chinese (8 males and 8 females) to ensure there was no ambiguity in language and word expression. The translation was found to be unambiguous in the Chinese version.

3.3 Etic and emic approach

In reviewing the key points of culture, Hofstede (2001) argues that culture is a multi-level and multi-disciplinary concept. In order to properly understand the nature of culture and its complexity, it is extremely important to study culture with a combination of etic and emic elements. Etic and emic approaches as an important cross-cultural foundation need to be briefly discussed here.

Etic dimensions refer to universally acceptable constructs, whereas emic dimensions mainly refer to culture-specific constructs (House et al., 2004). Furthermore, etic approaches can be divided into uniform, functional and variform universals. Uniform universality refers to the construct is extremely similar or exactly the same across cultures without any difference. This category of etic approach is believed by Hofstede (2006) to be almost impossible. Functional universals refer to shared values, behavioural patterns with similar social consequences. They display over 96% degrees of similarity. Variform universality involves behaviours with similar functional significance and common elements but behaviours are more or less moderated and adapted by the cultural context. Both emic and etic approach involve within-culture and culture universal investigations and contribute to further understanding of leadership behaviours in a global context.

According to the example by Smith et al. (1989), both U.S. and Japanese leaders would prefer to provide direction and instruction to their subordinates, but U.S. leaders would be more likely to talk to their followers face to face while Japanese leaders would inform their followers by writing guidelines or memos. In this case, the direction is an example of the etic approach as both U.S. and Japanese leaders used to direct their subordinates. But the methods other leaders choose to apply were examples of cultural-specific constructs, namely emic approaches. My study will attempt to concentrate on the interplay of etic and emic leadership attributes.

The six GLOBE universal leadership dimensions (discussed later) will be analysed to demonstrate whether they exist in China and New Zealand databases and how these dimensions manifest and differ in each context. More specifically:

- Etic leadership frameworks. The six GLOBE leadership dimensions will be tested to see whether they fit in previous China and New Zealand findings.
- Emic leadership frameworks: A comprehensive study will be conducted to identify culture-specific leadership attributes in China and New Zealand.
- Combined etic and emic frameworks: the two frameworks will be combined to see how these leadership dimensions differ in China and New Zealand societies.

3.4 Data analysis procedures

The following statistical tests were selected to analyse the research results. Descriptive data of first-order leadership scales (21) and second-order leadership dimensions (6) were summarized including mean, mean difference and standard deviation.

Firstly, this research is based on the previous GLOBE studies in China and New Zealand, so it is essential to include a detailed comparison between my samples and GLOBE samples. The reason for this is to show the results for each sample and identify differences or similarities of leadership scales and dimensions.

Secondly, for 21 leadership scales, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was computed. The purpose of running this analysis is to test the significance of differences between the China and New Zealand samples. A display of mean differences was also conducted. Furthermore, based on the previous findings, China and New Zealand had found some similar results in leadership behaviour ranking.

Thirdly, to properly analyse the ranked data of 6 leadership dimensions for each sample and make comparisons, Spearman correlation analysis was performed to determine the strengths of China and New Zealand means under the same variables followed by the MANOVA.

Fourthly, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of gender was computed for each sample respectively to examine the effects of gender (a demographic item) on ratings of leadership behaviours/characteristics.

Fifthly, as previously assumed, citizenship may be able to influence the scores of leadership behaviour ranking. The purpose of running multivariate analysis of covariation is to examine the effect of gender on six leadership dimensions, covarying out the effect of this additional variable (citizenship).

3.5 Participants

In this study, middle managers from management consultant industries in China and New Zealand were targeted as respondents to collect data. I selected this industry for several reasons. Firstly, a number of leadership theories were developed in organisational context, and I personally believe that the industry of management consultant is closely related to organisational studies. Secondly, culture is a multidimensional construct, and I wanted to test the consistency of previous results in different industries. Thirdly, I assumed that data from this industry would accurately reflect the perceptions in management study. Fourthly, compared to other industries, this one is much easier to generate data from both China and New Zealand. The targeted city in China is Changsha, Hunan province, in South China, and the selected city in New Zealand is Auckland.

I visited the randomly selected targeted companies to explain the purpose of the project and the importance of completing all the items in the survey. Respondents were all advised that their participation were completely voluntary and confidential. All the participants knew their answers would not be used for other purposes. Participants in both China and New Zealand completed the questionnaires at their workplaces during normal business hours.

In each company, I randomly distributed the questionnaires to middle managers who had indicated willingness to participate in this study. A total of 210 copies of the questionnaire were sent by post, email and personal connection, and 200 subjects completed and returned the questionnaire. Then I selected valid responses based on the following criteria. (1): single ethnic origin: each participant in China must be Asian Chinese, Han race, rather than ethnic minorities, and each participant in New Zealand required to be Caucasian New Zealander (Pakeha), in order to reflect the ideas of the largest ethnic group in the business environments. (2): All the selected participants' must have had full time working experience for at least one year in the company, so that they had sufficient experience to make judgments about the organisation. (3): Citizenship had to be Chinese born in China and New Zealander born in New Zealand, as a comparative analysis based on national citizenship would be conducted. (4): All the items in part 1 and part 2 of leadership survey must have been fully answered.

Thus, the final sample of the study population was 193, consisting of 109 subjects in China and 84 subjects in New Zealand. The gender demographics revealed a slight difference between the China and New Zealand data. Table 6 summarizes the gender percentages of China and New Zealand data.

Table 6: China and New Zealand by gender

Samples	Male	Female
China data	52.3%	47.7%
New Zealand data	48.8%	51.2%

3.6 Results of GLOBE leadership

3.6.1 Previous GLOBE research vs. present study

Culture, as the underlying system of beliefs, is an important force to specific groups and societies, shaping certain personal traits and motivating people in particular societies to engage in behaviours that may be or not be universal in other societies (Hofstede, 1998). These values and norms in certain cultural patterns can strongly direct and control human behaviours that are consistent with the cultural context and endure over time. In the following paragraphs, comparison of leadership results between the present study and previous GLOBE studies will be discussed.

3.6.1.1 China data

Fu et al. (2002) conducted the GLOBE study in China. The study population was restricted to Shanghai, a thriving coastal rim business centre in South China. The research combined the results of two groups of participants from two industries as there was no significant difference between the industry means found after running independent T tests.

In contrast, for my study the targeted city I chose is Changsha, Hunan province, South China. The reason is that Changsha, capital of Hunan province, (the hometown of Chairman Mao), has a different cultural heritage from Shanghai.

Table 7: Leadership results compared with GLOBE study (21 first -order scales)

Rank	China sample (N =109)	Rank	GLOBE China sample(N=158)
1	Charismatic 2: inspirational(6.01)	2	Charismatic 2: inspirational (5.92)
2	Integrity (5.92)	1	Integrity (5.98)
3	Charisma 1: visionary (5.81)	4	Charismatic1: visionary (5.85)
4	Administratively competent (5.80)	3	Administratively competent (5.88)
5	<i>Diplomatic (5.73)</i>	10	<i>Diplomatic (5.05)</i>
6	<i>Modesty (5.47)</i>	11	<i>Modesty (5.03)</i>
7	Team 2: team integrator (5.40)	5	Team2: team integrator (5.71)
8	Team 1: collaborative team orientation (5.17)	8	Team1: collaborative team orientation (5.36)
9	Humane-orientation (5.15)	7	Humane orientation (5.40)
10	Charisma 3: Self-sacrifice(5.13)	12	Charismatic 3: self-sacrifice (4.70)
11	Decisive(4.94)	9	Decisive (5.29)
12	<i>Performance-oriented (4.92)</i>	6	<i>Performance-oriented (5.64)</i>
13	Procedural/bureaucratic (4.65)	17	Procedural /Bureaucratic (3.94)
14	Autonomous (4.52)	15	Autonomous (4.07)
15	Face-saver (4.42)	16	Face-saver (3.97)
16	Conflict inducer (4.17)	14	Conflict inducer (4.40)
17	Status conscious(3.59)	13	Status conscious (4.47)
18	Nonparticipative(3.30)	18	Nonparticipative(3.24)
19	Malevolent(2.71)	21	Malevolent (2.04)
20	Autocratic(2.69)	19	Autocratic (2.66)
21	Self-centred(2.42)	20	Self-centred (2.22)

In the 21 first-order leadership scales, Chinese leaders perceived integrity (5.98), inspirational (5.92) and administratively competent (5.88) to be the most contributing factors to outstanding leadership. These results were basically consistent with Chinese culture feature of “personism”. Similarly, other people-related scales such as visionary (5.85), team integrator (5.71) and team collaborative orientation (5.36) got higher scores. Humane orientation also got high scores of 5.40; this could be attributed to cultural emphasis of personal dignity.

In lower scores, on the other hand, face-saving (3.97) was viewed to be the negative factor to leadership excellence as well as some reverse-scored scales of non-participative (3.24) and autocratic (2.66). Among the first-order leadership scales, the highest scale was integrity (5.98) and the lowest scale was malevolent (reverse-scored) of 2.04. The mean for Autonomous is 4.07, which indicated no great impact on outstanding leadership. Interestingly, previous GLOBE study in China discovered that none of the scores on the first-order scales was below 2 or above 6. This supports the contention that Chinese avoid expressing extreme views to aid in maintaining harmony.

As can be seen in Table 7 above, average scores were summarized and compared to the previous GLOBE results. Some of the scales have got similar ratings. More specifically, Chinese managers perceived charisma (5.45) on scales of visionary (5.81), inspirational (6.01), and integrity (5.92), decisive (4.94) and performance-oriented (4.92) as a contributor to outstanding leadership. The result was basically consistent with GLOBE result of charisma (5.56). Interestingly, face-saver (4.42) and procedural (4.65) got higher scores than GLOBE's. In addition, self-protective got similar result of 3.85 against GLOBE's 3.80, this result confirmed that self-protective was universally accepted to be a negative factor to outstanding leadership in China even though the scores were higher than the mid-point.

With regard to large differences, ranks of diplomatic, modesty and performance-oriented differ from present study. A possible explanation for this might be that Changsha has a different cultural heritage. As one of the most typical cities in South China, Changsha highly promotes traditional Chinese philosophies more than newly developed cities such as Shanghai. In addition, as an inland city in South China, the influence of Western management ideas is less stronger than Shanghai, it might lead to large difference in the rank of performance-oriented.

Table 8: Six second-order results compared with GLOBE study

Rank	China sample (N=109)	Rank	GLOBE China sample (N=158)
1	Charismatic/Value-based (5.45)	2	Charismatic/Value-based (5.56)
2	Humane-oriented (5.31)	3	Humane-oriented (5.19)
3	Participative (5.08)	4	Participative (5.04)
4	Team-oriented (4.90)	1	Team-oriented (5.57)
5	Autonomous (4.52)	5	Autonomous (4.07)
6	Self-protective (3.85)	6	Self-protective (3.80)

Source: Chhokar, Broddeck, & House (2007).

With regard to six second-order leadership dimensions in GLOBE study, team-oriented (5.57) was perceived to have the highest contribution to outstanding leadership. This finding was supported by the study in China by Fu et al. (2002) on the top management teams in Chinese high-tech organisations. The second contributing factor was charismatic/value-based leader (5.56) followed by humane-oriented leader (5.19). The dimension of self-protective has a lowest score of 3.80 which indicated it had a negative impact on achieving leadership excellence.

The previous GLOBE study of China also compared Chinese results to other countries results by listing the highest scores and lowest scores in 61 countries tested. Overall, it demonstrated that charismatic/value-based leader was universally accepted to be the contributing factor to outstanding leadership and self-protective leadership was universally endorsed to be the negative factor to leadership excellence.

As the previous results revealed, Chinese managers preferred to put a positive emphasis on humane-oriented (5.19). The result of 5.31 again supported the idea that Chinese culture still paid close attention to personal dignity that was influenced by Confucianism. Similarly, non-participative (3.16) was considered to be a factor that slightly inhibits

outstanding leadership. There was no surprise in the autocratic scale indicating a negative impact (2.69 against 2.66 in GLOBE). This result was also consistent with GLOBE findings of autocratic as a universal inhibitor of outstanding leadership. Despite that fact that team-oriented had a large difference in rank, overall, no significant differences were found between China data and previous study.

Overall, linking with hypotheses above, previous GLOBE study confirmed the fact that charismatic leadership is a contributing factor and self-protective is a negative factor against outstanding leadership behaviours. In the discussion of literature review, it shows Chinese cultural values and individual expectations are strongly linked with its society as well as political scheme. These characteristics also can be applied into business context. Based on the literature review, it also particularly emphasizes two important characteristics of Chinese culture that can directly impact on leadership perceptions.

Firstly, Dual identity. According to the study, researchers observed that most of business leaders in China were all members of Chinese Communist Party (CCP). Some of the leaders even held high positions in government agencies and institutes. As mentioned earlier, the only ruling party is the CCP, thus it controls every industry including business organisations in China. In order to generate and survive in a business it is obligatory to keep good relationships with the CCP. Its ideology, such as Marxism, Maoism, Deng Xiao Ping Theory and the theory of three-representatives, has been a major source of impact on business practice. Leaders and CCP members at the same time had to obey the rules of the Party and contribute to its construction. Role models were expected to establish these for their co-workers. Business leaders have to serve not only the organisations but also the industry. The effect of unconditional obedience or powerful authority shapes the importance of human factors/ attributes in Chinese leadership.

Secondly, Paternalism. The previous study described the fact that Confucian ideas extended the high value of family to organisational contexts, making leaders perform

like heads of families. In Chinese cultural pattern, males in a family represent the absolute authority to manage and control all matters. Even though leaders were no longer explicitly “fathers of families” in today’s Chinese organisations, the expectations for this role still exist. For example, in any matter people would instinctively report to and ask for help from their heads rather than make decisions individually, even though they could easily handle the issues. Heads of organisations still controlled key operation and the performance of their followers. All employees were supposed to unconditionally obey the rules made by Heads. Loyalty to Heads as well as organisations is highly promoted. This feature again could be attributed to the interdependent concept of family and country. Organisations were viewed as big families; leaders naturally were the fathers of the families. All of these can be explained why Chinese leadership always emphasizes the importance of role model which could be the original source of team work.

3.6.1.2 New Zealand data

Similar to prior work on leadership behaviours, New Zealand respondents were asked to complete the leadership survey to rate various leadership behaviours/characteristics and skills on a 7-point scale. As mentioned earlier, only participants with single New Zealand citizenship, born in New Zealand, were considered in the study. The following table shows the results of NZ leadership dimensions and scales.

Kennedy conducted the New Zealand study by using GLOBE survey to explore the leadership behaviours for outstanding leadership. Similarly, based on the findings of rating given leadership behaviours, charismatic/value-based (5.87) and team-oriented (5.44) were viewed to be contributing factors to outstanding leadership. Meanwhile, self-protective (3.19) was endorsed as a negative factor to leadership excellence. These findings were consistent with New Zealand cultural pattern. Autonomous has a mean of 3.77 which suggested it had no significant impact on achieving outstanding leadership.

Table 9: Leadership results compared with GLOBE study (21 scales)

Rank	N Z sample (N = 84)	Rank	GLOBE NZ sample(N =184)
1	Performance-oriented (6.31)	2	Performance-oriented (6.31)
2	<i>Integrity (6.13)</i>	6	<i>Integrity (5.49)</i>
3	Charismatic 2: inspirational (6.10)	1	Charismatic 2: inspirational (6.50)
4	Charismatic1: visionary (5.81)	3	Charismatic1: visionary (6.23)
5	Team2: team integrator (5.52)	4	Team2: team integrator (5.71)
6	<i>Modesty (5.44)</i>	12	<i>Modesty (4.57)</i>
7	Administratively competent (5.35)	11	Administratively competent (4.79)
8	Team1: collaborative team orientation (5.34)	8	Team1: collaborative team orientation (5.21)
9	Humane orientation (5.29)	9	Humane orientation (5.09)
10	Diplomatic (5.29)	7	Diplomatic (5.22)
11	<i>Decisive (5.26)</i>	5	<i>Decisive (5.69)</i>
12	Charismatic 3: self-sacrifice (4.50)	10	Charismatic 3: self-sacrifice (4.88)
13	Procedural /Bureaucratic (4.16)	13	Procedural /Bureaucratic (3.86)
14	Status conscious (4.05)	16	Status conscious (3.56)
15	Autonomous (3.95)	14	Autonomous (3.77)
16	Face-saver (3.43)	18	Face-saver (2.39)
17	Conflict inducer (3.32)	15	Conflict inducer (3.74)
18	Malevolent (2.75)	21	Malevolent (1.83)
19	Non-participative(2.37)	19	Non-participative(2.38)
20	Autocratic (2.14)	17	Autocratic (2.63)
21	Self-centred (1.96)	20	Self-centred (2.23)

In contrast to Chinese ratings, New Zealand got some extreme scores either below 2.50 or above 6.00. For higher scores in 21 leadership scales, charismatic 1 (6.23), charismatic 2 (6.50), performance-oriented (6.31) were rated above 6 which suggested these attributes were highly valued in effective leaders in New Zealand. Decisive (5.69), team 2 (5.71), were both rated above 5.50 or higher which revealed that NZ effective leaders should have the ability to make right decisions by involving team members in the decision making process. With regard to lower scores, malevolent (1.83), self-cantered (2.23), face-saver (2.39) and non-participative (2.38) all got means lower than 2.50 which indicated these attributes could seriously impact leadership success. It needs to point out humane-oriented dimension (4.78) consisting of modesty (5.47) and humane-orientation (5.09) also has a scores above 4.50. These findings supported the

study by Toulson (1990) that humanistic work beliefs were highly promoted in New Zealand work organisations.

With regard to the first order of leadership scales, GLOBE results in inspirational (6.50), performance orientation (6.31), visionary (6.23), team integrator (5.71) and decisive (5.69) were rated higher than 5.50. To link with NZ data this time, most of the scales has a similar outcomes (inspirational 6.10; performance orientation 6.31; visionary, 5.81; team integrator, 5.52) except the mean of decisive (5.26). On the other hand of low means, GLOBE results in malevolent (1.83), self-centred (2.23), face-saver (2.39) and non-participative (2.38) were all less than 2.40 which indicated these scales were greatly inhibiting outstanding leadership.

In contrast to NZ data in my study, even though some results slightly differ such as integrity, modesty and decisive. These large differences might be due to different targeted industries. Some items mentioned above (malevolent 2.75, self-centred 1.96, face-saver 3.43 and non-participative 2.37) were rated below the mid-point of 3.50 which indicate similar conclusions.

Overall, the results matched previous findings with no big surprises. Effective managers in NZ were viewed as a person with a range of abilities and skills to direct their followers with effective teamwork, show their confidence and care; and enhance performance effectiveness.

Table 10: Six second-order results compared with GLOBE study

Rank	NZ sample (N=84)	Rank	GLOBE NZ sample (N=184)
1	Charismatic/Value-based (5.68)	1	Charismatic/Value-based (5.87)
2	Participative (5.30)	2	Participative (5.50)
3	Team-oriented (4.78)	3	Team-oriented (5.44)
4	Humane-oriented (4.78)	4	Humane-oriented (4.78)
5	Autonomous (3.95)	5	Autonomous (3.77)
6	Self-protective (3.35)	6	Self-protective (3.19)

Source: Chhokar, Broddeck, & House (2007).

According to the previous analysis, two of leadership dimensions (charismatic and/or value-based and team-oriented) were universally accepted as contributing factors to outstanding leadership (with the mean of 5.87 and 5.44) and self-protective was viewed as an impediment to outstanding leadership (with the mean of 3.19). As shown in the table above, the overall result was basically consistent with GLOBE results (charismatic/value-based has a mean of 5.68 against 5.87 and team-oriented was 4.78 against 5.44, self-protective was 3.35 against 3.19).

Based on the findings above, New Zealand outstanding leaders were viewed to need a transformational leadership approach based on the perceptions of cooperative and teamwork context, with confidence building-up, greater-than-expected outcome expectations and motivation. Furthermore, leaders were expected to share information and communicate well to encourage their colleagues to perform well as strong teams. Group decision making was highly recommended, by obtaining more ideas from team members.

To sum up, previous leadership study in New Zealand demonstrated that charisma/value-based leadership was universally viewed to be a contributing factor to

outstanding leadership whilst self-protective was globally accepted to be an inhibiting factor to leadership excellence. In addition, performance was extremely important and thus highly valued.

However, high levels of performance expectation should be accompanied by some modest and self-deprecating attitude. Participative leadership approach was expected as well as flexibility of rule implementation. Leaders were viewed as effective if they could motivate and inspire their subordinates by perseverance. It also indicated that New Zealand leaders did not emphasize the importance of rules/policies and concrete administrative procedures, nor did they prefer bureaucratic control and fierce supervision to monitor people's behaviour.

On the contrary, effective leaders were expected to perform at an exceptional level, generate hope and share success rather than be solely policy makers. Moreover, compared to results in other countries, traditional leadership attributes of excellence were also confirmed, such as their strength of determination and commitment. Kennedy's (2000) study also pointed out the overall concern for leaders in the future got lower scores than other countries, which might suggest that New Zealanders need to plan ahead and perform in consideration of future goals.

3.6.2 China vs. New Zealand data (21 leadership scales)

As many dependent variables in two samples need to be compared, multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to compare their means across 21 leadership scales between China and New Zealand (discuss later). As mentioned earlier, participants who had single nationality in each sample were considered. The following table provides the details of MANOVA. To discuss the major similarities and differences between China and New Zealand data, these scales were sorted out and presented in the table below.

Table 11: Multivariate Tests

Multivariate Tests							
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.997	2366.409	21.000	171.000	.000	.997
	Wilks' Lambda	.003	2366.409	21.000	171.000	.000	.997
	Hotelling's Trace	290.612	2366.409	21.000	171.000	.000	.997
	Roy's Largest Root	290.612	2366.409	21.000	171.000	.000	.997
citizenship	Pillai's Trace	.786	29.875	21.000	171.000	.000	.786
	Wilks' Lambda	.214	29.875	21.000	171.000	.000	.786
	Hotelling's Trace	3.669	29.875	21.000	171.000	.000	.786
	Roy's Largest Root	3.669	29.875	21.000	171.000	.000	.786

a. Exact statistic

b. Design: Intercept+demo3

As shown in the Table above, a one-way MANOVA was calculated to examine the effect of citizenship on the 21 leadership scales. A significant result was found (Lambda (21,171) =0.214, p=0.000). This indicated that there was a significant difference between China and NZ data.

The following table displays the results of 21 leadership scales in China * New Zealand data

Table 12: Results of leadership scales in China × New Zealand data

China Rank	Leadership scales	China (N=109)		New Zealand (N=84)		Mean difference	Significance
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
1	Charismatic 2: inspirational	6.01	0.581	6.10	0.405	0.093	0.213
2	Integrity	5.92	0.798	6.13	0.563	0.203	0.049
3	Charisma 1: visionary	5.81	0.720	5.81	0.439	0.007	0.936
4	Administratively competent	5.80	0.806	5.35	0.677	0.449	0.000
5	Diplomatic	5.73	0.622	5.29	0.572	0.436	0.000
6	Modesty	5.47	0.740	5.44	0.648	0.037	0.715
7	Team2: team integrator	5.40	0.744	5.52	0.452	0.119	0.198
8	Team 1: collaborative team orientation	5.17	0.711	5.34	0.491	0.169	0.064
9	Humane-oriented	5.15	0.985	5.29	0.742	0.134	0.298
10	Charisma 3: self-sacrifice	5.13	0.682	4.50	0.991	0.632	0.000
11	Decisive	4.94	0.646	5.26	0.685	0.313	0.001
12	Performance-oriented	4.92	1.043	6.31	0.536	1.388	0.000
13	Procedural/bureaucratic	4.65	0.826	4.16	0.540	0.492	0.000
14	Autonomous	4.52	0.905	3.95	0.930	0.571	0.000
15	Face-saver	4.42	0.958	3.43	0.779	0.987	0.000
16	Conflict inducer	4.17	0.780	3.32	0.742	0.854	0.000
17	Status conscious	3.59	1.321	4.05	1.177	0.466	0.012
18	Nonparticipative	3.30	0.782	2.37	0.824	0.934	0.000
19	Malevolent	2.71	0.478	2.75	0.463	0.046	0.504
20	Autocratic	2.69	0.758	2.14	0.752	0.548	0.000
21	Self-centred	2.42	0.920	1.96	0.573	0.462	0.000

3.6.2.1 Scales with large differences

Table 13: The six largest differences across 21 leadership scales

Scales	China means	NZ means	Mean Differences	Sig level
Performance-oriented	4.92	6.31	1.388	0.000
Face-saver	4.42	3.43	0.987	0.000
Nonparticipative	3.30	2.37	0.934	0.000
Conflict inducer	4.17	3.32	0.854	0.000
Charisma3:self-sacrifice	5.13	4.50	0.632	0.000
Autonomous	4.52	3.95	0.571	0.000

The table above presents the six biggest differences of 21 leadership scales in China and New Zealand sample. A MANOVA test was conducted to examine whether there are significant differences between the two samples across 21 leadership scales. The calculated significance level of 0.000 was much less than 0.05, which suggested the results had more than 95% probability that there was a big difference between the two samples.

The biggest difference in leadership scales was performance-oriented. China data has a mean of 4.92 and NZ data got 6.31 with a mean difference of 1.388, which was the huge differential.

The second difference was face-saver scale with Chinese mean 4.42 and NZ mean 3.43. The mean difference was 0.987, slightly lower than the first differential.

Non-participative and conflict inducer were recorded the third and fourth differences across two samples, both of their mean differences were less than 1.00 (0.934 in non-participative and 0.854 in conflict inducer).

The last biggest difference was accordingly autonomous. China data got 4.52 while NZ data got 3.95 with mean difference of 0.571.

There are several possible explanations for this result. Firstly, leadership in China seeks a conflict free and harmonious environment, as conflict avoidance is highly promoted in Chinese culture, while New Zealand has a different cultural pattern which advocates problem identification to properly solve problems. Secondly, New Zealand leadership promotes individual skill enhancement more than Chinese leadership does. It believes that personal improvement is the core factor towards management effectiveness and leadership success. In contrast, Chinese leadership still emphasizes the importance of group membership and authorities. All of these could lead to the differences on the scales above. This finding further supports previous GLOBE research by Fu et al. and Kennedy.

3.6.2.2 Scales with small differences

Table 14: Scales with the six smallest differences

Scales	China means	NZ means	Mean Differences	Sig level
Charisma1: visionary	5.81	5.81	0.007	0.936
Modesty	5.47	5.44	0.037	0.715
Malevolent	2.71	2.75	0.046	0.504
Team 2: integrator	5.40	5.52	0.119	0.198
Humane-oriented	5.15	5.29	0.134	0.298
Team 1	5.17	5.34	0.169	0.064

As previously discussed, both China and New Zealand leadership styles highly promote the importance of people or personalism. Thus, there would be no surprise in the results of some people-related scales in both countries. As can be seen in Table 8, both China and New Zealand has a same mean of 5.81 in charisma 1, thus led to the smallest difference in two samples with the mean difference of 0.007 followed by modesty (5.47 vs., 5.44) and malevolent (2.71 vs. 2.75). Team 2 has a mean difference of 0.119, which was slightly lower than humane-oriented of 0.134. Significance level columns suggested the small differential between China and NZ data was insignificant thus perceived no significant difference across 21 leadership scales (calculated significant level more than 0.05).

These results might suggest that leadership excellence would not be achieved solely by leaders themselves. It would rely heavily on the synergy of all organisational members. Ideal leaders were expected to integrate human resources and offer emotional support to their subordinates thus lead to goal attainment regardless of culture.

The present findings seem to be generally consistent with previous research by Fu et al. and Kennedy, particularly in the scores of charisma 1 (5.85 vs. 6.23), team integrator (5.71 vs. 5.71), collaborative team orientation (5.36 vs. 5.21) and malevolent (2.71 vs.

1.83). The findings might suggest that effective leaders should have personal charisma and the abilities to have good vision, plus they need to be approachable and team performance oriented. Negative personal traits and characteristics such as dishonesty, negative actions and being unfriendly to organisational members are not welcomed regardless of cultures.

3.6.3 Scales ranked by mean

Taken together, Table 15 displays the ranking by means for each sample.

Table 15: Comparisons of ranked means across leadership scales

China Rank	China sample (N=109)	NZ Rank	NZ sample (N=84)	
1	Charismatic 2: inspirational(6.01)	1	Performance-oriented(6.31)	<i>Very high</i>
2	Integrity (5.92)	2	Integrity(6.13)	<i>Very high</i>
3	Charisma 1: visionary (5.81)	3	Charismatic 2: inspirational (6.10)	<i>High</i>
4	Administratively competent (5.80)	4	Charisma 1: visionary (5.81)	<i>High</i>
5	Diplomatic (5.73)	5	Team 2: team integrator (5.52)	
6	Modesty (5.47)	6	Modesty (5.44)	
7	Team 2: team integrator (5.40)	7	Administratively competent (5.35)	
8	Team 1: collaborative team orientation (5.17)	8	Team 1: collaborative team orientation (5.34)	
9	Humane-oriented (5.15)	9	Diplomatic(5.29)	
10	Charisma 3: Self-sacrifice(5.13)	10	Humane-oriented (5.29)	
11	Decisive(4.94)	11	Decisive(5.26)	
12	Performance-oriented (4.92)	12	Charisma 3: Self-sacrifice(4.50)	
13	Procedural/bureaucratic (4.65)	13	Procedural/bureaucratic (4.16)	
14	Autonomous (4.52)	14	Status conscious (4.05)	
15	Face-saver (4.42)	15	Autonomous (3.95)	
16	Conflict inducer (4.17)	16	Face-saver (3.43)	
17	Status conscious(3.59)	17	Conflict inducer (3.32)	
18	Nonparticipative(3.30)	18	Malevolent (2.75)	<i>Low</i>
19	Malevolent(2.71)	19	Nonparticipative (2.37)	<i>Low</i>
20	Autocratic(2.69)	20	Autocratic (2.14)	<i>Very low</i>
21	Self-centred(2.42)	21	Self-centred (1.96)	<i>Very low</i>

As described on the previous page, both China and New Zealand rated scales of charisma 1 and 2, this finding confirms Charisma scales are viewed as universally positive across cultures, and is consistent with previous observations by Fu et al. and Kennedy.

With regard to lower ranking, both China and New Zealand viewed autocratic, self-centred, non-participative and malevolent as inhibiting factors against outstanding leadership. This finding is in agreement with earlier Fu et al. and Kennedy findings which showed these scales were rated very low.

3.6.4 Leadership dimensions

All the leadership scales in the GLOBE survey were completed on the basis of ranks of items. To determine the strength of relationship between China and New Zealand variables, Spearman correlation analysis was performed to test the relationship between China and New Zealand means.

As shown in the table below, a Spearman's *rho* correlation coefficient was calculated for the relationship between China and New Zealand means under leadership dimensions. More specifically, an extremely weak relationship was found between China and New Zealand means in charismatic/Value-based dimension ($r = -0.075$, $p=0.496$ more than 0.05), self-protective dimension ($r = 0.059$, $p=0.595$ more than 0.05) as well as other dimensions.

Table 16: Correlation results

	nzCharismaticValuebased2	nzTeamOriented2	nzSelfProtective2	nzParticipative2	nzHumaneOriented2	nzAutonomous2
Spearman's rho						
CharismaticValuebased2						
Correlation Coefficient						
Sig. (2-tailed)	.075	-.047	.136	.113	-.076	.098
TeamOriented2						
Correlation Coefficient	.496	.670	.218	.308	.491	.373
Sig. (2-tailed)	.026	-.020	.029	.060	-.005	.001
SelfProtective2						
Correlation Coefficient	.816	.859	.792	.587	.967	.993
Sig. (2-tailed)	.100	.047	.059	.061	.132	-.188
Participative2						
Correlation Coefficient	.364	.669	.595	.579	.233	.086
Sig. (2-tailed)	.280**	.238*	-.016	.028	.031	-.014
HumaneOriented2						
Correlation Coefficient	.010	.029	.882	.800	.781	.902
Sig. (2-tailed)	-.112	.051	.175	.160	-.132	.122
Autonomous2						
Correlation Coefficient	.309	.643	.112	.145	.231	.269
Sig. (2-tailed)	.091	.061	.101	.115	-.048	.042
	.411	.580	.359	.298	.668	.705

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

a. Listwise N = 84

3.6.5 China vs. New Zealand data

Similar to the leadership scales, a multivariate test was also conducted to examine the effects of citizenship on ratings of leadership behaviours. It aims to see how each dimension contributes to outstanding leadership. Results are presented in the table below followed by the summary of the outcomes.

Table 17: Multivariate Tests

Multivariate Tests							
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.995	6432.647	6.000	186.000	.000	.995
	Wilks' Lambda	.005	6432.647	6.000	186.000	.000	.995
	Hotelling's Trace	207.505	6432.647	6.000	186.000	.000	.995
	Roy's Largest Root	207.505	6432.647	6.000	186.000	.000	.995
citizenship	Pillai's Trace	.430	23.429	6.000	186.000	.000	.430
	Wilks' Lambda	.570	23.429	6.000	186.000	.000	.430
	Hotelling's Trace	.756	23.429	6.000	186.000	.000	.430
	Roy's Largest Root	.756	23.429	6.000	186.000	.000	.430

a. Exact statistic

b. Desian: Intercept+demo3

As shown in the Table above, a one-way MANOVA was calculated to examine the effect of citizenship on the six leadership dimensions. A significant result of demo 3 (value of citizenship) was found (Lambda (6,186) =0.570, p=0.000). This indicated that there were significant differences between China and NZ amongst the variables in the test.

Table 18: Results of leadership dimensions

Leadership dimensions	China (N=109)		New Zealand (N=84)		Mean difference	Significance
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Charisma/Value-based	5.45	0.522	5.68	0.377	0.229	0.001
Humane-Oriented leader	5.31	0.777	5.36	0.588	0.049	0.634
Participative leader	5.08	0.613	5.30	0.503	0.220	0.000
Team-Oriented	4.90	0.383	4.78	0.283	0.110	0.051
Autonomous	4.52	0.905	3.95	0.930	0.571	0.000
Self-Protective	3.85	0.555	3.38	0.383	0.466	0.000

Table 19: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Charismatic/Value-based	2.481(a)	1	2.481	11.514	.001
	Team-Oriented	.576(b)	1	.576	3.868	.051
	Self-Protective	10.295(c)	1	10.295	43.351	.000
	Participative	24.250(d)	1	24.250	93.336	.000
	Humane-Oriented	.112(e)	1	.112	.227	.634
	Autonomous	15.480(f)	1	15.480	18.452	.000

a R Squared = .057 (Adjusted R Squared = .052)

b R Squared = .020 (Adjusted R Squared = .015)

c R Squared = .185 (Adjusted R Squared = .181)

d R Squared = .328 (Adjusted R Squared = .325)

e R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.004)

f R Squared = .088 (Adjusted R Squared = .083)

A one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed to investigate demo3 (citizenship) differences of leadership dimensions in two samples. Six dependent variables were investigated; a new alpha level of 0.083 was given. As the test reveals, the probability values (Sig.) of five leadership dimensions were less than 0.083 except Human-oriented dimensions. The results show differences in China and New Zealand samples (Charismatic/Value-based, Self-protective, Participative and Autonomous). The results also support the hypotheses (H1) that charisma/value-based leadership was viewed as a contributing factor to outstanding leader and (H2) self-protective was perceived to be a not contributing factor to outstanding leadership in both samples.

The most striking observation to emerge from the data comparison was team-oriented and humane-oriented leadership resulted in the low differential with very similar means. And NZ got a lower score of (4.78) than China (4.90). Hence, H3 was not supported. Contrary to what was expected, Chinese participants did not rate higher scores than NZ in humane-oriented (5.31 against 5.36). Thus, H4 was not confirmed. Calculated significance level was much more than 0.05 which indicated there was no significant difference found between the two samples. The interpretation of results will be presented further in discussion.

3.6.6 Leadership dimension ranked by mean

Again, similar to the summarized table of 21 leadership scales, Table 16 displays the ranked means to compare the similarities and differences between China and NZ data.

This duplicates the information in Table below:

Table 20: Comparative dimensions by ranked means

Rank	China sample	NZ sample
1	Charismatic/Value-based (5.45)	Charismatic/Value-based (5.68)
2	Humane-oriented leader (5.31)	Humane-oriented leader (5.36)
3	Participative leader (5.08)	Participative leader (5.30)
4	Team-oriented (4.90)	Team-oriented (4.78)
5	Autonomous (4.52)	Autonomous (3.95)
6	Self-protective (3.85)	Self-protective (3.38)

Overall, to link with developed hypotheses, even though there were some significant differences found in means, China and NZ data shared the same order of leadership dimensions, which indicated two samples in China and NZ basically agreed that charismatic/value-based leadership was the most important contributor to being an outstanding leader (H1), self-protective leadership was seen as a factor that could impede leadership excellence but varied in degree (H2). To compare each sample against previous the GLOBE study respectively, it did not significantly differ. However, the present results reject the H3 indicate New Zealand rate team-oriented higher China. Also, H4 was not supportive.

3.6.7 One-way ANOVA for gender

For cross cultural studies, it is important to test the correlations between leadership dimensions and relevant demographic items. The purpose of using one-way ANOVA is to compare the variance between the different groups. In my research, a one-way ANOVA test was conducted to explore their relationships with gender (demo 2) in each sample respectively. The tables below show the results of ANOVA for gender effects in China sample.

Table 21: ANOVA for gender (China)

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Charismatic/Value-based	Between Groups	.299	1	.299	1.100	.297
	Within Groups	29.080	107	.272		
	Total	29.379	108			
Team-Oriented	Between Groups	.075	1	.075	.511	.476
	Within Groups	15.784	107	.148		
	Total	15.860	108			
Self-Protective	Between Groups	.279	1	.279	.905	.343
	Within Groups	32.932	107	.308		
	Total	33.211	108			
Participative leader	Between Groups	.359	1	.359	.955	.331
	Within Groups	40.274	107	.376		
	Total	40.634	108			
Humane-Oriented leader	Between Groups	.248	1	.248	.408	.524
	Within Groups	64.928	107	.607		
	Total	65.176	108			
Autonomous	Between Groups	1.292	1	1.292	1.587	.211
	Within Groups	87.099	107	.814		
	Total	88.391	108			

As can be seen from Table 21, the results of six leadership dimensions did not differ significantly (p values above were over 0.05) for gender in China sample.

Table 22: ANOVA for gender (New Zealand)

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Charismatic/Value-based	Between Groups	.021	1	.021	.146	.703
	Within Groups	11.746	82	.143		
	Total	11.767	83			
Team-Oriented	Between Groups	.001	1	.001	.007	.935
	Within Groups	6.626	82	.081		
	Total	6.626	83			
Self-Protective	Between Groups	.270	1	.270	1.865	.176
	Within Groups	11.876	82	.145		
	Total	12.146	83			
Participative leader	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.013	.908
	Within Groups	20.987	82	.256		
	Total	20.990	83			
Humane-Oriented leader	Between Groups	.023	1	.023	.067	.796
	Within Groups	28.665	82	.350		
	Total	28.688	83			
Autonomous	Between Groups	.450	1	.450	.517	.474
	Within Groups	71.397	82	.871		
	Total	71.847	83			

Similar to the scenario of China sample, the results of six leadership dimensions in New Zealand did not differ significantly for gender. P values (significance levels) were all above 0.05. Therefore, the gender of the participants in both samples did not significantly influence the ratings of the leadership characteristics/behaviours. A possible reason for this finding might be that questions given are not particularly gender-oriented.

3.6.8 Multivariate Analysis of Covariance (Multivariate ANCOVA)

Based on the tests above, significant differences were found between China and New Zealand. It suggests that this additional variable (citizenship) may be influencing scores on the six leadership dimensions. Therefore, a one-way between-subjects ANCOVA was performed to examine the effect of gender on six leadership dimensions, co-varying out the effect of citizenship. The results of two samples indicate that the main effect for gender was not significantly related to leadership dimensions.

Table 23: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (China)

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Charismatic/Value-based	.299(a)	1	.299	1.100	.297
	Team-Oriented	.041(b)	1	.041	.213	.645
	Self-Protective	.279(c)	1	.279	.905	.343
	Participative	.459(d)	1	.459	1.783	.185
	Humane-Oriented	.248(e)	1	.248	.408	.524
	Autonomous	1.292(f)	1	1.292	1.587	.211

- a R Squared = .010 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)
- b R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = -.007)
- c R Squared = .008 (Adjusted R Squared = -.001)
- d R Squared = .016 (Adjusted R Squared = .007)
- e R Squared = .004 (Adjusted R Squared = -.006)

f R Squared = .015 (Adjusted R Squared = .005)

Table 24: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (NZ)

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	Charismatic/Value-based	.021(a)	1	.021	.146	.703
	Team-Oriented	.009(b)	1	.009	.101	.751
	Self-Protective	.270(c)	1	.270	1.865	.176
	Participative	.212(d)	1	.212	.813	.370
	Humane-Oriented	.023(b)	1	.023	.067	.796
	Autonomous	.450(e)	1	.450	.517	.474

a R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = -.010)

b R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.011)

c R Squared = .022 (Adjusted R Squared = .010)

d R Squared = .010 (Adjusted R Squared = -.002)

e R Squared = .006 (Adjusted R Squared = -.006)

4 Discussion

The existing literature on cross-cultural leadership is more useful at theoretical level than the behavioural level (House & Javidan, 2004). Much of the advice is mainly cultural-free and general and lack of cultural-specific guidelines. Global leaders are expected to obtain certain qualities and skills to respect and understand different cultures, yet they are not given sufficient knowledge on what to behave and achieve this principle.

The present results basically answered the three proposed research questions. More specifically, these results indicate that there are significant differences as well as similar perceptions on outstanding leadership behaviours in China and New Zealand culture. Furthermore, it examines how leadership behaviours are viewed different in China and New Zealand by conducting relevant statistically analysis. Out of four hypotheses tested, modest support was found. Taken together, overall findings using China and New Zealand data are generally supportive of the previous GLOBE studies.

4.1 Explanations and analysis

Leadership is viewed differently if the cultural context is not the same (Hofstede, 1983). To answer what makes an outstanding leader is not easy. Culture inevitably influences the formation of attitudes, beliefs and perceptions (Fiske, 2002). These existing attributes are the products of common values and beliefs of a society, and they offer certain standards for individuals to perceive interpret and assess behaviours. Despite the fundamental differences between China and New Zealand, some important similarities were also explored. I hypothesized that universal attributes of management systems can be found in today's organisations and those distinct management approaches are influenced by culture directly and indirectly.

The roles of personal and cultural values are essential to understand the effectiveness and influence of leadership behaviours in cross-cultural settings. From a comparative cross-cultural perspective, the results demonstrate that there are cross-cultural differences across two cultures in personal traits, characteristics and behaviours which are considered important to outstanding leadership.

The present findings further support the idea that Chinese culture places high value on hierarchy and authority orientation, whilst New Zealand values egalitarianism more highly. Cultural patterns of the two countries are reflected in the scores of some of the leadership items tested. Chinese leaders rated some traits of 'administratively competent' and 'procedural' higher than New Zealand participants did, suggesting that China is still influenced by the cultural pattern of collectivism and Confucian ideas.

Another contribution of this investigation is that universal leadership behaviours viewed as positive to outstanding leadership have been confirmed. Non-significant cultural differences were found for traits of visionary, modesty, team integrator, humane-oriented and collaborative team orientation. In the paragraphs that follow, a detailed interpretation of findings will be presented.

Charisma/Value-based leadership. Both Chinese and New Zealand participants believe effective leaders should be visionary, inspirational and decisive. More specifically, a good leader should have a good vision and think ahead. The transformational leadership approach is highly recognized here. Interestingly, the most striking observation to emerge from the results comparison is that both China and New Zealand has a same score in charisma 1 (visionary). This might be due to their common perception that effective leaders need to be anticipative, able to forecast events and bring future to their followers in organisations. In addition, they need to inspire and encourage followers by exerting their personal influence and commitment. Therefore, personal charisma is extremely important. Overall results may be explained by the fact that both culture valued the personal influence, core factor of leadership behaviour. Leaders with a strong mind, extra insight and logical thinking are viewed as excellent leaders in both cultures.

It is possible that Charisma/Value-based dimension could still be a contributing factor towards outstanding leadership regardless of cultural contexts.

However, among this leadership dimension, New Zealand participants gave much higher ratings of performance-oriented, which might suggest performance is highly valued and more important than in Chinese leadership. Leaders score high on performance orientation, perhaps suggesting they focus on individual performance enhancement to be effective.

Team-oriented leadership. The results in both countries confirm the importance of synergy. Good leaders in both countries believe the effort of group members is able to contribute to organisational success. Leaders are supposed to build up effective teams, keep up good networking with their colleagues and enhance their morale, in order to have greater-than-expected outcomes. By doing that, they co-ordinate and integrate teams in a team environment towards the overall business objectives. Both results indicate that effective leaders are supposed to be administratively competent. My findings and previous GLOBE studies rejected H3, but confirmed overall GLOBE China and New Zealand findings that team integrity and builder is a contributing factor across cultures. Despite that fact I have got very similar results, I can hypothesize that the perceptions of team under Chinese and New Zealand culture are not exactly the same. Apparently, this hypothesis needs empirical support in the future.

Self-protective leadership. The overall finding is consistent with previous GLOBE studies that self-protective is viewed an impeding factor to achieving leadership excellence. More specifically, New Zealand leaders do not favour formal rules or administrative details. Neither do they use prescribed orders to carry out procedures. They would not be micro-managers. Furthermore, the low rating of face-saver could be attributed to the fact that effective leaders in New Zealand would prefer feedback on their leadership implementation. The results also indicate that effective leaders should not always consider and pursue their own interests. It supports the Chinese cultural value

of in-group importance. It is possible the results would keep no surprise in both societies for a long time.

Humane-oriented leadership. Results found in China and New Zealand reveal that outstanding leaders should be humane. In Chinese culture, as mentioned earlier, leaders representing the authorities of organisations are expected to lead organisations intensively while New Zealand leaders also highly promote personal influence in managing organisations and their followers; they try to make their subordinates follow their instructions willingly. Leaders have designated roles and responsibilities to take; they must obey the policies/rules made and concern themselves not only with profits but also with people's expectations and values. Moreover, according to the Confucian principle of *Ren* (benevolence), leaders should value humanistic love with personal care and compassion. Effective leaders should treat people well. Chinese leaders particularly emphasize the moral terms instead of rules or regulations. Present findings seem to support previous research by Fu Ping Ping and Kennedy who indicated that effective and excellent leaders must have certain personal leadership characteristics and self-deprecating attitudes such as modesty, honesty and reliance. Characteristics such as being hostile and dishonest are not accepted in a good leader. Effective leaders should be kind, approachable, open-minded and willing to learn new things. I assume that these people-related attributes would not be changed dramatically in Chinese and New Zealand culture but vary in degrees.

Participative leadership. As the results suggest, both Chinese and New Zealand participants basically believe effective leaders should not tell subordinates what to do in a commanding way: they do not favour bossy leaders. They would expect leaders to implement a participative style to make decisions, and concern themselves with group needs rather than being individual-oriented. In addition, the findings indicate that effective leaders should not dominate other people's behaviours and ideas. The approach of maintaining close supervision is not welcomed. Compared to previous results in this dimension, New Zealand leaders would rate higher than leaders from China do. Current results support this fact, which might suggest that even though both cultures believe

participative leadership is a positive factor in outstanding leadership achievement, they vary in degrees as well.

Autonomous leadership. In contrast to earlier findings from Chinese samples, current results have slightly higher ratings, which might indicate that Chinese leaders start to believe autonomy may be a factor that can influence leadership excellence. This could be attributed to the influence of recent Western managerial perspectives and the outcome of frequent learning from the West. However, in New Zealand sample, effective leaders have nothing to do with some personal traits such as self-governing, unique and different behaviours from their peers. Current results are very similar to previous studies which support the idea that autonomy has no impact on achieving leadership excellence.

Based on the findings above, leaders in China and New Zealand stress the importance of global leader qualities. In particular, I summarised several competencies of global leaders from the findings.

Social awareness. Similar to earlier studies, leadership excellence depends on the quality and improvement of self-management capacity. In other words, I believe to be effective, leaders themselves are expected to be aware of their major roles in organisational performance and business success. They need to have a deep understanding of their strengths and weaknesses, personal drives and reactions to problems. Personal extra insight is extremely important to evaluate the values they have to promote and deal with value diversity. Meanwhile, as the results suggest, effective leaders should obtain visionary skills to see the big picture and continuously improve their managerial skills and develop themselves for organisational goal attainment.

Engagement in transformation. This refers to a personal ability to interact with other people. The current results show that effective leaders are supposed to be participative and sensitive to other's expectations and needs. Warm-heartedness and respect are highly expected. They need to emotionally influence people's behaviours and connect with people from various backgrounds, listen to different viewpoints, communicate in

appropriate ways and understand different people. They ideally should be culturally sensitive to building, motivating, inspiring people across cultures.

Knowledge management and learning organisation. Effective leaders need to have the ability to perform well and generate visible outcomes. This relates to the attainment of behavioural levels of global leadership qualities. Current findings highlight the importance of learning organisations. Knowledge here refers to essential technical knowledge, language skills and technical expertise. With regard to national culture, knowledge for global leaders also means understanding people and how culture impacts on organisational communication. The most effective leaders are expected to identify the universal basics of human functioning and appreciate cultural differences and be able to manage cultural diversity. An appropriate learning culture with a positive organisational environment and open system should be established to properly manage staff with different cultural backgrounds. This idea can be reflected in the high rating of attributes such as administratively competent and diplomatic. They should make employees satisfied and comfortable when they work together. The results in both countries reveal that leaders who dislike argument, discussion, feedback, communication and unable to resolve conflict are viewed a negative factor against leadership excellence.

In short, national culture is able to influence perceptions of leadership behaviours for a long time. Nonetheless, it is true that national culture contains various subcultures that differ from the culture. This can explain why some common perceptions can be found under completely different societies. I personally view national culture as a key factor that influences perceptions of leadership behaviours.

4.2 Practical implications

The findings of this study have a number of important implications for leadership practice. First, global leaders who attempt to work within Chinese culture should be aware that Confucian ideas and ideology shape the characteristics of Chinese leadership

with the emphasis of moral and ethical foundations. Confucianism is a double-sided sword in leadership practice in China. In addition, Chinese leaders do strongly believe the importance of social responsibility and ethics, and realize their impacts on organisational success. For top-executives doing business in China, it contributes to establishment of an appropriate culture and business climate with a transformational leadership approach to direct organisations to enhance performance effectiveness.

In terms of the key role of role-modelling, top leaders thus are able to know Chinese leadership is a symbol of a talented, effective and high performer. It enables followers to have enhanced morale, and the confidence to follow their heads to perform better, thus leading to business success.

It also needs to point out some aspects of Confucian ideas would have some negative impacts against leadership excellence in a business context. For example, Chinese cultural norms believe in face-saving and reciprocation. These could result in concealing personal errors, protecting bad performers, hiding the truth and leading to a sense of unfairness in the workforce. The Chinese practice of gift-giving could result in exchange of interests or even bribery. None of these issues in leadership practices should be overlooked.

In sum, Confucianism, an essential component of Chinese culture, has been addressed with respect to leadership practice in China. Managers who attempt to work in Chinese cultural backgrounds need to know that it is the key ideas of Confucianism that shape people's value systems and influence their perceptions of outstanding leadership behaviours. Collectivism, an important aspect of the cultural pattern, contributes to leadership attributes and characteristics such as trust, loyalty, indirect communication and a climate of transformational leadership. Current findings also suggest that moral leadership is highly expected in Chinese organisations. Chinese leaders believe responsibilities and ethics are critically important to business success. In addition to this, findings indicate that Chinese leadership still emphasizes the key roles of network building in business practice.

However, compared with the results of New Zealand, Chinese leadership is changing slowly as influenced by the Western managerial approaches. Participative style should be noticed and implemented in any Chinese context..

In terms of implications of New Zealand leadership, executives from cultural backgrounds that value status consciousness are expected to know the different perceptions of effective leaders if they work in New Zealand. Understanding the high level of informality in New Zealand is absolutely necessary. Leaders are not determined by their positions and backgrounds. Instead, the lack of bureaucracy between leaders and followers/employees indicates gaining followers' acknowledgement is very important as well.

Based on the low level of power distance in New Zealand, outstanding leaders are supposed to be open-minded, integrative and approachable. Also, the importance of clear vision and straightforward communication cannot be ignored. To be effective leaders in New Zealand, individual performance and teamwork must be emphasized. Interactions with people in organisations as well as personal performance need to be properly assessed.

In short, leaders working in a cross-cultural context need to have a sophisticated understanding of the essence of culture as an adaptive response by developing their greatest leadership competencies. They also need to be aware that culture is a complex system consisting of multiple elements. Global leaders should behave like reflective learners who are able to cope with complex cultural practice.

4.3 Limitations and future research

Several important limitations need to be noted regarding the present study. Firstly, the total sample (109 cases in China and 84 cases in New Zealand) is relatively small for fully exploring the leadership dimensions in these two countries. Secondly, this study

did not discuss the effects of national culture on leadership behaviour in detail. Thirdly, data collection in China took place before the Beijing Olympics. It is possible that the accuracy of some responses may have been influenced by forthcoming events.

Future research exploring in greater depth the relationship between culture and leadership will be needed for a reliable cross-cultural study. Further research is also required to discuss the culture and its implication towards leaders in the workplace. To properly investigate the leadership behaviours in targeted countries, more cases from different cities/areas in similar industries/occupations definitely will be required

5 Conclusion

The complex global economy has dramatically changed organisational practice today. Managerial communication frequency from one culture to another has increased due to globalization. Culture and its relevant forces clearly influence many aspects of leadership. National culture plays an essential role in understanding preferred leadership behaviours for organisational success. Leadership practices commonly used by business leaders are influenced by personal values that arise from their individual cultural background. Leaders have two straightforward responsibilities: understanding people and encouraging people to perform well to achieve business success. From the technical side of leadership, effective leaders are expected to have the functional knowledge and skills to know how people may enhance their performance.

On the other hand, culture is the product of human social interaction. Leaders are the cultural agents who transmit the core values within organisations and societies. The standard of excellence for managerial leadership across cultures is very difficult to achieve. The roles that leadership play are critically important to keep organisations moving forward. From a cross-cultural perspective, leading across cultures requires specific attributes and knowledge along with technical expertise and interpersonal skills identified by outstanding global leaders. Moreover, cross-cultural leaders must learn quickly from experience. From a perspective of human resource development, this paper might provide a basis for organisations in China and New Zealand to plan appropriate training programs to mentor successful leaders with expected personal qualities and characteristics.

Further understanding of the interplay between cross-cultural values/beliefs and leadership behaviours in business practice can assist managers to establish a wider scope, from a traditional perspective to a more cross-culturally comprehensive approach to business activities and leadership implementation. This study compares the leadership

dimensions in China and New Zealand based on previous GLOBE studies. It also provides a basis for future research in cross-cultural leadership. Overall conclusions that emerge from this paper confirm the previous findings that ideal leadership characteristics in China are different from New Zealand.

6 References

Akooie, M.E.M., & Leung, L.C. (1994). *The consequences of culture: An investigation into differences in management style: The case of New Zealand and Chinese firms in New Zealand*. In Feng, Y. and Wee, C. (Eds.), AIBSEAR 1994, Proceedings of the 10th Academy of International Business Southeast Asia Regional Conference on Asia-Pacific Business Year 2000, 23-25 June, China Aviation Industry Press, Beijing, China, 630-36.

Avery, G. C. (2004). *Understanding leadership: Paradigms and cases*. London: Sage Publications.

Badaracco Jr., J. L., (2002). *Leading quietly: An unorthodox guide to doing the right thing*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Baruch, Y. (2002). No such thing as a global manager. *Business Horizons*, 45 (1), 36-42.

Bian, Y. J., & Ang, S. (1997). Guanxi networks and job mobility in China and Singapore. *Social Forces*, 75, 981–1006.

Bracken, B. A; & Barona, A. (1991). State of the art procedures for translating, validating and using psychoeducational tests in cross-cultural assessment. *School Psychology International*, 12, 119–32.

Bradford, D., Cohen, A. (1998). *Power up! Transforming organisations through shared leadership*. CA: Jossey-Bass.

Brake, T. (1997). *The global leader: Critical factors for creating the world class organisation*. Chicago: Irwin Professional Publishing.

Cammock, P., Nilakant, V., & Dakin, S.R. (1995). Developing a lay model of managerial effectiveness: A social constructionist perspective. *Journal of Management Studies*, 32(4), 443-476.

Campbell-Hunt, C., & Corbett, L. (1996). *A season for excellence? An overview of New Zealand enterprise in the nineties*. Wellington: New Zealand Institute of Economic Research.

Child, J. (1981), "Culture, contingency and capitalism in the cross-national study of organisations", in Cummings, L.L. and Staw, B.M. (Eds), *Research in Organisational Behaviour*, 3, JAI Press, 303-56.

Chhokar, J.S., Brodbeck, F.C., & House, R.J. (2007). (Eds). *Culture, and leadership across the world: the GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Connerley, M. L., & Pederson, P. B. (2005). *Leadership in a diverse and multicultural cross-cultural context: Making progress, and raising new questions*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 729-68.

Dalton, M., 1998. Developing leaders for global roles. In: McCauley, C., Moxley, R., VanVelsor, E. (Eds.), *Center for creative leadership handbook of leadership development*. Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, NC, 379–402.

Dickson, M. W., Den Hartog, D.N., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2003). Research on leadership in a cross-cultural context: Making progress and raising new questions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 729-68.

Dietz, M.C., Orr, G., & Xing, J.(2008). How Chinese companies can succeed abroad. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 3, 22-31

Dorfman, P., W. (1998). Implications of vertical and horizontal individualism and collectivism for leadership effectiveness. In L.C. Change & R.B. Peterson (Eds.), *Advances in international comparative management* (12, 53-65). CT: Greenwich.

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

Emery, F. (1995). Participative design: Effective, flexible and successful, now! *Journal for Quality & Participation*, 18, 6-9.

Farth, J.L., & Cheng, B.S. (1999). A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organisations. In J.T. Li, A.S. Tsui, & E.Weldon (Eds.), *Management and organisations in China: Current issues and future research directions*. (84-127). London: MacMillan.

Fiske, A.P. (2002), Using individualism and collectivism to compare cultures – A critique of the validity and measurement of the constructs. Comment on Oyserman et al.. (2002), *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 78-88.

Fu, P. P., Li, J., Chow, I., & Peng, T. K. (2002). Societal development and the change of leadership style in oriental Chinese societies. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 18(1), 46-63.

Fu, P.P., & Wu, W.K. (2000). Management and leadership in Chinese organisations: Change and development in the past two decades. In C.M. Lau & J.F. Shen. (Eds.). *China Review 2000*, (381-404). Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

Goldsmith, M., & Walt, K. (1999). New competencies for tomorrow's global leader. *CMA Management*, 12-20.

Graen, G. B., Hui, C., & Gu, Q. L. (2004). A new approach to intercultural cooperation. In G B. Graen (Ed.) *New frontiers of leadership, LMX Leadership: The series, 2*, 225–246. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Harris, P.R., & Moran, R.T. (1987). *Managing cultural differences* (2nd ed.). Houston: Gulf Publishing Company.

Hines, G. (1973). *The New Zealand manager*. Wellington: Hicks, Smith & Sons Ltd.

Hofstede, G. (2001), *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviours, institutions, and organisations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.

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

Hofstede, G. (2006). What did GLOBE really measure? Researchers' minds vs. respondents' minds. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(6), 882-896.

House, R.J.(1998). A brief history of GLOBE. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 13 (3/4), 230-240.

House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Leadership, culture, and organisations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. CA: Sage.

House, R.J. & Javidan, M. (2004). 'Overview of GLOBE', in R.J. House, P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman and V. Gupta (Eds), *Culture, Leadership and Organisations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

House, R.J., Javidan, M., & Dorfman, P.W.(2001). Project GLOBE: An introduction. *Applied Psychology, An International Review*, 50(4), 489-505.

Inkson, J.H.K., & Henshall, B.(1990). Transformational leadership and management development, in P. Boxall (Eds.). *Function in search of a future: Perspectives on contemporary human resource management in New Zealand* (157-171). Auckland: Longman Paul.

Irving, D., Inkson, J.H.K. (1998). *It must be Wattie's: From Kiwi icon to global player*. Auckland: David Bateman Ltd.

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

Jensen Arnett, J. (2002). The psychology of globalization, *American Psychologist*, 57, 774-83.

Judge, T.A., & Bono, J, E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 751-765.

Jung, D.I.(2001). Transformational and transactional leadership and their effects on creativity in groups. *Creativity Research Journal*, 13, 185-195.

Kempton, W., Boster, J.S. & Hartley, J.A. (1995). *Environmental values in American culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press,

Kenis, I.(1977). A cross-cultural study of personality and leadership. *Group & Organisation Studies*, 2(1), 49-60.

Kennedy, J.C. (2000). Leadership in New Zealand: Findings of the Globe study, *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 4, 45-52.

Ling, W. Q. (1989). Patterns of leadership behaviour assessment in China. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 32, 129-134.

- Ling, W.Q., & Fang, L.(2003). The Chinese leadership theory. In W.H. Mobley & P.W. Dorfman (Eds.). *Advances in global leadership*. (3,183-204). Oxford: JAI.
- Littrell, R.F.(2002). Desirable leadership behaviours of multi-cultural managers in China. *The Journal of Management and Development*, 21(1), 5-74.
- Lok, P.,& Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development*, 23, 321–338.
- Lord, R.G., & Maher, K,J.(1991). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perceptions and performance*. Boston: MA.
- McCall, M.W., Jr & Hollenbeck, G.P. (2002). *Developing global executives: The lessons of international experience*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Melloan, G. (2004), Feeling the Muscle of the Multinationals, *Wall Street Journal*, 6 January 2004.
- Miroshnik, V.(2002), Culture and international management: A review, *Journal of Management Development*, 21, 521–544.
- Misumi, J. (1985). The behavioural science of leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research program. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Misumi, J., & Peterson, M. F.(1985). The performance-maintenance theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 207.
- Morrison, A. J.(2000). Developing a global leadership model. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 39 (2-3), 117-131.

Parry, K. W. (1996). *Transformational leadership: Developing an enterprising management culture*. Melbourne: Pitman Publishing.

Pearce, C.L., Sims Jr., H.P., (2000). Shared leadership: Toward a multi-level theory of leadership. In: Beyerlein, M., Johnson, D., & Beyerlein, S. (Eds.), *Advances in interdisciplinary studies of work teams: Team Leadership*, 7. JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 115–139.

Quinn, R. E. (1996). *Deep change: Discovering the leader within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ralston, D., Gustafson, D., Cheung, F., & Terpstra, R. (1993). Differences in managerial values: A study of US, Hong Kong and PRC managers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24 (2), 249-275.

Rappin, S. (1995). *The competencies used to assess the effectiveness of New Zealand managers*. Unpublished Ph.D., Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington: New Zealand.

Singer, M.(1985). Transformational and transactional leadership: A study of New Zealand company managers. *Psychological Reports*, 56, 916-818.

Smith, P.B., Misumi, M.H., Paterson, M., & Bond, M.H.(1989). On the generality of leadership styles across cultures. *Journal of Organisational Psychology*, 62, 97-110.

Srinivas, K.M. (1995). Globalization of business and the third world: Challenge of expanding the Mindsets. *Journal of Management Development*, 14 (3), 26-49.

Tait, R. (1996). The attributes of leadership. *Leadership and Organisational Development Journal*, 17(1), 27-31.

Tapsell, S.(1997). Is Maori management different? *Management*, 44,46-50.

Tom, K.S. (1989). *Echoes from old China: Life, legends, and lore of the middle kingdoms*. Honolulu: Hawaii Chinese History Center.

Toulson, P.K., (1990). *Perceptions, practices, and productivity: An assessment of personnel management in New Zealand*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Trevor-Roberts, E., & Kennedy, J.C.(2003). The egalitarian leader: A comparison of leadership in Australia and New Zealand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20, 517-540.

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

Vandenberg, R. J.; & Lance C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organisational research, *Organisational Research Methods*, 3, 4–69.

Wang, Z.M., & Satow, T.(1994). Leadership styles and organisational effectiveness in Chinese-Japanese joint ventures. *Journal of Management Psychology*, 9 (4), 31-36.

Wong, K.C.(2001). Chinese culture and leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 4(4), 309-319.

Xu, F. (1991). *The thinking method of the Chinese* (Translation); Taiwan: Student Press.

Yeung, I.Y.M., & Tung, R.L.(1996). Achieving business success in Confucian societies: The importance of connections. *Organisational Dynamics*, 25(2), 54-66.

Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.

7 Further reading

Fu, P.P., Wu, R.X., Yang, Y.K., & Ye J. (2007). Chinese culture and leadership. In Chhokar, J.S., Broddeck, F.C., & House, R.J. (Eds). *Culture, and leadership across the world: the GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies* .New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., & Gupta, V. (2004). (Eds.). Culture, leadership and organisations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies. Thousand Oaks, London and New Delhi: Sage Publications.

House, R.J., Spangler, D. and Woycke, J. (1991), Personality and charisma in the US Presidency: a psychological theory of leadership effectiveness, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 364-96.

Kennedy, J. C. (2007). Leadership and culture in New Zealand. In Chokar, J.S., Broddeck, F.C., & House, R.J. (Eds). *Culture, and leadership across the world: the GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Trevor-Roberts, E., & Kennedy, J.C.(2003). The egalitarian leader: A comparison of leadership in Australia and New Zealand. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 20, 517-540.

8 Appendix



Invitation to Participate in a Business Research Study

Project Title: A comparative study of leadership behaviours in China and New Zealand

Invitation

What is the purpose of this study? This cross-cultural study is a part of a multi-national, longitudinal project to obtain research data comparing opinions, attitudes and beliefs concerning individual values and desirable leadership behaviour from business people. This particular project deals with business people across cultures, to obtain information to facilitate future business relationships between the two groups. It is expected that the knowledge generated will facilitate doing business between and within groups. Data from several countries has already been gathered, and this study will be used in part to compare managerial leadership across many national cultures over a period of years. If others wish to participate, please copy the form and return all in the return envelope.

How was a person chosen to be asked to be part of the study? Volunteers from randomly selected organisations.

Can I join the study? Joining the study is voluntary; you merely have to request a survey from Romie.Littrell@aut.ac.nz ; contact this email address, or +64-9-921-9999x5805 with any questions.

What happens in the study?

A questionnaire describing leader behaviours given to you to complete and return, along with a demographic data sheet.

What are the discomforts and risks? There should be no physical discomforts; if you choose to participate you need to take the time to accurately complete the questionnaire, usually about a half-hour or so. There are no risks; your anonymity will be protected.

What are the benefits? The benefits are that we will collect data and provide information on how to facilitate the mutual engagement of business people from China and New Zealand; the benefits to you are that you may be able to operate in a more efficient and effective manner in your business from reading the results of the study.

How is my privacy protected? The questionnaires will be completed anonymously; no company affiliation or individual name data will be collected. By completing this questionnaire you are indicating your consent to participate in this research.

Costs of Participating: 30 to 60 minutes of your time

Opportunity to consider invitation: Completion of the attached questionnaire will be taken as indicating your consent to participate. Participation is completely voluntary; you may decide to participate or not at any time. After the survey is sent to the researcher, we cannot identify your particular questionnaire, so it cannot be returned.

Participant Concerns - Any concerns regarding the nature of this project should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor at 09-921-9999x5805, romie.littrell@aut.ac.nz. Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary, AUTECH, Madeline Banda, madeline.banda@aut.ac.nz, in New Zealand: 64 - 9 - 921- 9999x8044. AUT, Private Bag 92006, Auckland 1142, New Zealand.

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee

Date: February 2004 to 31 December 2008

AUTECH Reference Number: 03/183

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS OF LEADERSHIP SURVEY

For section 1 and 2, you are given a list of behaviours and characteristics that a leader might display. You are asked to rate these behaviours and characteristics using the scale shown below. To do this, on the line next to each behaviour or characteristic write the number from the scale that best describes how displaying that behaviour or characteristic affects the leader's effectiveness.

SCALE

- 1=** This behaviour or characteristic **greatly inhibits** a person from being an outstanding leader.
- 2=** This behaviour or characteristic **somewhat inhibits** a person from being an outstanding leader.
- 3=** This behaviour or characteristic **slightly inhibits** a person from being an outstanding leader.
- 4=** This behaviour or characteristic **has no impact** on whether a person is an outstanding leader.
- 5=** This behaviour or characteristic **contributes slightly** to a person being an outstanding leader.
- 6=** This behaviour or characteristic **contributes somewhat** to a person being an outstanding leader.
- 7=** This behaviour or characteristic **contributes greatly** to a person being an outstanding leader.

An example is shown below. If you believed that being tall inhibited a person from being an outstanding leader, you would write 1, 2, or 3 on the line to the left of "Tall," depending on how much you thought being tall inhibited outstanding leadership. If you believed that being tall contributes to a person's being an outstanding leader, you would write 5, 6, or 7 on the line to the left of "Tall," depending on how much you thought being tall contributed to outstanding leadership. Finally, if you believed that being tall had no effect on whether a person was an outstanding leader, you would write 4 on the line to the left of "Tall."

	A.	Tall	=	Of significantly above average height
--	-----------	-------------	----------	--

Section 1 — Leader Behaviours

Instructions: You are probably aware of people in your organisation or industry who are exceptionally skilled at motivating, influencing, or enabling you, others, or groups to contribute to the success of the organisation or task. In this country, we might call such people "outstanding leaders."

On the following pages are several behaviours and characteristics that can be used to describe leaders. Each behaviour or characteristic is accompanied by a short definition to clarify its meaning. Using the above description of outstanding leaders as a guide, rate the behaviours and characteristics on the following pages. To do this, on the line next to each behaviour or characteristic write the number from the scale below that best describes how important that behaviour or characteristic is for a leader to be outstanding.

SCALE

1 = This behaviour or characteristic greatly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader.
2 = This behaviour or characteristic somewhat inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader.
3 = This behaviour or characteristic slightly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader.
4 = This behaviour or characteristic has no impact on whether a person is an outstanding leader.
5 = This behaviour or characteristic contributes slightly to a person being an outstanding leader.
6 = This behaviour or characteristic contributes somewhat to a person being an outstanding leader.
7 = This behaviour or characteristic contributes greatly to a person being an outstanding leader.

Section 1 questions start here.

	1-1	Diplomatic =	Skilled at interpersonal relations, tactful
	1-2	Evasive =	Refrains from making negative comments to maintain good relationships and save face
	1-3	Mediator =	Intervenes to solve conflicts between individuals
	1-4	Bossy =	Tells subordinates what to do in a commanding way
	1-5	Positive =	Generally optimistic and confident
	1-6	Intra-group competitor =	Tries to exceed the performance of others in his or her group
	1-7	Autonomous =	Acts independently, does not rely on others
	1-8	Independent =	Does not rely on others; self-governing
	1-9	Ruthless =	Punitive; Having no pity or compassion

	1-10	Tender =	Easily hurt or offended
	1-11	Improvement-oriented =	Seeks continuous performance improvement
	1-12	Inspirational =	Inspires emotions, beliefs, values, and behaviours of others, inspires others to be motivated to work hard
	1-13	Anticipatory =	Anticipates, attempts to forecast events, considers what will happen in the future
	1-14	Risk taker =	Willing to invest major resources in endeavours that do not have high probability of successful
	1-15	Sincere =	Means what he/she says, earnest
	1-16	Trustworthy =	Deserves trust, can be believed and relied upon to keep his/her word
	1-17	Worldly =	Interested in temporal events, has a world outlook
	1-18	Intra-group conflict avoider =	Avoids disputes with members of his or her group
	1-19	Administratively skilled =	Able to plan, organize, coordinate and control work of large numbers (over 75) of individuals
	1-20	Just =	Acts according to what is right or fair
	1-21	Win/win problem-solver =	Able to identify solutions which satisfy individuals with diverse and conflicting interests
	1-22	Clear =	Easily understood
	1-23	Self-interested =	Pursues own best interests
	1-24	Tyrannical =	Acts such as a tyrant or despot; imperious
	1-25	Integrator =	Integrates people or things into cohesive, working whole
	1-26	Calm =	Not easily distressed
	1-27	Provocateur =	Stimulates unrest
	1-28	Loyal =	Stays with and supports friends even when they have substantial problems or difficulties
	1-29	Unique =	An unusual person, has characteristics of behaviours that are different from most others
	1-30	Collaborative =	Works jointly with others

	1-31	Encouraging =	Gives courage, confidence or hope through reassuring and advising
	1-32	Morale booster =	Increases morale of subordinates by offering encouragement, praise, and/or by being confident
	1-33	Arrogant =	Presumptuous or overbearing
	1-34	Orderly =	Is organised and methodical in work
	1-35	Prepared =	Is ready for future events
	1-36	Autocratic =	Makes decisions in dictatorial way
	1-37	Secretive =	Tends to conceal information from others
	1-38	Asocial =	Avoids people or groups, prefers own company
	1-39	Fraternal =	Tends to be a good friend of subordinates
	1-40	Generous =	Willing to give time, money, resources and help to others
	1-41	Formal =	Acts in accordance with rules, convention and ceremonies
	1-42	Modest =	Does not boast, presents self in a humble manner
	1-43	Intelligent =	Smart, learns and understands easily
	1-44	Decisive =	Makes decisions firmly and quickly
	1-45	Consultative =	Consults with others before making plans or taking action
	1-46	Irritable =	Moody; easily agitated
	1-47	Loner =	Works and acts separately from others
	1-48	Enthusiastic =	Demonstrates and imparts strong positive emotions for work
	1-49	Risk averse =	Avoids taking risks, dissuch ass risk
	1-50	Vindictive =	Vengeful; seeks revenge when wronged
	1-51	Compassionate =	Has empathy for others, inclined to be helpful or show mercy
	1-52	Subdued =	Suppressed, quiet, tame

	1-53	Egocentric =	Self-absorbed, thoughts focus mostly on one's self
	1-54	Non-explicit =	Subtle, does not communicate explicitly, communicates by metaphor, allegory, or example
	1-55	Distant =	Aloof, stands off from others, difficult to become friends with
	1-56	Intellectually stimulating=	Encourages others to think and use their minds; challenges beliefs, stereotypes and attitudes of others

This concludes Section 1. Please go on to Section 2.

Section 2 — Leader Behaviours (Part II)

Instructions: This section follows the same format as that of Section 1. You should again rate the leader behaviours and characteristics on the following pages. To do this, on the line next to each behaviour or characteristic write the number from the scale below that best describes how important that behaviour or characteristic is for a leader to be outstanding.

SCALE

<p>1= This behaviour or characteristic greatly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader.</p> <p>2= This behaviour or characteristic somewhat inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader.</p> <p>3= This behaviour or characteristic slightly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader.</p> <p>4= This behaviour or characteristic has no impact on whether a person is an outstanding leader.</p> <p>5= This behaviour or characteristic contributes slightly to a person being an outstanding leader.</p> <p>6= This behaviour or characteristic contributes somewhat to a person being an outstanding leader.</p> <p>7= This behaviour or characteristic contributes greatly to a person being an outstanding leader.</p>

Section 2 questions begin here.

	2-1	Cautious =	Proceeds/performs with great care and does not take risks
	2-2	Organised =	Well organized, methodical, orderly
	2-3	Cunning =	Sly, deceitful, full of guile
	2-4	Informed =	Knowledgeable; aware of information.
	2-5	Effective bargainer =	Is able to negotiate effectively, able to make transactions with others on favourable terms
	2-6	Egotistical =	Conceited, convinced of own abilities
	2-7	Non-cooperative =	Unwilling to work jointly with others
	2-8	Logical =	Applies logic when thinking

2-9	Status-conscious =	Aware of others' socially accepted status
2-10	Foresight =	Anticipates possible future events
2-11	Plans ahead =	Anticipates and prepares in advance
2-12	Normative =	Behaves according to the norms of his or her group
2-13	Individually-oriented =	Concerned with and places high value on preserving individual rather than group needs
2-14	Non-egalitarian =	Believes that all individuals are not equal and only some should have equal rights and privileges
2-15	Intuitive =	Has extra insight
2-16	Indirect =	Does not go straight to the point, uses metaphors and examples to communicate
2-17	Habitual =	Given to a constant, regular routine
2-18	Self-effacing =	Presents self in a modest way
2-19	Able to anticipate=	Able to successfully anticipate future needs
2-20	Motive arouser =	Mobilizes and activates followers
2-21	Sensitive =	Aware of slight changes in other's moods, restricts discussion to prevent embarrassment
2-22	Convincing =	Unusually able to persuade others of his/her viewpoint
2-23	Communicative =	Communicates with others frequently
2-24	Excellence-oriented =	Strives for excellence in performance of self and subordinates
2-25	Procedural =	Follows established rules and guidelines
2-26	Confidence builder=	Instils others with confidence by showing confidence in them
2-27	Group-oriented =	Concerned with the welfare of the group
2-28	Class conscious =	Is conscious of class and status boundaries and acts accordingly
2-29	Non-participative =	Does not participate with others
2-30	Self-sacrificial =	Foregoes self-interests and makes personal sacrifices in the interest of a goal or vision

	2-31	Patient =	Has and shows patience
	2-32	Honest =	Speaks and acts truthfully
	2-33	Domineering =	Inclined to dominate others
	2-34	Intra-group face saver =	Ensures that other group members are not embarrassed or shamed
	2-35	Dynamic =	Highly involved, energetic, enthused, motivated
	2-36	Coordinator =	Integrates and manages work of subordinates
	2-37	Elitist =	Believes that a small number of people with similar backgrounds are superior and should enjoy privileges
	2-38	Team builder =	Able to induce group members to work together
	2-39	Cynical =	Tends to believe the worst about people and events
	2-40	Performance-oriented =	Sets high standards of performance
	2-41	Ambitious =	Sets high goals, works hard
	2-42	Motivational =	Stimulates others to put forth efforts above and beyond the call of duty and make personal sacrifices
	2-43	Micro-manager =	An extremely close supervisor, one who insists on making all decisions
	2-44	Non-delegator =	Unwilling or unable to relinquish control of projects or tasks
	2-45	Avoids negatives =	Avoids saying no to another when requested to do something, even when it cannot be done
	2-46	Visionary =	Has a vision and imagination of the future
	2-47	Wilful =	Strong-willed, determined, resolute, persistent
	2-48	Ruler =	Is in charge and does not tolerate disagreement or questioning, gives orders
	2-49	Dishonest =	Fraudulent, insincere
	2-50	Hostile =	Actively unfriendly, acts negatively toward others
	2-51	Future-oriented =	Makes plans and takes actions based on future goals
	2-52	Good administrator=	Has ability to manage complex office work and administrative systems

	2-53	Dependable =	Reliable
	2-54	Dictatorial =	Forces her/his values and opinions on others
	2-55	Individualistic =	Behaves in a different manner than peers
	2-56	Ritualistic =	Uses a prescribed order to carry out procedures

This concludes Section 2. Please go on to Section 3.

Section 3 — Demographic questions

Following are several questions about you, your background, and the place where you work. These questions are important because they help us to see if different types of people respond to the questions on this questionnaire in different ways. They are NOT used to identify any individual.

Questions about your personal background

3-1. How old are you? _____ years old:

3-2. What is your gender? (tick one) Male _____ Female _____

3-3. What is your country of citizenship / passport? _____

3-4. What country were you born in? _____

3-5. How long have you lived in the country where you currently live?
Years _____

3-6. Besides your country of birth, how many other countries have you lived in for longer than one year?

Countries: _____

3-7. What is your ethnic background?

3-8. Do you have a religious affiliation? YES / NO

3-9 If you answer yes to question above, please indicate the name of the religion.

Questions about your family background

3-10. What country was your mother born in?

3-11. What country was your father born in?

3-12. What language(s) were spoken in your home when you were a child?

3-13. How many years of full-time work experience have you had? _____ years

3-14. If a manager, how many years have you been a manager? years: _____ or I'm not a manager ____

3-15. How long have you worked for your current employer? _____ years and _____ months.

3-16 Have you ever worked for a multinational corporation? (Circle one) YES / NO

3-17. Do you belong to any professional associations or networks? (Circle one) YES / NO

3-18. Do you participate in any industrial or trade association activities? (Circle one) YES / NO

Questions about your educational background

3-19. How many years of formal education do you have? _____ years of formal education:

3-20. If you have an educational major or area of specialization, what is it? _____

3-21. Have you received any formal training in Western management practices? YES / NO

Questions about this organisation

3-22. Please indicate the kind of work done primarily done by your unit:

Tick here

	Administration
	Engineering, manufacturing or production
	Finance or accounting
	Human resource management or personnel management
	Marketing
	Planning
	Purchasing
	Research & development
	Sales
	Support services (for example, plant & equipment maintenance)
	Other (please describe)

3-23. How many people report directly to you in the chain of command?
_____ people:

3-24. How many people work in your sub-unit of your organisation? _____ people:

3-25. How many organisational levels are there between you and the chief executive of your
organisation? _____ levels.

3-26. How many hierarchical levels are there between you and the non-supervisory
personnel in your
organisation or unit? _____ levels.

3-27. What language(s) do you use at work? _____

***This concludes the questionnaire. We truly appreciate your willingness to complete
this questionnaire, and to assist in this research project.***