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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Organizational leadership is an important determinant of organizational performance. Although there are various definitions of leadership, most imply an exerting of influence of others. In short, leadership is appropriately influencing others to act.

Leadership involves interpersonal influence which occurs when one person is able to gain compliance from another in the direction of organizationally desired goals. For the manager, leadership is the focus of activity through which the goals and objectives of the organization are accomplished. Leadership has also been the focus of attention of behavioral scientists because the leader may have a significant effect on the behavior, attitudes and performance of employees.

Leadership has been studied and researched for a number of years, resulting in numerous theories and models[1]. The early theories and the current situational theories have generally focused on one objective---identifying effective leadership. Many leadership researchers have proposed effective leadership styles. Most of the research has been performed with European or American samples.

Chemers pointed out that there would be a serious problem if results of leadership studies found in western countries were generalized to other cultures[2]. Cultural differences in
leadership are important because research indicates that autocratic leadership behavior is more effective in authoritarian cultures and democratic leadership behavior is more effective in democratic cultures. Different cultures may require variations in task versus relation orientation, and initiation versus consideration orientation [3][4][5][6][7].

In the present study, the main interest is in whether expected best possible leadership style differs from culture to culture.

In order to identify the ideal leadership, a categorization of leadership must be completed. In the first section of this thesis, most theories and models of proposed leadership styles are reviewed and assessed. In the second section of this review, Hofstede's Model on various culture values is presented and discussed. Based on Hofstede's research, it can be assumed that different cultural values would lead to a unique process of socialization, helps to shape the values and further create expectations and judgments about appropriate behaviors of leaders[8].
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of leadership can be roughly divided into four approaches: the trait approach (1910s to 1950), the behavioral approach (1950s to 1960), the contingency approach (1960 to present) and the cognitive approach (the late 70s to present).

A. Leadership Models

1. Trait Theory.

Most of the early studies of leadership between 1910 and 1950 focused on traits of the leader. Researchers attempted to find a set of identifiable characteristics or traits that could differentiate successful from unsuccessful leaders and leaders from non-leaders. Stogdill reviewed over 120 trait studies and concluded that although some traits seemed to describe leaders more often than others, it was not conclusive which traits could predict leadership effectiveness[9]. The inconsistent and contradictory results from the trait studies led Stogdill to conclude that traits alone did not define leadership. The effectiveness of a leader depends to a large extent on situational determinants. For example, a particular leadership pattern may work effectively for a group of assembly line workers but may be totally ineffective for a group of nurses. Stogdill predicted task leadership theorizing would be inadequate until personal and situational
characteristics would be integrated.

Behavioral Theories During the 1950s, the failure of trait approach led leadership researchers to focus attention on actual leader behavior. Research centered on what a leader does and how a leader does it. The foundation of the "style of leadership" approach was that effective leaders used a particular style to lead individuals and groups to achieve certain goals which can result in high productivity and/or morale.

A number of definitions of leadership style were offered by various researchers. A classic study of leadership style was conducted by Lewin Lippitt and White[10]. They examined three styles: autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire. Autocratic style was characterized by tight control of group activities and decisions made by the leader. Democratic style emphasized group participation and majority rule. Laissez-faire leadership stressed very low levels of involvement by the leader. Autocratic leadership led to low levels of subordinate satisfaction, Democratic leadership was associated with higher level of subordinate satisfaction. Those who work for democratic leaders were less resistant to change and showed more organization identification than those who work for autocratic leaders. Subordinate satisfaction and performance under laissez-faire was lower than under the democratic approach but higher than that under the autocratic approach.

One of the most widely known research efforts on leadership
was that conducted by Ohio State University[11]. Two leadership dimensions were identified: initiating structure and consideration. The initiating structure dimension stressed directiveness, goal facilitation, and task-related feedback. The consideration dimension emphasized interpersonal warmth, concern for the feelings of subordinates and the use of participative two way communication.

While the Ohio State research was being conducted, a series of leadership studies was in progress at the University of Michigan. Two distinct styles of leadership were developed: job-centered leadership and employee-centered leadership[12]. Job-centered leadership style focused on the use of close supervision, legitimate and coercive power, meeting schedules and evaluating work performance. Employee-centered leadership style is people oriented and emphasized delegation of responsibility and a concern for employee welfare, needs, advancement and personal growth.

The identification of two reliable dimensions of leader behavior was a major step forward in leadership research. Attempts to relate the behavioral factors to group and organizational outcomes proved quite difficult. Although the leader's consideration, this finding was not always obtained in all studies. Furthermore, the relationship between leader-structuring behavior and group productivity showed very few consistent patterns[13].

During both the traits and behavior eras of leadership
research, researchers attempted to identify the 'best' style of leadership. They had not yet learned that no single style of leadership was universally best across all situation and a universally accepted "best" was inappropriate for the complexities of modern organization.

2. Situational Theories.

During the late 1960s, researchers recognized the limitation of the behavioral theories and began to refine and develop new approaches to the study of leadership. This approach focused on the more complex situational theories of leadership. The work of the trait and behavioral style researchers provided a significant foundation for the study of leadership in organizations. Traits and behavioral theories strongly suggested that the most effective way to lead was a dynamic and flexible process that adapted to a particular situation. For the most part, situational theories either adopted the measurements of leader behavior and adopted them to a contingency model (e.g. Path-Goal Theory and Vroom & Yetton Model) or at least used the two domains of consideration and structure for a conceptual dichotomy (e.g. Fiedler’s Model).

One of the first situational models of leadership was developed by Fiedler[14]. The theory asserted that effectiveness of the leader in achieving high group performance was contingent on the work orientation of the
leader and the degree to which the leader had control and influence in a particular situation. The contingency theory suggested that a leader could be either task-oriented (low LPC) or relationship-oriented (high LPC), and depending on the leader's control in the leadership situation, one type would be more effective than the other. In this model, situational control is based on the combination of leader-member relations, task structure and the leader's position power. High situational control for a leader exists when there are good leader-member relations, high task structure and high position power. Low situational control occurs when there are poor leader-member relations, low task structure, and little position power. Moderate situation control exists when situational characteristics are mixed. The low LPC leader, with a strong task orientations, is most effective when situation control is either very low and very high while the high LPC leader, with a strong relationship orientation, is most effective when there is moderate situational control.

Another prominent contingency theory of leadership is the path-goal theory. The path-goal theory dealt with the effects of specific leader behavior on subordinate motivation and satisfaction. House and Mitchell identified four styles of leader behavior, all of which were appropriate under certain circumstances[15]: (1) directive leaders, who provide subordinates with specific guidelines by setting and maintaining performance standards. (2) achievement-oriented
leaders, who set challenging goals and encourage goal attainment by expressing confidence in their subordinates' ability to attain these goals. (3) Supportive leaders, who demonstrate their concern for subordinates' well being. (4) Participative leaders, who solicit their subordinates' ideas and suggestions, and consult with subordinates before making decisions that directly affect them. Leader behavior interacts with subordinates' characteristics and environment factors to affect subordinate performance and satisfaction. Three subordinate's characteristics (i.e., locus of control, authoritarianism and ability) had some effects on how subordinates perceived the leader's behaviors. Those subordinates with an internal locus of control reacted more favorably toward participative leadership. Directive leadership was more satisfying to subordinates with an external locus of control. Subordinates high in authoritarianism reacted more positively to directive leadership. Subordinates with high ability saw directive leadership as undesirable and reacted unfavorably to it. The environment factors were the task and organization. Then tasks were uncertain, a more directive leadership was more effective. Supportive leadership increased subordinate motivation when the environment was stressful.

Vroom-Yetton's normative model is also a contingency theory of leadership. Vroom and Yetton examined decision making[16]. The quality of leader's decision can influence commitment,
turnover, and productivity. The model is situational and has 7 rules which prescribes the appropriate choice of a range of five decision making strategy. These rules are categorized under the importance of quality for the decision or the importance of the acceptance for the decision. The strategies range from extreme autocratic to extreme participative. Effective strategy depends on the characteristics of the situation. The situational characteristics are 1) the expected support, acceptance, and commitment to the decision by subordinates and 2) the amount of structured, clear, decision relevant information available to a leader. Three general rules determine which styles are most effective. The first rule is that, other things being equal, an autocratic decision is more efficient. The second rule specifies that if a leader does not have sufficient structure and information to make a high-quality decision, the leader must consult with subordinates to gain the necessary information. The third general rule specifies that if a leader does not have sufficient support from subordinates to be assured that they will accept the decision, the leader must gain subordinate acceptance and commitment through participation in decision making.

Although only some leadership theories were reviewed above, numerous theories have been developed during the past several decades. Most of the influential leadership theories, however, were examined above. As shown above, the reviewed theories
proposed their own leadership styles. Although the leadership theories used different labels for leader's style, there were similarities across labels and theories. For example, leaders who were described as initiating structure in one theory were also described as job centered in another theory, and leaders who are considerate in one theory, were similar to employee-centered leaders in another theory.

In summary, the list below shows different researchers' labels of leader behavior. Bass[17] proposed that these labels could be described in two broad categories of leadership behavior: task oriented and person-oriented. The main leadership theories reviewed above also used these two categories to describe leadership style in their models.

Table 1. Leadership Style Categorization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Task-Oriented</th>
<th>Person-Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lewin &amp; Lippitt(1948)</td>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz et al.(1950)</td>
<td>Production-oriented</td>
<td>Employee-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Likert(1967)</td>
<td>Job-centered</td>
<td>Person-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Likert(1967)</td>
<td>System I, II</td>
<td>System III, IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukl(1971)</td>
<td>Decision centralization</td>
<td>Considerate initiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Anglo-American leadership theories, two generally accepted leadership styles were found. In other cultures, active research was also performed to validate these categories. For example, Misumi[18] in Japan, Sinha[19] in India, Ayman and Chemers[20] etc. expanded the Ohio State Studies of leadership and developed their own models and approaches.

For the purpose of the present research, Ohio State leadership theory, Misumi's P-M leadership theory and Sinha's leadership theory were chosen. The three leadership theories were selected because each theory is related to culture of U.S.A.: Misumi's theory is related to Japan's culture; the Sinha's theory is related to Indian culture.

Ohio State Studies Research into leader behavior was initiated at Ohio State University in the 1950s and has continued to the present. The overall objective of the Ohio State studies was to investigate the determinants of leader behavior and to determine the effects of leadership style on work group performance and satisfaction.

Through these studies, two independent leadership dimensions were identified. The first dimension, initiating Structure, includes behavior in which the leader organizes and defines group activities and the leader's relation to the group. Thus, the leader defines the role each member is expected to assume task, assign task, plan ahead, establish ways of getting things done, and push production. This
dimension emphasizes overt attempts to achieve organizational goals. The second dimension, consideration, includes behaviors indicating mutual trust, respect, and warmth, and rapport between the leader and the group. This dimension emphasizes a concern for group member's needs and includes such behaviors as allowing subordinates more participation in decision making and encouraging two way communication.

Studies have been concerned with the dimensions of leadership the Ohio State studies proposed. Some of the major findings on leadership styles were that leaders who were rated highly on initiating structure by their immediate subordinates were generally rated highly by their immediate supervisors and had subordinates who were high producers. However, high initiating leaders had subordinates with high absenteeism, employee grievances, turnover and low job satisfaction on routine task. Highly considerate leaders were found to be in charge of satisfied workers, who displayed group harmony and cohesiveness. Leaders with low consideration and high initiating structure had subordinates with high grievance rates and turnover as compared to leaders high in consideration but low in initiating structure[21]. House, Filley and Kerr conducted a study to look at the relationship between consideration and initiating structure as it related to satisfaction of subordinates[22]. Mean satisfaction score increased as structure increased when consideration was high but the results did not have a clear-cut pattern when
consideration was low. Correlation between consideration and leader effectiveness was higher than correlation between initiating structure and leader effectiveness. Schrieschiem and Kinich suggested consideration behavior was associated more closely with leader effectiveness as compared to initiating structure behaviors[23].

Fisher summarized the relationship between consideration, findings from the last 30 years of research[24]. Consideration and initiating structure were correlated positively with elements of leader effectiveness such as job performance, overall job satisfaction, intrinsic job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision and organizational stress. His research provided support for Fleishman's contention[25] that leadership which combined high consideration and high initiating structure was likely to result in leader effectiveness. The research also supported Schrieheim's conclusion[26] that consideration had an invariant positive effect on the group outcomes while structuring behavior effects were more situational bound.

The Ohio State Studies of consideration and initiating structure have been extended to cross-cultural research. Anderson studied discussion groups composed of the United States and Indian graduate students[27]. The leader's effectiveness as rated by American students was positively correlated to both consideration and structure. Ratings of the leader effectiveness by Indian students were only correlated
to the leader's consideration scores. In the Bass and Burger
twelve-nation data for Exercise Supervise, the lower the
manager's organizational level, the higher the need for more
consideration. Research in France showed consideration as
relatively unimportant at all management levels. Latin
Americans, Germans, and Australians thought consideration was
highly important for lower, middle, and top management.
Consideration was emphasized by fast-rising managers as
compared to slow climbing managers in Italy, Spain, Portugal,
and the United State; it was deemphasized in Belgium,
Scandinavia, France, Latin America, and India[28].

3. PM Leadership Theory.

The PM concept centered around the idea of basic group
functions. Numerous studies of small groups and hierarchical
organizations indicated that group could be broadly divided
into two components. One is the function of contributing
toward a group's goal achievement or problem solving, and the
other is that of promoting a group's self preservation or of
maintaining and strengthening the group process itself. The
problem solving and goal achievement function may be referred
to as P, for performance, and the self-preservation function
may be referred to as M for maintenance.

Leadership behavior that prompts and motivates group goal
achievement is called P leadership. P leader may have a good
grasp of how work is progressing, instruct subordinates about
how to improve their work method, read the contents of all
documents which require his or her approval, and reprimand the
subordinates without hesitation when necessary.

Once a group or hierarchical organization has been formed,
it tends to preserve or maintain itself. M leadership behavior
is oriented toward promoting and reinforcing the tendency
toward self-preservation. Maintenance-oriented behavior is
directed toward dispelling excessive tensions that arise in
interpersonal relations within a group or organization,
promoting the resolution of conflict and strife, giving
encouragement and support, providing an opportunity for
minority opinions to be expressed, inspiring personal need
fulfillment and promoting an acceptance of interdependence
among group members.

Although the meanings and aspects of P and M leadership
behavior have been discussed, the PM leadership theory does
not deal with P and M separately. The theory is premised on
the preposition that although any leadership behavior may
emphasize either P or M functions, every leadership behavior
contains some degree of P and M at the same time.

According to the PM leadership theory, there four basic
types of leadership behavior: PM, Pm, PM and pm. The way to
classify leadership style is as follows: There are items for P
and M leadership behavior separately. The P and M scores for
each leader were obtained using the average of ratings by his
or her immediate subordinates. If the leader of a group has a
P score higher than the average of P scores for all respondents, and also had an M score higher than the average M score for all respondents, then the leader is classified as a PM type leader. A leader who only has an above average score in P, the leader is classified as a Pm type leader.

4. Sinha’s Leadership Model.

The main leadership styles Sinha has proposed are nurturant, task and nurturant-task. According to Sinha, a nurturant leader cares for his or her subordinates, shows affection, takes personal interest in their well-being, and above all is committed to their growth, while a task-oriented leader structures his or her subordinates’ roles in such a way that the subordinates understand and accept goals, and directs them to work hard and maintain a high level of productivity[29].

In order to be effective, however, the two extreme styles should be mixed. Leader’s nurturance need to be contingent on his or her subordinates’ task accomplishment. Sinha has proposed nurturant-task (NT) style which shows nurturance contingent on the subordinate’s task accomplishment. An NT leader reinforces the subordinates who meet his or her expectations with nurturance. The NT leadership style is based on a reciprocal influence relationship between the leader and the subordinates. Initially, the subordinates depend heavily on the leader not only for guidance and direction but for support and encouragement. But as the subordinates work hard,
they develop skill and experience and hence gain self-confidence. The subordinates now need less direction and start exerting pressure on the leader to accept their preparedness to participate. Thus, a leader responds by shifting gradually towards a participative style. When a leader continues to close supervision on the mature subordinates, the subordinates start resisting and defying the leader.

In summary, the three models can be compared as shown below:

1. Nurturant leadership of Sinha, consideration leadership of Ohio State studies and M leadership of Misumi are similar to each other in that they all emphasize person-oriented leadership. Task leadership of Sinha, initiating structure leadership of Ohio State studies and P leadership of Misumi are similar to each other in that they all emphasize task-oriented leadership.

2. The most important difference between Sinha’s theory, and Ohio State studies and PM theory is that Sinha’s model conceptualized a reciprocal influence relationship between the leader and his subordinates, and the relationship changes as a function of the nature of interactive relationship. In short, Sinha’s NT leadership is dynamic because NT leadership can develop into a participative style or deteriorate into an authoritarian style while Ohio State studies and PM leadership model are static.

3. Another point which differentiates the three models is
that while Ohio State Studies and Sinha's Model used the same measures for different types of organizations, PM theory used different measures depending on types of organizations. PM theory proposed different questionnaires for leadership in industrial organizations, government administrative leadership, and leadership for children and students.

From the models reviewed above, three leadership styles were identified. Those are person-oriented, task-oriented and nurturant task-oriented leadership. These leadership styles are used in order to identify the ideal leadership style for both Americans and Koreans.

Next, cognitive approach to leadership is reviewed in that preference for ideal leadership styles by Americans and Koreans is influenced by their own implicit theory of ideal leadership[30]


Perception and cognition have played a major role in leadership research. At the end of the 70s, leadership theorist had begun to apply attribution theory-propositions to judgments involved in the process of leadership.

According to Calder, leadership processes and effects exist primarily as perceptual processes in the minds of followers and observers. These perceptions, judgments, and attributions are distorted by the biases which the perceiver has. Each
individual holds an implicit personal theory of leadership which serves as a cognitive filter to determine what the observer will notice, remember, and report about the leadership process.

Several researchers indicated that such implicit theories were especially problematic in ratings of leader behavior[31][32]. Raters who are led to believe that a group has performed well or poorly will modify their ratings of leader behavior to conform to the performance feedback. In other words, if one thinks that good leaders are very considerate of their followers, he or she is more likely to notice and report the consideration behavior of leaders whom he or she believes have performed well.

Ayman and Chemers have found that the structure of leader behavior ratings depended more on the culture of the raters than on the behavior of the leader. They factor analyzed leader behavior ratings made by Iranian subjects. They found that the structure of the behavior ratings was very different from the structure normally found in studies in the United States and Europe[33]. In most leadership studies done in Western Europe and the United States, analyses of leader-behavior ratings yielded two distinct and independent behavior clusters. These are the structuring, task oriented behaviors and the considerate, relation-oriented behaviors. However, the Ayman and Chemers analysis of ratings made by Iranian followers resulted in a single category of behavior.

19
which included both structuring and considerate items. This global factor depicting a directive but warm supervisor was labeled "benevolent paternalism." Furthermore, the factor was found to be strongly related to group performance as assessed by superiors and to satisfaction with supervision expressed by subordinates. The unique pattern of behavior was found when the leaders were either Iranian or American. This led Ayman and Chemers to conclude that leader behavior ratings are a function of the implicit theories which guide the "eye of the beholder" than they are of what the leader actually does.

Several studies also showed that culture leads each individual to hold an implicit personal theory of leadership. That is, culture, through the process of socialization, helps to shape the values and further create expectations and judgments about appropriate behaviors of leaders. Whyte and Williams reported that among workers in a Peruvian company and among workers in an American company there were different correlations between the emphasis that supervisors place on production as reported by workers and the satisfaction felt by these workers with their supervisor. Among the Americans correlation was negative, but among Peruvians it was positive. Similarly, the Peruvian workers were satisfied with their superiors to the extent that perceived them to exercise close rather than general supervision, contrary to the results among the American workers. Furthermore, group meetings in which workers could discuss matters with their supervisors were
strongly related to satisfaction with the supervisor among American workers but not Peruvian workers[34]. These results illustrated differences between the reactions of workers to supervision across cultures. A study of bank employees in Brazil by Farris and Butterfield also showed results that agreed with the study of Whyte and Williams. Employees in these banks reacted positively to supervisors whom they saw exercising close rather than general supervision, contrary to the prevailing results in the United States[35].

In order to understand why those differences happened across cultures, it is necessary to understand cultural differences which create different implicit theory of ideal leadership. Hofstede has proposed the main criteria by which national cultures differ. The criteria were Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism and Masculinity. He argued that a culture's standing on the four factors determined the kinds of organizational structure and managerial policies that would be most likely develop[36]. Different implicit personal theory of ideal leadership across countries may be explained by their cultures different standing on the factors. In the present study, power distance and uncertainty are employed to identify the cultures of Korea and the United States.

B. Hofstede's Model

1. Power Distance.
In order to describe meaningfully the relationship between boss and subordinates in a hierarchy, Hofstede used the concept of power distance. The power distance was taken from a work of Mulder[37]. He defined "power distance" as "the potential to determine or direct the behavior of another person/other persons more so than the other way round," and "power distance" as "the degree of inequality in power between a less powerful individual (1) and more powerful other (0), in which I and O belong to the same social system. According to Hofstede, the definition of power distance as follows: "the power distance between a boss B and a subordinate S in a hierarchy is the difference between the extent to which B can determine the behavior of S and the extent to which S can determine the behavior of B."

In order to explore power distance differences between countries, Hofstede focused on three factors. (1) Nonmanagerial employee's perception that employees are afraid to disagree with their managers. (2) Subordinate's perception that their boss tend to take decisions in an autocratic or persuasive Way. (3) Subordinate's preference for anything but a consultative style of decision-making in their boss: that is, for an autocratic, a persuasive or a democratic style. Hofstede chose the first factor as central for exploring power differences between countries.

He used an item to measure the fist factor: "How frequently, in your experience, does the following problem occur:
employees being afraid to express disagreement with their managers?" It was a projective question: respondents are not asked how frequently they themselves are afraid to disagree, but their answers can be expected to reflect a projection of their cultural beliefs.

For the second and the third factors, two items were used, which provide information about power distance in boss-subordinate relationship. Subordinates were given the description of four styles of decision-making behavior by managers and asked to indicate their preferred type and their perception of their boss's actual type. The four decision-making styles were autocratic, persuasive, consultative and democratic as Tannenbaum and Schmidt suggested[38]. Whereas the "employee afraid" question asked for a perception of asked for a perception of the behavior of the boss.

There was a significant positive correlation across 40 countries of the mean "employee afraid" scores and the mean percentage of employees perceiving a manager autocratic or persuasive if managers were often seen as afraid to disagree with them, and vice versa. And in countries in which few employees are perceived as afraid, many employees prefer a "consultative" manager. In countries in which many employees are perceived as afraid, employees tend not to prefer the consultative manager but to vote for the autocratic, the persuasive or the democratic manager. As the findings showed,
in systems in which superiors maintain a large power distance, subordinates tend to prefer extreme leadership style: autocratic or democratic.

In short, where superiors maintain a large power distance, subordinates tend to polarize into dependence or counter dependence. On the other hand, where superior maintain smaller power distance, subordinates tend to prefer consultative decision style: this can be interpreted as an interdependence between superior and subordinates.

Hofstede computed a Power Distance Index (PDI) on a basis of country mean scores for the three questions. The actual formula used was: \( PDI = 135 - 25X(\text{mean score of "employee afraid" question}) + \% \text{ of perceived manager autocratic and persuasive} - (\% \text{ of preferred manager consultative}). \)

In order to study influence of occupations and education levels on PDI, Hofstede surveyed six categories of occupation: unskilled/semiskilled workers, clerical workers/non professional salesmen, skilled workers/technicians, managers of previous categories, professional workers and managers of professional workers. The PDI of the six categories of occupations were 90, 71, 65, 42, 22, 8, respectively. He concluded that power distance between less educated and nonmanagerial employees and their superiors tend to be larger than between more educated and managerial employees and their superiors.

Hofstede also investigated country-occupation interactions.
On the basis of PDI values for four occupations in each of 11 countries, he concluded that the country differences in PDI are much larger for the more-educated than for the less-educated occupations. Among the 11 countries, Mexico showed the highest PDI, 81; Britain, the lowest PDI, 35. The PDI of Mexican technical experts and plant workers were 83 and 99. But PDI of Britain technical experts and unskilled plant workers were 15 and 102. The PDI difference of the technical experts of the two countries was 68, while that of the unskilled plant workers was only 3.

Hofstede's major findings about PDI are summarized as shown below. The table contrasts low PDI countries with high PDI countries with high PDI countries. The table dichotomize countries into high or low PDI countries, but PDI is a continuum so that countries are not just polarized between high and low but maybe anywhere in between[39]. The dichotomy was made so that it served to clarify the distinction (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Differences between Low/High PDI Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Low PDI Countries - Managers are seen making after consulting with subordinates.

High PDI Countries - Managers are seen making decision autocratically.
2. Uncertainty Avoidance.

The second dimension was Uncertainty Avoidance. It indicated the extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations and tries to avoid these situations by providing greater career stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviors, and believing in absolute truths and the attainment of expertise.

The tolerance for uncertainty was partly a matter of personality, partly a matter of culture. Societies differed in their societal norms for uncertainty avoidance and members of these societies were socialized in the society’s institutions toward this norm.

To measure uncertainty avoidance, Hofstede focused on three factors: rule orientation, stability and stress. The rule orientation item was "Company rules should not be broken---even if the employee think it is in the company's best interests. It may be evident that disagreement with the "rule orientation" statement indicated a higher level of tolerance for uncertainty. The opposite position agreement with the rule orientation statement, avoided the uncertainty of employees deciding themselves whether or not a rule should be followed.

The second "stability" item is "How long do you think you will continue working for this company?" The link for the two questions was that a low percentage of employees planned to leave within five years and a strong rule orientation both
indicated a strong uncertainty avoidance.

The last item of uncertainty was "stress". The "stress" question was: "How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?" Higher mean stress goes together with stronger rule orientation and greater employment stability and vice versa.

Using the three items, Hofstede developed a formula of the uncertainty avoidance index (UAI): 

\[ \text{UAI} = 300 - 30 \times \text{mean score rule orientation} - (\% \text{ of intending to stay less than 5 years}) - 40 \times \text{mean stress score}. \]

The rule orientation, employment stability, and stress related to the demographic factors of educational level, hierarchy, and age. The following presents Hofstede's findings on the association of uncertainty avoidance with the demographic factors:

1. An occupation's mean level of rule orientation was mainly dependent on the occupation's average formal educational level: higher-educated occupations tend to show less rule orientation.

2. An occupation's mean employment stability level was a combined function of average age, of its incumbent: the older, the more stability; their average educated level: the higher, the less stability.

3. An occupation's mean stress level depended on its hierarchical level. Managers showed higher stress level than nonmanagers.

4. Women and men scored equally on rule orientation.
5. On stress, women showed slightly higher stress, but the difference in stress scores between women and men was not statistically significant. The stress difference was therefore negligible.

6. On employment stability, women scored significantly less "stable" than men; this had nothing to do with their attitude to uncertainty, but with their family role.

7. As a whole, sex and uncertainty avoidance were unrelated. In association with leadership, in higher UAI countries, managers were likely to be more task-oriented. It was also found that high UAI countries prefer group decisions and consultative management. The preference on group decision making can be interpreted as a way of avoiding risk for the individual decision maker.

As in the case of the power distance norm, the uncertainty avoidance norm was meant to be a value system shared by the majority in the middle classes in a society. The UAI norm dealt with the level of anxiety about the future in a country and the consequent need to protect society. The higher anxiety led to higher stress and a more hurried social life, but also to higher energy release, which meant an inner urge to work hard, and to a stronger superego needed to control dangerous impulses. On the high UAI side, anxiety was released more through the showing of aggressiveness and emotions for which society had created an outlet; on the low UAI side anxiety was released more through passive relaxation, aggressiveness and
emotions not approved socially.

People in high UAI countries feel a greater need for consensus. Tolerance toward people with different ideas and/or showing deviant behavior was more present on the low UAI side. In high UAI countries, change was resisted more emotionally and there was a greater tendency to conservatism. Hofstede's major findings with UAI were shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Differences between Low/High UAI Countries

| Low UAI countries - Managers are more willing to make risky decision. |
| High UAI countries - Managers are less willing to make risky decision. |

3. Criticism of The Hofstede Model

The model may be criticized on these grounds:

1. Hofstede's power distance index (PDI) and uncertainty avoidance index (UAI) focused on a small range of power distance and uncertainty avoidance situations. Using only three items, each dimension (i.e., PDI and UAI) was measured.

2. Hofstede developed items for PDI and UAI based on Western European culture, and he used these items to measure power distance and uncertainty avoidance of Asian countries and Western European culture. Taking items designed and tested within the cultural context of one country, using the items in
other countries, and comparing the results between countries is a debatable form of cross-cultural research. Triandis called such research "pseudoetic." He referred to the distinction between emic and etic research. Emics refers to the natives' view of the world while etics refers to viewpoints of another culture imposed on the target culture. Cultures develop emic (cultural specific) constructs that are not shared with other cultures[40].

3. PDI and UAI were just for a country or a group, not for an individual. His PDI and UAI only considered country differences or group differences, ignoring individual differences.

4. Because PDI and UAI measure was designed for a group, it is impossible to look at a correlation between Hofstede's measure and other measures for power distance and uncertainty avoidance, or other measures such as satisfaction or individual's perceptions.

In order to resolve these problems, a new power distance and uncertainty avoidance scale was developed in this study. The difference between the new scale and Hofstede's measure are as follows:

1. The new scale measures power distance and uncertainty avoidance by considering a larger range of power distance and uncertainty avoidance situations than Hofstede's measure.

2. It can measure both a country's power distance and uncertainty avoidance, and an individual's. This means that an
individual's score on this measure can be compared to his/her score on another measure. In addition, with this measure not only can country index be calculated, but individual difference within a country can also be examined.

3. The new scale was developed from critical incidents reported by both Koreans and Americans. The scale developed on a basis of both Asian and Western country people.

C. The Purpose of This Study

The cultural relativity in an implicit theory of leadership is the main interest of the present study.

For the present study, the three measures of leader behavior were employed: Misumi's P-M leadership theory; Ohio State Studies; Sinha's leadership theory, representing three cultures, i.e., Japan, the U.S.A., and India. This ensures a more international representation of the measurement study included items representing the three leadership styles (i.e., person-oriented, task-oriented and nurturant-task-oriented style).

Leadership style which is ideal in one culture may not be ideal in another culture because culture shapes expectations and judgments about appropriate leadership style. In the present study, Hofstede's power distance, uncertainty avoidance values defining two dimensions of cultures were used.

Below are the research hypotheses the present study has:
1. Nationality, gender, education level and length of work experience will influence a level of power distance and uncertainty avoidance.

2. Nationality, gender, education level and length of work experience will influence a choice of ideal leadership style.

3. Power distance, uncertainty avoidance, nationality and gender will affect a choice of ideal leadership style.

In addition, the Korean and American power distance and uncertainty avoidance scores measured by the new scale developed in the present study will be compared with power distance index (PDI) and uncertainty avoidance index (UAI) measured by Hofstede's questionnaire. PDI and UAI will be calculated using Hofstede's three items for each index. Reliabilities of new power distance scale and uncertainty avoidance scale will be also tested.
CHAPTER III. METHOD

A. Subjects

Three hundred seventy individuals participated in the present study. One hundred ninety (51%) of the participants were males. Two hundred twenty seven (61%) participants were Koreans. Of the Korean participants, sixty three were company workers, seventy six were college staff members, and eighty eight were college students. One hundred forty three participants (39%) were Americans. Of the American participants, seventy one were college staff members and seventy two were college students. The followings describe each participant group in detail:

In Korea, company workers were selected from an insurance company in Seoul. They were employees of the sales and personnel departments. The subjects were full-time workers who were not managers. Completed questionnaires were obtained from 63 (81%) of the 78 employees. Of the 63 employees, thirty four (53%) were males. Mean employee age was 28 with a range of 20 to 50 and mean work experience was 4 years with a range of 1 to 20 years. Sixty seven percent of the workers were college graduates and the remaining thirty three percent were high school graduates. Korean college staff members and students who participated were from a major University at CheonjJu. The staff members were all nonacademic personnel who were
full-time workers below the level of manager. The questionnaires were returned by 76 (78%) of the 98 staff members. Sixty two (82%) of the staff members were males. Mean age of staff members was 32 with a range of 20 to 47 and work experience averaged 7 years with a range of 1 to 22 years. Fifty eight percent of the staff workers were college graduates and the remainder were high school graduates. The other Korean subject group was taken from students in introductory psychology courses. Eighty eight students (93%) of the 95 students returned the questionnaires. Mean age for students was 21 years with a range of 19 to 47 and work experience averaged 4 months with a range of 0 to 8 years. Thirty five (40%) of the students were male.

In the United States, students and staff members of a university participated in the present study. The university staff members chosen were not academic personnel, not managers, not union members, and not part-time workers. Out of two hundred and ten questionnaires mailed, seventy one (34%) responded. Of the seventy one staff members, twenty (28%) were male. Mean age for staff members was 36 with a range of 23 to 60, and mean work experience was 15 with a range of 1 to 40. Forty four percent of the staff members had college degree or Bachelors degree and the rest were high school graduates. Seventy nine students received the questionnaires. Forty four (64%) of the students were male. Mean age for students was 18.5 with a range of 17 to 24 and mean work experience was two
years with a range of 0 to 10 years. The students who participated received points toward their grade.

B. Measures

The cultural dimensions (i.e., power distance and uncertainty avoidance value) were measured by questionnaires developed in this study. The development of the questionnaires was based on Hofstede’s definitions and Triandis’ recommendations for constructing questionnaires in cross-cultural research. Four steps were used to develop questionnaire for cultural dimensions: 1) gathering critical incidents from Koreans and Americans, 2) developing items, 3) back-translating items, 4) testing reliability of questionnaire.

1. Cultural Dimensions

a. Power distance.

The first step was to gather a large number of examples relating to power distance from Americans and Koreans as a base for the development of items in this questionnaire. This was accomplished by using Flanagan’s critical incidents technique. Twenty two American undergraduate students taking an introductory psychology course, and thirty Korean undergraduate students, graduate students and their spouses were asked each to provide at least three examples of how they have behaved or felt when interacting with a high and low
status persons. The instructions given to them were as follows:

The degree to which your attitudes and/or behaviors are influenced would be different, depending on status of a person with whom you are in association. You might be more tense and/or observe decorum more than usual when with a high status person such as your supervisor, professor, etc., while you might feel more comfortable and behave more naturally when with the same or low status person such as a friend of yours. Describe in specific the experiences you think fit the case. Please, avoid words which are too broad and vague. For example, a specific statement such as "When I was smoking and met my manager, I put my cigarette away in haste." is more desirable as compared to a broad expression such as "I did not behave in a rude way in front of my manager."

One hundred and thirty critical incidents about power distance were gathered from the American and Korean informants. The critical incidents were categorized into two groups, high power distance (e.g., those critical incidents referring to interaction with a manager) and low power distance (e.g., those critical incidents referring to interaction with a friend). The critical incidents for high power distance were raw material for power distance items. The critical incidents about low power distance were used for making reversed power distance items.
The next step was to review the critical incidents collected from both countries and to group them, depending on their content. The criteria for a critical incident to be considered for item development were its uniqueness and relevance to the definition of power distance. Thus, forty items were developed which were to be responded on a five point scale (1=never, 5=always). In addition, Hofstede's three items on power distance were also included in the final power distance questionnaire to calculate power distance index (PDI). The first version of the items based on Korean and English critical incidents were written in English.

Item reliability of this questionnaire was tested for the forty developed items and one of Hofstede's items across the two country samples. The reliability coefficient was 84. The other two items of Hofstede were not included because they were categorical.

b. Uncertainty Avoidance

The same procedure as above with the same individuals was used to develop the uncertainty avoidance scale. The first step was to gather critical incidents for uncertainty avoidance. In the first step, the same people who provided power distance critical incidents also provided critical incidents about uncertainty avoidance. The instructions were as follows:

We live with uncertainty but we often want to avoid the
uncertainty. Although a new job is offered with higher position and salary than the current job has, many people stick to their job because they are afraid that other unknown conditions (i.e. personality of new supervisor) may be unfavorable. You also may have similar experiences. That is, you might meet with uncertain and ambiguous situations, and tried to avoid the situations. You, however, may have the opposite experiences, too. Please, provide both extremes of experiences. Describe your cases in as much detail as possible.

Through this procedure, about sixty critical incidents were collected.

The next was to review the critical incidents and group them, according to their content. Some critical incidents were eliminated because they overlapped with other critical incidents being used and/or because they did not reflect the definition of uncertainty avoidance. Using these criteria and based on these critical incidents, nineteen items were developed on a five point scale (1=never, 5=always). In addition, Hofstede's three item which he used for uncertainty avoidance index (UAI) were included in the final questionnaire. Item reliability of this questionnaire was tested for the nineteen developed items and one item of Hofstede. The reliability coefficient was .73. The other two items were not included because they were categorical.
2. Ideal Leadership

a. Person-oriented and Task-oriented Ideal Leadership

An ideal leadership style questionnaire was developed for this study using items from the following three measures: 1) Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ XII) 2) P-M Leadership Questionnaire 3) Leadership Behavior Scale. These measures were used in leader behavior studies in the United States, Japan and India. A cross cultural leadership questionnaire was developed by combining the three cultural specific questionnaires. Each measure is briefly described and subsequently the development of the final scale for the present study is discussed.

The LBDQ XII was designed to obtain a description of individuals' leadership behavior from subordinates. It was intended for use with any leader in any type of organization. The LBDQ XII was developed to cover 12 aspects of leadership behavior. Among the twelve dimensions, two dimensions (i.e., initiating structure and consideration) were selected for the present study.

For the present study, two kinds of items of PM leadership item were used. These items measured subsection chief's leadership and section chief's leadership. The items measuring subsection chief's leadership had eight P and eight M items (see introduction for definition of P and M): the items
measuring section chief’s leadership questionnaire also had eight P and eight M items. Thus, sixteen items measuring P leadership style and sixteen items measuring M leadership style were available. However, all items were not used. Items were chosen on the basis of two criteria. First, the item could not overlap with another item already chosen. Second, the item had to be appropriate for all subjects used in the study.

On the basis of these criteria, seven P leadership items were eliminated from the sixteen items about P leadership style. Four P leadership items for measuring subsection chief’s leadership overlapped with P leadership items for section chief’s leadership. Three P leadership items did not appear to be appropriate for the subjects in this study.

In the case of items measuring M leadership style, all eight M leadership items for the Thus, eight items were eliminated and eight items were retained for both questionnaires. Finally, nine items measuring P leadership style and eight items for measuring M leadership style were selected for this study.

Sinha proposed three leadership styles, Task-oriented leadership, Nurturant leadership and Nurturant-task leadership. Each of the sections for the questionnaire based on Sinha’s theory has ten items. For the measure of task-oriented and person oriented leadership, task leadership items and nurturant leadership items were taken.
The ten Initiating Structure items of the LBDQ XII Stodgill, the nine P leadership items of Misumi and the ten Task leadership items of Sinha (1986) were combined to measure the task-oriented leadership style. The total number of items designed to measure the task-oriented leadership style was twenty nine. The ten Consideration items of the LBDQ XII (Stodgill, 1963), the eight M leadership items of Misumi and the ten Nurturant leadership items of Sinha were collected to measure person-oriented leadership style. The total number of items designed to measure the person-oriented leadership style was twenty eight.

The twenty nine task-oriented leadership style items and the twenty eight person-oriented leadership style items were separately content-analyzed. Therefore, in each subscale mentioned above, when more than one item had similar content, only one was selected, with the restriction of a similar number of items selected from each of the three questionnaires (i.e., LBDQ XII, Misumi's and Sinha's). Seven items of the twenty nine task-oriented leadership style items and nine items of the twenty eight person-oriented leadership style items were eliminated because of their overlap with other item(s). Twenty two task-oriented leadership style items and nineteen person-oriented leadership style items were retained. Among the 22 items measuring task-oriented leadership, 8 items were from LBDQ XII, 8 items from Misumi's and 6 items from Sinha's. Among 19 items measuring person-oriented leadership, 6
items were from LBDQ XII, 6 items from Misumi's and 7 items from Sinha's.

The reliability coefficient for task-oriented ideal leadership measure was .87. The reliability coefficient for person-oriented ideal leadership measure was .88.

b. Nurturant Task-oriented Ideal Leadership

The original form of nurturant-task leadership of Sinha which has ten items was employed because of its lack of similarity to other constructs. The reliability coefficient of this scale was .73.

Although the three questionnaires were designed to measure perceptions of leader behaviors, the subjects were asked to answer on the basis of their ideal leader's behavior expectations in the present study. All ideal leadership items were randomly arranged and were to be responded on a five point scale (1=never, 5=always).

C. Procedure

1. Data collection.
The procedure for data collection in Korea is described first. The distribution of the questionnaire packets and data collection were conducted in July 1993 for company workers and college staff members. Data for college students was collected in September, 1993.
Before going to the company and the university, the manager of each organization was contacted to obtain permission to distribute the questionnaire packets to his staff. The researcher personally distributed the packets. Detailed written instructions were given to each subject and the researcher was available to answer any questions the subjects had. Two days later, the researcher picked up the completed questionnaires and reminded those who did not complete the questionnaire to fill it out.

For the surveys to college students, the instructor for introductory psychology was asked to distribute the questionnaire to his students, gather responses, and mail the responses to the researcher in the United States. The students were given instructions followed by thirty minutes to fill out the questionnaires. The questionnaires were completed and submitted during the class.

In the United States, the researcher contacted the university personnel director to obtain permission to survey university nonacademic staff members. A list of 210 staff members was provided. The questionnaire packets were mailed directly to the staff members with detailed instructions and return envelopes addressed to the researcher.

As in Korea, the researcher used college students taking the introductory psychology class. With permission of the instructor, the researcher briefly explained to the student the purpose of the investigation, answered questions and
distributed the questionnaire packets to those who wanted to participate.

2. Data Analysis

There were three groups of variables (1) cultural dimension variables (power distance and uncertainty avoidance) (2) ideal leadership style variables (task-oriented, person-oriented and nurturant-task-oriented leadership style) (3) demographic variables (nationality, gender, education level and length of work experience). Three multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were done to test the hypotheses in this study.

Hypotheses 1 was tested by performing a 2X2X2X2 MANOVA (nationality, i.e., Korea versus the United States by gender, i.e., male versus female by work experience, i.e., by education level, i.e., high versus low education level) with cultural dimensions (i.e., power distance and uncertainty avoidance) as the dependent variables. High school graduates were classified as the low education level: college students and college graduates or above as the high education level. Long and short work experience was formed on a mean split basis (4 years). A median split on work experience could not be used because it produced empty cells in the MANOVA.

Hypothesis 2 was tested by performing a 2X2X2X2 MANOVA (nationality, i.e., Korea versus the United States by gender, i.e., male versus female by education level, by work experience, i.e., long versus short work experience) with
three ideal leadership (i.e., task-oriented, nurturant-task-oriented, and person-oriented leadership) as the dependent variables.

Hypothesis 3 was tested by performing a 2X2X2X2 MANOVA (power distance, i.e., high versus low by uncertainty avoidance, i.e., high versus low by nationality, i.e., Korea versus the United State by gender, i.e., male versus female) with three ideal leadership (i.e., task-oriented, nurturant-task-oriented, and person-oriented leadership) as the dependent variables. The high and low power distance and uncertainty avoidance were formed by using a median split on both of these variables (150 for power distance; 64 for uncertainty avoidance).

A significance level of .05 was selected for the MANOVAs. For post-hoc analysis, based on Dunn-Bonferroni[41], the significance level of .05 was divided by the number of dependent variables. For the MANOVA with two dependent variables, the significance level of .025 was employed for post-hoc analysis. The MANOVA with three dependent variables used a significance level .02.

In addition, Korean and American power distance index (PDI) and uncertainty avoidance index (UAI) were calculated using Hofstede’s formula based on his three items for each index. In Hofstede’s original international study, Korea was not included. Although the U.S.A was included, the U.S. subjects in that study were all employees of a multi-nation
corporation. By having calculated power distance index (PDI) and uncertainty avoidance index (UAI) in this study, it was possible to compare the samples of this study with Hofstede's. The comparisons were done to establish the following three points: 1) to compare Hofstede's American sample with this study's American sample to examine if people working in different organizations within a country would adhere to the levels on the cultural values, 2) to compare the measures developed in the present study with Hofstede's measure of power distance and uncertainty avoidance, and 3) to provide a Korean PDI and UAI score which was missing in Hofstede's study.

To make comparisons between responses of Americans and Koreans on the two categorical items of Hofstede, Chi Square technique was used. These items evaluated the respondents' preferred leadership and their current manager's leadership style.
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

The power distance score measured by the scale developed in the present study was significantly correlated with Hofstede's "employees afraid' item (.29; p<.001) and .18 (p<.001), respectively.

A significant positive Pearson correlations was found between the power distance score and the uncertainty avoidance score (.43, p<.001). Also, significant positive correlations were found among the three subscales of ideal leader behavior. Task-oriented ideal leadership score and nurturant-task-oriented ideal leadership score (.51, p<.001); task-oriented ideal leadership score and person oriented ideal leadership score and person-oriented ideal leadership score (.51, p<001). To compare the scores on the U.S., Japanese and Indian scales, LBDQ XII Initiating Structure and consideration: Misumi's P and M: Sinha's Task, Nurturant, and Nurturant Task were correlated. As presented in table 4, all the subscales across countries were positively and significantly correlated. There was also a high positive correlation between the task-oriented subscales and person-oriented subscales.

A. Cultural Dimensions and Demographic Variables.

The 4-way MANOVA where demographic variables (i.e., nationality (Korea versus the United States), gender (male
versus female), education level (high versus low), and length of work experience (long versus short) were the independent variables, and cultural dimensions (i.e., power distance and uncertainty avoidance) were the dependent variables resulted in three significant main effects for each of the independent variables of nationality, gender and education level, and also one interaction effect of nationality by work experience was significant.

Table 4. Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Leadership Measures  
(N=370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(N)</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5(M)</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(C)</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(NT)</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05; **p<.01

The leadership measures
1 = Sinha's Task Leadership Scale
2 = Misumi's P Leadership Scale
3 = Initiating Structure of LBDQ XII
4 = Sinha's Nurturant Leadership Scale
5 = Misumi's M Leadership Scale
6 = Consideration of LBDQ XII
7 = Sinha's Nurturant-Task Leadership Scale

* Person Correlation Coefficients were calculated based on reduced sets of items.
Homogeneity assumption was not met as done by Box's M test \( (M=67.78, \ F(42,6734)=1.48, \ p<.05) \) The significance level for the follow-up univariate tests was set at .025, following the Dunn Bonferroni technique (see Bray and Maxwell, 1985). The followings describe the results in detail:

Nationality effect on cultural dimensions was significant using Wilks' Lambda (.87) with Rao's F \( (p<.001) \). In the follow-up tests, the univariate analysis for power distance was significant \( (F(1,354)= 35.3, \ p<.001) \) and the univariate analysis for uncertainty avoidance was all significant \( (F(1,354)=30.75, \ p<.001) \). Mean power distance score was significantly higher for Koreans \( (X=155.63) \) compared to Americans \( (X=140.13) \). Mean uncertainty avoidance score was also significantly higher for Koreans \( (X=66.56) \) compared to Americans \( (X=59.29) \).

Gender effect on cultural dimensions was significant using Wilks' Lambda (.98) with Rao's F \( (p<.03) \). In the follow-up tests, only the univariate analysis for power distance was significant \( (F(1,354)=6.45, \ p<.01) \). Mean power distance score was significantly higher for females \( (X=152.27) \) compared to males \( (X=147.02) \).

Education level effect on the cultural dimensions was significant using Wilks' Lambda (.97) with Rao's F \( (p<.01) \). In the follow-up tests, only the univariate analysis for power distance was significant \( (F(1,354)=7.94, \ p<.01) \). Mean power
distance score was significant \( F(1,354)=7.94, \ p<01 \). Mean power distance score was significantly higher for people with low education level \( (X=153.37) \) compared to people with high education level.

An interaction of nationality by length of work experience on cultural dimensions was significant using Wilks' Lambda (.97) with Rao's F \( (p<.02) \). In the follow-up tests, only the univariate analysis for uncertainty avoidance was significant \( F(1,354)=7.08, \ p<01 \). A simple main effect test revealed that there were significant differences in uncertainty avoidance between Koreans with long work experience \( (X=70.91) \) and Americans with long work experience \( (X=57.74)(p<.01) \), between Koreans with long work experience \( (X=70.91) \) and Koreans with short work experience \( (X=65.15)(p<.01) \), and between Koreans with short work experience \( (X=65.15) \) and Americans with short work experience \( (X=60.28)(p<.01) \)(see Table 5).

Table 5. Means of Uncertainty Avoidance by Nationality and Length of Work Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short Work Experience</th>
<th>Long Work Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koreans</td>
<td>65.15(n=169)</td>
<td>70.91(n=51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>60.28(n=89)</td>
<td>57.74(n=57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Ideal Leadership and Demographic Variables. The 4-way MANOVA where demographic variables (i.e., nationality (Korea
versus the United States), gender (male versus female),
education level (high versus low), and length of work
experience (long versus short)) were the independent
variables, and three ideal leadership (i.e., task-oriented,
person-oriented, nurturant-task-oriented) were the dependent
variables resulted in two significant main effects for each of
the independent variables of nationality and gender. Only one
interaction effect of education level by length of work
experience was significant. Homogeneity assumption was not met
as done by Boxs M test (M=152.26, F(84, 4838)=1.57, p<01). The
significance level for the follow-up univariate tests was set at .02, following the Dunn-Bonferroni technique. The
followings describe the results in detail:

Nationality effect on the three ideal leadership was
significant using Wilks’ Lambda (.97) with Rao’s F (p<.01). In
the follow-up tests, no univariate analysis for three ideal
leadership styles was significant. There was, however, a
general trend that mean person oriented ideal leadership score
was higher for Koreans (X=79.57) compared to Americans
(X=71.74) (for person-oriented ideal leadership, the
univariate F(1,354)=3.96, p<.05).

Gender effect on the three ideal leadership was significant
using Wilks’ Lambda (.97) with Rao’s F (p<.02). In the
follow-up tests, The univariate analyses for task-oriented,
nurturant task-oriented and person-oriented ideal leadership
style were all significant (F(1.354)=8.09, p<.01;
F(1, 354) = 6.03, p < .02; F(1, 354) = 6.76, p < .01, respectively). Mean task-oriented ideal leadership score was significantly higher for females (X = 88.05) compared to males (X = 83.34). Mean nurturant task-oriented ideal leadership score was significantly higher for females (X = 88.05) compared to males (X = 83.34). Mean nurturant task-oriented ideal leadership score was significantly higher for females (X = 78.05) compared to males (X = 75.01).

An interaction effect of education level by length of work experience on the three ideal leadership was significant using Wilks' Lambda (.97) with Rao's F (p < .01). In the follow-up tests, only univariate analysis for nurturant-task-oriented ideal leadership was significant (F(1, 354) = 4.50, p < .02). A simple main effect test revealed there was a significant difference in nurturant-task-revealed there was a significant difference in nurturant-task-oriented ideal leadership score between individuals with low education level and long work experience (X = 37.84) and individuals with high education level and long work experience (X = 34.33) (p < .01) (see Table 6).

Table 6. Means of Nurturant-Task-Oriented Leadership by Education Level and Length of Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short work experience</th>
<th>Long work experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low education level</td>
<td>35.09(n=34)</td>
<td>37.84(n=61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High education level</td>
<td>35.58(n=224)</td>
<td>34.33(n=51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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C. Ideal Leadership, Demographic Variables and Cultural Dimensions.

The 4-way MANOVA where demographic variables (i.e., nationality (Korea versus the United States), gender (male versus female) and cultural dimensions (i.e., power distance (high versus low), uncertainty avoidance (high versus low)) were the independent variables, and three ideal leadership styles (i.e., task oriented, nurturant-task-oriented, and person-oriented) resulted in four significant main effects for all of the independent variables, and four significant interaction effects. Homogeneity assumption was not met as done by Boxs M test (M=173.49, F(84,11818)=1.88, p<.001). The significance level for the univariate tests was set at .02, following the Dunn-Bonferroni technique. The followings describe the results in detail (the results of main effects of nationality and gender were presented in the previous section):

Power distance effect on the three ideal leadership was significant using Wilks' Lambda (.94) with Rao’s F (p<.001). In the follow-up tests, the univariate analysis for the task-oriented ideal leadership was significant (F(1,366)=9.34, p<.001) and the univariate analysis for person-oriented ideal leadership was also significant (F(1,366)=19.39, p<.001). Mean task-oriented ideal leadership score was significantly higher for higher distance group (X=84.29). Mean person-oriented ideal leadership score was also significantly higher for
higher power distance group (X=78.46) compared to lower power distance group (X=74.53).

Uncertainty avoidance effect on the three ideal leadership was significant using Wilk’s Lambda (.98) with Rao’s F (p<.04). Only the univariate analysis for task-oriented ideal leadership was significant (F(1.366)=5.20, p<.02). Mean task-oriented ideal leadership score was significantly higher for lower uncertainty avoidance group (X=86.20) compared to higher uncertainty avoidance group (X=84.87).

An interaction of gender by power distance by uncertainty avoidance effect on the three ideal leadership was significant using Wilk’s Lambda (.96) with Rao’s F (p<.003). In the follow-up tests, only univariate analysis for person-oriented ideal leadership was significant (F(1.353)=12.9, p<.001). A simple main effect test revealed that there was a significant difference in power distance and high uncertainty avoidance (X=68.9), and females with low power distance and high uncertainty avoidance (X=78.5) (p<.01), and between males with low power distance and high uncertainty avoidance (X=68.9), and males with high power distance and high uncertainty avoidance (X=77.8)(p<.01)

An interaction of nationality by gender by power distance on the three ideal leadership styles was significant using Wilk’s Lambda (.96) with Rao’s F (P<.001). In the follow-up tests, two univariate analyses for task-oriented and person-oriented ideal leadership were significant (F (1,354)=13.6, P<.001; F
(1,354)=14.4, P<.001, respectively). A simple main effect test revealed that there were significant differences in mean task-oriented ideal leadership score between Korean males with high power distance (X=83.5) and American males with high power distance (X=91.6) (p<.05), and between American males with high power distance (X=91.6) and American males with low power distance (X=82.1) (p<.05).

A simple main effect test revealed that there was a significant different in mean in mean person-oriented ideal leadership score between American male with high power distance (X=70.3) (p<.05).

An interaction of nationality by gender by uncertainty avoidance on the three ideal leadership styles was significant using Wilks' Lambda (.97) with Rao's F (p<.01). In the follow-up tests, two univariate analyses for task-oriented and nurturant-task-oriented ideal leadership were significant (F(1,354)=5.50, p<.02; F(1,354)=10.44, p<.001, respectively). A simple main effect test revealed that there was a significant difference in mean task oriented ideal leadership score between American females with high uncertainty avoidance (X=93.7) and American males with high uncertainty avoidance (x=79.4) (p<.01).

A simple main effect test revealed that there were significant differences in mean nurturant-task-oriented ideal leadership score between American females with high uncertainty avoidance (X=40.7) and American males with high
uncertainty avoidance (X=32.2)(p<.01), and between American females with high uncertainty avoidance (X=40.7) and Korean females with high uncertainty avoidance (X=35.2)(p<.05).

An interaction of gender by power distance on the three ideal leadership styles was significant using Wilks' Lambda (.97) with Rao's F (p<.03). In the follow-up tests, only the univariate analysis for nurturant- task-oriented ideal leadership was significant (F(1,354)=9.05, p<.003). A simple main effect test revealed that there was a significant difference between females with low power distance (X=37.4) and males with low power distance (X=34.0) (p<.01).

D. Hofstede's PDI and UAI

For PDI, two X² tests were performed. The two X² tests were conducted to identify differences between Koreans and Americans in selection ideal leadership style and perceiving current leader behaviors. Koreans chose democratic leadership style as their first preference (49%); consultative as the second (34%); persuasive as the third (15%); then autocratic (2%). Americans favored consultative managers first (41%); democratic, second (31%); persuasive, third, (25%); autocratic, lastly, (13%). The X² showed the tendency of Koreans to choose ideal leadership style was significantly different from that of Americans (see, Table 7).

Table 7. Differences in Ideal Leadership Between The Two Countries
### Table 8. Difference in Perceiving Behaviors of Current Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>Persuasive</th>
<th>Consultative</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koreans(N=224)</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans(N=146)</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 (3)=17.19: p<.001 \]

Using Hofstede’s formula for power distance index (PDI) and uncertainty avoidance (UAI), the indices were calculated for the two countries on the present study. Korean PDI was 104 and American PDI was 55. Korean UAI was 68 and American UAI was 13.
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

The present study had three research questions. First, the influence of demographic variables (nationality, gender, educational level and length of work experience) on power distance and uncertainty avoidance was investigated. Secondly, the influence of the demographic variables on the implicit theory of ideal leader behaviors was investigated. Thirdly, the influence of power distance, uncertainty avoidance, nationality and gender on the implicit theory of ideal leader behavior was investigated. In addition, power distance and uncertainty avoidance scores based on the measure developed in the present study was compared with PDI and UAI based on Hofstede’s measure.

A. Cultural Dimensions and Demographic Variables.

The present study showed that power distance and uncertainty avoidance scores were different, depending on nationality. That is, Koreans had higher power distance and uncertainty avoidance scores as compared to Americans. The higher power distance and uncertainty avoidance of Koreans can be understood through Korean value systems. One dominant factor that has influenced the behaviors of Koreans is Confucianism. Confucianism is a school of teaching by the great Chinese philosopher Confucius. The core of his thought focused on the
maintenance of proper relationships between King and his subordinates, father and son, and the young and the old. These relationships are to be governed by appropriate rules: (1) filial piety to parents, (2) loyalty to the King, (3) respect for the elder, (4) obedience to husband, and (5) trust between friends[42].

In the traditional Korean Family and associated social life, juniors are expected to obey seniors unconditionally. These norms have influenced behavioral patterns of employees in organizations. Filial piety implies that the son obeys the father’s authority and respects the father. Filial piety is not necessarily limited to only father-son relationships. It can be seen in loyalty to the nation, obedience to seniors in organizations. In an organization, these values are expressed in the form of obedience to superiors, loyalty to the company, a strong sense of belonging and paternalistic attitudes toward employees.

The gender variable also had a significant effect on power distance. The orientation of females was different from the orientation of males in relation to people with status. Because females as compared to males showed higher power distance scores, females were more inclined to respect authority and not to challenge it. The responses of Korean females made, especially, a great contribution to gender difference in power distance in the present study. In Korea, females are expected to obey authority more. Korean values
also stressed the importance of obedience of females. That is, obedience to husband is one of the Five Rules of Confucian ethics.

Individuals with higher educational levels showed a lower power distance score as compared to those with lower educational levels. This result supports Hofstede's observation that lower educational levels leads to low power distance values.

Koreans generally showed higher uncertainty avoidance as compared to Americans, regardless of length of work experience. In Korea, the more experienced workers had significantly higher uncertainty avoidance scores as compared to less experienced workers. Senior workers in Korea preferred a structured environment. This findings also suggests that older persons had the higher work experience and age (.82). In the United States, there was no significant relationship between uncertainty avoidance and length of work experience. The data from Korean subjects in the present study supported Hofstede's results. Hofstede suggests that older people show higher uncertainty avoidance scores. However the United States subjects did not show relationship between uncertainty avoidance and age.

B. Demographic Variables and Ideal Leadership Style.

Koreans generally favored person-oriented leadership style as compared to Americans. Both peoples preferred comparable
levels of task-oriented and nurturant-task-oriented leadership styles. At Korean workplaces interpersonal relations rather than task-relationship are considered most important.

Males and females in the present study, regardless of which country they were from, showed varied expectations of ideal leader behaviors. Females more than males expected the ideal leader to exhibit task-oriented, nurturant task-oriented, and person-oriented leader behaviors. Female workers may expect more interaction with their boss than males.

In gender and leadership research evidence suggests that gender differences are not related to the leader’s behavior style of effectiveness. Also, when people were asked to describe characteristics of an ideal or good leader, research shows that invariably masculine characteristics are called upon[43][44]. In most of the past studies the relation between perceivers’ gender and their responses was not studied. In the present study, it was found that males and females differ in their implicit theory of leadership. In Bronneberg’s results, the gender and sex-role of the subjects interacted in defining the expectation of amount structuring a leader should demonstrate. In the present study, there was a direct effect between gender and preference for leadership style. Therefore, the present study demonstrates that although male or female leaders may not behave differently, their subordinates have different schema for leadership based on their gender, irrespective of their country of origin.
Among highly experienced participants, those with a lower education level expected their ideal leader to exhibit a greater amount of nurturant-task behavior than those with higher education level. This may support Sinha's Leadership Model. Sinha proposed that nurturant-task leader reinforces the subordinates who meet his or her expectations with nurturance. But as subordinates are more experienced and knowledgeable, they prefer less direction and start to demand a participative leadership. Therefore, the highly experienced individuals with low education level prefer nurturant-task leadership because they can meet their leader's expectation and receive nurturance from the leaders. However, nurturant-task style can not satisfy subordinates who are experienced and knowledgeable because they prefer participative leadership[45]. This may also have implications on Bass's (1985) transformational leadership theory, where less knowledgeable and less experienced employees prefer leaders who are transactional, but more knowledgeable and more experienced employees prefer leaders who are transformational[46].

C. Demographic Variables (i.e., Nationality, Gender), Cultural Dimensions and Ideal Leadership Style.

The results on this analysis showed that each independent variable contributed to implicit theory of leadership, through both main effects and interaction effects with each other. In
this section, main effects of cultural dimensions and interaction effects on implicit theory of leadership were discussed. The discussion of main effects of nationality and gender was presented in the previous section.

Those who had high power distance score as compared to those with low power distance scores had higher expectation for their ideal leader to exhibit task-oriented and person-oriented leader behaviors. On the other hand, those who showed low uncertainty avoidance, as compared to those who high uncertainty avoidance, expected their ideal leaders to exhibit task-oriented leader behaviors. That is, those who had high power distance scores expected that their ideal leaders should show both a concern for those working in a group and have an ability to plan, organize and control group activities. Those who had low uncertainty avoidance expected their ideal leader to be disposed to assign individual tasks, plan, emphasize high productivity and quality, maintain performance standards, communicate information, and try out new ideas. This is congruent with Path-goal theory. House, and House and Mitchell argued that the values held by individuals affected their preference for a special style of leadership[47][48].

Among those with low power distance and high uncertainty, females as compared to males expected their ideal leader to exhibit a greater amount of person-oriented behavior. And among males with high uncertainty avoidance, individuals with
high power distance as compared to individuals with low power
distance expected their ideal leader to exhibit a greater
amount of person oriented behavior.

Among males with high power distance, American as compared
to Korean expected their ideal leader to exhibit more
task-oriented behavior. Among American male, individuals with
high power distance as compared to individuals with low power
distance expected their ideal leader to exhibit more
task-oriented behavior. And, among American males, individuals
with high power distance as compared to individuals with low
power distance expected their ideal leader to exhibit a
greater amount of person oriented behavior.

Among Americans with high uncertainty avoidance, females as
compared to males expected their ideal leader to show a
greater amount of task-oriented behavior. Among American with
high uncertainty avoidance, females as compared to males
expected their ideal leader to show a greater amount of
nurturant-task-oriented behavior. And, among females with high
uncertainty avoidance, Americans as compared to Koreans
expected their ideal leader to show a greater amount of
nurturant-task-oriented behavior.

Among individuals with low power distance, females as
compared to males expected their ideal to show a greater
amount of nurturant-task-oriented behavior.

In summary, when demographic characteristics of the sample
and their cultural values were used independently to predict
implicit theories of leadership, each independent variable (i.e., demographic characteristics and cultural values) had a main effect explaining implicit theories of leadership. However, when the "key" demographic characteristics (i.e., nationality and gender) were combined with the cultural values, the results yielded significant interaction effects between the demographic characteristics and the cultural values. This analysis attests to the position that demographic characteristics are confounding variables. Therefore, it is important to recognize that there are variabilities within the two gender types or citizens of a country due to their adherence to levels of certain values or orientations.

D. Power Distance Index (PDI) and Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI).

The findings in the present study showed these three points: 1) American university staff (PDI=55, calculated in the present study) showed higher power distance compared to the employees of multi-national corporation (PDI=40, calculated in the Hofstede's study). However the university staff (UAI=13) showed lower uncertainty avoidance compared to the employees of multi-national corporation (UAI=46), 2) Koreans had higher scores of power distance and uncertainty avoidance on both the measure developed in this study and the Hofstede's measured. The two measures supported each other in that they brought out the same results: Koreans showed higher PDI and UAI as well as
higher power distance scores and uncertainty avoidance scores.

3) Korean PDI was 104 and UAI was 68. This may make up Hofstede’s study which missing Korean PDI and UAI.

In summary, the results in the present study demonstrated that different aspects of the individual’s background and cultural values had significant effects on the individual’s expectations of the leader. In considering the results, it should be noted that the statistical criteria used for the three MANOVAs was Wilks’ Lambda, which is dependent on the homogeneity assumption. This assumption was not met in the present study, and the violation thus may weaken the Wilks’ Lambda results. However, Pillai-Bartlett trace was significant. Olson states that Pillai-Bartlett trace is robust enough to deal with the violation of homogeneity assumption[49].
VI. CONCLUSIONS

From theoretical standpoint, as Lord, Binning, Rush and Thomas suggest, an implicit theory of leadership serves as a cognitive filter to determine what an observer will notice, remember and report about the leadership behavior[50]. However, there are few studies (e.g., Arkelin, 1987)[51] which investigate factors influencing an implicit personal theory of leadership. As Eden and Leviatan recommended, the present study, thus, investigated whether cultural values, nationality, gender, education level, and work experience influence an implicit theory of leadership. As a result, the present study demonstrated that cultural values and background of people impacted an implicit theory of leadership. Based on the varied implicit theories of leadership influenced by culture, the present study supported Hofstede's cultural relativity in organizational theories, rather than Goodstein and Hunt's cultural universality[53]. Hofstede argues that there may be problems in applying American organizational theories abroad because of cultural differences while Goodstein and Hunt argue that American organizational theories can be applied to other cultures.

On a practical perspective, the results of the present study may make a contribution to training managers in organizations, especially multi-national or international organizations. Managers must be trained both to understand 1) ideal
leadership may be different from culture to culture because culture, through the process of socialization, shape expectations and judgments about appropriate behaviors of leaders, and 2) within a culture, an implicit theory of leadership may also differ depending on a background of an individual.

The significance of this study was as follows: First, this is the first study that considered the power distance and uncertainty avoidance as the variables contributing to the implicit theory of ideal leadership. And the findings of this study can be generalized because it was conducted on a varied population: Korean company workers, and college staff and students in both Korea and the United States. Second, a new scale for power distance and uncertainty avoidance was developed. The new scale resolved the problems of Hofstede's measure in that it considered a large range of power distance and uncertainty avoidance situations. The structure of these measures, unlike Hofstede's, allows not only country's differences but also individual differences to be measured. In addition, a compilation of three leadership measures, representing each culture was made. The final measure of leader behavior scale included both leader behaviors in western behavior descriptions reduces some concerns of overly emically imposed measurements in cross-cultural research.

Future studies need to consider these points: First, future research can examine the effect of the difference between
expected and observed leadership behavior in effective communication. Second, when the influence of cultural dimensions on the implicit theory of ideal leadership is studied, all cultural dimensions proposed by Hofstede (i.e., power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism and masculinity) should be considered to identify cultural differences. Third, other variables influencing the implicit theory of ideal leader behavior should be investigated. Fourth, the power distance and uncertainty avoidance measure developed in this study should be further validated and expanded for other cultures.
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MANOVA(다변량분석)을 통한 문화 가치 및 이상적 지도자유형에 대한 분석

홍 세희

본 연구의 목적은 문화 가치 (권력자이, 불확실성 회피) 와 인구학적 변인 (국적, 성별, 학력, 경력)이 이상적 지도자유형에 대한 개인의 암묵적 이론에 어떠한 영향을 주는지 알아보는 것이다. 한국에서 227명, 미국에서 143명의 피험자를 각각 조사 대상자로 하였으므로 두 나라의 문화적 가치에 대한 비교가 가능하도록 하였다.

첫째가설은 인구학적 변인에 따라 문화적 가치가 다르다는 것이었다. 둘째가설은 인구학적 변인에 따라 이상적 지도자유형에 대한 개인의 암묵적 이론이 다르다는 것이었다. 세째가설은 이상적 지도자유형에 대한 개인의 암묵적 이론의 형성에 문화 가치와 인구학적 변인 (국적, 성별)의 상호작용의 영향이 있을 것이라는 것이었다.

자료분석 결과 위의 세가지 가설은 지지되었다. 연구 결과가 시사하는 바는 이상적 지도자유형에 대한 개인의 암묵적 이론은 문화에 따라 다르며 동일문화권내에서도 개인의 인구학적 변인에 따라 달라질 수 있다는 점이다. 또 본 연구에서는 문화가치와 이상적 지도자유형에 대한 개인의 암묵적 이론을 측정하는 도구를 개발하였는데 신뢰도는 약 .80이었다.
The following items describe behaviors and attitudes of people in a work place. Please check how often you engage in each of these behaviors and attitudes. Circle for each item the level of occurrence best describing your style. If you do not have a Work experience, please imagine for each item your behaviors and attitudes in a work place.

1. Make jokes to manager.
2. Check whether I am neatly dressed before the meeting with manager.
3. Check the time so I will not be late for the appointment with manager.
4. Contradict opinion of manager without having knowledge about issue.
5. Get to the appointed place for meeting with manager a few minutes early.
6. Listen more than talk to manager.
7. Use a polite expression when talking to manager.
8. Not ask for clarification of ambiguous instructions of manager.
9. Talk about sexual experiences with manager.
10. Chew gum or smoke a cigarette when talking with manager.
11. Dress formally when there will be a meeting with manager.
12. Respond to manager’s request regardless of its cost to my persona life.
13. Feel sorry for being late for appointment with manager.
14. Show my frank feeling to manager about others.
15. Stop working and stand when manager enters the room.
16. Select topics for conversation that manager likes.
17. At a luncheon, start to eat before manager does.
18. Complain about work in the presence of manager.
19. Ask manager to lend me money.
20. Leave when manager is still at table.
21. Speak formally to manager, avoiding slang or familiar terms.
22. Interrupt when manager is speaking.
23. Pay undivided attention to the conversation with manager.
24. Use manager’s possession (e.g. a book, pen) without permission and tell manager later.
25. Stop doing personal matters in the presence of manager.
26. Respect the privacy of manager.
27. Call manager by his/her first name.
28. Reveal my frank emotion to manager.
29. Swear in the presence of manager.
30. Blow my nose in front of manager.
31. Speak to manager openly about any topic.
32. Think long about an answer before speaking to manager.
33. Try to give a good impression to manager.
34. Try to read the reaction of the manager to my comment in order to respond appropriately.
35. Behave in my own way in the presence of manager.
36. Not tell any dirty jokes to manager.
37. Feel tense and nervous when with manager.
38. Ask tense and nervous when with manager.
39. Stop speaking about personal matter when manager show up.
40. Do something else while conversing with manager.
41. How frequently, in your experience, does the following problem occur: employees being afraid to express disagreement with their manager?(circle one)
   1. very seldom 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. frequently 5. very frequently

The descriptions below apply to four different types of managers. First, please read through these descriptions.

Manager 1 Usually makes his/her decisions promptly and communicates them to his/her subordinates clearly and firmly. Expects them to carry out the decisions loyally and without raising difficulties.

Manager 2 Usually makes his/her decisions promptly, but, before going ahead, tries to explain them fully to his/her subordinates. Give them the reasons for the decisions and answers whatever questions they may have.

Manager 3 Usually consult with his/her subordinates before he/she researches decisions. Listens to their advice, considers it, and then announce his/her decision. He/she then expects all to work loyally to implement it, whether or not it is in accordance with the advice they gave.

Manager 4 Usually calls a meeting of his/her subordinates when there is an important decision to be made. Puts the problem before the group and tries to obtain consensus. If he/she obtains consensus, he/she accepts this as the decision. If consensus is impossible, he/she usually makes the decision him/herself.

42. Now for the above types of manager, please mark the one which you would prefer to work under.
   Manager 1 2 3 4

43. To which one of the above four types of managers would you say your own manager most closely corresponds?
   Manager 1 2 3 4 N/A (Not Applicable)

Identify the accuracy of the following statements which best describe you.
1=never, 5=always.

1. Be afraid of moving to new location
2. Stick to my habitual way.
3. Like to change jobs.
4. Can not sleep at other's home.
5. Like to meet new people.
6. Be reluctant to use a brand which is not well known.
7. Like to travel to new places alone.
8. Avoid ordering an unfamiliar food.
9. Want to live in a foreign country.
10. Feel stressful when meeting new people.
11. Offer an opinion in a meeting only when I am sure.
12. Feel anxious when given an unclear instruction.
13. Feel embarrassed when I think I am lost.
14. Take a taxi rather than a bus when going to a new place.
15. Can not sleep before important event.
16. Prefer to have a broad and general instructions so that I can show my ability.
17. Not present an answer even though I have some ideas.
18. Worry about results when doing something.
19. Want a high position which can offer chances to develop my talents although I have more responsibilities in the position.
20. Think that organization rules should not be broken even when the employees think it is in the organization's best interests. (circle one)
   1. strongly disagree 2. disagree 3. undecided 4. agree
   5. strongly agree
21. How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?
   1. never feel this way 2. seldom 3. sometimes 4. usually
   5. always feel this way 6. Not Applicable
22. How long do you think you will continue working for this organization?
   1. 2 years at most 2. From 2 to 5 years.
   3. More than 5 years but before I retire 4. Until I retire
   5. Not applicable

The items below ask for your opinion about your ideal manager. Please circle the number which best expresses your opinion on how frequently your ideal manager should do what is described by that item.

My ideal manager...
1. Is very punctual.
2. Takes personal interest in the promotion problems of those subordinates who work hard.
3. Is very concerned about subordinates future benefits like promotions and pay raises.
4. Keeps his/her job knowledge up-to-date.
5. Guides and directs with personal interest those subordinates who work hard.
6. Helps subordinates grow up and assume greater responsibility.
7. Precisely works out plans for goal achievement each month.
8. Encourages his or her subordinates to assume greater responsibility on job as they become more experienced on the job.
9. Treats all subordinates as his/her equals.
10. Is strict about the amount of work that his/her subordinates do.
11. Is affectionate and kind only to those subordinates who work sincerely.
12. Treats his/her subordinates as his/her family members.
13. Works hard even in adverse situations.
14. Openly provides personal patronage to those subordinates who are dedicated to work.
15. Is very affectionate and kind to subordinates.
17. Treats those subordinates as younger brother often come to him/her to learn job related matters.
18. Does things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group.
19. Urges his/her subordinates to complete their work by the time he/she has specified.
20. Goes out of his/her way to provide personal help to those who work up to their capacity.
21. Listens to subordinates personal problems of confidential nature.
22. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.
23. Maintains personal interest in those subordinates who maintain high standard of performance.
24. Tries out his/her ideas in the group.
25. Praises those subordinates who are punctual but also chides those who come late.
26. Guides and encourages his/her subordinates with personal interest.
27. Tries to make his/her subordinates work to their maximum capacity.
28. Feels very concerned when he/she finds one of his/her sincere subordinates become ill.
29. Put suggestions made by subordinates into operation.
30. Schedule the work to be done.
31. Is willing to make changes.
32. Maintains high standards of performance.
33. When a problem arises in work place, asks subordinates about how to solve it.
34. Has good grasp of how work is progressing.
35. Generally, supports subordinates.
36. Asks subordinates for reports about the progress of their work.
37. Openly provides personal patronage to his/her subordinates.
38. Assigns subordinates to particular tasks.
40. When necessary, reprimands subordinates without hesitation.
41. Subordinates talk freely with him/her about their work.
42. Strongly resents his/her subordinates coming late to work.
43. Praises his/her subordinates but also chides them affectionately.
44. Encourages the use of uniform procedures.
45. Shows special consideration when subordinates make mistakes so that they will not be discouraged.
46. Decides what shall be done and how it will be done.
47. Trusts his/her subordinates.
49. Gives subordinates recognition when they do their jobs well.
50. Lets subordinates know what is expected of them.
51. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the subordinates