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Abstract

More and more organizations are expanding from a local to a global market space, and it’s not only Western enterprises that expand globally, enterprises from emerging countries are doing the same. Especially China and India are establishing themselves as economic centers and are rapidly becoming the new global economic superpowers.

As Western enterprises continue to establish themselves into these emerging markets, an understanding of local culture and how it affect Western leadership practices and behavior is key in order to become a successful leader. In the very same way as enterprises from emerging markets need to understand the local culture when they establish themselves in Western countries.

The aim of this thesis is to investigate what cultural factors/dimension that affect leadership in general as well as to survey Swedish leaders operating in China and India about their experiences and recommendations from these markets and see how all of this affect Western leadership theories.
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Introduction

The rise of emerging markets and the need for multi-cultural leaders

In today’s world we have emerged from the industrial age, into the information age where knowledge is our most valuable assets. The rapid technological development that have enabled this information age is also affecting the pace at which change is happening in the world. The pace of change is rapidly increasing and in order for organizations to be successful they need to keep up with this pace (Schwarz & Brock, 1998).

To add to the complexity of rapid change more and more organizations are expanding from a local to a global marketplace (Olsen et al, 2005). The first thing that comes to mind are large Western based organizations expanding, but there are also organizations that originate from the emerging markets that expand to a global market (Klein & Wöcke, 2007).

In a recent business leader review with more than 400 senior executives around the world, forty-one percentages believed that new players from emerging markets will be the main development that will have impact on the business over the coming five years (Accenture, 2010). Their conclusion is understandable, as there have been a big change in the economic power ranking during the last 20 years. The BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, and China) countries economy has emerged and their economical power will continue to increase pushing down the economic super powers U.S. and Japan further as time goes (World Economic Forum, 2009; Accenture, 2009):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2030 (estimated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: GDP World ranking by purchasing power parity

The emergence of a world characterized by multiple centers of strong economic power and activity, such as the changes described above is normally referred to as a ‘multi-polar world’. As this goes on change is constant and leaders in the new economy needs to adapt new strategies in order to be successful in this economy (Accenture, 2007).

As Western enterprises continues to establish themselves into the new emerging markets such as China and India, an understanding of the local culture and how it affect Western leadership practices and behavior is key in order to become a successful leader. In the very same way as enterprises from emerging markets need to understand the local culture when they establish themselves in Western countries.

---

1 BRIC countries highlighted with grey background color
A leader that successfully can perform in such an environment is defined as a multi-cultural leader and is characterized as: “a leader with skills and attitudes to relate effectively to and motivate people across race, gender, age, social attitudes, and life styles” (Dubrin, 2007)

Problem discussion and aim with thesis
Both authors of this thesis have been trained in Western leadership theories, both academically, as part of a Master of Business Administration program., but also through formal training within the representative companies we work for. As professionals we also have multi-year (more than 15+ years combined) working experience in managing employees in and from both India and China as well as offshoring work to these countries and subcontracting employees from these countries for assignments within Sweden and other parts of the world.

As such we as authors have already been exposed to many of the multi-cultural challenges in our existing day to day work and have a feeling that there might be a glitch between the Western leadership theories we formally been trained in, and their validity within a multi-cultural leadership perspective.

For this thesis we have hence selected to investigate multi-cultural leadership aspects in China and India, as these both are two of the biggest nations in Asia (economically and population wise), but also due to the fact that both of them will continue to increase in economical significance in our multi polar world and the fact that they are countries where many Swedish and Western enterprises already are present and further establishments are very likely.

We will then investigate what this implies for Swedish leaders operating in these environments and along the way make comparisons with U.S. as the leadership research and theories that are taught around the world today have an origin from Western societies and cultures, especially from U.S., Canada and Western Europe (Yukl, 2001).

With this background in mind the aim with this thesis is to: Gain a deeper understanding of the applicability of Western leadership theories and what cultural differences Western leaders, and in particular Swedish leaders, should be prepared for when operating in China and India.

In order to fulfill this aim we have divided it into three main questions that we want to research and that will be used to guide us throughout the thesis:
1. From a leadership perspective investigate what cultural similarities and differences arise from the emerging Asian markets of China and India in comparison with the Western countries U.S. and Sweden?
2. What are the current recommended Western leadership practices and theories and how well do theses apply in the cultural context of China and India?
3. Which leadership aspects and behaviors do Swedish leaders, with experiences from China and India, see as most crucial to succeed and which that should be avoided?

By knowing what the similarities and differences are for Swedish leaders operating in China and India, such a leader may be able to use applicable leadership theories, perhaps with some additional modifications, in order to become a successful leader.
Thesis structure
This thesis will start with an Introduction chapter to explain why multi-cultural leadership is of interest to many Western managers and what areas we aim to address with this thesis. We will also provide a short description on how we have structured our thesis.

Then we will describe the research method used in the Methodology chapter in more detail and e.g. go through how we selected respondents for our survey and how we have analyzed the result.

We will then continue with a chapter that will review previous academic research. In Literature Review: Leadership and culture we will see what the academic world state around what cultural aspects that affected leadership. We will also describe the results from two of the main quantitative research studies that have been performed to see how our target cultures (U.S., Sweden, China, and India) have scored on the different identified cultural dimensions. We will then take a closer look on what the main Western leadership theories are.

With the academic review performed, we will in the Analysis: Western leadership applicability in India and China chapter analyze how the results from the survey relate to the previous academic review, before we provide our final conclusions in Summary.
Methodology

Introduction
As stated in the introduction, the main aim/goal with this thesis is to “Gain a deeper understanding of the applicability of Western leadership theories and what cultural differences Western leaders, and in particular Swedish leaders, should be prepared for when operating in China and India.” The nature of our research aim is basically to gain a deeper understanding in the aspect of leadership and the relation leadership has to cultural differences. This is in itself investigative research in the sense that it does not test any specific theory, but is explorative and could be used to generate new theories instead. This corresponds well with qualitative research, and less with quantitative research, and is hence the select research strategy used for this thesis (Bryman, 2003).

Based on the aim of the thesis, we stated three main questions that we believe need to be answered. In this chapter we will explain the academic approach and methodology used as well as how primary and secondary data sources were used.

![Methodology Overview](image)

To provide an answer to “From a leadership perspective investigate what cultural similarities and differences arise from the emerging Asian markets of China and India in comparison with the Western countries U.S. and Sweden?” we used secondary data from a wide range of academic sources as a base. The cultural leadership dimensions used in our litterateur review and analysis as well as input to our own primary research was based on the aggregated data from two quantitative multi-year and multi-country academic studies; The Hofstede studies and the Globe studies. These data sources stood out as most quoted and refer to studies in other academic papers. There are also a number of academic studies who have questioned, verified and/or validated the results from these studies over the years, which increase their academic valued further.

To answer “What are the current recommended Western leadership practices and theories and how well do theses apply in the cultural context of China and India?” we used a large
number of secondary data sources from the academic world to do a literature review of Western leadership practices and theories. We did this because it gave us deeper knowledge and an overview of existing leadership theories and how they have evolved over time, as well as which ones are currently in use and recommended. This exploration however only addresses the first part of the question, but it also gives us a base for answering the second part, and therefore we later used those practices and theories as a base for comparisons with the cultural dimensions described by Hofstede and Globe in combination with our own primary data. We did not try to relate the different practices and theories to each other as this was not required to fulfill the aim of the thesis. We simply used each practice / theory as input to our analysis to see if the practice or theory considered any dimensions that are somewhat different in the different cultures.

For the final question “Which leadership aspects and behaviors do Swedish leaders, with experiences from China and India, see as most crucial to succeed and which that should be avoided?” our main source of input comes from the data collected in our own primary research and relating that with the secondary data used throughout the thesis.

We will in this chapter describe the research methods used, the method for data collection and interpreting the result of the questions asked during our primary research.

**Research method**

In order to understand which leadership aspects and behaviors that leaders believe are most crucial for success in the multi-cultural environments of China and India and which ones that should be avoided, we needed to collect primary data from Swedish leaders who have this knowledge and experiences.

Due to constraints in the time available for this thesis and in available budget, travel to China and India was not feasible. This implied that research methods such as experiment and observations were ruled out as these would require local presence (Ghauri, 2005).

For the same reason performing interviews over the phone, while possible, would cost too much in phone charges as well as make it difficult to get a hold of respondents at times where it was suitable for both us and the respondents. This would also require significantly amount of time from people in higher level management positions that tend to not have much time to spare. (Ghauri, 2005)

Web based surveys was in our view the only logical choice to collect our primary data as this research method allowed us to gain a global reach, are cheap to carry out, made it possible for the respondent to answer when they felt they had the time and all without the need for us to be physically present at the same time. An indirect benefit of using a web based survey is that data is captured electronically and hence making analysis faster (Wyatt, 2000).

The web survey we designed was a semi-structured questionnaire, with both closed questions and open-end questions. The closed questions were designed to provide quantified data that would enable us to compare the results with the quantitative academic studies performed by Hofstede and Globe. The open-ended questions on the other hand allowed us to gain a deeper understanding of the area of multi-cultural leadership and other aspects which we otherwise may have missed (Ghauri, 2005).
In order for us to know which questions and areas to focus on in our primary research we used our secondary data to gain an insight and understanding of previous research investigating cultural similarities and differences between U.S., Sweden, China and India. As we also wanted to investigate how any leadership theories can be applied by Swedish leaders in China and India, we used our other secondary data and academic level literature review of the existing leadership theories and practices as a base.

After reviewing academic research, studies and literature in general we had a base for what areas to look further into and what questions to ask.

From the quantitative studies we found a number of areas that were more interesting to look into than others, either because the secondary data did not provide a complete picture, or where there were big differences between Sweden and India/China.

The **Power distance** dimension was the most interesting aspect as the previous research had conflicting result and our own experience told us that this dimension is one of major importance when it comes to differences between Sweden, China and India, so we decided to ask multiple questions related to this dimension.

**Individualism, institutional collectivism and in-group collectivism** is another dimensional area that we wanted to include questions about since it was difficult to compare the result of our secondary data, and our experience again told us that there could be differences in this dimension when comparing Sweden, China and India.

As there were some differences in the secondary data around **Uncertainty avoidance** and our experiences told us that this is an interesting area, we included questions regarding this area as well.

We also decided to include a question regarding **Masculinity, gender egalitarianisms and assertiveness** as we know that there is a difference in Sweden in regard to many countries. Our secondary data also confirmed that there is a difference between Sweden, China and India.

**Long-term orientation and future orientation** dimension also showed some difference in results among the secondary data. Therefore we decided to include a question investigating this dimension as well.

The last dimension that we wanted to gain more insights on was related to **Performance orientation**. This dimension was not even addressed in some of the secondary data, while addressed in some others; we decided to include a question regarding this to be able to compare the results.

After we created a number of questions addressing the dimensions mentioned above we create additional questions, mostly open-ended, to gain more in depth knowledge around the experiences and knowledge from the Swedish managers who have been operating in this environment and connect this to the Western leadership practices/theories. The questions also allowed us to cover areas that could not be addressed by the single choice questions around the dimensions and to address different attributes of leadership theories.
The survey was designed to follow questionnaire guidelines such as using concise and simple language, each question addressing one dimension, not suggestive, etc (Ghauri, 2005).

**Data collection**
In order to fulfill the aim of this thesis and provide an answer to the question “Which leadership aspects and behaviors do Swedish leaders, with experiences from China and India, see as most crucial to succeed and which that should be avoided?” we decided to conduct primary research by asking a number of leadership related questions to Swedish managers who have worked and been active as leaders in a higher management position, both in Sweden and in India or China. In order to get a broader understanding of the multi-cultural leadership challenges and conclusions from the Swedish managers, we decided to approach Swedish companies operating within different industry sectors.

To get in touch with appropriate companies we contacted the Swedish chamber of commerce in China and in India to get lists over medium to large Swedish companies operating in these countries. Based on these lists we contacted the different companies HR or student relation departments by e-mail, if we could find this information on their corporate web pages, and asked if they would be willing to assist.

If willing to assist we then distributed a new email with a short introduction as well as a link to our web survey itself. In the introduction we made it clear that all responses received were submitted anonymously. By stating that the data was submitted anonymously we believed that it would both increase our hit rate as well as provide more honest responses.

To make sure that we only reached Swedish leaders the web survey was presented in Swedish and contained three different sections, each with a different type of questions asked.

In the first section we asked nine closed questions (Q1-Q9) that could be used to segment the received data further as well to make sure that we reached our wanted target group.

The second section contained sixteen closed questions (Q10-25) related to leadership and culture. The sections first eight questions provided four statements where the respondent needed to describe how that statement correspond to India or China, followed by the same question again, but from a Swedish perspective. The second part of section two contained eight statements where the respondent had to decide if the statement was more valid for Sweden or India/China or if there was no difference.

In the final third section we asked eight open-ended questions (Q26-Q33) in order to secure that we gave the respondents with a chance to provide additional input that could be useful for our thesis.

**Data analysis**
After collecting all the data from the survey we inspected the answers and removed any incomplete survey answers. In total we got eighteen responses to the survey, but as two of them only answered section one, we decided to discard these and base our result on the remaining sixteen. We also reviewed all data for obviously incorrect answers but did not find any of these.

Out of the sixteen responses nine were related to leadership culture in India and remaining seven related to China. So to be able to analyze the data we divided the responses into two
main categories, one with all responses from Swedish leaders in India and one with all responses from Swedish leaders in China. As respondent in both China and India answered questions with comparison to Sweden we got a total of sixteen answers on questions relating to leadership culture in Sweden while only nine related to India and seven related to China.

Then we categorized questions and answers from the survey into the same structure that we used in the Literature Review: Leadership and culture. This made it easy for us to make comparisons between our primary data, secondary data and the academic literature review.

After this we calculated the answer percentage for each closed answer question to be able to compare between Sweden, China and India. Even though we only got a limited number of respondents we still wanted to calculate the percentage so that we could get an indication of how the results compare between the countries and relate this to the other studies, at least on an ordinary scale (Ghauri, 2005).

We then compared our findings to the Hofstede and Globe studies to conclude similarities and differences between our primary and secondary data. We did this by taking the leadership dimensions or aspects one by one and comparing the result between our primary and secondary data. From this we could then conclude what the cultural similarities and differences are between Sweden, China and India.

As we also wanted to relate these cultural similarities and differences to existing leadership theories we then took each leadership theory, one by one, and tried to conclude if the theory could be applied by a Swedish leader operating in China or India. We have not attempted to relate the theories to each other by any means but simple reflect on each theory in relation to our findings of cultural differences. We have also tried to point out any needed modifications of these theories in order to function in our given context.

This information answers our research question in that we now understand what a cultural difference a Western leader, and in particular Swedish leaders, should be prepared for. And the second part of how Western leadership theories can be used by a Swedish leader in China and India.

**Limitations**

The scope of this thesis was limited by time and as such we consciously focused on comparing our primary data results with secondary data from two very frequently referred studies, Hofstede and Globe. Even though there are many other quantitative studies we have noticed that these two are the once often referred to, as well as not all other studies provide public available data for each individual country/culture.

For our own primary research both the number of questions and the number of people who responded to our survey is a limiting factor for this thesis. Despite these limitations we believe that the result from this thesis will provide a useful indication and insights for other leaders.
Literature Review: Leadership and culture

In order to fulfill the aim of this thesis and provide an answer to the questions stated, we will in this section perform an academic review. We will start with reviewing what some of the leading expertise within the field, e.g. professors from both Harvard school of management and Kellogg’s school of management has to say on the subject in Leading voices. We will continue with digging into some of the major academic studies performed to see what leadership dimensions were investigated in Quantitative studies as well as to go through the secondary data on how our target countries performed on these dimensions in Cultural comparison between United States, Sweden, China and India. We will end our academic review with going through the Western leadership theories in Western leadership theories.

Leading voices

Jeanne M Brett, professor of dispute resolution and organizations at Kellogg school of management, elaborates on the challenges of multicultural teams. She divides the challenges into four different categories “Direct versus indirect communication”, “Trouble with accents and fluency”, “Differing attitudes toward hierarchy and authority” and “Conflicting norms for decision making” (Brett et al., 2006).

Direct versus indirect communication covers the challenges that in some cultures there is an indirect communication that is very significant. In Western cultures communication is very direct in that what is meant is actually what is said. While in non-Western cultures much of the meaning is hidden in within the presentation of the message.

Trouble with accents and fluency deals with the language problems that could occur when not all people speak the common language as a native, lack fluency, have an accent or have problems with translation. Any one of these challenges can lead to that experts withhold information because they are reluctant to speak up and expertise goes unutilized. It could also lead to misperception of status and competence. Lack of fluency can cause frustration and lead to interpersonal conflicts.

Some cultures are comfortable in an organization with very strict hierarchy and authority and this could of course also lead to challenges when put in a flat hierarchy or the other way around. This is especially true for people that are used to a flat hierarchy that are put in a very strict hierarchy and authoritative organization. Their behavior could lead to damage of status or credibility and even humiliation.

There is also great difference in the way people make decisions. Conflicting norms for decision making is common between cultures. For example in US managers are used to make decisions based on very little information and analysis compared to other cultures.

Rosabeth Moss Kanter, professor of business administration at Harvard business school, also elaborates on the challenges of leadership. Kanter states that the strict hierarchy and authority levels that are a natural part of some cultures can also affect receptiveness to change. New idea and suggestions (i.e. ideas of change) from less senior and less experienced people in an organization may be disregarded in that particular cultural climate while in other non-hierarchical organization may be acted upon to forward revolutionary success (Kanter, 2006).
Kanter also states that common values and standards within an organization, especially if geographically distributed, can facilitate decision making under pressure. These organizational values and standards can help in guide culturally different geography while not inhibiting differences; it simply creates a global standard that can be applied locally. This was a common similarity between the leading-edge companies which were examined (Kanter, 2008).

### Quantitative studies

When looking into multi-cultural leadership theories it can be tough to get a coherent view of how they all link together and in order to perform a cultural comparison between our selected markets and cultures, we need to find a common ground for comparison. Luckily there are multiple of quantitative academic studies that provide you with this type of secondary data.

For our thesis we selected two quantitative studies to use in comparison; the Hofstede and the Globe studies as they are, to the best of our knowledge, the most academically quoted studies in this field and both of them are based on multi-year, multi-country and multi-industry research. There are of course many other studies in this area that could have been used as well, such as the studies by Hampden-Turner and Trompenaars who interviewed 11,000 managers in 50 nations, and aggregated this into seven cultural dimensions (Hampden-Turner et al, 1997). Trompenaars seven dimensions of culture are described in Table 2 (Provenmodels, 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universalism versus Pluralism</td>
<td>The degree of importance a culture assigns to either the law or to personal relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism versus Collectivism</td>
<td>The degree to which people see themselves function more as a community or more as individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific versus Diffuse</td>
<td>The degree to which responsibility is specifically assigned or is diffusely accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affectivity versus Neutrality</td>
<td>The degree to which individuals display their emotions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner directed versus Outer directed</td>
<td>The degree to which individuals believe the environment can be controlled versus believing that the environment controls them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved status versus Ascribed status</td>
<td>The degree to which individuals must prove themselves to receive status versus status simply given to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential time versus Synchronic time</td>
<td>The degree to which individuals do things one at a time versus several things at once.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Trompenaars seven dimensions of culture

Other quantitative studies include these by the psychologist Schwartz who originally performed empirical test in 20² countries and identified ten motivationally distinct values that are recognized across societies (Schwartz, 1992). Schwartz values are described in Table 3.

The studies and results from both Schwartz as well as Hampden-turner & Trompenaars were used as input to the Globe studies. As such we decided to not perform any detailed analysis of these dimensions as such but only include them as reference. For the study and results from Hofstede these were also used as input to the Globe study, but as this study, in contrast to the others, is much more academically quoted we have still included this in our work. In the Globe study results, you can also find more information about how their results statistically relate to each of these studies.

² In later research samples from 66 countries were included (Schwartz, 2007).
Cultural values | Description
--- | ---
Power | Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources.
Achievement | Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards.
Hedonism | Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself.
Stimulation | Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life.
Self-direction | Independent thought and action-choosing, creating, exploring.
Universalism | Understanding, appreciation, tolerance, and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature.
Benevolence | Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact.
Tradition | Respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self.
Conformity | Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms.

Table 3: Schwartz basic values

The Hofstede studies

One of the most quoted studies, if not the most quoted study, in recent years is the studies done by Professor Geert Hofstede, where his team analyze national cultural differences within one large multinational company (IBM) in 64 countries during 1967-1973 (Hofstede, 1980). This research was later extended into other businesses and other international populations and his research today covers 74 countries (Itim International, 2010).

In his research Hofstede define five main different dimensions that affect leadership. Hofstede’s description of these dimensions is available in Table 4.

| Leadership dimension | Description |
--- | ---
Power Distance | The extent to which a society accepts the fact that power in institutions and organizations is distributed unequally. |
Individualism | Implies a loosely knit social framework in which people are supposed to take care of themselves and their immediate families only, while collectivism is characterized by a tight social framework in which people distinguish between in-groups and out-groups; they expect their in-group (relatives, clan, organizations) to look after them, and in exchange for that they feel they owe absolute loyalty to it. |
Masculinity | The extent to which the dominant values in society are "masculine" that is, assertiveness, the acquisition of money and things, and not caring for others, the quality of life, or people. |
Uncertainty Avoidance | The extent to which a society feels threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations by providing career stability, establishing more formal rules, not tolerating deviant ideas and behaviors, and believing in absolute truths and the attainment of expertise. |
Long-term Orientation | This index looks into how virtues oriented toward future rewards, e.g. perseverance and thrift, compared to virtues related to past and present, e.g. respect for tradition and preservation. Another way of looking at this is long-term perspective vs. short-term gains. |

Table 4: Hofstede’s leadership dimensions

To get a better overview on what high and low values in each of these indexes implies a short description for what low and high values imply for each of the indexes is described below (Itim International, 2010):

---

3 Originally Hofstede defined four dimensions but added long-term orientation to the list at a later stage.
A high power distance score implies that authorities openly demonstrate their rank and that subordinates are not given important work and hence expect clear guidance from above and the relationship between boss and subordinate is rarely close or personal. While a low power distance score, implies that superiors treat subordinates with respect and do not pull rank. Subordinates are also given important assignments and are not to be blamed for things that go wrong.

A high individualism score imply that a person’s identity resolves around “I” and that personal goals and achievements are strived for. It also implies that it’s acceptable that personal goals can be pursued on the expense of others. A low individualism score implies that “we” is much more important than “I” and conformity is expected. It also implies that individual desires and ambitions should be curbed if necessary for the good of the group.

A high masculinity score implies that life’s priorities are achievements, wealth and expansions (live to work) as well as its social accepted to settle conflicts through aggressive means. A low masculinity score typically implies that the main priorities in life are family, relationship and quality of life (work to live) as well as conflicts should be settled through negotiations.

A high uncertainty avoidance score implies that even calculated risks are avoided in business and that new ideas are difficult to introduce. A low uncertainty avoidance score implies that risk is embraced as part of the business as well as that innovation and pushing boundaries are encouraged. A low score also implies that country is much more diverse, usually through immigration while a high score means that the population is not as multicultural.

A high long-term orientation score implies a more long-term focus and focus on long-term gains compared to low long-term orientation scores which imply a much more focus on the current status and current/immediate gains.

The GLOBE studies

Substantial academic research was also carried out in the Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness (GLOBE) research program. This study lasted for eleven years and data was collected from more than 17 000 middle-managers in more than 950 organizations in 62 countries with the aim to collect data on what attitudes and values that is relevant for “outstanding leadership” in each country (House et al., 2004).

The GLOBE study included a questionnaire with 112 leadership items that were asked toward the middle managers. The result of the study was that 22 attributes were universally desirable, 8 were universally undesirable, and 35 were culturally contingent, meaning desirable in some cultures and undesirable in other cultures. These attributes were through factor analysis grouped into 21 primary leadership dimensions. In order to get required national distinctions and statistically reliable results, these 21 subscales where grouped into six global leadership dimensions. These global leadership dimensions are described in Table 5 and Table 6.

The universally 22 globally endorsed leadership attributes belonged to the following subscales; Inspirational (6), Team integrator (4), Integrity (3), Visionary (2), Diplomatic (2), Malevolent (2), decisiveness (1), administratively competent (1) and performance oriented (1). With this in mind you could say that a “universal” leader should possess a high level of integrity, while being inspirational and visionary and is a good team builder. However a big majority of the attributes were found to be culturally contingent and hence will vary from
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culture to culture. A list over attributes and subscales in relation to the leadership dimensions can be found in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global leadership dimension</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic/Value-based</td>
<td>…a leadership dimension that reflects ability to inspire, to motivate, and to expect high performance outcomes from others based on firmly held core values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-Oriented</td>
<td>…a leadership dimension that emphasizes effective team-building and implementation of a common purpose or goal among team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-protective</td>
<td>…this leadership dimension focus on safety and security of the individual and group through status enhancement and face saving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>…a leadership dimension that reflect the degree to which managers involve others in making and implementing decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane</td>
<td>…a leadership dimension that reflects supportive and considerate leadership but also includes compassion and generosity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td>…a leadership dimension that refers to independent and individualistic leadership attributes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: The GLOBE global leadership dimensions

The GLOBE study also investigated different society practices (as it works today) and values (as perceived that they should be) and defined nine dimensions of culture. Many of these dimensions have an origin from other studies such as these by Hofstede, Trompenaars, Schwartz, etc. However it shall be noted that even if some dimensions may have similar names with dimensions defined in other studies, the actual context of the dimension may be slightly different, and as such a one to one mapping is not possible, nor desirable. To give an example, in GLOBE there are two different scales for uncertainty avoidance (values and practices), while Hofstede’s uncertainty avoidance scale contains aggregated data from questions related to both values and practices. Such an aggregation as the one performed by Hofstede may not always be negative as it has other advantages such as simplicity. For our thesis we have decided to include both these studies as we believe that they to some extent will provide a complementary view.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global leadership dimension</th>
<th>Leadership subscale(s)</th>
<th>Leadership attributes (Selected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic/Value-based</td>
<td>Charismatic 1: Visionary</td>
<td>Foresight, prepared, anticipatory, plans ahead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charismatic 2: Inspirational</td>
<td>Enthusiastic, positive, morale booster, motive arouser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charismatic 3: Self-sacrifice</td>
<td>Risk taker, self-sacrificial, convincing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Honest, sincere, just, trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decisive</td>
<td>Willful, decisive, logical, intuitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance oriented</td>
<td>Improvement-oriented, excellence-oriented, performance-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-Oriented</td>
<td>Team 1: Collaborative team orientation</td>
<td>Group-oriented, collaborative, loyal, consultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team 2: Team integrator</td>
<td>Communicative, team-builder, informed, integrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diplomatic</td>
<td>Diplomatic, worldly, win-win problem solver, effective bargainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malevolent (reverse scored)</td>
<td>Honest, sincere, just, trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administratively competent</td>
<td>Orderly, administratively skilled, organized, good administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-protective</td>
<td>Self-centered</td>
<td>Self-centered, non-participative, loner, asocial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status conscious</td>
<td>Status-conscious, class-conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict Inducer</td>
<td>Normative, secretive, intra-group competitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Face saver</td>
<td>Indirect, avoids negatives, evasive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Ritualistic, formal, habitual, procedural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>Autocratic (reverse scored)</td>
<td>Autocratic, dictatorial, bossy, elitist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: The GLOBE global leadership dimensions, subscales and attributes

The cultural dimensions defined by GLOBE and how they relate to and affect the global leadership dimensions are described Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society practices</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Significant impact on leadership dimension^4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance orientation</td>
<td>is the degree which an organization or society encourages and reward group members for performance improvement and excellence.</td>
<td>+Charismatic/Value-based +Participative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness</td>
<td>is the degree which individuals in organizations or societies are assertive, confrontational, and aggressive in social relationships.</td>
<td>+Humane oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future orientation</td>
<td>is the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies engage in future-oriented behaviors such as planning, investing in the future, and delaying individual or collective gratification.</td>
<td>+Humane oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane orientation</td>
<td>is the degree to which individuals in organizations or societies encourage and reward individuals for being fair, altruistic, friendly, generous, caring, and kind to others.</td>
<td>+Participative +Humane Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional collectivism</td>
<td>is to the degree which organizational and societal institutional practices encourage and reward collective distribution of resources and collective action.</td>
<td>No significant impact on any leadership dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-group collectivism</td>
<td>is to the degree which individuals express pride, loyalty, and cohesiveness in their organizations or families.</td>
<td>+Charismatic/Value-based +Team-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender egalitarianisms</td>
<td>is to the degree to which an organization or society minimizes gender role differences while promoting gender equality.</td>
<td>+Participative -Self-protective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power distance</td>
<td>is to the degree which members of an organization or society expect and agree that power should be stratified and concentrated at higher levels of an organization or government.</td>
<td>+Self-protective -Charismatic/Value-based -Participative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty Avoidance</td>
<td>is to the extent to which members of an organization or society strive to avoid uncertainty by relying on established social norms, rituals, and bureaucratic practices.</td>
<td>+Team-oriented +Humane +Self-protective -Participative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: The GLOBE cultural dimensions

Cultural comparison between United States, Sweden, China and India

In order to validate how Western leadership practices are affected by difference in cultural values, we will in this section look into how our targeted countries relate to each other using the secondary data available from the Hofstede and GLOBE studies.

The Hofstede dimensions

For our selected countries, the results from the Hofstede’s studies are visualized in Figure 2.

^4 “+” implies a positive impact on leadership dimension score, while ”–“ implies a negative impact on the score
When it comes to the scores for our selected countries our conclusions on the differences and their meaning are summarized below.

China and India has a higher power distance score than the world average while U.S. and Sweden has a lower score than the world average. Implying that the distribution of power is much higher in China and India and hence subordinates expect a much clearer guidance and directive than subordinates in U.S. and Sweden.

For individualism both U.S. and Sweden scored a much higher score than world average implying that “I” and individual goals are much more important than “we” and collective goals. China scored a much lower score than world average so we can expect much more conformity for the good of the group.

For masculinity Sweden score a much lower score than world average implying a much higher focus on quality of life (work to live) and resolving conflicts through negotiations, while U.S., China, and India all scored above world average scores, implying a more focus on achievements and wealth.

For uncertainty avoidance, all four countries score well below world average implying that all countries do accept risk taking when doing business and the approval of pushing boundaries.

Chinas long term orientation is in a class of its own, with a much higher focus and acceptance of long term gains, while both U.S. and Sweden is somewhat below average implying a bigger focus on short term/immediate results gains. For India they have a higher score than the world average as well implying a somewhat more acceptance of long term gains, but not as extreme as for China.

The GLOBE dimensions
As the Globe cultural dimensions have a significant impact on the leadership dimensions let us start to look at the similarities and differences for these cultural dimensions from a value perspective (as it should be) in Figure 3 and from a practice perspective (as it is) in Figure 4.
Both the charismatic/value-based and participative leadership dimensions. Here we can see performance and innovation and hence not surprisingly has a significant positive impact on the cultural dimension that all four cultures value this much higher than the current practice level, implying the expectation that individuals or groups should be better rewarded and encouraged for performance improvements.

From the globe study we can conclude from the cultural dimensions that: The cultural dimension performance orientation implies valuing improving and rewarding performance and innovation and hence not surprisingly has a significant positive impact on both the charismatic/value-based and participative leadership dimensions. Here we can see that all four cultures value this much higher than the current practice level, implying the expectation that individuals or groups should be better rewarded and encouraged for performance improvements.

The cultural dimension assertiveness implies values to be aggressive, dominant and tough and has a significant positive impact on humane leadership dimension. As such it is not surprising that U.S. has a current practice score higher than the other three nations. However from a
value (as it should be) perspective we can see that both China and India would like to increase this dimension and be more aggressive than they are today surpassing the U.S. values by far, while U.S. and Sweden both do not want to change this dimension to much.

**Future orientation** implies valuing planning ahead and planning for the future and also has a significant positive effect on humane oriented leadership. For this cultural dimension all four nations are at level for current practices and all four want to improve this dimension further as we can see in the cultural values score.

For the **human orientation** cultural dimension implies being concerned about each others, being friendly and tolerating mistakes. It has a significant positive impact on the participative and humane oriented leadership dimensions. As current practice we can see that China has a somewhat lower score than the rest, while India has a somewhat higher score than U.S. and Sweden. All four nations do however strongly show in their cultural values scores (as it should be) that this dimension needs some significant improvements.

The **Institutional collectivism** dimension is characterized with group loyalty, team projects and team events. Compared to the previous cultural dimensions, this cultural dimension has not any strong impact on any of the identified leadership dimensions. For this dimension Sweden has a much higher current practices score than the other countries, but interesting enough Sweden also scores the lowest value in the value section, implying that Swedes would like to reduce this dimension.

The **in-group collectivism** dimension implies things such as organizational loyalty, and pride in group members’ achievements and accomplishments and has a significant positive impact on the charismatic/value-based and team oriented leadership dimensions. Here we can see that both China and India has much higher current practice scores than U.S. and especially Sweden. Sweden and U.S. does however have the highest cultural value score here implying that these nations want to improve this dimension a lot while both China and India would like to reduce this dimension.

The **gender equalitarian** cultural dimension implies having men and women as managers, equal professional development, and that failure has equal consequences for men and women. This dimension has a significant positive impact on the participative leadership dimension, while a significant negative impact on the self-protective leadership dimension. From an as-is perspective especially Sweden but also and U.S. has higher scores here than China and India. Sweden and U.S. are also the two nations that want to improve this dimension most, implying that especially China but also India want to be much more unequal compared to Sweden and U.S.

The **power distance** dimension implies that position is important, obeying leaders as well as saying that inequality is ok. It has a significant positive relation to self-protective leadership and a significant negative impact on participative leadership (and also charismatic, but only on societal level and not organization level). It’s not too big of a surprise that this is a dimension all countries would like to reduce, but it is somewhat surprising that all nations current practice scores are fairly equal today.

The last cultural dimension **uncertainty avoidance** implies orderliness and consistency, highly structured, detailed instructions and rules and laws. This cultural dimension has a significant positive effect on team-oriented, humane and self-protective leadership while a significant
negative relation towards participative leadership. Sweden followed by China scores the highest on current practices. But while both Sweden and U.S. want to reduce their scores; both China and India want to increase their scores.

Let us analyze what this implies for us from a leadership perspective.

Looking into the global leadership dimensions for our selected countries, the score for each country in a scale from one to seven is described in Figure 5. When looking at these scores, it is important to understand that a score above four implies that the dimension is considered to contribute to outstanding leadership while a value below four means that the dimension is considered to have a negative impact on outstanding leadership.

![Figure 5: GLOBE global leadership dimension scores for U.S., Sweden, China, India and World (mean)](image)

From the global leadership dimensions scores for our selected countries we can reach the following conclusions:

- All four countries believe that charismatic/value-based, team-oriented, participative and humane leadership contributed to outstanding leadership.
- For participative leadership this dimension was scored higher in U.S. and Sweden than in China and India.
- All four countries believe that autonomous leadership neither contributed nor had a negative effect on outstanding leadership, even though China considered it slightly positively while the other three nations considered it slightly negative.
- For self protective leadership China and India believed that this did not affect outstanding leadership while U.S. and Sweden considered this to have a negative effect on outstanding leadership.

In Table 8, we can see the individual ranking of the three primary leadership dimensions for each country. In all countries we can see that charismatic and team-orientation places in top three for all countries even though they are not scored in same place in all countries. This conclusion goes well in hand with the conclusion around globally endorsed traits. Participative leadership is of more interest in U.S. and Sweden than in China and India which put a higher focus on humane leadership than U.S. and Sweden even though the score in this dimension are comparable.
Even though the charismatic/value-based leadership dimension look fairly similar for all our nations there are some big differences under the surface. The most important cultural dimension values that affect this leadership dimension positively are performance orientation, in-group collectivism, and gender egalitarianism. There is also one cultural dimension that affects the leadership dimension negatively and that is power distance. Here we can see that there are some big differences especially when it comes to in-group collectivism and gender egalitarianism. Both U.S. and Sweden have much higher value scores than India and especially China.

Also the team-oriented leadership dimension look fairly similar, but even here there are some differences. This leadership dimension is mainly affected by two cultural dimension values; Uncertainty avoidance and in-group collectivism. As we could see in the previous leadership dimension U.S. and Sweden have much higher values on the in-group collectivism than India and China. However when it comes to uncertainty avoidance India and especially China has much higher values that U.S. and Sweden.

For the participative leadership dimension you can see that there are some big differences between U.S. & Sweden compared to China and India. The important cultural dimensions that affect this leadership dimension positively are performance orientation, gender egalitarianism and Humane Orientation. The cultural dimension values uncertainty avoidance and power distance will affect this leader dimension negatively. Again it’s the differences between U.S./Sweden and China/India when it comes to gender egalitarianism and uncertainty avoidance that stand for the biggest difference. However the differences when it comes to power distance as well as humane orientation also play a role when explaining the differences in the aggregated leadership dimension.

When it comes to the humane oriented leadership dimension U.S., India and China have similar scores while Sweden has a somewhat lower score. The cultural dimensions that affect this score are humane orientation, uncertainty avoidance and assertiveness. Sweden’s lower value could hence be explained with its much lower assertiveness value.

The autonomous leadership dimension is quite interesting even though the values look fairly the same. The reason for this is that this is the only dimension where we have a difference in if this dimensions is perceived as positive or negative by own culture. U.S., Sweden and India all perceive this is slightly negative (value less than four) while China perceives this dimension slightly positive (value above four). The cultural dimension values that affect this leadership dimension positively is performance orientation while humane orientation and institutional collectivism affect cultural dimension values affect the leadership dimension negatively. Here it’s the low values for humane orientation that explain the score for India and China while it’s the lower score in institutional collectivism that explain the Swedish values.

The self protective leadership dimension is perceived as negative in all cultures but China and India only see this as slightly negative while U.S. and especially Sweden see this as strongly
negative. The cultural dimension values that affect this leadership dimension positively are power distance and uncertainty avoidance while gender egalitarianism affects the score negatively. Here we can see that it is China's high score when it comes to uncertainty avoidance and low score for gender egalitarianism that is the main difference with U.S. and Sweden. India also differs from U.S. and Sweden on the same factors, but with a smaller difference compared to China. The difference between Sweden and U.S. can be explained in the differences in uncertainty avoidance and power distance.

**Western leadership theories**

In order for us to be able to answer the second research question in this thesis, regarding how well Western leadership practices and theories apply in the cultural context of China and India, we will in this section review existing leadership practices and theories.

A high level review of these practices and theories will give us a basis for analysis later on in this thesis using the result from our survey and the cultural leadership research review in the two prior chapters. We will attempt to make a rather complete but high level review of leadership practices and theories so that it is clear that we have not deliberately disregarded any major once from the start of the research in this thesis.

**Great man theory**

In early leadership theory, the main idea was that leaders were born and not made. This theory was drawn from studying existing leaders at that time and these were mainly from the upper class which indicated that leaders are born in great families. Leaders are somewhat mystical in this theory and are said to emerge where there is a need for them. This early research only refers to men as being leaders as few or no women leaders existed. This theory was later replaced by other leadership theories as this theory had several severe drawbacks (Bogardus, 2009).

**Trait theory**

This is also an early leadership theory from about 1920-1930, which mainly refers to that certain traits or skills are necessary in order to be a good leader and these traits and skills were found by studying existing great leaders. The theory indicates that you need to be born with these traits and skills in order to become a great leader. Some of these traits and skills were above-average height, enthusiasm, verbal fluency, originality, physical and nervous energy, teaching skill, decisiveness, a sense of purpose and direction, friendliness and affection, faith, persistence, willingness to accept the consequences of their actions, integrity, technical mastery, assertiveness, initiative, intelligence, and ambition according to some literature (Dunn, 2007). There is however plenty of different trait and skills listed by other research or studies even though there is some overlapping between them. There does also not seem to be a consensus around whether a leader really must be born with these trait and skill or if they could be learned in some way (Kliem, 2004) (Kloppenborg, 2003) (Bogardus, 2009).

The trait theory in general were soon criticized because it did not rank any of the traits or skills and it did not account for if someone could be a leader even without some of these traits or skills. Also many followers of the leaders showed many of these traits and skills (Bogardus, 2009). The trait theory is partly discredited now a days but it does mark a more significant starting point of leadership studies (Dunn, 2007).
Behavioral theory

This theory emerged during the 1940s and lasted to sometime during the 1960s (Sashkin, 2003). This theory steps away from the “fact” that leaders were born and recognized that leaders could be made. The theory looked at what behaviors leaders have and what they actually do. If certain actions can be concluded to be important for success then these actions, or this behavior, could be learned. The theory hence recognizes the possibility to train people to become leaders (Bogardus, 2009).

Several people have contributed with research and models within the area of behavioral theory. Some of the more common mentioned once are McGregor’s “Theory X” and “Theory Y”, Likert’s “System 1–4”, and Blake and Mouton’s “Managerial grid”.

McGregor’s “Theory X” and “Theory Y” is considered part of the behavioral theory by most literature, even though it is not really a leadership theory (Kliem, 2004). This theory is a simple two style behavior theory where “Theory X” stands for task-oriented behavior and “Theory Y” for people-oriented behavior. A leader of type X has a very negative view of his or her subordinates. Workers are thought of to be lazy, unmotivated, unreliable, untrustworthy, without ambition, unintelligent and are reluctant to change. The leader believes that their subordinates cannot be trusted and need clear directives and close supervision. Subordinates perform the work in order to receive economic, rewards or to avoid punishment and threats. The work itself is not believed to be a motivation for the workers. This behavior style is authoritarian and the leaders’ take the decisions by them self. This is a leadership style for an organization that is very hierarchical.

The problem with “Theory X” is that it will not sustain high performance and efficiency in the long run. This is because the workers do not take any ownership and they fell powerless as all decision are take above them and they are not treated with any real respect (Cecil, 2007).

A leader of type Y is much more positive towards their subordinates. This type of leader trusts the subordinates and believes in their ability and motivation. This is the opposite of all attributes describing the subordinates for “Theory X”. Here subordinates take on responsibility for their work and they are self-directing, self-coordinating and self-controlling. These subordinates seek rewarding work and like challenges that develop their capabilities. They are also motivated by fulfilling their own as well as organizational goals. Leaders of “Theory Y” also treat their subordinates with respect use rewards for motivation instead of threats and punishment. These types of leaders are people-oriented and have the potential of delivering high performance in the long run. “Theory Y” is often considered the optimal style (Cecil, 2007).

Rensis Likert performed research during the 1960s into organizations in order to find a leadership style for high performance teams. Likert looked at two different styles called “employee centered” and “job centered”. The employee centered style is people oriented and the leaders believe in communication, trust and setting goals with the subordinates. The job centered style is more task-oriented and such leaders focus on production standards and close supervision of their subordinates.

Likert constructed a scale with four different leadership styles called system 1–4.

- System 1 is a very task oriented style with a very negative view of the subordinates. Leaders use threats and punishment to get subordinates to perform their work.
• System 2 leaders have some confidence in their subordinates but all decisions are still made by the leaders.
• System 3 leaders have much more trust and confidence in their subordinates and delegate some decisions.
• System 4 is a very people oriented style with complete trust and confidence in the subordinates. This includes group decisions and building supporting relationship with the subordinates.

Likert concluded that most high performing teams corresponds with the employee centered style system 4 so this is the most appropriate approach (Kleim, 2004).

Blake and Mouton also defined a model in the early 1960s that tries to give answer to question of how much attention a leader should give their people compared to the tasks that needs to be performed. This is called “The Managerial Grid” which later has been referred to, and based on, by other studies. The model originally defined five different styles on a grid chart with x-axis representing concern for production and the y-axis representing the concern for people, on a scale from 1 to 9 on each axis.

• 1, 1 is the do nothing manager who does not really do anything but cover his/her own back.
• 1, 9 is the country club manager who is more concerned with the people and their needs than the production.
• 9, 1 is the production pusher who is basically only concerned with production and sees people interaction as interference.
• 5, 5 is the organization person who is moderately concerned for both people and production and keeps the wheels moving adequately.
• 9, 9 is the team builder who is both highly concerned with the people and the production and contributes on a high level by motivating people to keep a high level of production.

The team builder style is commonly said to be the preferred superior style to achieve high performance (Dearlove, 2003) (Cecil, 2007).

There is other literature that lists Blake and Mouton’s model under the heading of situational theory instead of behavior, but we have found that this theory is mostly listed under behavioral theory (Kleim, 2004), (Bogardus, 2009), (Sashkin, 2003).

**Situational leadership / contingency theories**

Situational leadership, or contingency theory as it is also called, emerged during the late 1960s to late 1970s. This leadership theory steps away from the thinking that there is one specific leadership style that is the optimal one and recognize that the optimal leadership style depends on, or is contingent on, the “situation”. This theory states that depending on the situation a leader may better use a task oriented approach while in other situations it may be better with a more people oriented approach. Situations could also occur where a dual approach meaning both task and people oriented, and in other cases a leaders may be better of delegating decisions completely to their subordinates (Sashkin, 2003), (Dunn, 2007).

Several models have been created within situational leadership as well. Some of these are Hersay and Blanchard’s model, Robert House’s Path-Goal theory, Vroom and Yetton’s Normative model, and Fiedler’s model.
Hersay and Blanchard situational leadership model (originally called “Life Cycle Theory of Leadership”) from 1969 consists of four different leadership styles that a leader could assume depending on the ability and motivation of the follower (Sashkin, 2003).

These leadership styles are called:

- Telling / Directing (S1)
- Selling / Coaching (S2)
- Participating / Supporting (S3)
- Delegating / Observing (S4)

S1 should be used when the follower readiness is low (low ability and low motivation) which requires a high task focus (low relationship orientation) from the leader. S2 should be used when the follower has some readiness (some ability and motivation) which requires both a high task and relationship focus from the leaders. S3 should be used when the follower has high readiness (high ability and some motivation) which requires a high relationship focus (low task focus) from the leaders. And S4 is recommended for situations where the follower has high ability and high motivation, which requires a low task and relationship focus from the leader (Cecil, 2007).

Robert House developed a situational leadership theory, though less known than the Hersay and Blanchards theory, called the “Path-goal theory of leadership” in 1971. This is a simple model that basically defines four leadership styles to be used depending on the complexity of the task and the ability of the subordinate performing the task (Sashkin, 2003).

These four styles are (Bogardus, 2009):

- Directive: Leader specifies what should be done
- Supportive: Leaders supports and encourages the subordinates
- Participative: The subordinate group is involved by the leaders in the decision making
- Achievement: Leaders defines a challenging goal and encourages the subordinates in group to fulfill it.

Vroom and Yetton defined a situational leadership model called the “Normative model” (Miner, 2005). This model is regarding decision making and which style a leader should apply depends on circumstances and time constraints of the decision. The Normative model lists five different leadership styles. Which style a leader should apply depends on the quality of the decision and the need/difficulty for acceptance among the subordinates. The styles vary and are more or less autocratic, consultative or group oriented in the decision making process. In general the model suggests that a participative decision making style works best but it is important to evaluate which style to use depending on the situation (Kleim, 2004).

The five different leadership styles by Vroom and Yetton are:

- A1: Problem solving and decision making by the leader with available information at the time
- A2: Leader retrieves necessary information from subordinates and then makes the decision by himself/herself.
- C1: The leader shares problem with relevant subordinates and retrieves suggestions and ideas individually from them, and then makes decision himself/herself.
- C2: The leader shares the problem at hand with the subordinate group and gathers their collective ideas and suggestions, and then makes the decision himself/herself.
• G2: The leader shares the problem with subordinates and facilitates a group discussion and tries to reach a consensus decision. The leader accepts the decision supported by the group.

For the leader to know which style to apply at a certain time, a number of rules were developed to guide the leaders’ behavior. These rules are aimed at protecting the quality of the decision and the acceptance of the decision (Miner, 2005).

Fred E. Fiedler also developed a leadership model that falls under the heading of situational or contingency theory during the 1960s. Fiedler studied the relationship between characteristics of individual leaders and the situation at hand for almost 40 years. In a particular situation a certain leader may be very successful while in another situation that leader may not be as successful with the same style. Fiedler concluded that there is not a single leadership style that is more appropriate than another; it all depends on the situation (Dunn, 2007).

Fiedler looks at a situation from three different angles:

• Leader-member relations: The leader’s level of influence within the subordinate group is closely connected to the relationship between the group and the leader.

• Task structure: The leader’s influence depends on how structured the task is, a highly structured task allow for more leader influence than less structured tasks.

• Position power: A leader has a greater chance of success if the situation allows the leader to assign tasks, reward and/or punish his or her subordinates (Bogardus, 2009).

Transactional leadership theory

Transactional leadership theory is based on a pure transaction between leader and group member. The group member and the leader form a contractual relationship where the group member agrees to perform some tasks in order to receive some compensation, often financial of some sort. The group member does not have any say in how the work gets done and do only what he or she is told. The group members are held accountable for performing the tasks that the leader distributes and are therefore blamed if the task is not performed in a satisfactory way. The thinking is that if a group member risks being fired, receive bad performance rating, or similar he or she will get the job done without asking questions. This kind of leadership can exist on just about any level in an organization. So this is a pure transactional relationship between leader and subordinate with reward and punishment as a motivator. This type of leadership can work for a short period of time but in the long run this will lead to loss of power for the leader and diminishing trust from the group members (Ferraro, 2008).

One way to handle this limitation and get long term success is to create a small closer circle of trusted group members that receive the privilege of being close to the leader and therefore commit themselves harder to the work. This is called the “Leader-Member Exchange Theory” (LMX). Leaders without any real authority and at the same time have a lot of accountability benefit from keeping a close circle of group member that he or she can trust to cover his or her back and deliver with high performance. The group members of this close inner group have the possibility to influence the leader and to make or contribute to decisions, and eventually become leaders themselves. This is sort of an informal agreement between the leader and the close group members and is needed for the leader to maintain his or her position. These relationships must be beneficial for both parties or they will not be formed (Ferraro, 2008).
Transformational leadership theory

Originally transformational leadership theory was developed by Burns (1978), and later extended by several others, one of the more known once were Bass (1985). Bass with others recognize transformational leadership as a complement to transactional leadership. The idea here is that transformational leadership actually increases the effectiveness of transactional leadership (Nemiro, 2008).

Transformational leadership is all about bringing about change and it leaders does this by raising awareness, to look beyond self-interest, enable self-fulfillment, realize need for change, sell the urgency of change, committing to greatness, having long-term orientation and enabling trust (Dubrin, 2007).

Transformational leadership is signified by having a vision and being able to communicate that vision so that the vision can be achieved. Transformational leadership is about enabling change by including others and empowering them to make the change happen. Participation is a corner stone in transformational leadership, which without greatness cannot be achieved. A transformational leader has integrity and brings this to the rest of the organization and ensures organizational effectiveness. Integrity is the most essential characteristic, but vision, passion, curiosity, inspirational and communication is also important (Geller, 1994). Other attributes of transformational leaders are that they encourage personal development of people, are supportive, do innovative thinking and lead by example. Transformational leaders do not always posses all of these characteristics and it is also not totally clear of how to describe a transformational leader (Dubrin, 2007).
Analysis: Western leadership applicability in India and China

To analyze the results from our primary research we decided to link the survey results (described in Appendix B: Survey Results) with the literature review presented in this thesis (described in Literature Review: Leadership and culture).

Survey results in relation to the leading voices

Most of the survey results are positively related to the views found in our leading voices section, indicating that there is a similarity between the views of Swedish leaders and other Western leaders.

From our survey we can conclude that most Swedish leaders state that the typical Swedish “consensus decision making” is stated as a main leadership trait/behavior that they recommend should be avoided both in India and China (Q32). “Conflicting norms for decision making” is also one of the four cultural challenges that Brett concluded (Brett et al., 2006). In the survey we also received feedback that a big challenge in China is that “a lot of decision making and influencing is taking place outside the formal meeting” (Q27) as well as that a big challenge in India is that “information is received very late, which creates many last minute decisions” (Q26), this input need to be considered in this context as well.

Another cultural challenge that Brett brought up was the difference between “direct vs. indirect communication” (Brett et al., 2006). Here Brett state that Western cultures are very direct and what people say is what is meant. From our survey we can see that we get similar input on what should be avoided, such as “assuming that a “yes” is a yes” (Q31). That you “can not assume that the information is correct/valid in the same way as Sweden” was also stated as one of the biggest cultural challenges in India (Q27). The Swedish leaders do however also indicate some behaviors that work, such as “If you need true feedback or input… you need to get this between two pair of eyes” (Q30). The importance of communication both when communicating goals as well as strategy and vision is as important in China and India as in Sweden (Q28, Q32). To be able to “convey a vision and direction” and “show clarity” and “to be clear” are also stated as some of the main leadership aspects required in order to successful as a leader (Q29).

Brett also talked about challenges around “differing attitudes toward hierarchy and authority” (Brett et al., 2006). From a cultural perspective we did conclude that there is a difference in power distance both from Hofstede and our own survey results (e.g. Q20). But we can also link this into Brett’s statement that people who are used to live in a flat organization and are put in a an strict hierarchical organization could face damage of status, credibility and even humiliation if behavior is not adapted. From our survey we get similar input that leaders are required to “show authority” and have “courage to lead upfront” to be successful both in India and China (Q29). “Indistinctness” and “too much consensus” is also highlighted as a behavior that should be avoided (Q31) and even though you need to adapt, you should also have “courage to coach even when directions are assumed” and “challenge people to exceed their own expectations” (Q29). We also got a hint that authoritarian leadership may be switched to more democratic leadership when a certain maturity is reached (Q30).
When trying to change local culture we also got the recommendation that you “need to pick your fights”, implying that leaders need to be careful when trying to change the local culture (Q32). This is also in line with the thoughts of Kanter who stated that the strict hierarchy and authority levels can affect the receptiveness for change (Kanter, 2008).

Survey results in relation to quantitative studies
In the survey we asked a number of questions to see if the results from the quantitative studies also were reflected in the opinions from our Swedish managers. As we neither had the time and the resources available to make an in-depth comparison we decided to focus on some of the dimensions that we found to be more interesting and provided a deeper insight into the aim of the thesis and in particular to the question “From a leadership perspective investigate what cultural similarities and differences arise from the emerging Asian markets of China and India in comparison with the Western countries U.S. and Sweden?”

Power distance
In our view, one of the more interesting aspects in the Globe and Hofstede studies is the Power Distance dimension. As such we included several questions related to this topic in our survey.

It is our belief that currently there is a general perception that there is a big difference in power distance between Sweden and China/India and that the perception is that Sweden has a much lower power distance than these countries. This perception is in-line with the results from the Hofstede studies but not to the same extend in the Globe studies. In the Globe studies the current practice (as it is) score do indicate a slightly higher score for India compared to U.S. and Sweden, but almost no difference between U.S., Sweden and China, which is a big difference compared to Hofstede. When it comes to the cultural values (as it should be) all countries want to slash this dimension by half or more, but in relation to each other China and U.S. expect a higher value than India and Sweden.

With this in mind, we decided to ask several questions looking at different aspects of power distance in our survey toward Swedish managers.

In one of our survey questions we asked about the organizational power structure and if this structure was more or less hierarchical in comparison to Sweden (Q20). The survey results were that based on their experiences from these markets 88% stated it was more hierarchical in India than in Sweden and 100% stated it to be more hierarchical in China than in Sweden. This is definitely in line with the Hofstede results and also in line with the Globe results, even though the Globe scores only show a slight difference between Sweden and these countries.

The results from the survey question around managerial level of control over their subordinates (Q19) are consistent with the result above. 100% state that you needed to micro-manage and control on a lower level in China compared to Sweden and 75% stated the same for India in comparison with Sweden.

We also decided to look into power distance from a responsibility point of view (Q14-15). The survey results show that the leader is seen as sole primary responsible for a task outcome scored 67% in India and 86% for China while the value was only 38% for Sweden. Shared responsibility between leader and team scored 56% in Sweden while only 11% in India and 14% in China. Again we can conclude that in Sweden there is a lower power distance where the responsibility is mainly shared between the leader and the subordinate. While China and
India has a higher power distance and that the leader is the one who is responsible in these countries.

As power distance also affect the decision making process we also decided to ask a question around this topic as well (Q10-11). The survey results showed that in India, you as a leader decided after consultative input from your employees (56%), followed by you as a leader without any input from others (22%). For China the results were a little more scattered but you as a leader without any input from others (43%) dominated by far. For Sweden the results were concentrated around consensus (62%) and consultative input (31%). We interpret this as that there is a higher degree of expectancy on management to make their own decisions without forming a consensus in China and India. This is consistent with our previous findings.

We also surveyed decision making from a situational leadership perspective (Q12-13). Here we used the different roles described in situational leadership theory (which will be discussed more in detail in a separate chapter). Even though the results were scattered between the different people who answered the survey, both average and mean value analysis provided a good indication about the differences. For China directive leadership was the most common response (44%) followed by coaching (26%). Similar values were seen for India which scored highest on directive leadership (45%) followed by coaching (23%). For Sweden only 15% of the time was spent using directive leadership. This is consistent with the analysis (Q10-11) above.

The final survey question related to power distance was stated to see if coaching of subordinates had any impact on these results (Q18). Here we see a big difference between China and India in relation to Sweden. In relation to India 75% state that people coach more in Sweden, while when China is compared to Sweden only 43% state the same. 43% also state that there is a similar level of coaching in China as is Sweden. The relationship between power distance and coaching is hence not easy to conclude and motivate further studies.

**Individualism, Institutional collectivism and In-group collectivism**

According to Hofstede individualism is about individualism versus collectivism and if personal goals and achievements are strived for. The Globe studies do not provide a one to one mapping, but instead the globe studies use the dimensions institutional collectivism and in-group collectivism. Where institutional collectivism is defined as to the degree that collective distribution and collective actions are encouraged and rewarded while in-group collectivism is about if individuals express pride and loyalty toward their organization.

It’s our opinion that the break down made in the Globe dimensions provides a lower and better level for comparison in this case than the Hofstede dimension and we will use these as base in our comparisons.

From the globe studies the institutional collectivism practices (as it is) scores show that Sweden has by far the highest score and India/China the lowest with China in the middle. However the values (as it should be) are different. Here India and China is on the top followed by U.S. and Sweden. In our survey (Q16-17) we can see that in Sweden 69% of the rewards are designed for the advantage of the group while only 22% in India and 14% in China. These results are in line with the Globe current practices relative ranking toward Sweden.
If we relate these results with Hofstede’s dimension individualism, we can see that these state that U.S. has the highest score followed by Sweden, India and China. In comparison with our survey, you could state that the score in Q16-17 would contradict the Hofstede results. But as Hofstede had a much wider definition of this dimension than the Globe studies it is thought to really state that this is a real contradiction. As such we believe that the survey question make much more sense in relation to the Globe dimension institutional collectivism.

For in-group collectivism the current practice score show that China and India scored much higher than Sweden, and that U.S. had a score in between. For the value scores (as it should be) both Sweden and U.S. want to improve most and have higher value scores than both India and China. In relation to this dimension we asked in relation to Sweden, is it more or less important it is to have a uniform view with your team or your manager (Q22). The result were that 71% believed it was more important to have the same view in China than in Sweden, and the results are almost the same for India where 63% state it’s more important in India than in Sweden. These results are in line with the Globe current practices. Even though results are inline we believe that this area would benefit from additional research to see if there would be possible to separate the common view aspect from group loyalty.

Just as for the question related to globe institutional collectivism (Q16-17), the question around unified views could be related to Hofstede’s individualism. Here the results are consistent with Hofstede’s results, but our opinion is once again, that the question makes very little sense to compare to the Hofstede dimension Individualism as we believe it is to general.

**Masculinity, Gender egalitarianisms and Assertiveness**

Just as for individualism there is no easy one to one comparison between the Hofstede masculinity dimension and the Globe dimensions gender egalitarianism and assertiveness.

In our survey we only asked one question related to these dimensions and it was about assertiveness and how acceptable it is to show dominant and/or aggressive behavior toward your employees (Q23). Globes current practice score did contrary to our belief state that it’s much more common to be assertive in U.S. today than in China, India and Sweden which all have a similar current practice score. However when it comes to cultural values (as it should be) you can see that China and India want to become much more assertive than they are today. The result from our survey indicate that 100% state that this is more acceptable in China than in Sweden and 75% state its more acceptable to be assertive in India compared to Sweden. This is in line with both the Globe current practices and values, even though you would expect the current practice value to show a bigger difference. In Hofstede’s masculinity dimension we can also see that Sweden score by far the lowest value while China, U.S. and India all score high values.

**Uncertainty avoidance**

For uncertainty avoidance the Hofstede and Globe studies did indicate some differences. Hofstede’s scale indicated that there were no major differences in how the different societies feel threatened by uncertain and ambiguous situations, even though Sweden did have a slightly minor score than the other cultures. However the Globe studies did show significant difference both then it comes to the cultural values (as it should be) and practices (as it is). For the cultural practices Sweden had a much higher value than U.S. and India with China in between. For the cultural values, Sweden had the lowest score while China had the highest on followed by India and U.S in between. These big difference between Hofstede and Globe as well as the big difference in ranking from values and practices was our rationale to ask Q24,
about if more processes/rules were expected in Sweden or in India/China. For Sweden in comparison with India, 100% stated that India expected more rules and processes. This is in line with the Globe values, but not the practices. We would have expected such a response for India due to the expected more directive leadership style (Q12-13). For Sweden in relation to China the responses were a little more mixed. 43% believe that more processes/rules were expected in Sweden while 29% believed that more processes/rules were expected in Sweden. The higher value for Sweden is in line with the Globe practices, but results were still too scattered to make any valid conclusions. However it is our personal believe that the more direct leadership behavior expected in China and India could both be interpreted both as “rules” (a manager decide rule) as well as “lack of rules” (no defined rules, but we follow manager). More research is needed here in order to sort this out.

Long-term orientation and Future orientation

Hofstede also looked into how virtues toward the future would be rewarded in comparison with short term gains in a dimension he called long-term orientation. According to the Hofstede results, China is by far most focused on the long-term followed by India (half the score of China) and Sweden/U.S. (half the score of India). In our survey we designed one question to investigate long-term orientation in China and India compared to Sweden (Q21). The results show us that 88% believe that Swedish leaders were more focus on long-term goals while 0% believed leaders in India was more long-term oriented. 43% of Swedish leaders in China believed that Swedish leaders were more focus on long-term goals, but in comparison to India 29% believed that leaders in China were more focused. This implies that the long-term orientation should be highest in Sweden, followed by both China and India. These results differ significantly from the Hofstede studies. However when compared to the dimension future orientation in Globe, the current practice scores here actually are consistent with the result. In the Globe study Sweden score highest of all nations followed by China, U.S. and India. Looking at the Globe values (as it should be) all four nations want to improve, and here China actually score lowest. Why the results differ so significantly between Globe and Hofstede is hard to explain without further research.

Performance orientation

One of the dimensions discussed in the Globe studies that were not addressed in the Hofstede studies was performance orientation. As such we decided to have a brief look into this topic as well in our survey. The Globe results once again showed differences in ranking between the countries when it comes to values and practices. For practices (as it is) Sweden had the lowest score, while U.S. and China had the highest scores closely followed by India. For the values (as it should be) there were only minor differences between all countries even though the scoring was that U.S. had the highest score followed by Sweden, India and China. The results from our survey (Q25) indicate that Swedish leaders put more focus on creating effective teams than in India (63%) and than in China (57%). However in comparison with China 43% believed that they were at a similar level (while only 25% in India). This result is neither in line with the Globe practices nor fully in line with the Globe values, but as we only scratched on the surface of this topic we cannot make any specific conclusions, and only state that performance orientation in relation to culture would make an excellent research topic of its own.

Survey results in relation to Western leadership theories

Now that we had analyzed the result of our survey and related these results to both leading voices and the quantitative studies performed by Hofstede and Globe, we could use this knowledge and put it in relation to the Western leadership theories in order to provide an
answer to the question “What are the current recommended Western leadership practices and theories and how well do these apply in the cultural context of China and India?”. To answer this question we used the leadership practices and theories previously reviewed and looked at each one of them to see if there were any considerations in the content of these practices and theories to the cultural differences found. As we focused our questions in the primary data on certain aspects of leadership culture, we have limited data to link to some of the Western leadership theories. The main reason for this is some of the theories are already discredited today or lack any attributes that can be connected to any cultural differences or cultural similarities. We will however attempt to make a shorter reflection on the theories which we have less data while give a more extensive look on the once where we have more data. We do not wish to exclude theories where we have less data as there can be some connections or relations to the research, and also to clearly show that we have not missed any theory. Further we believe that this actually shows that there are some theories that are less contingent on cultural aspects in themselves. This does not make them better or worse, they simple do not address attributes that are cultural dependent in the same way as others.

Great man theory
The Great Man theory implies that leaders are born not made, so there is not much to relate to our findings. The main reason is that our research is focused on attributes of leaders and thereby in itself goes beyond simply stating that someone is born a leader or not. Our research shows that good leadership is at least in some parts dependent on cultural aspects. Leaders must adapt to the culture in order to be good leaders (Q29).

Furthermore we have not found anything in our research to rectify this theory. Thereby is this theory somewhat discredited by our research, as well as by many others before us (Bogardus, 2009).

Trait theory
For Trait theory we can argue basically the same. Though trait theory identifies traits and skills of good leaders, we have shown, with supporting research that these differ in different cultures. The Globe studies do recognize that some trait are global in the sense that they are considered to contribute to good leadership regardless of culture, but the majority of good leadership traits and skills were culture contingent. However, It do not really matter that trait theory in some cases recognize that traits and skill could be learned, as it still only recognize one “type” of leader that do not adapt in any way which our research clearly indicate is needed.

We have not found anything in our research that supports this theory in such a way that it can be considered applicable for multi-cultural leadership.

Behavioral theory
Behavioral theory moved away from the belief that leaders were born and recognized that leaders could be made by developing certain behaviors. When we look at the difference in power distance between Sweden, China and India, and relate this to behavioral theory you could conclude that McGregor’s “Theory X” leadership style is more applicable for China and India in regards to the need of more clear directives and closer supervision (Q12-13, Q19). In Sweden “Theory Y” leadership style would probably be more applicable from a power distance perspective in that it is more consensus focused (Q12-13). The same connection can be made to Likert’s scale where China and India would be System 1 or 2, and Sweden would more towards System 3 or 4.
McGregor and Likert state that “Theory Y” or “System 4” leadership is the most efficient for high performance while theory X and or System 1 leadership will not sustain high performance in the long run. If this was correct China and India would not have the ability to create high performance teams in the long run. At the same time we can see in the Globe studies the cultural dimension values (as it should be) that it is a desire to have a lower power distance in Sweden, China as well as in India. If the desire for lower power distance would lead to increased effectiveness it supports the result and statement of behavioral theories that people-oriented leadership style is preferred when trying to create high performing teams in the long run.

As behavioral theory also states that a certain type of leadership style is preferred in order to achieve high performance and our research material indicate that different styles are needed depending on the culture (Q29), this theory is not really applicable for multi-culture leadership.

We can conclude that China and India wants to move more toward “Theory Y” leadership from the Globe studies. From our survey we can also conclude that this is what Swedish leaders think is needed.

**Situational Leadership / Contingency Theories**

Situational leadership theory states that there is not one preferred leadership style and the situation shall dictate what style is most appropriate in that given situation. This is a very interesting theory for us since it gives room for adaptability in assessing the situation. It is also exactly what is needed when addressing the challenges of multi-cultural leadership. Different models included in situational leadership theory use someway different ways to assess the situation. Often this involves task characteristics and the experience of the subordinates executing the task.

Our research shows that there is a cultural dimension to the situation as well. The result from the questions regarding situational leadership style (Q12-13) show that there is a clear difference in the amount of different leadership styles used in China and India compared to Sweden. In Sweden leaders use mostly S2 (Selling/Coaching) style, then S3 (Participating/Supporting) and S4 (Delegating/Observing), and use the least of S1 (Telling/Directive). While in China and India leaders use mostly S1, then S2 and use the least of S3 and S4. We do not believe that the task characteristics change due to culture nor do the abilities of the subordinates’ change, so therefore there must be cultural aspect to explain the difference in result. One of the reasons why S1 leadership style is the style mostly used in China and India may be the difference in power distance.

Vroom and Yetton’s normative model uses another evaluation to decide on the most appropriate leadership style. What leadership style to use depends on the required quality of the decision and the need, or difficulty, for acceptance among the subordinates. The need or difficulty for acceptance among subordinates could clearly be dependent on cultural aspects. Here we can look at the survey result on the question about the importance of employees to have a uniform view with the rest of the team or the manager (Q22). In China and India there is a much higher tendency to conform to the rest of the group or with the manager than compared with Sweden. This could be part of the reason that there is more consensus decision taken in Sweden than in China or India, for just the simple reason that it is needed in Sweden
to get people “on board”. While in China and India this is not need due to the cultural
difference in this in-group collectivism.

From our multi-cultural perspective the normative model is in a sense a better situational
model as it includes at least one aspect, the difficulty for decision acceptance (in-group
collectivism), that is culturally dependent. However we believe there are more cultural aspects
that needs to be included for it to be a good model for multi-cultural leadership. All in all we
believe that situational leadership theory is very good as it looks into the “situation” in order
to determine the most appropriate leadership style.

From our survey we can conclude that the culture has an impact on when which leadership
style should be used. Therefore we could ask ourselves if situational leadership theory should
be modified to include evaluation of cultural based characteristics in order to select the most
appropriate leadership style. Of cause this needs further research to be able to conclude for
sure.

**Transactional leadership theory**

In transactional leadership theory the subordinate is accountable for the outcome of the task
and the leaders do not share any responsibility with the subordinate. We can relate this in part
to the survey questions regarding power distance. Question 14 and 15 looked into who takes
responsibility for a task and the result show that in China and India the responsibility mostly
fall on the leader while in Sweden there is a more shared responsibility. We interpret this to
mean that this leadership theory would not really work in China or India from this
perspective.

Transactional leadership theory does not really take any aspects, of the task or people or other,
into consideration in order to adjust the leadership style. Therefore we cannot really relate any
more of our findings to this theory.

We can conclude that this leadership theory lacks any needed variable that account for
cultural aspects.

**Transformational leadership theory**

This theory corresponds to great extent with the cultural attributes that according to the Globe
studies endorse effective leadership globally. Some of the main characteristics of
transformational leadership theory are vision, effective communication of the vision,
empowerment, participation, integrity, passion, curiosity, inspiration, encouragement,
supportive, innovative and leading by example. The Globe studies lists 22 universally
endorsed leadership attributes, i.e. attributes that are not culture contingent. Several of these
global attributes correspond with the characteristics of transformational leadership such as
inspirational, visionary, integrity, etc. In the Globe study they hence draw the conclusion that
transformational leadership very well could work on a universal level.

We also find support for these conclusions in our primary data, where the importance of clear
communication is mentioned most frequently in multiple of the survey responses (Q26, Q28,
and Q32). Other transformational attributes such as charisma and vision were also stated as
important to succeed (Q28, Q29, and Q30). We also get some support for the transformational
attribute integrity as the importance of building trust also is brought up in the survey results
(Q28, and Q29)
This means that a transformational leader has a good base to become an effective leader in any culture. However, we believe that the result of this research have shown that there are cultural aspect that cannot be disregarded and that means that this leadership theory can benefit from an amendment with regards to cultural differences.
Summary

In this final chapter, we will revisit the aim of this thesis and try to provide you with a high level summary of our findings as well as go into the limitations of our research and provide some recommendations over some potential future areas of research.

General findings

During this thesis many conclusions and findings have been presented over the different chapters. As such our intention in this section is to summarize the main points found. In our opinion the main findings could be summarized in the following bullets:

- **Understanding and adapting to local culture is required**
  
  We can conclude that adaptation to local culture is crucial for leaders to be successful. This is supported by almost every source of information that we have looked at, including leading voices, cultural leadership studies (Hofstede and Globe), and our own survey result. As a result of this managers and leaders are recommended to attend cultural training in one way or another to better understand the environment they are expected to operate in, as well as to better be able to melt in and be able to take formal as well as informal discussions that are appreciated by the local employees.

  It has also been highlighted in our survey that a leader should be very careful when trying to change any local cultural aspects and when such a change still is required a large portion of patience will be needed as change will take time.

- **Universal leadership traits and transformational leadership theory is supported**
  
  The results from the Globe study as well as our own survey indicate that there is support some global leadership traits. The Globe study state that a “universal” leader should possess a high level of integrity, be inspirational, visionary and be a good team builder. The same traits are also indicated in our study of Swedish managers in India and China. The results from our survey also indicate that clarity in communication and enabling people to grow is as important in Sweden as in these foreign cultures.

  In relation to leadership theory transformational theory can be considered most universal among different cultures for good leadership as it share many similarities with the traits and behaviors above.

- **Adaptation required due to differences in power balance and decision making styles**
  
  One of the adaptations that will be needed by Swedish leaders when working in the cultures of China and India is to adapt to the much more strict hierarchy structure and the way decisions are made there.

  Leading voices, our survey and the Hofstede studies support the difference in hierarchy structure and decision making style used in China and India compared to Sweden. Our survey also imply that when in China or India a Swedish or Western leader will be required to micro-manage and follow-up the work from subordinates to a much higher extent than he/she is used to. Additionally they need to take-on a more complete responsibility for the result of the execution, even when working on an executive level.

  One finding supported by leading voices, our survey (both open-ended questions and closed questions) as well as the studies by Hofstede is that consensus decision making
does not work well with a high power distance and should hence not be practiced in China and India while it works very well in Sweden.

- **Situational leadership contribute most, but should be enhanced to also include multicultural context**
  Situational theory is clearly the one leadership theory that contributes the most to multicultural leadership as its one of the few theories that reflects that different leadership behavior is needed in different situations. However, some of the models within this category, e.g. Hersay and Blanchard, would improve by also considering cultural aspects such as power distance as part of the situation to be assessed.

**Fulfillment of thesis aim**
The aim of this thesis was to “Gain a deeper understanding of the applicability of Western leadership theories and what cultural differences Western leaders, and in particular Swedish leaders, should be prepared for when operating in China and India.”

We divided this aim into three main questions that we wanted to research further:
1. From a leadership perspective investigate what cultural similarities and differences arise from the emerging Asian markets of China and India in comparison with the Western countries U.S. and Sweden?
2. What are the current recommended Western leadership practices and theories and how well do theses apply in the cultural context of China and India?
3. Which leadership aspects and behaviors do Swedish leaders, with experiences from China and India, see as most crucial to succeed and which that should be avoided?

We believe that within this thesis we have provided answers to these questions and fulfilled the overall aim of this thesis.

The first question is addressed by looking into the secondary data available for academic quantitative studies such as the Hofstede and Globe studies as well as the primary data from our own survey and relating these toward each other. The first three bullet points under General findings section address this question.

The second question is addressed with the academic literature review of Western leadership theories and relating this toward our own primary data. The second and fourth bullet points in the General findings section address this topic.

The third question is addressed with the primary data from our survey of Swedish managers. We have also related the survey results to the academic literature review and the secondary data from the academic quantitative studies. The first three bullet points under General findings section address this topic.

**Thesis limitations**
This thesis has not evaluated all cultural aspects or dimensions available in academic studies that have been proposed to affected leadership from a cultural perspective. As such the scope of this thesis is limited and has consciously been focused on the dimension defined in two very frequently referred studies. For our own primary research both the number of questions and the number of people who responded to our survey was limited by the time and scope of this thesis. Despite these limitations we believe that the result from this thesis will provide useful indications and insights for other leaders.
Potential future research

Leadership in a multi-cultural context is a broad topic we believe will grow in focus and keep many researchers occupied for a long period ahead. We are sure that there will be more aspects investigated than we could even imagine today. From our side we can hence only highlight that based on our survey there are some main topics we believe would benefit from additional research. These are

- What cultural aspects should be included in a situational leadership model?
  As stated previously we believe that the situational leadership theory still is valid and of the few Western leadership theories that could be designed and enhanced with multi-cultural aspects.

- Relation between power distance and performance?
  Is there any relationship between performance and power distance? This is for sure a topic we believe will be of big interest for many enterprises as performance is one of the main consideration points when looking into foreign establishments or outsourcing.

- Cultural and leadership evolution due to change in e.g. economic power and health
  What kind of cultural aspects can be expected to change as emerging markets improve their buying power as well as health standards and way of life? And how will these changes affect leadership?
References

Accenture, **Rise of the multi-polar world**, 2007

Accenture, **Adapting to the multi-polar world – The new globalization playbook**, Outlook, June edition, 2009

Accenture, **From global connection to global orchestration**, 2010

Blunt, Peter; and Jones, Marrick, **Exploring limits of western leadership in East Asia and Africa**, Personnel Review, Vol. 26 No. 1-2, pp. 6-23, 1997


Clearly Cultural, **Making Sense of cross cultural communication: Geert Hofstede cultural dimensions**, Accessed July 2010
http://www.clearlycultural.com/geert-hofstede-cultural-dimensions/

Davis, Garry, **Managers at the top: Leadership challenges of Asian Companies**, Global Asia, Vol. 4 No. 1, pp. 74-84, 2009

Davis, Garry, **Leadership challenges emerge as Asia Pacific companies go global**, Heidrick & Struggles, 2008


Dorfman Peter; and Howell, Jon, **Leadership in Western and Asian countries: commonalities and differences in effective leadership processes across cultures**, Leadership Quarterly, Vol. 8 Issue 3, p233, 1997


Hofstede, Geert, *Motivation, Leadership, and Organization. Do American theories apply abroad?*, Organizational Dynamics, AMACOM, 1980


Itim international, *Geert Hofstede Cultural Dimensions*, 2010


Olsen, Thomas; Pinto, Monica; and Virji, Shalina, Navigating growth in emerging markets: six rules for improving decision making between corporate and local leadership. Journal of Business Strategy. Vol. 26 No. 6, pp. 37-44, 2005

Phatak, Arvind, International Management – Concepts and cases, South-Western college Publishing, 1997


Schwartz, Shalom, Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries, Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol.. 25, 1992


White House, Remarks by vice president Biden in Ukraine, 2009


Appendix A: Survey overview

The survey was conducted in Swedish and was designed into three different sections, each with a different type of questions asked.

In the first section we asked nine questions (Q1-Q9) that could be used to segment the received data further as well to make sure that we reached our wanted target group. The questions asked in this section were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q1) Age?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q2) Sex?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q3) In which country have you acted as a leader, India or China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q4) Highest management position in Sweden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q5) No of years in management position before leaving for India/China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q6) Highest management position in India or China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q7) No of years in management position in India/China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q8) Number of subordinates when in India/China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q9) Primary reason for going on contract to India/China?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second section contained sixteen closed choice questions (Q10-25) related to leadership and culture. The sections first eight questions provided four statements where the respondent needed to describe how the statement corresponded to India or China, followed by the same question again, but from a Swedish perspective, e.g. Q10 is related to how it works in China/India and Q11 is the same question but related to how it works in Sweden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2a:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q10-11) When a decision need to be taken, who is primarily expected to take that decision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q12-13) Situational leadership theory is based on four different roles a leader can take depending on the employees capabilities and motivation: S1 (Telling/Directive); S2 (Selling/Coaching) ; S3 (Participating/Supporting) ; S4 (Delegating/Observing). As a leader how would you estimate the distribution in % between these in your selected country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q14-15) Who is primarily responsible for if a task outcome is good or bad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q16-17) In your opinion, are rewards designed for an advantage toward the individual or for the group?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second part of section two contained eight statements where the respondent had to decide if the statement was more valid for Sweden or India/China or if there was no difference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2b:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q18) In your experience; does leaders coach their employees more or less in India/China than in Sweden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q19) In your experience, does leaders in India/China control on a higher or lower level of detail in comparison to Sweden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q20) In comparison with Sweden, is the organizational power structure flatter or more hierarchical in India/China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q21) In comparison with Sweden, does leaders focus more or less on long-term goals in India/China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q22) In comparison with Sweden, how important is it as an employee to have a uniform view with the rest of the team or your manager?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q23) In comparison with Sweden, how acceptable is at as a leader to show a dominant and/or aggressive behavior toward your employees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q24) In comparison with Sweden, do the employees expect more or less defined rules and processes in order to reduce uncertainties and risks during execution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q25) In comparison with Sweden, are leaders in India/China expected to stress and focus on creating efficient team with common goals for all team members?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: List of survey questions section 1

Table 10: List of survey questions section 2a

Table 11: List of survey questions section 2b
In the final third section we asked eight open questions (Q26-Q33) in order to secure that we gave the respondents with a chance to provide additional input that could be useful for our thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Q26)</td>
<td>In your experience, what is the biggest challenge as a leader when operating in India/China compared to Sweden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q27)</td>
<td>In your opinion, what are the biggest cultural differences related to leadership in India/China compared to Sweden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q28)</td>
<td>In your opinion, what are the main leadership similarities between India/China and Sweden?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q29)</td>
<td>In your opinion, what are the main leadership aspects required to be successful as a leader in India/China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q30)</td>
<td>In your opinion, is there any leadership trait or behavior that work well in India/China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q31)</td>
<td>In your opinion, is there any leadership trait or behavior that work well in Sweden that should be avoided in India/China?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q32)</td>
<td>Is there any other hints and tricks related to leadership that you would like to provide to other Swedish leaders that plan to be active in these markets?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Q33)</td>
<td>Any other comments and opinions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: List of survey questions section 3

Please note that the questions in the original survey as well as most answers were in Swedish and as such some of the English wordings might include some minor differences compared to the original Swedish wordings even though we tried to minimize this possibility. For a view of the original survey Appendix C: Survey screen shots, provide a view of the survey, its design and more details on the questions and alternatives as such.
Appendix B: Survey Results

In total we got eighteen responses to the survey, but as two of them only answered section one, we decided to discard these and base our result on the remaining sixteen.

Out of the sixteen responses nine were related to leadership culture in India and remaining seven related to China. The big majority of the respondents were male (94%), had a median age of 42 and in average had nine years of managerial experience from Sweden before moving abroad. 75% of the respondents were acting as leaders with the corporate management team or other higher management level when based in India or China. 44% of the respondents had more than 250 subordinates (81% more than 50 subordinates). In median they had this position for three years before moving back to Sweden or to another international assignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Q10-Q11) When a decision need to be taken, who is primarily expected to take that decision?</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) You as a leader without any interference from others</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) You as a leader based on input from other leaders on same management level</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) You as a leader after consultative input from your employees</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) You as a leader in consensus with other leaders on same management level</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) You as a leader in consensus with your employees</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Decision delegated to your employees</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Q12-13) Situational leadership theory is based on four different roles a leader can take depending on the employees capabilities and motivation: S1 (Telling/Directive); S2 (Selling/Coaching) ; S3 (Participating/Supporting) ; S4 (Delegating/Observing). As a leader how would you estimate the distribution in % between these in your selected country</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1: Average</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2: Average</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3: Average</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4: Average</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Q14-15) Who is primarily responsible for if a task outcome is good or bad?</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The employees who execute the task</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) You as a leader</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Shared responsibility</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Do not know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Q16-17) In your opinion, are rewards designed for an advantage toward the individual or for the group?</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) The individual</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The group</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Both</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Do not know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Survey responses to questions asked in section 2a
Table 14: Survey responses to questions asked in section 2b

(Q18) In your experience; does leaders coach their employees more or less in India/China than in Sweden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More coaching than in Sweden</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less coaching than in Sweden</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roughly same level as in Sweden</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Q19) In your experience, does leaders in India/China control on a higher or lower level of detail in comparison to Sweden?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than in Sweden</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than in Sweden</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roughly same level as in Sweden</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Q20) In comparison with Sweden, is the organizational power structure flatter or more hierarchical in India/China?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More hierarchical in Sweden</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More hierarchical in India/China</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference compared to Sweden</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Q21) In comparison with Sweden, does leaders focus more or less on long-term goals in India/China?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher degree of long-term focus in Sweden</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher degree of long-term focus in India/China</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference compared to Sweden</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Q22) In comparison with Sweden, how important is it as an employee to have a uniform view with the rest of the team or your manager?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More important than in Sweden</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More important than in India/China</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference compared to Sweden</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Q23) In comparison with Sweden, how acceptable is it as a leader to show a dominant and/or aggressive behavior toward your employees?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More accepted in Sweden</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More accepted in India/China</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference compared to Sweden</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Q24) In comparison with Sweden, do the employees expect more or less defined rules and processes in order to reduce uncertainties and risks during execution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More processes/rules expected in Sweden</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More processes/rules expected in India/China</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference compared to Sweden</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Q25) In comparison with Sweden, are leaders in India/China expected to stress and focus on creating efficient team with common goals for all team members?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>India</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More focus in Sweden</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More focus in India/China</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difference compared to Sweden</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Q26) In your experience, what is the biggest challenge as a leader when operating in India compared to Sweden?
* To get all members to take on personal responsibility and innovation, and not wait for management dictate as they are used to
* Information is received very late, which creates many "last minute" decisions and task activities that has to be rushed.
* Clarity and follow-up
* To get the organization to not only focus on maximizing current efforts but also act and think long-term
* Language and culture
(Q26) In your experience, what is the biggest challenge as a leader when operating in China compared to Sweden?
* The preconceived idea that you always have to control and manage in details
* To build a culture where reporting managers/employees think for themselves and not only trust on a decision from the top
* Communication
* The difference in level of education in combination with the view of the world outside China.
* Implement a western team-work model
* Most managers have less experience from up's and down's in business cycle. With this the understanding is less when things do not go as expected. A leader here is expected to know even more in this kind of situation what to do as few people have been exposed to this in their career
(Q27) In your opinion, what are the main leadership similarities between India and Sweden?
* The will for Change, and what they are prepared to do to succeed
* The fast speed of change in China
* No consensus needed (results in speed and flexibility but sometimes wrong decisions)
* A lot of decision making and influencing is taking place outside the formal meeting in China. "Lobbying" is much bigger
* No one questions the decision of a higher ranked manager in China
* That you have to communicate more, and will get much more silent responses
* The concept of consensus. In China people do not expect to have consensus within all areas as authority is more accepted.
(Q28) In your opinion, what are the main leadership similarities between India and Sweden?
* The importance of communication and that everyone has an understanding of the goals.
* The will to evolve both business and people
* Goal orientation and follow-up
* Its still an organization, and a group that should execute the tasks.
* Its important that people feel-good at work
(Q28) In your opinion, what are the main leadership similarities between China and Sweden?
* Individuals are individuals wherever you go
* McGregor's theory X and theory Y are both valid
* Building a strong team spirit is as important in China as in Sweden
* To give constructive feedback and help people grow is of the same importance in both countries
* Gain peoples confidence is important everywhere
* The importance of communicating strategies and visions
(Q29) In your opinion, what are the main leadership aspects required to be successful as a leader in India?
* Convey a vision & direction
* Challenge people to exceed their own expectations
* Clarity
* Show authority
* Patience
* Acceptance of cultural differences, be humble but firm
### Table 15: Survey responses to questions asked in section 3

Please note that the responses in Table 15 do not cover all individual responses, but it is our belief that the statements included here do cover the main points stated.
Appendix C: Survey screen shots

Figure 6: Survey screen shots, section 1
*10) Hur att bedöma berör i kringområdet av som förväntas kunskapen beslutat?  
   - Du som enskild ledare eller inblandad med andra ledare på samma cheftänk
   - Du som ledare efter (högerad) input från underordnade
   - Du som ledare i konferens med andra ledare på samma cheftänk
   - Du som ledare i konferens med underordnade
   - Deltarad till underordnade
   - Annat:

*11) Hur skiljer detta sig mellan beslutandet i Sverige? I Sverige förväntas beslutet fokusera på:
   - Du som enskild ledare utan inblandad med andra
   - Du som ledare eller inblandad med andra
   - Du som ledare eller (konsulent) input från underordnade
   - Du som ledare i konferens med andra ledare på samma cheftänk
   - Du som ledare i konferens med underordnade
   - Deltarad till underordnade
   - Annat:

12) Situationsexempel: Tänk på att du behöver ta en beslutande beslutning som en ledare som ansvarig för personer. Hur skulle du uppfatta att beslutningen är:
   - St (Telling / Directive) [%]
   - St2 (Selling/Coaching) [%]
   - St3 (Participating/Supporting) [%]
   - St4 (Delegating / Delegating) [%]

13) Hur skulle en inomfattande beslutning se ut i Sverige?
   - St1 (Telling / Directive) [%]
   - St2 (Selling/Coaching) [%]
   - St3 (Participating/Supporting) [%]
   - St4 (Delegating / Delegating) [%]

*14) Vem är huvudansvarig ansvarig för att resultat blir bra eller dåligt i internationella:
   - Du ansvarig som svarar uppgiften
   - Du som ledare
   - Generellt ansvar
   - Vet ej

*15) Vem är huvudansvarig ansvarig för att resultat blir bra eller dåligt i Sverige?
   - Du ansvarig som svarar uppgiften
   - Du som ledare
   - Generellt ansvar
   - Vet ej

Figure 7: Survey screen shots, section 2a
Effective leadership in the multi-polar and multi-cultural world

Figure 8: Survey screen shots, section 2b
Effective leadership in the multi-polar and multi-cultural world

Figure 9: Survey screen shots, section 3

*30) Finns det generellt några ledarskapsutmaningar som du tycker fungerar bra i Indien/Kina.

*31) Finns det något betydande som svenska ledare har som inte alla fungerar i Indien/Kina.

*32) Vilka specifika ledarskapsutmaningar rekommenderar ni är de som ska skapa andra svenska ledare att planera att bli verksamma i dessa kulturer.

*33) Övriga kommentarer/avvikelse.

(Fortfarande sida)