EFFECITVE LEADERSHIP FOR THE GLOBAL ECONOMY IN THE 21ST CENTURY

John Saee

Institut d'Economie Scientifique Et de Gestion
(IESEG- School of Management) Catholic University, rue de la Digue 3, Lille 59000, France
E-mail: j.saee@ieseg.fr

Abstract. Effective leadership of modern organizations within contemporary global economy in the 21st century is seen as a highly crucial function in organizations and good leadership is the most critical ingredient for successful organizations world over. In this research article, an examination is made of a broad range of theories and conceptualizations of leadership. Differences between managers and leaders are discussed. In addition, the notion of leadership in different cultures is explored which has considerable implications for management of enterprises internationally.

Keywords: leadership, globalization, management in different cultures

Introduction

The study of leaders and leadership has a long history. As Sarros and Woodman (1993) have observed "Leaders have existed for as long as mankind has been civilized. Egyptian hieroglyphic around 5 000 years ago differentiated among leaders, leadership, and followers. For almost as long, Taoism has emphasized leadership qualities in terms of guiding nurturing followers" (p. 3). However, leadership styles that were practiced in traditional hierarchies and that relied on authoritarian controls are seldom applicable to the changing workforces of the 21st century. Instead, new styles of leadership are needed in contemporary organizations, ones that could inspire trust, creativity and motivation amongst their followers.

Leadership is not an easy task for a culturally diverse workforce. Many situational factors contribute to the effectiveness of managerial leadership. These factors include the leader's characteristics, the followers' expectations, the task, organizational policies, and top management values and philosophies. An ever-present factor that influences all the other situational factors is the host culture. Without a thorough understanding of cultural differences, a leader that may be quite effective in their own culture may be doomed in a different culture. An examination in this research paper is made of different styles of leadership that would prevail across cultures. For leaders and managers of corporation intent on globalising their operations successfully, they would therefore need to adapt their leadership style(s) to local conditions present in overseas countries. Before proceeding any further, it is important here to recognize the differences that exist between a leader and a manager.

Management and leadership

Leaders create vision, the meaning within which others work and live. Managers, by contrast, act competently within a vision (Adler, 1997). Traditionally, we think of leadership as being associated with the role of managers. However, leader and manager are not necessarily the same. Someone may be an outstanding manager without in fact being a work group/team leader. While a manager performs planning,

organizing, coordinating and controlling activities deemed as essential managerial functions, leadership may go beyond management in that they act as role models, coaches and mentors for their team members. Much of managerial authority in carrying out the task of managing their day-to-day organization gains its legitimacy from formal managerial position, whereas, leaders may emerge without necessarily holding a manager's positional authority. Leadership thus implies something more than mere managerial/ supervisory responsibility or formal authority. It consists of influence that extends beyond the usual influence that accompanies legitimacy as a supervisor. It can, thus, be said that leadership is the incremental influence or additional influence that a person has beyond his or her formal authority (Hellriegel and Slocum, 1996).

Leadership defined

Literature reviews show that leadership is con-ceptualized in a number of ways, and cited below are some of those definitions about leadership:
- The process of influencing people to direct their efforts toward the achievement of some particular goal(s) (Hodgetts and Luthans, 1998);
- Getting the best out of subordinates individually and collectively, achieving objectives in the most effective way (*Cadbury-Schweppes* firm's documentation);
- Leader shows skills in directing group activity, has natural authority and gains respect of others, is capable of building effective team, involves all team members and gives advice and help when required (*WH Smith LTD*); and
- Leadership is about the ability to effectively use strategic competencies, power and influence to accomplish organizational goals (Weiss, 1996).

Arising from these definitions are a number of common features that can be attributed to leadership and they are worthy of note here:
- leadership is an influencing process;
- it requires at least two people, a leader and a follower(s); and
- it occurs in situations of attempting to achieve specific objectives, either explicit or implied goals.

Qualities of good leader

A good leader displays a number of personal attributes (Jackson, 1993), which are as follows:
- the ability to build effective team;
- the ability to listen;
- the capability to make decisions on their own;
- the ability to retain good people;
- the ability to surround themselves with good people.

Major sources of leadership power and influence

Effective leadership begins with an understanding of power. Leadership also depends on the responsible use of power and influence with followers and external constituencies. Power and influence are interrelated. Power is the ability to control behaviors and outcomes in a given direction. Influence depends on the followers' acceptance of the influences and the types of influence used. Influence is related, in this sense, to authority (i.e., the power granted to leader by followers (Weiss, 1996). It is generally accepted that leaders have four core sources of power and influence available to them. These are:
- *Formal (or legitimate) power*: this comes from being appointed by the organization into a leadership position (as a manager). Cultural norms tend to reinforce the view that a manager has the right to lead subordinates.
- *Expert power:* this sort of power comps from having knowledge, skills and expertise, which are regarded as important by the leader's followers. With a formal leader this expertise is usually associated with goal achievement.
- *Reward/punishment power*: this comes from the leader having the ability to reward and punish followers. That is, they have influence over promotion and recognition of followers.
- *Personality power:* many personal characteristics come into this category. If a leader is liked and respected by subordinates and peers, he or she will have more influence over them. This is sometimes called the power of charisma. A charismatic leader is one who inspires his or her subordinates to achieve goals, essentially through force of personality (McLaughlin in Collins, 1993).

These sources empower leaders with the ability to achieve a number of managerial tasks including the following:
- to sort and control agendas;
- to build and cultivate strategic alliances and networks;
- to control the interpretation and flow of information in the organization, and in the roles of president, CEO, and chair of boards, to

influence the vision, culture, and strategies of their organization (Kotter, 1990; Lukes, 1974, cited in Weiss, 1996).

According to Fink et al (1992, cited in Fulop and Linstead, 1999) organizational leaders and followers can also exert (or fail to exert) the following types of influence:

- *Legitimate influence:* this is based on orders, instructions, directions, or by example, which are accepted as proper by followers. For example, John Scully initially had significant legitimate influence at Apple Computer. After several years his influence as a visionary waned. Critics claimed that he lost touch with the technology market.
- *Illegitimate Influence:* this is based on orders, instructions, directions, or by example, which are not accepted as proper by followers. Both legitimate and illegitimate influences may refer to a leader's individual or personal experience, qualities, profile, and/or to a process (policy, directives, goal implementation) established or directed by the leader.
- *Formal (assigned) legitimate influence*: this is attributed to position, title, assigned authority. Mitterand of France exemplified a presidential leader whose influence resided in his position or his formal use of it.
- *Legitimate informal (unassigned) influence*: this comes from authority given to a leader by followers not because of a title or position, but because of personal characteristics such as charisma, experience, skills, or attractive personality traits.
- *Formal illegitimate influence:* that is when a leader orders or requests an activity that is not within his or her formal position description or boundary to do so. For example, a company's managing director requests a supervisor to contribute a sum of money to charity fund.
- *Informal illegitimate influence:* this can be illustrated by means of an example; a supervisor on probation threatens an employee to decrease his higher-than-average productivity output in order not to threaten the supervisor's already poor status in the factory (Weiss, 1996).

Further, an examination is made now on how power and influence are translated into leadership behaviors and styles within an organization.

Leadership and behaviours and styles

There are essentially several recognized leadership styles reflecting leader behaviors: (1) authoritarian; (2) paternalistic; and (3) participative (Hodgetts and Luthans, 2000).

Authoritarian leadership is the one where leader behavior typically involves the use of one-way communication from superior to subordinate. The focus of attention here is on work progress, work procedures and goal attainment.

Paternalistic leadership style can be best summarized by the statement "work hard and the company will take care of your". This is best supported by cultures like those found in Japan.

Participative leadership is the use of both work centered and people centered approach. Such leadership has been widely espoused in the USA, England and the other Anglo-countries and it currently is very popular in Scandinavian countries as well.

Burns (1978, cited in Fulop and Linstead, 1999) has made a further distinction between yesterday's approach to leadership and today's approach - he calls this "from transactional leadership to transformational leadership".

Transactional leaders motivate subordinates to perform at expected levels by helping them recognize task responsibilities, identify goals, acquire confidence about meeting desired performance levels and understand how their needs and the rewards that they desire are linked to goal attainment.

Transformational leaders in contrast, motivate subordinates to perform beyond normal expectations by inspiring them to focus on broader missions that transcend their own immediate self-interests; to concentrate on intrinsic, higher level goals (such as achievement and self-actualization, in Maslow's term) rather than extrinsic, lower level goals (such as safety and security); and to have confidence in their abilities to achieve the extraordinary missions articulated by the leaders.

Key behaviors of transformational leaders may include: (a) charisma (i.e., leader's ability to inspire faith, pride and respect amongst its followers); (b) individualized consideration (i.e., it involves leaders paying personal attention to each follower's needs and treating each follower as an individual worthy of respect); and (c) intellectual stimulation (i.e., offering new ideas to stimulate followers to rethink old ways of doing things; fostering creative breakthroughs in obstacles that has seemed insurmountable (cited in McLaughlin in Collins, 1993).

As organizations change from simple to complex to organic, they do so in the context of societal and

technological development, reflecting changes in individual need levels. As societies change, leadership styles change accordingly (Basi, 1998). More than 50 years ago, Weber cited in Basi (1998) developed a typology of authority and leadership styles that is still germane in Western societies. His analysis defined leadership style as a continuum from charismatic to traditional to legal/rational.

According to Basi (1998), in the light of recent societal and technological transformations, two additional leadership styles (i.e., supportive and facilitative) should be added to explain the current leadership continuum and these include supportive and facilitative leadership styles:

*   *Supportive Leadership Style:* it gains power and the status is earned from the demonstration of his knowledge and willingness to be helpful.
*   *Facilitative Leadership Style*: it empowers employees and removes hurdles to accomplish outcome.

Basi (1998) further maintained that these styles of leadership would differ with the societal contexts. In general, the leadership styles need to change progressively from charismatic at all levels in a traditional society to facilitative at all levels in a mass consumption society. However, when jobs stay individualized or repetitive, the organizational designs will tend to be mechanistic and therefore, leadership will tend to stray towards the rational. In traditional transitional societies, leadership styles depend upon coercive power and the application of sanctions against those who do not comply. During the take off stage, styles change. Rather than sanctions, leader's authority becomes rational, based on policies and rules governing the system. As societies move toward maturity and mass consumption, employee support becomes more important. Management at all levels shift toward facilitation and personal influence to obtain compliance.

Charismatic and *traditional* styles are similarly deriving power from ascribed status rather than earned status. This combined authority typology can be termed aristocratic. The basis of power for legal/rational style on the other hand is rules and regulations or an appointed or elected office. This can be termed rational.

Leadership theories

There are a number of theories being advanced over time by the behavioral scientists in their attempts to explain the phenomenon of leadership.

Historically, much of the literature in the area focused on the "Great Man theory" which indicated that leaders were born, not made and therefore social scientists endeavored to isolate these innate characteristics of great leaders. However, later studies (Stogdill, 1948, cited in Robbins et al, 2000) found no consistent set of traits differentiating leaders from people. For example, North Americans value charisma in their leaders and identify such business and political leaders as Lee Iacocca, former CEO of Chrysler Corporation and Ronal Reagan, former President of the United States, as charismatic leaders. On the other hand, German people do not value charisma in their contemporary leaders, as they attribute it with the evil Hitler perpetrated during World War II (Adler, 1997).

One major rationale why leaders behave as they do is based on their philosophy regarding how to direct subordinates. Study by Douglas McGregor (1960 cited in Saee, 2002) showed that these are two schools of thought attributable to leadership and managers.

The first school of thought referred to by McGregor (1960), is premised on Theory X which contains a number of assumptions about human beings. According to Theory X, people by their very nature do not like to work and will avoid work whenever possible; workers have little ambition; try to avoid responsibility; and thus they like to be directed. The primary need of employees is job security; to get the people to do their work, Theory X leaders believe they must direct, control and coerce people in order to motivate them to work.

The second school of thought about human nature is called Theory Y, and it subsumes a number of assumptions about people:

*   the expenditure of physical and mental effort at work is as natural to people as resting or playing;
*   external control and threats of punishment are not the only ways of getting people to work toward organizational objectives;
*   if people are committed to the goals, they will exercise self-control; commitment to objectives is determined by the rewards that are associated with their achievement;
*   under proper conditions, the average human being learns not only to accept but to seek responsibility;
*   the capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely distributed throughout the population; and
*   under conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potential of the average human being is only partially utilized (Adler, 1997; Hodgetts and Luthans, 2000).

Guided by these philosophical assumptions, Theory Y leaders believe that they must give employees freedom, autonomy and responsibility in their work order to motivate them. Leaders from different cultures vary in their reasons for making Theory X and Theory Y assumptions. For example, Theory Y managers in US believe that most people can and want to develop interpersonal relationships characterized by trust and open communication. Theory Y assumptions in China were closely tied to the philosophy of Chairman Mao according to which workplace had to become egalitarian – that all employees had to improve their lot together, both economically and culturally. Both Americans and Chinese agree for different reasons that Theory Y organizations can perform efficiently and productively; that is industrialization without dehumanization is possible. The primary assumption behind Theory Y as well as other classic and contemporary theory is that people are basically good and trustworthy (Adler and Bartholomew, 1992).

Behavioral theory of leadership

Behavioral theory of leadership came about as result of the Ohio State studies in the 1940s. It classified two dimensions along which leadership behavior can be identified and compared: initiating structures and consideration. A leader who shows a high degree of initiating structure is concerned with detailing task requirements, clarifying and emphasizing standards of work assignments and schedules. A leader who shows a high degree of consideration is sensitive to employees' ideas, emphasizes trust, and seeks to communicate. In other words, relationship-oriented leaders place much more emphasis on maintaining a good relationship with their subordinates than they do on the performance of tasks. Task-oriented leaders place more importance on the performance of tasks than they do on maintaining a good relationship with their subordinates. This theory suggests that leaders who can choose and adopt both initiating structure and consideration style of management appropriate to the situational requirements will be more successful. A major research by Blake and Mouton (1964) in which they surveyed 2500 managers from 6 countries found that most managers agreed that ideal leadership style is the integration of relationship and task orientation. However, when the managers have been asked to describe their actual style, the practice was more task than relationship oriented.

In addition, Weiss (1996) argued that based on current literature reviews there is no conclusive result to support the notion that a particular combination of initiating structure and consideration will result in optimum groups' performance.

Contingency leadership theory

Fiedler (1967, cited in Hellriegel and Slocum, 1996) pioneered the contingency theory in which he postulated that one can identify for different individuals their particular leadership styles and that can be measured through what he called the least preferred co-workers (LPC) scale. Those with a high LPC scale are relationship-oriented, those with a low LPC scale are task-oriented, and those with in the middle straddle use both styles. Fiedler also argued that leadership style depends on three major contingency variables: task structure, leader-member relations, and the leader's position power. Task structure refers to the extent the task is routine or non-routine. Routine task has a well defined goals and procedures. The outcomes are verifiable and the means of performing the work is specific. Non-routine tasks have the opposite characteristics. Leader-member relations refer to the extent to which a group accepts a leader. Acceptance leads to commitment and loyalty, unacceptable leads to friction and tension. Leader position power refers to the extent a leader can hire, fire, reward, and discipline subordinates. Organizations, Fielder claims, should match tasks and work environments with an individual's leadership' leadership style to ensure high group performance.

Whilst Fiedler' theory has been tested, questions remain over the cross cultural reliability of the theory and of the selection and measurement of the major variables (Weiss, 1996).

Path-goal theory

This theory developed by House (1971, cited in Hellriegel and Slocum, 1996) postulates that leaders are effective if they can clarify goals for subordinates and assist them in attaining these goals. The leader can assist by providing training, coaching and guidance and by removing obstacles to goal attainment.

House proposes and defines four leadership styles which he believes could be adopted (any or all) by leaders, depending on the situation:
- *Directive*: leaders inform of what to do and when to do it. This is a telling style.
- *Supportive*: leaders are friendly with followers and show them what to do. This is a sharing style.
- *Participative*: leaders are friendly with followers

and solicit their ideas and suggestions. This is a consultative style.

- *Achievement* oriented: leaders set challenging goals and show confidence in employee performance. This is a delegating style.

Research findings regarding the validity of the path-goal theory are mixed (Ful and Wendler, 1983, cited in Weiss, 1996).

So far, the "Great Man" thesis and Theory X and Theory Y, behavioral theory, contingency and path-goal theories discussed above fall within a universalist approach to leadership implying that these theories, originally developed in Anglo culture, in particular the USA, can be applied to all other cultures and organizations present around the world. However, this is not generally corroborated in the light of empirical evidence.

Cultural relativity of leadership across the globe

There is a widely held view emerging amongst leadership scholars in the leadership and management literature suggesting that in order for leaders to be effective in other cultures, they should adapt their leadership styles and approaches to local cultures prevalent overseas (i.e., leaders need to adopt a culturally contingent approach to leadership style).

A major international research on leadership by Haire et al (1963) demonstrated that there were more similarities than differences amongst the leaders studied across the fourteen countries. However, the countries studied were clustered along ethnic rather than industrial lines. Research by Hofstede (1980) found that participative management approaches, including Theory Y, which were strongly encouraged by American theorists and managers, were not suitable for all cultures. People in large power distance societies including Germans, Austrians, and Swiss believe in a hierarchical power distribution where everyone has a rightful place and everyone is protected by this order. Managers perceive themselves different from subordinates and vice versa. The difference between superiors and subordinates leads to inaccessibility of superiors. Power entitles people to certain privileges that include obedience and respect from others and subordinates. Powerful people will not hide their powers, and in fact, use various trappings to signal their power. Officeholders can be identified by the mode of dress, type of office, and their entourage. For example, employees in high power distance cultures expect managers to act as strong leaders; they become uncomfortable with leaders delegating discretionary decisions.

Similarly, cultures with a strong uncertainty avoidance including France, Iran, Japan, Argentina, Pakistan, Turkey, Spain and Thailand consider the uncertainty of life as a continuous threat that must be fought. They avoid conflict and competition and strive for consensus. Security in life is valued greatly, which leads to the search for truth and values. People in these cultures are risk averse, and worry a lot about the future. To avoid uncertainty, there is a heavy reliance on written rules and regulations. Matters of importance are left to the authorities, which relieve subordinates from assuming the responsibility. To manage there is to deal with uncertainty in running an organization. A critical aspect of managing and leading is dealing with uncertainty by providing subordinates with direction and instructions fro task performance. Hofstede discovered that in countries high in uncertainty avoidance, loyalty to employers is considered a virtue (Fatehi, 1996).

Notion of leadership in different cultures and its implications for international management

Because of the diverse values and core beliefs of different societies, concepts of leadership and organization are inevitably culture bound. No two cultures view the essence of authority, hierarchy or optimum structure in an identical light (Lewis, 1996). At the present time, there is no cross-cultural leadership theory to explain leadership with reference to cultural differences present across the globe. The existing leadership theories, however, can be useful to global managers if we take into account the cultural dimensions. Armed with an understanding of cultural differences, we may be able to chart a safe passage in the sea of Global Management.

The use of authority varies across cultures. The conspicuous use of power and authority is frowned upon in some cultures and encouraged in others. Cultures vary in their practice of delegating authority and responsibility. Subordinates in some cultures are not comfortable in participating in decision-making, such as Indonesia. The meaning of work also varies by cultures. For some, work is a necessary evil; for others it is a source of pride and purpose. Dealing with each culture requires a different leadership approach. An essential aspect of leadership is the role and behavior of the subordinates.

Leadership centers on the relationship between the managers and the followers. The manner of relating to employees, the style of projecting and using power

and the method of dealing with conflict and crisis set the stage for managerial leadership. The boundaries within which these issues are dealt vary among cultures (Fatehi, 1996). The way in which a cultural group goes about structuring it's commercial and industrial enterprises or other types of organizations, usually reflects to a considerable degree the cultural orientation and accordingly the manner in which it is organized. The basic questions to be answered are how authority is organized; and what authority is based on. Western and Eastern answers to these questions vary enormously. In the West alone, there are striking differences in attitude. There is, for instance, little similarity in the organizational patterns of French and Swedish companies while Germans and Australians have almost diametrically opposing views as to the basis of authority for leaders.

To illustrate different leadership styles and behaviors prevailing in different countries, outlined below are leadership styles prevalent in the USA, Sweden and in Asia.

USA

American managers symbolize vitality and audacity of the land of free enterprise. In most cases, they retain the frontier spirit: they are assertive, aggressive, goal and action oriented, confident, vigorous, optimistic, ready for change, achievers used to hard work, instantly mobile and making decisions. They are capable of teamwork and corporate spirit, but they value individual freedom above the welfare of the company and their first interest is furthering their own career. Intellectuality and refinement as qualities of leadership are prized less in the USA than in Europe. Leadership means getting things done, improving the standard of living, making money for oneself, one's firm and it's shareholders. With status accorded almost exclusively on grounds of achievement and vitality, age and seniority assume less importance. American mangers are often young, female or both. Chief executives are given responsibility and authority, and then expected to act. They seldom fail to do so. How long they retain power depends upon the results they achieve. Motivation for American mangers and their staff does not have the labyrinthine connotations that it does in European and Oriental companies, for it is usually monetary. Rampant individualism in American society is strictly controlled in business life through strict procedures and paper work (Hall and Hall, 1987).

Sweden

Like Swedish society itself, enterprises are essentially 'democratic'. Managers of thousands of middle-sized and even large firms have attained managerial success through subtle self-effacement. Modern Swedish egalitarianism has age-old cultural roots. Although some historical Swedish monarchs such as Gustav V and Charles the Great were dominating, compelling figures, the Swedish royals, like those of Denmark and Norway have espoused democratic principles for many centuries, no doubt mindful of the old Viking *lagom* tradition when warriors passed round the drinking horn (or *Hugh bowl*) in a circle where each man had to decide what amount to drink. Not too little to arouse scorn; not too much to deprive others of the liquid (Philips-Martinson, 1992).

Asia

Cultural values dominate the structure, organization and behavior of Eastern enterprises more than is the case in the West, in as much as deeply rooted religious and philosophical beliefs impose near irresistible codes of conduct. In China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore as well as in Japan and Korea, Confucian principles hold sway. Although, national differences account for variations in the concepts of leadership, there is clearly discernible Eastern model, which is compatible with general Asian values. Virtuous behavior, protection of the weak, moderation and calmness are the rules prescribed. The Chinese ideal was rule by men of superior education and morality rather than those merely of superior birth. Japanese and Korean business leaders flaunt qualifications, university and professional connections more than family name or wealth. Many of the traditional Japanese companies are classic models of Confucian theory where paternalistic attitudes to employees and their dependents, top-down obligations, bottom-up loyalty, obedience and blind faith are observed to a greater degree than in China itself. In the decision making process, Japanese employ a consensus building 'a system of reverential inquiry about a superior's intention' (Hofstede, 1980). The term means obtaining approval on the proposed matter through vertical or sometimes horizontal circulation of documents to the concerned members of the organization (Sethi et al, 1984). The secretive nature of the group and the benevolence attributed to it's leader, however, permeate Asian concepts of organization and leadership from Rangoon to Tokyo. In Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia, slight variations in the concept of leadership do little to challenge the idea of benign authority. In Malaysia and Indonesia, status is inherited not earned, but leaders are expected to be installed from above. Age and seniority will bring progress (Hofstede, 1980).

Summary

In this research paper, a broad range of theories and conceptualizations of leadership were discussed and it was established that leadership is the art of influencing others towards accomplishment of goals. The context is created by interaction between organizational structure and culture. Effective styles of leadership vary among cultures. Whereas managers in all countries must lead, motivate and make decisions, the way in which they approach these core managerial responsibilities, remains in part, determined by their own cultural dimension and that of their work environment. The questions raised about the leadership are universal but the solutions remain culturally specific. The approaches to leadership have been divided into two main types that is universalistic and contingency. A number of the leadership theories and models were advanced over time, but their application worldwide remains to be guided by the cultural orientations. Leadership behaviors are also translated into different leadership styles including Authoritarian, Paternalistic and Participative. With the frameworks and the cultural contexts, various nations and their organizations have varying conceptualizations and styles of leadership. More styles a leader exhibits, the better. Leaders, who master four or more leadership styles, have a greater chance of being effective in their organizational context. And the most effective leaders switch flexibly among the leadership styles appropriate to each prevailing situation and cultural dimension across the globe.

The author dutifully acknowledges that an earlier version of this paper is published in my latest book titled Managing Organizations in a Global Economy, SW Thomson Learning, USA.

References

1. Adler, N. (1997). *International dimensions of organizational behavior.* 3rd ed. Ohio, USA: South-Western College Publishing.

2. Adler, N.J. & Bartholomew, S. (1992). Academic and professional communities of discourse: Generating knowledge on transnational human resource management, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 23 (3), 551-569.

3. Barsoux, J.L., & Lawrence, P. (1991). The Making of a French manager, *Harvard Business Review*, (July-August).

4. Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership.* Mahwah, N J: Lawrence Erlbaum.

5. Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence E. Erlbaum Associates.

6. Basi, R.S. (1998). *Conceptional management: A global perspective.* New York: International Business Pre 30 (1983). 241-263

7. Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

8. Beyer, J. M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *Leadership* Quarterly, 10(2), 307-330.

9. Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid.* Houston, TX:Gulf.

10. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

11. Cadbury-Schweppes Corporate brochure

12. Cohen, A., Fink, S. Gadow, H. and Josefowitz N., (1992) *Effective behavior in organization* (5th ed.) Irwin, Homewood.

13. Collins, R. & McLaughlin, (1996). *Effective management.* 2nd ed. North Ryde, NSW: CCH Australia.

14. Collins, R. (ed.) (1993). *Effective Management.* CCH International: NSW, Australia.

15. Fatehi, K. (1996). *International management: A cross culture and functional perspective.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

16. Fiedler, F.E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. McGraw-Hill, NY.

17. Fulk, J., & Wendler E.R. *Dimensionality of Leader-Subordinate interactions: a path-goal investigation,* Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance.

18. Fulop, L. & Linstead, S. (eds) (1999). *Management: A Critical Text,* Macmillan Education, South Yarra.

19. Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of *leadership* prototypes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 121-134.

20. Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results, *Harvard Business Review*, March-April, 78-90.

21. Gregersen, H., Morrison, A.J., & Black, J.S. (1998). Developing leaders for the global frontier. *Sloan Management review,* Fall, 40 (1): 21-32.

22. Hall, E. T. & Hall, M. R. (1987). *Understanding cultural differences.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

23. Haire, M., Ghiselli, E. & Porter, L. (1963). Cultural patterns in the role of the manager, *Industrial relations,* 2 (2), 95-117.

24. Harris, P. & Moran, R. (1991). *Managing cultural differences.* 3rd ed. Houston, Texas: Gulf Publishing Company.

25. Hartog D., Deanne N., House R.J., Hanges P.J., Ruiz-Quintanilla S.A. and Dorfman P.W. (1999). Culture specific and cross-culturally generalizable implicit *leadership* theories: are attributes of charismatic/transformational *leadership* universally endorsed? In

Leadership Quarterly, Summer99, Vol. 10 Issue 2, p219, 38p

26. Hellriegel, D. & Slocum, J. (1996). *Management.* 7th ed. Cincinnati, Ohio: South Western College Publishing.

27. Hodgetts, R.M., & Luthans, F. (2000). *International Management.* New York: Mc Graw Hill Inc.

28. Hofstede, G. (1980a). Motivation, leadership and organization: Do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics 9, no.2, 42-63.*

29. Hofstede, G. (1980b). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

30. Holt D.H., 1 Wigginton K.W., (2002). *International Management.* (2nd Ed.) Harcourt College publishers, USA

31. House, F.J., *A path goal theory of leadership effectiveness*, Administrative Science Quarterly, September, 1971: 321-338

32. House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic *leadership*. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership*: The cutting edge (pp. 189-207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

33. House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of *leadership*: Quo vadis? Journal of Management, 23, 409-473.

34. House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A, Dorfman, P., Javidan, M., Dickson, M., and Associates. (1999). Cultural influences on *leadership* and organizations. In W. H. Mobley (Ed.), Advances in global *leadership* (vol. 1; pp. 171-233). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

35. Jackson, T. (1993). *Organizational behavior in international management.* London: Butterworth Heinemann.

36. Kirkpatrick S., & Locke, E.A., (1991). *Leadership: do traits matter*?, Academy of Management Executive 5(2) 48-60

37. Kotter, J. (1990). *A force for change.* New York: McMillan.

38. Lewis, R. (1996). Take the 'big' out of big projects: break them into manageable chunks. *Infoworld*, 18 (20), 24.

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

40. McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise.* NY: McGraw Hill.

41. McLaughlin, Y. Corporate leadership: putting it together, in Collins, R. (ed.) (1993). *Effective Management.* CCH International: NSW, Australia.

42. Mole, J. (1995). *Mind your manners: Managing business cultures in Europe.* London: Nicholas Brealey.

43. Phillips N., *Managing international teams* (Burr Ridge, Il: Richard D.Irwin, 1994)

44. Robbins,S., Bergman., R., & Stagg, I. (2000). *Management.* 2nd Edition, Prentice Hall Publishing.

45. Roddick A., (1991). *Body and soul* Crown, New York

46. Rodrigues, C. (1996). *International management: A cultural approach.* West Publishing Company, NY.

47. Saee J. (2003) *Mr. Gérard Mulliez, Auchan Group's Chairman: A Visionary Leader,* This research is based on Auchan's Corporate literature and an interview with Mr. Minet, Secretary General - Auchan, France.

48. Sarros, J.D.&Woodman, D.S. (1993). Leadership in Australia and its organizational outcomes, *Leadership and Organzational Journal*, 4 (4), 3-9.

49. Sethi, S.P., Namiki, N. & Swanson, C.L. (1984). *The false promise of the Japanese miracle.* Boston MA: Pitman Publishing.

50. Weiss, J. (1996). *Organizational behavior and change: Managing diversity, cross-cultural dynamics, and ethics.* West Publishing Company, USA.

51. WH Smith LTD Corporate brochure