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Abstract This monograph reports and compares “desirable” leadership traits, and leadership traits actual exhibited by managers and supervisors as defined by responses on the original English and a Chinese language translation of the Ohio State University leadership behaviour description questionnaire XII (LBDQ XII). From anecdotal evidence and personal experience, the researcher found considerable difficulty in transferring research results from Hong Kong, Taiwan and Singapore to useful practice in the interior of China and performed this study in an attempt to gain understanding for management training courses. Data was collected for 220 managers and supervisors in two hotels in the interior of China. Both expatriate and indigenous Chinese managers were included. All supervisors were Chinese. A significant (p < 0.05) difference between Chinese and non-Chinese expatriates was observed for factor: Tolerance of Freedom, interestingly, with the Chinese managers indicating more tolerance of freedom than the expatriate managers. Nonetheless, Chinese supervisors believed the ideal manager should be even more tolerant of freedom than their managers (p < 0.01).

This monograph reports and compares “desirable” leadership traits, and leadership traits actual exhibited by Mainland and Hong Kong Chinese and expatriate managers and supervisors as defined by responses on the original English and a Chinese language translation of the Ohio State University leadership behaviour description questionnaire XII, (LBDQ XII). Of the 12 factors on the scale, significant differences were found only for “Tolerance of Freedom”, with the interesting result that the Chinese leaders tended to be more tolerant of freedom than the expatriate managers, and the supervisors they managed seemed to desire even more freedom.

Introduction and review of the literature

As the world of international business ebbs, flows, and changes direction, the role of cross-cultural management remains a major issue (Cascio, 1992; Selmer, 1998). Recent developments in communications, travel and trade between countries have not brought national cultures closer together (Craig et al., 1992). Neither has the improved physical accessibility been accompanied by a corresponding improvement in cross-cultural understanding, usually as a result of expatriate business managers being regularly assigned to all parts of the world without any cross-cultural preparation at all (Black et al., 1991, 1992a, pp. 92-3; Selmer, 1995a). In some countries, the institution of expatriate management has led to increasing feelings and exhibition of xenophobia.

In the international hotel business, the presence of multicultural staff and management is an essential factor in the ability of hotels to provide service to guests.
from many cultures. If one has not been exposed to individuals from foreign cultures, one is obviously unaware of even the existence of differences. The behavioural examples of employees from foreign cultures provide a valuable example to local employees. Employment of expatriate management and staff has long been a practice in international hotels, particularly in the more successful ones in every country.

Little empirical psychological research concerning leadership has been done in Mainland China. Bond and Hwang (1986) reference less than 60 studies of leadership in China, in *The Handbook of Chinese Psychology*, since Deng Xiao Ping’s “opening” policies. Most of these studies inter-mix the concepts and characteristics of general operations management and leadership. As the need for expatriates in China waxes and wanes, the need for understanding of the cultural aspects of leadership in the country are necessary. With the further opening of the business sectors with China’s entry in the World Trade Organisation, we will see an even greater influx of expatriate managers, particularly in the financial sector. The few investigations of management psychology in China have indicated a considerable divergence in leadership expectations on the part of Chinese workers, supervisors, and managers, when compared to those of Westerners. Additionally, Hofstede (1980a) and Smith and Bond (1999) point out that in many parts of the world, power distance and hierarchy are part of social structures that are also collectivist and participative. Careful inspection of the applicability of the Western model of leadership outside Western countries is necessary. If leaders face different organisational and environmental challenges in different cultures, they are also likely to need different ways of handling their relations with others.

This study should be useful to students of expatriate management in China, and for expatriates planning to work in China, and also for those training expatriates to work in China. This is a report of a study of perceptions of leadership behaviour by managers and supervisors working in two international-chain-managed hotels in the interior of Mainland China; the hotels shared a common management team and many employees worked in both hotels.

The study reports and compares “desirable” leadership traits, and leadership traits of the actual managers and supervisors as defined by responses on a Chinese language translation of the LBDQ XII.

The opinion of host-country national subordinates and peers is necessarily based on what they have experienced, i.e. their perceptions of the leadership behaviour of the expatriate managers. Local managers constitute a point of reference of prevailing leadership behaviour and leadership style in the host country and a host-country national employee with experience of both expatriate and local managers would be able to compare these two categories of managers. Consequently, the purpose of this article is to explore empirically the differences in leadership behaviour between expatriate managers and local managers as perceived by their host-country national (HCN) subordinates in the local operation.

**Research rationale**

The researcher identified a need for this study while a manager in the hotels, and while engaged in management and leadership education and training in
Mainland China. While engaged in research for course development for the training, it was noted that a majority of the studies on management and leadership purporting to represent Chinese practices were, in fact, from other parts of “Greater China”, excluding the People’s Republic of China (PRC), usually from Hong Kong, Taiwan, Macao, and sometimes Singapore. Most studies were based on the areas outside the PRC.

From anecdotal evidence and personal experience, the researcher found considerable difficulty in transferring these research results to useful practice in the interior of China. Consequently, a study was initiated to attempt to determine what might be the perceptions of successful leadership behaviour in the PRC, and if we could find a way to accurately measure the exhibition of this behaviour. The research adds to that previously done by investigating differences in the Asian Chinese subcultures, which have been deviating from one another for the past 50 to 100 years, and now, with the “opening” of the PRC, could possibly begin converging due to increased interaction.

An additional intent is to evaluate the usefulness of a leadership evaluation instrument developed in the USA for use in the PRC.

The Western leadership literature
Although the phenomenon of leadership has been around since antiquity (Bass, 1990), and probably (I use “probably” to follow the rules of scholarly papers; we all know that the correct adverb is “certainly”) since the start of the evolution of hominids, the systematic social scientific study of leadership did not begin in earnest until the early 1930s. From the subsequent research, a great deal is known about leadership phenomena. However, there remain many unanswered questions. From literature reviews, we see many and varied interpretations of what leadership consists. We are obviously not at the definitive stage of theoretical development in the area. In most theories of leadership, we see deficiencies in the present knowledge. For example, the majority of the more than 3,000 studies listed by Bass (1990), the most complete survey prior to House and Aditya (1997), are primarily concerned with the relationship between leaders and their immediate followers, and largely ignore the organisation and culture in which leaders function, the relationships between leaders and superiors, external constituencies, peers, and the kind of product or service provided by the leader’s organisation. The studies are somewhat fragmented and not systematically followed up with additional studies in many cases, indicating a lack of a sense of urgency in the need to specifically identify what makes good leaders. One supposes that this arises from the fact that, in most cases, when a leader is needed, one appears. If a leader is needed and one does not appear, there is a high likelihood that the group needing a leader will disappear. Perhaps leaders are obvious enough that social scientific instruments are not really necessary. However, a business with only managers and no leaders will soon grind to a halt, so we really do need to define “What is a leader?” in order to be able to develop these qualities in more mundane managers.

For an excellent, thorough review of leadership research, see: House and Aditya (1997), House and Shamir (1993), and Bass (1990).
A major study programme, the qualitative Global Research and Effectiveness Research Program (GLOBE)[1], is supported by 170 or so researchers from 60 or so cultures and directed by Robert J. House at the University of Pennsylvania see also House et al. (1999).

**GLOBE project leadership construct definitions**

The major constructs investigated in the GLOBE research programme are nine attributes of cultures which are operationalised as quantitative dimensions:

1. Uncertainty avoidance.
2. Power distance.
5. Gender egalitarianism.
6. Assertiveness.
7. Future orientation.

These dimensions were selected on the basis of a review of the literature relevant to the measurement of culture in previous large-sample studies and on the basis of existing cross-culture theory.

The stated meta-goal of GLOBE is to develop an empirically-based theory to describe, understand, and predict the impact of specific cultural variables on leadership and organisational processes and the effectiveness of these processes.

Specific objectives include answering the following fundamental questions:

- Are there leader behaviours, attributes and organisational practices that are universally accepted and effective across cultures?
- Are there leader behaviours, attributes, and organisational practices that are accepted and effective in only some cultures?
- How do attributes of societal and organisational cultures affect the kinds of leader behaviours and organisational practices that are accepted and effective?
- What is the effect of violating cultural norms relevant to leadership and organisational practices?
- What is the relative standing of each of the cultures’ studies on each of the nine core dimensions of culture?
- Can the universal and culture-specific aspects of leader behaviours, attributes, and organisational practices be explained in terms of an underlying theory that accounts for systematic differences across cultures?

The project promises many publications concerning the cross-cultural aspects of leadership, with several available on the Website.
The GLOBE conceptual model
House et al. (1999) state that the theoretical base guiding the GLOBE research programme is an integration of “implicit leadership theory” (Lord and Maher, 1991), “value/belief theory” of culture (Hofstede, 1980a), “implicit motivational theory” (McClelland, 1985), and “structural contingency theory of organisational form and effectiveness” (Donaldson, 1997). These are described in House et al. (1999) and the “integrated theory” proposed and also in House et al. (1997b).

Universal or near universal effective leader behaviours
Considering the common definitions of the sources of leaders, generally: emergent, positional/appointive, hereditary, elective, studies of leadership traits of individuals in such posts possibly select managers who are not particularly competent leaders. For example, in post-Communist China, all managers and supervisors are termed “leader”. As pointed out by Den Hartog et al. (1999), in work, social, and family environments, leadership perceptions are derived from intellectual and emotional processes in which leaders are categorised as such by followers and observers. The follower or observer easily and intuitively places an individual in on a continuum from definite-leader to definitely-not-a-leader. Leadership ability is a continuum, and attempts to define categories when investigating leadership can lead to confusing, unexpected, and misleading results.

Most researchers of leadership attempt to find reasons to believe that some generic leadership functions may be universally acceptable and effective, regardless of the dispositions and norms of diverse groups, although enacted with different behaviours depending on the situation or culture.

First, there are undoubtedly several problems that are universally associated with the management of large complex organisations and with the management of groups. For example, the two factors of the need to ensure task orientation and the need to develop and maintain cohesiveness and collaboration among organisational members are likely to be present in all complex organisations and in all organisational sub-units (task orientation and group nurturance).

Second, as House and Baetz (1979) and Nicholson (1998) noted, effective leadership requires a disposition to be influential (leaders have a desire to lead). This disposition may well result in some universal influence-oriented behaviours.

Third, many of the strategic contingencies facing organisations may well be universal, or near universal. For example, all organisations that function in competitive environments must of necessity conduct negotiations and transactions with external constituencies for the attainment of resources and legitimacy.

While the logic suggesting universality of leader behaviours is compelling, empirical evidence relevant to this issue is sparse. Following is a brief review of available evidence.

A 12-country study by Bass et al. (1979) revealed that managers from all countries indicated a desire to get work done, while using less authority; that is, they desire to successfully “empower” employees. Smith and Peterson (1994) found that managers in 25 countries representing a wide variety of cultures report satisfaction with events for which they were delegated substantial discretion. That is, they desire “empowerment” themselves.
Interpretative interviews and focus group research in 38 countries involved in the GLOBE study suggests that the behaviours specified in the “neo-charismatic” leadership paradigm might well be universally accepted and preferred. In all 38 countries, managers were asked in focus groups to describe leader attributes and behaviours that enhance outstanding leader performance. In all countries, managers described behaviours similar to those of the neo-charismatic leader behaviour syndrome.

Bass (1997) reports studies using the MLQ transformational leadership scales in China, the USA, The Netherlands, Singapore, the UK and Japan. In all of these countries, transformational leadership was found to be positively related to leader effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction. Research by Messallam and House (1997) in Egypt; by Javidan and Carl (1997) in Canada; and by Geyer and Steyrer (1994) in Germany, yielded similar findings. However, the specific behaviours and the mannerisms (styles) with which these apparently generic leadership functions are enacted may vary substantially among leaders, and may be differentially required for diverse groups. For example, charismatic leader behaviours may be enacted aggressively, as exemplified by General George Patton, Fidel Castro, or Theodore Roosevelt, or in a quiet, unemotional, and non-aggressive manner as exemplified by Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela or Mother Teresa.

Cultural limitations of extant leadership theory
At the present time, the bulk of the leadership literature is based on a self-limiting set of assumptions, mostly reflecting Western industrialised culture. Almost all of the prevailing theories of leadership and almost all of the empirical evidence are rather distinctly American in character. The theories are characterised by:

• being individualistic rather than collectivist;
• stressing follower responsibilities rather than rights;
• assuming hedonism rather than commitment to duty or altruistic motivation;
• assuming centrality of work and democratic value orientation; and
• emphasising assumptions of rationality rather than asceticism, religion, or superstition.

The above set of emphases is not particularly Asian in nature, and certainly not typical of the PRC.

Even Hofstede’s (1980a) seminal study was supported by and used, for the most part, by subjects from a large USA multinational corporation with a strong US corporate culture.

A frequently noted limitation of these theories, but one rarely addressed in research, is that they do not address the issue as to whether they can be generalised to other cultures. It is very likely that most of these theories are culture-bound, reflecting US assumptions, values, and beliefs. For example, both Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory and the original Path-Goal
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theory are based on the presumption that leadership consists basically of dyadic relationships between leaders and followers. This assumption is clearly a reflection of the individualistic orientation of dominant mainstream US culture. In high power distance cultures, there may be no personal relationship between leaders and followers.

Transformational theory asserts that effective leadership involves the exercise of individualised consideration toward subordinates. This leader behaviour may well violate the cultural norms of highly collectivist societies. It is likely that group-oriented consideration will be more readily accepted and effective in collectivist societies. Transformational Theory also asserts that effective leadership includes the exercise of intellectual stimulation, which involves encouraging subordinates to be independent and to approach problems in new ways. This leader behaviour reflects the achievement and entrepreneurial orientation of the US culture and may violate norms of dependency and conformity that characterise many other cultures, especially China.

There is also a need for identification of emic manifestations of generic leader behaviours in all cultures to which theories of leadership might be applied. It is very doubtful that the generic leadership functions adequately describe the exercise of leadership in all cultures. For example, in cultures as diverse as Asian, Scandinavian and Dutch, the expression of individuality is considered socially undesirable. In these cultures, singling out individuals with public praise is likely to result in embarrassment, rather than gratification. Similarly, the GLOBE research suggests that in these cultures, highly assertive behaviour is also considered socially undesirable, whereas in the USA and in Eastern European countries, such behaviour appears to be not only accepted but also, expected of leaders. The GLOBE project has published six global leadership dimensions: “charismatic/value-based”, team-oriented leadership (highly correlated with charismatic/value-based), humane leadership, participative leadership, self-protective, and autonomous. The latter two, self-protective and autonomous leadership, are said to vary by culture.

In the USA, superior-subordinate relationships that foster independence and allow subordinates to experience autonomy and openness are most generally accepted and preferred as a result of egalitarian norms (Hofstede, 1980a, 1980b; House et al., 1997a). LMX theory reflects this American cultural preference, and prescribes reciprocal influence between superiors and subordinates and a high degree of job autonomy for subordinates. In Southeast Asia, superior-subordinate relationships that are less open and that foster face saving are most generally accepted and preferred. This often involves indirect conflict resolution tactics, rather than open discussion of differences which is implied in LMX theory.

In cultures characterised by norms and widespread acceptance of high-power concentration, subordinates may find job autonomy and reciprocal influence between themselves and their superiors to be incongruent with cultural norms and therefore stressful and unacceptable. In many cultures, such as Korea, supervisors are expected to be paternalistic toward subordinates (Kim, 1994). Among other attributes, paternalism involves dependence of subordinates on their supervisors.
for satisfaction of many of their personal as well as job-related needs. Thus, job autonomy, as recommended by LMX theory, may in fact violate Korean cultural norms. When applying or conducting research on LMX theory in cultures other than Anglo-Saxon cultures, it would be advisable to first determine the kinds of superior-subordinate relationships that are considered acceptable and supportive, and that have the theoretical effects asserted by LMX theory. One could then trace the origins of culturally-specific high-quality LMX to discover the attributes and behaviours of both supervisors and subordinates that lead to such relationships.

It is likely that the kinds of leader behaviours required to foster high-quality superior-subordinate relationships will vary from one culture to another as well (House et al., 1997a).

Cognitive resource theory assumes that reactions to stress are universal. However, in societies that emphasise suppression of emotions and educate members to engage in emotional control, this assumption may not hold. Fiedler (1996), it may be recalled, reported that an experimentally administered stress reduction program increased the performance of officer candidates on an in-basket management simulation task. It may well be that, in cultures in which individuals are socialised to engage in meditation, the effects of stress asserted in Cognitive Resource Theory may not occur.

Available evidence suggests that the generic leadership functions specified in the neo-charismatic leadership paradigm may be universal, or near universal, under high-levels of uncertainty or stress. Further, the specific emic leader behaviours by which the neo-charismatic leadership functions are enacted have not yet been identified. This possibility remains to be investigated more rigorously.

For very thorough reviews of the literature on leadership, see Bass (1990), House and Aditya (1997), and House et al. (1997a).

**The leader behaviour paradigm**

After World War II, in the USA, there was a period of almost 30 years during which leaders were studied either by observing their behaviour in laboratory settings or by asking individuals in field settings to describe the behaviour of individuals in positions of authority, and relating these descriptions to various criteria of leader effectiveness. Three influential groups of investigators pursued the quest for explanations of leader effectiveness in this manner. These were Robert Bales and his associates at Harvard (Bales, 1954), members of the Ohio State Leadership Center (Stogdill and Coons, 1951), and members of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan (Kahn and Katz, 1953; Likert, 1961; Mann, 1965).

Research conducted within this paradigm became known as the behavioural school of leadership. One of the major empirical contributions from the behavioural school was the identification of two broad classes of leader behaviours – *task-oriented* and *person-oriented* behaviours – which were identified by repeated factor analyses conducted by the Ohio State group, interviews by the Michigan group and observation of emergent leaders in laboratories by the Harvard group. It should be noted that the Harvard group also identified a third dimension, *individual prominence*, which was somehow ignored in subsequent leadership literature. This dimension may have been
neglected because of the social-liberal disapproval of individual prominence seeking found in some universities at the time.

A second major contribution of the behavioural paradigm was a more refined and detailed specification of task- and person-oriented behaviours. For a good summarisation of the behaviours conceptualised by various investigators, the reader is referred to Bowers and Seashore (1966). Unfortunately, there was no pattern of leader behaviour that was found to be consistently associated with subordinates’ satisfaction or any criteria of supervisor or manager effectiveness (House, 1971; Larson et al., 1974).

Assumptions and limitations of the leader behaviour paradigm

Research conducted within the leader behaviour paradigm shares several similarities with early research on leader traits. This research was based almost exclusively on observations of individuals who functioned at lower organisational levels and whose roles primarily concerned supervision, or observations of university students in laboratories, rather than observations of higher-level leaders responsible for the functioning of entire organisations. Behavioural studies were frequently based on questionnaires that sought to elicit subordinates’ recall of the behaviour of their superiors, presumably reflecting global historical patterns of behaviour and relationships between leaders and followers, as well as specific recently enacted behaviours.

The research of the behavioural school was largely inductive and lacked theoretical orientation, since basic theoretical concepts had not been well developed at the time. This school was also plagued by limitations of measurement. Many of the leader behaviour questionnaires were of questionable validity. For example, the scales most frequently used to measure the leader task and person orientation constructs were the Leader Initiating Structure and Consideration scales developed by the Ohio State investigators. The Leader Initiating Structure and Consideration constructs were measured with several different scales that were subsequently shown to measure substantially different specific leader behaviours and to correlate differentially with various criterion variables (Schriesheim et al., 1976).

The initial guiding assumption of the behavioural paradigm was that there are some universally effective leader behaviours, and these could be discovered by either observing leaders in action, usually in a laboratory setting, or by asking subordinates about the behaviour of their immediate superiors. Little thought was given to the specific role demands of leaders, the context in which they functioned, or differences in dispositions of leaders or followers. Failure to consider these factors was subsequently thought to be the reason for the researchers’ inability to identify leader behaviours that had universal or near universal effectiveness.

Stogdill (1963) noted that it was not reasonable to believe that the two factors of Initiating Structure and Consideration were sufficient to account for all the observable variance in leader behaviour relating to group achievement and the variety of social roles. Stogdill’s theory suggested the possible factors of:

- tolerance of uncertainty;
- persuasiveness;
tolerance of group members’ freedom of action;
predictive accuracy;
group integration; and
reconciliation of conflicting demands on group and managerial resources.

And Stogdill suggested new factors derived from the current literature:
representation of group interests;
role assumption by the leader;
production emphasis; and
relationship with superiors.

The LBDQ XII, discussed further below, was developed to describe the behaviour of leaders and used in this study.

Cultural implications in business

Culture is central to all parts of the enterprise; culture is about the whole of business. The concept has been defined as patterns of behaviour that are acquired and transmitted by symbols over time, which become shared within a group generally, and are communicated to new members of the group in order to serve as a cognitive guide or blueprint for future actions. The building blocks of culture are value systems and norms. Values are abstract ideals about what a society believes to be good, right and desirable. Norms are social rules and guidelines that prescribe appropriate behaviour in particular situations.

It is common for expatriates to believe that it is the people from the local culture who are deviating from the corporate cultural norm, and to overlook or ignore the fact that it is he or she who is deviating from the norms of the host country. Ethnocentrism, or the belief that one’s own ethnic culture or group is superior, is as damaging to an expatriate assignment as a total disregard or contempt for the other culture or people. Cultural sensitivity and empathy are important aspects of expatriate competence. While these concepts are difficult to teach, through the use of cross-cultural training, international managers can learn how to adapt to cultural differences.

International business is much more personal and relationship-oriented than domestic business. Managers in the international arena require multiple approaches in order to deal with multiple cultures. Those who are skilled only in mono-cultural management rarely succeed in a multicultural or bicultural environment. Without a proper understanding of cultural norms, expatriates can make embarrassing, sometimes debilitating, social mistakes while trying to communicate with their co-workers and business associates.

Culture has everything to do with the ways people give and receive information, and everything to do with the ways they learn. Communicating goes beyond the translation of words from one language to another, and beyond substituting the correct cultural equivalents for gestures, attitudes and customs. In a foreign culture, knowing the language is not enough. If the
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Culture

Culture is not sufficiently understood, it may not be possible to appreciate and understand the message behind the words.

When business associates share a similar culture, they have a common context for communication. Communication is broader than language; it involves transmitting and understanding ideas. Cross-cultural communication differs from familiar communication because of differences in assumptions made by people from different cultures. To help improve communication between cultures, one must be aware of and understand these different assumptions and their cultural influences on communication. There must be a sincere desire to communicate and to seek understanding. Conducting business in a different culture requires adaptation to the value systems and norms of that country. Respecting another culture and its customs and etiquette is not only good manners but also good business.

For a successful expatriate, general multi-cultural awareness and regional or country-specific awareness are essential. Cultural awareness does not focus on a specific region of the world, but instead requires general sensitivity to other cultures.

It is important to understand how one’s own culture influences one’s behaviour, in order to understand how a foreign culture influences the behaviours of the people in that culture. Most individuals do not realise that their beliefs, values and behaviours are not universal, particularly if they have limited or no experience with another culture. They take those beliefs for granted and are unable to see them as something that may be unfamiliar to others. Until we come into contact with other cultures, it is unlikely that we will understand what distinguishes our own culture.

The less people are aware of their own cultural biases, and the fact that their own behaviour is a potential liability, the less competent they will be in their working relationships with foreign nationals. Inaccurate attributions, then, have a dysfunctional effect on an expatriate’s ability to interact. One goal of a successful expatriate is to try to reduce this ethnocentrism.

Essential adaptive traits are how to be tolerant of ambiguity, and to reserve (or suppress) judgement about the actions of members of other cultures.

If one is serious about success as an expatriate, regional and country-specific knowledge of the historical, political, religious and economic factors that shape the mentality of the people in the region is essential, as is understanding of how these factors differ from the home culture. Additionally, business customs and practices, values and beliefs of the society, social interactions, tax and legal structure, standard compensation and benefits practices, workplace regulations, geography and climate, are all important. The purpose of acquiring this knowledge is to help one to adjust, in a practical way, to the work environment and to the personal work situation.

Language

Knowledge of the host country’s language may not be essential, but it will facilitate adjustment to a foreign culture. Day-to-day issues can create significant problems for the expatriate who does not know the language. Unless one is involved in some specialised area, such as a language teacher, it is impossible to function at the highest level without fluency in the language.
Knowledge of a foreign language may not guarantee competent performance, but it enables the expatriate to develop a better rapport with co-workers, customers and members of the local community.

**Mainland Chinese culture**

Bond and Hwang (1993) comment in their review of literature on the social psychology of the Chinese:

... subordinates in Chinese groups prefer a leadership style in which the leader maintains a harmonious, considerate relationship with the followers and defines clear-cut tasks for each member of the group.

It seems that Chinese prefer an authoritarian leadership style in which a benevolent and respected leader is not only considerate of his followers, but also able to take skilled and decisive action.

Hui and Tan, in their chapter, “Employee Motivation and Attitudes in the Chinese Workforce”, in Bond (1996), report the following results of a small body of research on leadership of Chinese, which rather randomly mixed supervisory and leadership processes:

- That a supervisor behaves as he or she should and does not deviate too far from the subordinates expectations is a reason for subordinates to be willing to devote extra effort to their work (note: the author assumes “should” means the two behaviour patterns listed below).
- Chinese employees want their leaders to be considerate and benevolent, and to adhere to the Confucian parental role.
- Exercise sound moral judgement: self-restrained, honest toward fellow colleagues and subordinates, trustworthy, and impartial.

These traits are exemplary of Confucian ideology.

**Power distance**

In a discussion of high power distance leading to authoritarian management and leadership styles in Chinese cultures, Bond and Hwang (1993) note the dangers of such a cultural characteristic in the large organisation:

... many Chinese leaders tend to adopt an authoritarian pattern of leadership, making all the important decisions, assigning tasks to subordinates, all the while striving to be kind and considerate towards those led. This pattern of leadership may work well in temporary leader-subordinate relationships and in small-scale organisations. In large-scale organisations that require more complex levels of technology and organisation, however, it is difficult for the manager to keep everything within his span of control. In the latter case, insistence on running the organisation by traditional ways may result in chaos and decrease the satisfaction level of subordinates. Demands of scale and complexity thus push the Chinese manager towards a more Western style of management – delegating and formalising.

This point is important, for if Chinese leaders do adopt an authoritarian style when they operate within the large multinational corporation (MNC), this style may be a hindrance to successful management of the organisation. There is a
clear conflict here between the possibility of a leadership style that might be socio-culturally appropriate in the PRC, and a style that is considered appropriate for effectiveness in the large MNC. This confrontation is much more important than the simple recognition of a cultural difference, and has specific implications for the effectiveness of decision making and employee motivation.

Collectivism
Collectivist/group orientation in China refers to the family, extended family, clan, Chinese Communist Party (CCP) organisation, or a self-identified subculture, up to and including the Chinese culture. The “we” group is the source of identity, protection, loyalty, and dependent relationships. People are integrated into strong, cohesive groups who protect them and demand loyalty throughout their lifetime. The high end of the dimension in business is whether workers have training opportunities (for the benefit of the organisation), good working physical condition, and full use of skills and abilities on the job. (Collectivist societies should not be expected to be particularly nationalistic, rather, most of these societies define the in-groups rather narrowly, usually emphasising the family in-group.) Generally, collectivist countries, with exceptions, tend to be relatively poor. Regions high on collectivism include: Guatemala, Equador, Panama, Venezuela, Columbia, Indonesia, Pakistan, Costa Rica, Peru, China, Taiwan, and South Korea. The two relatively well-to-do regions, Taiwan and South Korea, have 50-year relationships with the USA and Japan, countries with historically growing economies.

Collectivistic characteristics include:

- Large families, close working relationships, and confined spaces shared with other people, requiring regard for others and harmony, and conflict is minimised.
- People who deviate from the norm are considered to have bad or weak character.
- Special leave and other breaks for special family ceremonies are common.
- Collectivist cultures regulate behaviour through shame or loss of “face.”
- Hiring persons from one’s family reduces business risk.
- Poor performance may not result in loss of a job, but may include reassignment of tasks.
- Workers may prefer anonymity and group/team work.
- In-group and out-group can be important in business relations, with friends and relatives getting better treatment.
- These are usually high-context communication countries.
- Education diplomas provide entry into high status groups.
- Employee-employer relationship is defined in moral terms.
- Relationship prevails over task.
- Management is management of groups.
Private life is subject to the group. Opinions are predetermined by group membership. Laws and rights differ by group.

As noted above, we usually see low GNP per capita, the role of the state is dominant in economic systems; the press is controlled by state; imported economic theories may be considered as irrelevant; harmony and consensus are ultimate goals.

**Guanxi and Renqing**

Guanxi are increasingly complex relationships which expand, day by day, throughout the lives of ethnic Chinese. One is born into a social network of family members, and as one grows up, group memberships involving education, occupation, and residence provide additional opportunities for expanding the network (see Bond, 1996, where guanxi is discussed in most chapters).

In contrast to the social patterns in “Western” societies, especially the USA, these relationships persist long after the groups are dissolved or lead to face-to-face interaction on the part of members. The Chinese form lifelong, rich, networks of mutual relations, usually involving reciprocal obligations similar to the Confucian rules, but with the obligations and reciprocity running much deeper. The relative permanence of such social networks contributes to the importance and enforceability of the Chinese conception of reciprocity (bao). See Yum (1988) for a comparison of reciprocity in Western and Chinese societies.

Almost always, when a friend or relation telephones, early in the conversation he or she will be asked, “What do you want?”. The guanxi relationships are useful and used. Hwang (1987) thoroughly analyses the implications of this long-term reciprocity.

Intermediaries are important in the development of networks of guanxi. Chang and Holt (1991) interviewed Chinese adults in Taiwan to investigate the establishment of guanxi relationships through intermediaries. They found the expected methods of using family connections, pointing out a previous association, using non-family-in-group connections, and a complex social interaction process using social skills such as the ability to play the renqing (favours) game (Hwang, 1987). Intermediaries are used in bringing out-group individuals into new relationships, and for asking for favours both large and small.

Renqing (favours) has many implications in Chinese cultures (Hwang, 1987; Chu, 1991). The direct translation of the Chinese characters for renqing is “human feelings”. The dictates of renqing are that the human element should not be removed from human affairs, and a sympathetic give-and-take compromise should govern the relationships of men.

Ideally, renqing is an informal and unselfish give-and-take among people. In reality, accounts are kept carefully and strictly, and favours and obligations are weighed carefully, and the balances owed between people are known as well as if they were recorded in a ledger. The debts of renqing are not often written down or discharged rigidly and exactly. But they are remembered in minute detail and enforced by deeply rooted feelings of guilt and shame in those who fail in the fulfilment of their obligations. However, renqing is often the basis of
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Manipulation of adversaries in business negotiations. An obligation is created through a gesture that costs little, and the debt is called due when the adversary can only repay it with a more valuable concession. This aspect of *renqing* is worth remembering when engaged in business negotiations.


**Face and social interaction**

Social interaction in Chinese cultures involves dynamic relationships among the concepts of face (*mianzi*), favours (*renqing*), and relationships (*guanxi*).

Hu and Grove (1991) published the pioneering investigation of “face” and identified two basic categories of face in Chinese culture: *lian* and *mianzi*. A person’s *lian* face can be preserved by faithful compliance with ritual and social norms. One gains *lian* by demonstrating moral character. When one loses *lian*, one cannot function properly in the community.

From Hu, *mian* represents a more Western conception of “face”, a reputation achieved through success in life and frequently through ostentatious display of wealth (automobile brands, conspicuous consumption, wanton waste) or some other desirable trait (education, position).

Bond (1996), Bond and Hwang (1986), and Bond and Lee (1981) discuss face at length.

**Confucian ideology**

Confucian ideology has been thoroughly discussed in Asian management literature. Xing (1995) and Bond and Hwang (1986) suggest that throughout the long history of the Chinese people, Confucian ideology has been firmly established as an undeniable system governing nearly all aspects of Chinese lives. They further propose that thousands of years of a feudalistic system have dominated the Chinese view of themselves and the world. The three dominant cultural influences in modern Mainland China are “Neo-Confucianism”, “Legalism”, and the mixed rejection, adaptation and modification of these two philosophies in the ever-changing Chinese Communist Party doctrine since 1949.

Wong et al. (1998) proposed that the business and work behaviour of the Chinese, and of China as a country, is driven more by its culture than by global business dynamics and Western ideas of economics. The major force in the culture, despite the Communist political system, is Confucian, particularly Neo-Confucianism. Neo-Confucianism, coupled with a perpetual tendency toward international isolation, conditions the way in which China expects to be dealt with on the international political and trade levels. From this propensity, managers who do not understand and study this issue will be in a difficult position when working in China and doing business with China and the Chinese.

Although Confucianism was abolished in China at the turn of this century, having been the predominant ideology in China for 2,000 years, it has had a fundamental and prevailing influence on the Chinese character. Confucianism is a belief system which has provided the Chinese with great stability and
resilience and it remains a major force in Greater China and Overseas Chinese culture and values (Redding, 1990, p. 48; Tan, 1986).

Confucianism is an authoritarian system that places great emphasis on values such as conformity, submission and respect for one's parents and elders. Confucius’ Five Cardinal Relations (Wu Lun), between sovereign and subject, father and son, elder brother and younger brother, husband and wife, and friend and friend, prescribe precise vertical relations between superiors and subordinates. Everyone knows their own place and to whom they must defer. These status differences are regarded as the correct and best way of conducting relationships and are accepted and maintained at all levels of the hierarchy (Bond, 1991; Bond and Hwang, 1986; Hofstede and Bond, 1988). These Five Cardinal Relations have been propagated for centuries to emphasise the deference and duty to hierarchy, while frequently ignoring the Confucian principle of the requirement for responsible, ethical, humane behaviour by those in ruling positions.

The Chinese have carried these values into their managerial practices to such an extent that a distinct Chinese leadership pattern has emerged. Although Chinese businesses have become as large and complex as those of any other industrial nation have, they display a conservative and security centred approach to internal management (Limlingan, 1986). The structure is essentially authoritarian. Subordinates must show respect and obedience to superiors and those of unequal status maintain a social distance from one another to prevent familiarity destroying the order (Redding, 1990; Silin, 1976; Whitley, 1992). The uniqueness of Chinese management culture is also indicated by recent empirical research. Comparing managerial values, using well-developed Western as well as Eastern measures, Ralston et al. (1992, 1993) revealed significant differences between Hong Kong and US managers. Schermerhorn and Bond (1992) concluded that Hong Kong managers used different influence tactics from US managers, and Okechuku and Man (1992) found that Hong Kong and Canadian managers exhibited significantly different managerial traits.

**Bing fa**

Some Chinese managers, to some extent, draw insights from ancient, traditional, generic Chinese wisdom such as bing fa (art of war) publications as Sun Zi’s *The Art of War* and *The Thirty-Six Strategies*, that give strategies suited for “business wars”. From the author’s personal experience in China, those managers educated prior to the Cultural Revolution may understand and employ such strategies. However, most of the current middle managers encountered in China missed an education during the Cultural Revolution (approx. 1966-1976), and while they generally (or may not, if the discussion is in English) recognise the discussion of the application of ancient strategies, the strategies are part of the folk culture, so at the middle-management and operations management levels they rarely are observed to plan and proactively apply them systematically in business relationships. Nonetheless, these practices have been studied, taught and applied for thousands of years, to the degree that they are an integral part of Chinese business and personal relationships, particularly *The Thirty-Six Strategies*. 
Those in their late twenties and early thirties seem to be less interested in historical precepts (perhaps due to the widely-known fact that the content of history taught in the education systems tends to be highly controlled) and tend more to learning Western business and management practices. As study of the Asian arts of war literature is somewhat in vogue in the West, Chinese students may encounter them in English or Japanese in their first exposure.

**Chinese leadership**

Who leads in China? Older men. Two of Confucius’ “Five Cardinal Relations” involved the subordination of the younger brother to the elder, and the wife to the husband. These basic rules permeate Chinese social life, even in modernised societies like Singapore and Hong Kong. The authority of elders is socially ingrained.

In collectivist systems, a leader has broad and unquestioned authority. To be effective he must, therefore, be more skilled in the technical and performance aspects of the job than managers in individualist cultures, because no subordinate will compromise the leader by correcting him. He must, however, be perceived as considerate and kind in order to lessen the fear and avoidance his subordinates will show in the face of his unbridled power. The effective model is the loving father, leading to a leadership style labelled “paternalism” by Redding (1990) in *The Spirit of Chinese Capitalism*.

Research on leadership, including that in China, continually shows the two dimensions of consideration and task orientation (Smith and Bond, 1999). However, in the 1980s (reported in Bond, 1991), the Institute of Psychology in Beijing reported identification of a third factor of leadership behaviour: “moral character”. The measure includes such characteristics as:

- commitment to abide by the law and avoid corrupt practices;
- a positive attitude toward the CCP and willingness to follow party dictates even when they conflict with one’s own personal views;
- fairness to all employees;
- a positive attitude toward party political workshops held during working hours;
- responsiveness to suggestions from workers.

Not surprisingly, research with Chinese subjects outside China has not found this dimension. Its presence in Chinese studies reflects the intense politicisation of the workplace in post-revolutionary China. The possibility also exists that the dimension was artificially “defined” by the CCP leadership as an education programme, rather than observed in research findings. This dimension is analogous to the GLOBE projects “Integrity”: just, honest, trustworthy leadership attribute, excluding the references to the party.

**Current Chinese culture**

Perhaps the most significant event effecting contemporary Chinese managers and workers was the Cultural Revolution, a ten-year period of chaos from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s, in which all institutions of higher learning were closed. This was
a period of destruction of any semblance of trust in China. People received often fatal denunciations from co-workers, friends, casual acquaintances, and even family, so any openness, initiative, and expressions of talent or uniqueness were effectively programmed out of the public personality of the Chinese. These individuals are now in most middle and senior management positions in China. Some have taken advantage of vocational education programmes, most were barred from the lock step Chinese education system of government assignment to schools, major fields of study, and jobs. As the generation now entering their thirties enters the ranks of middle and executive management we could see dramatic improvement in skills. Many of these individuals have travelled outside China and seen what could be in terms of business and quality of life.

Indigenous leadership styles and work values in China are considerably different from Western concepts and also deviate from many other Asian countries (Hofstede, 1980a, p. 315; Selmer and de Leon, 1993; Whitley, 1992, pp. 59-63). Contemporary society in Beijing, Shanghai, and Guangzhou is assuming a modern, deceptively Western look, but we should not be deceived by the buildings. Western values are merely superficially embraced, more as skin-deep cosmetics than a fundamental basis for thought and conduct (Kirkbride and Westwood, 1993; Redding and Richardson, 1986). It can be argued that the Chinese cognitively and emotionally separate modernisation from Westernisation. Remaining Sino-centric, they are able to adopt some modern Western practices, and regard themselves as modern without losing their Chineseness (Bond and King, 1985). Consequently, most expatriate managers would encounter a cultural divide in China. In the interior cities, Westerners are still noted, pointed out to friends and children, commented on, and stared at on city streets, sometimes drawing a crowd. A large portion of the population in smaller cities may never have seen a living non-Chinese person.

Huyton and Sutton (1996) studied hotel employee perceptions of expatriate managers compared to local managers. Among all of the staff surveyed, it was found that attitudes toward “foreigners” varied according to the degree of staff exposure to such visitors; and the perceived national characteristics of the visitors. The attitude of staff towards foreign visitors could be divided into two groups. Group 1 staff were the older generation of staff, and those employed in “back-of-house” positions (that is those staff without direct customer contact, e.g. washing-up, clerks, linen room, etc.) and staff from the more provincial regions (such as the staff in the hotels in this study). These displayed a more markedly stereotypical and ethnocentric impression of what customers were like and what the customer would expect from a hotel. Group 2 staff were “front-of-house” employees and those of the younger generation and had a greater degree of experience on which to base their impressions of the foreign visitor. This group showed a degree of preference for consumers from the West, and for non-Chinese Asian visitors, especially those from Japan. This was in contrast to the Group 1, who, despite being curious about foreigners, perceived visiting Chinese simply as returning compatriots and were more suspicious of other ethnic groups. That is, ethnographically, Group 2 staff felt that all Chinese were perceived as being the
same both physiologically and culturally, despite coming from a variety of countries. Thus, only non-Chinese could be “proper foreigners”.

All hotel staff generally displayed similar attitudes towards expatriate managers. Western managers, for example, were seen as emotional, volatile and demanding, but with a high degree of technical skill, and the ability to listen. They were also seen as being fair in their dealings with local staff. Westerners did not go along with the traditional guanxi principle, which is the use of relationships to further one’s own position or as a requirement to getting things done. Consequently, the older generation of staff felt that Westerners had no scruples, but the younger generation welcomed this break from tradition because it meant that they could achieve promotion through “what you know rather than who you know”. Overall, Western management was viewed as a necessary, short-term “safe-keeper” of the industry and as a training medium.

The characteristics of volatility and emotion on the part of expatriates were considered by some staff to be due to frustration caused by communication difficulties, but others saw them as a cultural problem. Western managers were expected by many staff to be a universal panacea to all problems and, as such, these expatriates experienced difficulties when delegating responsibility. Consequently, when local staff were faced with a problem they expected their foreign manager to solve it for them, as this is what they had been used to from their Chinese managers. To paraphrase the Confucian analects “a manager’s role is to manage, a worker’s is to work”. This aspect of poor decision making on the part of the Chinese staff was also the cause of much frustration on the part of the hotel guests. Empowerment is not yet accepted in China but, then again, neither is it well accepted in Hong Kong. Louie (1980) explained how PRC State Councillor and Professional Engineer, Wu Yi, saw this lack of ability to make decisions in Chinese workers as still being due to a deep-rooted belief in the Confucian analect of filial piety. To Wu, all faults and vices of traditional Chinese society, ranging from the unquestioning obedience expected of the people to the acceptance of concubinage, resulted from the attitude engendered by the practice of unquestioning filial piety. The effects of the idea of filial piety, she declared, “has been to turn China into a big factory for the production of obedient subjects”. Communist ideology has only compounded this attitude of unquestioning obedience, and it will take considerable exposure to both vocational and management training to begin to effect any changes. In the same vein, Hwang (1990, 1991) studied Chinese organisations, and came to the conclusion that they become more effective only as they move away from structures reliant on traditional Confucian values such as paternalism, personalism, filial piety, and toward structures based on a more overt rationality.

Business training and development
Up to the Sino-Soviet split in 1960, training courses were taught by Soviet advisors and technicians, at that time there were more than 10,000 “foreign experts” from the Soviet Union in China (Warner, 1992). The emphasis was on training for production management in a system where the economic units were factories producing to a central plan. No distinction was made between training of
factory line management and of executive management staff (all communist party appointees). Since 1979, with the exposure of the failure of production efficiencies, considerable attention has been given to the need for management training.

From that time, the State Economic Commission (SEC) was directed to implement a programme of training. The SEC, in 1979, set up the China Enterprise Management Association (CEMA) to co-ordinate management education through bringing together experts from industry, government, research, and education. The CEMA set up university and in-service programmes, and also entered into partnership with foreign institutions to run MBA and executive programmes. These programmes were, and remain, oriented toward management science, with few, if any, programmes dealing in-depth with managerial finance.

The SEC organised courses for the senior managers of large factories; it initiated training from high-level technologists; and ran programmes to train middle-management technical specialists in modern management techniques. The SEC was abolished in 1988, and the State Commission assumed the management training responsibilities for “Restructuring the Economic Systems”. In 1988, there were some 107,000 managers studying (not including night and correspondence courses): 43,000 undergraduates, 4,000 graduates, and 60,000 in-service. There were more than 300 colleges and universities offering management-training courses. From this beginning the training programmes have continually expanded, but nonetheless China remains very short of personnel who can manage modern competitive enterprises and run sophisticated technologies. This is still the major bottleneck in achieving modernisation.

The major weakness lies in the employer’s side, with very few enterprises having systematic programmes for training and development of managers and employees. Training and development, based on an audit of future needs and personnel potential, is non-existent. Frequently the choice of who to send to training programmes is treated as a reward or a perk of status, rather than one of finding an appropriate course for an appropriate manager related to the needs of the organisation. One still occasionally finds managers and executives in courses taught exclusively in a foreign language who neither speak nor understand the foreign language.

In a study by the China-European Community Management Institute (CEMI), Child (1996) found that the young recruits drawn by the MBA programme, when they returned to their employers, found themselves slotted again into their old jobs, or employed as translators and interpreters, as though nothing had happened. The graduates were placed back into the traditional career ladder based on length of service and guanxi. As a consequence, many MBA graduates move over to join foreign joint ventures or representative offices.

As do most cultures, the Chinese culture in the PRC changes, the rate of change can be wrenching as a result of the total control of institutions by the CCP. We have seen dramatic destruction from “The Great Leap Forward” and the “Cultural Revolution”, and dramatic beneficial progress from Deng Xiao Ping’s opening policies. Some may expect rapid “Westernisation” resulting from expansion of the Internet and the “requirements” of World Trade Organisation membership. This expectation is probably misguided.
Agreements
Among Chinese an agreement, especially a written contract, does not have the binding quality as in Western business circles, especially between parties who accept the obligations of renqing (see above). Chinese contracts may be no more than a memorandum concerning the duties and responsibilities of each party. If a problem arises, the parties generally sit down and hash it out face-to-face rather than by examining the text of the contract for a solution. The intent of the agreement is to be vague because it leaves room for later adjustment if things are not working out. The Chinese understand that this deliberate vagueness is not understood and not accepted by Western businessmen, so they generally adapt to the need for specific and detailed agreements. Nonetheless, when problems arise in contracts, Chinese expect them to be worked out as one human being to another. This tradition of flexibility in contractual agreements frequently arises by Chinese businesses requesting, and expecting consideration of, changes to a contract after the agreement has been finalised and signed.

Change
Westerners in China can find themselves dealing with Chinese counterparts in business who are driven by concerns which do not even occur to the Western businessperson. Progress in modernising management will be slow in the PRC, for even state enterprises are modelled on the paternalistic, family firm. Regional Vice President of the Asian Development Bank, in Manila, Shin Myoung-ho, comments (in Gilley, 2000, p. 42): “Chinese family firms have to become internationally competitive and operate according to international standards. That requires some changes in management.” However, Gordon Redding, of the Insead School of Management (Gilley, 2000, p. 45), comments further: “The honour of any Chinese family business is tied up with its ownership of assets. Losing control is a loss of honour in the family record which stretches for centuries”. “Control” is an emotionally-charged, many-faceted concept in the PRC. As something not easily relinquished in any situation in the PRC, notions of control will die hard in the older generation.

Methodology of this study
The suitability of first-order data collection, such as questionnaire responses, from Chinese workers and management has been questioned. Shenkar and von Glinow’s (1994) review of the literature provides myriad methodological problems. These include for questionnaires: unfamiliarity; a tendency to complete mid-range values; failure to distinguish among variables; the production of halo effects far more likely than for Western respondents; problems with answering hypothetical questions; using the group rather than self as the frame of reference; and reporting a desired rather than an actual state. For interviews, problems include: reserving the most important points to the end; and “face” introducing distortions (see also Adler et al., 1989; Bond and Hwang, 1986; Metzger, 1977; Young, 1982).

Nonetheless, as always, the researcher was constrained by shortage of time, resources, and funds, so the economical first-order data collection by means of a questionnaire was selected as the data collection technique for this study.
The justifications for this decision are that the Human Resources Department for the hotels implemented an employee satisfaction survey for all staff in 1996, using a five-point Likert-scale technique for data collection. This survey was repeated in 1997, using a forced-choice “agree-disagree” technique. Also in 1997, the hotel chain implemented an employee satisfaction survey produced by a professional survey-research firm, also using Likert-type responses. Therefore, when the questionnaires were administered in 1999, the staff of the hotels had two years’ experience in responding to several survey-research questionnaires using the Likert technique.

Additionally, the questionnaire was administered twice, the first asking the participants to rate their Chinese and expatriate managers, and the second to rate the characteristics of a hypothetical “ideal” leader. The second administration was not announced until the questionnaires were given to the participants the second time. This process was expected to somewhat reduce the halo effect and the tendency to reproduce the desired rather than the actual state. The tendency to choose mid-range scores was not observed in this sample.

Management environment
The work environment of the subjects for the study was in two chain-managed international hotels in a medium-sized city in the interior of Mainland China, the PRC. In this case, the owners, a provincial government bureau, contracted with an international company to manage the hotels. The chairman of the operation was a PRC-national employee of the owner. The general manager and the financial controller (expatriates) were employees of the chain. In this management contract, the general manager hired the expatriate managers, with final approval by the chairman. The local management team generally hired the local managers, along with the usual CCP and guanxi appointments common in China. A category termed “local expatriate”, indicating a PRC-national from another city, was hired by the general manager. Most personnel and training operations were handled in pre-opening by an expatriate manager, then, after two years, a local manager was appointed personnel and training manager. About one year later, an expatriate deputy personnel and training manager was appointed, ostensibly with equal authority to the local personnel and training manager. The two hotels were comprised of some 400 rooms, with the number of employees ranging seasonally from 500 to 600.

The hotels had been operating for five years with a management team split more-or-less half-and-half between PRC managers and expatriates from various nationalities, including at one time or another, Germany, Singapore, the USA, Italy, Nepal, Pakistan, Belgium, Hong Kong (before and after reversion), the Philippines and The Netherlands (Holland).

Trust
Trust is difficult to earn in China. Practically every time a question is asked, the typical response is: “Why do you want to know that?”. For example, in the hotel Business Center, the question: “What time do the flights to Beijing leave Sunday?” is met with: “Why? Do you want to make a reservation?”, rather than “10:00, 2:00 and 4:00”. In the Human Resources Department, “The Storeroom is out of
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notebooks, do we have any of the ones we used to give as birthday gifts to employees?" is answered: “Why? How many do they want?” rather than “Yes” or “No”. As for trusting strangers, the collectivist mentality tends to treat strangers as meaningless objects, or as objects to be taken advantage of with little moral compunction, or as objects to be feared. People whom one does not know and have some sort of relationship with are “wai”, outsiders, to whom one owes no obligation. Sometimes outsiders are treated with politeness, often not, especially if the outsider appears to be Chinese. In encounters with strangers (and in most interpersonal transactions), each situation is evaluated in terms of how to gain some personal advantage for oneself or for an important member of one’s in-group.

The issue of trust was considered (discussed further below), and the researcher attempted to assure the managers and supervisors of the privacy of their responses. Nonetheless, many supervisors and, surprisingly, many expatriate managers, expressed great concern that the demographic data collected would be used to identify them and some sort of punitive action taken against them for negative responses.

After much thought and discussion, the questionnaire rating the indigenous Chinese and expatriate managers was administered first to all managers and supervisors in the hotel complex. After one month, the “ideal leader” version was administered to all managers and supervisors in the hotel complex, with each asked to describe the “ideal leader” via the questionnaire. The reasoning behind this decision was that if the subjects were asked to rate the “ideal leader” first, many of them would attempt to artificially manipulate the subsequent rating of actual leaders for some perceived or possible personal advantage.

Table I shows a sample question from the questionnaire. “A”, always, was scored 5; and “E”, never, was scored 1; therefore a higher score on a factor indicates that a leader demonstrated the behaviour described in the questionnaire item more frequently.

The responses to the questionnaire were tested through t-tests. The first question (Q1) attempts to establish whether the perception of the ideal leadership behaviour of expatriate managers and local managers is different. Q2-Q4 concern the evaluation of subordinates of managerial leadership, so that comparisons can be made between groups.

Measures
A questionnaire was administered to the group, the LBDQ (Stogdill, 1963). A modified version of the LBDQ XII translated to Chinese characters (LDBQ-CN). The English version of the LBDQ XII was double-blind, or back-, translated by two bilingual native-Chinese speakers, and the translation verified by a bilingual native-English speaker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local manager</th>
<th>Expatriate manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Acts as the spokesperson of the group</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: A = always; B = often; C = occasionally; D = seldom; E = never

Table I. Sample question
Originating in the Ohio State University studies in the late 1940s (Fleishman, 1953; Stogdill and Coons, 1951), this instrument was developed to obtain descriptions of the leadership behaviour of a superior as perceived by his or her subordinates (Stogdill, 1963) and it has been used widely to measure leadership behaviour (Black and Porter, 1991). Initially, two basic constructs of leadership behaviour were included in this instrument: “consideration” and “initiation of structure” (Fleishman, 1957; Halpin and Winer, 1957; Hemphill and Coons, 1957). Subsequently, the LBDQ was revised to include 12 subscales of leadership behaviour (LBDQ XII) (Stogdill, 1963).

In addition to its common use on American managers in the USA, the LBDQ instrument has also been applied successfully in Asia. The LBDQ was used in Singapore, resulting in high reliabilities (Putti and Tong, 1992). Black and Porter (1991) used the LBDQ XII to compare the leadership behaviour of three samples of managers; American managers in the USA, American managers in Hong Kong and Hong Kong Chinese managers in Hong Kong, and they found the reliability to be consistent at acceptable to moderately high levels for all of the samples. Furthermore, Smith et al. (1989), found that the two basic constructs of leadership behaviour have a similar factorial structure in the UK, Hong Kong, Japan and the USA. Selmer (1998) employed the LBDQ XII with results of good reliability comparing indigenous and expatriate managers in Hong Kong.

The instrument was administered twice. In the first instance, two response dimensions identifying ratings of “expatriate manager” and “local manager” were added to the original LBDQ XII instrument. These dimensions served to measure the leadership behaviour of the two categories of superiors as perceived by the respondents. Four weeks later, the questionnaire was again administered to the same group of subjects, asking them to describe the behaviour of the “ideal leader”. A first page collecting identification of the subject’s manager and demographic data for age, sex, job level and education level was added to the original set of items for each administration. Some subjects omitted responses to items that they believed might specifically identify them as individuals.

Each LBDQ item had two five-point Likert-type scales (A = very little; E = a great deal), referring to the two categories of superiors, “expatriate manager” and “local manager”, respectively, or to the “ideal leader”. The respondents were to be instructed to think of their particular manager as the referent manager in the event that they had experience with more than one expatriate or local manager, and a “typical” local manager or expatriate manager for the other class of manager. Those who had no experience with one of the other managers rated only one category of manager.

The 12 LBDQ XII subscales represent a complex and varied pattern of leadership behaviour described as follows (Stogdill, 1963):

- **Factor 1: Representation** measures to what degree the manager speaks as the representative of the group.
- **Factor 2: Demand reconciliation** reflects how well the manager reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system.
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- **Factor 3: Tolerance of uncertainty** depicts to what extent the manager is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or getting upset.

- **Factor 4: Persuasiveness** measures to what extent the manager uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions.

- **Factor 5: Initiation of structure** measures to what degree the manager clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected.

- **Factor 6: Tolerance of freedom** reflects to what extent the manager allows followers scope for initiative, decision and action.

- **Factor 7: Role assumption** measures to what degree the manager exercises actively the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.

- **Factor 8: Consideration** depicts to what extent the manager regards the comfort, well-being, status and contributions of followers.

- **Factor 9: Production emphasis** measures to what degree the manager applies pressure for productive output.

- **Factor 10: Predictive accuracy** measures to what extent the manager exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately.

- **Factor 11: Integration** reflects to what degree the manager maintains a closely-knit organisation; resolves inter-member conflicts.

- **Factor 12: Superior orientation** measures to what extent the manager maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status.

**Employee surveys**
This study is limited to two hotels under one management team in a single city in the interior of China. The management group was quite homogeneous, with only two managers of the 19 being natives of non-Asian-Pacific cultures, and only six managers from non-Chinese cultures (including China, the Hong Kong SAR and Singapore). The key assumptions were that the researcher would find at least two significantly different groups, “Chinese” and “non-Chinese” managers, or “Chinese” and “Expatriate” managers.

Hypotheses regarding the leadership behaviour of expatriate and local managers were tested to investigate if the leadership behaviour of expatriate managers is indeed different from the behaviour of Chinese managers. This was expected as being in line with earlier findings on expatriate leadership behaviour and expatriate adjustment. This study relies on single-source measures, Chinese subordinates, to assess the leadership behaviour of expatriates. Past observations in this area tend to be either anecdotal in nature (Black et al., 1991) or are based on self-reports (McEvoy and Parker, 1995), with Selmer (1998) producing an empirical study similar to this one.

Although several nationalities were represented in the group of expatriate managers, some caution should be exercised in generalising the results to expatriate managers not included in our study, or, due to the small numbers, even to characterise the nationalities included.
Second, there is a possibility that the meaning of leadership behaviour and its manifestations are culture-bound. This connects to the controversy in cross-cultural psychology regarding “emic” versus “etic” perspectives, where the former refer to cultural relativism, arguing for a culture-specific approach and the latter implies a universal approach (Jahoda, 1983). In the case of leadership styles, it has been pointed out that, for example, concern and consideration can be demonstrated in different ways in different cultures. A Chinese manager showing consideration towards his subordinates behaves very differently from an equally considerate British manager in Britain (Bond, 1991, p. 79). It is, therefore, possible, or expected, that subordinates will interpret not only the behaviour of their local manager but also some of the behaviour of their expatriate manager using the Chinese cultural code of behaviour as the norm.

Third, it has long ago been pointed out that international adjustment takes time (Black and Mendenhall, 1991; Stening, 1979; Torbiorn, 1982). All intelligent expatriate managers try to adjust their leadership behaviour. It is important to establish some parameters as to how much time is necessary to adjust after arrival in China. Black and Mendenhall (1991) indicate that the final stage of the adjustment process, during which no further substantive adjustment will take place, would be entered sometime between one and three years after arrival in a foreign location. All expatriate managers in this study had been in China at least two years, most longer.

Population and sample
The target population consisted of expatriate managers, Chinese managers, assistant managers and supervisors in an international hotel complex in the interior of China, who had varying amounts of experience with both Chinese and expatriate peers and superiors. The operational population chosen is 157 managers, assistant managers and supervisors above the first supervisory pay grade (generally senior workers, so excluded) of the two hotels. Of 19 senior managers in the hotel complex, ten are local Chinese, two Hong Kongese, two Nepali, one Netherland, one Pakistani, one Filipino, five Singaporeans and one American (USA). As we see, there are only two “Westerners” and even they are from North America and Continental Europe, not necessarily homogeneous cultures. A complicating factor is that with the “Westerners”, two Nepali, one Pakistani and one Filipino, the remaining six managers (one-half of the expatriates) are of Chinese heritage from Chinese cultures in Singapore and Hong Kong.

Trust, again
An instance of the well-known “Hawthorn Effect”, where the observation of behaviour in a research study effects the observed behaviour, occurred in this investigation. When the questionnaires were distributed to the managers and supervisors, several expressed hesitation in participating in the study, stating that the demographic data collected would allow them to be identified, and expressing fear that they would be “punished” for giving negative ratings of managers. This, of course, indicates a significant lack of trust. China is a “Low Trust” society as defined by Francis Fukuyama, a senior social scientist, at the

\[...\] trust is the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, and co-operative behavior, based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of that community. Those norms can be about deep “value” questions like the nature of God or justice, but they also encompass secular norms like professional standards and codes of behavior. That is, we trust a doctor not to do us deliberate injury, because we expect him or her to live by the Hippocratic oath and the standards of the medical profession.

Fukuyama points out that the Chinese have difficulty in moving to what in the Western world is known as “professional management”, due to the nature of Chinese Confucian familism. There is a very strong inclination on the part of the Chinese to trust only people related to them and, conversely, to distrust people outside their family and kinship group. In Redding’s (1990) study of Hong Kong businesses, he noted that the key feature would appear to be that one trusts one’s family absolutely, and trusts friends and acquaintances to the degree that mutual dependence has been established and “face” invested in them. With everyone else, one makes no assumptions about their goodwill. As the Chinese business person is looking primarily to their own (their family’s) best interests, the expectation is that others are looking primarily to their own best interest. Altruism is not widespread.

Of 20 senior managers, the return rate is listed in Table II.

Excluding the manager from Hong Kong, 55 percent of all senior managers returned questionnaires. Of the expatriate managers, 70 percent returned questionnaires; excluding Singapore, 83 percent of the expatriate managers returned the questionnaire. The low-trust level in the Chinese cultures is seems evident.

This low rate of return from the managers from PRC and non-PRC Chinese cultures calls into question the validity of testing of hypotheses comparing management groups, therefore these groups are not compared.

**Demographics**

The total sample available was 157 employees, 122 usable questionnaires were returned (see Table III). One-third of the questionnaires had at least one data item missing. To obtain factor scores, the scoring procedure from the Ohio State University Leadership Center was employed, and these factor scores were divided by the number of non-blank responses to the questions for each factor score. Factors on a questionnaire with less than three of five or eight of ten

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table II.* Managers’ return rates of questionnaire by nationality
responses marked were omitted. While not a perfect technique, sequential $t$-tests were run for the groups omitting responses to items until the differences between groups responding to all the items for a factor and the groups omitting items became non-significant at the 0.95 level of confidence. This was observed to be three of five for five-item factors and eight of ten for ten-item factors.

**Results**

The LBDQ XII was developed in the USA; Stogdill (1963) provided a set of sample results obtained by administering the questionnaire to rate the leadership behaviour of several highly selected samples of leaders in the USA: army division commanders, highway patrol police officers, air force commanders, ministers, community leaders, corporation presidents, labour union presidents, college presidents and US senators. In Table IV and Figure 1, the results of these samples are compared with the composite rating of “Ideal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>“Ideal leader” in this study</th>
<th>USA leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand reconciliation</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of uncertainty</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of structure</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of freedom</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role assumption</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production emphasis</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive accuracy</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior orientation</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Desirable leadership behaviours

Leader” from the sample in this study. From this comparison, we begin to suspect that the questionnaire might be culturally biased.

Inspection of the factor scores and chart indicate there is very little correspondence between the Chinese ratings of a hypothetical “ideal” leader and the typical leader in the USA. The implication is that the LBDQ XII factors are “Western” and USA culture-specific from the point of view of defining desirable leadership behaviours.

From this descriptive comparison, we see that the expectations of managers and supervisors in PRC hotels are quite different from the behaviour of leaders in the USA. As noted in the discussions above, inadequate cross-cultural understanding and intercultural abilities inhibit the expatriate executives’ adaptation of their leadership style to local norms and practices.

In a study of Swedish managers in Southeast Asia, Selmer (1995b) found that there were significant differences in nearly two-thirds of the investigated work-related values of middle managers employed by Swedish subsidiaries in Hong Kong, Singapore and Thailand compared to the Swedish managers’ perceptions of those values. Lawson and Swain (1985) examined the dysfunctional outcomes of dissonance between the leadership style of the expatriate executives of an Australian multinational company and the leadership traditions of the host country, Papua New Guinea, involving high labour turnover, excessive absenteeism and even riots. Zeira et al. (1975) investigated HCN employees in one foreign subsidiary in the USA and concluded that the low morale among HCN employees was the result of a non-adapted, inappropriate leadership style imposed by the expatriate managers. These findings and a wealth of similar observations, indicate that expatriate managers typically do not adapt their leadership behaviour in foreign assignments. This suggests that there could be a distinct difference between the leadership behaviour of local Chinese managers and expatriate managers in China. The questions are an attempt to examine this difference as perceived by their local subordinates.
Q1. Do the “ideal” leadership behaviour descriptions by Chinese supervisors and managers reporting to Chinese managers differ from those of Chinese supervisors and managers having expatriate managers?

Table V and Figure 2 indicate that the mean factor scores for the hypothetical “ideal manager” does not differ for the groups of employees with Chinese managers and those with expatriate managers in this sample, except for Factor 6: Tolerance of Freedom. The group with expatriate managers seems to indicate that the “ideal leader” should exhibit tolerance for freedom less frequently than the group with Chinese managers. That is, the ideal manager should be more controlling and directive. Interestingly, the group identifying themselves as having a Chinese manager indicated the “ideal leader” should exhibit Tolerance of freedom more frequently than the group with expatriate managers. This outcome could be explained by the fact that the current tendency in Western management styles is toward greater “empowerment” of subordinates. As noted, most research into management and supervision of Chinese workers indicates a desire for close supervision, fear of punishment for initiative, and so on. “Tolerance of Freedom” might not necessarily be regarded as a sign of a good manager in an authoritarian management culture where subordinates expect the manager to take the initiative, make the decisions and take action. Transferral of these activities to the subordinates may be interpreted as an attempt by the manager not to do his or her job. The possibility exists that the expatriate managers actually demonstrated tolerance of freedom more frequently than the Chinese managers did (whatever their opinions indicated by responses to the questionnaire). Perhaps those Chinese subordinates who had experienced some level of “empowerment” enjoyed it less and valued it less than their compatriots who had not experienced it. Western expatriate managers, accustomed to empowerment environments, who are working in the PRC, obviously need to carefully consider whom they “empower” and how they use their “tolerance of freedom.” The Chinese workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean for group with Chinese managers</th>
<th>Mean for group with expatriate managers</th>
<th>T-tests results (significant difference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand reconciliation</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of uncertainty</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of structure</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of freedom</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role assumption</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production emphasis</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive accuracy</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior orientation</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V. Mean factor scores for “ideal leader” for group with Chinese managers compared to group with expatriate managers for Q1
Desirable leadership behaviours

Q2. Do the “ideal” leadership behaviour descriptions of the expatriate managers from non-PRC Chinese cultures and of the indigenous Chinese managers differ?

The two groups of managers, assuming that they are representative of the total management team, are not significantly different in the mean ratings of the “Ideal Leader” for all factors (see Table VI and Figure 3). This indicates that the management team seems to have developed a cohesive culture with similar goals and behaviours. Developing a co-operative joint expatriate-indigenous team is a major objective of successful international chain-managed hotels in China; the team apparently achieved this goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean for Chinese managers</th>
<th>Mean for expatriate managers</th>
<th>T-tests results (significant difference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand reconciliation</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of uncertainty</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of structure</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role assumption</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production emphasis</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive accuracy</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior orientation</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VI.
Mean factor scores for Chinese managers compared to expatriate managers for Q2
Q3. Do the “ideal” leadership behaviour descriptions of the expatriate managers from non-PRC Chinese cultures and the non-Chinese expatriate managers differ?

This question could not be answered, as only two of the five Singapore managers participated in the study, and the Hong Kong expatriate manager may have listed his nationality as Chinese, or did not participate.

Q4. Do the “ideal” leadership behaviour descriptions of all senior managers and that of the other respondents differ?

Again, as in the testing of Q1 for Q4 only on Factor 6: “Tolerance of Freedom”, is there a clear difference between the perceptions of senior managers and that of the other employees (see Table VII and Figure 4). In apparent contradiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean for senior managers</th>
<th>Mean for other employees</th>
<th>T-tests results (significant difference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand reconciliation</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of uncertainty</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of structure</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of freedom</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role assumption</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production emphasis</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive accuracy</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior orientation</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VII. Comparison of the “ideal leader” descriptions between senior managers and all other sample respondents for Q4.
of the results in Table II, the employees seem to prefer working relationships that allow themselves greater responsibility and control over their work when compared to the managers, who seem to want closer supervision. From the complex results from ratings of this factor, it is obvious that “tolerance of freedom” is an area of mixed attitudes in the PRC.

From these results concerning “tolerance of freedom”, in this study, Chinese managers indicate on the questionnaire a desire for initiative and performance similar to expatriate managers. A major objective of the management development program of the international hotel chain is to develop effective management practices as defined by Western standards; this seems to have happened in these hotels. However, for the senior management personnel, accustomed to a high power distance, authoritarian, closely supervising style of management, the acceptance of the benefits of “empowerment” may take longer. Recognition of this fact could be a significant employee development benefit in bringing the hotels to international standards. The younger employees seem more willing to accept change and new ideas.

Q5A. The leadership behaviour of indigenous Chinese managers is not different from that of all expatriate managers as perceived by Chinese subordinates.

From the results in Table VIII (see also Figure 5) we see that the Chinese managers are rated by their subordinates as exhibiting the behaviours defining each factor significantly more often than the expatriate managers, for most leadership factors. From Table IX (see also Figure 6), we see that the Chinese managers are rated as being nearer the “ideal” leader than the expatriate managers. With the exception of “Tolerance of Uncertainty”, “Role Assumption”, and “Superior Orientation”, the differences are significant at beyond the 0.02 level, some far beyond. As the direction of the differences are positive toward the “always” level of frequency, the results indicate that, in the opinion of their subordinates, the Chinese managers in
the sample exhibited the leadership behaviours identified as desirable on the questionnaire more frequently than the expatriate managers.

An explanation of these results could be that the expectations and behaviour of managers trained and experienced in the communist/socialist environment of the past 50 years in China have assumed a laissez-faire attitude toward subordinate performance. Perhaps realising that the CCP has a far greater influence on their future than the employees and expatriates in a joint-venture company. In a study by Chow (1992), of managers in Henan Province (the province in which the hotels are located), he found that 97 percent of the managers were “far more concerned” about advancement in the party than with managing their enterprise. The managers attached most importance to
“maintaining contacts with the party representative in the organisation” and “to seeing that the employees have the right political attitude”. Chow suggests that senior Chinese managers feel obliged to give most attention to relations with their higher administrative authorities. Middle managers are more concerned with maintaining their good standing with the enterprise party secretary who continues to exert influence over personnel matters, where the political attitude of employees still counts. Additionally, most enterprises were considerably overstaffed, so high production per employee was not required. Consequently, the managers paid little attention to supervision and management, and for the most part, workers were allowed to work (or not work) as they pleased.

### Table IX.
Comparisons of mean factor score ratings by their subordinates of Chinese managers and expatriate managers and the hypothetical “ideal manager” for Q5B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Ideal leader</th>
<th>Chinese leader</th>
<th>Expatriate leader</th>
<th>Ideal vs Chinese T-test</th>
<th>Ideal vs Expatriate T-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand reconciliation</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.0009*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of uncertainty</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.8E-009*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.0003*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of structure</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>5.0E-008*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of freedom</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.0006*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role assumption</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.0002*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.0E-005*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production emphasis</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.0028*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive accuracy</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.0002*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.5E-007*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior orientation</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.0057*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6.**
Chart comparing mean factor score ratings by their subordinates of Chinese managers and expatriate managers and the hypothetical “ideal manager” for Q5B
The expatriate managers, on the other hand, are evaluated by the international hotel chain, and are highly motivated to develop a staff that can successfully operate hotels to international standards. Income, promotion, and continued employment are on the line. As a result, the expatriate managers could be more demanding and, in fact, supervise the supervisors more closely than indigenous managers.

Q5B. The subordinates' ratings of the leadership behaviour of indigenous Chinese managers is not different than for the “ideal leader”, and the subordinates’ ratings of the leadership behaviour of expatriate managers is not different than for the “ideal leader”.

From the results in Table IX, we see that the subordinates rated their Chinese managers as not significantly different from the “ideal leader” on all factors except “Tolerance of uncertainty” and “Persuasiveness”. These factors are operationalised by the questionnaire items in the following sub-sections.

**Factor 3: Tolerance of uncertainty**

“Tolerance of uncertainty”, depicts to what extent the manager is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or getting upset:

1. Waits patiently for the results of a decision.
2. Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next (reverse scored).
3. Accepts defeat in stride.
4. Accepts delays without becoming upset.
5. Becomes anxious when waiting for new developments (reverse scored).
6. Can wait just so long, then blows up (reverse scored).
7. Remains calm when uncertain about coming events.
8. Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs.
9. Worries about the outcome of any new procedure (reverse scored).

This is an interesting factor. One could argue that “tolerance for uncertainty” could be construed by subordinates as the leader being somewhat unconcerned and non-aggressive in solving the business problems of the group, and therefore not sufficiently task-oriented. We of course want our leaders to be task-oriented. The fact that this factor has the lowest rating of all could support this conclusion. Both the Chinese and expatriate managers were rated as being significantly lower than the “ideal” manager on this factor.

**Factor 4: Persuasiveness**

“Persuasiveness” measures to what extent the manager uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions. [Comment by author: Obviously the abilities to demonstrate the qualities specified in these questions
are highly dependent on language skills and on the leader and led having a common language.

3. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group.
13. His/her arguments are convincing.
23. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view.
33. Is a very persuasive talker.
43. Is very skilful in an argument.
53. Is not a very convincing talker (reverse scored).
63. Speaks from a strong inner conviction.
73. Is an inspiring talker.
83. Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage.
93. Can inspire enthusiasm for a project.

Both the Chinese and expatriate manager groups were rated as demonstrating these behaviours significantly less frequently than the “ideal” manager, with the expatriates, more than half of whom did not speak fluent Mandarin Chinese, being very significantly lower. A low score on this factor could result from poor language skills, and also from poor leadership skills, where the leader did not take the time and make the effort to be persuasive, but commanded rather than convinced, using an authoritarian leadership style. (As a participant-observer in the study, the author believes the latter situation to have existed, leading to the lower scores.)

An international hotel is a 24-hours-per-day, seven-days-per-week, continuous process operation, frequently generating high stress. Most managers have needs to be able to forecast business outcomes with some degree of certainty, and to be provided with information allowing accurate forecasts. They also need to have the personnel resources available according to schedules to meet business demands at a high level of service.

On the other hand, modern Chinese workers in the PRC do not have a strong, widely held work ethic, and work attendance, work performance, and work quality are not their highest concerns (which we might expect in a Confucian society). This dissonance between the needs of the managers and behaviour of the employees can lead to frustration and an increased intolerance for uncertainty.

As for “Persuasiveness”, difficulties in persuading could stem from language difficulties. Additionally, as noted, the relationship between leader and led, manager and managed is a paternalistic relationship in Confucian societies, and supervisor and supervised perhaps more of an older-brother/older-sister to younger/brother-sister relationship. While the local Chinese managers fall into this role with the ease and familiarity of their native culture, this kind of relationship in these business environments is not common in non-Asian environments. The expatriate managers would exhibit alien behaviours to their subordinates, with emphasis on work-oriented behaviours rather than relationship-oriented
behaviours. Managers demonstrating very high relationship and very high task orientations together are, not surprisingly, more successful in China and elsewhere.

Considering human resource development, as a further departure from non-Chinese practices, Hofstede (1989, 1994), McKenna (1998) and Bond and Hwang (1993) believe that for Chinese managers “coaching” is akin to paternalism; it is essentially a dependent relationship, which reflects Hofstede’s individualism-collectivism index. We would expect individualist-oriented managers to desire to help those they manage to become more independent, while more collectivist-oriented managers may view a “coaching” role more in terms of looking after their staff. From Bond and Hwang, quoted earlier: “subordinates in Chinese groups prefer a leadership style in which the leader maintains a harmonious, considerate relationship with the followers and defines clear-cut tasks for each member of the group” and “It seems that Chinese prefer an authoritarian leadership style in which a benevolent and respected leader is not only considerate of his followers, but also able to take skilled and decisive action”.

We see in these hotels a management team that seems to have developed congruent values in terms of the leadership behaviours measured by the LBDQ XII. However, the actual demonstration of these behaviours in the work environment seems to be different between expatriates and indigenous managers, at least in the eyes of the supervisory personnel in the hotels.

Supervisors desire more freedom to do their work, less supervision, than they seem to be getting. This could be due to a belief on the part of managers that the supervisors cannot perform at a high enough level, a lack of trust of the supervisors in terms of reliability, or an inability on the part of the managers to effectively train and develop empowered employees.

Both groups of managers exhibit a low level of tolerance of uncertainty, perhaps due to the conflict of Confucian/socialist/communist work ethic, and the continuous demands of operating an international hotel.

**Selmer’s comparable study in Hong Kong**

Selmer (1996) published a study of Hong Kong managers who had experience with both expatriate and Chinese managers. He administered the LBDQ XII, the English-language version, to a sample of subordinates who were graduates of a university business programme taught in English at the Hong Kong Baptist University.

The sample in the study reported in this paper was primarily graduates of Chinese Middle Schools and professional institutes, with nine college or university graduates in the entire sample. Additionally, the percentage of the subjects in the PRC sample who had travelled outside China, or even travelled widely inside China, was negligible. It is problematic to consider these two samples as comparable; in fact, they are not. Nonetheless, as both studies are exploratory in intent, the paired ratings of the “ideal” leader for the two samples are presented in Table X and Figure 7.

We observe relatively large differences in “Tolerance of uncertainty” (Hong Kong higher), “Tolerance of freedom” (Hong Kong higher), “Consideration” (Hong Kong higher), and “Production emphasis” (PRC higher).
For “Tolerance of uncertainty”, with the “ideal” Hong Kong manager expected by subordinates to be tolerant of uncertainty more frequently, reviewing the definition: “depicts to what extent the manager is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or getting upset”, speculation could lead us to conclude that in the PRC culture, where all decisions are the prerogative of the manager/leader, proof of technical competence would require that the manager be “certain” of his or her decisions.

[Author’s note: At the risk of sounding condescending, from living and working in the PRC, the author has observed that the PRC is certainly a land of rule by person rather than by law, exhibiting uncertainty is a sign of extreme weakness. With the well-known controlled and manipulated public information in China, leading to universal mistrust of the source and content, one can carry the day in an argument, discussion, or decision-making situation by merely exhibiting absolute certainty that one is correct, regardless of information. Local re-interpretation of the intent of laws to the personal benefit of bureaucrats is
pandemic. One is reminded of a line in a Marx Brothers’ movie by Chico Marx when he is found in flagrante delicto with another man’s wife, “Who are you going to believe, me or your eyes”. one occasionally hears a reference in the country to the PRC as “The land of the uninformed informing the uninformed.”]

Again we find an observed difference in “Tolerance of freedom”, with the Hong Kong sample rating the “ideal” leader as demonstrating this trait more often than the PRC sample. Obviously, a group of business graduates from a programme taught in English in a Hong Kong university can be expected to demonstrate more “Western” attitudes than PRC middle school and technical school graduates.

There is an observed difference on Factor 8, “Consideration”, with the Hong Kong subordinates rating this characteristic as more desirable than the PRC subordinates. Reviewing the definition: “depicts to what extent the manager regards the comfort, well-being, status and contributions of followers”. In the Confucian culture, acceptance of inequality by subordinates is the norm. Perhaps the Western-university-trained subordinates in Hong Kong have come to expect more.

Additionally, there is an interesting observed difference on Factor 9, “Production emphasis”, with the “ideal” manager defined by the PRC subordinates expected to demonstrate this trait more frequently than the “ideal” manager defined by the Hong Kong subordinates. A possible explanation is that the “work ethic” is more developed and widespread in traditionally capitalistic and entrepreneurial Hong Kong than in the socialist/communist PRC. The “production emphasis” behaviour may not be necessary. As this factor is related to the practice of “empowerment”, we expect Hong Kong university graduates to be more desirous of being empowered, without supervisory emphasis. Again, this is speculation.

In Figure 8a (see also Table XI) we see that the Hong Kong subordinates rated their expatriate managers as demonstrating the traits more frequently than their Hong Kong Chinese managers, with the exception of “Production emphasis”, where the Hong Kong Chinese were higher. When considering that this sample had been trained in a Western-style university business programme, and the LDBQ developed in a Western culture, this should not be surprising.

In Figure 8b, comparing subordinates’ ratings of Hong Kong managers and PRC managers, the delta of in the differences in factor scores is very similar, with the PRC managers being rated by their subordinates as demonstrating the traits measured by the LDBQ much more frequently than the managers rated by their Hong Kong subordinates.

Considering this observation from knowledge of the characteristics of Confucian cultures, in such cultures managers and leaders are to be respected, obeyed, and not questioned. Such an attitude will produce generally higher ratings of managers in such cultures, compared to most non-Confucian cultures. We could conclude that the business culture in Hong Kong is more Westernised, less Confucian than in the PRC. In Figure 8c we see a similar result, possibly for the same reason.

From Figure 9, it appears evident that the LDBQ XII is not a normative instrument. If the questionnaire has use in cross-cultural studies, it is as a comparison of cultures on the set of factors the LDBQ purports to measure.
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Figure 8.
Chart comparing the results of Selmer's (1996) study between indigenous managers and expatriate managers in Hong Kong and the PRC.
Relation to the GLOBE project leadership construct definitions

The GLOBE dimensions selected on the basis of a review of the literature relevant to the measurement of culture in previous large-sample studies and on the basis of existing cross-culture theory are discussed below, with an assessment of the results of this study:

1. Are there leader behaviours, attributes and organisational practices that are universally accepted and effective across cultures? In this study, the traditionally observed generic behaviours of task-orientation and group-nurturance were noted.

2. Are there leader behaviours, attributes, and organisational practices that are accepted and effective in only some cultures? The factor “Tolerance of freedom”, with an implied tendency toward “empowerment” was observed.

Table XI.
Comparison with the results of Selmer’s (1996) study between indigenous Chinese managers and expatriate managers in Hong Kong and the PRC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>“Ideal” leader Hong Kong</th>
<th>“Ideal” leader PRC</th>
<th>HK expat</th>
<th>HK manager</th>
<th>PRC manager</th>
<th>PRC expat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Representation</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demand reconciliation</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of uncertainty</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Persuasiveness</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Initiation of structure</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tolerance of freedom</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role assumption</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Consideration</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Production emphasis</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Predictive accuracy</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Integration</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Superior orientation</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.
Comparison of ratings of “ideal” leaders in Hong Kong and the PRC and ratings of leaders in the USA
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to be not well accepted by PRC employees or PRC managers. This is a well-accepted employee motivator and performance enhancer in the USA. The factor “Tolerance of uncertainty” was rated by subordinates to be a desirable behaviour, with the “ideal” leader expected to demonstrate the behaviour significantly more frequently than the PRC or expatriate managers in this study.

(3) How do attributes of societal and organisational cultures affect the kinds of leader behaviours and organisational practices that are accepted and effective? In this study, we found that in the PRC, if one wishes to implement an empowered employee environment, careful attention must be paid to the management of the behaviours defined in the “Tolerance of freedom” factor on the LBDQ XII. The Confucian cultural requirement for unquestioned demonstration of respect for and unquestioned obedience to one’s manager/leader can lead to confusion and role conflicts on the part of subordinates. Also, attempting to delegate authority in the PRC can lead to the opinion that the manager/leader is not carrying out his required job tasks.

(4) What is the effect of violating cultural norms relevant to leadership and organisational practices? This item in the GLOBE list seems highly related to item (3).

(5) What is the relative standing of each of the cultures’ studies on each of the nine core dimensions of culture? From this study, taking the data from the description of the “ideal” leader:

- **Uncertainty avoidance**: with “Tolerance of uncertainty” receiving a score of 3.5 of 5.0, the lowest rating of the 12 LDBQ factors, it appears that subordinates in the PRC are high on uncertainty avoidance.
- **Power distance**: High power distance has been demonstrated repeatedly in studies of China and Chinese.
- **Collectivism I**: Societal emphasis on collectivism: again, repeatedly demonstrated.
- **Collectivism II**: Family collectivistic practices: also repeatedly demonstrated.
- **Gender egalitarianism**: While not measured by the LDBQ XII, the PRC is led by older men, with rare token women in positions of power.
- **Assertiveness**: The factors of “Persuasiveness” (4.3 of 5.0), “Initiation of structure (4.4 of 5.0), and “Role assumption” (3.9 of 5.0), as components of Assertiveness, all of which receive relatively high scores. The Ideal manager in the PRC seems to be high in assertiveness.
- **Future orientation**: While not measured by the LDBQ, the studies by Bond and Hofstede demonstrated Chinese cultures to be high in the characteristic.
• **Performance orientation:** With a score of 4.2 of 5.0, the factor of “Production emphasis” has a moderately high score. However, the importance of a job and work in Chinese life is certainly lower than in the West.

• **Humane orientation:** While “Humane orientation” is a tenet of the ideal Confucian leader, per Confucius, at 3.8 of 5.0, the “Consideration” factor received a relatively low score for the “Ideal” PRC leader.

(6) Can the universal and culture-specific aspects of leader behaviours, attributes, and organisational practices be explained in terms of an underlying theory that accounts for systematic differences across cultures? The author does not see any existing “theory” of leadership that adequately explains or predicts leadership skills at the present time.

**Discussion of conclusions**

The review of the literature and the results of this study indicate that additional leadership factors beyond the LBDQ factors are important. Of particular interest would be the addition of a factor estimating Fukyama’s concept of “Trust”, as having a significant “Hawthorne effect”, decreasing the numbers participating in the study, and probably having an influence on the leadership ratings by suspicious subjects.

From this study:

• Subordinates with expatriate supervisors indicate that the “ideal leader” should demonstrate “Tolerance for freedom” less frequently than do subordinates with Chinese managers. The implication is that after experiencing “empowerment”, Chinese subordinates may desire a return to close, highly directive supervision requiring them to demonstrate little initiative, a comfortable, non-demanding environment consistent with their experience in the socialist/communist work culture.

• In comparisons of two widely-divergent samples from Hong Kong and China, assuming that the PRC is more steeped in Confucian culture than Hong Kong, PRC subordinates may tend to rate all managers and leaders highly to demonstrate their respect.

• It does not appear that the LBDQ XII, in its present form, is a sufficient instrument for comparing leadership skills across cultures, but has value in comparing ratings of leadership behaviours across cultures on the set of factors measured.

Several implications, both for practitioners and researchers of international management, may be drawn from the findings of this study and Selmer’s 1996 study. First, it appears that the LBDQ XII is not a normative device for estimating leadership skills across cultures, but has some use in actually comparing the 12 factors between cultures. However, we have the difficult problem of what factors, or traits, should be included, and whether or not the LBDQ XII defines the 12 most important factors; perhaps not. Guidelines for
expatriate manager training and counselling may be developed using the LBDQ “ideal” scores for an organisation to which he or she will be assigned. Second, it seems obvious that “ideal” leader behaviour varies from culture to culture, at least when comparing Greater China cultures and “Western” cultures, and perhaps even PRC and Hong Kong cultures. We are not surprised at this outcome, as practically every study comparing cultures since Hofstede’s in 1980 have indicated this conclusion.

The expectation of cross-cultural validity of the LBDQ
Since the LBDQ questionnaire was developed in a Western cultural context, creating a Western bias, the normative characteristics of the instrument seem to be different in China. For example, more “Tolerance of freedom” might not necessarily be regarded as a sign of a good manager in an authoritarian management culture where subordinates expect the manager to take the initiative, make the decisions and take action. Transferral of these activities to the subordinates may be interpreted as an attempt by the manager not to do his or her job. Hence, a case can still be made for the often-mentioned need for cross-cultural training of expatriate managers.

The guiding assumption of the LBDQ XII is that there are some universally effective leader behaviours, and these can be assessed by asking subordinates about the behaviour of their immediate superiors. Stogdill (1963) attempted to expand the original theoretical structure beyond two factors of “Initiating structure” and “Consideration”, and suggested the 12 possible factors. One of the major empirical contributions from the behavioural school of leadership was the identification of two broad classes of leader behaviours, task-oriented and person-oriented behaviours, which were identified by repeated factor analyses conducted by the Ohio State group, interviews by the Michigan group, and observation of emergent leaders in laboratories by the Harvard group. We again see these two factors emerging as the predominant traits of the “Ideal leader” in the PRC. The 12 factors defined by Stogdill appear to be highly culture-specific, at least in terms of how frequently the “Ideal leader” should engage in the 12 behaviours.

The conclusion of this study is that leadership traits outside task and person orientation appear to be highly culture-specific.

A set of dimensions developed from the literature can be used to describe the ways in which cultures can differ, including: high/low context languages, time orientation, individual vs collectivist, gender, protocol, negotiation style, basis of trust, uncertainty avoidance, risk propensity, and power distance. Using the LBDQ outside of the USA, especially in China, does not appear to be appropriate for “measuring” leadership skills, but only in defining differences.

Web resource
http://www.bsos.umd.edu/psyc/hanges/globepag.htm or http://mgmt3.ucalgary.ca/web/globe.nsf/index
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