

**A STUDY OF PREFERRED LEADERSHIP STYLES IN GERMANY:
CHARISMATIC LEADERS BEWARE!**

MARY UHL-BIEN
Department of Management
University of Central Florida
PO Box 161400
Orlando, Florida 32816
(407) 823-2915
mary.uhl-bien@bus.ucf.edu

ANKE ARNAUD
Department of Management
University of Central Florida
PO Box 161400
Orlando, Florida 32816
(407) 823-3624
anke.arnaud@bus.ucf.edu

RONALD J. DELUGA
Department of Social Sciences
Bryant College
1150 Douglas Pike
Smithfield, RI 02917-1284
(401) 232-6279
rdeluga@acad.bryant.edu

Paper submitted to IV IFSAM World Congress, Madrid Spain, July 1998
(submitted December, 1997)

A STUDY OF PREFERRED LEADERSHIP STYLES IN GERMANY: CHARISMATIC LEADERS BEWARE!

As firms expand beyond their national borders and globalization takes hold, understanding differences in business practices across countries becomes increasingly important. International research has recognized this issue, and as a result a body of literature has developed addressing cultural differences across countries. Although this literature has been growing, one area that is underexplored is leadership. Very little research has examined the cross-cultural aspects of leadership (Dorfman, 1996; House & Wright, in press), and many of the recent developments in the leadership literature in the U.S. have not been adequately discussed relative to cultural differences (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996). For example, the current “hot topics” in the leadership literature in the U.S. include transformational leadership (Bass, 1990), charisma (Klein & House, 1995), empowerment (Block, 1987), and leader-member exchange (LMX) (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The leadership styles described by these approaches are clearly being promoted to practitioners in the U.S., and many companies are investing substantial amounts of resources in training their managers to use such styles. The question is, how well accepted are these leadership practices in other countries? Given that these leadership styles are considered appropriate for American employees, how appropriate are they for leading employees in other countries?

The present paper explores the question of transferability of American leadership styles to foreign contexts, and one country in particular--Germany. Germany was selected for this study because questions could be raised about the appropriateness of certain popular American leadership styles for German employees. One issue in particular was that of charisma. Discussions with Germans and a review of the literature suggests that contrary to the U.S. where charisma is very popular, Germans may not prefer charisma, and may even respond very negatively to it (Steyrer, 1995). Despite this possibility, empirical research has not examined the subject, and the cross-cultural literature has not yet

recognized it. This issue is important, however, since Germany continues to be a strong presence in the global arena, and many of the major international firms can expect to find themselves operating at some time within the German context. If charisma is not well accepted in Germany, foreign firms must factor this into their decisions about the kinds of managers they send to Germany. Moreover, it would be useful to know what styles *are* preferred in Germany so that multinational firms can be careful about the kinds of investments they make in leadership training and education for the global arena.

Thus, the present paper begins to address the issue of appropriate leadership styles for managing within Germany by offering conceptual background for understanding differences in the German context. The paper focuses first on charisma, and then expands the focus to other approaches discussed in the leadership literature, including empowerment, leader-member exchange, transformational/transactional leadership, and directing. Each of the styles are briefly reviewed and then discussed relative to the German context. Hypotheses are developed, and a preliminary test of these hypotheses using a pilot study is reported. The paper concludes by discussing the findings and describing a plan for a follow-up investigation of these issues.

LEADERSHIP IN THE GERMAN CONTEXT

Charisma

Of the leadership trends currently popular in the American context, one of the most appealing is charisma. Charisma has an aura and mystique that intrigues researchers and practitioners alike. Unlike other leadership approaches that have generally accepted definitions and descriptions, there is less agreement about what makes a leader charismatic and what attracts followers to such a leader. One thing is clear, however—in the American context the idea of charismatic leadership is not only appealing but desirable. The question of interest to many Americans is not what is charisma, but how can I become a charismatic leader?

In the German context, however, the appeal of charisma is less certain. Germans have lived for the past half-century in the shadow of World War II, and for many the shame of their actions at the

hands of Hitler—perhaps the ultimate charismatic leader—seems to have left many wary of charisma in general (Zingerle, 1981). As an indicant of this, a review of the German literature reveals a notable absence of discussion of charisma, and even today the mention of Hitler or the Holocaust in German society evokes incredible emotion. As one of the few who have broached the subject, German scholar Johannes Steyrer (1995) notes that though Germans should be studying charisma more they are averse to even discussing it—the German people may be so touchy they cannot bring themselves to talk about it. Zingerle (1981) concurs, arguing that the inhibition of the charismatic phenomena in Germany is due to history, which causes Germans to associate charisma with dictatorship.

This inhibition toward charisma is consistent with modern German cultural norms regarding interpersonal behavior and communication. Unlike Americans who relish hype and image, Germans tend toward understatement and value frankness and directness. They want the facts, and do not feel secure about situations until they get behind the surface to see the truth (Hall & Reed Hall, 1983). They are suspicious of hyperbole, and fear being manipulated by others who they perceive as fast talkers. They prefer directives to dialogue, and believe that aggressiveness is bad form—often in meetings the German who speaks the most softly is the one to pay attention to, not the one who makes the most noise. They are more reserved than Americans and like conformity, believing that standing out is flaunting one's success.

In addition, contrary to American culture which advocates powerful leaders who have high individualism, creativity, and charisma, Germany has enacted strong legislation to protect citizens from potentially dangerous overly powerful leaders. Government regulates many aspects of labor, and major decisions are made by committees of managers, employees, and union representatives to ensure that decisions are not dictatorial. This creates an emphasis toward social control that results in loss of power for leaders (Mueller, 1987). Thus, power is not personal but is based on standardized procedures to ensure objectivity, resulting in leaders' reliance on task-orientation more than charismatic types of interpersonal influence and personal charisma (Salz-Trautman, 1994). A survey reported by

Schmidtberger (1994) confirms such lack of charisma with its finding that only seven percent of German executives saw themselves as charismatic.

When considering the concept of charisma itself, many of its components would appear to be unappealing to German culture. Charismatic leaders are opposed to status quo, striving to change it by articulately advocating their idealized vision (Conger, 1989). They take great personal risk and use innovative strategies. Followers admire their unconventionality, inspired to imitate the leader because they identify with the cause and view the leader as a likable and honorable hero. As just discussed, however, this view of the leader as hero and the desire of followers to imitate him may evoke Germans' fear of being manipulated (Wunderer, 1985). Moreover, according to Klein and House (1995), followers who are most open or susceptible to charisma are vulnerable and looking for direction or psychological meaning in life. Such followers tend to be submissive and dependent (Conger & Kanungo, 1988, p. 328), with low self-confidence and strong feelings of uncertainty. Shamir, House, and Arthur (1993) proposed that followers of charismatic leaders are expressive (rather than instrumental) in their orientations to work and principled (rather than pragmatic) in their orientations to social relations. This, however, does not seem to typify modern Germans.

Rather than submissive and dependent, Germans tend to be strong, hard negotiators who understand power and how to use it (Salz-Trautman, 1994). They have a highly pragmatic orientation. Because of their education system, they are highly trained and technically proficient. They are methodical, deliberate, and logical in their approach to business, as well as resistant to change and risk averse. Germans value order and tend to move slowly, not preoccupied with immediate results. Their decision-making process is involved, requiring many lateral clearances as well as considerable background research. Because of this they commit completely to decisions that are made in a logical fashion and resist changes to these plans once in place. Moreover, by law they have a narrower spread between top management and lower echelons, thereby reducing the power difference between managers and subordinates. Steyrer (1995) suggested that consistent with Hofstede's typology, this low tolerance

of risk combined with the low tolerance toward power distance may be another explanation for the aversion to charisma.

Thus, for all of these reasons, we can expect that charisma will neither be desirable nor typical among Germans. Based on this, we can predict that:

Hypothesis 1a: Germans will rate the charismatic leadership style among their least preferred styles.

Hypothesis 1b: Of the six styles, Germans will report that charismatic leadership is the least typical in Germany.

Empowerment and Leader-Member Exchange

In addition to charisma, two other popular trends in American theory and practice are empowerment and leader-member exchange. Empowerment is the delegation of decision-making authority downward through the hierarchy. Empowered individuals take more responsibility for monitoring and managing their own work, and are encouraged to do this on the assumption that if selection and training has been appropriate, employees know best how to perform their jobs and are qualified to make decisions about how the job is performed (Block, 1987). Empowerment is beneficial to attitudinal as well as effectiveness outcomes because employees are given more opportunity for challenge and personal discretion over their work situations. To be successful, however, empowerment requires employees who are highly trained and self-disciplined. Leader-member exchange is a relation-based approach to leadership, which describes effective leadership as the development of high quality work relationships between managers and subordinates (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). These relationships are based on mutual trust, respect, and obligation, and are characterized by open and honest communication, incremental influence to get one another to perform beyond formal work requirements, and partnership relationships. High LMX relationships have been shown to be beneficial for personal and organizational outcomes (Gerstner & Day, in press).

Contrary to charisma, both of these approaches are likely to be desirable and typical among German employees. Relative to empowerment, Germans have a very high level of training, a serious work ethic, and strong self-discipline. Germans as a whole are better trained and better educated than Americans. A German university degree means more than its U.S. equivalent because German educational standards are higher and a smaller percentage of the population is allowed to enter the university (*numerus clausus*). Germans do not respond well to direct orders from others and will see this as an affront to their professionalism and training. Similarly, they are easily insulted if they perceive that another is talking down to them. They take great pride in their work—work is serious business--and rarely have to be asked to do a job twice. Individuals do not generally complain; they do their best and don't ask for help. They are typically perfectionists, who expect perfection in themselves and others.

Thus, Germans expect to have more responsibility than is customary in American business and expect to be treated as professionals. Moreover, German managers are expected to solve their own problems. They don't make waves and they don't present their problems to others for resolution. In general, managers expect to be given responsibility to perform a job and then be left alone. They are used to operating in a compartmentalized society, where each unit is responsible for its own performance. The strategic goals are determined from above, but then the unit (and below that the individual) is held responsible for getting the job done. This dispersion of power reflects the German preference for an organizational structure without a center—power is not centralized anywhere in Germany.

Germans can also be expected to respond favorably to leader-member exchange. Because of German law, it is virtually impossible to fire someone. As a result, one of the most valued skills a manager can develop is that of being able to motivate employees. It is very important that supervisors in Germany do their jobs well, show concern for their subordinates, and create an atmosphere of cooperation (Salz-Trautman, 1994). LMX does this by developing high quality relationships in which

followers are given more challenging work assignments because they are willing to outgrow their formal job specifications. Consistent with high LMX, German managers expect a great deal of their subordinates and test them by pushing them to perform. Moreover, although Germans appear to have a serious exterior, underneath is a deep need not only to be well thought of and respected but also to be liked. German feelings run deep—they don't show emotion but they feel it. They value loyalty, fairness, and a sense of order, as well as honesty and directness. The LMX relationship, which is based on trust, respect, and obligation, meets all of these needs by developing partnership relationships between managers and subordinates. Germans value a sense of belonging more than Americans, who tend to value self-respect and individual sense of accomplishment more highly (Grunert & Scherhorn, 1990), and much of German business depends on long-term personal relationships. Thus, the camaraderie and companionship of the LMX relationship would likely appeal to German's sense of belongingness.

Thus, we can expect that Germans will rate empowering and LMX among their most preferred styles. Given the high level of training and desire for empowerment, as well as the typically compartmentalized structures, we could expect empowerment to be both a desirable and typical style in Germany. We can also expect the relational approach of LMX to be both appealing and typical among German business managers.

Hypothesis 2a: Germans will rate empowering and high leader-member exchange (LMX) among their most preferred styles.

Hypothesis 2b: Germans will report that empowering and LMX styles are the most typical in Germany.

Transactional and Transformational Leadership

Since their introduction to the literature by Bass (1985), transactional and transformational leadership approaches have received significant attention among leadership researchers. Numerous studies in the past decade have explored the theoretical and empirical underpinnings of these

approaches. According to this literature, the two approaches differ in how leaders relate to subordinates. Transactional leaders believe their role is to identify the needs of followers and exchange rewards for appropriate levels of effort and performance. Transactional leaders make clear to followers what they can expect to receive if their performance meets designated standards. Beyond that, they do not intervene with subordinates unless a problem occurs. When this happens, these leaders prefer to use rules rather than make an emotional appeal for improvement. They prefer to operate within the existing system and company culture and do not like to initiate change. Moreover, they avoid risk, and pay attention to time constraints and efficiency. Transformational leaders, on the other hand, believe the role of leaders is to inspire and motivate employees by making them believe in the value of high performance and encouraging them to place organizational interests above their own interests. Transformational leaders build a climate of trust with followers, and inspire followers with the use of symbols and emotional appeals directed at goal achievement. They also encourage employees to break with the past. They are risk takers, averse to status quo. Because of the leader's emotional appeal, followers of transformational leaders trust in and emotionally identify with the leader and his/her vision.

As described in the literature, transformational leadership is preferable to transactional leadership. Transformational appeals to followers' higher order needs, and has been described as a way to generate performance beyond expectations (Bass, 1985). Transformational leaders achieve effectiveness through their personal power and charisma, which enables them to transform followers into more committed, loyal, and motivated employees. To do this the leader uses such techniques as individualized consideration and idealized vision. However, transformational leadership also has a strong charismatic component, and as such, is harder to develop than transactional leadership. Transactional styles can be described more as management than leadership. Transactional consists of management-by-exception, laissez faire approaches, and contingent reward. Transactional styles are

more fundamental and require less leadership skill, bringing them closer to more traditional, command-and-control models.

Because of the strong distinction made in the literature about the desirability of the two approaches, within the German context we can expect the appeal of the two styles to be consistent with their theoretical depiction, with transformational preferable to transactional. However, we can also make predictions about their appeal relative to the leadership styles discussed earlier. In particular, although transformational leadership would be expected to be highly desirable in the American context, because of its charismatic component and the risk-taking behavior of the transformational leader we can expect its appeal to be less for Germans. The leader's personal power and charisma, as well as the use of emotional appeal, idealized vision, and risk-taking will likely turn off Germans because they go against Germans' methodical, logical orientation. Thus, we can also expect that transformational leadership will not be typical in Germany, and will be less typical than transactional, empowering, and LMX. Thus:

Hypothesis 3a: Germans will prefer transformational leadership to transactional leadership, but not as much as empowering or LMX.

Hypothesis 3b: Germans will report transformational leadership to be less typical than transactional, empowering, and LMX.

Directing

A final leadership style considered in the present study is directing. Although not a popular contemporary approach in theory, directing styles are still highly prevalent in practice. The directing style represents a more traditional leadership approach in organizations. Leaders who use this style are task-oriented, focusing primarily on administering and enforcing the organizational system by ensuring that everyone performs as expected. They are explicit in providing instructions, ensure that employees are highly trained in technical skills, and are very involved in the operations of the unit. They pay close attention to detail, are highly aware of what is happening in the unit, and support the status quo, though

they continually look for ways to make incremental improvements. The directive leader is usually efficient, precise, hard working, and dependable.

When considered in the German context, the directing style would seem to appeal to German's sense of order and precision, as well as their technical orientation. Germans like to follow procedure, like to adhere to schedules, and value hard work and dependability. As mentioned above, however, they also value empowerment, and do not like to be given direct orders. They react negatively if they feel their technical proficiency is not recognized and they are micro managed. Thus, we can expect that these two forces will counteract one another to produce a moderate reaction to preference for a directing style. Because this style appears to fit well in German systems and structure, however, we can also expect that directing will be a relatively typical style among German managers. Thus:

Hypothesis 4a: Germans will report a moderate preference for the directing style.

Hypothesis 4b: Germans will report that directing is relatively typical in Germany.

The hypotheses will be examined using a multi-stage investigation into preferred and typical leadership styles among Germans. The first stage of the investigation is exploratory and has already been conducted. This consisted of testing the initial hypotheses to determine whether the ideas had merit and warranted a more in-depth investigation. Based on the findings of the pilot study, a follow-up will be conducted in the next six months. The study will gather additional information about preferences and reactions to the styles, and will use a larger cross-section of Germans. A description of the follow-up and expected findings is provided in the Discussion. The results of both investigations will be presented at the conference.

METHODS

Sample

Participants in the pilot study included 41 Germans, mostly from the West German city of Bonn. Respondents included owners, managers, and employees of small to medium sized businesses in Germany, as well as two business instructors in German technical schools, and approximately 15

members of the banking industry. All of the respondents except one were working full-time. The sample was 71% male, and the majority of respondents were between 30 and 50 years old (1 individual was 20-29, 13 were 30-39, 10 were 40-49, 14 were 50-59, and 3 were 60 and over). Respondents were relatively highly educated, with 4 individuals holding a Ph.D., 21 having a University degree, and 16 holding varying levels of high school degrees (the German education system has multiple levels of high school degrees). About half the respondents were in managerial positions.

Measures

A questionnaire was developed using scenarios to describe each of the leadership styles. The six styles represented in the scenarios were transactional, transformational, empowering, LMX, charismatic, and directing. The scenarios were developed from the descriptions of each leadership approach in the literature. Key defining characteristics of each leadership approach were used to generate a prototypical leader for each style. All of the managers were given a German name, and all were male (the scenarios are available from the authors upon request). The questionnaire was developed in English and then translated into German by the second author.

Following each questionnaire respondents were asked to answer ten questions describing their reactions to the leader in the scenario (see Appendix 1). Factor analyses were run on the ten items separately for each scenario. From the factor analyses two 3-item measures were identified: preferred style and typical style. One item (item 3) was not analyzed because the reverse scoring confused some respondents, making the item unreliable. The remaining three items did not load cleanly on any factors and thus were not included in the measures.

The *preferred style* measure consists of three items asking on a 9-point scale from “definitely no” (1) to “definitely yes” (9) whether the respondents would like to work for such a manager, whether they would like to be such a manager, and whether the style is the direction management needs to be going in Germany. Separate preferred style measures were computed from the questions following each scenario, resulting in 6 measures (e.g., *charisma prefer*, *empowering prefer*, etc.). The Cronbach

alphas for these measures range from .91 to .96 (see Table 1). The *typical style* measure also consists of three items on a 9-point scale, and asks respondents to indicate whether the manager described in the scenario is a typical manager in their organization (1- “definitely no” to 9-“definitely yes”), whether the respondent believes this type of style works in Germany (1-“definitely no” to 9-“definitely yes”), and whether this style is typical in Germany (1-“not at all representative” to 9-“extremely representative”). Six measures were generated (one for each style) with Cronbach alphas ranging from .53 to .82.

Analysis

The hypotheses were tested by examining mean differences in responses across the scenarios. First, the Friedman test was computed to determine whether the responses across the scenarios were significantly different. This test is a one-way non-parametric repeated measures analysis of variance using the six scenarios as the independent variable, and provides a chi-square test of the significance of the differences in mean ranks across leadership styles. Next the specific differences predicted in each hypothesis were analyzed using paired t-tests. In addition, correlations were computed to examine interrelationships among the variables. Finally, effects of demographic variables were explored using one way analysis of variance.

RESULTS

Correlations and descriptive statistics for the preferred and typical measures for the six leadership styles are shown in Table 1. The Friedman test was significant for both preferred style (chi-square=84.05, $p < .000$, 5 df) and typical style (chi-square=19.99, $P < .001$, 5 df), indicating that responses were significantly different across the scenarios. In the test of hypothesis 1, respondents rated charismatic leadership as their second least preferred style (charisma prefer mean= 3.41) (H1a), with only transactional leadership ranked lower (transactional prefer mean=3.18) (the difference between charisma and transactional prefer was not statistically significant). They also reported charismatic leadership as the least typical style used in Germany (mean =3.85) (H1b). Analysis of the paired t-tests (see Table 2) indicates that charisma prefer is significantly lower than transformational prefer,

empowering prefer, and LMX prefer, and that charisma typical is significantly lower than all other styles (the t-test with transformational was significant at the .10 level). These findings indicate support for Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that respondents would rate empowering and LMX among the most preferred and most typical styles. Findings show support for this hypothesis. Respondents reported empowering and LMX as most preferred (empowering mean=6.84, LMX mean=7.23) (H2a). These styles were also rated as the most typical in Germany (empowering mean=5.03, LMX mean=5.14) (H2b). These means were significantly higher than the other styles on the preferred measure (see Table 2), and were significantly higher than charisma and transformational on the typical measure.

Moreover, transformational leadership was preferred over transactional (transformational prefer mean=5.22, transactional prefer mean=3.18), and this difference was significant (see Table 2). Transformational was less typical than transactional, but this difference was not statistically significant (transformational typical mean=4.42; transactional typical mean=4.72). Transformational typical was significantly lower than empowering (mean=5.03) and LMX (mean=5.14). Thus, these findings show support for hypothesis 3.

Finally, the respondents indicated a moderate preference for directing (directing prefer mean=3.67). It was preferred over transactional (mean=3.18) and charismatic leadership (mean=3.41), though these differences were not significant, but was significantly less preferred than transformational (mean=5.22), empowering (mean=6.84), and LMX (mean=7.23). Directing typical fell in the middle of the typical measures (mean=4.93), but only behind empowering (mean=5.03) and LMX (mean=5.14). Thus, findings supported hypothesis 4.

Examination of the one-way ANOVAs indicates that demographic variables did not significantly affect the findings. None of the ANOVAs were significant on any of the measures for Age or Gender. The ANOVAs were also all non-significant for Education, with the exception of the ANOVA on LMX Prefer ($F=3.06, p<.02, 6,34$ df). Finally, whether the respondent was a manager or

subordinate did not appear to affect the findings except for Transactional Typical ($F=4.56$, $p<.04$, 1, 35 df) and Transformational Typical ($F=3.93$, $p<.055$, 1, 35 df).

DISCUSSION

The research reported in the present paper examines the transferability of American leadership approaches to the German context, focusing on six styles prominent in the American leadership literature (charisma, empowerment, LMX, transformational, transactional, and directing). The paper offers conceptual development for hypotheses about how Germans will react to the six styles, and reports a preliminary empirical investigation of these hypotheses. Although findings support the predictions for all the styles, perhaps the most interesting aspect of the study is its focus on charisma. Contrary to the U.S. environment where charisma has strong appeal, the present research predicts that for historical and cultural reasons, Germans appear to be charisma averse. Preliminary findings support the prediction, showing that Germans responded very negatively to the charismatic leadership style (charisma was the least typical and second least preferred of the six styles). This finding is intriguing as well as enlightening. Charisma is so popular among Americans it is difficult to imagine its appeal is not universal, but the present research indicates that it is culturally specific. Thus, charisma researchers need to investigate cross-cultural aspects of charisma to determine its transferability to different cultures. In addition, given that Germans do not seem to like charisma, the German context provides an opportunity for researchers to use Germans to further explore what makes charisma attractive or unattractive to followers. The findings also have practical implications, suggesting that multinational firms operating in Germany be aware of the aversion of Germans to charisma and modify their management approaches accordingly.

In addition to charisma, the paper examines the transferability of empowerment, LMX, transactional/transformational leadership, and directing. We predicted that empowerment and LMX would be well received among Germans due to their high training and strong work ethic (empowerment) and their preference for open and direct communication, loyalty, and belongingness

(LMX). Findings support this prediction, with respondents ranking LMX and empowerment as their most preferred and most typical styles. These findings are an important contribution to the empowerment and LMX literature, since few studies have examined the cross-cultural aspects of these models, particularly in the German context. Transformational leadership was expected to be preferred to transactional, but due to its charismatic component and the risk-seeking behavior of the charismatic leader, not as appealing to Germans as empowerment and LMX. Findings support this prediction, with transformational ranked behind LMX and empowerment on the preferred measure, but second lowest on the typical measure. Transactional was the least preferred, but somewhat higher on typical (third from bottom). The findings are thus consistent with the arguments made about charisma, further supporting the notion that Germans are charisma averse. They also add to the literature examining the cross-cultural aspects of transactional and transformational leadership, extending these approaches to the German environment. Finally, directing was predicted to be moderately preferred and relatively typical, due to its appeal to Germans' sense of order and structure on the one hand but undesirability due to its use of direct orders and potential micro-management. Findings support this prediction, with directing falling in the middle on both measures (preferred and typical).

The present study provides preliminary evidence about preferred leadership styles of Germans. A follow-up to this study will be conducted in the next few months, using an expanded questionnaire and a larger sample of Germans. Additional measures will be included in the study to help understand why Germans respond negatively to charisma. For example, measures of narcissism, power distance, propensity for risk, values, and interpersonal styles will be included to validate some of the conceptual arguments presented in the present paper. Moreover, the questionnaire will be translated and back translated, and steps will be taken to further validate and support the use of scenarios. These results will be presented at the conference.

TABLE 1

Correlations and Descriptive Statistics of Preferred and Typical Measures for the Six Leadership Styles

	N	Mean	SD	Range	Alpha	1	2	3	4	
1. Transactional Prefer	41	3.18	2.00	1.00-8.33	.91	-.11	.37*	.42*	.00	.2
2. Charisma Prefer	41	3.41	2.21	1.00-9.00	.94	.06	.14	-.39*	-.07	.1
3. Directing Prefer	41	3.67	2.16	1.00-9.00	.96	.34*	.31*	.08	.45*	.2
4. Transformational Prefer	41	5.22	2.45	1.00-9.00	.92	.22	.24	.09	-.04	.2
5. Empowering Prefer	41	6.84	2.15	1.67-9.00	.94	-.02	.13	.15	.21	.6
6. LMX Prefer	41	7.23	2.02	1.00-9.00	.92	-.17	-.23	-.02	-.12	-.0
1. Charisma Typical	41	3.85	1.69	1.00-7.00	.75		.65**	.13	.07	.1
2. Transformational Typical	41	4.42	1.74	1.00-8.00	.82	.31*		.08	.56**	.1
3. Transactional Typical	41	4.72	1.79	1.33-8.00	.80	-.30	.07		.05	.0
4. Directing Typical	41	4.93	1.33	2.00-7.33	.53	-.05	-.08	.35*		.0
5. Empowering Typical	41	5.03	1.59	2.00-7.67	.65	.09	.30	.00	-.09	
6. LMX Typical	41	5.14	1.60	1.67-8.67	.67	-.14	.01	.08	.08	-.2

Note—Correlations above the diagonals in bold are the correlations between the preferred and typical measures.

TABLE 2

Results of Paired Comparison T-Tests Across Scenario Means

	N	mean	<u>Transactional</u> t	<u>Charisma</u> t	<u>Directing</u> t	<u>Transformat.</u> t	<u>Emp</u> t
Transactional Prefer	41	3.18		-.50	1.30	-4.69***	-7.90**
Charisma Prefer	41	3.41	-.50		.65	-4.05***	-7.62**
Directing Prefer	41	3.67	1.30	.65		-3.21**	-7.21**
Transformational Prefer	41	5.22	-4.69***	-4.05***	-3.214**		3.55**
Empowering Prefer	41	6.84	-7.90***	-7.62***	-7.213***	3.55***	
LMX Prefer	41	7.23	-8.44***	-7.37***	-7.661***	3.82***	-.818

	N	mean	<u>Charisma</u> t	<u>Transform</u> t	<u>Transactional</u> t	<u>Directing</u> t	<u>Empc</u> t
Charisma Typical	41	3.85		-1.81+	1.98*	3.11**	-.340**
Transformational Typical	41	4.42	-1.81+		.800	1.42	1.98*
Transactional Typical	41	4.72	1.98*	.800		.715	-.823
Directing Typical	41	4.93	3.11**	1.42	.715		-.312
Empowering Typical	41	5.03	-3.40**	1.98*	-.823	-.312	
LMX Typical	41	5.14	-3.33**	-1.97*	-1.17	-.703	-.287

+<.10

DUE TO SPACE LIMITATIONS, REFERENCES AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST

REFERENCES

- Bass, B.M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications* (3rd. ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Block, P. (1987). *The empowered manager*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J.A. (1989). *The Charismatic Leader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1988). Behavioral dimensions of charismatic leadership. In J.A. Conger, R.N. Kanungo, & Assoc., *Charismatic Leadership: The elusive factor in organizational effectiveness* (pp. 78-97). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dorfman, P.W. (1996). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited. *Advances in International Comparative Management*, 3, 127-150.
- Graen, G.B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2), 219-247.
- Grunert, S.C., & Scherhorn, G. (1990). Consumer values in West Germany: Underlying Dimensions and cross-cultural comparison with North America. *Journal of Business Research*, 20: 97-107.
- Hall, E.T., & Reed Hall, M. (1983). *Hidden Differences*. Germany: Gruner & Jahr.
- House, R.J., & Wright, N. (in press). Cross cultural research on organizational leadership: A critical analysis and proposed theory. In C. Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), *Cross cultural organizational behavior and psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kanungo, R.N., & Mendonca, M. (1996). Cultural contingencies and leadership in developing countries. In P.A. Bamberger, M. Erez, & S.B. Bacharach (Ed.), *Research in the sociology of organizations* (vol. 14, pp. 263-295). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Klein, K., & House, R.J. (1995). On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(2): 183-198.

- Salz-Trautman, P. (1994) Germany. *Management Today*. Jan, 1994, p. 46.
- Schmidtberger, S. (1994). *Die Fuehrungskraft der Zukunft*. Muenchen, Germany: mvg.
- Shamir, B., House, R.J., & Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4, 577-594.
- Steyrer, J. (1995). *Charisma in Organisationen, Social-Kognitive Und Psychodynamische-interaktive Aspekte von Fuehrung (Charisma in Organizations: Social-Cognitive and Psychodynamic-interactive aspects of leadership.)* Muenchen, Germany: Campus Verlag.
- Wunderer, R. (1985). Betriebswirtschaftslehre und Fuehrung-Entwicklungslinien, Besonderheiten, Funktionen. In Wunderer, R. (ed.), *Betriebswirtschaftslehre als Management und Fuehrungslehre* (pp. 237-267). Stuttgart, Germany:
- Zingerle, A. (1981). *Max Webers historische Soziologie. Aspekte und Materialien zur Wirkungsgeschichte*. Darmstadt, Germany: