THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Defiance of One Size Fits All! Can Leaders Lead the Same across the Globe? A Comparative Study on Effective Leadership from a Cultural Perspective across the Globe: Implications of the GLOBE Study on Leadership on Selected Countries Worldwide

Milton Gwakwa
Lecturer, Department of Business Management, BA ISAGO University, Botswana

Abstract:
*The operations of Multinational enterprises across the globe, can be improved if the concerned institutions take a leaf from the highly and most popularised research works conceived and commissioned by Robert J. House of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania in 1991. This work has been nomenclature:Project **GLOBE**-an acronym standing for Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness This paper dedicates itself to leadership practices, emphatically from a cultural perspective across the globe. The sample of countries studied include a spectrum of chosen countries so referred to as societies by the study-and the key countries for reference are: China, United Arab Emirate(Dubai), Germany, United States, Russia, Zimbabwe, South Africa, Bolivia, Saudi Arabia, United Kingdom, Brazil and Japan. In this paper, these listed societies represent countries in which the MNEs are operating from, implying therefore that focus on implications of GLOBE Study is hinged on in accordance with this research. The study's major finding is that leadership across globe is culturally inclined and cannot be universally applied; instead it has to be culturally contextualised. The major recommendation is that leadership across the globe must be applied selectively using a selective model approach. This paper strongly encourages that, that leaders operating across the Globe draw important insights, lessons and issues emanating from the said study in order for them to adopt and adapt their operations accordingly.*

1. Introduction

Historical and socio-cultural influences on leadership decisions, as we speak, continue to affect all organisations' policies and programs as well as results across the globe. Without insights to cultural, socio-political and economic and institutional forces, multinational Enterprises leadership will stumble in the darkness to find effective international strategies for managing differences. Broadly speaking, I need to quickly point out that, though it sounds politically-oriented-the events that include the fall of the Soviet Union in the early 90s, the legacy of colonialism in developing world, the resurgent of nationalism worldview –have both direct and in direct influence in which organisations and firms with global interests operate subjecting their leadership to some form of 'acid tests' in meeting set goals. The other factors that needs serious considerations and diagnosis include issue of ethics of use of force, balance of global power, role of international institutions, persistence of poverty and economic inequality worldwide and other threats to world peace and stability. What is of essence to mention at this early juncture is that corporate leaders cannot effectively plan international strategies and execute their mandates without bringing the aforementioned forces into consideration.

1.1. Overview to Project GLOBE

As already alluded to, in the introductory part of this work, project GLOBE is the brainchild of Robert J. House of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. The research program was conceived in 1991.This is a cross-cultural research effort that exceeds all others (including Geert Hofstede 's landmark 1980 study) in scope, depth, duration, and sophistication). The project directly involved 170 social scientists (here referred to as country co-investigators) based in 62 of the world's cultures. Its first comprehensive volume on '*Culture, Leadership and Organisations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies'* was published in 2004. A second major volume was published in 2007 and coined: '*Culture and Leadership across the world: The GLOBE Book of in-depth Studies of 25 Societies'*. This second volume complimented the findings of the 2004 volume with an in-country leadership analyses meant to provide in-depth descriptions of leadership theory and leader behaviour in those 25 cultures. The central and fundamental question in this study is: How is culture related to societal, organisational, and leader effectiveness? The major concern is the extent to which specific leadership attributes and behaviours are universally endorsed as contributing to effective leadership and the extent to which the endorsement of leader attributes and behaviour is culturally contingent. It is important to note that the research project measured culture in different segments (country, industry and organizations) exploring both current practices and values and the results are based on data obtained from 17 300 middle managers from 951 organisations in the food processing, financial services and telecommunication services in

industries across the 62 societies alluded to earlier on. GLOBE's major finding is that leader effectiveness is contextual, that is, it is embedded in the societal and organisational norms, values and beliefs of the people being led. The result is akin to the old adage which asserts that: *'when you are in Rome, do as the Romans do'*. Important to highlight at this juncture is that GLOBE empirically established nine cultural dimensions that distinguishes one society from another. With respect to these dimensions, there is high within-culture and within organisation and high between-culture and between –organisation differentiation. The key dimensions are tabled in the next page:

Institutional collectivism	In-Group Collectivism	Power Distance
Assertiveness	Humane -Orientation	Future Orientation
Gender Egalitarianism	Performance Orientation	Uncertainty Avoidance

Table 1: Nine Cultural Dimensions of the GLOBE Study

Important to mention in passing is that each of the above dimension was conceptualised in two ways: 'practises' or 'as is' and 'values' or 'should be. It is important to point out that eight of the dimensions in the table above are similar to those of Geert Hofstede (1980), making his study worth referring to. In the same study, the other cracking issue was on leadership effectiveness. The major question addressed by the research team concerned the extent to which the practices and values associated with leadership are universal and the extent to which they are specific to just a few societies. In summary six leadership styles emerged and are tabled below:

Charismatic/Value based style	Participative Style	The Humane Style
Team-oriented Style	The Autonomous Style	Self-Protective Style

Table 2: GLOBE Study-leadership styles identified

It is clear from the study that some attributes contributed positively to outstanding leadership, others are inhibiting, and others are culturally specific (contribute positively in society (a) and negatively in society (b).

Let me take an opportunity that the afore-discussed issues on GLOBE provide a basis upon which the next session is based. But before looking at the overall leadership and culture overtures of the sampled societies from which MNEs operates in in this write-up, I need to define a few words as implied by the study.

Leadership: The GLOBE Researchers defines leadership as '...the ability of an individual to influence, motivates, and enables others to contribute toward the effectiveness of the organisations of which they are members'.

Culture:

Society: GLOBE speaks of Societies rather than countries, as their data showed that some countries are fractioned into rather different cultural groups

1.2. Country Discussion by Culture and Leadership Ways

The following section presents a detailed but summarised view of the cultural and leadership(historical and contemporary) issues found in the 12 societies chosen including western and Northern Europe, Northern America, SE Asia and Latin America perse), implying that any MNE operating in that country –must at least together with the knowledge and understanding of GLOBE Study, have an in-depth understanding of the macro and micro cultural and leadership tenets of the societies in which it has interests for effective performance of their entity. In other words an understanding of the leadership culture as is in these countries is fundamental, and also an understanding and comprehension of the outcome of GLOBE study will assist the leaders to effectively design effective business leadership models that are globally oriented and have a cross-cultural flavour that facilitates competitiveness and operational advantages premised on cultural synergies and also enables them to achieve their goals, with minimum disruption on the implementation process. Information on the sampled societies is hereby presented in singular format or group adjusted economic approach, where there is almost a single universal culture and leadership scenarios. The study reiterates that effective performance of MNE as in the areas below is a function of their ability to assume multiple approaches and models within a given cross-cultural and leadership pedagogies.

Country/Society	Embedded Leadership and Cultural Traits	Relevant Literature
America	American CEOs tend to use one of five leadership styles-directive, participative, empowering, charismatic and celebrity, It is culturally unique as compared to other societies, society is highly individualistic, low on power distance and uncertainty avoidance, and medium on paternalism, firms are run by professional managers, high zeal to win drives leadership and money is less important than achievement(high need for achievement), leaders tend to be hard drivers(similar to India leaders) and have a much more ''push-oriented'' approach to change management, Charismatic leadership is predominant, a culture of energizing others is core to American leaders as commented by Jack Welch *'You may be a great leader and manager but unless you can energize other people, you are of no value to General Electric as a leader'*, Adaptability and emotionalism(emotional	Hofsted (1980), House,2004; Howell,1988; Mclellend and Boyatzr,1982;

	resonance) is prevalent, utilitarian and moral idealism are also prevalent among many Americans, leaders thrive through challenges and enjoys creating opportunities, there is structured and formal decision making processes, culture of debate and discussion of business matter with opposing parties drives the democratic processes politically, economically and socially.	
South Korea	High collectivism and medium to high uncertainty avoidance, heavily influenced by Confucianism(*Confucian code of behaviour includes maintenance of harmonious relationships and trust as the basis of business activities*) than any other Asian countries, Absolute loyalty to leadership is common, leaders assume personal interest in the welfare and development of followers, there is high emphasis of group harmony(*Ihwa*) and smooth conflict-free interpersonal relations, supportive and directive leadership is predominant, planning and control in business are centralised-evident in their chaebols (which are large diversified companies, primarily owned and managed by founders and or family members-a practice that dominates Korean Businesses, subordinates do not question decisions made by their superiors though there is currently high encouragement of employee involvement, there is clear emphasis on collective, rather than individual achievement, Leadership prefer recognition rather than physical /tangible rewards, leader contingent reward behaviours are impactful, high spirit of entrepreneurship by corporations	Dortman and Howell,1994,Hofstede,1991; Steers, Shen and Ungson,1989; Steers et al.1989; Hofated,1980; Hayshi,1988; Far et al,1987; Aston,1989
Saudi Arabia	The environment is not homogenous as perceived as the area is not solely populated by Arabs but also Kurds, Turks, Iranians and etc., is not only inhabited by Muslims as pockets of Christianity, Judaism and Zoroastrianism are all over, leaders have long traditions of consultative decision making supported by the Koran and the sayings of Mohamed, consultation occurs on a person to person basis not group(this is assumed to diffuse potential conflict),business is transacted in a highly personalised manner with decisions made by top leadership despite the so called 'Shura'(*a level of consultation done with others before endorsement of decisions)* approach, the need to build relationships with leaders as well as those who advise them cannot be overemphasized, culture is deeply religious, conservative, traditional and family oriented(applies in all institutions of the country),many attitudes and traditions are centuries old, and derive from Arab civilization, following the principle of enjoining good and forbidding wrong' there are many limitations on behaviour, daily life is dominated by Islamic observance with Friday being the holiest day, Businesses are closed three to four times a day for an average 30 to 45 minutes while employees and customers are sent off to go and pray.	
Germany (Northern Europe)	Participative leadership is common in Europe especially Germany in Northern Europe. Germany has a hierarchical structure where authorisation for action has to be passed upward through echelons of management before final decision is made, employees expect the autocrat boss to do most of the decision akin and would not be comfortable anyway, personal relationships are not needed to do business, Germans display great deference to people in authority, hence should understand one's level relative to their own, follow established protocol to do business, is heavily regulated and extremely bureaucratic and decisions once made cannot be changed, businesses in German have characteristics such as-collegial, consensual, product and quality oriented, export conscious and commitment to long term prospects, system is not as innovative, aggressive or results oriented as the Americas, change is gradual though slow under the mottoes of stability and permanence, most concentration is on product quality and product service-quality-responsiveness-dedication and follow-up are watch words for progress, their style of completion is rigorous not ruinous, companies such as BMW,BENZ and DAIMLER seek for market share rather than market domination	House 1995; Bass,1997
China	China is part of a culture of South East Asia. Leadership and the general principle of culture seek to maintain social-order through a harmony with hierarchy arrangement, have a very strong focus and skill-set on operational execution, focus on hands on management, operational process and management of individual performance, humility is common, leaders are however adopting American styles of being less autocratic and more empowering, most practices are	Chen and Lee,2008;Antonakis and House,2002; Bass et al.1987, Beddell et al,2006, Mintzberg et al,

	guided by moral idealism, use inductive reasoning, power distance between the leaders and employees is large, advocating for assertive nationalism through cultural conformity(backed by force),harmony and learning are achieved through and idealised under Confucian traditions, leadership is regarded as an Art, a highly collectivist culture prevails, however employees expect the autocratic leadership because their value system presupposes the leaders to automatically be the wisest, emphasis on interactional respect, ancient Chinese philosophy is firmly entrenched in rational Chinese leadership with a strong focus on improving employees through personal development, leaders are expected to regard ethical considerations than they do with profits, have an inspirational spirit, leaders lead by examples in promoting quality, simple living and harmony with nature and others, Confucian still influences Chinese decision making in many ways and it considers the welfare of society as a whole, rather than the happiness or needs of individuals or families	2003Chhokar et al;2007, Cleg,2003, Fenby, 2013.Gutierrez et al.,2012
Mexico	Has a culture and leadership style that is highly collectivist, paternalistic, power distance and masculinity seems to resemble the Asian culture cluster more than its neighbour the USA, Compliant follower roles quite dominant and does reinforce strong directive leader, culture is highly paternalistic, supportive and caring type of leadership dominates Mexican business environment, however the authoritarian tradition in Mexico still resists incursions of western liberalism, Research done in Mexico revealed that the prototypical' good leader' will not offend and embarrass others but will maintain respect and interact with others in a culturally sensitive manner(simplitico concept),The country's history is filled with revolutionary charismatic leaders whose names are continuously honoured and celebrated	Dortman and Howell,1988, Hofstede,1991; House et al, 1994;
Japan	Perceives western(America) in particular) thinking to differ vastly from their own way of thinking, characterize western thinking as subjective, synthetic, emotional and personal, concept of 'moi' bridges the rational and irrational way of doing business, business leaders tend to favour decision-making outcomes that preserve already established relationships or help to cultivate new ones consensus decision making is predominant, a culture of focusing on understanding multiple alternatives rather than a single right answer, leadership is rated as higher in masculinity and uncertainty avoidance and only medium on collectivism in comparison to countries such as South Korea and Taiwan, Confucianism in Japan requires respect and obedience to leaders who have historically responded with highly paternalistic attitudes towards their subordinates, organisations are extremely hierarchical and are rigidly organised, their *semparkohai* member relationship system reinforces a close personal bond between leaders and subordinates, their ideal leadership model is derived from the early village leaders who were skillfully unassertive and who led by implicit consensus, nonverbal communication, and indirect discussions, leaders in Japan typically outlines general objectives, make vague group assignments and generally let subordinates use their own approaches to achieve overall objectives(popularising the saying that goes "I trust you, you can do it''. Asian scholars describe Japanese as planning strong emphasis on group harmony and collective responsibility fulfilling the popularist saying which states that: "the nail which sticks out is usually pounded inside''. Compliments and criticisms are directed to the group and not individuals, charisma is important for top leaders who represents a symbol of respected authority, and the main function of senior leaders include establishing an overall theme, developing strategy and engaging in high level external relations	Chen,1995; Hayashi,1988; Dortman and Howell,1994, Hofstede,1991; Morgan and Morgan,1991, Den Hartog et al.1999
Indonesia	Principle of Javanese is prevalent, authoritarianism was predominant during Suharto's leadership, his leadership made people to adopt a culture of seeking for security and protecting their belongings, positions and status, as well as employing corruption, collusion and nepotism, central values include harmony (rukun),avoidance of open conflict and hormat (respect), concept of discussion and consultation-consensus (musyawarh-mufakat),everyone is given a chance to contribute until a decision is reached, voting is not recommended as it promotes interest of the majority and undermines interests of the minority, results of decision making must please all parties although the process is time consuming, from a western culture perspective-this approach can be equated to participative leadership, another practice is called gotong-royong which means carry together	Maning and Diermen,200; Brandt,1997; Pareek,1988; Moeljono; Hofstede and inkov (2010),House et al.2004, Taorminia and Selvarajah,2005; Hofstede,2010;

	derived from their indigenous system in the village so called kerja bakti(work to help),in maintaining harmony in hierarchical situations, the Javanese culture takes into account rasa(sensitivity) and eling (thoughtfulness) as basic competencies, the three basic principles for an Indonesian leader and organisation are\merit (Hasta\Brata),Obligation(Tri brata-Mankunegara) and education(tri prakarti utama), Leadership is high on collectivism and femininity-which indicates significance of family model and good interpersonal relations among others, consideration for others is high while masculine behaviour and direct communication are low, values charismatic leadership more than team orientation, humane orientation and participation leadership and the autonomous and self-protective types are appraised to be less effective, managers also practice what is called Bapakism (fatherism) style where a leader acts as a role model focusing on noble values, such as honesty, responsibility, care and integrity.	Setiade,2007;
Latin America	Latin American history is unique -(Colombia, Argentina,Mexican styles of leadership),is made up of about 20 countries, culture is based on the unifying roots of Latin Europe, countries are racially mixed and speak Spanish, use of collective leadership models with a strong bias towards a historically anchored autocratic, populist and paternalistic leadership style,relational approaches are key, Overall most countries hold similar values alluded to, have strong central government, a common language and a common link to Spain, about ten of the countries belong to none cluster as per GLOBE Study, inspirational and visionary leadership appears dominant in most countries	Inglehart and Carballo,2008; Ronen and Shankar,1985; Schwartz,2006; Recht and Wilderrom1998, Davila and Elvira,2012; Majul,1992; Camacho-Garcia,1996; Pellegrini and Scandura,2008
United Kingdom	Rank, status and inequalities between people are reasonably low, on a macro level this manifests in a number of ways, such as legislation protecting ethnic minorities?, on a micro level this is witnessed in the office where the relationship between superiors and subordinates is relatively casual and incorporates little ceremony, British culture values and promotes individuality, on a micro level, in the business environment the individual may be more concerned with themselves rather than the team, culture is relatively open to taking risks and dealing with change. On a macro level this can be seen in the constant revision of laws and government structures. On a micro level, conflict or disagreement in the workplace, even with superiors, is considered healthy, society and culture aims for equality between the sexes, yet a certain amount of gender bias still exists underneath the surface.	Camacho-Garcia,1996; Pellegrini and Scandura,2008

Table 3: The 12 societies and their leadership and culture orientation-as is
Source: Self-created (2017)

1.3. Implications in Detail
At this juncture, I would like to draw you back to GLOBE Study and the major areas of concern that an MNE operating in the countries in Table 1 above has to draw a leaf from for them to find space in the international operations and business environment. A critical study and comprehension of the GLOBE Study will in a bigger way provide deep insights to MNEs in terms of what is and what ought to be. The interested MNEs must not only rely with the study outcome, but also look at unproved cultural traits as presented in the brief herein. At least there is a point of reference for understanding differences between countries and this assists to move beyond the subjective measures of effectiveness used in the studies reported in this paper. Choosing several MNCs with different national origins, but a common presence in different national contexts, would also provide an important point of comparison. It is important to note that for global leaders, these studies provide an interesting point of reference for the choices that they make about building their organizations and their cultures. The findings suggest that a common perspective on organizational culture may indeed be possible in multinational corporations. A predictable impact on effectiveness cannot be ruled out. This additional complexity paints a clear, yet challenging picture of the challenges that face a global leader: Attempting to create a common set of organizational traits that are expressed in different ways in different national contexts. GLOBE Study has done very well in this area. The major areas of concern that the MNEs operating in various countries should take heed of GLOBE study key areas (cultural dimensions-Table 1 and leadership styles Table 2) for MNE's attention. Understanding that leadership, unlike management is not dependent on position, title or privilege and that it is an observable, understandable and learnable set of skills that can be mastered by anyone that is willing to take the time and put forth the effort to learn them(Yukl,1998) is indeed a critical practice that global leaders

must cherish and embrace. How can an individual succeed to operate in 15 different countries and achieve the same with different cultural backgrounds? The western practices are different from Asians-the Chinese, Japanese and Indonesians way of doing things is different from the way Americans, Britons and Brazilians in Latin America or Germans in North America do their Business or Zimbabweans, Zambians, Nigerians and South Africans in the Sub-Saharan Region do their things. Operating in these countries as an MNE, means the need to adopt a leadership cross cultural framework that is flexible, non-rigid and responsive. GLOBE study, while it is an on-going project continues to provide an extended insight to multinational companies and their leadership. Identifying the cluster to which the host company belongs is equally a good ingredient and open-prescription for swallowing. According to Morrison (2000) article, global leadership models must draw from many academic disciplines to be able to understand and appreciate the business environment across the globe. Thus, I also assert that by adopting a multi-disciplinary approach, leaders are able to understand the communities where their organisation is present and have the ability to work with, motivate, adapt and structure themselves accordingly and implement their strategies with sound knowledge of what is and what is not. The theoretical base that guides the GLOBE Research program is an integration of implicit leadership theory (Lord and Maher,1991), value /belief theory of culture (Hofstede,1980), implicit motivation theory (McClelland,1985) and the structural contingency theory of organisational form and effectiveness (Donaldson,1983; Hickson, Hoinnings, McMillan& Schwitter,1974). An in-depth understanding of this leadership provided an operating menu, for leadership absorption and practice that cuts across all diverse. Cross-cultural comprehension cannot be discussed from GLOBE study's perspective without acknowledging the works of founder researchers in the culture areas such as Hofsted (1980)'s preliminary studies on global cultures and hats off to him and his team. The implicit theory asserted that individuals have implicit theories (beliefs, convictions and assumptions about attributes and behaviours that distinguish leaders from others, effective leaders from ineffective ones and moral from immoral ones, the theory influence the values that individuals place on selected leaders behaviour and attitude. The value belief theory, in accordance with Hofsted (1980) and Triandis (1995) assert that the values and beliefs held by members of cultures influences the behaviours of individuals, groups and institutions within cultures and enacted and the degree of legitimization of them. Implicit motivation theory is the theory of non-conscious motives originally advanced by McClelland, Artkinson, Clark and Lowell (1953). This theory asserts that the essential nature of human motivation can be understood in terms of three implicit (non-conscious) motives: achievement, affiliation and power (social influence). Thus, the GLOBE Theory is a theory of motivation resulting from cultural forces. The structural contingency theory's central proposition is that there is a set of demands that are imposed on organisations that must be met if organisations are to survive and be effective. This call for effective change management and borrowing from Kurt Lewin's change model will facilitate and influence easy-fit and adaptability processes in new cultures and or multi-cultural societies as evidence by the wide differences in the selected 15 countries and sectors of the world or the so-called clusters by GLOBE study. These theoretical issues are critical in the choices of leadership placed upon a given society, otherwise strategy formulation and implementation can be a floppy. Let me take you back to the cluster approach proposed by GLOBE and highlight why it is important for the concerned MNE regardless of whether it is in food industry, financial sector, telecommunication or travel and tourism to take a leaf from it. Knowing the cluster to which a given society presupposes strategy reformulation and adjustment. The major clusters identified in the GLOBE study are-Confucian Asia, Anglo, Eastern Europe, Germanic Europe, Latin America, Latin Europe, Middle East, Nordic Europe, Southern Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. The GLOBE study has clustered these societies according to their cultural dimensions as illustrated below:

Cultural Dimension	High-Score Cluster	Low-score Cluster
Uncertainty avoidance	Germanic Europe *(German)* Nordic Europe	Eastern Europe, Latin America Middle East
Power distance	No clusters	Nordic Europe
Institutional collectivism	Nordic Europe Confucian Asia	Germanic Europe, Latin America Latin Europe
In-group collectivism	Confucian Asian*, (South Korea, Japan and China, Indonesia)* Eastern Europe Latin America, *(Mexico)* Middle east, Southern Asia	Anglo, Germanic Europe Nordic Europe *America, South Africa (white sample)*
Gender	Eastern Europe Nordic Europe	Middle East

Table 4: Clusters of societies and their cultural value dimensions
Source: Adapted from House et al. (2002) The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies, Thousand Oaks,CA:Sage
N.B Countries in italics are some of the sampled (part of the 12 countries) discussed in this write-up

2. Discussion and Conclusions: Lessons to be drawn for Effective Leadership

An MNE choosing to operate in the societies already alluded to should brace up for what I want to refer to as a multi-diversified cross cultural leadership framework based on the works of various researchers such as Hofstede et al and the GLOBE Study for them to be successful and effective in achieving high performance. While leaders have tremendous power to change the organisational culture by utilizing several methods that address the underlying assumptions, beliefs and values of its members, it is not as easy as is said. Culture indeed does manifest in unconscious behaviours, values and assumptions develop over time and change new employees and environments creep in. Recognising the elements in leadership and culture enables an MNE to leverage the differences that cultures create and to use that to create positive intercultural growth. We cannot debate effective leadership if we do not mention the

contribution made by Robert Tannenbaum and Warren H.Schmidt, who argued that the style of leadership is dependent upon prevailing circumstances, therefore leaders should exercise a range of leadership styles and should deploy them accordingly. Companies such as IBM,General Electric, Debonnairs, Toyota have demonstrated that it is indeed possible.

A multinational Enterprise is not a one homogenous company or organisation. It has to fragment its approach in accordance with the cultural issues which may be varied from one region to another. It has to be borne in mind that some nations are more culturally homogeneous than others. Any MNE that is multi-faceted, even if they train their embers of staff across the globe, they will still face challenges of implementation of similar systems because of the heterogeneity of cultures. The success of mergers and acquisitions, for example do not depend on the mere differences in culture (organisational or national) but on how the cultural, issues are managed (Harzing et al.2011). Thus, the success of an MNE to achieve positive results in another society is a function of leadership effectiveness and cultural orientation. The popular saying which states that: 'when you are in Rome, do as the Romans do' can be applied here to. Given little or no other information about individual societies, culture provides a good first impression of that person (Maznervski and Peterson, 1997). Without insights to political, socio-economic forces, institutional leaders will stumble in the darkness to find effective international strategies for managing differences. Structure design must be fluid, dynamic, able to adapt to changing needs. It is also naive not to mention that corporate culture dictates strategy and set structures, Global leaders cannot control the environment in which they operate but capitalizes on opportunities that emerge. Choices made are considered objectively, but the final choice is made almost subjectively based on the beliefs and values of the culture as well as the material needs of the company. One of the challenges alluded to earlier on for international expansions is how to maintain corporate culture while coordinating far-flying operations in vastly different environments. It will be naive for the chosen MNE operating in the 12 countries to be bogged down in administrative heritages of 'the way we do things around here'' or ''which we have always done''. Future of MNEs lies in a global web of networked companies.

I would therefore leave a few recommendations to the MNE operating from America to Asia given the multi-differences at stake:

- Hybridisation of culture must become a priority.
- Culture adoption must be a priority
- There could be need for cultural creation
- There is need to enhance research and development activities of the said MNEs to enhance their understanding on cultural dynamic in markets in which they are operating
- A general adoption of GLOBE study outcomes and recommendations results will help MNEs obtain a clear perspective on what is valued in a leader and what is not valued in a given societal context. The need to also realise and understand of culturally endorsed differences in leadership concepts may be a first step that global leaders can take to adjust their leadership behaviour to be more suited to perceived effective behaviours in the host country.
- From a practitioner's point of view, being aware of culturally varied conditions and various leadership styles allows one to identify how these cultural differences influence interactions and a company can create more targeted training programs for its personnel,

3. Conclusion

GLOBE Research provides empirically grounded evidence based on cross-cultural leadership and organisation theory. Given the historical dominance of the western culture, it should also be understood that western leadership styles are not wholly effective in every part of the works-such as the Chinese or Japanese. Hence the Chinese, for example have their own Chinese leadership model. Flexibility has become a core function for the survival of multinationals. Issues that are endemic to leadership must be taken into account-competence, character and community, strategic planning and implementation is critical to consider from a cross cultural perspective. The successful leader of the 21st century will be one who promotes leadership development and encourages workers to assume their roles as leaders. We need to note that successful leadership traits vary widely and predictably, from country to country and that successful leaders in developed countries are different from successful leaders in emerging economies. The need for creativity and innovation, continuous learning, having values that include integrity, personal vision and seeking harmonious relationships with stakeholders cannot be over emphasised. Firms that manage adaptation effectively are able to achieve congruence in the various cultures. Focusing more on what unites us is critical than to spend energy on what divides us. We should bear in mind that GLOBE is the most comprehensive study that provides cross-cultural relationships with empirically based evidence. Perhaps most importantly-the founder member of GLOBE had this to say ": My final conclusion is that we are in a position to make a major contribution to the organisation and leaders literature'' To date more than 90% of organisational behaviour literature reflects U.S. based research and theory. Hopefully GLOBE will be able to liberate behaviour from US hegemony'' (2004)'' Thus achieving high performance requires de-complicating cultural issues across the globe in a way that provide an integrated-universal to country specific leadership model that is fluid and flexible. Reflecting and making reference to GLOBE Study could by the best way to date to tape wisdom of cultural influences on effective leadership across the globe. The nine cultural dimensions and the emerging six leadership styles provide a rich background from which multinational companies can draw personal inspiration and lessons to take home for continuous improvement within the global fraternity. Effective leadership across the globe calls for effective strategic change and execution.

4. References
   i. Ardichvili, A., Cardozo, R. N. and Gasparishvili, A. (1998) 'Leadership styles and management
  ii. Bass, B. (1997) 'Does the transactional-transformational paradigm transcend organizational

iii.   Bass, B. M. (1985) Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations, New York: The Free Changing Nature of Work, San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.

iv.   Donaldson, L. (1993). Anti-management theories of organization: A critique of paradigm Economic growth. Organizational Dynamics, 16, 4-21.

v.   Grove, C. (2005). Introduction to the GLOBE Research Project on Leadership Worldwide from http://www.grovewell.com/pub-GLOBE-Intro.html Hill.

vi.   Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values.

vii.   Hofstede, G. (1997) Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind, London: McGraw-

viii.   Hofstede, G. (n.d.) Values Survey Module 1994: Manual, University of Limburg: Institute for

ix.   Hofstede, G. 1980. Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

x.   Hofstede, G. 1994. The business of international business is culture. International Business Review, **3**(1): 1–14.

xi.   Hofstede, G. 2006. What did GLOBE really measure? Researchers' minds versus respondents' minds. Journal of International Business Studies, **37**(6): 882–896.

xii.   Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1988). The Confucius connection. From cultural roots, to

xiii.   Hofstede, G.H,1980, Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, (revised and expanded in 2001).

xiv.   Hofstede, G.H. 2001, Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

xv.   House R.J. et al. 2004.Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage,

xvi.   House, R. J. (1995) 'Leadership in 21st century: a speculative inquiry', in A. Howard (ed.) The

xvii.   House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis?

xviii.   Inglehart, R. 1997., Modernization and Post-Modernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press,

xix.   Inglehart, R. 1997. Modernization and post modernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

xx.   Integrating a half century of behavior research. Journal of Leadership and Organizational

xxi.   Javidan, M., & Dastmalchian, A. (2009). Managerial implications of the GLOBE project: A study of 62 societies. Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 47(1), 41.

xxii.   Journal of Management, 23(3), 409-473 London: Sage.

xxiii.   Long, David E. (2005). Culture and Customs of Saudi Arabia. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

xxiv.   Marin, G., Triandis, H. C., Betancourt, H., & Kashima, Y. (1983). Ethnic affirmation versus

xxv.   McClelland et al.(1953) The achievement motive. (Eds.). (1953).

xxvi.   McClelland, D. C. & Atkinson, J. W. (1948). The projective expression of needs, I: The effect of different intensities of the hunder drive on perception. Journal of Psychology. 25, 205-222.

xxvii.   McClelland, D. C. (1985). Human motivation. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman

xxviii.   Misumi, J. (1985). The behavioral science of leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

xxix.   Peterson, M. F. 2004. Review of culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies by House R.J., Hanges P.J., Javidan M., Dorfman P.W. & Gupta V. 2004. Administrative Science Quarterly, **49**(4): 641–647 practices of Russian entrepreneurs: implications for transferability of Westerns HRD interventions', Human Resource Development Quarterly 9(2): 145–55.

xxx.   Schwartz, S. H. 1994. Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

xxxi.   Shenkar, O. 2001. Cultural distance revisited: Towards a more rigorous conceptualization and measurement of cultural differences. Journal of International Business Studies, **32**(3): 519–535.

xxxii.   Tihanyi, L., Griffith, D. A., & Russell, C. J. 2005. The effect of cultural distance on entry mode choice, international diversification, and MNE performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of International Business Studies, **36**(3): 270–283

xxxiii.   Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism and Collectivism. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

xxxiv.   Tripp, Harvey; North, Peter (2003). Culture Shock, Saudi Arabia. A Guide to Customs and Etiquette. Singapore; Portland, Oregon: Times Media Private Limited.

xxxv.   Verbeke, A. 2010. International acquisition success: Social community and dominant logic dimensions. Journal of International Business Studies, **41**(1): 38–46

xxxvi.   Verbeke, A., & Brugman, P. 2009. Triple-testing the quality of multinationality-performance research: An internalization theory perspective. International Business Review, **18**: 265–275

xxxvii.   Verbeke, A., & Kenworthy, T. 2008. Multidivisional versus metanational governance of the multinational enterprise. Journal of International Business Studies, **39**(2): 940–95

xxxviii.   Verbeke, A., Li, L., & Goerzen, A. 2009. Toward more effective research on the multinationality-performance relationship. Management International Review, **49**: 149–162.

xxxix.   Yukl, G. A. (1994). Leadership in organizations (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

xl.   Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: