LEADERSHIP, PERSONAL VALUES, AND CULTURAL CONTEXT IN BRAZIL, CHINA, AND THE UNITED STATES: A PATTERN APPROACH

Autoria: Reed Elliot Nelson

This research examines the association between configurations of personal values and managerial incumbency among college educated professionals in Brazil, the United States, and ethnic Chinese in capitalist Asia. Two theoretical perspectives distinguish this research from traditional studies of leadership. First is the emerging "pattern approach" in social psychology which, instead of positing main effects to be discovered through regression or analysis of variance models, looks to patterned variance within individuals and within and across samples to provide insight. Second is the increasing tendency in leadership studies to seek to understand the contexts—be they organizational, sectoral, or national—within which leadership is defined and exercised. Both of these perspectives call for more emphasis on descriptive techniques which first identify the overall contours or clusters of factors which characterize populations along with their relative size, and then consider the distribution of dependent variables across clusters. By generating comparable clusterings of professionals in Brazil, China, and the USA, we obtain a different view of the relationship between individual variables, cultural setting, and leadership. Our findings provide strong indications of both convergence and divergence in the leadership or managerial function across cultures. We find convergence in that in each of the three cultural settings sampled there is one cluster of personal values which is highly associated with managerial position, and particularly with occupation of an upper management position such as departmental, general or executive management. These "managerial clusters" are similar in their overall profile, and are the smallest clusters in each of the three countries studied, suggesting a universalistic "managerial personality" along much the same lines that Miner posited over thirty ago. At the same time, we find significant differences between countries in the absolute numerical levels of values held by managers and even greater differences in the levels of values found the clusters which characterize their subordinates. By taking a pattern approach to leadership and culture, we are exposed to a radical change of perspective. Instead of seeing leadership as either universal or idiosyncratic to cultural context, we see leadership as stable across cultures, but embedded in clusters of contrasting values which vary across nations, but which also reflect common universal archetypes. This view is at once similar and different to that the GLOBE studies. The GLOBE studies, which use a more traditional "main effects/interaction effects" view, identify a core of leadership behaviors that are universally desired, and a subset of leadership behaviors that are idiosyncratic to cultural areas. Our study, however modest, offers a different view by identifying a core of individual managerial values that interact with other clusters of values which in turn share commonalities and differences across nations.

Keywords: Leadersihp, Culture, Comparative Management

Introduction

In the early to mid 20th century, the essence of leadership was thought to reside in individual attributes—a perspective which has been exposed to decades of criticism and yet still persists in most managers' minds, probably because it contains a lot of truth. The focus of study then shifted to the more concrete behaviors of leaders and then to the relationship or "fit" between leader behaviors and various aspects of the settings within which they exercised their craft (Kakabadse and Kakabadse-Korac, 1999). Among the more noteworthy contingences that seemed to influence the success of a given "style" of leadership were subordinate willingness and ability, the nature of the task at hand, and the organizational setting, albeit defined in rather limited terms (Yukul, 2006).

As the century waned, perspectives on leadership (like most 20th century management and social thought) multiplied and became much more diverse. Theories of "shared leadership," "substitutes for leadership" and more esoteric "constructivist" perspectives on "the romance of readership" and the "leadership arts" generally diluted and challenged the traditional concept (Duskrat and Wheeler, 2003; Grint, 2000; Keegan, 1987; Meindl, 1990). Charismatic leadership and two related antimonies-- transactional versus transformational leadership, and leadership versus management --received renewed attention, bifurcating the concept (Conger and Kanugo 1988; Kotter, 1990; Seltzer and Bass, 1990).

Amidst all of this ferment, "trait theories" of leadership never entirely disappeared and they have made somewhat of a comeback in recent years as a working consensus around the big five personality dimensions has permitted intellectual consolidation of independent variables and the organization of disparate empirical results and theoretical perspectives through metanalyses, and broader theorizing (Judge et. al. 2002; Miner, 1976, Roccas et al. 2002). There is renewed interest if not growing evidence, both within and between countries, of more or less invariant personal factors which favor the occupancy of and effectiveness in leadership roles (Zaccaro, 2007). At the same time, there is a renewed interest in the impact of organizational and cultural setting on leadership dynamics, and a call for greater sophistication in the conceptualization and operationalization of the settings within which leadership roles are exercised (House et. al. 2004; Porter and McLaughlin, 2006; Schein, 2004).

To our knowledge, however, recent work on leadership across cultures *emphasizes universalistic leadership norms and the general societal norms associated with effective leadership, rather than individual variance in factors which are associated with leadership incumbency or effectiveness*. Hence the relationship between stable individual dispositions, leadership, and cultural context remains unexplored or at best neglected. This is likely due to the overwhelming influence of Geert Hofstede, (1980), his disciples, and his successors in the Globe project (House et al, 2004; 2007). Hofstede's and kindred work invariably collects data about social systems from individuals with minimal attention to possible variance in the individuals who provide these data (Hampton and Trompenars, 1993). While we find this work significant and useful, we believe that explorations at the individual and subcultural levels of analysis can provide a useful if not necessary complement.

For us a pattern approach to individual values and category differences represents the likely most efficient way to begin investigation into the interaction between individual disposition, leadership, and cultural context. The pattern approach to leadership looks at the integrated profile of disposition possessed by a person or groups of persons rather than concentrating on separate variables viewed at the sample or population level. We extend this logic by looking at the overall contours indicated by the clusters of profiles found in diverse yet comparable populations (Foti e Hauenstein, 2007; Judge et al, 2002). Different from the traditional approach to cross cultural management studies, we compare individual differences in values across cultures and hierarchical position rather than individual affirmations about desirable states or values. Hence, our purpose in this exploratory research is to conceptually and empirically revisit the longstanding tension between "trait" and "contextual" dimensions dynamics of leadership using novel methods and perspectives that are informed by recent advances in (or at least by the increased complexity of) the study of leadership. More specifically:

1. Instead of employing more common "trait" measures, we propose and deploy a "personal values" approach which permits us to consider individual level variables that are more susceptible to influence by contextual factors and therefore should permit a clearer view of the interface between the individual and her setting (Roccas et al. 2002). It also permits a more conservative "test" of universalistic theories of leadership in that values are generally presumed to be less heritable and shaped by the sociocultural environment to a greater degree. Our personal values instrument uses the same measurement strategy and dimensions as an internationally validated companion instrument designed to measure organizational values or culture (Nelson, 1997; Nelson, Bass, and Vance, 1994; Nelson and Gopalan 2003).

2. We employ the emerging "pattern" analytical strategy which considers the overall configuration of individual variables instead of traditional main effects models (Foti and Hauenstein 2007). This approach is particularly appropriate for analyzing the interface between individual and collective levels of analysis because it locates the clusters of similar actors which compose the social landscape of the particular setting.

3. We apply our research strategy to middle and upper level managers and their subordinates in multiple organizational settings of different types in the US, Brazil, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Singapore. The wide range of different settings coupled with our investigation of configurations of values permits the generation of a rich variety of observations and propositions about real world contexts within with leadership/managerial roles are exercised.

Because our work is frankly exploratory, we have little disposition to advance a priori hypotheses about the outcomes of our analysis. We do expect, however, based on the recent resurgence of trait research in leadership studies that:

1. ***We will find a greater frequency of managerial incumbents in some value clusters than others.***

2. ***Clusters with a high incidence of managerial incumbency will exhibit discernable similarities across cultural categories.***

We are also willing to predict based on the extensive work comparing value orientations across cultures that:

3. ***There will be discernable differences in the size and content of individual value clusters across cultures***.

Beyond these general predictions, we refrain from advancing specific a priori hypotheses about the personal value profiles of groups or managers and nonmanagers across the three cultural contexts considered.

Methodology and Sample

We used Nelson's Personal Value Profile to collect self reports of personal values from professionals in Brazil, the United States, and ethnic Chinese from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore—all capitalist states dominated by Chinese culture. Our sample consisted of 734 salaried, college degree holders from 46 different organizations. Of these 734, 212 held middle or upper level management positions with at least 5 direct reports. Three hundred forty one of our sample were ethnic Chinese from Hong Kong, Singapore, or Taiwan, 210 were from the United States and 183 were from Brazil. Although the samples were not randomly drawn we were careful to include professionals from organizations of roughly comparable size and type in all three samples. Respondents were from manufacturing, financial, and other service business with an average size of 125.4 and a standard deviation of 98. There were no significant differences between the samples on these parameters. The public sector was not represented in our sample.

The PVP is part of a suite of three instruments using the same variables to measure personal values, perceived organizational values, and desired organizational values, however, in this research only responses to questions about personal values are reported. Like the classic leadership studies, the PVP instrument contains a Task or Work Quadrant, and a Relations or Concern for Persons quadrant, each with four subdimensions. The work quadrant contains subdimensions regarding Hard Work, Time, Finish Task, and Quality. The Relations Quadrant contains, Affect, Empathy, Sociability or group orientation, and Loyalty. Two other quadrants, Control and Thought are less dependent on traditional American management thought and were informed by an extensive survey of anthropological and sociological literatures (see Nelson and Gopalan 2003 for more theoretical detail). Within each of these four general domains, four subthemes are proposed, which, like the general dimensions of Work, Relations, Control, and Thought, also frequently stand in relations of tension to one another. The four subdimensions of the Work Quadrant are Effort (hard work), Time (deadlines, speed), Complete Task, and Quality. As an example of tensions between subdimensions, Time and Finishing Task are frequently seen as detrimental to quality (haste makes waste). The relations Quadrant contains Affect, Empathy, Sociability, and Loyalty. These dimensions perhaps coexist more peacefully than other quadrants, but it is still common to find negative correlations between Sociability, Affect, and Loyalty for instance. The Control quadrant contains Dominance, Status, Politics, and

Leadership. The Thought Quadrant contains Abstraction, Planning, Exposition, and Flexibility. These too contain contradictions which are rendered especially clear by the ipsative nature of the instrument.

The Personal Value Profile attempts to measure its 16 variables by ranking 20 sets of four statements like "I am a hard worker.", "I am loyal", "I enjoy the uncertainties of life", and "I am punctual" By forcing the respondent to assign 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th place to each statement in 20 unique sets, each of the sixteen dimensions appears in a ranking with each other dimension exactly once. The resulting response vector has a sum of 200 and each dimension receives 5 rankings from 1 to 4, yielding scales that range from 5 to 20. Validations of and modest normative data for the AVP and PVP instruments have been undertaken in the US, Argentina, Brazil, India, and more recently for Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Singapore (www.c-vat.com).

The original PVP was simultaneously developed in both Brazilian Portuguese and English. The Mandarin Chinese version of the instrument was used only for 43 non English speaking respondents in Taiwan. The other 298 ethnic Chinese responded to the English version of the instrument. The means and variances for both the English PVP and Mandarin PVP completed by ethnic Chinese were not significantly different.

The ipsative nature of the instrument precludes evaluation using traditional factor analytic techniques (Closs, 1996; Dunlap and Cornwell, 1994) and interitem reliabilities for scales must use monte carlo, or enumerative variance estimation techniques to compensate for negative mean intercorrelations. Using alternative reliability computations, scale reliabilities vary from .6 to .9. Test-retest reliabilities using a testing interval of one month have proven acceptable, ranging from .6 to .9 with average correlations around .8. Reliability and validity studies of the Personal Value Profile and its partner instrument, the Aggregate Value Profile can be found in Loureiro and Nelson 1996 Nelson et al. 2010; Nelson, 1997 and 2011, Nelson and Gopalan, 2003, Nelson, Vance and Bass, 2009 as can extensive justifications for the use of the instruments' ipsative nature and of cluster analyses to study organizational culture, executive turnover, personal values, and related topics. Extensive normative data for the PVP have been collected, particularly in Asia where over 60,000 PVPs have been administered.

Analytical Strategy

The traditional or "variable" approach to the study of leadership emergence would involve a ANOVA, discriminant or kindred analysis on occupancy of a managerial role or level in the hierarchy and country. This technique would identify main effects distinguishing managers from non managers, or Brazilians from Chinese and US, then seeking interaction effects. By contrast, we cluster our results in order to get an idea of the distribution of configurations of personal values in the particular organizational context and then consider the distribution of managerial roles between the clusters. This provides an idea of the social landscape within which leadership is being exercised and of the relative distribution of value orientations both within a given national as well as across national settings. It also permits a graphic, standardized comparison of differences between subgroups. In this paper, we use four clusters per cultural regions, a choice which is somewhat arbitrary, but is best maintained across the three sampled environments for comparative purposes.

In addition to the theoretically driven reasons for the use of cluster analysis here there are other methodological and epistemological motivations for its use in this setting. Given the exploratory and practical nature of our study, limited N vis a vis the populations studied, and the absence of clear theoretical guidance for the formulation of formal hypotheses, it would be preferable to identify the underlying contours of our data set and interpret regularities post hoc rather than relying on the stronger inferential and statistical assumptions required by techniques which involve identification of independent and dependent variables and their associated causal assumptions (Carvalho e Vergara 2002; Glaser and Strauss 1964, Kerlinger, 2000). Another practical, but not trivial reason is that the mechanical identification of clusters and subsequent interpretation of their meaning is much easier to understand and present within the space limitations of a paper like this especially in the light of the multiple approaches, literatures and types of data used in studies involving multiple cultures and levels of analysis.

Results

A few results are immediately striking when we use clustering instead of main effects/interaction effects models to examine managerial incumbency in its international context. Others are less immediately obvious but perhaps equally significant. We first note that within the clusterings of each of the three cultural groups is one small—indeed the smallest—grouping for each country that contains a similar profile. For Brazil, it is Cluster 3 with 15 percent of the respondents, for the USA it is Cluster 2 with 18 percent of respondents, and for the Ethnic Chinese it is Cluster 1 with 20 percent of the respondents. (See Tables 1,2, and 3 respectively). Upon studying these clusters we note immediate similarities. For three out of four Work dimensions, each of these groups (3 for Brazil, 2 for the USA, and 1 for China) has the lowest means for its respective country. For the Leadership and Flexibility dimensions, each of these groups has the highest means for its respective country. For the Abstraction dimension, each group, has the highest, or in the case of the USA, the second highest mean for its respective culture. In the relationship quadrant, the USA and the Chinese have the lowest or second lowest means for Affect, Empathy, and Loyalty, while Brazil has comparatively high Empathy and Loyalty means. Finally we observe that each of these clusters is the only one in its country which contain a majority of managers: 22 out of 29 for Brazil, 29 out of 38 for the USA and 52 out of 68 for the Chinese. Similarly, each cluster, again the smallest for its country, contains the largest proportion of managers of any of the four clusters: 52% of all of the managers for Brazil, 36% percent of all the managers for the USA sample, and 57 % for the Chinese. The statistical significance for these results is massive at less than .0000 for all three cultures, and the magnitude of the association is large-- Phi for the Brazilian and Chinese results is ,58 and .50 for the USA result.

These results supply resounding support for the idea that there is a "managerial value set" in capitalist organizations that transcends cultural and organizational boundaries. This idea is of course not new— in many ways it merely reaffirms the assertions of trait theorists (Miner, 1976) and indeed the intuitions of many if not most practicing managers. What we feel is new here, and would not have been discovered using traditional methodologies, is the comparative smallness of the "managerial values" group and the distance between their values and the values of the majority of their subordinates. Despite the fact that our sample contained only well trained and paid professionals from corporations, in none of the three cultural settings did they make up more

than 20% of the sample. Perhaps more importantly, in each country there are large clusters of professionals whose personal values are starkly different from those of the "managerial cluster." Indeed, the managerial cluster holds some values which no other group favors. The mean for the USA managerial cluster on Work is 11.16 while the other group means are 15.85 ,15.65, and 14.08. For time, it is 8.76 while for the other groups the means are 14.07, 14.09, and 11.59. For Exposition, it is 15.74 versus 11.0, 10.19, and 11.97 This tendency is amplified for Brazil and literally doubled for the Chinese sample. For the Brazilian sample, there are 5 values that follow this pattern, Hard Work, Time, Quality , Sociability and Exposition. The Chinese sample is yet more extreme with 7 of 16 values: Hard Work, Loyalty, Politics, Leadership, Abstraction, Exposition and Flexibility.

Aside from dimensions upon which the managerial cluster is absolutely anomalous vis a vis its immediate colleagues and subordinates, the management cluster faces overall patterns of values which exhibit great diversity. For instance, in the Brazilian sample, cluster 2, with 39 percent of the respondents, is higher than the managerial cluster (cluster 3) on virtually all four of the work quadrant dimensions, all four of the Relations quadrant dimensions, and lower than the managerial cluster on virtually all four of the Cognition dimensions. Cluster 4 of the USA sample, with 31 percent of the respondents, exhibits the exact same pattern of contrast with the North American managerial cluster (Cluster 2), as does Cluster 2 of the Chinese sample with 32 percent of respondents, compared to the managerial values Cluster 1.

While these results suggest that managers across countries face some similar contextual issues, they do not support a purely "convergence" (Boisot and child, 1996; Boyer, 1996, Guillen 2001), or universalistic (Birnbaum and Wong; 1986, Hickson and McMillian, 1981) view suggesting that leadership across cultures is invariant. To the contrary, the data contain all manner of interesting idiosyncrasies from one culture to the next. Space will not permit an exhaustive description and discussion of these idiosyncrasies but a few examples should be sufficient to illustrate the type and significance of the cross cultural dynamics we discovered using the pattern approach. Consider the cluster centroids for Tolerance for Ambiguity, a variable we use as a surrogate for creativity, risk taking behavior, and flexibility. For Brazil the centroids are: 11.53, 10.41, **13.45** and 13.25. For the US, they are 10.33, **13.11**, 10.83, 8.52. for China they are **12.66**, 9.94, 8.50 and 9.49. (The "managerial clusters" above are bolded) If we were to run a simple one way ANOVA of Tolerance for Ambiguity by country, we would doubtless identify a modest main effect indicating Brazil's means as highest, and China's as lowest, with the USA in the middle. By the same token, if we were to run a simple one way ANOVA of Tolerance for Ambiguity for managerial position, we would doubtless find a modest main effect distinguishing managers from non managers. We would not discover however, that in the Brazilian sample there is a cluster containing 27% of the population with a mean on Tolerance for Ambiguity identical to that of the management cluster, and that this group is low on Leadership and contains few (5 of out of 44) managers. Contrast this with the Chinese sample where the mean on Tolerance for Ambiguity for the management cluster is 12.66, and the next closest cluster mean is 9.94.

As another example, consider the centroids for Loyalty for Brazil (13.33, 16.62, **15.36**, 14.95) and China (**12.21**, 14.92, 14.71, 17.07). The mean for the managerial cluster is bolded. Again, the Brazilian managers have two clusters of colleagues constituting 66 percent of the population

(39+27) who value loyalty about as much as the managerial cluster. The Chinese managerial cluster is alone in its low Loyalty scores, a full 2.5 points from its closest neighbor. The implications of these results for a manager who must implement changes in the organization are significant to say the least. In Brazil, s/he will have a ready made set of allies who pose no challenge her leadership. In China, s/he will have no allies whose personal values support risk taking and change. Similarly, the majority of the Brazilian managers' subordinates and colleagues will view Loyalty and its rewards similarly, while the bulk of the Chinese sample will harbor personal values regarding Loyalty that are quite different from their managers. Taken together these results suggest that while managers in the three cultural settings posses important similarities in personal values, they face substantially different ecologies of personal values among their subordinates.

Limitations and Conclusions

Our sampling strategy in this research is limited to the white collar portion of capitalist organizations. While clearly an important economic and social territory, the view of leadership generated by a focus on white collar professionals omits consideration of the tensions faced by those who attempt to lead across class and technological boundaries. It is presumable that the constellation and size of our clusters would be even more extreme had we included blue collar workers in our samples. By the same token, it is possible that at least the size of clusters and the absolute levels of certain variables would be different if public sector and NGO representatives were present in our sample. It is equally probable that because of the power distance and other cultural differences between the countries studied, the dynamics of the clusters identified would vary more from one culture to another.

Our dependent variable is also limited in scope to the distinction between those occupying managerial positions, i.e. those with direct subordinates, and those without. While it seems clear that those who have secured a position which commands direct subordinates, by definition exercise leadership of some kind, this "emergent" (Kaiser, 2008) leadership is neither effective nor homogenous by definition (Duskrat and Wheeler, 2003, Kotter, 1990, Santana, 2010). We thus can make no affirmations that the fairly robust profile of personal values that we associate with managerial incumbency is also related to leader effectiveness.

Despite these limitations and despite the exploratory nature of our research, we believe that our findings suggest interesting theoretical and practical implications that merit continuing scrutiny and investigation. Specifically--

1. Our configurational analysis of personal values reveals a robust but anomalous profile highly associated with occupancy of managerial positions across a considerable range organizational settings in three distinct cultural environments. Those who occupy managerial positions entertain an unusual mix of values that are uncommon in the general population. For instance, they are simultaneously high in Abstraction, Planning, Organization and Flexibility. Intuition as well as a perusal of other statistically derived clusters suggest that those who emphasize Planning and Organization tend to be rather risk averse and favor stable rather than changing situations. Similarly, it is intuitive as

well as easily confirmed in our results that those who are high in Abstraction, tend to eschew the detail filled world of planners. Again, the managerial cluster is simultaneously attracted to big picture theories and abstractions at the same time they exhibit a tolerance for if not interest in more mundane planning and organization.

2. The distinctiveness of this managerial/leadership profile is found more in the comparative levels of values in each setting than in their absolute levels. That is to say, people in our organizations find themselves in leadership positions not because they possess greater or lesser levels or certain personal values than members of our total sample, *but by possessing greater or lesser levels of certain personal values than their peers* . For instance, the mean in Tolerance for ambiguity of the Chinese managerial cluster is 12.66—lower than two of the Brazilian clusters making up more than 50 percent of the sample. It is, however, higher than any of the means for TA in the Chinese sample. This "tournament dynamic" or "relative dynamic" may suggest that the existence of a general "managerial personality" or managerial value profile has been underestimated in studies which aggregate scores over units without adequately analyzing comparative profiles within units. It is also fraught with implications for career dynamics, training, development and selection strategies, and for the adaptation of managers who change organizational settings.

3. The size of clusters possessing certain value profiles varies considerably from one national setting to another. In some settings there are large clusters of employees with values similar to their managers. In others, the "managerial cluster is comparatively small and its values quite distinct from those of the majority. These results suggest important contextual forces influencing the exercise of leadership which to our knowledge, have not been considered in the literature.

4. Perhaps most ground breaking of all of our results, we find that the value profile associated with managerial incumbency is a somewhat rare commodity, not exceeding more than 20% in a sample of college educated professionals in capitalist enterprises. This finding has implications for recruitment, selection, retention and training in organizations. As examples of a few intuitive implications, if this managerial type is subject to some kind of universal upper limit, managers need to be made aware that their perspective is somewhat different from the rest of the population, they may also find out that they are in a relatively privileged bargain position vis a vis their employers, and leadership training may add less value than careful selection and promotion.

References

Birnbaum, F. , Y. Gilbert, and Y. Wong. (1985). "Organization structure in multinational banks in Hong Kong from a culture free perspective." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 30: 262-277.

Boisot, M. and J. Child. (1996). "From fiefs to clans and network capitalism: Explaining China´s emerging economic order." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41: 600-629;

Boyer, R. (1996). "The convergence hypothesis revisited: Globalization, but still the century of nations." *In National Diversity and Global Capitalism*. Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore (eds.) Ithaca: NY Cornell University |Press.

Carvalho, L.F. and S.C. Vergara. (2002). A fenomenologia da pesquisa dos espaços de serviços. *Revista de Administração de Empresas* 42: 103-129.

Closs, S.J. (1996). On the factoring and interpretation of ipsative data. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology.* 69:41-47

Dunlap, W.J. and J.M. Cornwell.. (1994). Factor analysis of ipsative means. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 21: 115-126.

Conger, J.A. and R. Kanugo. (1988). Charismatic leadership: the elusive factor in organizational effectiveness. San Fransisco: Josey Bass, 1988.

Duskrat, V.U. and J.V. Wheeler. (2003). Managing from the boundary: The effective leadership of self managing work teams. *Academy of Managmenet Journal 45*: 435-458

Foti, R.J. and N.M. Hauenstein. (2007), Pattern and variable approaches in leadership emergence and effectiveness. Journal of Applied Psychology 92: 347-355.

Garibaldi de Hilal, A.V. (2006). "Brazilian national culture, organizational culture and cultural agreement: Findings from a multinational company." *International Journal of Cross cultural Management* 6: 139-167.

Glaser, B.G. and A.L. Strauss. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research. New York: Aldine.

Gopalan, S. Dittrich, e R..E. Nelson. (1994). The analysis of organizational culture: a necessary step in mergers and acquisitions. *Journal of Business Strategies*. 11: 124-140.

Grint, K. (2000). The arts of leadership. Oxford,: Oxford University Press.

Guillen, M. (2001). *The Limits of Convergence*. Princeton: NJ Princeton University Press.

Hampden-Turner, C. and A. Trompenars. (1993). *The Seven Cultures of Capitalism*. New York: Currency-Doubleday.

Hickson, D. and C.J. MacMillian. (1981). *Organization and Nation: The Aston Programme IV*. Farnborough: Grower.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture´s Consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. B. Heuijeu, D.D. Ohay, and G. Sanders. (1990) "Measuring organizational cultures: A qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 35: 286-316.

House, R.J.; P.J. Hanges, M. Javidan; P. Dorfman, V. Gupta. (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: the GLOBE study of 62 Societies*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE

House, R, M. Javidan, P. Hanges, P. Dorfman. (2007). Understanding culture and implicit leadership theories across the globe. *Journal of World Business* 37: 3-10.

Judge, T. J.E. Buono, R. Ilies, M.W. Gerhardt. 2002. Personality and leadership: a qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87: 465-480.

Kakabadse, and Korac Kakabadse (1999) *Essence of Leadership*. London: Thompson International Learning.

Kerlinger, F. and H. E. Lee (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research*. 4th ed. Glendale, CA: Thompson Learning.

Keegan, J. (1987). *The mask of command*. New York: Viking

Kotter, J.P. (1990). A force for change: How leadership differs from management. New York: Free Press.

Kotter, J.P. and Heskett, J.L. (1992). Culture and performance. New York: Free Press.

Meindl, R.J. 1990. On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. *Research in Organizational Behavior* 12: 159-203.

Miner, J.B. (1976). The managerial personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 61: 419-427.

Menon, T e J. Pfeffer. (2003). Valuing internal vs. external knowledge: explaining the preference for outsiders. *Management Science.* 49: 358-370.

Nelson, R.E. (2005). *Cultura Organizacional e Atendimento Superior*. São Paulo: Fundação Instituto de Administração.

Nelson, R.E. (1997). *Troubleshooting Organizations.* Westport Ct: Quorum Books.

Nelson, R.E. e M. Loureiro. (1996) Cultura Organizacional. Rio: Imagem.

Nelson, R.E. K.C. Bass and C. Vance. (1995). Managed group formulation: An approach to team formulation in policy courses. *Journal for Business Education*: 25-29.

Nelson, R.E and S. Gopalan. (2003). Do organizational cultures replicate national cultures? *Organization Studies* 24: 115-152.

Nelson, R. E. (1989), Social networks and intergroup conflict. *Academy of Management Journal* 32: 516-549.

Roccas, S. L. Sagiv, S.H. Schwartz, A. Knafo. (2002). The big Five Personality dimensions and Personal Values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 28: 789-881.

Schein, E. (2004). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Seltzer, J. and B.M.Bass. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management* 16: 693-703.

Porter, L.W. and G.B. McLaughlin. (2006). Leadership and the organizational context: Like the weather? *Leadership Quarterly* 17: 559-576.

Trice, H.M. and Beyer, J.M. (1993). The cultures of work organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice Hall.

Van Vianen A.E.M. (2000). Person-organization fit: The match between newcomers and recruiters' preferences of organizational cultures. *Personnel Journal*. 48: 747-773.

Yukul, G.A. (2006) Leadership in Organizations. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zaccaro, S.J. (2007) The trait theory of Leadership. *American Psychologist.* 62: 7-16.

Table 1: Cluster Centroids for Brazilian Professionals

Final Cluster Centers

	Cluster			
	1	2	3	4
Hard Work	16.20	15.03	10.09	16.80
Time	13.87	14.86	8.55	11.40
Finish Job	10.47	13.07	10.73	13.85
Good Work	16.13	15.59	13.82	16.00
Affect	9.87	13.03	9.09	8.20
Empathy	10.20	14.66	13.09	11.65
Sociability	13.40	14.72	16.00	13.30
Loyalty	13.33	16.62	15.36	14.95
Dominance	13.47	11.79	12.18	12.40
Status	10.53	9.38	8.45	8.85
Politics	12.07	9.83	13.18	9.70
Leader	15.53	10.83	16.00	11.65
Abstraction	8.80	9.45	12.82	12.40
Plan-Org.	14.07	10.90	14.45	13.95
Exposition	10.53	9.83	12.73	11.65
Tol. Ambiguity	11.53	10.41	13.45	13.25
Percentage	**20**	**39**	**15**	**27**
Managers	**12**	**3**	**22**	**5**
Nonmanagers	**33**	**62**	**7**	**39**

Chisquared= 61.96 df= 3 p= .0000

Table 2: Cluster Centroids for USA Professionals

Final Cluster Centers

	Cluster			
	1	2	3	4
Hard Work	15.05	11.16	15.85	14.08
Time	14.07	8.76	14.09	11.59
Finish Job	12.95	10.08	14.03	12.55
Good Work	16.77	14.50	17.23	15.02
Affect	11.84	10.84	9.05	15.89
Empathy	14.16	12.39	11.91	16.19
Sociability	10.65	11.55	10.11	12.64
Loyalty	16.58	13.71	13.63	17.00
Dominance	11.51	12.45	12.83	12.58
Status	10.60	11.50	11.25	13.19
Politics	6.93	11.05	7.89	8.14
Leader	9.19	14.79	13.00	11.28
Abstraction	14.93	14.50	11.29	10.08
Plan-Org.	13.44	13.87	15.05	11.08
Exposition	11.00	15.74	11.97	10.19
Tol. Ambiguity	10.33	13.11	10.83	8.52
Percentages	**20**	**18**	**31**	**31**
Managers	**10**	**29**	**34**	**7**
Nonmanagers	**32**	**9**	**31**	**58**

Chiquared= 53.32 df= 3 p= 0000

Table 3: Cluster Centroids for Ethnic Chinese Professionals

Final Cluster Centers

	Cluster			
	1	2	3	4
Hard Work	11.68	15.52	12.91	15.17
Time	11.84	15.06	13.14	11.83
Finish Job	12.32	15.17	12.34	13.28
Good Work	16.25	17.59	15.51	15.81
Affect	9.38	10.64	13.62	15.34
Empathy	11.32	12.72	14.70	15.56
Sociability	12.57	11.27	15.57	13.57
Loyalty	12.21	14.92	14.71	17.07
Dominance	12.01	12.03	13.14	11.51
Status	10.72	10.92	13.28	9.49
Politics	10.76	8.73	8.66	8.89
Leader	13.78	9.63	10.53	8.19
Abstraction	14.03	12.70	11.74	12.88
Plan-Org.	15.29	13.93	11.49	12.06
Exposition	13.16	9.25	10.17	9.86
Tol. Ambiguity	12.66	9.94	8.50	9.49
Percentages	**20**	**32**	**22**	**26**
Managers	**52**	**24**	**9**	**5**
Nonmanagers	**16**	**85**	**67**	**83**

Chisquared = 116.56 df= 3 p = 0000.