

EFFECT OF GENDER AND VALUES ON PREFERRED LEADERSHIP  
BEHAVIORS – A CASE OF KOREA

By

Nguyen Trong Kien

A THESIS

*Submitted to  
School of Public Policy and Management, KDI  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of*

MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT

2007

EFFECT OF GENDER AND VALUES ON PREFERRED LEADERSHIP  
BEHAVIORS – A CASE OF KOREA

By

Nguyen Trong Kien

A THESIS

*Submitted to  
School of Public Policy and Management, KDI  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of*

MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT

2007

Approval as of ....., 2007  
Supervisor JUNG KWON \_\_\_\_\_

## **ABSTRACT**

### **EFFECT OF GENDER AND VALUES ON PREFERRED LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS – A CASE OF KOREA**

By

Nguyen Trong Kien

Researchers believe that different people might be differently affected by various leadership styles. Therefore, the thesis was executed to somehow assess the effect of followers' features such as gender and values on their preference for certain leadership styles. A questionnaire composed from Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire form XII (LBDQ XII) and Schwartz Value Inventory was used to check people's gender, values and their preferred leadership behaviors. After literature review had been done, the data were input and processed by SPSS to check the developed hypothesis. The result showed not much effect of gender on preferred leadership behaviors; however, it reflected that people with different values do differ in their desire for specific leadership behaviors. These findings suggest certain applications for leadership practice in Korea.

**Copyright by  
NGUYEN TRONG KIEN  
2007**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1. Research Motivation</b>	2
<b>2. Research Objectives</b>	4
<b>3. Contribution</b>	5
<b>4. Thesis overview</b>	7
<b>II. LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1. Leadership</b>	8
<b>2. Leadership and Gender</b>	12
<b>3. Leadership and Values</b>	17
<b>4. Leadership, gender and values in Korea</b>	21
<b>5. Hypotheses Development</b>	26
<b>III. METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>1. Questionnaire design</b>	29
<b>2. Samples and sites</b>	32
<b>3. Data Analysis and Discussion</b>	33
<i>3.1. Gender difference in preferred leadership behaviors:</i>	33
<i>3.2. Impact of personal values on preferred leadership behaviors</i>	38
<b>IV. CONCLUSION</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>1. Contribution</b>	48
<b>2. Applications</b>	51
<b>3. Limitations</b>	52

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **1. Research Motivation**

People believe that leadership is both science and art. First of all, leadership is an immature science. Owing to the truth that it is not easy to predict human beings' behaviours, all findings in leadership has not lead to precise rules and laws as other fields of research. Secondly leadership is regarded as an art because and it is hard to grasp and measure. Knowing about leadership and being able to effectively apply it into the real world are not always identical. According to Bass & Stogdill (1990), the number of studies on leadership was approximately 8,000 and it is surely increased over time. This great number shows leadership is one of the most widely studied phenomena and that leadership's abstraction does not prevent studies from being conducted. The question is why leadership draws so much attention from researchers even it is very abstract? And the answer might be due to the truth that we can assess some factors affecting leadership, thus improving the productivity of the so-called leaders in organization. The thesis, therefore, is also motivated by the idea to somehow disclose the abstraction of leadership by analyzing those factors and develop applications from extracted findings.

So far, there are more theories following the leader-centred approach than theories emphasizing characteristics of followers such as empowerment theory, attribution theory. But as leadership is an interaction process between leader and followers and "leadership is very much in the eyes of the beholder", how the followers perceive and want their leaders to be plays an important role in the influence process of leadership. For this reason, understanding how followers' characteristics have impact on leadership perception is an interesting aspect that the thesis aims to pursue.

Two among many of followers' features are gender and values. The former is the natural feature since a person was born and the second is defined by the environment and education that one has been through.

Up to now, there is limited number of researches studying the linkage between values with people's preferred leadership behaviours. And even though studies of gender affect on leadership have been numerous, (Carless, 1998; Dobbin and Platz, 1986; Donnell and Hall, 1980; Eagly, Makhijani, and Klonsky, 1992; Heilman et al, 1989; Lewis & Fagenson-Eland, 1998; Ragins, 1991; Schein et al, 1996; Tharenou, Latimer, & Conroy, 1994), they only concentrated on how man and woman differ in practicing leadership. There's hardly any research studies the affect of followers' gender on perception of ideal leadership behaviors. As the effect of gender on preferred leadership behaviors and leadership styles has been a controversial issue for a long time, this gap in empirical researches raises interest and encourages the author to discover how gender could affect follower's preferred leadership behaviours.

Personal values are another aspect that have closely link to the human beings' perception. According to Shamir, (1991); Ehrhart & Klein (2001), values play an important role in predicting how followers respond to leaders' influence. Shung Jae Shin and Jing Zhou, (2003), found the connection of values with transformational leadership by figuring out conservation, a subscale of values, play a mediating role between transformational leadership and followers' creativity. Schein, (1985) have also emphasized the importance of culture in which personal values are main components. According to his view, for leaders to be effective cultural issues must be clearly identified. Thus, by only

understanding the organization culture and its effect can leaders build the vision and align themselves and employees to that vision.

Although values truly shape human beings perception and believed to play a key role in leadership processes and outcomes, they have been examined in only a few studies, with the notable exception of those published in a special issue of *The Leadership Quarterly* (Volume 12, Issue 2) on values and leadership. For such a reason, the connection between personal values and preferred leadership behaviors becomes an interesting and intriguing issue that the study is going to probe.

## **2. Research Objectives**

The research objective, as the headline itself, will be figuring out the linkage between followers' characteristics and their preferred leadership behaviors by a specific case of Korea. To do that, it will corroborate findings from previous literature on the effect of demographic variables and values on leadership. Based on those findings the research's hypotheses will be developed and tested. The hypotheses after being tested will help to reveal two main concerns. First, it might clarify if difference in perception of leadership among people of different gender exists. Second, it will reveal whether people with different values have different ideas for how their leaders should be.

The result of the research will either solidify current assumptions on leadership or bring new approach for future researches. Additionally, findings from this research can be further exploited to raise some leadership applications in organizations.



### **3. Contribution**

Since Korea is often regarded as a masculine society, the difference in genders' roles is believed to exist but the effect of gender on how leadership is perceived and desired has not been discovered yet. And as values have great effect on how people perceive and act, the impact of values on leadership is also believed to clearly exist. Even there has been a call for studying the importance of values in organization, researches were biased to exploring the impact of personal values on managers' effectiveness, and hardly any study ever found the linkage between followers' values and preferred leadership behaviors.

Besides, Korea has been through a great evolution both socially and economically, the factors that make up people's perception might change over time. Great interference of different cultures recently might strongly affect the gender gap and personal values in Korean culture. That fact also encourages the research to explore the true aspect of personal values in Korea and its effect on leadership perception of Koreans.

Nowadays, both the business and political environment are becoming more swiftly changing, some issues related to leadership has been raised including culture management and team leadership. Team leadership means the leadership is conducted by a group of people who share the common values and act on their shared vision.

Meanwhile culture management mentions the ability of leaders to know and understand what the organizational culture is and modify that culture to meet the needs of his organization. Instead of simply telling followers exactly what to do, leaders, by understanding values existing within their organization and their effect, can clarify the visions and enhance the values that support the future organizational structure.

Therefore, theoretically the research can help to test the current assumptions of gender impact on leadership perception which are not fully revealed. Findings of the personal values impact on leadership from the research are also valuable in term it might set a fundamental step for subsequent researches.

Practically, the thesis' findings, by presenting preference for specific traits of leadership in Korea, might help both domestic and expatriate managers find specific applications in building their organizations' culture. For instance, by analyzing the difference in leadership perception of gender as well as the nature of each industry, Koreans might find effective ways to allocate labor force with different sex properly. On the other hand, using the cross-nations study, expatriate managers can figure out the difference in their leadership styles and their native employees' preferred ones so that they can adjust their conduct to improve the organization's productivity. Finally, findings will bring practical implications such as building a leadership model which best motivates employees of a gender majority or new entrepreneurs who want to have a business with a profound culture can choose employees based on their tested values which mostly fit their current leadership and corporate culture.

Other interesting aspects derived from the research for future studies might be how followers with different values build relationship with leaders of different preferences, or in which way followers' values affect the influence process of leadership.

#### **4. Thesis overview**

The thesis is broken down into five main parts: Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Conclusion and Bibliography.

The above introduction reflected the motivation, objective and contribution of the thesis. Chapter II, Literature Review, will present the main theories that relate to the topics and explain why the thesis approach was chosen instead of others. Additionally, this chapter will review researches on gender and values' impact on leadership to create solid background for the thesis' hypotheses. How the questionnaire was formed using the combination of Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire form XII (LBDQ XII) and Schwartz Values Inventory (SVI), data analysis and discussion will be presented in the third chapter which is named Methodology. Conclusion, the last chapter will again summarize the contribution of the thesis, its practical applications and limitations. The Bibliography is used to list all the books, articles that have been utilized for this thesis.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1. Leadership

#### *a. Definition*

Leadership is a notion that is first mentioned in the first half of the nineteenth century and so far nobody can say there is a single accurate definition of leadership. Bennis (1959, p. 259) should be absolutely right as he ever said:

*Always, it seems the concept of leadership eludes us or turns up in another form to taunt us again with its slipperiness and complexity. So we have invented an endless proliferation of terms to deal with it.... And still the concept is not sufficiently defined.*

Researchers usually define leadership based on their individual perspectives and the aspects of the phenomenon which is most interesting to them. Thus, leadership has been defined in many terms, but not restricted to, such as traits, behaviours, influence, interaction patterns, role relationships, etc...

*Leadership is "the behaviour of an individual... directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal" (Hemphill & Coons, 1957)*

*Leadership is "the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement" (Raunch & Behling, 1984, p.46)*

*Leadership is "the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organization." (House et al., 1999)*

*Leadership is "the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization" (D.Katz & Kahn, 1978)*

*Leadership is "an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their shared purposes". (Joseph C. Rost, Leadership for the Twenty-first Century, 1993)*

*"The process by which an agent induces a subordinate to behave in a desired manner" (Bennis, 1959)*

*Leadership is "the process of making sense of what people are doing together so that people will understand and be committed" (Drath & Palus, 1994)*

As we can see from the aforementioned collection of leadership definitions, the definitions were formed with many different respects. They can be from who creates influence, the purpose of the influence, the manner how influence is exerted, and the outcome of the influence. However, most of them reflect the common point that leadership is a process and that there are always two types of objects, one is the one who creates influence, guide and instruct and the other one is the one who follows.

According to Daft (1999), leadership is carried out among leader and followers, if there's no follower there will be no leadership. Additionally, as leadership reflects leaders and followers' shared purposes, relationship among leaders and followers is not passive, it is multidirectional. In other words, leadership is reciprocal, superiors don't just influence subordinates they are also influenced by subordinates' actions and attitudes. That could be the reason why contingency theories have suggested leaders to adjust their behaviours to fit situations, and especially to adapt with their followers. More importantly, in all organizations nowadays there is the fact that active and effective followers are not "yes people"; they have their own perception of how things should be done.

For such reasons, leadership is not only process or activity of a person who is in leading position, but also encompasses the environment where this leader exist and his responses to the particular characteristics of his followers. Hence, leadership can be briefly defined as "a multidirectional interaction between leader and followers in order to reach to their shared goals".

The relationship of leader and followers is similar to every other relationship which needs to start by a cognitive process in which each other initially perceive of others' behaviours. This process will set the cornerstone for further step in their relationship. Since

behavioural theory has long mentioned that how people perceive strongly affect their action, understanding followers' perception of leadership will help to improve the influence process of leadership.

### ***b. Research Approaches***

According to Yukl (2002), theories and empirical research can be classified into the following five approaches: (1) the trait approach, (2) the behaviour approach, (3) the power-influence approach, (4) the situational approach, (5) the integrative approach.

*The trait approach* concentrates on studying features of leaders such as personality, motives, values, and skills. According to this approach, some people are born leaders and that they are naturally given certain traits not possessed by other people. Some extraordinary abilities such as tireless, energy, penetrating tuition, uncanny foresight, and irresistible persuasive powers are also believed to be the basis for their managerial success. Many trait studies were conducted to discover these qualities, but this massive research effort failed to find any trait that would guarantee leadership success.

*The behaviour approach* pays attention to what managers usually do in their job. The behaviour includes two subcategories.

One line of research examines how managers spend their time and the typical pattern of activities, responsibilities, and functions for managerial jobs. Some of the research also investigated how managers cope with demands, constraints, and role conflicts in their jobs.

Another way of the behaviour approach is mainly focused on identifying effective leadership behaviour. The popular research method is a survey using behaviour description questionnaire.

*The situational approach* gives more attention to contextual factors that affect leadership processes including characteristics of followers, the nature of the work performed by the leader's organization, the type of their organization, and the nature of their external environment. Situational approach also has two subcategories. One line of research tends to discover the extent to which leadership processes are in common across different organizations, levels of management, and cultures. Others attempt to clarify aspects of the situation that "moderate" the relationship of leader attributes such as traits, skills, behaviour to leadership effectiveness. The assumption of this kind of research is that different leader attributes can be effective in one situation but can not be effective in others.

*Integrative Approach* is the approach where researcher applies more than one type of leadership variable. This approach has become a more popular recently, but it is still rare to find a research that includes all of them.

Another base for comparing leadership theories is *leader versus follower-centric theory*. This way of classification depends on the extent to which a theory is focused on either the leader or the followers. Most leadership theories emphasize the characteristics and actions of the leader without much concern for followers' characteristics. So far, the number of researches and theories emphasizing characteristics of leaders still outnumber the one concentrating on followers' characteristics.

According to Yukl (2002), theories that focus almost exclusively on either the leader or the followers are less useful than theories that offer a more balanced explanation.

Correspondingly, this thesis' approach using a questionnaire combined of groups of

necessary leadership behaviors and followers' characteristics is neither narrowed in leader-centric perspective nor follower-centric perspective. Under other approach classification, it is also difficult to exactly classify which research approach: behavior approach, situational approach or integrative that the research is built upon. By using the different variables of these approaches the writer hope the research could bring a more comprehensive understanding of the linkage between what leaders often need to do and what are the preferences in the eyes of followers with different characteristics.

## **2. Leadership and Gender**

Due to the different psychological characteristics of males and females that historically derived from the gender division of labor in societies, gender prototypes do exist. Based on that fact, assumptions that woman and man may differ in how they practice leadership was tested and the findings did support this assumption.

According to Bartol & Martin (1986); and Wheeland & Verdi (1992), women tend to be involved in more social or interpersonal behaviours, while men used to engage in more task behaviours. Another research of Bartol, Martin & Kromkowski (2003) was congruent to this finding. The research figured out that females at both middle and executive levels were rated higher for their interpersonal behaviours than were males at the same levels. Ragins & Sundrom (1989) also supported these findings when suggesting that women used to be socialized toward interpersonal concerns and thus are likely to have strengths in this area.

Eagly & Johnson (1990) posit that females in organizations tend to be more democratic and participative, whereas men are more autocratic. A group of studies (e.g., Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Falbo & Peplau, 1980) indicates that



women use more indirect manipulative strategies and direct persuasive strategies are men's typical behaviours.

Eagly, Karau, and Makhijani (1995) concluded that women were more effective than men in roles that were defined in less masculine terms, while men were more effective than women in roles that were defined in more masculine terms. Other research in this vein has suggested that men and women leaders do not differ in their styles when compared within organization studies, while their behaviours were more gender-stereotypic (i.e., women led in an interpersonally oriented style, whereas men led in a more task-oriented style) when the study context was a laboratory experiment or an assessment study (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Nonetheless, in all three research settings (organization, laboratory, and assessment), women showed a tendency to lead more democratically (relative to men) in accordance with a social role theory of sex differences in social behaviour.

Alimo – Metcalfe and Alban – Metcalfe's (2003) findings showed that women are related directly to the notion of transformational leadership whereas men are related to transactional leadership. Rosener (1990) found that male leaders operate from a power base using position and coercion, while women typically avoid power bases and instead choose a more personal and indirect interaction. According to Rosener, women used an interactive style, by encouraging participation, sharing power and information, enhancing people's self-worth and building on mutual trust and respect. On the contrary, men were found to be more likely than women to adopt transactional leadership. They tend to use power that comes from their organizational position and formal authority. Stanford et al. (1995) also contended that female leaders possessed a high degree of employee involvement that typically resulted in a team-based management approach. They adopted

the skills of being a good listener, showing empathy, sharing information with others and a soft approach in dealing with people. They articulated the vision and were able to communicate effectively to their employees.

In another relevant stream of research, Heilman, Block, Martell, and Simon (1989), Lord, Phillips, and Rush (1980), and Schein, Mueller, Lituchy, and Liu (1996) have examined differences in how genders conceive of and rate successful managers. Generally, their research has identified a tendency for males, especially in cultures outside of the US (Schein & Mueller, 1992), to think of successful managers in terms of relatively masculine attributes (e.g, assertive and direct) rather than female attributes (e.g, passive and demure). In contrast, females in the US tend to view female and male managers as equally likely to possess requisite management characteristics. Female in the US are also markedly more egalitarian in their views relative to females in other cultures.

In investigating the extent to which sex role prototypes influence the evaluation of leadership behaviour, Bartol and Butterfield (1976) have used two versions of a questionnaire containing four stories depicting a leadership style based on one of the following leadership dimensions: initiating structure, consideration, production emphasis, tolerance for freedom to conduct a survey on male and female business students. The result has shown that female gave higher evaluation than male subjects on initiating structure; the evaluations of both male and female subjects on consideration were not significantly different. Evaluation of production emphasis and tolerance for freedom did differ depending on whether the subject was male or female but the precise nature of the effect was not clarified.

Chow (2005) has studied the gender differences in perceived leadership effectiveness in Hong Kong. The study shows some slight differences between genders. According to the findings, women emphasized more importance on collaborative team orientation, integrity, self-sacrifice and human orientation than their male counterparts, even though these were not statistically significant. Women also put higher ranks on inspiring, team integration, but lower on decisiveness and performance orientation than men.

There have been several studies which used Leadership Behaviour Description Questionnaire to find the association of gender and leadership behaviour preferences. Vecchio and Boatwright (2002) have tested the difference in genders' perception of ideal leader by using LDBQ with 10 items which best tap the key dimensions of Consideration (depicts to what extent the manager regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers) and Structuring (measures to what degree the manager clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected). The findings proved that female employees in USA express a stronger desire for consideration while there was no significant difference between male and female evaluation on structuring.

In the same vein, Littrell, using LBDQ form XII conducted the research on the genders' difference in leadership preference in UK, Germany, Romania, China, South Africa, Uganda. Results indicated that preferences for explicit behaviour of an "ideal leader" vary between genders.

German males considered "*Tolerance of Freedom*" (reflects to what extent the leader allows followers scope for initiative, decision and action) to be a more desirable leader behaviour than do German females. However, German females indicated *Persuasiveness*

(measures to what extent the leader uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions) as a more preferred behaviour.

For the samples from the UK, no significant differences were observed between the mean scores for any of the factors for males and females. Inspecting the rank-order for the two samples, *Demand Reconciliation* (reflects how well the leader reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system) had a large difference, with UK women indicating it to be a more preferred behaviour.

In China, Chinese females indicated *Persuasiveness, Tolerance of Freedom, Consideration, and Predictive Accuracy* to be less desirable than did Chinese males.

Ugandan males also showed a stronger preference for *Predictive Accuracy* (measures to what extent the leader exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately) than did the females. But no difference in any other factors has been found between Ugandan male and female.

The exploration of former researches revealed inconsistent findings of the gender impact on leadership practice and preferred leadership behaviors, thus raising us to a doubt about the difference of leadership perception between male and female.

### **3. Leadership and Values**

“A value is a conceptual, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of actions” said Kluckhohn (1951/1967). This is also in line with Rokeach’s definition (1972): “To say that a person has a value is to say that she or he has an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally and socially preferable to alternative modes of conduct or end-state of existence”. Another definition from Schwartz (1992): “desirable state, objects, goals, or behaviors transcending specific situations and applied as normative standards to judge and to choose among alternative modes of behavior”.

And to be simplified by Rokeach, value is “a broad tendency to prefer certain states of affairs over others.” or a belief that “transcendentally guide actions and judgments across specific objects and situations”.

Values can be assessed as social features. In this aspect, values are conceptualized as having general rather than specific nature and as being applicable for demonstrating nations or groups. Consequently, most theorists agreed that values develop through the influences of culture, society and values serve as strong regulatory guides by specifying modes of behaviors that are socially acceptable.

As individual characteristics, values do not just motivate human beings’ action, show them direction and exert emotional intensity but also function as standards for judging and justifying actions. Thereupon, we believe values can be taken as variables which influence people’s preferences of certain objects including leadership behaviors.

Nowadays, leaders are facing questions such as, “How can I determine what cultural values are important? Are some values “better” than others? How can the organization’s culture help us be more competitive? Changes in the nature of work, as well as the increasing diversity in the workforce, have made the topic of values even a more considerable concern. However, one of the most fundamental aspects tends to be neglected is that how values affect the way employees perceive and act.

As Schwartz (1999) theorized that values reflect the basic issues or problems that societies must address to regulate human behavior. Patterns of values, in turn, are suggestive of various coherent societal solutions to human regulation problems (Lord and Brown, 2001). Thus, a key function of leaders in organizations is help to develop, articulate and communicate, and model organizational values based on consensus through social validation. Effective leaders should have good understanding of their value system and moral compass. This understanding includes knowing the nature of values, their degree of resilience, harmony of values, achievement of values clarification, and the role values play in day-to-day decisions of the leader. According to Burns (1978) leadership is a process of morality to the degree that leaders engage with followers on the basis of shared motives and values. By this reason, leaders must seek ways to achieve corporate values which not only are consistent with the business aims, but also enable the compatibility of corporate values and employees’ self values.

Values congruence predictably produces positive outcomes and that will happen when an individual’s values are in line with those of others people in the organization. Empirical research supports this assumption. For example, Meglino et al. (1991) administered a values survey to research participants who later viewed one of two video-taped

presentations of leadership behavior. The results showed that congruence between participants' values and values of a leader was associated with greater satisfaction with the leader. According to Bass and Stogdill (1990), leader's orientation toward followers' attitudes, beliefs, and values affect their performance. Pennings (1991) interestingly found promotion rates of managers to be directly related to values of subordinates. Thomas et al. (2001), in researching the American army has found that values held by managers are related to their effectiveness. Similarly, Ghiselli (1996) also found a consistent correlation between personal values of managers and several criteria of managerial effectiveness.

Brown (1976) presumed that as values are the basic to behavior, the critical conflict which leads to ineffectiveness in organization is mainly due to the conflict of subordinates and superiors' values.

Shin and Zhou (2003) has investigated the relationship between transformational leadership and creativity and the moderating role of followers' values in this relationship. The finding has proved that conservation, a measure of individual's values, has a significant impact on the relationship between transformational leadership and followers' creativity. Transformational leaders are defined as leaders who focus on intangible qualities such as vision, shared values, and ideas in order to build relationship, give larger meaning to diverse activities, and find common ground to enlist followers in the change process. Thus, Shin and Zhou's findings bring a hint that highly conservative followers might be more attracted by leadership behaviors such as *Demand reconciliation*, *Tolerance of uncertainty*, *Persuasiveness*, *Tolerance of freedom*, *Consideration*, and *Integration*.

In a culture-level study, Navarro (2004) has found the significant difference in perception of leadership between employees of the same multinational company in Poland, US, and Mexico. The research shows significant effect of values on leadership behaviors perception. Employees in Poland and US whose cultures are lower in Power Distance, higher in Individualism perceive their leaders as less strategically visionary but more sensitive to member needs than employees in Mexico which has higher Power Distance and lower Individualism culture.

Ehrhart and Klein, (2001) in search for the link between followers' work values with preferences for different leadership styles has revealed that followers do differ in their preferences for different types of leaders. The findings from their research also suggest that followers' leadership preferences are predictable – to some extent – on the followers' characteristics and especially followers' values. Ehrhart and Klein identified nine follower attributes and values that would predict leader preferences including *achievement orientation, self-esteem, need for structure, extrinsic rewards, interpersonal relations, security, and worker participation*. According to this research, followers who have *strong worker participation* and *low security work values* are most likely to be drawn to charismatic leaders who can *articulate collective identity, high aspirations and empowerment*. Followers who value the extrinsic rewards of work may be most satisfied by *relationship-oriented leaders*. Followers who have *strong security values* were particularly attracted to *task-oriented leaders*, which means leaders' provision of clear standards, norms, and guidelines seems appealing to followers who seek order and stability at work. In addition, the findings also indicated individuals with high self-esteem, high desire for structure, low value for the intrinsic rewards of work, high value



for relationships and low value for participation in decision-making may also be attracted to the task-oriented leader.

Theory and research suggest charismatic leaders are distinguished by a number of characteristics including *risk-taking, goal articulation, high expectations, emphasis on the collective identity, and vision* (Bass, 1985; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; House, 1977; House & Shamir, 1993; House, Spangler, & Woycke, 1991; Shamir et al., 1993).

Consequently, we can interpret that charismatic leader will often act as representative of the group and he needs to be persuasive and accurate in prediction. Relationship-oriented leader is concerned with people, showing trust and confidence, acting friendly and considerate, trying to understand subordinate problems, helping to develop subordinates and support their careers, keeping subordinates informed, showing appreciation for subordinates' ideas and providing recognition for subordinates' contributions and accomplishments. The behaviors of relationship-oriented leader are similar to the behaviors labeled "consideration" in Ohio State leadership studies (Yukl 2001). Task-oriented leader's behaviors are similar to the behaviors labeled "initiating structure" in Ohio State leadership studies and this type of leader is considered as person who is concentrated on getting things done. According to those research's findings people of high *Conservation* might prefer leaders whose behaviors are more people-oriented while people who are more open to change might prefer task-oriented leaders.

#### **4. Leadership, gender and values in Korea**

Leadership patterns in Korea are largely influenced by Confucianism. The Confucian ideal of society emphasizes virtue, endurance, and interdependence. Confucian ethics is mainly governed by hierarchy and the distinctive characteristic of Confucianism is

patriarchy: the idea that the young people should give precedence to the elder and of placing greater importance on the ruler than the ruled, and that a man is better than a woman (Oh, 2003). Under the influence of Confucianism, Koreans tend to define all human relationship in terms of superior versus subordinate, the ruler versus the ruled, parent versus child, older and younger brothers, and husband versus wife. Wisdom, responsibility, and benevolence must come from the superior, and obedience, loyalty, and respect are expected from the subordinate.

Although Confucianism has been criticized for some reasons, Confucian ethics and a Confucian mentality still pervade everyday Korean life, and are reflected in many practices and institutions. Like other East Asian countries, the Confucian value system has contributed to collectivism in Korea, often characterized as a social pattern in which individuals are closely linked with one or more collectives (e.g., family, clan, or nation) and are willing to give priority to the interests of their collectives over their own (Triandis, 1995). Many Koreans buy in the idea that it is of paramount importance to fulfill one's expected roles both within the family and in society even at the cost of individuality (Koh, 1984) and living moderately is pursued to maintain harmony with others. This recognized feature is also supported by Hofstede's (1983) classical work on international difference in work-related values in 1970. Among the 53 countries and regions studied, Korea scored as strong collectivism on the individualism – collectivism dimension.

However, Korea has been undergoing remarkable socio-cultural changes in the wake of modernization, swift industrialization, and current globalization. It is believed that

greater contact with Western cultures and rapid industrialization may have influenced Korean's traditional values.

In the last three decades, Korea has moved from a traditional agrarian society to a young, urban, educated industrial society that has achieved significant economic growth. South Korea's population increased from 72% rural in 1960 to 73% urban in 1990 (Worthy, 1990). Literacy rates soared from 71% in 1960 to 98% today. The standard of living in South Korea has also improved substantially: annual per capita income rose from US\$87 in 1962 to over US\$10,000 in 1995 (Park and Cho, 1995; National Statistical Office, 1996). Moreover, Koreans' increasing exposures to Western ideas and practices are evident in the influx of Western movies and music, the significant increase in international travel and the spread of Christianity in Korea. As Lee (1995) reported, Korean population in US only has accounted for more than one million, this significant number of Koreans in US may play an active role in bringing new western lifestyles. The interference of Western culture and change in the economic development has lead more elements divorced from Korean traditional culture. Major changes in the mode of production and exposure to foreign culture can affect not only culture and its value systems, but also people's meaning systems and value orientations (D'Andrade, 1984). In a study on values conducted in Seoul, Cha and Jang (1992) reported that Korean college students' endorsement of certain Confucian values (e.g., respect for the hierarchical order and loyalty to superiors) was low. Formal education in virtually all societies models the Western-style education system to handle the demands created by industrialization (Tan, 1983). Highly educated Koreans and those greatly exposed to a complex urban life are more likely to develop an individualistic orientation and have less

traditional values. In addition, younger Koreans who have been socialized to meet the changing demands of industrialized Korea in homes and schools may also have a more individualistic orientation than older Koreans and thus appreciate less Confucian values.

Another aspect of Confucianism in Korea is its overwhelmingly negative impact on the status of women. In Korean feudalism, *Namjon yobi*, which means “Men should be respected and women should be lowered”, served as the guiding principle of gender relations. Under Confucianism, severe restrictions were applied on women. Women’s behavior was dictated by the law of three obediences: obeisance to the father before marriage, to the husband upon marriage, and to the son after the husband’s death. The woman’s role was named as “within”. This means that women’s domain to control is all the affairs at home. The man’s role was “outside”, and his concern was defined to the affairs of the state and all the things beyond the confines of the home. It was the woman’s duty to care for the children, to help her husband with the farm work, to prepare family meals, to make the family’s clothes, and to create an atmosphere of peace so as to better enable her husband to concentrate on the larger issues of society.

The 1970s saw the revisions and abolishment of discriminatory laws and practices against women. In 1977, some women’s organizations succeeded in making changes in provisions of the Family Law which deemed unfair to women. These actions paved the ways for the expansion of woman’s education and role in society. In 1980s statistics showed high school girls admitted to colleges accounted for 23% of the total graduates. In 1996 that rate increased to 53%. The average number of high school and college years completed by women in 1960 was at 2.92 compared to 5.78 years for men. The wide gap

between men's and women's education narrowed substantially in 1995 when women completed 9.26 years of school, compared with 10.14 years for men. However, at that time there haven't been a significant number of women in work. In 1998 only 47.7% of adult women were working outside of home. The ratio of female professionals and managers was only 12.6%, while the ratio for male was 22.5%. Only 34.4% of women were holding steady jobs, while 65.7% of men were regularly employed. Women's earnings, on average was only 63.4% of what men could earn for the same job. Observed in June 1998, two of 17 (11.8%) cabinet members were women. The number of female civil servants only account for 2.5% of the total. As of July 1997, the number of female diplomats was 47, or 3.8 % of the total. As of December 1996, women judges numbered 72, or 5.6%; there were female 31 prosecutors or 2.6% of the total.

All the changes in Korea predict a multifarious society and that there are diversified values among Korean people under the impact of industrialization and globalization. The socio-cultural change may also have impact on women. Women who are exposed more to education, Western culture and managerial position might have their self-concept changed. This could be even truer at organizations where there is not a big gap between women and men's education. However, in a high Masculinity society like Korean, these changes perhaps are limited in a way that women may react more positively to factors that favor their upward move in the society. Other gender-related features might still exist.

## 5. Hypotheses Development

The first factor which might have impact on preference for specific leadership behaviors is gender.

According to the past researches, there are several factors can affect gender difference in perceived leadership behaviors including popular leadership behaviors defined by culture, gender prototypes and gender's reaction to new cultural interference. Since Korea scores high on Power Distance and Collectivism people might expect their leaders to show their authority instead of empowerment, leaders are also expected to be accurate in their prediction for face-saving and maintain a close relationship with their seniors in order to protect their groups' benefit. Reaching to the position of one of the best economies in Asia Pacific from trash, Korea has been through a profound industrial revolution with the nation's strong will and effort. Until recently the word "*pal li*" is widely used and reflects the desire for getting things done as much and as soon as possible. These features leads to the hypothesis that Korean men and women don't have much different preferences for leadership behaviors which are culture-based such as *Representation*, *Initiation of structure*, *Role assumption*, *Predictive accuracy*, *Superior orientation* and *Production emphasis*.

Yoder (2001) posits that leadership itself is gendered and is enacted within a gendered context. Williams and Best (1990) found that the variance of gender stereotypes between males and females was smaller in highly developed countries and larger among the cultures where there was a great gap between the educational achievement of men and women. This finding is supported by Norris and Inglehart (2000). Although there have been significant changes in women's education and their exposure to managerial position,

these changes couldn't reverse a deeply-rooted culture and it is believed that gender stereotypes still pervade in Korea. This idea is supported by Hyun (2001). According to the research, the gender disparity in Korean's value endorsement was primarily shaped by historically determined gender-biased social experiences, and that higher education and greater exposure to modern lifestyle had no significant impact on local Koreans. Therefore, as the role of woman is restricted, female's preferences for specific leadership behaviors might be very much affected by common leadership norms. Since the standards for a leader in Korea has long been attached with paternalism, Korean women and men may have the same preference for *Demand Reconciliation, Persuasiveness, Consideration, and Integration*. Besides, Korea is known for a high rank of Uncertainty Avoidance both Korean women and men will be identical in perception of *Tolerance of Uncertainty*.

The research also gives a great concentration on the impact of individual values on leadership perception. So far, not so many studies have clarified the degree to which personal values affect the preferred leadership behaviors however, prior theory and research have still provided indirect and suggestive support for our arguments. Our hypotheses for the connection between values and preferred leadership behaviors include: People with high level of *Conservation* will prefer leadership styles associated with the image imposed by culture. As Korea is regarded as a society high in Collectivism, Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance and Masculinity (Hofstede, 2001), conservative people might rate leadership behaviors including *Representation, Demand Reconciliation, Initiation of structure, Consideration, Integration, and Superior orientation* higher and

than people who are open to change (Littrell and Valentine, 2005). On the other hand, people of *Openness to Change* often easily assimilate new culture and oppose the status quo and strive to change it in promoting their vision. This type of followers might expect more behaviors such as *Persuasiveness*, *Tolerance of Uncertainty*, and *Tolerance for Freedom* from their leaders.

*Self-transcendent* values are rooted in the altruistic motive (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996) and focus one's attention away from the self and toward helping others, recognizing one's connectedness to natural or spiritual systems. Examples of such values include altruism, self-sacrifice, unity with nature, and social justice. People of *Self-transcendence* therefore may consider leaders whose behaviors are close to *Demand Reconciliation*, *Persuasiveness*, *Integration*, and *Consideration* as ideal leaders. Conversely, as individuals who possess *Self-enhancement* values are often driven by needs for power or opportunities to assume desired leadership roles (Peterson & Seligman, 2004), those people might prefer leaders who hold values of *Tolerance of freedom*, *Predictive Accuracy*, and *Production Emphasis*.



### III. METHODOLOGY

#### 1. Questionnaire design

The questionnaire consists of three parts: Biographical Information, Ideal Leadership Behaviors and Values.

The first part Biographical Information includes eleven additional demographic questions such as gender, age, marital status, religion, level of religiousness, race...

The second part Ideal Leadership Behaviors using Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire form XII (LBDQ XII) which is popular in many studies of leadership. The LBDQ XII includes 100 items and divided into twelve subscales, each subscale is composed of either five or ten items. These subscales include:

1. *Representation* measures to what degree the manager speaks as the representative of the group.
2. *Demand reconciliation* reflects how well the manager reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system.
3. *Tolerance of uncertainty* depicts to what extent the manager is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or getting upset.
4. *Persuasiveness* measures to what extent the manager uses persuasion and argument effectively.
5. *Initiation of structure* measures to what degree the manager clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected.

6. *Tolerance of freedom* reflects to what extent the manager allows followers scope for initiative, decision and action.
7. *Role assumption* measures to what degree the manager exercises actively the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.
8. *Consideration* depicts to what extent the manager regards the comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers.
9. *Production emphasis* measures to what degree the manager applies pressure for productive output.
10. *Predictive accuracy* measures to what extent the manager exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately.
11. *Integration* reflects to what degree the manager maintains a closely-knit organisation; resolves inter-member conflicts.
12. *Superior orientation* measures to what extent the manager maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status.

In this part, people were asked to rate the behaviour of the “ideal leader” on 100 items on a 5-point scale with the respective scoring: 1=Never, 2=Seldom, 3=Occasionally, 4=Often, 5=Always. For each factor the part asked people questions such as “Acts as the spokesperson of the group” for *Representation*, “Handles complex problems efficiently”, for *Reconciliation* or “Wait patiently for the results of a decision” for *Tolerance of Uncertainty*, etc...

The third part named Values uses Schwartz Value Inventory which is also widely used in studies on managerial and cultural aspects. The Schwartz Value Inventory consists of a total of 10 distinct value types including *Power*, *Achievement*, *Hedonism*, *Stimulation*, *Self-direction*, *Universalism*, *Benevolence*, *Tradition*, *Conformity* and *Security*.

These individual level value types each represent a number of values which can be combined in a joint 'idea': Values located in the '*Power*' value type are likely to indicate an individual that values social status and prestige or control and dominance over people and resources. High scores in the '*Achievement*' value type would indicate a high priority given to personal success and admiration. '*Hedonism*' represents a value type where preference is given to pleasure and self-gratification. '*Stimulation*' represents a group of values that express a preference for an exciting life, and '*Self-direction*' a distinct group of values that include independence, creativity and freedom. The '*Universalism*' value type represents a preference for social justice and tolerance, whereas the '*Benevolence*' value domain contains values promoting the welfare of others. The '*Conformity*' value type contains values that represent obedience, and the '*Tradition*' value type is made up out of values representing a respect for traditions and customs. Lastly, the '*Security*' value type is a value orientation containing values relating to the safety, harmony and welfare of society and of one self (Schwartz, 2001).

Then these ten types of values can be ordered into four higher order value types: '*Openness to change*' combines *Stimulation*, *Self-direction* and a part of *Hedonism*, '*Self-enhancement*', combines *Achievement* and *Power* as well as the remainder of *Hedonism*. On the opposite side of the circle, '*Conservation*' combines the value orientations of

*Security, Tradition and Conformity*; and *Self-transcendence*, which combines *Universalism* and *Benevolence*. These four higher order value types form two bipolar conceptual dimensions. This type of order is derived from the location of values depending on their (negative) correlation within the circle, hence values situated on one side of the circle will be strongly negatively correlated with values on the opposing side of the circle, yet positively correlated with values located nearby. In practical terms, this means that a person who assigns high scores to values which are located in the '*Security*' value type is also likely to regard values located in the '*Conformity*' value type as "guiding principles of his life" and she/he will be unlikely to assign high scores to values located in the '*Stimulation*' or '*Self-direction*' value types.

The survey asked subjects to rate each value "according to its importance as guiding principle" in their life with scoring as: -1= Opposed to my values, 0= Not Important, 3 = Important, 6 = Very important and 7 = Supreme important.

The questionnaire was translated from English to Korean and then reviewed by a group of Korean graduate students to check if it fully delivers the idea of each item and made into two versions with reversed placement of the two last parts (LBDQ XII and SVI).

## **2. Samples and sites**

Two hundred thirty six copies of both versions were distributed in two graduate management schools in Seoul, Korea, in 2005 where almost all students have working experience. Among the total copies distributed two hundred and three was collected. Data were directly incorporated into an SPSS file for data analysis.

### 3. Data Analysis and Discussion

As each factor of Leadership Behaviors and Values is a multiple items scale, Reliability test was carried out to measure their internal consistency. Computed Cronbach's alpha for grouped items are almost higher or approximate 0.70 and basically meet the common standard for social sciences except that the subscales *Tolerance of Uncertainty*, *Tolerance of Freedom*, *Consideration*, *Production Emphasis* for Leadership Behaviors and *Hedonism*, *Stimulation* for Values. Cronbach's alpha for *Production Emphasis* are significantly improved up to 0.696 after one reversed item had been removed. Similarly, for *Tolerance of Freedom*, Cronbach's Alpha was up to 0.672 after the amendment. As the number of items in *Hedonism and Stimulation* subscales is quite small, the Cronbach's alpha 0.631 and 0.605 were, to some extent, acceptable.

After that, Factor Analysis was conducted for the rest subscales. Subsequently, items including "Remains calm when uncertain about coming events", "Is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty", "Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs" are chosen to present *Tolerance of Uncertainty*; "Assigns a task, then lets the members handle it", "Encourages initiative in the group members", "Trusts members to exercise good judgment", "Allows the group a high degree of initiative" ... for *Tolerance of Freedom*; and "Is friendly and approachable", "Looks out for the personal welfare of group members", "Is willing to make changes", "Treats all group members as his/her equals" for *Consideration* respectively.

Reversed items of Leadership Behaviors was recoded before MEAN function is used to compute all the subscales of Leadership Behaviors and Values. Test of Homogeneity of

Variances in which Levene Test was used shows no significant difference thus the assumption of equal variances is not violated.

**Table 3.1.1:**  
*Test of Homogeneity of Variances*

	<i>Levene Statistic</i>	<i>df1</i>	<i>df2</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Representation	.525	1	191	.469
Demand Reconciliation	.291	1	197	.590
Tolerance of Uncertainty	.161	1	197	.689
Persuasiveness	1.057	1	197	.305
Initiation	.098	1	197	.754
Tolerance of Freedom	2.472	1	197	.117
Role Assumption	1.818	1	197	.179
Consideration	.269	1	197	.605
Production Emphasis	.583	1	197	.446
Predictive Accuracy	.000	1	197	.989
Integration	.023	1	197	.880
Superior Orientation	1.118	1	197	.292

In the next steps we conducted ANOVA for Gender Inferential Statistics and for Values.

The result is as follows:

### 3.1. Gender difference in preferred leadership behaviors:

**Table 3.1.2:**

*One-Way Analysis of Variance of Preferred Leadership Behaviors by gender*

	Source	<i>df</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
<b>Representation</b>	Between Groups	1	0.028	0.028	0.083	0.772
	Within Groups	191	63.80	0.334		
	Total	192	63.83			
<b>Demand Reconciliation</b>	Between Groups	1	1.08	1.08	3.449	0.064
	Within Groups	197	61.99	0.314		
	Total	198	63.08			
<b>Tolerance of Uncertainty</b>	Between Groups	1	2.47	2.47	4.275	0.040
	Within Groups	197	113.84	0.577		
	Total	198	116.32			
<b>Persuasiveness</b>	Between Groups	1	0.00	0.004	0.018	0.892
	Within Groups	197	48.31	0.245		
	Total	198	48.32			
<b>Initiation</b>	Between Groups	1	0.43	0.43	2.545	0.112
	Within Groups	197	33.60	0.170		
	Total	198	34.03			
<b>Tolerance of Freedom</b>	Between Groups	1	0.038	0.038	0.243	0.622
	Within Groups	197	31.28	0.158		
	Total	198	31.32			
<b>Role Assumption</b>	Between Groups	1	0.007	0.007	0.026	0.871
	Within Groups	197	52.97	0.268		
	Total	198	52.98			
<b>Consideration</b>	Between Groups	1	0.005	0.005	0.018	0.892
	Within Groups	197	57.45	0.291		
	Total	198	57.45			
<b>Production Emphasis</b>	Between Groups	1	0.136	0.136	1.034	0.310
	Within Groups	197	25.96	0.131		
	Total	198	26.10			

<b>Predictive Accuracy</b>	Between Groups	1	0.198	0.198	0.749	0.388
	Within Groups	197	52.16	0.264		
	Total	198	52.35			
<b>Integration</b>	Between Groups	1	0.00	0.00	0.000	0.987
	Within Groups	197	46.50	0.236		
	Total	198	46.50			
<b>Superior Orientation</b>	Between Groups	1	0.181	0.181	0.883	0.348
	Within Groups	197	40.37	0.204		
	Total	198	40.55			

Table 3.1.2 shows whether Fs for these twelve ANOVAs are significant. The result turns out very interesting as there is only significant interaction between gender on *Tolerance of Uncertainty*, ( $F(1, 197)=4.275, p=0.040$ ) which means that there is difference in preferred leadership behaviors between male and female. Table 3.1.3 further shows that female rate *Tolerance of Uncertainty* much higher than male, 3.13 for male versus 3.39 for female.



**Table 3.1.3:**  
*Descriptives*

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Representation	Male	145	3.5862	.57429	.04769	3.4919	3.6805	1.80	5.00
	Female	48	3.5583	.58921	.08504	3.3872	3.7294	2.20	4.60
	Total	193	3.5793	.57662	.04151	3.4974	3.6611	1.80	5.00
Demand Reconciliation	Male	149	3.8057	.55280	.04529	3.7162	3.8952	2.60	5.00
	Female	50	3.9760	.58504	.08274	3.8097	4.1423	2.80	5.00
	Total	199	3.8485	.56445	.04001	3.7696	3.9274	2.60	5.00
Tolerance of Uncertainty	Male	149	3.1298	.76323	.06253	3.0062	3.2533	1.33	5.00
	Female	50	3.3867	.75099	.10621	3.1732	3.6001	1.33	4.67
	Total	199	3.1943	.76647	.05433	3.0872	3.3015	1.33	5.00
Persuasiveness	Male	149	3.7125	.50825	.04164	3.6302	3.7948	1.80	5.00
	Female	50	3.7016	.45374	.06417	3.5726	3.8305	2.60	4.60
	Total	199	3.7098	.49402	.03502	3.6407	3.7788	1.80	5.00
Initiation	Male	149	3.8219	.42679	.03496	3.7528	3.8910	1.90	4.80
	Female	50	3.9296	.36822	.05207	3.8249	4.0342	3.10	4.70
	Total	199	3.8489	.41461	.02939	3.7910	3.9069	1.90	4.80
Tolerance of Freedom	Male	149	3.7877	.39115	.03204	3.7244	3.8510	2.11	4.89
	Female	50	3.8198	.41996	.05939	3.7005	3.9392	3.11	4.78
	Total	199	3.7958	.39775	.02820	3.7402	3.8514	2.11	4.89
Role Assumption	Male	149	3.6600	.50751	.04158	3.5778	3.7421	2.30	5.00
	Female	50	3.6462	.55059	.07787	3.4897	3.8027	2.60	4.70
	Total	199	3.6565	.51729	.03667	3.5842	3.7288	2.30	5.00
Consideration	Male	149	3.8770	.53065	.04347	3.7911	3.9629	2.25	5.00
	Female	50	3.8650	.56742	.08025	3.7037	4.0263	2.50	5.00
	Total	199	3.8740	.53869	.03819	3.7986	3.9493	2.25	5.00
Production Emphasis	Male	149	3.4872	.37293	.03055	3.4269	3.5476	2.00	4.40
	Female	50	3.4269	.33142	.04687	3.3327	3.5211	2.70	4.40
	Total	199	3.4721	.36308	.02574	3.4213	3.5228	2.00	4.40
Predictive Accuracy	Male	149	3.8332	.51931	.04254	3.7492	3.9173	2.00	5.00
	Female	50	3.9060	.49996	.07071	3.7639	4.0481	2.80	5.00
	Total	199	3.8515	.51424	.03645	3.7796	3.9234	2.00	5.00
Integration	Male	149	3.9943	.49071	.04020	3.9149	4.0737	1.60	5.00
	Female	50	3.9930	.47100	.06661	3.8591	4.1269	2.80	5.00
	Total	199	3.9940	.48465	.03436	3.9262	4.0617	1.60	5.00
Superior Orientation	Male	149	3.6415	.46971	.03848	3.5655	3.7176	1.80	4.80
	Female	50	3.5720	.39695	.05614	3.4592	3.6848	2.90	4.60

The statistics indicated there was no difference in male and female's ratings for *Demand Reconciliation, Consideration, and Integration...* The reason why women and men are not different in rating these leadership behaviors might be explained by the fact that leaders in the eyes of Koreans must be identically as the one who are paternal. Thus, leaders are required to balance the benefits of all members, care for members' personal issues and build up a tight relationship among all people in the organization.

Initially, due to the truth that Korea is rated high in the *Uncertainty Avoidance*, the author presumed that both woman and man will have the same perception of *Tolerance of Uncertainty*. However, the result showed that women have higher reference for *Tolerance of Uncertainty* which is an interesting finding. This result might be explained by the assumption that being regarded as weaker and gentle sex, women will love to be lead by people who are gentle and reasonable in any circumstance.

### ***3.2. Impact of personal values on preferred leadership behaviors***

As mentioned above, Values Items make up 4 subscales including *Openness to Change, Self-Enhancement* versus *Conservation and Self-Transcendence*, we decided to recode all items composing *Conservation* and *Self-Transcendence* then summate them into only two factors including *Openness to Change* and *Self-Enhancement*. Subsequently, these variables were revised so that each variable will have three categories reflecting three degrees from "low", "medium" to "high". It could be understood that the low level of *Openness to Change* means the high *Conservation*. On the other hand, high *Openness to Change* means low *Conservation...*

ANOVA were again used to check if there is any significant difference among these categories.

**Table 3.2.1:**  
*One-Way Analysis of Variance of Preferred Leadership Behaviors by Openness to Change*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Representation	Between Groups	2.166	2	1.083	3.163	.044
	Within Groups	66.777	195	.342		
	Total	68.943	197			
Demand Reconciliation	Between Groups	.330	2	.165	.504	.605
	Within Groups	63.845	195	.327		
	Total	64.175	197			
Tolerance of Uncertainty	Between Groups	.255	2	.127	.345	.709
	Within Groups	71.959	195	.369		
	Total	72.213	197			
Persuasiveness	Between Groups	.949	2	.475	1.945	.146
	Within Groups	47.587	195	.244		
	Total	48.536	197			
Initiation of Structure	Between Groups	1.247	2	.624	3.697	.027
	Within Groups	32.886	195	.169		
	Total	34.133	197			
Tolerance of Freedom	Between Groups	.404	2	.202	1.312	.272
	Within Groups	30.032	195	.154		
	Total	30.436	197			
Role Assumption	Between Groups	.037	2	.019	.069	.933
	Within Groups	52.150	195	.267		
	Total	52.187	197			
Consideration	Between Groups	.063	2	.032	.197	.821
	Within Groups	31.218	195	.160		
	Total	31.281	197			
Production Emphasis	Between Groups	2.455	2	1.227	8.210	0.0003
	Within Groups	29.152	195	.149		
	Total	31.606	197			
Predictive Accuracy	Between Groups	.207	2	.103	.387	.679
	Within Groups	52.031	195	.267		
	Total	52.237	197			
Integration	Between Groups	1.006	2	.503	2.137	.121
	Within Groups	45.868	195	.235		
	Total	46.873	197			
Superior Orientation	Between Groups	5.139	2	2.569	14.262	.000
	Within Groups	35.131	195	.180		
	Total	40.269	197			

Table 3.2.1 indicated a significant impact of *Openness to Change* on *Representation*,  $F(2,194)=3.163$ ,  $p=.044$ ; *Initiation of Structure*,  $F(2,195)=3.697$ ,  $p=.027$ ; *Production Emphasis*,  $F(2,195)=8.210$ ,  $p=0.0003$ ; and *Superior Orientation*,  $F(2,195)=14.262$ ,  $p=.000$ .

**Table 3.2.2:**  
*Test of Homogeneity of Variances by Openness to Change*

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Representation	1.138	2	195	.323
Demand Reconciliation	.067	2	195	.936
Tolerance of Uncertainty	.383	2	195	.683
Persuasiveness	.042	2	195	.959
Initiation of Structure	.075	2	195	.928
Tolerance of Freedom	.162	2	195	.850
Role Assumption	1.041	2	195	.355
Consideration	3.517	2	195	.032
Production Emphasis	.663	2	195	.516
Predictive Accuracy	1.632	2	195	.198
Integration	1.663	2	195	.192
Superior Orientation	.104	2	195	.901

Table 3.2.2 with the Levene test showed no significant difference among three level of *Openness to Change* on *Representation*, *Initiation of Structure*, *Production Emphasis*, and *Superior Orientation*. Thus, a follow-up Tukey test is used to clarify which specific means are different from which other ones.

**Table 3.2.3:**  
*Post-hoc Tukey test for Openness to Change*

**Representation**

Tukey HSD

Revised Openness to Change	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
High OTC	16	3.2250	
Medium OTC	93		3.5984
Low OTC	89		3.6169
Sig.		1.000	.990

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.  
a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 35.508.

b The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

**Initiation of Structure**

Tukey HSD

Revised Openness to Change	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
High OTC	16	3.5875	
Medium OTC	93		3.8409
Low OTC	89		3.8907
Sig.		1.000	.866

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 35.508.

b The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

**Production Emphasis**

Tukey HSD

Revised Openness to Change	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
High OTC	16	3.1736	
Medium OTC	93		3.4973
Low OTC	89		3.5944
Sig.		1.000	.541

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 35.508.

b The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

**Superior Orientation**

Tukey HSD

Revised Openness to Change	N	Subset for alpha = .05	
		1	2
High OTC	16	3.0875	
Medium OTC	93		3.6345
Low OTC	89		3.7009
Sig.		1.000	.788

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 35.508.

b The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

The Homogenous subset table (Table 3.2.3) shows an adjusted Tukey that is appropriate when group sizes are not similar. They indicated that the high *Openness to Change* group differs significantly from the medium and low *Openness to Change* groups on

*Representation*. Likewise, there were also significant difference on *Initiation of Structure*, *Production Emphasis*, and *Superior Orientation* between the high *Openness to Change* group and the medium and low *Openness to Change* groups. The result indicated that people who have high level of *Openness to Change* rated lower for *Representation* (M=3.22 versus 3.59 and 3.61), *Initiation of Structure* (M=3.58 versus 3.84 and 3.89), *Production Emphasis* (M=3.17 versus 3.49 and 3.59), and *Superior Orientation* (M=3.08 versus 3.63 and 3.70). The finding supports our hypothesis that people who are more conservative will more highly appreciate *Representation*, *Initiation* and *Superior Orientation* while people who are biased to freedom will have less desire for being told what to do. These people will not really appreciate the leaders with high *Representation*, *Initiation* and *Superior Orientation* behaviors. The finding shows an interesting result in the ratings of people for *Production Emphasis* where people who are more open rated lower for this leadership behavior. However, this might be interpreted another way due to the truth that Korea is one of the most industrious country, and with a spreading history of poverty before soaring up to the position of a developed country being hard-working is always a must for all employees. Many Koreans recently confessed they have worked so hard that they were not able to control their life and wondered if their life is the real life or not. The low rating of people who are open to change might reflect a desire to have less pressure of being effective than these people were enduring.

For the impact of *Self Enhancement* on preferred leadership behaviors, Table 3.2.4 shows significant difference of three levels of *Self Enhancement* on *Demand Reconciliation*,  $F(2,194)=3.179$ ,  $p=0.044$ ; *Persuasiveness*,  $F(2,194)=4.910$ ,  $p=.008$ ; *Initiation Structure*  $F(2,194)=6.814$ ,  $p= 0.001$ ; *Tolerance of Freedom*,  $F(2,194)=9.890$ ,  $p=0.00$ ;

*Consideration*,  $F(2,194)=6.275$ ,  $p=.002$ ; *Predictive Accuracy*,  $F(2,194)=4.731$ ,  $p=.010$ ;

*Integration*,  $F(2,194)=7.209$ ,  $p=.001$ ; and *Superior Orientation*,  $F(2,194)=3.691$ ,  $p=.027$ .

**Table 3.2.4:**

*One-Way Analysis of Variance of Preferred Leadership Behaviors by Self Enhancement*

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Representation	Between Groups	.316	2	.158	.453	.637
	Within Groups	67.669	194	.349		
	Total	67.985	196			
Demand Reconciliation	Between Groups	2.035	2	1.018	3.179	.044
	Within Groups	62.113	194	.320		
	Total	64.148	196			
Tolerance of Uncertainty	Between Groups	2.050	2	1.025	2.869	.059
	Within Groups	69.289	194	.357		
	Total	71.339	196			
Persuasiveness	Between Groups	2.307	2	1.154	4.910	.008
	Within Groups	45.578	194	.235		
	Total	47.885	196			
Initiation of Structure	Between Groups	2.237	2	1.118	6.814	.001
	Within Groups	31.837	194	.164		
	Total	34.074	196			
Tolerance of Freedom	Between Groups	2.797	2	1.398	9.890	.000
	Within Groups	27.432	194	.141		
	Total	30.229	196			
Role Assumption	Between Groups	.684	2	.342	1.290	.278
	Within Groups	51.439	194	.265		
	Total	52.123	196			
Consideration	Between Groups	1.873	2	.937	6.275	.002
	Within Groups	28.959	194	.149		
	Total	30.832	196			
Production Emphasis	Between Groups	.700	2	.350	2.209	.113
	Within Groups	30.743	194	.158		
	Total	31.443	196			
Predictive Accuracy	Between Groups	2.429	2	1.215	4.731	.010
	Within Groups	49.806	194	.257		
	Total	52.235	196			
Integration	Between Groups	3.219	2	1.609	7.209	.001
	Within Groups	43.308	194	.223		
	Total	46.527	196			
Superior Orientation	Between Groups	1.466	2	.733	3.691	.027
	Within Groups	38.531	194	.199		

**Table 3.2.5:**  
*Test of Homogeneity of Variances for Self Enhancement*

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Representation	.360	2	194	.698
Demand Reconciliation	.065	2	194	.937
Tolerance of Uncertainty	1.397	2	194	.250
Persuasiveness	1.691	2	194	.187
<b>Initiation of Structure</b>	<b>5.673</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>.004</b>
Tolerance of Freedom	.866	2	194	.422
<b>Role Assumption</b>	<b>4.144</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>.017</b>
Consideration	.534	2	194	.587
Production Emphasis	.592	2	194	.554
<b>Predictive Accuracy</b>	<b>3.815</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>.024</b>
Integration	1.176	2	194	.311
Superior Orientation	.066	2	194	.936

The Table 3.2.5 shows the variances of three groups based on level of *Self-Enhancement* are significant for *Initiation of Structure, Role Assumption and Predictive Accuracy*. Thus, the post-hoc Tukey test is appropriate for checking which group really differs from each on *Demand Reconciliation, Persuasiveness, Tolerance of Freedom, Consideration, Integration, and Superior Orientation*, while Games-Howell test is appropriate for *Initiation of Structure and Predictive Accuracy*.



**Table 3.2.6:**  
*Post-hoc Tukey test for Self Enhancement*

Tukey HSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Revised Self Enhancement	(J) Revised Self Enhancement	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Demand Reconciliation	Low SE	Medium SE	.07321	.17072	.904	-.3300	.4764
		High SE	.29030	.18028	.244	-.1355	.7161
	Medium SE	Low SE	-.07321	.17072	.904	-.4764	.3300
		High SE	.21710(*)	.09102	.047	.0021	.4321
	High SE	Low SE	-.29030	.18028	.244	-.7161	.1355
		Medium SE	-.21710(*)	.09102	.047	-.4321	-.0021
Persuasiveness	Low SE	Medium SE	-.02164	.14624	.988	-.3670	.3238
		High SE	.22116	.15443	.326	-.1436	.5859
	Medium SE	Low SE	.02164	.14624	.988	-.3238	.3670
		High SE	.24279(*)	.07797	.006	.0586	.4269
	High SE	Low SE	-.22116	.15443	.326	-.5859	.1436
		Medium SE	-.24279(*)	.07797	.006	-.4269	-.0586
Tolerance of Freedom	Low SE	Medium SE	-.00089	.11345	1.000	-.2688	.2671
		High SE	.26480	.11981	.072	-.0182	.5478
	Medium SE	Low SE	.00089	.11345	1.000	-.2671	.2688
		High SE	.26569(*)	.06049	.000	.1228	.4085
	High SE	Low SE	-.26480	.11981	.072	-.5478	.0182
		Medium SE	-.26569(*)	.06049	.000	-.4085	-.1228
Consideration	Low SE	Medium SE	.04971	.11657	.905	-.2256	.3250
		High SE	.26130	.12310	.088	-.0294	.5520
	Medium SE	Low SE	-.04971	.11657	.905	-.3250	.2256
		High SE	.21159(*)	.06215	.002	.0648	.3584
	High SE	Low SE	-.26130	.12310	.088	-.5520	.0294
		Medium SE	-.21159(*)	.06215	.002	-.3584	-.0648
Integration	Low SE	Medium SE	-.16333	.14255	.487	-.5000	.1733
		High SE	.12212	.15054	.697	-.2334	.4777
	Medium SE	Low SE	.16333	.14255	.487	-.1733	.5000
		High SE	.28545(*)	.07600	.001	.1060	.4650
	High SE	Low SE	-.12212	.15054	.697	-.4777	.2334
		Medium SE	-.28545(*)	.07600	.001	-.4650	-.1060
Superior Orientation	Low SE	Medium SE	-.28844	.13446	.084	-.6060	.0291
		High SE	-.14606	.14199	.560	-.4814	.1893
	Medium SE	Low SE	.28844	.13446	.084	-.0291	.6060
		High SE	.14238	.07169	.118	-.0269	.3117
	High SE	Low SE	.14606	.14199	.560	-.1893	.4814
		Medium SE	-.14238	.07169	.118	-.3117	.0269

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

**Table 3.2.7:**  
*Post-hoc Games-Howell test for Self Enhancement*

Dependent Variable	(I) Revised Self Enhancement	(J) Revised Self Enhancement	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Initiation of Structure	Low SE	Medium SE	-.04728	.18496	.965	-.5427	.4481
		High SE	.19293	.19222	.587	-.3120	.6979
	Medium SE	Low SE	.04728	.18496	.965	-.4481	.5427
		High SE	.24021(*)	.06851	.002	.0767	.4037
	High SE	Low SE	-.19293	.19222	.587	-.6979	.3120
		Medium SE	-.24021(*)	.06851	.002	-.4037	-.0767
Predictive Accuracy	Low SE	Medium SE	-.21295	.22251	.616	-.8071	.3812
		High SE	.02576	.22612	.993	-.5730	.6245
	Medium SE	Low SE	.21295	.22251	.616	-.3812	.8071
		High SE	.23871(*)	.07444	.005	.0620	.4155
	High SE	Low SE	-.02576	.22612	.993	-.6245	.5730
		Medium SE	-.23871(*)	.07444	.005	-.4155	-.0620

\* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

According to Table 3.2.6, there were significant differences between high *Self Enhancement* group with medium and low *Self Enhancement* group on *Demand Reconciliation, Persuasiveness, Tolerance of Freedom, Consideration, Integration* while even there is difference in mean between the groups on *Superior Orientation*, no significant difference was found. People in high *Self Enhancement* group rated lower for all of the above leadership behaviors than people in medium *Self Enhancement* and low *Self Enhancement* group. The findings are somehow identical with our initial assumptions about how people of *Self Enhancement* or *Self Transcendence* might differ in their preference for leadership behaviors including *Demand Reconciliation, Persuasiveness, Tolerance of Freedom, Consideration, and Integration*. The result of Games-Howell test (Table 3.2.7) also signaled that high *Self Enhancement* group rated lower for *Initiation of Structure* and *Predictive Accuracy* than low and medium *Self Enhancement* group. Such finding is very much against the initial assumption that people of high *Self Enhancement* might prefer leaders who can set the

role for each member of the organization to follow and have strong intuition in their prediction. This phenomenon might be explained by another assumption that high *Self Enhancement* people have higher desire for freedom so they might consider *Predictive Accuracy* and *Initiation of Structure* to be less favorable leadership characteristics.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

##### **1. Contribution**

Even there were some discrepancies between the hypothesis and the findings, the study bring a practical understanding of how different values might have impact on individual's preference for leadership behaviors.

The result of data analysis showed no big impact of gender on leadership behaviors preference except for *Tolerance of Uncertainty*. As Korea is rated very high on *Uncertainty Avoidance, Power Distance, and Collectivism*, the findings enhances the fact that Koreans tend to highly appreciate paternal leaders. Being a leader in Korea, one might be expected to act on behalf of his group, knows how to maintain harmony in his organization, define member's role, make a concrete group and keep a close relationship with his superiors. The only leadership behavior that gender shows a difference in the magnitude of preference is *Tolerance of Uncertainty*. This might reflect the very natural desire of woman for a superior who is stable under vague situation and a little bit subjective in their assessment.

This finding suggests that in organizations in Korea gender might not have great impact on how employees want a leader to be. However, it is not encouraged to infer such a conclusion in organizations where employees with different gender are not highly

educated and common as the samples are drawn from two graduate schools where education of men and women are identical.

The analysis also figures out great impact of social values on preference for certain specific leadership behaviors. According to the findings, people who are conservative prefer leaders with leadership behaviors including *Representation, Initiation of Structure, Production Emphasis, and Superior Orientation*. In the contrary, people who are open to change are not really attracted by those types of leaders. This strongly reflects the deeply rooted Confucianism culture of Korea where *Power Distance* and *Collectivism* are the main features.

Differences were also found in analyzing preference for leadership behaviors of self-transcendent and self-enhancement people. The findings indicated high self-transcendent people have desire to be lead by the one who are thoughtful, persuasive and who can contribute as much as he wants to receive from others. It suggests self-transcendent people might need to be given specific instruction of his/her scope of responsibility as well as a clear and practical vision from his/her boss. In the contrary, self-enhancement people show little preferences for those leadership behaviors. The reason could be that these people are more independent in their thought and they are often driven by their vision than any other. Suggestion for leaders in organizations from the findings is to give self-transcendent people more guidance and care while provide self-enhancement people the resources but let them a certain degree of freedom in their work.

## **2. Applications**

From our findings, various applications might be developed. Firstly, the findings are valuable in term it helps probe relationship between existing employees and their leaders and help to set values standards for an organization. Questionnaire can be composed to test staffs' values, preferred leadership styles and common leadership practice in the organization. The result can reveal if leadership behaviors in organizations are really what employees expect and desire and which values play the mediating roles between those two. The recognized mediating values then can be set as the standard values in the organization.

Additionally, it is noticed that some specific values are found popular in certain types of organizations, for instance, conservative and self-transcendent people are often found in education and health industry while in competitive and fast changing environment such as high-tech industries people are found very open to change and self-enhanced. This suggests that when a company or organization wants to recruit an outsider for managing positions, the understanding of values that current employees highly appreciate in combination with the "DNA" required for such position can be a hint to make sure that candidates are right people. In these industries, from leader-centric viewpoint, candidates for employment might also be tested to see if their values are in conformity with popular leadership behaviors in that organization.

Besides, doing business in a foreign country is very much dealing with culture norms and people. Social values are reflection of how culture is diffused in the society. Even though the interviewees are restricted to graduate students, the research does give a broad sense of Korea culture. With this meaning, the findings can give expatriate managers an

overview of what is expected from a Korean staff and how to behave in such an environment to exert the best outcome for the organization. This is truly valuable for multinational companies when they do or plan to do business in Korea.

### **3. Limitations**

Since the restricted period of time for such a study and the lack of literature closely related to the questions raised, assumptions have somehow been made subjectively. However, it is impossible to negate that the approach and findings of the research are fresh, thus creating a reference for more profound studies later.

There are also other limitations in the survey as sample is composed of only master students. For that reason, the conclusion is only confined to certain group of highly educated people which hardly can represent all labor classes. Thus, it will be not prudent to conclude that findings and applications are appropriate for blue collar workers.

Besides, the analysis also did not fully cover other potential extraneous effect (i.e. the environment where interviewees grow up, work and their current work position). This, to some extent, can make the final result of the analysis biased and not to reveal all factors which might have impact on preferred leadership behaviors.

After all, the author believes this research is an additional contribution to former studies on the connection between gender and leadership behaviors. Additionally, the research is also valuable as it has also initially probed some connection between values and preference for leadership behaviors.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham Pizam, Ray Pine, Connie Mok, and Jae Young Shin (1997). Nationality vs Industry Cultures: Which has a greater effect on Managerial Behavior? *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol.16, No.2, 127-145.

Ajiferuke, Musbau & Jean J. Boddewyn (1970). "Culture" and other explanatory variables in comparative management studies. *Academy of Management Journal*, 13, 153-163.

Andrew J. Dubrin. *Leadership: research findings, practice, and skills*. Houghton Mifflin, 1998.

Andrew Kakabadse and Nada Kakabadse. *Essence of leadership*. Thomson, 1999.

Bartol, K. M. & Butterfield, D. A. (1976). Sex effects in evaluating leaders. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 61, 446-454.

*Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, & Managerial Applications*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Free Press, 1990.

Butterfield, D.A., & Grinnell, J. P. (1999). *Gender influences on performance evaluations*. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender at work* (pp. 223-238). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cleveland, J.N., Stockdale, M., & Murphy, K.R. (2000). *Women and men in organizations: Sex and gender issues at work*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cristina B. Gibson, (1995). An investigation of Gender Difference in Leadership across Four Countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 2, 255-279.

Dan Navarro (2004). The Influence of National Culture (and other Independent Variables) on Leadership Perceptions. *American Society for Quality*,

David A. Ralston, David H. Holt, Robert H. Terpstra and Yu Kai-Cheng (1997). The impact of National Culture and Economic Ideology on Managerial Work Values: A Study of The United States, Russia, Japan and China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 177-207.

Dobbins, G. H., & Platz, S. J. (1986). Sex differences in leadership: How real are they? *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 11, 118-127.

- Eagly, A.H., & Johnson, B.T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 233-256.
- Erna Szabo et al (2001). Values and behavior orientation in leadership studies: reflections based on findings in three German-speaking countries. *The Leadership Quarterly* Volume 12, 219-244.
- Ferdam, B.M. (1999). *The color and culture of gender in organizations*. In G.N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender at work* (pp. 17-34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gary Yukl. *Leadership in organization*. 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Prentice Hall, 2001.
- Geert Hofstede. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations across Nations*. Sage Publications, 2001.
- Gerstner, C.R., and Day, D.V., (1994). Cross-cultural comparison of leadership prototypes. *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.5, 121-134.
- Heilman, M.E. (1995). Sex stereotypes and their effects in the workplace: What we know and what we don't know. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 10, 3-26.
- Hooijberg, R., & DiTomaso, N. (1996). Leadership in and of demographically diverse organizations. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 1-19.
- Hughes, Ginnett and Curphy. *Leadership: Enhancing the lessons of experience*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Irwin, 1996.
- Irene Hau – Siu Chow (2005). Gender differences in perceived leadership effectiveness in Hong Kong. *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 20, No. 4, 216-233.
- Jago, A.G., & Vroom, V.H. (1982). Sex differences in the incidence and evaluation of participative leader behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67, 776-783.
- James C. Sarros and Joseph C. Santora (2001). Leaders and values: A cross-cultural study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22/5, 243-248.
- Jeffrey L. Thomas, Marcus W. Dickson and Paul D. Bliese (2001). Values predicting leader performance in the U.S Army Reserve Officer Training Corps Assessment Center: Evidence for a personality-mediated model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Volume 12, 181-196.
- John J. Sosik (2005). The role of personal values in the charismatic leadership of corporate managers: A model and preliminary field study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Volume 16, Issue 2, 221-244.
- Kanter R.M. *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- Karin Klenke (2005). Corporate values as multi-level, multi-domain antecedents of leadership behavior. *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 26, No. 1, 50-66.



Kathryn M. Bartol, David C. Martin, and Julie A. Kromkowski (2003). Leadership and the glass ceiling: Gender and Ethnic Group Influence on Leader Behaviors at Middle and Executive Managerial Levels. *The Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, Vol. 9, No.3.

Kyoung Ja Hyun (2001). Sociocultural change and traditional values: Confucian values among Koreans and Korean Americans. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 25, 203-229.

London, M., & Wohlers, A.J. (1991). Agreement between subordinate and self-ratings in upward feedback. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 375-390.

Lord, R.G. and Maher, K.J. *Leadership and Information Processing: Linking Perceptions and Performance*. Routledge, London, 1993.

Lynn R. Offerman, Paul J. Hanges and David V. Day (2001). Leaders, followers, and values: progress and prospects for theory and research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 12, Pages 129-131.

Mark G. Ehrhart and Katherine J. Klein (2001). Predicting followers' preferences for charismatic leadership: the influence of followers values and personality. *The Leadership quarterly*, Vol. 12, 153-179.

Martha A. Brown (1976). Values – A necessary but neglected ingredient of motivation on the job. *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol.1, No.4, 15-23.

Meindl J.R (1995). The romance of leadership as follower-centric theory: a social construction approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.6, 329-341.

Meindl J.R., Erlich, S.B and Dukerich, R.M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 30, 78-102.

Mellissa Horner (1997). Leadership theory: past, present and future, *Team Performance Management*. Vol. 3, No. 4, 270-287.

Micha Popper and Natan Druyan (2001). Cultural prototypes? Or leaders' behaviors? A study on workers' perceptions of leadership in an electronics industry. *Journal of Management Psychology*, Vol. 16, No. 7, 549-558.

Myungsoen Oh (2003). Study on appropriate Leadership pattern for the Korean church in postmodern era. *Journal of Asian Mission*.

Patrick E. Connor and Boris W. Becker (1975). Values and the organization: Suggestions for research. *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol.18, No.3, 550-561.

Philip Sadler. *Leadership: Styles – Role Models – Qualities – Behaviours*. Page, 1997.

- Pulakos, E.D., White, L.A., Oppler, S.H., and Borman, W.C. (1989). Examination of race and sex effects on performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 770-780.
- Ragins, B.R., & Sundstrom, E. (1989). Gender and power in organizations: A longitudinal perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 105, 51-88.
- Richard L. Daft. *Leadership: Theory and practice*. The Dryden Press, 1999.
- Robert J. Lord and Douglas J. Brown (2001). Leadership, values, and subordinate self-concepts. *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 12, 133-152.
- Robert P. Vecchio and Karyn K. Boatwright (2002). Preferences for idealized styles of supervision. *The Leadership Quarterly* 13.
- Romie F. Littrell, and Lapadus N. Valentin (2005). Preferred Leadership Behaviors: Exploratory Results from Romania, Germany, and The UK. *The Journal of Management Development*, vol. 24, no. 5, 421-442.
- Romie F. Littrell, Stella M. Nkomo (2005). Gender and Race Differences in Leader Behaviour Preferences in South Africa. *Women in Management Review*, volume 20, issue 8.
- Sarah Burke and Karen M. Collins (2001). Gender differences in leadership styles and management skills. *Women in Management Review*, Vol. 16, No. 5, 244-256.
- Shung Jae Shin and Jing Zhou (2003). Transformational Leadership, Conservation, and Creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 46, No. 6, 703-714.