



Journal of Management Development

Explicit preferred leader behaviours across cultures: Instrument development and validation

Romie Frederick Littrell, Gillian Warner-Soderholm, Inga Minelgaite, Yaghoub Ahmadi, Serene Dalati, Andrew Bertsch, Valentina Kuskova,

Article information:

To cite this document:

Romie Frederick Littrell, Gillian Warner-Soderholm, Inga Minelgaite, Yaghoub Ahmadi, Serene Dalati, Andrew Bertsch, Valentina Kuskova, (2018) "Explicit preferred leader behaviours across cultures: Instrument development and validation", Journal of Management Development, Vol. 37 Issue: 3, pp.243-257, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-09-2017-0294>

Permanent link to this document:

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-09-2017-0294>

Downloaded on: 21 April 2018, At: 11:08 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 55 other documents.

To copy this document: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

The fulltext of this document has been downloaded 18 times since 2018*

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by emerald-srm:508869 []

For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit www.emeraldinsight.com/authors for more information.

About Emerald www.emeraldinsight.com

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

*Related content and download information correct at time of download.

Explicit preferred leader behaviours across cultures

Instrument development and validation

Explicit preferred leader behaviours

243

Received 20 September 2017
Revised 11 December 2017
Accepted 1 January 2018

Romie Frederick Littrell

Department of Management,

*National Research University Higher School of Economics,
Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation*

Gillian Warner-Soderholm

*Department of Communication and Culture, BI Norwegian Business School,
Oslo, Norway*

Inga Minelgaite

School of Business, University of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland

Yaghoub Ahmadi

Department of Sociology, Payamenoor University, Sanandaj, Iran

Serene Dalati

*Department of Management, Arab International University, Damascus,
Syrian Arab Republic*

Andrew Bertsch

*College of Business, Minot State University, Minot,
North Dakota, USA, and*

Valentina Kuskova

*International Laboratory for Applied Network Research,
National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow,
Russian Federation*

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to develop a reliable and valid field survey research instrument to assess national cultural cognitive templates of preferred leader behaviour dimensions to facilitate education, development, and training of managerial leaders operating across diverse organisations.

Design/methodology/approach – The study consists of focus group evaluations of the validity and the translations to local languages of a survey instrument assessing leader behaviour preferences in business organisations.

Findings – The studies find that the survey instrument and its translations are valid and reliable for assessing preferred leader behaviour across national cultures. The length of the survey is problematic, and a new project is underway to produce a shorter version with equivalent reliability and validity.

Research limitations/implications – As the research project is long term, at this point, a relatively long survey is available for research, with a shorter version planned for the future.

Practical implications – Practical implications include producing and validating a field survey research instrument that is reliable and valid across cultures and languages, and can be employed to improve the understanding, development, and education of managers and leaders of international business organisations.

Social implications – Management and leadership processes are employed in all aspects of life, and can be better understood and improved through this research project.

Originality/value – The majority of cross-cultural research is leader-centric studies of implicit leader characteristics; this project expands the scope of studies further into follower-centric studies of observed leader behaviour.

Keywords Cross-cultural management, Leadership development, Measurement, International business

Paper type Research paper



Journal of Management
Development
Vol. 37 No. 3, 2018
pp. 243-257

© Emerald Publishing Limited
0262-1711
DOI 10.1108/JMD-09-2017-0294

1. Introduction

Cross-cultural leadership research has long recognised the importance of understanding cultural differences in the leadership process (Mustafa and Lines, 2016). Hofstede (1980), House *et al.* (2004), and Littrell (2013) are among the researchers who have found strong connection between leadership dimensions and societal norms and values. The findings of many empirical studies, for example, House *et al.* (2013) and (Dorfman *et al.*, 2010), find that members of a society develop a cognitive template of preferred leader traits and behaviours, and that leaders tend to behave in a manner that is consistent with the expectations of their respective societies. Therefore, the research findings from the literature lend credence to the culture-specific view of leadership by showing culture as a causal variable affecting the level of leader behaviours and its role as a moderator of leadership effects (Elenkov and Manev, 2005).

This research project is designed to take an English-language version of an existing reliable and valid survey of preferred leader behaviour dimensions, and produce comparable versions in the primary and official language of ten countries. The aims are determining if the dimensions represent common preferred leader behaviours in a country, if the dimensions defined by the survey items are common, representative leader behaviours in the country, and if the item translations are judged by focus group participants to sufficiently and accurately represent the meanings of the English version. This project is developed by the Centre for Cross Cultural Comparisons consortium (www.crossculturalcentre.homestead.com). In all studies, a local country research manager is involved, indicated by the author list. In all cases, the collaborators were familiar with the academic research literature relating to their country, and participated in the literature review.

Our studies add to the management literature by advancing the development of measurement of dimensions of explicit preferred leader behaviour for employed businesspeople across cultures. We provide empirical data and analyses to establish the universality or specificity of theoretical constructs and findings in the study of leader behaviour, as we expand the scope of such studies into follower-centric studies of leadership. The validity of hypothetical constructs is investigated and discussed to determine functionally equivalent constructs across cultures. The interpretation of the results of our studies can provide guidance for practices facilitating managerial leadership across societal cultures. Littrell (2013) describes the overarching project and provides results of data collection and analyses employing the survey analysed in this study.

2. Literature review

Employing cross-cultural studies for validation of theories, theoretical constructs, and instruments to assess theories has a long history (e.g. Cretchley *et al.*, 2010; Hui and Triandis, 1985; Keller and Greenfield, 2000; Schwartz *et al.*, 2001). Elder (1976) proposed cross-cultural research for the generalisation of findings and constructs across cultures, or better, following Popper (1959), to determine if a theory or behavioural law may be culture-specific. Triandis *et al.* (1973) proposed reasons for conducting cross-cultural research being to check the generality of behavioural laws; to increase the range of our observations on variables of interest; to determine the variations found in subjective culture variables in different settings; to take advantage of natural experiments involving combinations of variables (conditions) that cannot be obtained in the laboratory; to study the manifestation of psychological variables in different cultural contexts; and to study cultures for their own sake. Poortinga (1975) further indicated that such research can serendipitously lead to a better insight into the communalities and specificities of behaviour in business in different cultural settings, and validate any universality of behavioural laws and concepts across cultures (for further support of such research, see Knodel (1995) and Bickman and Rog (2008, pp. 589-616)). Adler and Gundersen (2008) pointed out that in periods of great change (which seem to be continuous so far in the twenty-first century), only those international business leaders and

managers who understand the myriad and changes driven by international differences survive. O'Connell (2014) argued further that excellence in shared leadership will require both follower and leader skills across boundaries will be important in an increasingly complex twenty-first century. According to Uhl-Bien *et al.* (2014), there is no leadership without followership, and further attention needs to be given to the role of followership in the leadership process. Her study identifies two theoretical streams in the followership literature: a role-based approach, reversing the lens between leadership and followership, and a constructionist-based approach whereby followers are co-constructors of leadership and its outcomes. Uhl-Bien *et al.* (2014) emphasised that the significance of followership is related to the assumption that understanding leadership is incomplete without understanding followership behaviour. There is a significant research needed to identify followership constructs to be included in the framework leadership process.

Two threads of research since the mid-1990s focus on explicit theories of leadership (ELTs) and implicit theories of leadership (ILTs). From a lexical perspective, implicit refers to a thing capable of being understood through knowledge of something else. Explicit refers to something fully revealed or expressed without vagueness, implication, or ambiguity, leaving no question as to meaning or intent. Hence, the study of leadership will obviously benefit from greater emphasis on ELTs and a better understanding of preferred managerial leader behaviour. In our article we focus on ELTs (explicit theories of leadership). A major contribution of this present project has been the development of testing of an operationalization of a model of an explicit theory of leadership using an extension of the LBDQXII. Indeed, this supports the claim by O'Connell (2014) that excellence in leadership seeks alignment in expectations of leaders, followers, and the common goals they want to achieve.

The implicit/explicit approach is derived from the leadership-categorisation theory (Lord and Maher, 1991), which suggests that a person is more likely to be accepted as a leader if the person who is evaluating sees a good fit between a leader's expected and actual behaviour. The better the fit between the leader's behaviour and the cultural explicit leader behaviour template, the more influential the leader can be. Researchers have specified that implicit leader theory can be shaped by the societal culture in which the leader operates (Ayman and Chemers, 1983). The approach of our global leadership and values project has been defining explicit leader behaviour prototypes within cultures, and comparing the prototypes across cultures.

2.1 *The leader behaviour description questionnaire XII survey instrument*

Evaluations of leadership may be obtained by means of various trait rating surveys. A less common procedure is the measurement of a group's beliefs about descriptions of its leader's explicit behaviour. Hemphill and Coons (1950) originally devised a survey for this purpose, the leader behaviour description questionnaire, assessing two dimensions of leader behaviour, consideration and task structuring. Kerr *et al.* (1974) found additional variables that significantly moderated relationships between leader behaviour predictors and satisfaction and performance criteria. These were: subordinate need for information, job level, subordinate expectations of leader behaviour, perceived organisational independence, leader's similarity of attitudes and behaviour to managerial style of higher management, leader upward influence, and characteristics of the task (including pressure to accomplish the task and provision of intrinsic satisfaction). Stogdill (1963) developed an assessment of 12 leader behaviour dimensions with the LBDQXII. A brief review of the research and development of leader behaviour survey instruments leading to and including the LBDQXII is available in Schriesheim and Bird (1979). The development of the LBDQXII was the result of an extensive programme of research in the USA identifying dimensions of leader behaviour across different types of organisations. Stogdill (1965) reported that

reliabilities of measures of the dimensions of initiating structure, consideration, and hierarchical influence consistently fall in the range of Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.80$ and above for several different populations including US senators, company presidents, middle managers, military officers, and state police officers. These data reported by Stogdill attest to the internal consistency of the leader behaviour scales in the USA. Halpin (1957) showed the LBDQ to have concurrent criterion validity, and an experiment reported by Stogdill (1969), conducted under well-controlled laboratory conditions resulted in clear experimental criterion validation of the Ohio State scales. The LBDQXII consists of 100 items with Likert-type response categories designed to describe typical behaviours of leaders. These 100 items were factor analysed to construct 12 dimensions of leader behaviour (see Littrell (2010, 2013) for a copies of these items).

2.2 Components of leadership theories

While the LBDQXII can provide a 360° assessment of leader behaviour, our studies focus on followership and fill a follower-centric gap in the list from Bass and Bass (2008, pp. 15-23), who list components of what needs to be in a comprehensive definition of leadership. We have cross-referenced the list to the LBDQXII dimensions, the most psychometrically sound version of the Ohio State leadership scales (Schriesheim and Bird, 1979; Schriesheim and Kerr, 1977). The LBDQXII asks respondents to describe the behaviour of a person in a managerial leader, leadership, or supervisory position towards the work group or unit, usually groups of which the subjects are a member (Stogdill, 1965). Most approaches to the study of leadership are leader-centric and define implicit characteristics.

Stogdill's contingency approach is Followercentric and defines explicit leader behaviours. The vagaries in correspondence in Table I reflect this dichotomy.

Following the prescriptions of Cronbach and Meehl (1955), prior to the study described, Littrell (2002) reviewed the construct, content, and criterion literature relating to the LBDQXII. An extensive meta-analysis of the survey instruments developed by the Ohio State studies was carried out by Judge *et al.* (2004). These authors found that all the survey instruments had significant predictive validity for leader success, and they found the LBDQXII to have the highest validities averaged across the overarching dimensions of consideration and initiating structure of their exhaustive array of studies reviewed. Earlier, Vecchio (1987) also found the psychometric qualities of the LBDQXII, i.e. its reliability and construct validity, to have received considerable attention and that it was a widely accepted index of leader behaviour.

When estimating a follower's preferred leadership style, the following elements of leadership are measured and compared across cultures by applying the LBDQXII: representation measures a follower's preference for a manager who speaks clearly as the representative of the group. Demand reconciliation reflects a follower's preference for a manager who explicitly reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system. Tolerance of uncertainty measures a follower's preference for a manager who is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or getting upset. Persuasiveness measures to what extent a follower prefers a manager who uses persuasion and argument effectively, and exhibits strong convictions. Initiation of structure measures to what degree a follower prefers a manager who clearly defines his or her own role, and lets followers know what is expected. Tolerance of freedom reflects to what extent a follower prefers a manager who allows followers scope for initiative, decision, and action. Role assumption measures to what degree a follower prefers a manager who actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. Consideration depicts to what extent a follower prefers a manager who regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers. Production emphasis measures to what degree a follower prefers a manager who applies pressure for productive output. Predictive accuracy measures to what extent a

Country	Focus groups	Results
China	The survey was first translated from English to Putonghua-based Chinese characters by a local Chinese English teacher in Zhengzhou City, Henan Province, the back-translated by a US American fluent in Cantonese and Mandarin who had lived in Taiwan and Hong Kong for several decades, and was an engineering consultant in Mainland China. Thereafter, a group of 10 academics and students from Singapore, Hong Kong, and Taiwan revised the translation to make it as location-neutral as was feasible. The focus groups consisted of two groups each of 12 hotel industry supervisors, one English-Putonghua bilingual and one Putonghua-only speaker with an interpreter in Cluj, Romania, a focus group of ten bilingual university postgraduate students with a bilingual interpreter	A A – several suggestions for improving the Romanian translation were made and implemented prior to large-scale data collection in the country
Ghana	In Accra, Ghana, a group of twelve businesspeople discussed the survey in English after completing it in English and reviewing their dimension scores. The group indicated the survey measured leader behaviour common in their country	A
Iceland	The translated version of the questionnaire was emailed to six Icelandic native speakers. They were asked to answer the questionnaires and be prepared to give their general impression of it, mark specific questions they had difficulty in understanding, and provide other comments that could help researchers to improve the instrument. Then, the group met at an agreed place and time to discuss the questionnaire. After providing the feedback, the English version of the questionnaire was presented, to help improve the items in question. Subsequently, one more focus group with six participants was organised. This group received the same version of the questionnaire and group process as the first group. Corrections were applied to translated versions according to the feedback received during focus group discussions. Then, the improved versions of the questionnaires were sent to linguists for comments regarding style and grammar. The last phase of questionnaire preparation included input from five academics from business studies, who provided feedback regarding the text of the questionnaire	The focus groups in Iceland indicated that the survey items and dimensions were common, and representative leader behaviours in that country, and the Icelandic translation accurately represented the English version of the questionnaire. Iceland is an ethnically homogeneous country; in discussions of the demographic data sheets, the focus group members noted that the item requesting ethnic group identification should not be included. (Authors' note: The majority of the study authors believe the ethnicity item should be retained, as there are, in fact, relatively large groups of emigrant workers in the country; additionally, proof of the relevance of the item can only be obtained by data collection and analysis.)
Iran	The local researcher assembled a group of ten experts in various fields of management, economics, sociology, and psychology, who discussed the survey	A: some participants mentioned that the survey is too long (too many items); many items indicate obviously highly desirable leader behaviours, and this could obscure differences amongst respondents from different job types and

(continued)

Explicit preferred leader behaviours

Table I.
Details of focus group studies

Country	Focus groups	Results
Lithuania	<p data-bbox="326 879 372 1554">in Persian after completing it. (Additionally, they compared two versions of questionnaire: English and Persian)</p> <p data-bbox="422 879 731 1554">The Lithuanian version of the questionnaire was sent to six Lithuanian native speakers. They were asked to answer the questionnaires and be prepared to give their general impression of it, mark specific questions they had difficulty in understanding, and provide other comments that could help researchers to improve the instrument. The group then met at an agreed place and time to discuss the questionnaire. In the focus group meetings, participants were asked to provide feedback. After providing the feedback, the English version of the questionnaire was presented, to help improve the translation of the items in question. Subsequently, one more focus group was organised with 5 Lithuanian native speakers. Corrections were applied to translated versions according to the feedback received during focus group discussions. Then, the improved versions of the questionnaires were sent to linguists for comments regarding style and grammar for final revision prior to use</p>	<p data-bbox="326 207 418 868">industries. Many of the items obviously indicate ideal behaviour. Many of the items are similar. Participants in the focus group stated that due to the similarity of some items, the number of items can be reduced with little or no effect on construct validity</p> <p data-bbox="422 207 514 868">The focus groups in Lithuania indicated that the survey items and dimensions were common and representative leader, behaviours in that country, and the Lithuanian translation accurately represented the English version</p> <p data-bbox="518 207 613 868">The focus groups indicated that ethnicity and ethnic group were not the terms widely used in Lithuania, but that the term nationality is generally used as a designation of ethnicity, often associated with first language spoken</p>
Norway	<p data-bbox="735 879 827 1554">The survey items were translated into Norwegian Bokmål since it is the main written language used by the majority of the population in Norway. A pilot study of the LBDQXII was carried out using stratified convenience sampling. The respondents were Norwegian middle managers, working in Norway. Respondents were emailed the questionnaire. Participants were then invited to take part in a focus group and provide feedback on their experience of taking part in the survey. Feedback showed consensus that this was an important research topic in a global business setting and was interesting to answer. In a Norwegian context, it is mostly usual to use a Likert scale with 1 = totally agree and 5 = totally disagree. The style of response options in the LBDQXII deviated from this tradition usually used in Norwegian surveys. Consequently, an amendment was made to the visual graphics of the final online survey to ensure greater clarity of the introductory information text and the ABCDE response options</p>	<p data-bbox="735 207 922 868">The feedback showed consensus that this was an important research topic in a global business setting and was interesting to answer. In a Norwegian context, it is mostly usual to use a Likert scale with 1 = totally agree and 5 = totally disagree. The style of response options in the LBDQXII deviated from this tradition usually used in Norwegian surveys. Consequently, an amendment was made to the visual graphics of the final online survey to ensure greater clarity of the introductory information text and the ABCDE response options</p>

(continued)

Country	Focus groups	Results
Russia	English-to-Russian translations were prepared by bilingual university professors whose native language was Russian. Then, a focus group consisting of seven university professors and Master's Degree students analysed different translation versions to check for theoretical correspondence of each item to the intended meaning of the item. In an iterative fashion, requiring several in-person and e-mail communications	The focus group arrived at a Russian language version of the questionnaire that they thought matched the original English-language version in the most precise manner
Syria	A bilingual university professor translated the survey from English to Arabic, and a bilingual Arabic-English colleague translated it back to English. Two focus group discussions were conducted in Damascus, Syria, to examine and validate the translation of the questionnaire. The first focus group consisted of 4 individuals, 2 males, 2 females from the telecommunication industry. The second focus group consisted of 6 female participants working at the human resources department at a private higher education institution in Syria. The survey questionnaire was provided in standard Arabic	The results of the focus group discussions indicated that regarding the demographic section of the questionnaire, certain questions relating to religion and ethnicity required modification of wording. Ethnicity is not a common designation of an individual in Syria. Some changes were made to the questionnaire translation to ensure the clarity of questions. All participants indicated the survey described leader behaviour common in their country
Turkey	The English version of the LBDQXII was initially translated to Turkish in a double-blind, back-translated process by several bilingual native-Turkish speakers at xx University xx, and the composite of the translation verified by a bilingual native-Turkish speaker. The translation has been verified and modified slightly after review by academics in teams managed by the Izmir University of Economics and Marmara University in Istanbul	

Notes: Results category A: group(s) indicated that the items of the LBDQXII were related to leader behaviour and described behaviour that was common in their organisations in their home country: Lithuania was a long-term member of the USSR. In discussions in Zamyatin (2015), we see conceptual usage in Russia equating intra-country/union/commonwealth nationalities with the social science concept of ethnic group. The usage in Russia defines ethnic minorities by their particular first language. According to Russia's Constitution of 12 December 1993 (Zamyatin, 2015), the country's multinational people is the bearer of sovereignty and the only source of power (Article 3); Russian is a state language across the whole territory of Russia and Russia's constituent republics have the right to establish their own state languages (Article 68.2). Today, since amendments to constitutions have marked a policy shift towards recentralization and construction of a "power vertical", the republics retained only two additional rights over other units of the federation: the right to have their own constitutions and the right to designate their state languages. The republics and the titular languages coincide and are based on the principle of territoriality, and a non-Russian first language defines non-Russian ethnicity, and languages are associated with nationalities, which are in reality ethnicities: Turkish academics involved in the translation project and their affiliation at the time of publication of study results are: E. Serra Yurtkoru, Social Sciences Institute, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey; Handan Kepir Sinangil, Department of Psychology, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey; Beril Durmus, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey; Alev Katrmlı, Department of Business Administration, Istanbul Aydn University, Istanbul, Turkey; Remziye Gulem Atabay, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Izmir University of Economics, Izmir, Turkey; Gonca Gümay, Department of Business Administration, Istanbul Aydn University, Istanbul, Turkey, and Burcu Güneri Cangarli, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Izmir University of Economics, Izmir, Turkey. See Littrell *et al.* (2013)

Table I.

follower prefers a manager who exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately. Integration measures to what degree a follower prefers a manager who maintains a closely-knit organisation, and resolves inter-member conflicts. Lastly, superior orientation measures to what extent a follow prefers a manager who maintains cordial relations with superiors, has influence with them, and is striving for higher status. For more details of the 12 factors and all measurement items, please see Littrell (2010).

3. Method

When initiating this project, we solicited volunteers from the consortium who were located in countries yielding a cross-section of ten diverse languages, with the group of researchers authoring this paper following this project till completion.

The first task in our project was the translation of the data collection instrument into the ten local languages of the societies in our study. The countries were not selected as representative of their regions or continents, but as having different local languages, with researchers in China, Ghana, Iceland, Iran, Lithuania, Norway, Romania, Russia, Syria, and Turkey expressing interest.

3.1 Translation

The goal of cross-cultural translation of surveys is to achieve equivalence between different languages. We employed the Brislin model for instrument translation, a well-known method for cross-cultural research (Brislin, 1970; Jones *et al.*, 2001), using at least two independent bilingual translators for each translation (see McDermott and Palchanes, 1994).

A well-translated survey instrument should have semantic equivalence across languages, conceptual equivalence across cultures, and normative equivalence to the source survey. Semantic equivalence refers to the words and sentence structure in the translated text expressing the same meaning as the source language. Conceptual equivalence is when the concept being measured is the same across groups, although the wording to describe it may be different. Normative equivalence describes the ability of the translated text to address social norms that may differ across cultures. For example, some cultures are less willing to share personal information or discuss certain topics than other cultures.

When developing a new survey, if possible, simultaneous development of the survey should be carried out simultaneously in as many languages as feasible, preventing the survey from being influenced too deeply within one culture and language. However, in many, if not most, situations, a survey developed in a particular language is translated to an additional language. In our study, the English-language version of the LBDQXII developed by the Ohio State University researchers was taken as the standard source upon which translations are based.

Each country collaborator or team were responsible for the data collection and the focus group interviews in their society. Data and focus group interview information were recorded for analyses by each national team in their native language. Findings were then translated by each of the individual national collaboration teams into English, and sent to the research director for comparative analyses of the ten sets of data.

4. Analysis

In the set of consortium projects discussed below, focus group studies are employed to develop semantic equivalence across languages and conceptual equivalence across cultures.

Use of the LBDQXII in our consortium project was first reported in Littrell (2002), who found the outcomes to produce appropriate information for developing the managerial leadership training programme. In the initial stages of the research project, additional focus group studies were carried out in Zhengzhou, China; Cluj, Romania, and Accra, Ghana,

to validate the survey content and translations. Participants first completed the survey, the focus group moderator scored the dimensions, returned them to the group, and then discussed through a local interpreter each item and dimension as to whether the survey items were meaningful, and whether the items and the preferred leader behaviour dimensions reflected leader behaviour in their societies. Following the suggestions of Hinkin (1998), the authors of this research report have assessed the content, construct, and face validity of the survey across ten diverse national cultures: China, Ghana, Iceland, Iran, Lithuania, Norway, Romania, Russia, Syria, and Ghana. Subsequently, as colleagues joined the project, the consortium conducted LBDQXII studies in other locations in China, including Hangzhou, Guangzhou, Macau, and Zhengzhou (Littrell *et al.*, 2012), and in England and Germany (Schneider and Littrell, 2003), in Romania (Littrell and Valentin, 2005), in Sub-Saharan Africa (Littrell and Baguma, 2005; Littrell and Nkomo, 2005; Littrell *et al.*, 2009), and values and leader behaviour studies in Mexico and Chile (Littrell *et al.*, 2009; Littrell and Cruz-Barba, 2013), and Turkey (Littrell *et al.*, 2013).

4.1 Reliability studies

LBDQXII reliability studies included Cronbach's α -based reliability analysis and item-to-scale correlational analyses, along with goodness-of-fit tests using structural equations modelling (SEM); see Littrell (2010, 2013) for details. Littrell found, using SEM and exploratory factor analysis investigating both orthogonal and oblique processes, that a set of 12 identifiable factors similar to the LBDQXII dimensions, with at least 2 or 3 dimensions identical to the LBDQXII are observed in analyses from all regions other than Sub-Saharan Africa countries north of the Republic of South Africa and Namibia. That region requires further investigation.

In Cronbach item-to-scale reliability analyses, there are some problematic items that vary across cultures, and the reverse-scored items are generally less reliable across cultures. We have embarked on a project to build a more valid and reliable cross-cultural version of the LBDQ, eliminating reversed items and ambiguous and idiomatic phraseology.

5. Findings and implications

Our objective for this set of studies is to enhance the applicability of and implicit leadership survey instrument, the leader behaviour description questionnaire XII for use across national cultures. We have taken significant steps towards accomplishing this objective through a series of translations vetted by focus groups, and the focus groups discussing the meaning and applicability of the leader behaviour concepts in their countries. The survey is developed to a point where it is a reliable and valid instrument for use across diverse language groups. Analyses of results from the survey can be used in the areas of business involving interactions amongst multi-cultural managers, supervisors, and workers to understand and enhance motivation and job satisfaction. Additionally, insights may be gained for facilitating any cross-cultural, cross-national interactions and international human resource management.

6. Conclusions and future study

As noted above, the series of studies discussed in this paper focussed on an explicit model of preferred leader behaviour that identifies national behaviour templates for a wide range of countries. Day *et al.* (2014) call for a broader focus on leadership development measures, and for more attention to be placed upon collective aspects of leadership in the next 25 years, such as follower theory development, we have heeded this call to some degree as our survey instrument can provide information for leadership development in cross-cultural situations, with a focus on followers' preferences. This study therefore corresponds to Uhl-Bien *et al.*'s (2014) examination of follower-centric perspectives which

emphasises followers' attitudes and schematics for leader behaviour through investigating the follower perception of preferred leadership style and the examination of 12 factors of LBDQXII leadership behaviours.

We contribute to this field with a followercentric approach to leadership across cultures, with our management tool validation. These templates can be used to specify characteristics of a person who is more likely to be accepted as a managerial leader if the person who is evaluating sees a good fit between a leader candidate's expected and actual behaviour. The better the fit between the leader's behaviour and the cultural explicit leader behaviour template, the more influential the leader can be. We conclude that after a few problematic issues, primarily of item phraseology, are resolved in a revision of the survey. The LBDQXII, as such, is a useful, reliable, and valid survey instrument that can be employed to produce information to prepare, educate, and develop expatriates and local managers as to what behaviours are expected in business organisations in different cultures to facilitate managerial leader and organisational performance. Please access survey instrumentation at the consortium website: <http://crossculturalcentre.homestead.com/>. Research currently underway and future research will revise the LBDQXII to remove reverse-scored items, and reduce the total number of items while maintaining reliability and validity. We hope that future management researchers and practitioners will apply this innovative management tool to understand how we may add value to our global organizations with a measurement tool that includes a followercentric approach to leadership.

Acknowledgements

The paper was prepared within the framework of a subsidy granted to the Higher School of Economics, Moscow, by the Government of the Russian Federation for the implementation of the Global Competitiveness Program. Some data and information employed in this study were provided by and collected in collaboration within the Leadership & Management Studies in Sub-Saharan Africa consortium (<http://crossculturalcentre.homestead.com/lmsssa.html>), and parts of the data were utilized in other studies with different research questions, hypotheses, and analysis approaches. Some data and information employed in this study were provided by and collected with the assistance of the Steadman Group in Kenya; the company provided generous support with the collection of the surveys in Sub-Saharan African countries and their assistance is greatly appreciated.

References

- Adler, N.J. and Gundersen, A. (2008), *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior*, Cengage, Florence, KY.
- Ayman, R. and Chemers, M.M. (1983), "Relationship of supervisory behavior ratings to work group effectiveness and subordinate satisfaction among Iranian managers", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 68 No. 2, pp. 338-341.
- Bass, B.M. and Bass, R. (2008), *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications*, Free Press, New York, NY.
- Bickman, L. and Rog, D.J. (2008), *The SAGE Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*, SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Brislin, R.W. (1970), "Back-translation for cross-cultural research", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 185-216.
- Cretchley, J., Rooney, D. and Gallois, C. (2010), "Mapping a 40-year history with leximancer: themes and concepts in the journal of cross-cultural psychology", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 318-328.
- Cronbach, L.J. and Meehl, P.E. (1955), "Construct validity in psychological tests", *Psychological Bulletin*, Vol. 52 No. 4, pp. 281-302.

- Day, D.V., Fleenor, J.W., Atwater, L.E., Sturm, R.E. and McKee, R.A. (2014), "Advances in leader and leadership development: a review of 25years of research and theory", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 63-82.
- Dorfman, P.W., Sully de Luque, M., Hanges, P. and Javidan, M. (2010), "Strategic leadership across cultures: the new GLOBE multinational study", presentation at Academy of Management Annual Meeting, Program Session No. 1435, Montreal, 10 August.
- Elder, J.W. (1976), "Comparative cross-national methodology", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 2, pp. 209-230.
- Elenkov, D.S. and Manev, I.M. (2005), "Top management leadership and influence on innovation: the role of sociocultural context", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 381-402.
- Halpin, A.W. (1957), "The leadership behavior and effectiveness of aircraft commanders", in Stogdill, R.M. and Coons, A.E. (Eds), *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, Monograph*, Vol. 88, Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, pp. 39-51.
- Hemphill, J. and Coons, A. (1950), *Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire*, Personnel Research Board, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Hinkin, T.R. (1998), "A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires", *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 104-121.
- Hofstede, G. (1980), "Motivation, leadership, and organization: do American theories apply abroad?", *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 42-63.
- House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W. and Gupta, V., and Globe Associates (2004), *Leadership, Culture and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*, Sage Publications, Inc., Thousand Oaks, CA.
- House, R.J., Sully-de Luque, M., Dorfman, P.W., Javidan, M. and Hanges, P. (Eds) (2013), *Strategic Leadership Across Cultures: The New GLOBE Multinational Study of CEO Leadership and Culture*, Routledge/Taylor and Francis, Florence, KY.
- Hui, C.H. and Triandis, H.C. (1985), "Measurement in cross-cultural psychology: a review and comparison of strategies", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 131-152.
- Jones, P.S., Lee, J.W., Phillips, L.R., Zhang, X.E. and Jaceldo, K.B. (2001), "An adaptation of Brislin's translation model for cross-cultural research", *Nursing Research*, Vol. 50 No. 5, pp. 300-304.
- Judge, T., Piccolo, R. and Ilies, R. (2004), "The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89 No. 1, pp. 36-51.
- Keller, H. and Greenfield, P.M. (2000), "History and future of development in cross-cultural psychology", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 31 No. 1, pp. 52-62.
- Kerr, S., Schriesheim, C.A., Murphy, C.J. and Stogdill, R.M. (1974), "Toward a contingency theory of leadership based upon the consideration and initiating structure literature", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 62-82.
- Knodel, J. (1995), "Focus groups as a qualitative method for crosscultural research in social gerontology", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology*, Vol. 10 Nos 1-2, pp. 7-20.
- Littrell, R.F. (2002), "Desirable leadership behaviours of multi-cultural managers in China", *The Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 5-74.
- Littrell, R.F. (2010), "Comparative value priorities of Chinese and New Zealand businesspeople and their relationships to preferred managerial leader behaviour", PhD thesis, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, available at: <http://aut.researchgateway.ac.nz/handle/10292/1198> (accessed 4 October 2012).
- Littrell, R.F. (2013), "Explicit leader behavior: a review of literature, theory development, and research project results", *The Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 32 No. 6, pp. 567-605.
- Littrell, R.F. and Baguma, P. (2005), "Education, management, and the world's work: leadership traits of educators in undeveloped and developing countries focusing on Uganda in Sub-Saharan Africa", in Alon, I. and McIntyre, J.R. (Eds), *Business and Management Education in Transitioning and Developing Countries: A Handbook*, ME Sharpe, Armonk, NY.

- Littrell, R.F. and Cruz Barba, E. (2013), "North and South Latin America: influence of values on preferred leader behaviour in Chile and Mexico", *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 32 No. 6, pp. 629-656.
- Littrell, R.F. and Nkomo, S. (2005), "Gender and race differences in leader behaviour preferences in South Africa", *Women in Management Review (currently published as: Gender in Management: An International Journal)*, Vol. 20 No. 8, pp. 562-580.
- Littrell, R.F. and Valentin, L.N. (2005), "Preferred leadership behaviours: exploratory results from Romania, Germany, and the UK, 2005", *The Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 421-442.
- Littrell, R.F., Alon, I. and Chan, K.W. (2012), "Regional differences in managerial leader behaviour preferences in China", *Cross-Cultural Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 315-335.
- Littrell, R.F., Cruz-Barba, E. and Liberman-Yaconi, L. (2009), "North and South Latin America: influence of cultural values on preferred leader behaviour", *Proceedings of the 14th Cross Cultural Research Conference, Puerto Vallarta, and Laie, HI, 13-16 December*.
- Littrell, R.F., Yurtkoru, E. Serra, Sinangil, H.K., Durmuş, B., Katrinli, A., Atabay, R.G., Günay, G. and Çangarli, B.G. (2013), "Explicit leader behaviour preferences: Turkish and cross-national sample comparisons", *The Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 32 No. 6, pp. 606-628.
- Lord, R.G. and Maher, K.J. (1991), *Leadership and Information Processing: Linking Perceptions and Performance*, Unwin Hyman, Cambridge, MA, p. 1.
- McDermott, M.A.N. and Palchanes, K. (1994), "A literature review of the critical elements in translation theory", *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 113-118.
- Mustafa, G. and Lines, R. (2016), "The emergence and effects of culturally congruent leadership: current status and future developments", *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 161-180.
- O'Connell, P.K. (2014), "A simplified framework for 21st century leader development", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 183-203.
- Poortinga, Y.H. (1975), "Limitations on intercultural comparison of psychological data", *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor de Psychologie en haar Grensgebieden*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 23-39.
- Popper, K.R. (1959), *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*, Hutchinson, London.
- Schriesheim, C.A. and Bird, B.J. (1979), "Contributions of the Ohio state studies to the field of leadership", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 135-145.
- Schriesheim, C.A. and Kerr, S. (1977), "Theories and measures of leadership: a critical appraisal of current and future directions", in Hunt, J.G. and Larson, L.L. (Eds), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge: A Symposium Held at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale*, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: IL, pp. 9-45.
- Schneider, J. and Littrell, R.F. (2003), "Ideal leader perceptions in German and English managers", *The Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 130-148.
- Schwartz, S.H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., Harris, M. and Owens, V. (2001), "Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement", *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp. 519-542.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1963), *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire – Form XII: An Experimental Revision*, Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1965), *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire*, Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1969), "Validity of leader behavior descriptions", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 153-158.
- Triandis, H.C., Malpass, R. and Davidson, R. (1973), "Psychology and culture", *Annual Review of Psychology*, Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 355-378.

- Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R.E., Lowe, K.B. and Carsten, M.K. (2014), "Followership theory : a review and research agenda", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 83-104, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.007.
- Vecchio, R.P. (1987), "Situational leadership theory: an examination of a prescriptive theory", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 72 No. 3, pp. 444-451.
- Zamyatin, K. (2015), "The evolution of language ideology in post-soviet Russia", in Xabier ArzozMarten, H.F., Riessler, M.R., Saarikivi, J. and Toivanen, R. (Eds), *Cultural and Linguistic Minorities in the Russian Federation and the European Union: Comparative Studies on Equality and Diversity*, Springer, Cham, pp. 279-315.

Further reading

- Lord, R.G., Foti, R.J. and De Vader, C.L. (1984), "A test of leadership categorization theory: internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Vol. 34 No. 3, pp. 43-378.
- Schriesheim, C.A. and Kerr, S. (1974), "Psychometric properties of the Ohio state leadership scales", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 81 No. 11, pp. 756-765.
- Schriesheim, C.A. and Stogdill, R. (1975), "Differences in factor structure across three versions of the Ohio state leadership scales", *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 189-206.
- Schriesheim, C.A. and Hill, K.D. (1981), "Controlling acquiescence response bias by item reversals: the effect on questionnaire validity", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 1101-1114.
- Schriesheim, C.A., Cogliser, C.C. and Neider, L.L. (1995), "Is it 'trustworthy'? A multiple-levels-of-analysis reexamination of an Ohio state leadership study, with implications for future research", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 111-145.

Appendix. Sample introduction and items from english-lanaguage version of survey (Littrell, 2010)

IDEAL LEADER BEHAVIOUR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – FORM XII

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behaviour of a managerial leader as you think he or she should act, the ideal managerial leader. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behaviour of an ideal managerial leader.

- a. READ each item carefully.
- b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behaviour described by the item.
- c. DECIDE whether he/she (A) always, (B) often, (C) occasionally, (D) seldom or (E) never acts as described by the item.
- d. CAREFULLY MARK AN X OVER around one of the five letters (A B C D E) following the item to show the answer you have selected.
- e. MARK your answers as shown in the example below.

Example: Often acts as described	A	B	C	D	E
Example: Never acts as described	A	B	C	D	E

The "ideal managerial leader" A=Always B=Often C=Occasionally D=Seldom E=Never

Sample of ten items:

The "ideal managerial leader" A=Always B=Often C=Occasionally D=Seldom E=Never	
1. Acts as the spokesman of the group	1. ABCDE
6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group	2. ABCDE
11. Publicises the activities of the group	3. ABCDE
21. Speaks as the representative of the group	4. ABCDE
31. Speaks for the group when visitors are present	5. ABCDE
51. Handles complex problems efficiently	6. ABCDE
61. Gets swamped by details	7. ABCDE
71. Gets things all tangled up	8. ABCDE
81. Can reduce a madhouse to system and order	9. ABCDE
91. Gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her	10. ABCDE
100. Maintains cordial relations with superiors	11. ABCDE

About the authors

Romie Frederick Littrell is the Technical Supervisor of the Master's programme of "Business and Politics in Modern Asia", and a Professor in the Department of Management of the National Research University Higher School of Economics – Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation. He has an extensive research and publication background in leadership in international business, and several decades of international business practitioner experience. He has earned PhDs in industrial/organisational psychology at Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand, and in business administration at Kennedy College Zurich, Switzerland. Romie Frederick Littrell is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: romielittrell@yahoo.com

Gillian Warner-Soderholm is an Associate Professor and the Head of the Department of Communication and Culture at BI Norwegian Business School in Oslo, Norway. She is also the Head of the Summer School Programme at her business school. Her main research interests are cross-cultural management, trust, and gender diversity in organisations. Gillian has worked globally in international business consulting and holds board positions in the UK and Norway.

Inga Minelgaite is a Researcher and Lecturer at the University of Iceland, School of Business. Her main research field is (cross-cultural) leadership and gender studies. She is also interested in new and emerging fields of leadership such as neuroscience of leadership and followership. Inga has 15 years' experience working in senior and top management positions in various countries and sectors of business.

Dr Yaghoub Ahmadi is an Associate Professor in the Sociology Group at Payamenoor University at Sanadaj Center, Iran. He is an experienced researcher with interests in sociology, cultural studies, and social and cultural anthropology. He received his PhD in sociology from Isfahan University in Iran.

Dr Serene Dalati is a Senior Lecturer of Management at the Faculty of Business Administration at the Arab International University, Syria. Serene has earned a PhD in managerial leadership, organisational culture, and job satisfaction in 2008 which was preceded by a British Chevening scholarship to study for an MBA at Bangor University in 2002. Serene teaches organisational behaviour, leadership, culture, and job satisfaction. Her fields of expertise also include strategic management, international management, marketing, and entrepreneurial small business. Serene has also developed experience in capacity building projects for Erasmus+ programmes.

Andrew Bertsch holds a Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) Degree and an Advanced Postgraduate Diploma in Management Consultancy (APDMC) from the Henley Management College in England. With over 20 years of experience in executive management and management consultancy, Andy has actively guided or participated with organisations, education institutions, and government agencies as they have undergone transformation through environmental assessments, mission analysis, visioning, strategic analyses and formulation, and implementation. Andy actively researches and consults in fields of culture, leadership, entrepreneurship, and strategic planning and implementation.

Dr Valentina Kuskova is the Deputy First Vice Rector and a Member of the Academic Council of the National Research University-Higher School of Economics – Moscow, Russian Federation; additionally, she is the Laboratory Head of the International Laboratory for Applied Network Research at NRU-HSE, the Programme Academic Supervisor of Applied Statistics with Social Network Analysis, and an Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Social Sciences, School of Psychology. She earned her PhD Degree at Indiana University in the USA.

For instructions on how to order reprints of this article, please visit our website:

www.emeraldgroupublishing.com/licensing/reprints.htm

Or contact us for further details: permissions@emeraldinsight.com