

Dutch and Polish Perceptions of Leadership and Culture: The GLOBE Project

Deanne den Hartog and Paul Koopman
Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Henk Thierry and Celeste Wilderom
Tilburg University, The Netherlands

Jerzy Maczynski and Slawomir Jarmuz
University of Wroclaw, Poland

In this paper the objectives of a new international research project that focuses on the perception of leadership across cultures will be presented. The definition of leadership will be discussed in relation to cross-cultural leadership research. The ideas and theory on which the project is based will be introduced along with several of the hypotheses the project is designed to test. Besides testing the general hypotheses, results obtained in the GLOBE study can also be used for a more focused comparison between two countries. In this paper, differences in preferred leadership attributes and national culture dimensions in The Netherlands and Poland are presented. A total of 287 Dutch managers from six organizations and 277 Polish managers from six organizations filled out questionnaires. The results indicate that Dutch and Polish cultures differ strongly on power distance, uncertainty avoidance and future orientation. Regarding preferred attributes for outstanding leadership, Polish respondents score especially high on administrative skills, vision, and diplomacy, whereas Dutch managers emphasize integrity, inspirational behavior and vision. Polish respondents are also less negative about autocratic leadership.

Leadership in organizations has become an important topic in scientific research over the last six decades. Bass (1990) and Yukl (1994) provide overviews of the many ideas, perspectives and viewpoints in the extensive amount of research and literature on leadership built up over the years. One area where new developments in studying leadership are needed, namely cross-cultural research, is

Requests for reprints should be addressed to Deanne den Hartog, Department of Work and Organizational Psychology, Vrije Universiteit, v.d. Boechorststraat 1, 1081 BT Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

discussed in this paper in relation to a new international research project on leadership, the GLOBE project. The main focus of this project is to do an extensive study of perceptions of leadership across cultures. Aside from the substantial theoretical significance for both the field of leadership and cross-cultural research, the results of the GLOBE project may have a great deal of practical relevance. An increasing amount of people are involved in cross-border operations, intercultural management or organizational leadership in cultures different from their own. The knowledge resulting from the GLOBE study will, among other things, help to select, counsel, and train individuals who work under these cross-cultural conditions (House, Hanges, & Agar, 1995). After introducing the GLOBE project, data concerning dimensions of national culture and preferred leader attributes which were gathered in six organizations in The Netherlands will be presented and compared to Polish data collected in six organizations in Poland. Although much has been written about the transition in Central or Eastern Europe, surprisingly little is known about countries such as Poland, for instance, about Polish values and management practices. Following the collapse of the communist regime after nearly 50 years of rule, Poland is currently in transition and approaching a free market economy. Poland is also in the process of establishing the institutions and legislation that are central to the democratic system. It seems likely that the years of communist rule as well as the recent transition both shaped management practices and values. The Netherlands on the other hand have a long-established and stable democratic political system and a firmly established capitalistic economy. Values and preferred management practices in The Netherlands are likely to be more firmly established and to reflect the Dutch system and stability. Comparing two European nations representing different political and economical systems is of interest to those doing business in these countries and may also increase understanding of the differences between Central European and Western European countries. Whether Poland and The Netherlands can indeed be conceived as representative for Western and Central or Eastern European cultures should be investigated in future research comparing more countries in these regions.

DEFINING A "LEADERSHIP" IN A MULTI-CULTURAL CONTEXT

"Leadership" means different things to different people. Bass (1990) states that there are almost as many ways of defining leadership as there are persons who attempted to define the concept. Definitions of leadership vary in terms of emphasis on leader abilities, personality traits, influence relationships, cognitive versus emotional orientation, individual versus group orientation, and appeal to self versus collective interests. Definitions can also vary in whether they are primarily descriptive or normative in nature as well as in their relative emphasis

on behavioural styles. Leadership is sometimes distinguished from management (e.g. Kotter, 1990; Zaleznik, 1977) or seen as one of several managerial roles (e.g. Mintzberg, 1989). Bryman (1992) states that most definitions of leadership emphasize three main elements: “group”, “influence” and “goal”. Table 1 presents several of such definitions of leadership.

As the word “leader” can be interpreted differently within a language or culture (see Table 1), one can imagine that the interpretation of the term “leader” varies even more across cultures. An extreme example is that the German word “Führer” is a literal translation of the English word “leader”. “Führer” however, has an understandably strong negative connotation in Germany, making its meaning different from the word “leader” which is interpreted in a far more positive sense in Anglo-Saxon countries. The negative historical connotations of words like “führer” are usually not the focus of the research, making this an issue that warrants attention when conducting a cross-cultural study. Even a similar interpretation of the word “leader” should not be taken for granted in cross-cultural research. Translation of questionnaire items and interview questions can thus be difficult especially because some cross-cultural differences impair trying to capture similar meaning of concepts through translation of items.

In the international GLOBE project, which will be described later, both similarities and differences in the cultural semantic definition of leadership in the participating countries are of interest. In the GLOBE study leadership is defined as: “*The ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members*”. This definition is based on extensive discussion among 84

TABLE 1
Examples of Definitions of Leadership

Several Definitions of Leadership

- Leadership is the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization (Katz & Kahn, 1978).
 - Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement (Rauch & Behling, 1984).
 - Leadership as influence processes affecting the interpretation of events for followers, the choice of objectives for the group or organization, the organization of work activities to accomplish the objectives, the motivation of followers to achieve the objectives, the maintenance of cooperative relationships and teamwork, and the enlistment of support and cooperation from people outside the group or organization (Yukl, 1994).
 - Leadership is defined in terms of a process of social influence whereby a leader steers members of a group towards a goal (Bryman, 1992).
 - Leadership is the ability of an individual to motivate others to forego self interest in the interest of a collective vision, and to contribute to the attainment of that vision and to the collective by making significant personal self-sacrifices over and above the call of duty, willingly (House & Shamir, 1993).
-

social scientists and management scholars representing 56 countries from all over the world (this discussion took place at the international meeting of GLOBE researchers and coordinating team held in August 1994 in Calgary, Canada). "While this rather abstract definition of leadership is acceptable to representatives of a wide range of cultures, the evaluative and semantic interpretation of the term leadership, and the culture specific enactments of leadership, are likely to vary by culture studied" (GLOBE, 1996, p. 4). As Smith and Bond (1993, p. 58) note: "If we wish to make statements about universal or etic aspects of social behavior, they need to be phrased in highly abstract ways. Conversely, if we wish to highlight the meaning of these generalizations in specific or emic ways, then we need to refer to more precisely specified events or behaviors". As will be discussed later, GLOBE focuses on both the universal, common or etic elements of leadership as well as on the culture-specific or emic differences.

STUDYING CULTURE-BASED DIFFERENCES IN LEADERSHIP

Yukl (1994) points out that most of the research on leadership during the past half century was conducted in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe. Hofstede (1993, p. 81) states: "In a Global perspective, US management theories contain a number of idiosyncrasies not necessarily shared by management elsewhere. Three such idiosyncrasies are mentioned: A stress on market processes, a stress on the individual and a focus on managers rather than workers". Similarly, House (1993) notes that almost all prevailing theories of leadership and most empirical evidence is rather North American in character, that is, "individualistic rather than collectivistic; emphasizing assumptions of rationality rather than aesthetics, religion, or superstition; stated in terms of individual rather than group incentives, stressing follower responsibilities rather than rights; assuming hedonistic rather than altruistic motivation and assuming centrality of work and democratic value orientation". A substantial body of cross-cultural psychological, sociological and anthropological research shows that there are many cultures that do not share these assumptions. "As a result there is a growing awareness of the need for a better understanding of the way in which leadership is enacted in various cultures and a need for an empirically grounded theory to explain differential leader behaviour and effectiveness across cultures" (House, 1993; see also Bass, 1990; Boyacigiller & Adler, 1991; Dorfman & Ronen, 1991).

In the past decade there has been a growing interest in both the similarities and the differences in leadership across cultures (Bass, 1990). Still, much research that has been conducted has been limited in scope, usually comparing leaders and leader effectiveness in two or three countries. An example is a study by Singer and Singer (1990). Presuming subordinates' leadership preferences mediate the

effectiveness of actual leader behaviour, they conducted their study in New Zealand and Taiwan and found a common preference among their respondents for transformational leadership. This preference has also been found in the United States (Bass & Avolio, 1989). An interesting example of studying cross-cultural aspects of leadership in a more elaborate project (involving approximately 25 countries) is found in the ongoing work on event management, which presents an analysis of role relationships, putting the role of leaders in the context of other sources of meaning (see, for example, Smith & Peterson, 1988; Smith, Peterson, & Misumi, 1994). In handling events, managers can use different sources of information and meaning (e.g. rules, national norms, superiors, peers, subordinates). Smith et al. (1994) show that managers in high power-distance countries (i.e. countries where a high degree of inequality among people is considered normal by the population, cf. Hofstede, 1984) report more use of rules and procedures than do managers from low power-distance countries.

PERCEPTION OF LEADERSHIP IN DIFFERENT CULTURES

Being perceived as a leader acts as a prerequisite for being able to go beyond a formal role in influencing others (Lord & Maher, 1991). Leadership perceptions can, according to Lord and Maher, be based on two alternative processes. Leadership can be *recognized* based on the fit between an observed person's characteristics with the perceivers' implicit ideas of what "leaders" are. This type of process is tied closely to categorization theory (see also Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984; Lord, Foti, & Phillips, 1982; Rosch, 1978). Alternatively, leadership can be *inferred* from outcomes of salient events. Attribution processes are crucial in these inference-based processes (Lord & Maher, 1991). A successful business "turnaround" is often quickly attributed to the high quality "leadership" of top executives or the CEO (Chief Executive Officer). Another example of such an inference-based process is that attributions of charisma to leaders are more likely when organizational performance is high (Shamir, 1992). Charismatic leadership is inferred from business success. Meindl's "romance of leadership" approach is an example of a perspective in which inference-based processes (leadership is inferred from success) are central to the conception of leadership (Meindl, 1990; Meindl, Ehrlich, & Dukerich, 1985).

This paper focuses on recognition-based processes and leadership perception. Lord et al. (1982, 1984) adapted the more general principles of categorization (see Rosch, 1978) to form "a theory of leadership categorization". Research shows that perceivers' use of categorization processes, in matching an observed person against an abstract prototype stored in memory, plays an important role in leadership perceptions. A prototype can be conceived as a collection of characteristic traits or attributes and the better the fit between the perceived individual and the leadership prototype, the more likely this person will be seen as a leader

(Gerstner & Day, 1994; see also Foti & Luch, 1992; Offermann, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994).

The way in which the social environment is seen and interpreted is strongly influenced by the cultural background of the perceiver. Similar to the variation in defining the concept of leadership itself, the attributes that are seen as characteristic or prototypical for leaders may also strongly vary in different cultures. Shaw (1990) emphasizes the relevance of cognitive categorization in the context of cross-cultural management and suggests that much comparative management research so far can be interpreted as showing culturally influenced differences in leadership prototypes. Gerstner and Day (1994) performed a study focusing on a cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. Respondents filled out a questionnaire (developed and tested only in the United States which asked respondents to assign prototypicality ratings to 59 attributes relevant to (business) leadership. They compared these prototypicality ratings from a sample of American students ($n = 35$) to small samples ($n =$ between 10 and 22) of students from seven countries outside the United States (who on average had been living in the United States for 2–5 years). They found that the traits considered to be most (as well as moderately and least) characteristic of business leaders varied by respondents' country or culture of origin. This study has obvious limitations due to the small sample sizes, using only foreign students in the sample, and using only an English-language trait-rating instrument which has not been cross-culturally validated. However, the discovery of these culture-based differences warrants further examination.

THE GLOBE STUDY

The GLOBE research project is a long-term study directed toward the development of systematic knowledge concerning how societal and organizational cultures affect leadership and organizational practices (GLOBE, 1996). Increasing the understanding of culture-based differences in leadership perception is a key issue in the GLOBE study. Approximately 60 countries from all major regions of the world are participating in this study, making it the most extensive investigation of cross-cultural aspects of leadership to date. The project was originated by Professor Robert House who is also the head of "the coordinating team" based in the United States. Besides the coordinating team, approximately 140 social scientists (co-country investigators) from around the world are responsible for managing the project and collecting data in their respective countries. The main objectives of the GLOBE study are to answer the following fundamental questions: Are there leader behaviours, that are universally accepted and effective across cultures and are there such behaviours that are differentially accepted and effective across cultures? In this study, aspects of societal cultures, and the cultures and practices of organizations in which individual respondents work, will be measured along with preferred leader

attributes. Combining the total set of preferred attributes for outstanding leadership identifies the prototype of outstanding or highly effective leaders within the different countries. The information gained through this project will be useful for understanding how leaders in various societal and organizational cultures can be effective and for identifying the constraints imposed on leaders by cultural norms, values and beliefs (House, 1993).

In the GLOBE project, a multiple-method approach is taken by combining hypothesis-testing quantitative methodology using questionnaires with qualitative methodology emphasizing ethnographic interviews, focus groups, and unobtrusive measures. The idea is that combining these approaches could lead to unique insights. Qualitative data are used, among other reasons, to try to ensure that dimensions also reflect information about leadership which may not be relevant in so-called "Western" cultures, but may be of interest in "Eastern" cultures. The qualitative description in GLOBE concerns several topics, including the cultural semantic interpretation of the term leadership mentioned earlier.

The focus in this paper is on presenting data from the quantitative study. The first phase of the quantitative study consisted of the development of the questionnaires and an extensive two-part pilot study in which the questionnaires were tested and further refined (see GLOBE, 1996). The second phase of the quantitative study involved having middle managers from three organizations in each of two (and in some countries three) industries fill out questionnaires measuring preferred leader attributes and aspects of organizational and societal culture. The next phase in the quantitative study, which has not been started yet, is aimed at identifying culture-based differences in leader behaviour and effectiveness. Besides answering the main questions in the GLOBE study, which focus on large-scale general comparisons of countries and regions from all over the world, the quantitative data gathered in this project can also be used for smaller scale in-depth comparisons between two (or more) countries using the internationally validated questionnaires. This allows for a focused comparison providing more detailed information than the general study, while being able to rely on the internationally developed and thoroughly tested questionnaires. The data presented in this paper are an example of just such a focused comparison of national culture and preferred leader attributes between The Netherlands and Poland, two of the European countries participating in the GLOBE study.

GLOBE'S THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Besides the leadership background discussed above, the theory that guides this study is a modification of Hofstede's (1984, 1991) model of cultural consequences and McClelland's theories of national economic development (1961) and human motivation (1985). Hofstede's model includes four dimensions of cultural variables: individualism versus collectivism, masculinity

versus femininity, tolerance versus intolerance of uncertainty, and power stratification versus power egalitarianism. Three dimensions were added: humanistic versus impersonal orientation, achievement orientation, and future versus present orientation (GLOBE, 1996; House, 1993). A description of these orientations can be found in Table 2.

The leader attributes measured in this study can be classified into 17 dimensions. These 17 dimensions are part of five higher-order leadership styles, the charismatic and action oriented, the bureaucratic, the considerate, the individualistic, the autocratic style (see GLOBE, 1996). As the classification into these higher-order styles has not yet been corroborated, this study will report all 17 original dimensions. A description of these dimensions can be found in Table 3.

The **central theoretical proposition** in the GLOBE study is that selected values and beliefs that distinguish a given culture are predictive of the practices of organizations of that culture, and are predictive of leader traits and behaviours that are acceptable to members of that culture and effective in that culture. Examples of hypotheses of the GLOBE study (that will be tested by the coordinating team on the complete data set in the future) are:

- Some leadership dimensions, such as integrity and charisma, will be universally endorsed.
- Preferred leader attributes will be more accurately predicted by specific organizational cultures than by national cultures or industrial sector.

TABLE 2
GLOBE's Societal Culture Dimensions, Practices and Values
(i.e. Society "as is" and Society "as should be")

Societal or National Culture Dimensions (practices and values)

Uncertainty avoidance	the extent to which a society relies on social norms and procedures to alleviate the unpredictability of future events
Gender differentiation	the extent to which a society minimizes gender role differences and stresses "masculine" or "feminine" attributes
Future orientation	the extent to which a society encourages and rewards future-oriented behaviours such as planning, investing in the future and delaying gratification
Power distance	the degree to which members of a society expect power to be shared equally
Individualism/collectivism	the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups within a society
Humane orientation	the degree to which a society encourages and rewards group members for being fair, altruistic, generous, caring and kind to others
Performance orientation	the degree to which a society encourages and rewards group members for performance improvement and excellence

TABLE 3
Leadership Attributes Measured in the GLOBE Study

<i>Leadership Characteristics or Behaviours</i>	<i>Described by leaders</i>
Performance orientation	emphasizing improvement, high performance, and excellence
Autocratic	acting autocratically, not tolerating questioning or disagreement, being domineering
Equanimity	displaying patience and a calm and modest attitude
Charismatic self-sacrifice	taking risks and making personal sacrifices for the sake of the vision
Collective	being group-oriented, collaborative, loyal and consultative
Decisiveness	being logical, determined, willful, and intuitive
Diplomatic	acting as a win-win problem solver, diplomatic, a tactful and effective bargainer
Face saver	interacting in an indirect, evasive manner to avoid conflict and maintain good relationships
Visionary	having foresight, being able to anticipate and plan ahead, prepared, visionary, and intellectually stimulating
Humane	showing compassion and being generous
Integrity	acting honestly, sincere, and being dependable and trustworthy
Risk avoider	behaving in a formal, habitual and cautious manner with a preference for regularity and routines
Isolationistic	being a "loner" who acts self-interestedly and asocially
Administrative attributes	being well organized, methodical and orderly with strong administrative skills in managing complex office work and systems
Individualistic	acting independently and autonomously without relying on others, being unique
Status conscious	being aware of others' socially accepted status and acting class consciously
Inspiration	being enthusiastic, positive, encouraging, and motivational

NATIONAL CULTURE AND PREFERRED LEADER ATTRIBUTES IN THE NETHERLANDS AND POLAND

As stated, this paper compares data from The Netherlands and Poland on societal culture and leadership and tries to explain the findings by comparing them to results from other studies and interpreting them, taking the recent developments in Eastern Europe into account. Before presenting the results, Poland and The Netherlands will briefly be described.

Poland

Although several years have passed since the breakdown of the totalitarian communist regimes of Eastern Europe, still little is known about many Central or Eastern European countries such as Poland. After the 1989 Solidarity election victory, many drastic changes took place in Poland. Table 4 presents an overview of the market reforms and changes introduced in Poland after the collapse of

communism throughout Central and Eastern Europe (see Borkowska & Kulpinska, 1995; Obloj & Thomas, 1996). The Polish economy and former state-owned firms are still in transition to meet the new demands of what Oechslin (1991) calls "the logic of the market". Changes such as private ownership of firms and abandoning of principles of guaranteed labour and full employment have dramatically influenced organizational forms, strategies and personnel management in Eastern Europe (Zinovieva, Ten Horn, & Roe, 1993).

Management under communist rule faced different challenges than management in the post-socialist society: '... breakdown of former power structures is leading to new ways of decision making and changing relationships between management and workers' (Zinovieva et al., 1993, p.1). The post-socialist society with its new market economy creates new roles to be fulfilled, new tasks to be mastered, and also creates new demands for leadership and management in Poland. Few studies on leadership and culture have been done in Poland. Maczynski, Jago, Reber, and Böhnish (1994) reported a study comparing the leadership style of Austrian, American, and Polish managers on data gathered before the transition in Poland, showing that Polish managers were relatively autocratic. Jago, Maczynski, and Reber (1996) present data gathered from Polish managers before (in 1988) and after (in 1993 and 1994) market economy reforms, revealing that management practices remain relatively autocratic although they observed an incremental change towards greater use of subordinate consultation. Martan (1993) suggests that economic reform depends on a change in the mentality of managers and workers, and that this change requires time. After a few years, the problem of reforming the system ceases to exist, since the system itself is no longer in place. However, the change in mentality has not kept pace, and this change requires far more time. Martan also states that the people's mentality which was shaped in the period the former system functions, is a legacy of this system and that this mentality has yet to change. Maczynski et al. (1993a,

TABLE 4
Changes Introduced in Poland after the Collapse of Communism

The Set of Changes in Poland Introduced in 1989–1990

- An austerity programme was introduced to fight the huge inflation of almost 900%.
 - Interest rates were raised tenfold (to 120%).
 - Polish currency was made internationally convertible.
 - A privatization programme of Polish state-owned firms was started.
 - Price controls were lifted.
 - Almost a million new ventures were established.
 - Subsidies for the state-owned firms were abandoned.
 - Traditional export markets in Eastern Europe and especially Russia collapsed, and trade ties with these former communist countries were severed (Comecon).
-

1993b, 1994) note that exhaustive centralized planning caused a lack of responsibility in behaviour and decision-making, demonstrated by both managers and subordinates. Factors such as the centralized control of economic undertakings, highly directive systems, excessive bureaucracy and the passive attitude of employees all contributed to managerial autocracy. The comparative research by Jago et al. (1996) shows the espoused changes in mentality are indeed occurring, but they are, at least where participative management is concerned, occurring at very slow pace.

Obloj and Thomas (1996) present several case studies focusing on the strategies of successful Polish firms. One of their conclusions is that there was: ‘... a cultural gap between the top management and the rest of the employees. Top management is clearly in charge, controls the information flows and makes the decisions. They do not engage with employees in mission building exercises; teams are a rarity, consultants are used sparsely and for particular purposes’ p. 475). They go on to state that employee involvement in the development and even execution of strategy was limited and contained. ‘Therefore, while top management understands very well the complex and competitive world ... employees do not yet follow or understand and in some of those companies it begets frustration and a lack of goodwill among the rank and file, and middle management’ (p. 475).

Little is known about how Eastern European nations “score” on national culture dimensions such as those developed by Hofstede. Hofstede (1993) *estimates* that Russia would score relatively high on power distance and uncertainty avoidance, low on masculinity and long-term orientation, and medium on individualism. Trompenaars (1993), who uses somewhat different dimensions to describe culture, does measure individualism and collectivism. In his database, Eastern European countries (including Poland) score relatively low on individualism. Presenting Polish scores on national culture dimensions and comparing them to scores obtained on the same questions in The Netherlands could provide more insight into Polish societal values at this moment, which may perhaps even, to a certain extent, be generalized to other Central European countries.

The Netherlands

Regarding national culture as measured by the Hofstede dimensions, The Netherlands score high on individualism, low on power distance and masculinity and medium on uncertainty avoidance and long-term orientation (Hofstede, 1984, 1991, 1993). Hofstede (1993) describes the basic management principle in The Netherlands to be a need for consensus among all parties, neither predetermined by a contractual relationship, nor by class distinctions, but based on an open-ended exchange of views and a balancing of interests. This predisposition seems to be reflected in government, as The Netherlands have

been governed by the careful balancing of interests in a multi-party system for years.

Hofstede (1993) contrasts The Netherlands with the United States. According to Hofstede, leadership in The Netherlands presupposes modesty, whereas leadership in the United States presupposes assertiveness. Comparing ideal jobs as described by American and Dutch business students, Hofstede reports that Americans attach more value to aspects such as earnings, advancement benefits, employment security and a good working relationship with their boss than the Dutch. The Dutch attach more importance to being consulted by their boss about decisions, freedom to adopt their own approach to the job, contributing to the success of the organization, training opportunities, fully using their skills and abilities, and helping others. Findings from the aforementioned event management study also indicate a strong preference of managers in The Netherlands to involve subordinates and rely on their own experience in decision making rather than the use of formal rules. In contrast, managers in high power-distance countries report more use of rules and procedures as guides for decision making (Koopman & De Jong, 1994; Smith et al., 1994). In a study on preferred leader attributes for leaders at two different levels in the organization, a representative Dutch sample emphasized the importance of characteristics such as reliability, communication skills, and inspirational behaviour for leaders at both levels. Besides these, to be a good top-manager, one would need vision, a long-term orientation, persuasiveness, courage, and diplomacy, whereas lower-level managers ought to be participative, compassionate, and have social skills. In a small sample from Russia, relatively high scores on team building, diplomacy and self-knowledge were found. These last two might be important characteristics to survive in the current transition which is accompanied by high levels of uncertainty (Koopman, Den Hartog, Van Muijen, Thierry, & Wilderom, 1996). Inspirational and visionary dimensions of leadership are hypothesized to be "universals" in the GLOBE study, and were found to be important for Dutch leaders in the aforementioned study by Koopman et al. (1996). Research shows that transformational or inspirational leadership is indeed found in The Netherlands (Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). An emphasis on the importance of these dimensions for outstanding leadership is therefore expected for the Dutch managers.

Although little is known about Polish national culture in terms of the dimensions measured here, following Hofstede's estimates for Russia it seems likely that Poland will score higher on both power distance and uncertainty avoidance and lower on individualism than The Netherlands. In Hofstede's terms, The Netherlands are supposed to be a "feminine" country, thus we expect femininity to be higher in The Netherlands. Also, the current period of transition in Poland may lead to a focus on the present rather than the future in the practices, or the society "as is" part of the future-present orientation (this does not necessarily hold for the values; the society "as should be" part).

With regard to leadership, again little is known about Polish managers and especially about preferred leader attributes in Poland. Under the former communist system the combination of a centralized, directive, and enormous bureaucracy and the passive attitude of subordinates produced managers who behaved in the same way they themselves were treated by their managers—that is, in a highly autocratic fashion. This was not only the norm, it was the expectation held by all involved (see Maczynski et al., 1994). Comparing these findings and those of Jago et al. (1996) concerning autocratic leader behaviour with the Dutch emphasis on consultation, we expect a less negative attitude of Polish managers towards autocratic leader behaviours and characteristics as compared with Dutch managers. We would also expect the former communist system and transition period to lead to a less negative attitude towards risk avoiding behavior and the (former) excessive bureaucracy to a more positive appreciation of administrative skills. The findings by Koopman et al. (1996), in a Russian sample, suggest that diplomacy is more important in Central or Eastern European countries. Being diplomatic was probably a necessary attribute to survive in the managerial ranks of the communist bureaucratic system, thus it seems likely that diplomacy is also valued more highly in Poland than in The Netherlands.

METHOD

Sample

In both countries, middle managers (defined as managers having at least two hierarchical levels below and above them) of six different organizations in two industries (financial and food processing) participated in the study. Managers were randomly divided into two groups and filled out a questionnaire either measuring societal culture and preferred leader attributes, or measuring organizational culture and preferred leader attributes. In this study the results for societal culture and leadership are presented. A total of 287 Dutch managers participated (287 filled out the leadership questionnaire, 146 of them filled out the national culture questionnaire), and a total of 277 Polish managers participated (277 filled out the leadership questionnaire, 143 of them filled out the national culture questionnaire).

Questionnaire

Scales used in this study are based on an extensive two-part pilot study (see GLOBE, 1996). Questionnaire items were translated from English to Polish and to Dutch and backtranslated. Backtranslations were checked by the American coordinating team. Examples of items used to assess societal culture dimensions and preferred leader attributes can be found in Fig. 1 (culture) and Fig. 2 (leadership).

All items are scored on seven-point scales. The scale anchors vary—examples are provided below. The questionnaire consists of two parts, a societal practices part, asking about society “as is” and a values part, asking about how things “should be”. There are 73 items in total. Most items have two versions, “as is” and “as should be”; (r) means reverse coded. Examples of practices and value items for three culture dimensions are given below.

Uncertainty avoidance Practices (4 items) example:

This society has rules or laws to cover (r):
 1 = almost all situations; 4 = some situations;
 7 = very few situations

Values (5 items) example:

I believe that society should have rules or laws to cover (r):
 1 = almost all situations; 4 = some situations;
 7 = very few situations

Future perspective

Practices (5 items) example:

In this society the accepted norm is to (r):
 1 = plan for the future; 7 = accept the status quo

Values (9 items) example:

I believe that the accepted norm in this society should be to (r):
 1 = plan for the future; 7 = accept the status quo

Power distance

Practices (5 items) example:

In this society, a person’s influence is based primarily on:
 1 = one’s ability to contribute to the society
 7 = the authority of one’s position

Values (4 items) example:

I believe that a person’s influence in this society should be based primarily on:
 1 = one’s ability to contribute to the society;
 7 = the authority of one’s position

FIG. 1. Sample items of the societal culture questionnaire.

The leadership items consisted of behavioural and trait descriptors (e.g. nurturing) followed by a short description of the attribute (see below). These items were rated on seven-point Likert-type scales ranging from the low (undesirable point) of “This behaviour or characteristic greatly inhibits a person from being an outstanding leader”. Examples are:

Visionary	=	has a vision and imagination of the future
Just	=	Acts according to what is right or fair
Calm	=	Not easily distressed
Bossy	=	Tells subordinates what to do in a commanding way

FIG. 2. Sample items of leadership scales.

Data-analysis

T-tests were done to assess whether found differences between the Dutch and Polish scale means of culture dimensions and leadership attributes were significant. As sample sizes were rather large and almost equal, even large differences in variance between the two groups were not likely to affect conclusions. Still, homogeneity tests were conducted to indicate when the Dutch and Polish variances could be treated as equal and pooled. For the scales for which the homogeneity test indicated that variances ought to be considered heterogeneous, the t-test formula for heterogeneous variances was used to perform the analyses. In the cases in which the f-test was not significant, the formula for homogeneous variances was used. For the culture dimensions the “within-country” differences between practices (“society as is” questions) and values (“society as should be”) were also calculated using paired-sample t-tests.

RESULTS

Table 5 presents Dutch and Polish means on the societal culture “as is” scales, the practices, results of homogeneity of variance tests, and t- and p-values, indicating which of the differences in means are significant.

Table 5 shows that all differences between Dutch and Polish means except one (individualism/collectivism) are significant at the 5% level and all but two at the 1% level. Large differences in means are especially found on future orientation (Dutch managers score a stronger future orientation); power distance (Dutch managers indicate less power distance); and uncertainty avoidance (the Dutch score higher on uncertainty avoidance).

Table 6 presents Dutch and Polish means on the societal culture “as should be” scales, the values, as well as results of t-tests, indicating which of these differences are significant.

Table 6 shows that all but two differences (future and humane orientation) are significant at the 5% (and 1%) level. The Dutch score on gender indicates that Dutch managers value “femininity” somewhat more than the Polish. Interestingly, the score for uncertainty avoidance is reversed; the Polish score much higher on

TABLE 5
Differences Between The Netherlands and Poland on Societal Culture Practices
(i.e. Society "as is")

Practices	No. of Items	NL		POL		f-values variances**	t-value	p-value***	
		Sc. mean*(sd)	Sc. mean*(sd)	Sc. mean*(sd)	Sc. mean*(sd)			1-tailed/	2-tailed
Uncertainty avoidance	4	18.77 (3.32)	14.55 (3.70)	1.24 (n.s.)	10.29	.00/.00			
Gender	9	33.37 (4.87)	35.26 (4.50)	1.17 (n.s.)	-3.39	.00/.00			
Future	5	22.99 (3.92)	15.55 (4.30)	1.20 (n.s.)	15.24	.00/.00			
Power distance	5	20.60 (4.54)	25.49 (4.15)	1.19 (n.s.)	-9.47	.00/.00			
Individualism/collectivism	4	17.84 (2.97)	18.13 (3.44)	1.34 (n.s.)	-0.76	.22/.44			
Humane orientation	5	19.21 (3.54)	18.04 (4.97)	1.98 (s.)	2.30	.01/.02			
Achievement orientation	3	12.92 (2.50)	11.66 (3.19)	1.64 (s.)	3.71	.00/.00			

The Netherlands (NL) n = 146; Poland (POL) n = 143

*Sc.mean stands for the Dutch (NL) and Polish (Pol) scale means.

**F-var presents homogeneity of variances test, if f-value is significant ($p < .01$) the variances are considered heterogeneous and the formula used in the following t-test is adapted accordingly (s. = significant; n.s. = non-significant).

***Both 1-tailed and 2-tailed p-values are presented as the direction of some differences were predicted (implying a 1-tailed test), whereas for others the direction was not predicted (implying a 2-tailed test).

TABLE 6
Differences Between The Netherlands and Poland on Societal Culture Values
(i.e. Society "as should be")

<i>Values</i>	<i>No. of Items in Scale</i>	<i>NL</i>		<i>POL</i>		<i>f-values variances **</i>	<i>t-value</i>	<i>p-value ***</i>	
		<i>Sc. mean*(sd)</i>	<i>Sc. mean*(sd)</i>	<i>Sc. mean*(sd)</i>	<i>Sc. mean*(sd)</i>			<i>1-tailed/</i>	<i>2-tailed</i>
Uncertainty avoidance	5	16.11 (4.16)	23.53 (4.21)	1.02 (n.s.)	-14.89	.00/.00			
Gender	9	42.24 (3.99)	37.00 (4.49)	1.53 (s.)	9.83	.00/.00			
Future	4	20.24 (3.16)	20.80 (4.03)	1.64 (s.)	-1.32	.00/.00			
Power distance	5	12.26 (3.54)	15.60 (4.34)	1.51 (n.s.)	-7.14	.00/.00			
Individualism/collectivism	4	18.20 (2.58)	16.17 (3.38)	1.71 (s.)	5.73	.00/.00			
Humane orientation	4	20.78 (2.93)	21.15 (2.94)	1.01 (n.s.)	-1.07	.14/.28			
Achievement orientation	4	21.95 (2.69)	24.46 (3.20)	1.41 (s.)	-7.21	.00/.00			

The Netherlands (NL) n = 146; Poland (POL) n = 143

*Sc.mean stands for the Dutch (NL) and Polish (Pol) scale means.

**F-var presents homogeneity of variances test, if f-value is significant ($p < .01$) the variances are considered heterogeneous and the formula used in the following t-test is adapted accordingly (s. = significant; n.s. = non-significant).

***Both 1-tailed and 2-tailed p-values are presented as the direction of some differences were predicted (implying a 1-tailed test), whereas for others the direction was not predicted (implying a 2-tailed test).

“as should be” uncertainty avoidance whereas they scored lower than the Dutch managers on uncertainty avoidance “as is”.

Tables 7 and 8 present results of paired samples t-tests comparing mean scores (i.e. scale mean divided by the number of items in the scale) on each practice dimension with each value dimension in The Netherlands (Table 7) and Poland (Table 8).

The only non-significant difference between the practices and values is found for the Dutch sample on individualism/collectivism. All other differences are significant. Polish managers indicate that society “as it should be” would be higher on uncertainty avoidance than it is at present, whereas the Dutch managers feel society “as should be” less uncertainty avoidance. Regarding the

TABLE 7
Comparing Values and Practices (i.e. Society “as is” and Society “as should be”) within The Netherlands

<i>The Netherlands</i> (<i>n</i> = 146)	<i>“as is”</i> mean (sd)*	<i>“as should be”</i> mean (sd)*	<i>t-value</i> (paired samples)	<i>p-value</i> (2-tailed)
Uncertainty avoidance	4.69 (.84)	3.22 (.83)	15.00	.00
Gender	3.71 (.54)	4.45 (.40)	-13.18	.00
Future	4.60 (.79)	5.06 (.79)	-5.78	.00
Power distance	4.11 (.95)	2.45 (.71)	19.33	.00
Individualism/collectivism	4.46 (.74)	4.55 (.64)	-0.09	.25
Humane orientation	3.84 (.72)	5.20 (.73)	-16.61	.00
Achievement orientation	4.31 (.84)	5.49 (.67)	-12.70	.00

*Mean stands for the scale mean divided by the number of items in the scale (i.e. item mean).

TABLE 8
Comparing Values and Practices (i.e. Society “as is” and Society “as should be”) within Poland

<i>Poland</i> (<i>n</i> = 143)	<i>“as is”</i> mean (sd)*	<i>“as should be”</i> mean (sd)*	<i>t-value</i> (paired samples)	<i>p-value</i> (2-tailed)
Uncertainty avoidance	3.64 (.93)	4.71 (.84)	-10.22	.00
Gender	3.92 (.50)	4.11 (.55)	-1.78	.00
Future	3.11 (.86)	5.20 (1.01)	-18.60	.00
Power distance	5.10 (.83)	3.12 (.87)	18.36	.00
Individualism/collectivism	4.53 (.86)	4.04 (.85)	4.51	.00
Humane orientation	3.61 (1.00)	5.29 (.74)	-15.65	.00
Achievement orientation	3.89 (1.06)	6.11 (.80)	-18.75	.00

*Mean stands for the scale mean divided by the number of items in the scale (i.e. item mean).

masculinity/femininity dimension, respondents from both countries (but especially in The Netherlands) indicate society should be somewhat more feminine and a lot more humane. In both countries, future orientation as well as achievement orientation should also be stronger. According to respondents in both countries, power distance should decrease in their society. Table 9 presents Dutch and Polish means on the preferred leader attributes scales as well as results of t-tests indicating which of these differences are significant.

Table 9 shows that most differences are significant at the 5% (and even 1%) level. Large differences are found for several preferred leader attributes. The Polish managers score much higher than the Dutch on the autocratic style, diplomatic behaviour, face saving, risk avoiding, administrative skills, status consciousness, and individualistic and isolationistic behaviour. This does not necessarily mean all these attributes are valued greatly or even regarded positively by Polish managers. It means that Dutch managers find these attributes significantly less desirable (or even more undesirable) than the Polish. Conversely, the Dutch score substantially higher on a preference for integrity, visionary leadership and inspiration as well as a humane style. The f-test for the variances in Table 9 indicates that the distribution around the mean is significantly different in 12 out of the 17 leadership dimensions. Interestingly, in all these cases Polish means have a higher variance, indicating that the Polish agree less on the desirability and undesirability of these characteristics. Polish scores on preferred leadership attributes vary more and are somewhat less extreme than Dutch scores (mean between 6.08 and 2.12 for Polish managers versus 6.52 and 1.75 for the Dutch).

Table 10 shows the scale means divided by the number of items in the scale for The Netherlands and Poland. The means are ranked (highest through lowest mean) to show profiles ranging from the most desirable attribute (inspirational behaviour in The Netherlands and administrative behaviour in Poland) to the least valued attribute for outstanding leaders (isolationistic behaviour for both). There are both interesting differences and interesting similarities in these rankings. Whereas Polish respondents find administrative attributes the most important, the Dutch managers rate integrity as the most important quality for being an outstanding leader. The ranking of vision is similar, but the ranking of inspirational behaviour is higher for Dutch respondents and diplomatic behaviour is valued more strongly by the Polish managers. At the low end of the scale, undesirable attributes are found. The same attributes (face saver, autocratic, and isolationistic) are found at the low end in both countries in a slightly different order, although the absolute scores are quite different.

DISCUSSION

Many differences can be seen between the scores of Dutch and Polish managers on societal culture dimensions as well as preferred attributes for outstanding leadership.

TABLE 9
Differences in Preferred Leader Attributes Between The Netherlands and Poland

Preferred Leader Attributes	No. of Items in Scale	NL		POL		f-values variances**	t-value	p-value***	
		Sc. mean*(sd)	Sc. mean*(sd)	Sc. mean*(sd)	Sc. mean*(sd)			1-tailed/ 2-tailed	
Performance orientation	3	17.81 (2.35)	17.54 (3.10)	1.73 (s.)	1.17	.12/.24			
Autocratic	6	12.43 (4.67)	19.25 (7.33)	2.46 (s.)	-13.12	.00/.00			
Equanimity	4	18.84 (.307)	19.92 (3.87)	1.58 (s.)	-3.66	.00/.00			
Charismatic self-sacrifice	3	14.33 (2.65)	13.81 (3.06)	1.33 (n.s.)	2.13	.02/.03			
Collective	6	32.48 (3.59)	33.18 (5.30)	2.19 (s.)	-1.82	.03/.07			
Decisiveness	4	23.40 (2.24)	23.88 (3.36)	2.23 (s.)	-1.98	.02/.05			
Diplomatic	5	27.11 (2.58)	29.87 (4.00)	2.41 (s.)	-79.70	.00/.00			
Face saver	3	6.69 (2.36)	9.31 (3.65)	2.38 (s.)	-10.1	.00/.00			
Visionary	9	56.68 (4.00)	54.06 (7.28)	3.32 (s.)	5.28	.00/.00			
Humane	2	9.96 (1.66)	8.07 (2.50)	2.27 (s.)	10.58	.00/.00			
Integrity	4	26.07 (1.93)	22.23 (3.90)	4.09 (s.)	14.75	.00/.00			
Risk avoider	5	16.08 (4.03)	19.50 (4.79)	1.41 (n.s.)	-9.18	.00/.00			
Administrative	4	21.67 (3.04)	24.30 (3.42)	1.27 (n.s.)	-9.65	.00/.00			
Isolationistic	4	6.99 (2.28)	8.46 (3.95)	3.02 (s.)	-5.42	.00/.00			
Individualistic	4	14.05 (4.09)	17.39 (4.63)	1.28 (n.s.)	-9.07	.00/.00			
Status conscious	2	7.88 (2.22)	9.03 (2.18)	1.04 (n.s.)	-6.19	.00/.00			
Inspiration	9	56.89 (3.89)	52.44 (6.80)	3.06 (s.)	9.27	.00/.00			

The Netherlands (NL) n = 287; Poland (POL) n = 277

* Sc.mean stands for the Dutch (NL) and Polish (Pol) scale means.

** f-var presents homogeneity of variances test, if f-value is significant ($p < 0.1$) the variances are considered heterogeneous and the formula used in the following t-test is adapted accordingly (s. = significant; n.s. = non-significant).

*** Both 1-tailed and 2-tailed p-values are presented as the direction of some differences were predicted (implying a 1-tailed test), whereas for others the direction was not predicted (implying a 2-tailed test).

TABLE 10
 Profiles of Preferred Leader Attributes: Rankings of Scale Means
 (Highest through Lowest) for The Netherlands and Poland

<i>Preferred Leader Attributes Profiles</i>			
<i>The Netherlands (n = 287)</i>		<i>Poland (n = 277)</i>	
	<i>Mean*</i>		<i>Mean*</i>
Integrity	6.52	Administrative	6.08
Inspiration	6.32	Visionary	6.01
Visionary	6.30	Diplomatic	5.98
Performance orientation	5.94	Decisiveness	5.97
Decisiveness	5.85	Performance orientation	5.85
Administrative	5.42	Inspiration	5.83
Diplomatic	5.42	Integrity	5.56
Collective	5.41	Collective	5.53
Self-sacrifice	4.78	Equanimity	4.98
Equanimity	4.71	Self-sacrifice	4.60
Humane	4.98	Status Conscious	4.52
Status conscious	3.94	Individualistic	4.35
Individualistic	3.51	Humane	4.04
Risk avoider	3.22	Risk avoider	3.90
Face saver	2.33	Autocratic	3.21
Autocratic	2.07	Face saver	3.10
Isolationistic	1.75	Isolationistic	2.12

*Mean stands for the scale mean divided by the number of items in the scale (i.e. item mean).

Culture

As expected, several large differences between The Netherlands and Poland were found on the culture dimensions. For future orientation, the Dutch score quite a lot higher than the Polish on the “as is” questions or practices, whereas the scores are almost equal on the “as should be” questions or values. This might reflect the situation of transition in which Poland is still engaged. The Dutch managers can look further ahead than their Polish counterparts at this time, because the turbulent and highly uncertain situation in Poland calls for an orientation on the present and near future rather than looking further ahead. The high-value score (“as should be”) on uncertainty avoidance by the Polish as opposed to the low current uncertainty avoidance (“as is”) score, also seems to reflect this situation. Polish managers answer that society should have more rules and traditions, offer more stability and security.

As expected, the Dutch score much lower on power distance, both on the “as is” and “as should be” questions. This was expected, as The Netherlands has typically scored low on power distance. Also, Hofstede (1993) expected a large

power distance for Russia. This is in line with studies in Poland that found an emphasis on autocratic leadership (Jago et al., 1996; Obloj & Thomas, 1996) as well as the preferred leader attributes found here, showing a less negative attitude towards autocratic leadership in Poland.

Not expected were the results on the individualism/collectivism dimension, showing that Dutch and Polish societal culture hardly differ on the individualism/collectivism dimension. The Polish managers score especially high on valued individualism, stating that society should be more individualistically oriented. This highly-espoused individualism may reflect the current change in which a highly collective system is being replaced by a more individualistic system. The Dutch were expected to score high on individualism. Comparison to other countries can reveal whether the Dutch score on individualism is indeed high from a global point of view. If so, the Polish culture score is an unexpected result, and further research into the individualism versus collectivism in Central and Eastern European nations would be beneficial.

Interestingly, the Dutch managers are less feminine on the practices dimension, but for the values dimension a stronger preference for femininity is found. This seems to imply that Polish managers value assertiveness, dominance, and aggression more than the Dutch, even though in practice this is not reflected (yet). The achievement orientation shows a similar pattern. The Dutch managers score higher on achievement orientation "as is", whereas the Polish managers score higher on achievement orientation "as should be".

Preferred Leadership

Some interesting differences are found on the preferred leader attributes in The Netherlands and Poland. In line with what was mentioned above, the Polish respondents have a considerably less negative attitude towards autocratic leader behaviour, although autocratic behaviour is not considered desirable. Also, maybe reflecting the valued uncertainty avoidance or the strong bureaucratic tradition, the Polish managers have a more positive attitude towards risk avoidance and administrative skills (such as being orderly). Administrative skills are valued highest of all leader attributes in Poland (whereas they are sixth in the Dutch ranking). In line with the difference in power distance, status consciousness is also less negatively valued in Poland than in The Netherlands. Polish managers also rank diplomacy as important to be an outstanding leader, whereas the Dutch stress this quality somewhat less strongly. This might be a result of the careful balancing act managers have to perform within the organizations of the former socialist societies. In the aforementioned study by Koopman et al. (1996) a difference between The Netherlands and Russia on the value of diplomacy was also found. In this small study it was also found that the characteristic "reliable" was seen as a lot more important for being a good leader in The Netherlands than in Russia.

In the current study there is a large difference in the rating of “integrity”, which is valued much stronger in The Netherlands than in Poland. These findings may reflect that for integrity to become an essential characteristic for good leadership, a general situation which allows for integrity is necessary. In a situation in which the implicit norm is that “the system comes first”, values such as “integrity” can be at odds with that system. The political and economical system in Poland used to employ a wide range of punishments when displayed values and behaviours differed too strongly from those imposed and reinforced by that system.

Another interesting difference is that the Dutch value charismatic dimensions, especially inspirational behaviour in their leaders. Visionary qualities score high in both countries (a little higher in The Netherlands). In the GLOBE study, integrity and charismatic qualities are expected to be universally endorsed (see also House et al., 1995). This study, involving two countries, shows that although in both countries these dimensions are indeed rated positively. Their relative importance is quite different. Inspirational behaviour and integrity are considered substantially less important in the Polish sample. From the top three attributes in the profiles presented, it can be seen that a Polish outstanding leader has excellent administrative skills, and thus such a leader is orderly, well-organized, and a good administrator. The outstanding leader shows visionary qualities, in terms of having foresight, being prepared and having an attractive vision, and being able to anticipate. This leader also behaves diplomatically and is a tactful win-win problem solver. In contrast, according to respondents, a Dutch outstanding leader needs integrity and is first and foremost trustworthy, honest, and dependable. Also, such a leader shows inspirational behaviour by encouraging subordinates, being an enthusiastic and motivational morale booster, and is visionary, again in terms of having foresight and vision, being prepared and able to anticipate.

The Dutch score lower on the “individualistic” leadership items. The Dutch also score as less individualistic on the values part of the culture dimension of individualism/collectivism. However, this lower leadership score is probably not only related to the culture dimension but also might have to do with the content of the leadership items (autonomous, individualistic, independent, unique). These items might reflect the image of a leader who is at a distance from subordinates, does not consult them, and so on. This approach is not valued by the Dutch, and fits better with the Polish autocratic style of this moment. Another interesting aspect in this respect is that there is no significant difference between Polish and Dutch scores on “collectivistic” leadership items. The content of these (such as group-oriented, consultative, mediator, collaborative) in part suggests “participation in decision making and consultation” which, as was mentioned before, has been identified as an important feature of Dutch management and leadership. Perhaps individualistic and collectivistic leadership items do not only reflect the culture dimension of individualism/collectivism but also the dimension of power distance. The fact that for dimensions the variance in Poland is higher seems to imply there is a less uniform idea about what outstanding

leadership entails in Poland than in The Netherlands. This might be a consequence of the aforementioned change in mentality which accompanies the transition period in Poland and a realization that different skills are necessary for leaders in the new system.

Summary

Regarding the practices (societal culture “as is”), large differences in means are especially found on future orientation (Dutch higher); power distance (Dutch lower); uncertainty avoidance (Dutch higher); and individualism/collectivism (Dutch more individualistic). On the value dimensions, differences for power distance and individualism/collectivism are in the same direction as the practices. Interestingly, the score for uncertainty avoidance is reversed for the value dimension. The Polish managers score much higher on uncertainty avoidance “as should be” whereas they scored lower than the Dutch managers on uncertainty avoidance “as is”. Consideration of the “top three” leadership dimensions in both rankings shows that according to the respondents, a Polish outstanding leader has excellent administrative skills, shows visionary qualities, and behaves diplomatically. Respondents feel a Dutch outstanding leader needs integrity, shows inspirational behaviour, and has visionary qualities. Regarding the absolute differences, the Polish managers score much higher than the Dutch managers on administrative skills, diplomatic behaviour status consciousness, individualistic behaviour, face saving, risk avoiding, the autocratic style, and isolationistic behaviour. The Dutch score substantially higher on a preference for integrity, inspiration, and a humane style.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this article was twofold. Its first purpose was to introduce the GLOBE project to the European forum of work and organizational psychologists as a new and interesting research effort focusing on the cross-cultural study of leadership through multiple methods and at multiple levels of analysis. It seems likely that the results from the GLOBE project will profoundly influence the cross-cultural study of organizational behaviour and especially leadership. The second purpose of this paper was to compare in more detail dimensions of culture and preferred leadership attributes as measured in two different European nations, The Netherlands, a Western European nation, and Poland, a Central or Eastern European nation.

Our findings may contribute to a better understanding of culture-based differences in leadership, and serve as a source of information about both cultures. This information could be of practical use to those working in organizations operating in both countries (especially Dutch companies operating in Poland, Polish companies working in The Netherlands, or those considering doing so). Future research in the area of cross-cultural leadership seems

interesting and useful both to scientists and practitioners. This research should not only aim to compare preferred leadership attributes (i.e. implicit theories) but also to study culture-based differences in their enactment, i.e. actual leader behaviour. In Central or Eastern Europe, the changing mentality after the breakdown of the former communist system calls for longitudinal research. Longitudinal studies could record how preferences for leadership and culture dimensions change during and after the transition period, and provide better insight as to which culture and leadership dimensions are highly affected by this transition and which are more firmly rooted in cultural values and are hence less susceptible to change.

REFERENCES

- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (3rd Edn). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1989). Potential biases in leadership measures: How prototypes, leniency and general satisfaction relate to ratings and rankings of transformational and transactional leadership constructs. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 49, 509–527.
- Borkowska, S., & Kulpinska, J. (1995). Transformatie naar een marketeconomie: Het geval Polen. In P.J.D. Drenth, H. Thierry, & C.J. De Wolff (Eds.) *Nieuw handboek A&O-psychologie, aflevering 14 (5.8)*. (New handbook of I/O psychology). Houten: Bohn Stafleu & Van Loghum.
- Boyacigiller, N., & Adler, N. (1991). The parochial dinosaur: Organizational science in a global context. *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 262–290.
- Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and leadership in Organizations*. London: Sage.
- Den Hartog, D.N., Van Muijen, J.J., & Koopman, P.L. (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 70 (1), 19–34.
- Dorfman, P.W., & Ronen, S. (1991). *The universality of leadership theories: Challenges and paradoxes*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management meetings, Miami, August, 1991.
- Foti, R.J., & Luch, C.H. (1992). The influence of individual differences on the perception and categorization of leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3(1), 55–66.
- Gerstner, C.R., & Day, D.V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5(2), 121–134.
- GLOBE (1996). *The development and cross-cultural validation of scales measuring societal culture, organizational culture, and prototypical leader attributes*. Wharton School, PA, in review.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Cultures Consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: The Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7(1), 81–94.
- House, R.J. (1993). *GLOBE prospectus*, Internal publication. Philadelphia: Wharton School of Management.
- House, R.J., Hanges, P., & Agar, M. (1995). *GLOBE prospectus* (updated). Internal publication. Philadelphia: Wharton School of Management.
- House, R.J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic and visionary theories. In M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: perspectives and directions* (pp. 81–107). San Diego: Academic Press.

- Jago, A.G., Maczynski, J., & Reber, G. (1996). Evolving leadership styles?: A comparison of Polish managers before and after market economy reforms. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 27(2), 107–115.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (2nd Edn.) New York: John Wiley.
- Koopman, P.L., & De Jong, H. (1994). 'Event management' in a cross-cultural perspective. *Gedrag en Organisatie*, 7, 114–121.
- Koopman, P.L., Den Hartog, D.N., Van Muijen, J.J., Thierry, H., & Wilderom, C. (1996, August). *Requirements for good leadership at two levels*. Poster presented at the 25th International Congress of Psychology, Montreal, Canada.
- Kotter, J.P. (1990). *A Force for Change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.
- Lord, R.G., Foti, R.J., & De Vader, C.L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34, 343–378.
- Lord, R.G., Foti, R.J., & Phillips, J. (1982). A theory of leadership categorization. In J.G. Hunt, U. Sekaran, & C.A. Schriesheim (Eds.), *Leadership: Beyond establishment views* (pp. 104–121). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Lord R.G., & Maher, K.J. (1991). *Leadership & Information Processing*. London: Routledge.
- Maczynski, J., Jago, A.G., Reber, G., & Böhnisch, W. (1993a). Leadership style of Polish and Austrian managers. *Organization and Management*, 3(73), 71–87.
- Maczynski, J., Jago, A.G., Reber, G., & Böhnisch, W. (1993b). Leadership style of Polish, Austrian and US managers. *The review of psychology*, 1, 65–80.
- Maczynski, J., Jago, A.G., Reber, G., & Böhnisch, W. (1994). Culture and leadership styles: A comparison of Polish, Austrian and US managers. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 25, 303–315.
- Martan, L. (1993). The necessary change of human mentality. *Organization and Management*, 3(73), 89–95.
- McClelland, D.C. (1961). *The Achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Norstrand.
- McClelland, D.C. (1985). *Human motivation*. Glenview, IL: Scott-Foresman.
- Meindl, J.R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 12, pp. 159–203). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Meindl, J.R., Ehrlich, S.B., & Dukerich, J.M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, 78–102.
- Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg on management*. New York: Free Press.
- Oechslein, J.J. (1991). The changes taking place in Central and Eastern Europe as viewed by an employer. *Labour and Society*, 16(1), 95–102.
- Obloj, K., & Thomas, H. (1996). Breaking away from the past: Strategies of successful Polish firms. *European Management Journal*, 14(5), 467–476.
- Offermann, L.R., Kennedy, J.K., & Wirtz, P.W. (1994). Implicit leadership theories: Content structure, and generalizability. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5(1), 43–55.
- Rauch, C.F., & Behling, O. (1984). Functionalism: Basis for an alternate approach to the study of leadership. In J.G. Hunt, D.M. Hosking, C.A. Schriesheim, & R. Stewart (Eds.), *Leaders and Managers: International perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership* (pp. 45–62). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In E. Rosch & B.B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorization*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shamir, B. (1992). Attribution of charisma and influence to the leader: The romance of leadership revisited. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(5), 386–407.
- Shaw, J.B. (1990). A cognitive categorization model for the study of intercultural management. *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 435–454.

- Singer, M.S., & Singer, A.E. (1990). Situational constraints on transformational versus transactional leadership behavior, subordinates' leadership preference, and satisfaction. *Journal of Social Psychology, 130*, 385–396.
- Slay, B. (1994). *The Polish economy: Crisis, reform, and transformation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, P.B., & Bond, M.H. (1993). *Social psychology across cultures: Analysis and perspectives*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Smith, P.B., & Peterson, M.F. (1988). *Leadership, organization and culture*. London: Sage.
- Smith, P.B., Peterson, M.F., & Misumi, J. (1994). Event management and work team effectiveness in Japan, Britain and the USA. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 67*, 33–43.
- Trompenaers, F. (1993). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding cultural diversity in business*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations*. (3rd Edn.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review, 15*(3), 67–78.
- Zinovieva, I.L., Ten Horn, L.A., & Roe, R.A. (1993). *Work motivation under forced transition*. Paper presented at the sixth European Congress of Work and Organizational Psychology, Alicante, Spain, April. (Tilburg University WORC-paper 93.03.001/6).

Copyright of *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology* is the property of Psychology Press (T&F) and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.