ISCTE ⬡ Business School
Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

LEADERSHIP OF MULTICULTURAL TEAMS AT A FRENCH COMPANY: PROJECT GLOBE BASED STUDY

Mafalda Marques Ferreira da Costa

Dissertation submitted as partial requirement for the conferral of

Master in International Management

Supervisor: Prof. Álvaro Augusto da Rosa, Assistant Professor, ISCTE Business School, Department of Marketing, Operation and Management

September 2018

- Spine -

Leadership of Multicultural Teams at a French Company:
project GLOBE based study
Mafalda Marques Ferreira da Costa

ISCTE ⬡ Business School
Instituto Universitário de Lisboa

RESUMO

A liderança está constantemente presente na vida profissional de qualquer pessoa, provocando mais desafios aos gestores e líderes quando estes têm que chefiar equipas. Ora, o desafio é ainda maior quando se trata da gestão de equipas com mais do que uma nacionalidade. É nesta realidade que esta dissertação se insere, cujo objetivo é, através de um estudo de caso dedutivo, caracterizar o estilo de liderança de equipas multiculturais numa empresa francesa a operar em Portugal há mais de 30 anos. O presente estudo baseia-se na teoria proposta pelo projecto GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness), estudo iniciado na década de 90, tendo Robert House como seu propulsionador e inverstigador principal, e que se dedicou a investigar a relação entre cultura e comportamento organizacional. Utilizando uma adaptação do questionário criado pelo projecto GLOBE, os colaboradores desta empresa francesa classificaram 89 atributos de liderança numa escala de 1 (inibe a pessoa de ser um bom líder) a 7 (contribui para que a pessoa seja um bom líder). Os resultados obtidos neste questionário permitiram apurar os traços de liderança mais valorizados pelos colaboradores e verificar que o tipo de liderança preferível é a liderança carismática. Adicionalmente, este estudo demonstra que tanto gestores como subordinados valorizam os mesmos atributos num líder, o que sugere que a liderança nesta empresa é eficaz. Esta dissertação termina com as principais conclusões, limitações e sugestões para futuras pesquisas.

Palavras-chave: gestão intercultural, liderança, equipas multiculturais, GLOBE.

JEL class system:

M16 - International Business Administration

M14 - Corporate Culture; Diversity; Social Responsibility

ABSTRACT

Leadership is always present in everyone's professional life, challenging managers and leaders, especially when they need to manage teams. Nevertheless, the challenge is even bigger when they have to manage a team composed by people with different cultural backgrounds. This dissertation falls under the leadership scope and its aim is to characterise the leadership style of multicultural teams at a French company operating in Portugal for more than 30 years, using a deductive study case. This study is based in the project GLOBE's theory (Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness), an investigation initiated in the 90's by Robert House, which objective is to investigate the relationship between culture and organisational behaviour. By taking advantage of the questionnaire already created by GLOBE, the employees of this French organisation were asked to rate 89 leadership attributes using a 7-point scale, where 1 stands for a characteristic that greatly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader and 7 stands for a characteristic that greatly contributes to a person being an outstanding leader. The results obtained in this questionnaire enabled to determine the leadership attributes more desirable by the employees and to verify that charismatic/value-based leadership style is the most preferable one. In addition, this investigation shows that both managers and subordinates value the same leadership features, which suggests that the leadership in this company is effective. At the end of this dissertation, the main conclusions, limitations and future research suggestions are presented.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This piece of work is the sum of hours and hours of individual research and writing, but, most importantly, it is the result of the support of the wonderful people I am lucky to be surrounded by.

My first thank you belongs to Tomás, for encouraging me to enrol in this Master, to be present in all the steps of the way, and to believe in me, even when I was not able to.

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Álvaro Augusto da Rosa, for all the support, guidance, and encouragement throughout these months. Without him, I would have not been able to complete this work.

To my closest colleagues from MIM, thank you for all the laughs and complicity shared along these two years.

Finally, a special thank you to my family and friends, for always having my back.

INDEX

LIST OF FIGURES

GLOSSARY

CLT - Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership Theory

CV – Critical Value

DF – Degrees of freedom

GLOBE - Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness

ILT - Implicit Leadership Theory

H1 – Hypothesis 1

H2 – Hypothesis 2

H3 – Hypothesis 3

SD – Standard Deviation

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, a company is no longer composed by only one nationality. Even if we are working in our home country, the probability of our colleague being foreigner is higher than never. Group dynamics evolved with the increasing growth of multicultural teams in organisations and this "new" reality poses new leadership and management issues which need to be addressed properly. In fact, culture is a pertinent variable when managing multicultural teams. Culture is relative, it differs from society to society, it is not wrong or right, and it is important to acknowledge these differences when we have people with different backgrounds working together. As working in a French company and being a member of a multicultural team, I face this reality on a daily basis.

This thesis intends to produce a scientific work based on the investigation of leadership of multicultural teams at a French company operating in Portugal. For confidentially reasons, the name of the company will not be disclosed. The theme of this thesis arises not only from the issues I experienced throughout my professional life, but also from the fact that I want to understand better my work environment and contribute proactively to its enhancement.

This French company has been operating in Portugal for the last 32 years, being one of the largest foreign organisations in the country. In Portugal only, it counts with around 4,000 employees that deliver a high-quality variety of services. For instance, if we look at my team, we are composed by 11 elements, and from those 11 elements, 6 are foreigners, e.g., almost half of the team is not Portuguese, and it is managed by a non-Portuguese person, too. In a universe of 4,000 people, more teams will have similar characteristics. In this perspective, I think this company is the perfect object of study and deserves being studied.

In what concerns cross-cultural investigation, it became relevant and object of study only 30 years ago, mainly due to globalisation. Until that time, all organisational instruments and techniques were based on paradigms (sets of assumptions) (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1998). Hofstede was a big pioneer in this field of investigation and thanks to him we were able to start comparing leadership behaviours between countries based on a culture measurement scientific model (Teodósio, 2014).

More recently, a group of American investigators come up with a new a cultural model called project GLOBE (Global Leadership & Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness), which, according to its authors (House, 2004) is the biggest intercultural leadership study ever made as it collected data in 62 different countries. It researched the influence of cultural values in

organisational practices and its correlation between leadership styles, society and human condition.

Also, it come up with nine cultural dimensions (Performance Orientation, Uncertainty Avoidance, Humane Orientation, Institutional Collectivism, In-Group Collectivism, Assertiveness, Gender Egalitarianism, Future Orientation and Power Distance), and six dimensions of leadership (Charismatic/value-based leadership, Team-oriented leadership, Participative leadership, Humane-oriented leadership, Autonomous leadership and Self-protective leadership).

In this thesis, I will be focusing only in GLOBE's leadership dimensions and will use them to characterise the Company's leadership style of multicultural teams through a deductive case study. My main objective is to understand the implications of having different cultures working together as a team and how does the management respond to it. How can people with different expectations achieve results together?

A questionnaire will then be applied to the employees, to collect quantitative data. The questionnaire that is going to be used is the one designed by the project GLOBE. As this thesis aims to use this project to analyse the internal culture of a multicultural company, it makes sense to use the same questionnaire to validate this investigation.

As far as I am concerned, I believe this topic is pertinent and worth being researched because it affects almost every company nowadays. Moreover, GLOBE is a recent study, it is a good alternative to Hofstede's approach, and it will be interesting to have a different characterisation of a company and see its practical applications.

This thesis is divided in 6 Sections. It starts with the introduction, followed by the literature review. In the section of the literature review, I start by addressing the subject of group dynamics in multicultural teams as an introductory topic to the main subject of this thesis – the GLOBE project. Furthermore, Section 3 will be focused on explaining the problem in study and the hypothesis, and Section 4 will be about data analysis and the explanation of the main findings and results. Section 5 concludes and finally in Section 6 the limitations and suggestions to future researches will be discussed.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 GROUP DYNAMCS IN MULTICULTURAL TEAMS

2.1.1 GROUP DYNAMICS

Cartwright and Zander (1960: 97) wrote the following about group dynamics: "most people cluster into relatively small groups. With the members residing together in the same dwellings satisfying their basic biological needs within the group, depending upon the same source for economic support, rearing children, and mutually caring for the health of one another". Nevertheless, groups need someone to ensure the shared objectives are achieved and everyone is respected and listened to, which means they need a leader. In fact, in 1939, Kurt Lewis and his colleagues did leadership decision experiments coming up with the conclusion that when human beings participated in democratic group activities, they were more productive and their relationships with the other members of the group were based on cooperation (Billig, 2015).

To understand better the term group dynamics, it is better to separate the two words and describe them: group and dynamics. Johnson & Johnson (2006) defined group as several individuals who come together to achieve a goal, mainly because they cannot achieve the goals by themselves. The term dynamics derives from the Greek word force.

By combining these two terms we can define group dynamics as a set of variables which behaviour outline and constrain the essence of the group (Cronin, Weingart and Torodova, 2011). These variables include group identity, the group's status structures, values, group cohesiveness, conflict, leadership and, also, task performance effectiveness within the group (Cronin, Weingart and Torodova, 2011). Klep, Wisse and Van der Flier (2011) strongly support this definition by highlighting the fact that group dynamics include group processes that define how a group works. Group dynamics is highly influenced by two core specific group features: group information sharing and group belongingness. These two represent indeed the essence of group dynamics.

Group information sharing concerns all the information that is shared among the group members – shared team cognition, team mental models, shared team mental models –, and how easily the information flows from team member to team member (Klep et al. 2011). It is important to mention that group dynamics constructs only exist due to the numerous member interactions and information exchange that occur in the group (Cronin, Weingart and Torodova, 2011).

Group belongingness is related with one's motivation to connect and interact with other group members, which can avoid isolation and lonesomeness (Klep, Wisse and Van der Flier, 2011). In a study conducted by Klep et al. (2011), they noted that group dynamics helped increasing interactive affective sharing within groups and, ultimately, enhancing unity in a group. In the seventy work groups they used in their study, they found that group belongingness affected the group's behaviour and interaction.

2.1.2   WORK ENGAGEMENT

As time went by relationships and groups evolved and were no longer constrained to one physical space or one nationality. Globalisation and companies' internationalisation highly contributed to this different scenario, and nowadays we can have teams that are not only composed by one nationality, but also its members work in different countries (virtual teams).

According to Bachmann (2006), we have assisted to a change in the workplace which has become more diverse, multicultural and complex. This new reality triggered an increase on the research of group processes within multicultural teams (Foldy, Rivard, & Buckley, 2009). Cronin et al., (2011) alerted to the necessity of understanding group level constructs in order to understand team level phenomenon, as it can be helpful in understanding employee engagement phenomena in multicultural teams.

With the increase of multicultural teams, another area where researchers are focused on is work engagement within teams (Bakker & Leiter, 2010). The different values that individuals with different cultural backgrounds share are pertinent in understanding work engagement in multicultural groups (Bachmann, 2006), as well as their intercultural interactions which are important in determining group effectiveness. Nevertheless, these diversities have both positive and negative impacts in the way the group operates (Brett, Behfar & Kern, 2006).

In what concerns work engagement, it is no longer enough for organisations to attract and hire the most talented people. It is essential to have employees committed and emotionally engaged with their work, who are willing to go the extra mile and put the best of themselves in every task they do (Bakker & Leiter, 2010). According to Macey et al. (2009), work engagement is often referred as the key factor that ensures high performance, learning and productivity.

Work engagement can be defined as a work-related state of mind deeply characterised by optimistic and fulfilling feelings as well as a strong dedication to the company (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2010). In essence, it is the way how employees experience their work. Research has

demonstrated that the higher the engagement, the higher the levels of self-efficacy and energy in ones work and interaction with the team members (Bakker, Albrecht, & Leiter, 2011).

2.1.3 WORK ENGAGEMENT IN MULTICULTURAL TEAMS

Diversity in a multicultural group can be challenging to work engagement due to cultural diversity. According to the Thesaurus dictionary, cultural diversity is defined as "*the cultural variety and cultural differences that exist in the world, a society, or an institution*". In a multicultural team this means that there is a variety of cultural and different views of working together to obtain a mutual goal.

In addition, some consequences of cultural differences are not known as it occurs frequently below the level of consciousness. Besides, culture triggers stereotypes and labelling which means that the effects of multiculturalism can be stronger than others (Stahl et al., 2010). Therefore, diversity plays an influent role in work engagement and team performance as it impacts group processes and dynamics (Bachman, 2006). It is also fundamental to understand that, when employees are integrated in multicultural teams, they are motivated at different levels (Bakker, et al., 2011).

As per the negative aspects of diversity in groups, we can point out the tendency to have different points of views that lead to disagreement among the team members (Hopkins, Hopkins, & Gross, 2005). Also, communication can be a barrier due to the fact that people express themselves differently because of their culture (High and Low Context Communication). These communication issues can decrease team cohesion and performance (Brett, Behfar, & Kern, 2006) and later influence employees' work engagement.

Nevertheless, diversity also brings positive aspects to groups. If on one side, different opinions may be a negative thing, on the other side it helps increasing creativity in solving problems (Bachmann, 2006). In addition, diversity contributes positively to lower the impact of group think (Stahl et al., 2010).

2.1.4 GROUP DYNAMICS IN MULTICULTURAL TEAMS

Understanding group dynamics in multicultural teams is fundamental as this heightens the possibility to understand better the different challenges and opportunities that these types of team face (Yasser, Binsiddiq and Rashed, 2013). The group processes that are relevant to multicultural teams can be diverging or converging (Stahl et al., 2010).

Diverging group dynamics is related to processes that bring together different ideas and values (Canney Davison & Ekelund, 2004). According to Stahl et al. (2010), this different perspectives, mental models, and different ways to solve issues inherent to multicultural teams frequently enhance creativity and brainstorming processes.

Nevertheless, unsuccessful communication, different priorities or perceived cultural power inequalities within the group members may have negative consequences like less involvement of the members in the tasks or even conflict (Foldy, Rivard, & Buckley, 2009). Conflict is most likely to have negative consequences on the group performance because it affects people's emotions (De Dreu and Weingart, 2003).

Converging group dynamics concerns processes related to adjusting the team to the same goals and level of commitment (Stahl et al., 2010). Communication can be tricky and impact the group both negatively and positively. On the one hand, communication heightens the group cohesion and permits having problem solving strategies in teams when it is effective, and information is shared and perceived the same way by all the members (Brett, Behfar, & Kern, 2006). On the other hand, if the information is interpreted differently, it is no longer a positive thing (Von Glinow, Shapiro and Bret, 2004).

In addition, based on the similarity-attraction theory, which will be explained further on, converging group dynamics can likely lead to the development of sub groups that might impact negatively on social integration within the group (Foldy, 2004).

It is important to make a remark on the fact that these discoveries on multicultural groups are sometimes contradictory (Yasser, Binsiddiq and Rashed, 2013). On one side, findings state that divergent cultural perceptions in multicultural teams generate more creative and high-quality solutions, ideas, perspectives and decisions (Mannix & Neale, 2005). On the other side, some studies found out that these ideas and perspectives not always have good quality (Bachmann, 2006). Also, this type of group takes more time to reach conclusions (Ferdman et al., 2010) and its members tend to be less dedicated (Martins et al., 2003).

In addition, and according to Brett, Behfar and Kern (2006), multicultural teams face some challenges which can be considered as a barrier to group interaction. These factors are related with communication, authority and leadership and norms.

Regarding communication, one relevant thing to add is that people from different cultural backgrounds endorse different systems of communication and, therefore, this can impact

interpretation in communication (Brett, Behfar and Kern 2006). Besides, when someone does not communicate in their native language sometimes it is hard to express themselves correctly, be understood by others and make them value their opinions (Brett, Behfar and Kern 2006).

The way individuals recognise authority poses another challenge to multicultural work groups as it affects the way how group members participate in the group work process. For example, there are cultures where it is normal to have defined hierarchical structures in the work place and there are other cultures that have more flat structure organisations, and people feel uncomfortable when working outside their comfort zone (Karjalainen & Soparnot, 2012).

2.1.5 THE MEDIATING ROLE OF GROUP DYNAMICS

Throughout this group dynamics' section, we could observe that studying the nature of interactions between team members has become more relevant and that it helps understanding the influence of group dynamics on work engagement within multicultural groups (Yasser, Binsiddiq and Rashed, 2013).

According to Mannix and Neale (2005), the groups that achieve a higher level of performance are the ones whose members are more engaged with their work, and this corroborates the importance that group engagement and processes have in the performance of the groups. When extended these findings to multicultural groups, some studies performed by Homan et al. (2007) found out that heterogeneous groups performed better when they valued diversity.

Nevertheless, when it comes to the interaction between team members and leaders, it is important to reinforce the fact that in multicultural groups there are unique features that impact the way each member relates themselves with their work (Foldy, Rivard, and Buckley, 2009). In fact, when we have a high level of culturally diversity in a group, power interpretations are defined and determined by such culture. In some cases, and from a general point of view, some cultural identities are perceived as having more access to resources and/or higher status (Foldy, 2004), hence are considered as being the majority culture and usually people from this majority culture hold high positions. Also, they behave in a way that strengthens their authority and influence highly decision-making processes (Foldy, 2004). According to Foldy, Rivard, and Buckley (2009), this phenomenon impact negatively work engagement as it can strongly emphasise division between cultural identities in a work group.

To sum up, we can conclude that homogenous groups and heterogeneous groups such as multicultural teams have different group dynamics. If on one side, conflicts and

communications are an issue for these groups, on the other side the probability of having highly engaged teams which are more creative and cooperative teams that homogeneous groups, is higher (Stahl et al., 2010).

Diversity impacts teams in three contrasting ways which impact workgroups and may explain work dynamics.

The first one is the similarity-attraction theoretical model. According to Devendorf & Highhouse (2008), this theoretical model states that people have the tendency to collaborate and work more and be attracted to other people with whom they share similar values, opinions and attitudes. Having people looking and acting like themselves in a work group makes the team members feel more comfortable.

The impacts of this phenomenon on team processes and engagement is very high as it interferes with the inclusion or exclusion of its team members (Ferdman et al, 2010). If people feel excluded in a group because of culture differences, they will not trust their team mates and, consequently, will be less committed with their work.

The second theory is the social identity theoretical model that defends that within a company people classifies themselves into common interest groups, and label others as outsiders. Also, similar groups have the tendency to help and favour each other and, sometimes, can even make judgements and create stereotypes about other people and groups with different sociocultural backgrounds (Foldy, 2004). When this happens, cultural diversity can be seen as negative to work group processes as it interferes negatively with team cooperation, optimism and working environment and, hence, with employee engagement (Shuck, Rocco & Albornoz, 2011).

Last, but not least, the information-processing theoretical model encourages and promotes diversity as it claims that people with different point of views, perspectives and culture bring quality contributions to the work group (Yasser, Binsiddiq and Rashed, 2013). In addition, it boosts problem solving processes, innovation and creativity (Mannix & Neale, 2005).

In conclusion, group dynamics proposes that it is hard to accomplish work engagement in multicultural teams. This is due to the fact that, at a personal level, employees need to be highly engaged with their work in order for the group to succeed (Yasser, Binsiddiq and Rashed, 2013). To have a high level of work engagement in culturally diverse groups, team members need to have strong connections and relationships between themselves, as well as to cope with the issues inherent to this type of group (Joshi & Roh, 2009).

2.2 THE PROJECT GLOBE

2.2.1 CULTURE AND LEADERSHIP

Globalisation brought organisations one of its biggest and most important challenge so far – acknowledge and appreciate the different cultural values and practices that exist around the world (Duncan, Green and Herrera, 2012). Besides, with the increase of people with different nationalities working in the same company, organisations also need to incorporate those cultural values and practices into the company's culture and take advantage of this cultural diversity to achieve their goals. Therefore, there has been an analytical need to understand the role of culture in business (Hofstede, 2001), as culture colours almost every aspect of human behaviour (House et al., 1999).

According to Burggraaf (1998), intercultural management is a field that became very helpful to multinational companies because it combines knowledge, insights and skills which are necessary for dealing in the most adequate way with national and regional cultures and differences between cultures, at the various management levels within and between organisations.

Broadly speaking, social scientists use culture to allude to a set of aspects of a group of individuals that are different from another group of individuals in meaningful ways. According to House et al. (2002), the emphasis is on the cultural indicators and characteristics that are shared among the members of the group. Nevertheless, Project GLOBE come up with its own definition of culture: "shared motives, values, beliefs, identities, and interpretations or meanings of significant events that result from common experiences of members of collectives that are transmitted across generations" (House et al., 2002: 5).

In addition, leadership also plays an essential part in organisations since it exists in all societies and is fundamental to the function of organisation within societies (Wren, 1995). According to GLOBE, in 1994 at the first GLOBE research conference held at University of Calgary in Canada organisational leadership was defined as "the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable other to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organisations of which they are members" (House et al., 2002: 5).

Furthermore, it is necessary to study and to have leadership and organisational theories that exceed culture in order to know what works and what does not work in different cultural

sceneries (Triandis, 1993). Throughout the years, cross-cultural literature has proved that exists a strong connection between culture and leadership philosophies (House, Wright, & Aditya, 1997). However, there are some discrepancies on the different views regarding the universality of leadership patterns.

On one side, there are several authors that claim that leadership styles are directly influenced by culture since specific cultural traditions, beliefs and values are destined to differentiate as much or even more than structural features between societies (Lammers & Hickson, 1979).

On the other side, there are some researchers that argue that some characteristics of leadership should be universally accepted as they may transcend cultural boundaries due to the fact that common technologies (Woodward, 1958), common industrial logic (Adler, Doktor, & Redding, 1986), and global institutions and practices contribute to the harmonisation of business and management practices and structures (Child & Tayeb, 1983; Levitt, 1983; Yavas, 1995). As per Javidan and Carl (2004), these common leadership behaviours and traits emerge because of a shared need for attainment and self-actualisation, and guide leaders to pursuit common practices (Bass et al., 1979).

It is also important to note that cross-cultural leadership literature does not focuses exclusively on cultural differences and their implications for managers. Indeed, there is a natural inclination to assume that in different countries the challenges and requirements will be considerably unlike (Javidan, Dorfman, Sully de Luque & House, 2006). Nevertheless, GLOBE questionnaires showed that apart from the divergent views on several aspects of leadership effectiveness, there is also convergent views on other aspects (Javidan, Dorfman, Sully de Luque & House, 2006). These convergent views gave way to establish a group of leadership attributes that were universally desirable and undesirable in all the countries that participated in the GLOBE survey. In addition, there are also some leadership attributes that are considered as culturally contingent because even though they may be effective in a specific culture, they can cause harm or be less desirable in another culture (Javidan, Dorfman, Sully de Luque & House, 2006).

These groups of attributes are to be discussed further on.

2.2.2   IMPLICIT LEADERSHIP THEORIES

A crucial aspect of cross-cultural leadership has been the pursuit to discriminate the leadership features that are mainly universal from the ones that are explicit to a particular culture (Dickson

et al., 2001; Graen et al., 1997; Leung et al., 2002; Scandura & Dorfman, 2004). Implicit leadership theory (ILT) plays an import role in this field of study and had indeed a big influence on the findings proposed by the GLOBE team (Duncan, Green and Herrera, 2012).

This theory suggests that people hold certain beliefs and assumptions about which characteristics should a leader have, how they should behave and what is expected of them (Eden & Leviathan, 1975). In other words, "Leadership is in the 'eye of the beholder'. Leadership is a social label given to individuals if either their personality, attributes, and behaviours sufficiently match the observer's beliefs about leaders, or the observer attributes group success or failure to the activities of perceived leaders" (House et al., 2004: 670).

Leaders act and behave in a specific way as subordinates accept and expect these behaviours (Collinson, 2006), and must fit followers' cognitive expectations (Lim et al., 2012). ILT explains how leadership traits and behaviours that are seen to be the most effective or ineffective influence the perception of people as leaders (Bullough & Sullly de Luque, 2015). According to Lord & Maher (1991), even though leadership perceptions may not be reality, perceivers use it to assess and differentiate leaders from non-leaders or effective from non-effective leaders. The basis for social power and influence is established by this type of attribution process

The best way to understand implicit leadership theories is by looking at it as if they were cognitive frameworks or categorisation processes that people use while processing and encoding information to recall specific events and behaviours in the future (Shaw, 1990). Categorisation helps making the external world less complex by organising data about a several number of stimuli into a smaller number of groups and enables people to have a shared label system that facilitates the communication and exchange of information about the categorised groups (Cantor & Mishel, 1979).

Foti & Luch (1992) affirm that cognitive categorisation processes constitute the basis for leadership perceptions in which perceivers make a match between the perceived qualities of possible leaders they observe and the internal prototype of leadership qualities. A cognitive leadership prototype can be described as a set of characteristic traits or qualities (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004, 2005; Epitropaki et al., 2013; Fraser & Lord, 1988). They provide a simplified image of the leader which brings prominent leader traits out for perceivers to better and easier identify the leader (Fraser & Lord, 1988, Phillips & Lord, 1986). A person has a higher

probability of being seen as a leader if the fit between the perceived individual and the leadership prototype is also high (Offermann et al., 1994; Foti & Luch, 1992).

2.2.3   THE GLOBE RESEARCH PROGRAM

Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness (GLOBE) project was conceived in the early 1990s by Robert House, the principal investigator, and ended up involving more than two hundred researchers from numerous academic disciplines spread around the world (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012). The alliance formed between House and its several coordinating teams and hundreds of co-investigators gave rise to the one of the most bold and large-scale international management research project that has ever been taken (Morrison, 2000; Leung, 2008), which goal is to develop an empirically based model that could describe, analyse and predict the influence of certain cultural variables on leadership and organisational processes and its effectiveness (House et al., 2002).

To achieve its goal, the GLOBE project has been investigating the intricate and enthralling relationship between societal culture and organisational behaviour for more than twenty years by exploring the influence of culture on leadership and organisational effectiveness. GLOBE's findings demonstrated that leadership behaviours are indirectly influenced by national forces due to the fact that supervisors have the tendency to manage in a way more a less consistent with the leadership models recognised within their specific culture (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012). Using the ILT concept, the GLOBE researchers demonstrated that the most effective leaders are the ones who act according to expectations of the people within the culture where they operate in (Duncan, Green, and Herrera, 2012).

In addition, the information collected helped to present which leadership features are globally seen as positive and negative, and the extent to which they vary from one societal culture to another (Duncan, Green, and Herrera, 2012).

2.2.4   GLOBE PHASES

GLOBE project is a multi-phase research project that consists of four phases. Phase 1 was focused to the development of research instruments, such us the societal culture and leadership questionnaires, where nine dimensions of societal culture and nine isomorphic dimensions of organisational culture were developed. Phase 2 consisted on the assessment of nine cultural dimensions of both societal and organisational cultures (Dorfman, House, Javidan, and Sully

de Luque, 2006), identification of leadership attributes crucial for outstanding leadership and the relationship between national culture, leadership effectiveness and societal phenomena (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

Phase 3 of this research project is due to investigate not only the impact and effectiveness of certain leader behaviours and styles on subordinate's attitudes and job performance and on leader effectiveness (House et al., 2002), but also to detect the way national culture influences executive leadership methods (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012). In addition, this phase will be devoted to identifying culture-specific aspects of leadership and organisational practices, relationships between organisational contingencies (environment, technology), organisational form and processes, and organisational effectiveness (Dorfman, House, Javidan, and Sully de Luque, 2006).

The major outcomes of phase 3 were that leaders have the tendency to behave in a way expected within their country, and that cultural values influence indirectly leaders' behaviours as they behave according to subordinates' expectations (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

The phase 4 will engage on field and laboratory experiments to confirm, establish causality and extend previous findings (Dorfman, House, Javidan, and Sully de Luque, 2006).

Project GLOBE uses both quantitative and qualitative approaches to provide scientifically validation of cultural impact on leadership and organisational procedures. Quantitative features include measurement of societal culture, organisational culture, and leadership traits and behaviours. Qualitative culture aspects of local behaviours, norms, beliefs are being developed through content analysis of data collected from interviews, focus groups, and published media (Dorfman, House, Javidan, and Sully de Luque, 2006).

2.2.5 *GLOBE'S CULTURAL DIMENSIONS*

Even though the focus of this thesis is not the global cultural dimensions, it is important to briefly explain them and make a remark to the fact that some culture dimensions were inspired by the ones identified by Hofstede in 1980 (House et al., 2002).

GLOBE's cultural dimensions are the following (House et al., 2002):

- *Uncertainty Avoidance:* this dimension refers to the extent to which members of a society or organisation struggle to dodge uncertainty by dependence on social norms, rituals, administrative practices to mitigate the unpredictability of future events.

- *Power distance:* this dimension deals with the fact that power is shared unequally and with the degree to which members of a society or organisation agree and expect that unequally distribution of power.

- *Collectivism I:* Societal Collectivism expresses the extent to which societal and organisational institutional practices embolden and compensate collective distribution of resources and collective action.

- *Collectivism II:* In-Group Collectivism is concerned with the degree to which people express pride, loyalty and cohesiveness in their families or organisations.

- *Gender Egalitarianism:* reflects the degree to which a society or institution diminishes gender role differences and gender discrimination.

- *Assertiveness:* expresses the way how individuals in organisations and societies are assertive, confrontational, and violent in social relationships.

- *Future Orientation:* reflects the level of engagement in future-oriented behaviours such as planning, investing in the future, and postponing gratification expressed by individuals in organisations and societies.

- *Performance Orientation:* this dimension is concerned with how societies and organisations encourage and recompense collective members for continuous performance improvement and excellence.

- *Humane Orientation:* this last dimension is concerned with how each member of societies and organisations encourage and reward group members to be fair, altruistic, friendly, caring, generous, and kind to others.

2.2.6   GLOBE'S LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS

The other main question addressed by GLOBE and the focus of this thesis is to understand how certain leader attributes and behaviours are universally endorsed as contributing to effective

leadership, and how these attributes and behaviours are connected to cultural characteristics (House et al., 2002).

For that purpose, a questionnaire was set in place - the GLOBE Leader Attributes and Behaviour Questionnaire - which became the research's primary leadership survey instrument included in the research for phases 1 and 2, and, thanks to it, 21 primary dimensions of leadership were identified (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

The last version of this questionnaire consisted of 112 leader behaviours and attribute descriptors (e.g., "loyal") which included an extensive assortment of traits, skills, behaviours, and aptitudes that were conjectured to either obstruct or facilitate leadership (Dorfman, House, Javidan, and Sully de Luque, 2006). Each item in the survey was supported by a small description to decrease misinterpretations of the meaning of the adjective. When generating the leadership items, the emphasis was on developing a complete and inclusive list of leader behaviours and attributes, and not on developing a priori leadership scales (House et al., 2002). Items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale that ranged from a low of 1 (this behaviour greatly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader) to a high of 7 (this behaviour contributes greatly to a person being an outstanding leader). (House et al., 2002).

However, after creating the questionnaire, there was the need to group the items through various theoretical and statistical methods in order to make sense of these dissimilar items. The result was, first, the development of 21 primary dimensions of leadership (e.g., visionary leadership), and, second, after the analysis of these dimensions, a set of only 6 global leadership dimensions were established. (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

GLOBE's global leadership dimensions are the following (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012):

- *Charismatic/value-based leadership:* it reflects the capacity to inspire, to motivate, and to expect high performance outcomes from others based on firmly held core values.

- *Team-oriented leadership:* this dimension's focus is to promote effective team building and the implementation of a mutual purpose or goal among team members.

- *Participative leadership:* it expresses the level to which managers involve individuals in making and implementing decisions.

- *Humane-oriented leadership:* this dimension is concerned not only with supportive and considerate leadership but also with compassion and generosity expressed by managers.

- *Autonomous leadership*: it reflects independent and individualistic leadership traits.

- *Self-protective leadership:* this dimension needs to be looked at from a Western perspective, and, in this case, it is focused on ensuring the protection and security of the individual and group through status enhancement and face saving.

The relationship between the global and primary culturally endorsed implicit leadership theory (CLT) dimensions along with the attributes comprising each dimension can be observed on table 1.

Table 1 – Global and Primary Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership Theory Dimensions and Attributes Comprising Each Dimension

LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS		LEADERSHIP ATTRIBUTES
GLOBAL LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS	**PRIMARY LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS**	
I. Charismatic/Value-Based Leadership	Charismatic 1: Visionary	Foresight Prepared Anticipatory Plans ahead
	Charismatic 2: Inspirational	Enthusiastic Positive Morale booster Motive arouser
	Charismatic 3: Self-Sacrificial	Risk taker Self-sacrificial Convincing
	Integrity	Honest Sincere Just Trustworthy
	Decisive	Willful Decisive Logical Intuitive
	Performance oriented	Improvement-oriented Excellence-oriented Performance-oriented
II. Team-Oriented Leadership	Team 1: Collaborative team orientation	Group-oriented Collaborative Loyal Consultative

Table 1 – Global and Primary Culturally Endorsed Implicit Leadership Theory
Dimensions and Attributes Comprising Each Dimension (Continued)

LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS		LEADERSHIP ATTRIBUTES
GLOBAL LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS	PRIMARY LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS	
II. Team-Oriented Leadership	Team 2: Team integrator	Communicative Team builder Informed Integrator
	Diplomatic	Diplomatic Worldly Win-win problem-solver Effective bargainer
	Malevolent	Hostile Dishonest Vindictive Irritable
	Administratively competent	Orderly Administratively skilled Organised Good administrator
III. Participative Leadership	Non-participative	Autocratic Dictatorial Bossy Elitist
	Autocratic	Individually oriented Non-delegator Micromanager Non-egalitarian
IV. Humane-Oriented Leadership	Modesty	Modest Self-effacing Patient
	Humane orientation	Generous Compassionate
V. Autonomous Leadership	Autonomous	Individualistic Independent Autonomous Unique
VI. Self-Protective Leadership	Self-Centered	Self-centered Non-participative Loner Asocial
	Status conscious	Status conscious Class conscious
	Internally competitive (formerly labelled *conflict inducer*)	Secretive Normative Intragroup competitor
	Face-Saver	Indirect Avoids negatives Evasive
	Bureaucratic (formerly labelled *procedural*)	Habitual Procedural Ritualistic Formal

Source: Adapted from House, Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, De Luque (2014)

The six global leader behaviours dimensions were empirically identified from a large pool of leadership items. It is important to make a remark to the fact that three of the six global CLT dimensions are closely related to prior leadership constructs found in the existing leadership literature (charismatic/value-based, team orientation, and participative leadership). Human orientation can be considered very much alike to supportive leadership (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

Nevertheless, there are two dimensions that have not been previously associated with "Western" oriented leadership, and, in some cases, it can even have a negative connotation. The first dimension is autonomous leadership due to the focus on a more independent and individualistic aspect of leadership. And, the second dimension is self-protective leadership since some characteristics such as face saving, and status consciousness are more important in non-Western countries (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

From the larger group of leader behaviours, we found twenty-two features that were universally considered to be desirable and facilitators of outstanding leadership in all GLOBE countries, such us being honest, decisive, motivational, and dynamic (Dorfman, House, Javidan, and Sully de Luque, 2006). This means that the global grand mean score surpassed 6.0 on a 7-point scale and at least 95% of the societal average scores for these features were more than 5.0 on a 7-point scale. Putting it in other words, leaders in all countries examined should be honest and people of integrity and, at the same time, inspire their subordinates, develop new visions and drive their teams to be performance oriented (House at al., 2014).

Moreover, there are also eight leadership traits there were classified as universally undesirable, like being loner, irritable, egocentric, and ruthless. (Dorfman, House, Javidan, and Sully de Luque, 2006). This means that the global grand mean score was lower than 3.0 on a 7-point scale and at least 95% of the societal average scores for these features were less than 3.0 on a 7-point scale (House at al., 2014). However, from a cross-cultural perspective, the most interesting attributes and dimensions are the ones that are considered as cultural contingent due to the fact that they can be desirable in some cultures, but undesirable and harmful in others. This usually happens because cultures differ in their conceptions and favourability of the construction of the leadership itself (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

Table 2 shows some examples of what was stated above.

Table 2 – Societal Ratings for Universally Desirable, Undesirable, and Culturally Contingent Leadership Attributes

Universally Positive		Universally Negative		Culturally Contingent					
					Ratings				
Leadership Attribute	Mean	Leadership Attribute	Mean	Leadership Attribute	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum	Range
Trustworthy	6.36	Non-explicit	2.30	Ambitious	5.85	0.61	2.69	6.73	4.04
Dynamic	6.28	Dictatorial	2.12	Logical	5.84	0.44	3.89	5.68	2.69
Decisive	6.21	Loner	2.07	Sincere	5.83	0.59	3.99	6.55	2.56
Intelligent	6.18	Ruthless	2.06	Enthusiastic	5.74	0.53	3.72	6.44	2.72
Dependable	6.17	Asocial	2.05	Intuitive	5.72	0.51	3.72	6.47	2.75
Plans ahead	6.17	Egocentric	2.02	Orderly	5.58	0.42	3.81	6.34	2.53
Excellence oriented	6.16	Irritable	1.98	Willful	5.47	0.84	2.98	6.48	3.51
Team builder	6.15	Non-cooperative	1.69	Worldly	5.18	0.70	2.48	6.54	4.05
Encouraging	6.14			Self-sacrificial	5.06	0.60	3.07	5.96	2.88
Confidence builder	6.14			Sensitive	4.83	0.87	1.95	6.35	4.39
Informed	6.13			Intragroup competitor	4.70	0.68	3.00	6.49	3.49
Honest	6.11			Compassionate	4.63	0.64	2.69	5.56	2.88
Effective bargainer	6.10			Procedural	4.62	0.72	3.03	6.10	3.06
Motive arouser	6.07			Unique	4.61	0.49	3.47	6.06	2.59
Win-win problem solver	6.06			Status Conscious	4.51	0.73	1.92	5.89	3.97
Positive	6.04			Formal	4.37	0.63	2.22	5.47	3.25
Foresight	6.02			Risk taker	4.13	0.74	2.14	5.96	3.82
Just	6.02			Class conscious	4.11	0.76	2.53	6.09	3.55
Communicative	6.02			Intragroup conflict avoider	4.00	1.04	1.84	5.74	3.90
Motivational	6.00			Independent	3.94	0.68	1.67	5.28	3.61
Coordinator	6.00			Self-effacing	3.94	0.86	1.82	5.23	3.41
Administrative skilled	6.00			Autonomous	3.79	0.77	1.63	5.14	3.51
				Cautious	3.73	0.77	2.03	5.81	3.77
				Evasive	3.33	0.82	1.52	5.67	4.14
				Domineering	3.20	0.76	1.60	5.14	3.54
				Habitual	3.17	0.66	1.86	5.38	3.51
				Individualistic	3.14	0.78	1.67	5.99	4.32
				Indirect	3.01	0.56	2.16	4.86	2.70
				Subdued	3.00	1.17	1.27	6.18	4.90
				Micromanager	2.86	0.80	1.38	5.00	3.62
				Elitist	2.74	0.77	1.61	5.00	3.39
				Ruler	2.67	0.64	1.66	5.24	3.58
				Cunning	2.47	0.95	1.26	6.38	5.11
				Provocateur	2.44	0.85	1.38	6.00	4.62

Source: Adapted from House, Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, De Luque (2014)

The numbers in table 2 represent mean values for the 64 societal cultures on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (greatly inhibits) to 7 (greatly contributes) to outstanding leadership. Scores above 4 indicate this CLT leadership dimension contributes to outstanding leadership. Scores below 4 indicate this CLT leadership dimension inhibits outstanding leadership.

In conclusion, national and organisational culture need to be taken into consideration with regards to culturally contingent leadership. For example, countries with high power distance appreciate leaders who behave in a rule-oriented way and who differentiate themselves from their followers. Therefore, these cultural contingent leadership dimensions – status conscious, bureaucratic, and internally competitive – were predictive by cultural values (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

2.2.7   CULTURAL VALUES AS PREDICTORS OF LEADERSHIP EXPECTATIONS

The GLOBE project helped support previous hypothesis of a connection between leadership and culture (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012) as GLOBE's societal and organisational performance-oriented cultural values were positively related with the CLT dimension of participative leadership (Javidan, House, & Dorfman, 2004). In addition, GLOBE investigators were able to demonstrate that it is possible to cluster together societies which are culturally similar (Gupta & Hanges, 2004) with significant differences in the content of the CLT profiles (Dorfman, Hanges, & Brodbeck, 2004).

Nevertheless, it is important to note that it is not cultural *practices* that are predictive of leadership features but *values* due to the fact that cultural values and desired leadership attributes reveal an idealised state of what leadership should be (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

The relationship between GLOBE cultural values as predictors of CLT leadership dimensions can be observed in the table 3 below where the "+" indicates a positive relationship between the culture dimension and CLT; "++" indicates a strong positive relationship between the culture dimension and CLT; "-" indicates negative relationship between the culture dimension and CLT; "- -" indicates a strong negative relationship between the culture dimension and CLT.

It is important to look at this table from the perspective of each leadership dimension and to note that, in on hand, expectations of charismatic and participative leadership are positively associated to the cultural values of performance orientation, humane, and gender egalitarian,

and on the other hand, negatively associated to power distance (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

Table 3 – Cultural values as predictors of CLT leadership dimensions

Societal culture dimensions (values)	CLT leadership dimensions					
	Charismatic/value-based	Participative	Self-protective	Humane oriented	Team oriented	Autonomous
Performance orientation	++	++	-	+	+	++
Humane orientation	+	++		++	+	- -
Uncertainty avoidance		- -	++	++	++	
In-group collectivism	++		-		++	
Power distance	- -	- -	++			
Gender egalitarianism	++	++	- -			
Future orientation	+			+	+	
Assertiveness		-		++		
Institutional collectivism						--

Source: Adapted from P. Dorfman et al. (2012)

2.2.8   CULTURE CLUSTERS AND IDEAL LEADERSHIP QUALITIES

GLOBE's regional clusters are: Anglo, Eastern Europe, Latin America, Latin Europe, Confucian Asia, Nordic Europe, Sub-Saharan Africa, Southern Asia, Germanic Europe, and Middle East (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

Clusters are very useful since they propose a valuable outline for understanding the complexity of multi-cultural ventures. The information provided by the clusters enables managers to use this knowledge to apply the best practices, policies and human resources across cultural boundaries (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

2.2.9   GLOBE'S MAJOR FINDINGS

As previously mentioned, the main goal of GLOBE's phase 3 was to observe the liaison between national culture, culturally endorsed leadership theory, and leadership effectiveness. In order to achieve that, the impact of national culture and CLTs on real behaviour and CEO effectiveness was studied (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).).

This phase was essentially concerned with executive and top management team members' behaviour; therefore, the focus of the investigation was the essence of CEO strategic leadership and the relationship between previously determined culturally preferred leadership styles and authentic executive behaviour. In addition, it was important to empirically demonstrate if executives lead in a way that is consistent with the societies' expectations (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

GLOBE's major findings regarding the predictability of leadership behaviours and leadership effectiveness are the following (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012):

- **National culture does not predict leadership behaviour***:* GLOBE's researchers were able to verify that national cultural values are precursor aspects which impact leadership expectations. Indeed, the analysis of the relationship between the 9 cultural values and 6 global leadership dimensions of CEO behaviour indicates that with a few exceptions, national culture values do not directly predict CEO leadership behaviour.

- **Culturally endorsed leadership theory predicts leadership behaviour:** empirical evidence was found for the relationship between the culturally endorsed leadership theory and actual CEO leadership behaviour correlating the need to understand the idealised leadership in a specific culture. It was studied the association between the 6 CLT global leadership dimensions and their counterpart leadership behaviours. Five out of six CLTs are significantly correlated with their behavioural counterparts, which means that leaders tend to behave in a way consistent with the desired leadership found in that culture.
  For example, it was observed that CEOs working in societies that desire participatory leadership (e.g., Germanic Europe) are more likely to act in a participatory manner. And CEOs in societies that wish for a humane leadership (e.g., Southern Asia) behave in a more humane manner. Consequently, if we know the idealised leadership, or CLT of a particular society, it is possible to predict the behaviours of the leaders in that society.
  It is also important to note that leadership should be seen as a set of personal features and actions that are profoundly implanted in the society's cultural values, therefore, transportability styles across leadership cultures is a sensitive issue.

- **Leaders who behave according to expectations are effective***:* the findings also show that it is the congruency ("fit") between expectations and behaviour that is critical for

leaders' effectiveness. As an example, in societies whose CLT includes high desirability of participative qualities, leaders who also display these traits generate a strong sense of commitment, effort, and team solidarity among their direct subordinates. Regarding leaders' behaviours, they tend to behave according to their society's leadership CLTs because they know it is likely to lead to success, meaning it is essential to know CLTs to better understand leadership in different societies.

All in all, GLOBE was the first study to empirically and scientifically compile and show the complex relationships between national culture and leadership, expectations, behaviour, and effectiveness, and plus, to identify what societies expect from their leaders, how leaders perform in different societies and what it takes to thrive as a leader in different cultures (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

GLOBE researchers reached the conclusion that the code for successful leadership in a global world is to lead in a way that is almost consistent with the leadership prototypes consistent with their particular culture. It is all about the fitness or compatibility between what is expected and what is enacted, and to match or exceed expectations. In the same way, investigators empirically ascertained what the society's expectations are with respect to various leadership qualities. Besides, these expectations can be very different across societies and, as a matter of fact, a few valued CEOs behaviours in one country can be unwanted in others. (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

Furthermore, with project GLOBE it was possible to find out that there are universal and consistent leadership actions required for success, as it was found that in almost all aspects of this project, successful leaders endorse core universally desired behaviours that include charismatic/value-based leadership. In other words, it is essential to develop a vision, to encourage and influence others, to be decisive and firm, to demonstrate integrity, and to create a performance-oriented culture. (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012).

3. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND HYPOTHESES

Throughout this dissertation there is always present the idea that with the development of globalisation and the rapprochement of the countries worldwide, people tend to professionally behave in a more similar way. Expectations from different cultures have also becoming less evident and tend to blur over, hence the fact that charismatic/value-based leadership is universally accepted to be the most effective leadership dimension. Nevertheless, it is also important to have in mind that leaders need to be up to fit their subordinates' expectations.

The main aim of this thesis is to see if the core findings of the GLOBE project can also be observed in this French company operating in Portugal. Therefore, comparisons between the means obtained in the results of the project GLOBE and the means obtained in this sample were applied.

In the initial literature review and data collection, there were few questions that have arisen and need to be further explored:

- Does the desired leadership style of the Latin Europe cluster influence management in multicultural teams at this Company?
- Are there "stronger" cultures that stand out? For example, does the French culture prevail?
- Does this organisation follow a universal leadership style?
- Do managers behave accordingly to what their subordinates are expecting?

Having this in mind, the following hypotheses have been suggested:

Hypothesis 1 (H1): Regardless of the citizenship, charismatic/value-based leadership should be the desirable leadership style.

As per the literature review, this leadership style is the most desirable one, therefore, it should be evidence of this preference in this multicultural company.

Hypothesis 2 (H2): This company is included in the Latin Europe GLOBE country cluster.

Being a French company, the most preferable CLT dimensions in this cluster should be Charismatic/Value-Based and Team Oriented Leadership (Javidan, Darfman, Sully de Luque & House, 2006). I expect indeed the French culture to stand out and to influence the leadership style. Most of the managers are either French or French speakers which means that it seems to be a tendency to have a French influence in high level positions.

Hypothesis 3 (H3): Both managers and subordinates believe in the same set of behaviours and characteristics that a leader should display.

According to the literature review, the most successful teams have leaders who behave accordingly to their subordinates' expectations. I intend to find the same evidence in this company.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS AND DATA COLLECTION

This study focused on the case of a French company operating in Portugal where the number of foreigner people and multicultural teams is very high, hence the perfect object of study.

This French company presents itself as one of the biggest foreign organisations in Portugal, operating in our country since 1985. It has nine affiliates and branches and employs around 4,000 people.

Being in Portugal, it is natural for most of the employees to be Portuguese. Nevertheless, this company really strives to have diversity in their rankings and has a very high number of multicultural teams. For example, in a team of 11 people, 5 are foreigners. Furthermore, it is important to also mention that it is usual to see French speakers occupying higher levels, such as team leaders or head of the departments, instead of only French people.

Concerning the methodology chosen to perform this study, either qualitative or quantitative research methods could have been used. For qualitative research, a type of research that uses a naturalistic approach to study the subject in matter (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), interviews to the employees and managers could have been made in order to study the individuals in their natural environment and have an approximal understanding to their reality has members of multicultural teams (McLeod, 2017). For quantitative research, a type of research that collects data in a numerical form that can be put into categories, and that is used to test a specific theory, questionnaires are often used, and the data is then analysed and summarised using statistical analysis (McLeod, 2017).

For this case, the research method used was quantitative, and data was collected via an online questionnaire (Annex 5) shared with the employees of this company. As mentioned previously in the literature review, GLOBE project designed a questionnaire which was also applied to this study, where only the sections concerning leader behaviours were considered. It was essential to use the same questionnaire used in the project GLOBE to be able to compare information. The scale for this questionnaire was already validated by the wide-ranging psychometric properties as it proved to be "high within culture respondent agreement, high between culture differences in aggregated means of individual responses, and high inter-item consistency within scales" (House et al., 2002). In addition, the Generalisability Coefficient (inter-class correlation

ICC-KK), that also measures the psychometric properties, was higher than 0.85 for all the scales (House et al., 2002).

It is important to mention that, in this thesis, the number of items were reduced from 112 to 89, since a first version of the questionnaire handed out to respondents was not being successful due to the length of the questionnaire. Items removed were either incorporated on similar adjectives or completely removed due to meaning overlap. The results were gathered for a period of one and a half month and 101 completed questionnaires were retrieved.

From the 101 respondents, the average age is between 26 and 30 years old (SD=1.153), being many of the individuals females (63.40%). Of these 101, 22 individuals (20.8%) have been managers between 1-3 years (SD=0.844), of those 12.9% are females, which poses no surprises as more than half of this sample is composed by females. The average time of working for this company is between 1-3 years (SD=0.794). Regarding citizenship, as previously mentioned, 61.40% of this sample are Portuguese, followed by 9.9% of French people, 3% for both Belgium and India, and the 23% remaining individuals come from 16 additional different countries, most of which are European countries. All this information is described in Table 4.

Table 4 – Sample demographics

Sample Demographics	N	%
Number of Respondents	101	100
Age		
Average; Standard Deviation	26-30 years old; 1.153	
Citizenship		
Portugal	62	61.4
France	10	9.9
Brazil	2	2.0
Germany	2	2.0
Italy	2	2.0
Poland	1	1.0
Belgium	3	3.0
Spain	2	2.0
India	3	3.0
Hungary	2	2.0
Netherlands	2	2.0
Czech Republic	1	1.0
New Zealand	1	1.0
Lithuania	1	1.0
Luxembourg	1	1.0
United Arab Emirates	1	1.0
Colombia	1	1.0

Table 4 – Sample demographics (Continued)

Citizenship	N	%
Syria	1	1.0
Romania	1	1.0
United Kingdom	2	2.0
Gender		
Female	64	63.4
Male	37	36.6
Time working for the company		
Average; Standard Deviation	1-3 years; 0.794	
Manager		
Yes	22	20.8
No	79	79.2
Time being a manager		
Average; Standard Deviation	1-3 years; 0.844	

In order to have a better understanding of the demographic variables, numerical values were assigned to each one of them as follows: age was measured using several year ranges (from 1='between 20 and 25 years old', to 5='more than 40 years old'), gender (1=female, 2=male), citizenship (1=Portugal, 2=France, 3=Brazil, 4=Germany, 5=Italy, 6=Poland, 7=Belgium, 8=Spain, 9=India,10=Hungary, 11=Netherlands, 12=Czech Republic, 13=New Zealand, 14=Lithuania, 15=Luxembourg, 16=United Arab, 17= Colombia, 18=Syria, 19=Romania, 20=United Kingdom). In addition, the question 'How long have you worked for your current employer?' was also assessed using multiple year ranges (1='Less than 1 year', 2='Between 1 and 3 years', 3='More than 3 years'), as per being a manager (1=yes, 2=no), and, last but not least, the question 'If yes, how many years have you been a manager?', was assessed with the same year ranges as the previous question mentioned.

4.2 RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis 1 (*H1*) is trying to test if charismatic/value-based leadership is the desirable leadership style in this company. To test *H1*, descriptive statistics tests were run to find the average mean of each type of leadership style in this company. Each leadership style included the primary leadership dimensions proposed by project GLOBE. Results for the descriptive statistics can be observed in Annex 1.

The mean scores for each style are as follow: Charismatic/Value-based leadership: 5.86; Humane-Oriented leadership: 5.40; Team-Oriented leadership: 5.05; Autonomous leadership:

4.37; Self-Protective leadership: 3.66; Participative leadership: 2.43. *H1* is confirmed as the highest average mean for global leadership dimensions is the charismatic/value-based.

In addition, all the scores for each global leadership dimension are listed in table 5.

Table 5 – Average mean for each global leadership dimension

Global leadership dimension	Average mean	SD
Charismatic/Value-Based leadership	5.86	1.02
Humane-Oriented leadership	5.40	1.13
Team-Oriented leadership	5.05	1.00
Participative leadership	2.43	1.54
Autonomous leadership	4.37	1.67
Self-protective leadership	3.66	1.49

According to Den Hartog et al. (1999), the scores for the six leader styles above for Portugal are: Charismatic/Value-based leadership: 5.75; Humane-Oriented leadership: 4.62; Team-Oriented leadership: 5.92; Autonomous leadership: 3.19; Self-Protective leadership: 3.11; Participative leadership: 5.48. These scores are somehow similar to the ones collected in this study, being the Participative leadership the style that differs the most.

Hypothesis 2 (*H2*) states that it should be evidence that this company is included in the Latin Europe GLOBE country cluster. The theory tells us that the most preferable CLT dimensions in the Latin Europe cluster should be Charismatic/Value-Based and Team Oriented Leadership (Javidan, Darfman, Sully de Luque & House, 2006). To test this hypothesis, a similar approach of testing *H1* was conducted.

Using the same descriptive statistics and average mean comparisons of *H1,* it is possible to affirm that *H2* is partially confirmed. The reason behind is that even though Charismatic/Value-Based leadership has the highest score, Team-Oriented leadership appears only in third place. These results mean that the two most desirable leadership styles in this company is Charismatic/Value-Based and Humane-Oriented leaderships.

In Javidan, Darfman, Sully de Luque & House (2006), the CLT score results for societal clusters for Latin Europe were: Charismatic/Value-based leadership: 5.78; Humane-Oriented leadership: 4.45; Team-Oriented leadership: 5.73; Autonomous leadership: 3.66; Self-Protective leadership: 3.19; Participative leadership: 5.37. Charismatic/value-based leadership dimension remains the most desirable style, followed by Team Oriented. Contrary to what we observed in this study, the Participative leadership style comes better scored in the results obtained by Javidan, Darfman, Sully de Luque & House (2006).

The third hypothesis (*H3)* is set up to compare the desirable leadership attributes that managers believe a leader should have with the desirable leadership attributes that subordinates believe a leader should have. In order to test this hypothesis, an independent sample T-test was implemented. It is important to note that from our 101 respondents, only 22 individuals were managers.

By looking only to the table in Annex 3 that shows groups statistics results for each variable, we can compare the means and see if there are any relevant difference. We compared the average mean of each global leadership dimension and were able to observe that the results for managers and for subordinates were similar, as observed in table 6.

Table 6 – Average mean for each global leadership dimension: managers & subordinates

Global leadership dimension	Manager	Subordinates
Charismatic/Value-Based leadership	5.78	5.88
Team-Oriented leadership	5.00	5.07
Participative leadership	2.18	2.06
Humane-Oriented leadership	5.41	5.40
Autonomous leadership	2.62	2.54
Self-protective leadership	3.65	3.66

Nevertheless it is more important to focus on table from Annex 2 that demonstrates the inferential statistics, where we will mostly focus on the columns that shows the *t*-scores, the degrees of freedom for the two groups and the p-value that corresponds to the *t*-scores at those degrees of freedom that we will use to determine if there is a significant difference between the two groups or not.

There are three ways to determine statistical significance. First way is to compare the *t*-value with a critical value (CV) found in the student's distribution table (Annex 4). If *t* is larger than the CV, it shows that the means are statistically different. In our case, for 99 degrees of freedom the critical value is 1.9842, and in our data only three variables were above the CV – intra-group competitor, autonomous, and distant, therefore we can affirm that the two groups look like to be not statistical different (Todd, 2017).

The second way is to look to the probability vale - *p-value* – to see if *p*<0.05. In this case, only five variables were lower than 0.05: intra-group competitor, autonomous, intra-group conflict avoider, win/win problem-solver, and distant (Todd, 2017).

The third and last way is to look to the confidence interval (CI) and check if it crosses zero, because if the 95% CI includes zero, the means are not different. When the lower confidence

interval value is lower than zero and the upper value is positive, this means than this confidence interval includes zero. Only four variables did not include zero in their confidence interval: intra-group competitor, autonomous, win/win problem-solver, and distant (Todd, Daniel, 2017).

As per the results we can conclude that *H3* is not rejected as the fact of being a manager or a subordinate is not statistically different when it comes to desirable leadership features. Going back to the literature review where it states that there is a higher probability of having an effective leadership when leaders fit subordinates' expectations, it is possible to assume that in this company there should be an effective leadership style among their multicultural teams.

5. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this case study was helpful to understand better the reality where I am professionally inserted, not only because it can help me interact in the best way I can with my multicultural team, but also because the information I collected will always be useful for me in the future, especially if I intend to be a (good) leader.

In what concerns this company, some other conclusions were identified. The first one is that employees value managers that are trustworthy, honest, and just, that are be able to inspire others, communicate clearly with their teams, boost the team's moral whenever they need, anticipate good and bad situations, guide them through excellence and constant improvement, and that have a positive attitude. These features were among the highest rated ones by the respondents as qualities of an effective leader. On the other hand, the employees of this company prefer not to have managers that are hostile, tyrannical, that do not speak clearly and treat people differently according to status, gender, etc. All these results can be observed on Annex 1.

Regarding leadership styles, this study suggests that the two most desirable ones in this organisation are charismatic/value-based and humane-oriented leadership styles. This finding meets the theory of the GLOBE project, as it states that successful leaders endorse core universally desired behaviours that include charismatic/value-based leadership (Dorfman, Javidan, Hanges, Dastmalchian, & House, 2012). Even though the team-oriented leadership style did not score the second place in terms of preferable leadership styles in this company, it is not completely excluded the possibility of the influence from the Latin Europe GLOBE country cluster, where France is included, in this organisation.

In what concerns being an effective leader, this study proposes that teams should be effective as both managers and subordinates think similarly regarding the desirable qualities a good leader should have.

By way of conclusion, and in a more general level, human resource managers (Oddou, Mendenhall, & Ritchie, 2000) should know how important it is to understand the richness of the multicultural team they are managing in order to be an effective leader. Therefore, the global leader should have a cross-cultural training and spend some time learning about the cultures of the subordinates and, also, let himself/herself be known in reverse.

6. STUDY LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This dissertation had some methodological limitations.

The first limitation pertains to the sample size used in this study. The sample consisted of only 101 respondents, from which more than a half were Portuguese. This poses some questions regarding the representativeness of the sample, which should have had more responses from foreigners. Plus, some nationalities had only one respondent (e.g. Colombia and United Arab Emirates). Following the same line of thought, the same issue happened with the disparity of responses between managers and subordinates, as only 22 people questioned were managers.

These limitations could have been overcome by increasing the sample size and letting the questionnaire open to answers for a larger period of time, therefore enlarging the probability of having more replies. With more replies, a principal component analysis could had also been possible, leading to new possibilities for hypothesis.

Another limitation is that this study only aimed to characterise the leadership style of this company through the theory proposed by the project GLOBE.

Considering these limitations, this study can be embellished by, apart from the questionnaire, also interviewing managers and subordinates, which can, not only improve and make more accurate the characterisation of the company, but also have more data to support the results obtained with the questionnaire and see if people really practice what they preach.

Moreover, other French companies with similar characteristics could be included in this study to look for patterns in leadership styles.

Lastly, under the subject that this company is insert (or not) in the Latin Europe cluster, the question if being French or speaking French has a really influence in allocating people to manager positions, could be explored, as well as how it affects the group dynamics.

7. REFERENCES

Adler, N. J., Doktor, R., & Redding, S. G. 1986. From the Atlantic to the Pacific century: Cross-cultural management reviewed. *Yearly Review of Management of the Journal of Management*, 12(2): 295-318.

Bachmann, A.S. 2006. Melting pot or tossed salad? Implications for designing effective multicultural workgroups. *Management International Review.* 46(6): 721-747.

Bakker, A. B., & Leiter, M. B. (Eds.) 2010. *Work engagement: A handbook of theory and research.* New York, NY: Psychology Press/Taylor & Francis Group.

Bakker, A., Albrecht, S. L., & Leiter, M. P. 2011. Key questions regarding work engagement. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 20(1): 4-28.

Bass, B. M., Burger, P., C., Doktor, R., et al. 1979. *Assessment of Managers: An International Comparison.* New York: Free Press.

Billig, M. 2015. Kurt Lewin's leadership studies and his legacy to social psychology: Is there nothing as practical as a good theory? *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*. 45(4): 440-460.

Brett, J., Behfar, K., & Kern, M. C. 2006. Managing multicultural teams. *Harvard Business Review.* 84(11): 84-91.

Bullough, A., Sully de Luque, M. 2015. Women's participation in entrepreneurial and political leadership: The importance of culturally endorsed implicit leadership theories. *Leadership: Sage Journals*, 11(1): 36-56.

Burggraaf, W. 1998. *Intercultural management: on cultures and the multicultural organisation.* Breukelen: Universiteit Nijenrode.

Canney Davison, S., & Ekelund, B. Z. 2004. Effective team processes for global teams. In H. Lane, M. Maznevski, M. Mendenhall & J. Mcnett (Eds), *Handbook of global management*: 227–249. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. 1979. Prototypes in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Eds.). *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 3-52. New York: Academic Press.

Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. 1960. *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory* (2nd ed.): 97. Evanston, IL: Harper & Row Publishers.

Center for Creative Leadership. 2012. *Leader Effectiveness and Culture: The GLOBE Study.* [Online]
Available at: https://gdl29.files.wordpress.com/2014/03/globestudy.pdf
[Accessed 26 September 2018].

Child, J. D., & Tayeb, M. 1983. Theoretical perspectives in cross-national research. *International Studies of Management and Organization,* 23(4): 32-70.

Collinson, D. 2006. Rethinking followership: a post-structuralist analysis of follower identities. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17: 179.

Cronin, M. A., Weingart, L. R., & Todorova, G. 2011. Dynamics in groups: Are we there yet? *Academy of Management Annals*, 5(1): 571-612.

De Dreu, C. K. W., & Weingart, L. R. 2003. Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 88(4): 741–749.

Den Hartog, D. N., House R. J., Hanges P. J., et al. 1999. Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit leadership theories: Are attributes of charismatic/transformational leadership universally endorsed? *The Leadership Quarterly*. 10(2): 219-256.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds). 1994. *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks (Calif): Sage.

Devendorf, S. A., & Highhouse, S. 2008. Applicant-employee similarity and attraction to an employer. **Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology**, 81(4): 607-617.

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

Dictionary.com. *Thesaurus.com: cultural diversity*. [Online]
Available at: https://www.dictionary.com/browse/cultural-diversity?s=t
[Accessed 5 March 2018]

Dorfman, P., Hanges, P. J., & Brodbeck, F. C. 2004. Leadership and cultural variation: The identification of culturally endorsed leadership profiles. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 Societies*: 667-718. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dorfman, P., Javidan M., Hanges, P., Dastmalchian, A., & House, R. J. 2012. GLOBE: A twenty year journey into the intriguing world of culture and leadership. *Journal of World Business*, 47: 504-518.

Duncan, P., Green, M. T., Herrera, R. 2012. Culture predicting leadership. *Business Studies Journal*, 4(1): 71-83.

Eden, D., & Leviatan, U. 1975. Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60: 736-741.

Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. 2004. Implicit leadership theories in applied settings: Factor structure, generalizability, and stability over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(2): 293–310.

Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. 2005. From ideal to real: A longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader–member exchanges and employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4): 659–676.

Epitropaki, O., Martin, R., Tram-Quon, S. & Topakas, A. 2013. Implicit leadership and followership theories "in the wild": Taking stock of information-processing approaches to leadership and followership in organizational settings. *The Leadership Quarterly,* 24: 858–881.

Ferdman, B. M., Avigdor, A., Braun, B., Kokin, J., & Kuzmycz, D. 2010. Collective experience of inclusion, diversity, and performance in work groups. *Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, 11(3): 6-26.

Fraser, S. L., & Lord, R. G. 1988. Stimulus prototypicality and general leadership impressions: Their role in leadership and behavioral ratings. *The Journal of Psychology*, 122(3): 291–303.

Foldy, E. 2004. Learning from diversity: A theoretical exploration. *Public Administration Review*, 64(5): 529-538.

Foldy, G. E., Rivard, P., & Buckley, T. R. 2009. Power, safety, and learning in racially diverse groups. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*. 8(1): 25-41.
Foti, R. J., & Luch, C. H. 1992. The influence of individual differences on the perception and categorization of leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3: 55-66.

Graen G. B., Hui C., Wakabayashi M., et al. 1997 Cross-cultural research alliances in organizational research. In P. C. Earley and M. Erez (Eds.), *New Perspectives on International Industrial/Organizational Psychology*: 160–189. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gupta, V., & Hanges, P. 2004. Regional and climate clustering of societal cultures. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 Societies*: 178-215. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Homan, A. C. et al. 2007. Bridging fault lines by valuing diversity: Diversity beliefs, information elaboration, and performance in diverse work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92:1189-1199.

Hopkins, W. E., Hopkins, S. A., & Gross, M. A. 2005. Cultural diversity recomposition and effectiveness in monoculture work groups. **Journal of Organizational Behaviour**, 26(8): 949-964.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., et al. 1999. Culture influences on leadership and organizations: Project globe. In W. F. Mobley, M. J. Gessner & V. Arnold (Eds.), *Advances in global leadership*, vol. 1: 171-233. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.

House, R. J., Wright, N. S., & Aditya, R. N. 1997. Cross-cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory. In P. C. Earley, & M. Erez (Eds.), *New perspectives in international industrial organizational psychology*: 535-625. San Francisco: New Lexington.

House, R. J., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dorfman, P. 2002. Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: an introduction to project GLOBE. *Journal of World Business*, 37: 3-10.

House, R. J., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., Dorfman, P., W., & Gupta V., GLOBE Associates. 2004. *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations; The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies.* Thousand Oaks, Calif. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

House, R. J., Dorfman, P. W., Javidan, M., Hanges, P. J., De Luque, M. F. S. 2014. Societal Culture and Leadership. *Strategic Leadership Across Cultures: GLOBE Study of CEO Leadership Behavior and Effectiveness in 24 Countries*: 1-34. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Javidan, M., & Carl, D. 2004. East meets west: searching for the etic in leadership. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41: 665–691.

Javidan, M., House, R. J., Dorfman, P. 2004. A nontechnical summary of GLOBE findings. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. Dorfman, & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Leadership, culture and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 Societies*: 29-48. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Javidan, M., Dorfman, P., Sully de Luque, M., & House, R. J. 2006. In the Eye of the Beholder: Cross Cultural Lessons in Leadership from Project GLOBE. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(1): 67-90.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. 2006. *Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills.* Boston: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.

Joshi, A., & Roh, H. 2009. The role of context in work team diversity research: A metanalytic review. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(3): 599-627.

Karjalainen, H., & Soparnot, R. 2012. Interpersonal cooperation in multicultural working context. *International Business Research*, 5(6): 73-82.

Klep, A., Wisse, B., & Van der Flier, H. 2011 Interactive affective sharing versus noninteractive affective sharing in work groups: Comparative effects of group effect on workgroup performance and dynamics. *European Journal of Social Psychology.* 41(3): 312-323.

Lammers, C. J., & Hickson, D. J. (Eds.). 1979. *Organizations alike and unlike: International and inter-institutional studies in the sociology of organizations*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Leung, K. 2008. *Foreword to leadership across the world: The GLOBE book of in-depth studies of 25 societies.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Leung K., Bond M. H., Reimel de Carrasquel S., et al. 2002. Social axioms: the search for universal dimensions of general beliefs about how the world functions. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33: 286–302.

Levitt, T. 1983. The globalization of markets. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(3):92-102.

Lim, S., Othman, R., Zain, A. Y., & Pengiran, D. S. R. (2012). Implicit leadership theories of Bruneians. *Journal of Asia-Pacific Business,* 13(4): 302–319.

Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. 1991. *Leadership & Information Processing*. London: Routledge.

M. Brad Shuck, Tonette S. Rocco, Carlos A. Albornoz. 2011. Exploring employee engagement from the employee perspective: implications for HRD. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, Vol. 35(4): 300-325.

Macey, W. H., Schneider, B., Barbera, K. M., & Young, S. A. 2009. ***Employee engagement: Tools for analysis, practice, and competitive advantage***. Malden, WA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mannix, E., & Neale, M. A. 2005. What differences make a difference? The promise and reality of diverse teams in organizations. ***Psychological Science in the Public Interest***, 6:31-55.

Martins, L. L., Milliken, F. J., Wiesenfeld, B. M., & Salgado, S. R. 2003. Racioethnic diversity and group members' experiences: The role of the racioethnic diversity of the organizational context. ***Group & Organization Management***, 28(1): 75–106.

McLeod, S. A. 2017. *Qualitative vs. quantitative research.* [Online]
Available at: https://www.simplypsychology.org/qualitative-quantitative.html
[Accessed 20 November 2018].

Morrison, A. J. 2000. Developing a global leadership model. ***Human Resource Management***, 39(2&3): 117-131.

Oddou, G., Mendenhall, M. & Ritchie, J. B. 2000. Leveraging travel as a tool for global leadership development. ***Human Resource Management Journal***, 39(2-3): 159–172.

Offerman, L. R., Kennedy, J. K., & Wirtz, P. W. 1994. Implicit leadership theories: content, structure, and generalizability. ***Leadership Quarterly***, 5(1): 43-55.

Öztürk, A., Abdülkadir Varoğlu, M., & Demet Varoğlu. 2017. A critical review of implicit leadership theory on the validity of organizational actor-national culture fitness. ***International Journal of Organizational Leadership,*** 6: 456-469.

Phillips, J. S., & Lord, R. G. 1986. Notes on the practical and theoretical consequences of implicit leadership theories for the future of leadership measurement. ***Journal of Management***, 12(1): 31–41.

Scandura T., & Dorfman P. 2004. Leadership research in an international and cross-cultural context. ***The Leadership Quarterly***, 15: 277–307.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. 2010. Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. In A. B. Bakker & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), ***Work engagement: A handbook of essential theory and research:*** 12:10–24. New York: Psychology Press.

Shaw, J. B. 1990. A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural management. ***Academy of Management Review,*** 10: 435-454.

Stahl, G. K., Maznevski, M. L., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. 2010. Unravelling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. **Journal of International Business Studies**, 41(4): 690-709.

Teodósio, J. 2014. ***Gestão Comparada: A validade do Modelo Cultural GLOBE na predicção de comportamentos medidos pelo Leadship Practices Inventory.*** Unpublished doctorol dissertation, ISCTE – IUL, Lisbon.

t Table [Online]
Available at: http://www.sjsu.edu/faculty/gerstman/StatPrimer/t-table.pdf
[Accessed 17 September 2018].

Todd, Daniel, 2017. 0*7 SPSS for Beginners - Independent Samples t Test* [Online] Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-qGFZFOQx7Q&index=10&list=PLVI_iGT5ZuRmXlbuwMKi04R6Oe1G3De8G [Accessed 17 September 2018].

Trompenaars, A., & Hampden-Turner, C. 1998. *Riding the waves of culture.* London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Triandis, H. C. 1993. The contingency model in cross-cultural perspective. In M. M. Chemers, & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions*: 167-188. San Diego: Academic Press.

Von Glinow, M. A., Shapiro, D. L., & Bret, J. M. 2004. Can we talk, and should we? Managing emotional conflict in multicultural teams. **Academy of Management Review**, 29(4): 578-592.

Woodward, J. 1995. *Management and Technology.* London: HMSO.

Wren, T. J. (Eds.). 1995. *The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Yasser A. Binsiddiq, and Rashed A. Alzahmi. 2013. Work engagement and group dynamics in diverse and multicultural teams: critical literature review. *Review of Management Innovation & Creativity*, 6(19): 121-133

Yavas, B. F. 1995. Quality management practices worldwide: Convergence or divergence? *Quality Progress*, 28(10): 57-61.

8. ANNEXES

Annex 1 - One-Sample Test

Test Value = 4					
Leadership Attributes	**Mean**	**SD**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	***t***	**df**
Diplomatic	6.18	0.899	0.000	24.354	100
Evasive	3.34	1.802	0.000	-3.701	100
Mediator	6.13	0.976	0.000	21.911	100
Bossy	2.53	1.500	0.000	-9.815	100
Positive	6.11	1.113	0.000	19.048	100
Intra-group competitor	4.10	1.769	0.575	0.562	100
Autonomous	4.24	1.856	0.201	1.287	100
Independent	4.83	1.600	0.000	5.223	100
Ruthless	1.75	1.236	0.000	-18.272	100
Tender	2.25	1.292	0.000	-13.636	100
Improvement-oriented	6.23	0.947	0.000	23.631	100
Inspirational	6.38	0.847	0.000	28.202	100
Anticipatory	6.18	1.090	0.000	20.085	100
Risk taker	4.64	1.501	0.000	4.310	100
Sincere	5.93	1.134	0.000	17.116	100
Trustworthy	6.42	0.941	0.000	25.803	100
Informed	6.08	0.935	0.000	22.356	100
Intra-group conflict avoider	4.45	1.803	0.015	2.484	100
Administratively skilled	5.97	0.974	0.000	20.325	100
Just	6.14	0.895	0.000	24.021	100
Win/win problem-solver	5.89	1.029	0.000	18.477	100
Clear	6.32	0.905	0.000	25.734	100
Self-interested	3.67	2.060	0.114	-1.594	100
Tyrannical	1.50	1.006	0.000	-25.019	100
Integrator	6.02	1.049	0.000	19.358	100
Calm	5.89	1.038	0.000	18.305	100
Provocateur	2.42	1.472	0.000	-10.819	100
Loyal	5.66	1.329	0.000	12.581	100
Unique	4.89	1.232	0.000	7.268	100
Collaborative	6.13	0.924	0.000	23.160	100
Morale booster	6.14	0.949	0.000	22.648	100
Arrogant	1.88	1.194	0.000	-17.833	100
Secretive	2.45	1.466	0.000	-10.655	100
Loner	2.42	1.306	0.000	-12.191	100
Fraternal	4.83	1.289	0.000	6.485	100
Generous	5.21	1.160	0.000	10.462	100
Formal	4.82	1.236	0.000	6.681	100
Modest	5.17	1.141	0.000	10.292	100
Intelligent	6.31	0.834	0.000	27.813	100
Decisive	5.98	0.894	0.000	22.255	100
Consultative	5.63	1.093	0.000	15.022	100
Irritable	1.85	1.152	0.000	-18.739	100
Enthusiastic	5.55	1.204	0.000	12.976	100
Risk averse	3.42	1.366	0.000	-4.298	100
Vindictive	1.50	0.867	0.000	-28.906	100
Compassionate	5.36	1.145	0.000	11.903	100

Annex 1 - One-Sample Test (Continued)

Leadership Attributes	Mean	SD	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	df
Test Value = 4					
Subdued	2.88	1.351	0.000	-8.321	100
Egocentric	2.19	1.405	0.000	-12.960	100
Non-explicit	1.83	1.209	0.000	-18.026	100
Distant	2.19	1.164	0.000	-15.647	100
Intellectually stimulating	6.12	0.875	0.000	24.334	100
Cautious	4.17	1.357	0.215	1.247	100
Organised	5.86	0.928	0.000	20.165	100
Cunning	2.41	1.544	0.000	-10.377	100
Effective bargainer	5.56	1.072	0.000	14.671	100
Noncooperative	1.57	0.952	0.000	-25.599	100
Logical	5.94	0.870	0.000	22.424	100
Status and class-conscious	4.41	1.638	0.014	2.490	100
Normative	5.10	1.253	0.000	8.815	100
Individually oriented	3.53	1.988	0.021	-2.353	100
Non-egalitarian	2.12	1.710	0.000	-11.053	100
Intuitive	5.50	0.976	0.000	15.395	100
Indirect	2.43	1.410	0.000	-11.224	100
Habitual	3.77	1.427	0.112	-1.603	100
Motive arouser	5.43	1.023	0.000	14.004	100
Convincing	5.24	1.297	0.000	9.588	100
Communicative	6.19	0.880	0.000	24.991	100
Excellence-oriented	6.21	0.753	0.000	29.485	100
Procedural	5.27	1.288	0.000	9.892	100
Group-oriented	5.82	1.144	0.000	16.009	100
Self-sacrificial	5.18	1.244	0.000	9.517	100
Patient	5.86	1.087	0.000	17.217	100
Honest	6.26	0.902	0.000	25.160	100
Domineering	2.73	1.593	0.000	-7.995	100
Intra-group face-saver	5.37	1.332	0.000	10.308	100
Dynamic	6.17	0.861	0.000	25.308	100
Elitist	2.16	1.579	0.000	-11.718	100
Cynical	1.92	1.405	0.000	-14.874	100
Ambitious	5.94	1.103	0.000	17.683	100
Motivational	6.03	0.974	0.000	20.938	100
Micromanager	2.66	1.557	0.000	-8.625	100
Nondelegator	2.03	1.187	0.000	-16.681	100
Avoids negatives	2.68	1.462	0.000	-9.050	100
Visionary	5.85	0.921	0.000	20.209	100
Willful	6.14	0.800	0.000	26.854	100
Ruler	2.12	1.314	0.000	-14.391	100
Dishonest	1.47	0.975	0.000	-26.117	100
Hostile	1.39	0.894	0.000	-29.381	100
Dependable	5.24	1.866	0.000	6.665	100

Annex 2 - Independent Samples Test

t-test for Equality of Means			
Leadership Attributes	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**_t_**	**df**
Diplomatic	0.174	1.368	99
Evasive	0.541	0.613	99
Mediator	0.092	-1.703	99
Bossy	0.319	1.002	99
Positive	0.244	-1.171	99
Intra-group competitor	0.006	2.791	99
Autonomous	0.020	2.361	99
Independent	0.481	0.707	99
Ruthless	0.504	0.670	99
Tender	0.523	-0.641	99
Improvement-oriented	0.998	-0.003	99
Inspirational	0.718	-0.362	99
Anticipatory	0.389	-0.866	99
Risk taker	0.103	-1.646	99
Sincere	0.755	-0.312	99
Trustworthy	0.116	-1.587	99
Informed	0.482	-0.706	99
Intra-group conflict avoider	0.047	-2.009	99
Administratively skilled	0.741	-0.332	99
Just	0.414	-0.820	99
Win/win problem-solver	0.043	-2.048	99
Clear	0.994	0.008	99
Self-interested	0.340	0.958	99
Tyrannical	0.491	-0.691	99
Integrator	0.898	0.129	99
Calm	0.405	-0.835	99
Provocateur	0.200	1.291	99
Loyal	0.665	0.435	99
Unique	0.212	1.255	99
Collaborative	0.829	-0.216	99
Morale booster	0.990	-0.013	99
Arrogant	0.259	1.135	99
Secretive	0.845	0.196	99
Loner	0.876	0.156	99
Fraternal	0.540	-0.615	99
Generous	0.461	-0.741	99
Formal	0.859	0.179	99
Modest	0.570	-0.569	99
Intelligent	0.829	-0.217	99
Decisive	0.675	-0.420	99
Consultative	0.990	0.013	99
Irritable	0.792	0.264	99
Enthusiastic	0.150	-1.449	99
Risk averse	0.617	0.501	99
Vindictive	0.760	-0.307	99
Compassionate	0.086	1.734	99
Subdued	0.189	-1.323	99
Egocentric	0.091	1.708	99
Non-explicit	0.953	-0.059	99
Distant	0.024	2.298	99

Annex 2 - Independent Samples Test (Continued)

t-test for Equality of Means			
Leadership Attributes	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	***t***	**df**
Distant	0.024	2.298	99
Intellectually stimulating	0.514	0.655	99
Cautious	0.958	0.053	99
Organised	0.446	-0.765	99
Cunning	0.357	-0.925	99
Effective bargainer	0.445	-0.767	99
Noncooperative	0.243	-1.175	99
Logical	0.063	-1.878	99
Status and class-conscious	0.471	-0.724	99
Normative	0.322	-0.996	99
Individually oriented	0.977	0.029	99
Non-egalitarian	0.177	-1.361	99
Intuitive	0.786	0.273	99
Indirect	0.817	-0.233	99
Habitual	0.314	-1.012	99
Motive arouser	0.083	-1.753	99
Convincing	0.103	1.644	99
Communicative	0.815	0.235	99
Excellence-oriented	0.275	1.099	99
Procedural	0.562	0.582	99
Group-oriented	0.089	-1.720	99
Self-sacrificial	0.988	0.015	99
Patient	0.834	-0.210	99
Honest	0.479	-0.710	99
Domineering	0.376	0.889	99
Intra-group face-saver	0.582	-0.552	99
Dynamic	0.845	-0.196	99
Elitist	0.079	1.776	99
Cynical	0.065	1.866	99
Ambitious	0.248	1.162	99
Motivational	0.932	0.085	99
Micromanager	0.807	-0.246	99
Nondelegator	0.178	-1.357	99
Avoids negatives	0.098	-1.668	99
Visionary	0.652	-0.452	99
Willful	0.137	1.500	99
Ruler	0.325	0.988	99
Dishonest	0.954	-0.058	99
Hostile	0.895	-0.133	99
Dependable	0.165	1.398	99

Annex 3 – Group Statistics

Manager	N		Mean	SD	Manager	N		Mean	SD
Diplomatic	Yes	22	6.41	0.666	**Self-interested**	Yes	22	4.05	2.104
	No	79	6.11	0.947		No	79	3.57	2.049
Evasive	Yes	22	3.55	1.896	**Tyrannical**	Yes	22	1.36	0.953
	No	79	3.28	1.783		No	79	1.53	1.023
Mediator	Yes	22	5.82	1.296	**Integrator**	Yes	22	6.05	0.844
	No	79	6.22	0.857		No	79	6.01	1.104
Bossy	Yes	22	2.82	1.651	**Calm**	Yes	22	5.73	0.883
	No	79	2.46	1.457		No	79	5.94	1.078
Positive	Yes	22	5.86	1.552	**Provocateur**	Yes	22	2.77	1.541
	No	79	6.18	0.958		No	79	2.32	1.446
Intra-group competitor	Yes	22	5.00	1.877	**Loyal**	Yes	22	5.77	1.020
	No	79	3.85	1.665		No	79	5.63	1.407
Autonomous	Yes	22	5.05	1.527	**Unique**	Yes	22	5.18	1.181
	No	79	4.01	1.884		No	79	4.81	1.241
Independent	Yes	22	5.05	1.588	**Collaborative**	Yes	22	6.09	0.921
	No	79	4.77	1.609		No	79	6.14	0.930
Ruthless	Yes	22	1.91	1.377	**Morale booster**	Yes	22	6.14	0.834
	No	79	1.71	1.200		No	79	6.14	0.984
Tender	Yes	22	2.09	1.065	**Arrogant**	Yes	22	2.14	1.424
	No	79	2.29	1.351		No	79	1.81	1.122
Improvement-oriented	Yes	22	6.23	0.869	**Secretive**	Yes	22	2.50	1.535
	No	79	6.23	0.973		No	79	2.43	1.456
Inspirational	Yes	22	6.32	0.894	**Loner**	Yes	22	2.45	1.143
	No	79	6.39	0.838		No	79	2.41	1.354
Anticipatory	Yes	22	6.00	1.234	**Fraternal**	Yes	22	4.68	1.211
	No	79	6.23	1.049		No	79	4.87	1.314
Risk taker	Yes	22	4.18	1.680	**Generous**	Yes	22	5.05	0.950
	No	79	4.77	1.432		No	79	5.25	1.214
Manager	N		Mean	SD	**Manager**	N		Mean	SD
Sincere	Yes	22	5.86	1.037	**Formal**	Yes	22	4.86	1.424
	No	79	5.95	1.165		No	79	4.81	1.188
Trustworthy	Yes	22	6.14	1.246	**Modest**	Yes	22	5.05	1.090
	No	79	6.49	0.830		No	79	5.20	1.159

Annex 3 – Group Statistics (Continued)

Manager	N		Mean	SD	Manager		N	Mean	SD
Informed	Yes	22	5.95	0.899	**Intelligent**	Yes	22	6.27	0.703
	No	79	6.11	0.947		No	79	6.32	0.870
Intra-group conflict avoider	Yes	22	3.77	1.926	**Decisive**	Yes	22	5.91	0.921
	No	79	4.63	1.733		No	79	6.00	0.892
Administratively skilled	Yes	22	5.91	0.921	**Consultative**	Yes	22	5.64	1.136
	No	79	5.99	0.993		No	79	5.63	1.088
Just	Yes	22	6.00	0.816	**Irritable**	Yes	22	1.91	0.750
	No	79	6.18	0.917		No	79	1.84	1.245
Win/win problem-solver	Yes	22	5.50	1.012	**Enthusiastic**	Yes	22	5.23	1.378
	No	79	6.00	1.013		No	79	5.65	1.144
Clear	Yes	22	6.32	0.839	**Risk averse**	Yes	22	3.55	1.535
	No	79	6.32	0.927		No	79	3.38	1.323
Vindictive	Yes	22	1.45	0.596	**Excellence-oriented**	Yes	22	6.36	0.658
	No	79	1.52	0.932		No	79	6.16	0.775
Compassionate	Yes	22	5.73	0.631	**Procedural**	Yes	22	5.41	1.436
	No	79	5.25	1.235		No	79	5.23	1.250
Subdued	Yes	22	2.55	1.224	**Group-oriented**	Yes	22	5.45	1.595
	No	79	2.97	1.377		No	79	5.92	0.971
Egocentric	Yes	22	2.64	1.677	**Self-sacrificial**	Yes	22	5.18	1.140
	No	79	2.06	1.304		No	79	5.18	1.279
Non-explicit	Yes	22	1.82	1.140	**Patient**	Yes	22	5.82	0.907
	No	79	1.84	1.234		No	79	5.87	1.136
Distant	Yes	22	2.68	1.211	**Honest**	Yes	22	6.14	0.889
	No	79	2.05	1.120		No	79	6.29	0.908
Intellectually stimulating	Yes	22	6.23	0.813	**Domineering**	Yes	22	3.00	1.902
	No	79	6.09	0.894		No	79	2.66	1.501
Cautious	Yes	22	4.18	1.622	**Intra-group face-saver**	Yes	22	5.23	1.378
	No	79	4.16	1.285		No	79	5.41	1.325
Organised	Yes	22	5.73	0.767	**Dynamic**	Yes	22	6.14	0.710
	No	79	5.90	0.969		No	79	6.18	0.902
Manager	N		Mean	SD	**Manager**		N	Mean	SD
Cunning	Yes	22	2.14	1.552	**Elitist**	Yes	22	2.68	1.615
	No	79	2.48	1.543		No	79	2.01	1.548

Annex 3 – Group Statistics (Continued)

Manager		N	Mean	SD	Manager		N	Mean	SD
Effective bargainer	Yes	22	5.41	0.854	Cynical	Yes	22	2.41	1.501
	No	79	5.61	1.126		No	79	1.78	1.356
Noncooperative	Yes	22	1.36	0.492	Ambitious	Yes	22	6.18	0.853
	No	79	1.63	1.040		No	79	5.87	1.159
Logical	Yes	22	5.64	0.953	Motivational	Yes	22	6.05	0.899
	No	79	6.03	0.832		No	79	6.03	1.000
Status and class-conscious	Yes	22	4.18	1.651	Micromanager	Yes	22	2.59	1.790
	No	79	4.47	1.640		No	79	2.68	1.498
Normative	Yes	22	4.86	1.207	Nondelegator	Yes	22	1.73	1.202
	No	79	5.16	1.265		No	79	2.11	1.177
Individually oriented	Yes	22	3.55	1.969	Avoids negatives	Yes	22	2.23	0.973
	No	79	3.53	2.005		No	79	2.81	1.553
Non-egalitarian	Yes	22	1.68	1.041	Visionary	Yes	22	5.77	1.066
	No	79	2.24	1.841		No	79	5.87	0.882
Intuitive	Yes	22	5.55	0.671	Willful	Yes	22	6.36	0.658
	No	79	5.48	1.048		No	79	6.08	0.829
Indirect	Yes	22	2.36	1.590	Ruler	Yes	22	2.36	1.560
	No	79	2.44	1.366		No	79	2.05	1.239
Habitual	Yes	22	3.50	1.596	Dishonest	Yes	22	1.45	0.739
	No	79	3.85	1.378		No	79	1.47	1.036
Motive arouser	Yes	22	5.09	0.921	Hostile	Yes	22	1.36	0.581
	No	79	5.52	1.036		No	79	1.39	0.966
Convincing	Yes	22	5.64	1.093	Dependable	Yes	22	5.73	1.638
	No	79	5.13	1.334		No	79	5.10	1.912
Communicative	Yes	22	6.23	0.869					
	No	79	6.18	0.888					

Annex 4 – *t* Table

t Table

cum. prob	$t_{.50}$	$t_{.75}$	$t_{.80}$	$t_{.85}$	$t_{.90}$	$t_{.95}$	$t_{.975}$	$t_{.99}$	$t_{.995}$	$t_{.999}$	$t_{.9995}$
one-tail	0.50	0.25	0.20	0.15	0.10	0.05	0.025	0.01	0.005	0.001	0.0005
two-tails	1.00	0.50	0.40	0.30	0.20	0.10	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.002	0.001
df											
1	0.000	1.000	1.376	1.963	3.078	6.314	12.71	31.82	63.66	318.31	636.62
2	0.000	0.816	1.061	1.386	1.886	2.920	4.303	6.965	9.925	22.327	31.599
3	0.000	0.765	0.978	1.250	1.638	2.353	3.182	4.541	5.841	10.215	12.924
4	0.000	0.741	0.941	1.190	1.533	2.132	2.776	3.747	4.604	7.173	8.610
5	0.000	0.727	0.920	1.156	1.476	2.015	2.571	3.365	4.032	5.893	6.869
6	0.000	0.718	0.906	1.134	1.440	1.943	2.447	3.143	3.707	5.208	5.959
7	0.000	0.711	0.896	1.119	1.415	1.895	2.365	2.998	3.499	4.785	5.408
8	0.000	0.706	0.889	1.108	1.397	1.860	2.306	2.896	3.355	4.501	5.041
9	0.000	0.703	0.883	1.100	1.383	1.833	2.262	2.821	3.250	4.297	4.781
10	0.000	0.700	0.879	1.093	1.372	1.812	2.228	2.764	3.169	4.144	4.587
11	0.000	0.697	0.876	1.088	1.363	1.796	2.201	2.718	3.106	4.025	4.437
12	0.000	0.695	0.873	1.083	1.356	1.782	2.179	2.681	3.055	3.930	4.318
13	0.000	0.694	0.870	1.079	1.350	1.771	2.160	2.650	3.012	3.852	4.221
14	0.000	0.692	0.868	1.076	1.345	1.761	2.145	2.624	2.977	3.787	4.140
15	0.000	0.691	0.866	1.074	1.341	1.753	2.131	2.602	2.947	3.733	4.073
16	0.000	0.690	0.865	1.071	1.337	1.746	2.120	2.583	2.921	3.686	4.015
17	0.000	0.689	0.863	1.069	1.333	1.740	2.110	2.567	2.898	3.646	3.965
18	0.000	0.688	0.862	1.067	1.330	1.734	2.101	2.552	2.878	3.610	3.922
19	0.000	0.688	0.861	1.066	1.328	1.729	2.093	2.539	2.861	3.579	3.883
20	0.000	0.687	0.860	1.064	1.325	1.725	2.086	2.528	2.845	3.552	3.850
21	0.000	0.686	0.859	1.063	1.323	1.721	2.080	2.518	2.831	3.527	3.819
22	0.000	0.686	0.858	1.061	1.321	1.717	2.074	2.508	2.819	3.505	3.792
23	0.000	0.685	0.858	1.060	1.319	1.714	2.069	2.500	2.807	3.485	3.768
24	0.000	0.685	0.857	1.059	1.318	1.711	2.064	2.492	2.797	3.467	3.745
25	0.000	0.684	0.856	1.058	1.316	1.708	2.060	2.485	2.787	3.450	3.725
26	0.000	0.684	0.856	1.058	1.315	1.706	2.056	2.479	2.779	3.435	3.707
27	0.000	0.684	0.855	1.057	1.314	1.703	2.052	2.473	2.771	3.421	3.690
28	0.000	0.683	0.855	1.056	1.313	1.701	2.048	2.467	2.763	3.408	3.674
29	0.000	0.683	0.854	1.055	1.311	1.699	2.045	2.462	2.756	3.396	3.659
30	0.000	0.683	0.854	1.055	1.310	1.697	2.042	2.457	2.750	3.385	3.646
40	0.000	0.681	0.851	1.050	1.303	1.684	2.021	2.423	2.704	3.307	3.551
60	0.000	0.679	0.848	1.045	1.296	1.671	2.000	2.390	2.660	3.232	3.460
80	0.000	0.678	0.846	1.043	1.292	1.664	1.990	2.374	2.639	3.195	3.416
100	0.000	0.677	0.845	1.042	1.290	1.660	1.984	2.364	2.626	3.174	3.390
1000	0.000	0.675	0.842	1.037	1.282	1.646	1.962	2.330	2.581	3.098	3.300
z	0.000	0.674	0.842	1.036	1.282	1.645	1.960	2.326	2.576	3.090	3.291
	0%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	95%	98%	99%	99.8%	99.9%
						Confidence Level					

Annex 5 – Questionnaire

Leadership of Multicultural Teams at a French Company

I - Leader Behaviours

In this section, you are given a list of behaviours and characteristics that a leader might display. You are asked to rate these behaviours and characteristics using a scale. To do this choose the number from the scale that best decribes how diplaying that behaviour or characteristic affects the leader's effectiveness.

1 - Diplomatic = Skilled at interpersonal relations, tactful

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

2 - Evasive = Refrains from making negative comments to maintain good relationships and save face

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

3 - Mediator = Intervenes to solve conflicts between individuals

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

4 - Bossy = Tells subordinates what to do in a commanding way

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

5 - Positive = Generally optimistic and confident

1 - greatly inhibits 2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

6 - Intra-group competitor = Tries to exceed the performance of others in his or her group

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

7 - Autonomous = Acts independently, does not rely on others

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

8 - Independent = Self-governing

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

9 - Ruthless = Punitive; having no pity or compassion

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

10 - Tender = Easily hurt or offended

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

11 - Improvement-oriented = Seeks continuous performance improvement

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

12 - Inspirational = Inspires emotions, beliefs, values, and behaviours of others, inspires others to be motivated to work hard

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

13 - Anticipatory = Able to successfully anticipate future needs, attempts to forecast events, consideres what will happen in the future

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

14 - Risk taker = Willing to invest major resources in endeavours that do not have high probability of success

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

15 - Sincere = Means what he/she says; earnest

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

16 - Trustworthy = Deserves trust, can be believed and relied upon to keep his/her word

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

17 - Informed = Knowledgeable; aware of information; interested in current events

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

18 - Intra-group conflict avoider = Avoids disputes with members of his or her group

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

19 - Administratively skilled = Able to plan, organise, coordinate, and control work of large numbers (over 75) of individuals

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

20 - Just = Acts according to what is right or fair

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

21 - Win/win problem-solver = Able to identify solutions which satisfy individuals with diverse and conflicting interests

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

22 - Clear = Easily understood

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

23 - Self-interested = Pursues own best interests

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

24 - Tyrannical = Acts like a tyrant or despot, makes decisions in dictatorial way

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

25 - Integrator = Integrates people, subordinated into cohesive, working whole; team-builder

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

26 - Calm = Not easily distressed

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

27 - Provocateur = Stimulates unrest

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

28 - Loyal = Stays with and supports friends even when they have substantial problems or difficulties

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

29 - Unique = An unusual person; has characteristics of behaviours that are different from most others

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

30 - Collaborative = Works jointly with others

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

31 - Morale booster = Increases morale of subordinates by offering encouragement, advises, praise, and/or by being confident

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

32 - Arrogant = Presumptuous or overbearing

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

33 - Secretive = Tends to conceal information from others

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

34 - Loner = Works and acts separately from others; prefers own company

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

35 - Fraternal = Tends to be a good friend of subordinates

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

36 - Generous = Willing to give time, money, resources, and help to others

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

37 - Formal = Acts in accordance with rules, convention, and ceremonies

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

38 - Modest = Presents self in a humble manner

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

39 - Intelligent = Smart; learns and understands easily

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

40 - Decisive = Makes decisions firmly and quickly

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

41 - Consultative = Consults with others before making plans or taking action

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

42 - Irritable = Moody; easily agitated

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

43 - Enthusiastic = Demonstrates and imparts strong positive emotions for work

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

44 - Risk averse = Avoids taking risks; dislikes risk

    1 - greatly inhibits

    2

    3

    4 - has no impact

    5

    6

    7 - contributes greatly

45 - Vindictive = Vengeful; seeks revenge when wronged

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

46 - Compassionate = Has empathy for others; inclined to be helpful or show mercy

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

47 - Subdued = Suppressed, quiet, tame

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

48 - Egocentric = Self-absorbed; thoughts focus mostly on one?s self

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

49

50 - Non-explicit = Difficult to comprehend, does not communicate explicitly, ambiguous

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

51 - Distant = Aloof, stands off from others, difficult to become friends with

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

52 - Intellectually stimulating = Encourages others to think and use their minds; challenges beliefs, stereotypes, and attitudes of others

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

53 - Cautious = Proceeds/performs with great care and does not take risks

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

54 - Organised = Well organised, methodical, orderly

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

55 - Cunning = Sly, deceitful, full of guile

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

56 - Effective bargainer = Is able to negotiate effectively, able to make transactions with others on favourable terms

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

57 - Noncooperative = Unwilling to work jointly with others

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

58 - Logical = Applies logic when thinking

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

59 - Status and class-conscious = Is conscious of social class and status boundaries and acts accordingly

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

60 - Normative = Behaves according to the norms of his or her group

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

61 - Individually oriented = Concerned with and places high value on preserving individual rather than group needs; behaves in a different manner than peers

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

62 - Non-egalitarian = Believes that all individuals are not equal and only some should have equal rights and privileges

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

63 - Intuitive = Has extra insight

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

64 - Indirect = Does not go straight to the point; uses metaphors and examples to communicate

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

65 - Habitual = Given to a constant, regular routine

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

66 - Motive arouser = Mobilises and activates followers

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

67 - Convincing = Unusually able to persuade others of his/her viewpoint

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

68 - Communicative = Communicates with others frequently

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

69 - Excellence-oriented = Strives for excellence in performance of self and subordinates

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

70 - Procedural = Follows established rules and guidelines

> 1 - greatly inhibits
>
> 2
>
> 3
>
> 4 - has no impact
>
> 5
>
> 6
>
> 7 - contributes greatly

71 - Group-oriented = Concerned with the welfare of the group

> 1 - greatly inhibits
>
> 2
>
> 3
>
> 4 - has no impact
>
> 5
>
> 6
>
> 7 - contributes greatly

72 - Self-sacrificial = Foregoes self-interests and makes personal sacrifices in the interest of a goal or vision

> 1 - greatly inhibits 2
>
> 3
>
> 4 - has no impact
>
> 5
>
> 6
>
> 7 - contributes greatly

73 - Patient = Has and shows patience

> 1 - greatly inhibits
>
> 2
>
> 3
>
> 4 - has no impact
>
> 5
>
> 6
>
> 7 - contributes greatly

74 - Honest = Speaks and acts truthfully

> 1 - greatly inhibits 2
>
> 3
>
> 4 - has no impact 5
>
> 6
>
> 7 - contributes greatly

75 - Domineering = Inclined to dominate others

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

76 - Intra-group face-saver = Ensures that other group members are not embarrassed or shamed

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

77 - Dynamic = Highly involved, energetic, enthused, motivated

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

78 - Elitist = Believes that a small number of people with similar backgrounds are superior and should enjoy privileges

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3´
4 - has no impact

5

6
7 - contributes greatly

79 - Cynical = Tends to believe the worst about people and events

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

80 - Ambitious = Sets high goals; works hard

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

81 - Motivational = Stimulates others to put forth efforts above and beyond the call of duty and make personal sacrifices

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

82 - Micromanager = An extremely close supervisor, one who insists on making all decisions

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

83 - Nondelegator = Unwilling or unable to relinquish control of projects or tasks

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

84 - Avoids negatives = Avoids saying no to another when requested to do something, even when it cannot be done

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

85 - Visionary = Has a vision and imagination of the future; makes plans and takes actions based on future goals

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

86 - Willful = Strong-willed, determined, resolute, persistent

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

87 - Ruler = Is in charge and does not tolerate disagreement or questioning; gives orders; forces her/his values and opinions on others

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7

88 - Dishonest = Fraudulent, insincere

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

89 - Hostile = Actively unfriendly; acts negatively toward others

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

90 - Dependable = Reliable

1 - greatly inhibits

2

3

4 - has no impact

5

6

7 - contributes greatly

II - 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.

1 - How old are you?

Between 20 and 25 years old

Between 26 and 30 years old

Between 31 and 35 years old

Between 36 and 40 years old

More than 40 years old

2 - What is your gender?

Female

Male

3 - What is your country of citizenship/passport?

_____

4 - How long have you worked for your current employer?

Less than 1 year

Between 1 and 3 years

More than 3 years

5 - Are you a manager?

Yes

No

6 - If yes, how many years have you been a manager?

Less than 1 year

Between 1 and 3 years

More than 3 years