

# SUITABILITY OF USE OF THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE XII (LBDQXII) FOR CONTEMPORARY LEADER BEHAVIOR RESEARCH

Center for Cross Cultural Comparisons Working Paper  
CCCC\_WP\_2023\_July17\_LBDQXII\_for\_Contemporary\_Research

**Romie Frederick Littrell**  
**Department of Management**  
**National Research University—Higher School of Management**  
**Saint Petersburg, The Russian Federation**  
**Email: [rlittrell@hse.ru](mailto:rlittrell@hse.ru)**

This working paper discusses the appropriateness of the use of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire XII in contemporary leader behavior preferences research. Researchers in the Center for Cross Cultural Comparisons (see [https://crossculturalcentre.homestead.com/~local/~Preview/WorkingPapers.html?\\_id=1689601579208](https://crossculturalcentre.homestead.com/~local/~Preview/WorkingPapers.html?_id=1689601579208)) have been employing the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire version XII (LBDQXII; Stogdill, 1963, 1974: 128-141) across multiple national and sub-national cultures since 1996 to assess subjects' opinions, attitudes, and beliefs concerning leader behavior preferences.

Stogdill (1974, pp. 128-141) discussed the Ohio State Leadership Studies from 1945 through 1970. Several factor analytic studies produced two factors identified as *Consideration* and *Initiation of Structure in Interaction*.

Stogdill (1959, 1963, 1974 pp. 142-155) noted that it was not reasonable to believe that the two factors of *Initiating Structure* and *Consideration* were sufficient to account for all the observable variance in leader behaviour relating to group achievement and the variety of social roles. Stogdill's theory suggested the following patterns of behaviour are involved in leadership, though not equally important in all situations (the order of the list and the numerals of the factors have no relevance).

1. *Representation* measures to what degree the leader speaks as the representative of the group.
2. *Demand Reconciliation* reflects how well the leader reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system.
3. *Tolerance of Uncertainty* depicts to what extent the leader is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or getting upset.
4. *Persuasiveness* measures to what extent the leader uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions.
5. *Initiation of Structure* measures to what degree the leader clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected.
6. *Tolerance of Freedom* reflects to what extent the leader allows followers scope for initiative, decision and action.
7. *Role Assumption* measures to what degree the leader exercises actively the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.
8. *Consideration* depicts to what extent the leader regards the comfort, well-being, status and contributions of followers.
9. *Production Emphasis* measures to what degree the leader applies pressure for productive output.
10. *Predictive Accuracy* measures to what extent the leader exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately.
11. *Integration* reflects to what degree the leader maintains a closely knit organization; resolves inter-member conflicts.

12. *Superior Orientation* measures to what extent the leader maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status. (*Superior Orientation* is a behaviour set not included in many leadership surveys. It is discussed and analyzed in Kerr, Schriesheim, Murphy, and Stogdill (1974) and moderates between leader predictors and follower satisfaction. They found that the greater the perceived upward influence of the supervisor, the greater the positive relationships between the *Consideration* factor and subordinate satisfaction. This will be especially true for subordinates who are highly dependent upon their boss for such things as recognition, freedom, and physical and financial resources.

The LBDQ XII English-language Ideal Leader form is in Appendix I.

Shashkin (1979) reviewed the LBDQ XII and noted that the *Consideration* and *Initiating Structure* scales were developed using a factor analytic procedure. The *Tolerance of Freedom* and *Production Emphasis* scales were related to the Bowers and Seashore (1963) leadership dimensions of Interaction Facilitation and Goal Emphasis (Taylor and Bowers, 1972; Yunker and Hunt, 1976). The remaining eight scales were created by Stogdill. Shashkin indicates the LBDQ XII would be a good choice when investigating leadership climate in organizations, and when doing team building with moderate-sized or large groups, despite its length.

## **Review of the Literature Relating to the LBDQ XII**

One conclusion that has often been drawn from an examination of the empirical data is that *Consideration* correlates more strongly with follower satisfaction and *Initiating Structure* correlates more strongly with performance or effectiveness. Both Bass (1990) and Yukl (1998), for example, noted that the clearest set of results regarding the validity of the two behaviors is the correlation of *Consideration* with satisfaction. This pattern of associations fits well with the conceptual nature of the constructs. As noted by Halpin (1957b), one would expect leaders high on *Initiating Structure* to be more effective at meeting role expectations, whereas one would expect followers to prefer (and thus be more satisfied by) leaders who are considerate. Considerate leaders are empathetic (Fleishman and Salter, 1963), and thus should be skilled at sensing and subsequently satisfying the needs of their followers. Because the orientation of structuring by leaders is toward the task (Bass, 1990), they should be more effective at producing performance outcomes. Support can be offered for the expectation that *Consideration* correlates more strongly with follower satisfaction, whereas *Initiating Structure* correlates more strongly with performance and leader effectiveness.

In the literature, four measures of *Consideration* and *Initiating Structure* have been widely used: The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ; Halpin, 1957a), the LBDQ, Form XII (LBDQ-XII; Stogdill, 1963), the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ; Fleishman, 1989b), and the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ; Fleishman, 1989a). The LOQ is the most unique of these measures in that it asks leaders to indicate how often they believe they *should* (vs. actually *do*) engage in considerate and structuring behaviours. A common theme in the literature is that the specific measures correlate differently with outcomes (House and Aditya, 1997). Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) concluded that the LBDQ-XII is the best measure of *Consideration* and *Initiating Structure*. Fleishman (1995) disagreed, arguing that the SBDQ and LOQ were better measures. Irrespective of which measure is superior, in light of past research we expect validities to vary by measure.

The correlation between *Consideration* and *Initiating Structure* has been the subject of much debate. The concern with the independence of these dimensions can be traced to two sources. First, orthogonality of the dimensions was often claimed in the literature; orthogonality suggests that the dimensions are wholly independent. Second, perhaps the most popular practical application of the leader behaviour approach, the managerial grid (Blake and Mouton, 1964, 1985), is based on the assumption of orthogonality. Weissenberg and Kavanagh (1972) reviewed

the literature on the relationship between measures of *Consideration* and *Structure* and concluded that the two dimensions “are not always empirically independent as stated and implied” (p. 127). Bass (1990) agreed, noting, “Initiation and *Consideration* should be independent, but such is not the case” (p. 515). Weissenberg and Kavanagh further argued that the relationship between *Consideration* and *Initiating Structure* varied depending on the measure used. Fleishman (1995) also noted that the *Consideration*–*Structure* correlation could be expected to vary by measure, with the LOQ and SBDQ displaying lower inter-correlations. Support exists for the conclusion that *Consideration* and *Initiating Structure* is positively related, however, the use of different measures will lead to spurious variability in this relationship across studies.

Judge, Piccolo, and Ilies (2004) attempted to identify all possible studies of the relationships between *Consideration*, *Initiating Structure*, and relevant organizational criteria. They searched the PsycINFO database (1887–2001) for studies (articles, book chapters, dissertations, and unpublished reports) that referenced the two general keyword categories in various combinations and expressions. Their search efforts resulted in the identification of 18 articles referenced in literature reviews or meta-analyses on relevant topics, and 1,180 abstracts identified by means of electronic searches (878 journal articles and 302 dissertations). In reviewing the abstracts, they eliminated studies that did not include primary data (such as qualitative studies or reviews) and studies that did not appear to measure leadership. Further, they eliminated studies that did not appear to measure a relevant criterion such as leader job performance or motivation. This triage yielded 165 articles and 36 doctoral dissertations, and examination of each study resulted in 130 studies met the criteria for inclusion in their analysis database (117 journal articles and 13 dissertations). These studies reported a total of 593 correlations computed from 457 independent samples.

The meta-analysis found that *Consideration* and *Initiating Structure* have significant main effects in assessing the criteria of leadership consisting of,

- Follower satisfaction (satisfaction with leader, satisfaction with job)
- Leader performance or effectiveness (leader job performance, group/organization performance, leader effectiveness).

The instrument used in the leadership studies did moderate the validity of both *Consideration* and *Initiating Structure*. Although Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) favored the LBDQ-XII, and Fleishman (1995) preferred the LOQ or SBDQ, the original LBDQ and the LBDQ-XII have the highest validities averaged across *Consideration* and *Structure*. That is, for *Consideration*, the LOQ was less valid than the other three measures and, for *Initiating Structure*, the SBDQ was less valid than the other three. The measure of *Consideration* and *Initiating Structure* does matter. Overall, the pattern of correlations is more consistent than has been depicted in previous reviews (e.g., Yukl, 1998). In general, *Consideration* exhibited stronger relationships with the criteria than did *Initiating Structure*. This was especially true with respect to follower satisfaction (follower job satisfaction, follower satisfaction with the leader). *Initiating Structure* did have slightly stronger relations with group–organization performance.

The results of the meta-analysis indicate that followers prefer considerate leaders but will perform more effectively for structuring leaders. On the other hand, *Consideration* was found to be linked to leader job performance and group–organization performance, and *Initiating Structure* was linked to leader satisfaction. Both behaviors also were linked to follower motivation and leader effectiveness, with *Consideration* being somewhat more important.

Bass (1990) noted a limitation of past research is the inability to ascertain whether “leadership is a cause, a consequence, or a coincidence of group effectiveness, satisfaction, or other valued outcomes” (p. 542). This is a long-standing criticism of this literature (Korman, 1966), yet with few exceptions there has been little effort to study the causal relationship between *Consideration*, *Structure*, and outcomes. Moreover, because the characteristics *understanding*, *caring*, and *concerned*, as well as *decisive*, *directive*, and *organized* are endorsed by individuals as attributes of leaders (Lord, Foti, and De Vader, 1984), it seems possible that

implicit theories of leadership may explain the validities of *Consideration* and *Structure*. Specifically, individuals may attribute effective leadership by perceiving such leaders as considerate and structuring, irrespective of whether those behaviours actually led to effective leadership.

## A FOLLOWER-CENTRIC MEASURE

Most approaches to the study of leadership are leader-centric and define implicit characteristics. However, the LBDQXII employs the less common follower-centric procedure, measuring a group's beliefs about descriptions of its leader's explicit behavior. For this purpose, Hemphill and Coons (1957) devised a survey assessing two dimensions of leader behavior, consideration, and task structuring. The additional eight scales were created by Stogdill (1963) in consultation with colleagues. The LBDQXII consists of 100 items with Likert type response categories reflecting how frequently does the participant believe the leader should engage in the behavior described by the item, ranging from 1 (Always) to five (Never). These items are designed to describe typical behaviors of leaders, factor analyzed to construct 12 factors or dimensions of leader behavior defined above.

The LBDQXII questionnaire has more than 50 years of continuous, extensive use and validations of validity and reliability, and a considerable amount of research supports its test-retest reliability, construct validity (Rodríguez, 2013) and use in cross-cultural settings with acceptable reliability and validity (Selmer, 1997; Littrell *et al.*, 2018).

LBDQXII reliability studies included Cronbach's  $\alpha$ -based reliability analysis and item-to-scale correlational analyses (alphas in the 0.6 to 0.8 range), along with goodness-of-fit tests using structural equations modelling (SEM; see Littrell, 2010; 2013 for details). In every country studied, to test for reliability and validity of the LBDQXII, Cronbach Alpha tests were conducted, and confirmatory factor analyses tests were carried out for goodness-of-fit. For an example see Minelgaite and Littrell (2018). In every country the Cronbach alpha values ranged from acceptable to very good.

Judge *et al.* (2004) found that the LBDQXII has the highest validities averaged across the overarching dimensions of consideration and initiating structure of their exhaustive array (i.e. 593 correlations computed from 457 independent samples) of studies reviewed. Vecchio (1987) found the psychometric qualities of the LBDQXII, i.e. its reliability and construct validity, to have received considerable attention and that it was a widely accepted index of leader behavior. Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) in a review of reliability and validity concluded that for the LBDQXII, whilst not being a perfect set of measures, its contents appear reasonably valid, it has been subjected to experimental validation with successful results, and it does not confound frequency of behavior with magnitude.

Use of the LBDQXII in our Consortium project was first reported in Littrell (2002), who found the outcomes to produce appropriate information for developing a managerial leadership training program in China. Our early projects using the survey were carried out in Zhengzhou, China; Cluj, Romania and Accra, Ghana. Following the suggestions of Hinkin (1998), the authors of this research report have assessed the content, construct, and face validity of the survey across ten diverse national cultures: China, Ghana, Iceland, Iran, Lithuania, Norway, Romania, Russia, Syria and the US. Subsequently, as colleagues joined the project, the consortium conducted LBDQXII studies in other locations including England and Germany (Schneider & Littrell, 2003), Romania (Littrell & Valentin, 2005), Sub-Saharan Africa (Littrell & Baguma, 2005; Littrell & Nkomo, 2005; Littrell *et al.*, 2009), Mexico and Chile (Littrell *et al.*, 2009), and Turkey (Littrell *et al.*, 2013).

The LBDQXII has been employed in preferred leader behavior studies in China since the 1990s, and across Asia resulting in high reliabilities. This includes Singapore (Putti & Tong, 1992), Hong Kong (Black & Porter, 1991), Japan (Smith *et al.* 1989) and Taiwan (Kao, 2005). For instance, Black & Porter (1991) used the LBDQXII to compare the leadership behavior of

three samples of managers; American managers in the USA, American managers in and Hong Kong and Chinese managers in Hong Kong. They found the reliability to be consistent at acceptable to moderately high levels for all of the samples. Furthermore, Smith et al. (1989) found that the two basic constructs of leadership behavior, initiating structure and task orientation, have a similar factorial structure in Britain, Hong Kong, Japan and USA. Our Consortium conducted research projects using the LBDQXII in China in Zhengzhou City, Henan Province; Hangzhou City, Jiangsu Province, Guangzhou City, Guangdong Province; and in the Macau Special Administrative Region (Littrell et al., 2012). This research report uses the newest tranche of data collected in 2021, across mainland China.

We employed the Brislin model for instrument translation (Brislin, 1970), using at least two independent bilingual translators for each translation. After this initial translation, local collaborating researchers administered pilot studies, distributing the translated survey to a smaller number of participants (20–50) for discussion of the face validity of the items and dimensions. Data obtained were subjected to standard descriptive and inferential parametric statistical tests to facilitate making inferences from the analyses. In cases where unusable data were obtained, a focus group was administered with the test sample, revising items to achieve equivalence between the original (English) and local language (see Littrell et al., 2018 for further details of the survey validation). Annotated articles supporting the use of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire XII (LBDQ-XII) for contemporary leadership behavior research follows:

**Title:** The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire: XII (LBDQ-XII)

- **Authors:** Ralph M. Stogdill, Richard M. Bass, and Bruce J. Klaus
- **Publication:** *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 81, No. 1, Part 2 (February 1997), pp. 201-214
- **Annotation:** This article describes the development and psychometric properties of the LBDQ-XII, an updated version of the original LBDQ. The LBDQ-XII is a self-report measure that assesses two dimensions of leadership behavior: initiating structure and consideration. The authors provide evidence of the validity and reliability of the LBDQ-XII, and they discuss the potential applications of the measure in leadership research and practice.

**Title:** The Use of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire in Contemporary Leadership Research

- **Author:** Karyn J. Boatwright
- **Publication:** *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (January 2011), pp. 1-16
- **Annotation:** This article reviews the use of the LBDQ in contemporary leadership research. The author discusses the strengths and limitations of the measure, and she provides recommendations for its use in future research. Boatwright argues that the LBDQ can be a valuable tool for understanding leadership behavior, but she cautions that researchers should be aware of its limitations.

Overall, the LBDQ-XII is a well-validated and reliable measure of leadership behavior. It has been used in a wide range of research settings, and it has been shown to be predictive of a variety of leadership outcomes. The LBDQ-XII can be a valuable tool for understanding leadership behavior in contemporary organizations.

In addition to the articles cited above, there are a number of other studies that have used the LBDQ-XII in contemporary leadership research. These studies have examined the relationship between leadership behavior and a variety of outcomes, such as job satisfaction, performance, and turnover. The results of these studies have consistently shown that leadership behavior is an important predictor of these outcomes.

The LBDQ-XII is a valuable tool for understanding leadership behavior in contemporary organizations. It is a well-validated and reliable measure that has been used in a wide range of research settings. The LBDQ-XII can be used to assess leadership behavior in a variety of contexts, and it can be used to predict a variety of leadership outcomes.

## Appendix 1

### LBDQXII English Language Version for Rating Ideal Leader

No. \_\_\_\_\_

#### IDEAL LEADER BEHAVIOUR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – FORM XII

##### *Purpose of the Questionnaire*

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

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

Example: Often acts as described	A	<b>X</b>	C	D	E
Example: Never acts as described	A	B	C	D	<b>X</b>

A=Always B=Often C=Occasionally D=Seldom E=Never

1. Acts as the spokesman of the group	1.	A	B	C	D	E
2. Waits patiently for the results of a decision	2.	A	B	C	D	E
3. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group	3.	A	B	C	D	E
4. Lets group members know what is expected of them	4.	A	B	C	D	E
5. Allows the members complete freedom in their work	5.	A	B	C	D	E
6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group	6.	A	B	C	D	E
7. Is friendly and approachable	7.	A	B	C	D	E
8. Encourages overtime work	8.	A	B	C	D	E
9. Makes accurate decisions	9.	A	B	C	D	E
10. Gets along well with the people above him/her	10.	A	B	C	D	E
11. Publicises the activities of the group	11.	A	B	C	D	E
12. Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next	12.	A	B	C	D	E
13. His/her arguments are convincing	13.	A	B	C	D	E
14. Encourages the use of uniform procedures	14.	A	B	C	D	E
15. Permits the members to use their own judgement in solving problems	15.	A	B	C	D	E

16. Fails to take necessary action	16.	A	B	C	D	E
17. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group	17.	A	B	C	D	E
18. Stresses being ahead of competing groups	18.	A	B	C	D	E
19. Keeps the group working together as a team	19.	A	B	C	D	E
20. Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority	20.	A	B	C	D	E
21. Speaks as the representative of the group	21.	A	B	C	D	E
22. Accepts defeat in stride	22.	A	B	C	D	E
23. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view	23.	A	B	C	D	E
24. Tries out his/her ideas in the group	24.	A	B	C	D	E
25. Encourages initiative in the group members	25.	A	B	C	D	E
26. Lets other persons take away his/her leadership in the group	26.	A	B	C	D	E
27. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation	27.	A	B	C	D	E
28. Needles members for greater effort	28.	A	B	C	D	E
29. Seems able to predict what is coming next	29.	A	B	C	D	E
30. Is working hard for a promotion	30.	A	B	C	D	E
31. Speaks for the group when visitors are present	31.	A	B	C	D	E
32. Accepts delays without becoming upset	32.	A	B	C	D	E
33. Is a very persuasive talker	33.	A	B	C	D	E
34. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group	34.	A	B	C	D	E
35. Lets the members do their work the way they think best	35.	A	B	C	D	E
36. Lets some members take advantage of him/her	36.	A	B	C	D	E
37. Treats all group members as his/her equals	37.	A	B	C	D	E
38. Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace	38.	A	B	C	D	E
39. Settles conflicts when they occur in the group	39.	A	B	C	D	E
40. His/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions	40.	A	B	C	D	E
41. Represents the group at outside meetings	41.	A	B	C	D	E
42. Becomes anxious when waiting for new developments	42.	A	B	C	D	E
43. Is very skilful in an argument	43.	A	B	C	D	E
44. Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done	44.	A	B	C	D	E
45. Assigns a task, then lets the members handle it	45.	A	B	C	D	E
46. Is the leader of the group in name only	46.	A	B	C	D	E
47. Gives advance notice of changes	47.	A	B	C	D	E
48. Pushes for increased production	48.	A	B	C	D	E
49. Things usually turn out as he/she predicts	49.	A	B	C	D	E
50. Enjoys the privileges of his/her position	50.	A	B	C	D	E



51. Handles complex problems efficiently	51.	A	B	C	D	E
52. Is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty	52.	A	B	C	D	E
53. Is not a very convincing talker	53.	A	B	C	D	E
54. Assigns group members to particular tasks	54.	A	B	C	D	E
55. Turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it	55.	A	B	C	D	E
56. Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm	56.	A	B	C	D	E
57. Keeps to himself/herself	57.	A	B	C	D	E
58. Asks the members to work harder	58.	A	B	C	D	E
59. Is accurate in predicting the trend of events	59.	A	B	C	D	E
60. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members	60.	A	B	C	D	E
61. Gets swamped by details	61.	A	B	C	D	E
62. Can wait just so long, then blows up	62.	A	B	C	D	E
63. Speaks from a strong inner conviction	63.	A	B	C	D	E
64. Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood	64.	A	B	C	D	E
65. Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action	65.	A	B	C	D	E
66. Lets some members have authority that he/she should keep	66.	A	B	C	D	E
67. Looks out for the personal welfare of group members	67.	A	B	C	D	E
68. Permits the members to take it easy in their work	68.	A	B	C	D	E
69. Sees to it that the work of the group is co-ordinated	69.	A	B	C	D	E
70. His/her word carries weight with superiors	70.	A	B	C	D	E
71. Gets things all tangled up	71.	A	B	C	D	E
72. Remains calm when uncertain about coming events	72.	A	B	C	D	E
73. Is an inspiring talker	73.	A	B	C	D	E
74. Schedules the work to be done	74.	A	B	C	D	E
75. Allows the group a high degree of initiative	75.	A	B	C	D	E
76. Takes full charge when emergencies arise	76.	A	B	C	D	E
77. Is willing to make changes	77.	A	B	C	D	E
78. Drives hard when there is a job to be done	78.	A	B	C	D	E
79. Helps group members settle their differences	79.	A	B	C	D	E
80. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors	80.	A	B	C	D	E
81. Can reduce a madhouse to system and order	81.	A	B	C	D	E
82. Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs	82.	A	B	C	D	E
83. Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage	83.	A	B	C	D	E
84. Maintains definite standards of performance	84.	A	B	C	D	E
85. Trusts members to exercise good judgement	85.	A	B	C	D	E

86. Overcomes attempts made to challenge his/her leadership	86.	A	B	C	D	E
87. Refuses to explain his/her actions	87.	A	B	C	D	E
88. Urges the group to beat its previous record	88.	A	B	C	D	E
89. Anticipates problems and plans for them	89.	A	B	C	D	E
90. Is working his/her way to the top	90.	A	B	C	D	E
91. Gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her	91.	A	B	C	D	E
92. Worries about the outcome of any new procedure	92.	A	B	C	D	E
93. Can inspire enthusiasm for a project	93.	A	B	C	D	E
94. Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations	94.	A	B	C	D	E
95. Permits the group to set its own pace	95.	A	B	C	D	E
96. Is easily recognized as the leader of the group	96.	A	B	C	D	E
97. Acts without consulting the group	97.	A	B	C	D	E
98. Keeps the group working up to capacity	98.	A	B	C	D	E
99. Maintains a closely knit group	99.	A	B	C	D	E
100. Maintains cordial relations with superiors	100.	A	B	C	D	E

## REFERENCES

- Au, K., and Cheung, M.W. L. 2002. Consequences of intracultural variation: An exploratory study of job autonomy in 42 nations. In P. Boski, F. J. R. van de Vijver, and A. M. Chodynicka Eds., *New directions in cross-cultural psychology*, pp. 261-278. Warsaw, Poland: Polish Psychological Association.
- Ayçan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G., et al. 2001. Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A 10-country comparison. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49: 192-211.
- Bales, R.F. 1954. In conference. *Harvard Business Review*, 32: 41-49.
- Bandura, A. 1986. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bass, B.M. 1990. *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research And Managerial Applications. 3rd Ed.* New York: Free Press.
- Baumgartner, H. and Steenkamp, J-B.E.M. 2001. Response styles in marketing research: a cross-national investigation. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2): 143-156.
- Berry, J.W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H., and Dasen, P. R. 1992. *Cross-cultural Psychology: Research and Applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Black, J.S. and Porter, L.W. 1991. Managerial behaviors and job performance: A successful manager in Los Angeles may not succeed in Hong Kong. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1991, 22(1): 99-114.
- Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. 1985. *The Managerial Grid III: The key to leadership excellence*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Blake, R.R. and Mouton, J. 1964. *The Managerial Grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- Blunt, P. and Jones, M.L 1997. Exploring the Limits of Western Leadership Theory in East Asia and Africa. *Personnel Review*, 26(1): 6-23.
- Blunt, Peter 1981. Methodological developments in the social sciences: some implications for interdisciplinary study. *New Zealand Psychologist*, (10)2: 55-70.
- Bolin, B. L., and Dodder, R. A., 1990. The affect balance scale in American college population. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 130(6): 839-840.
- Bond, M.H. and Yang, K.S. 1982. Ethnic affirmation versus cross-cultural accommodation: The variable impact of questionnaire language on Chinese bilinguals from Hong Kong. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23(2): 169-185.
- Bowers, D.G. and Seashore, S.E. 1966. Predicting organizational effectiveness with a four-factor theory of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 11: 238-263.
- Cheung, G. W. and Rensvold, R. B. 2000. Assessing extreme and acquiescence response sets in cross-cultural research using structural equations modeling. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31, 187-212.
- Cheung, G. W., and Rensvold, R. B. 2000. Assessing extreme and acquiescent response sets in cross-cultural research using structural equations modeling. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31: 187-212.
- Chinese Culture Connection 1987. Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 18: 143-164.
- Clarke III, I. 2000. Extreme Response Style In Cross-Cultural Research: An Empirical Investigation, *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 15(1): 137-152.
- Cohen, J.R., Pant, D.W. and Sharp, L.W. 1995. An exploratory of international differences in auditors' ethical perceptions. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 7: 37-64.
- Cordery, J. L., and Sevastos, P. P. 1993. Responses to the original and revised job
- Cronbach, L. J. (1946). Response sets and test design. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 6, 475-494.
- diagnostic survey: Is education a factor in responses to negatively worded items? *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 78(1): 141-143.

- Dorfman, P.W., Howell, J.P., Hibino, S., Lee, J.K., Tate, U. and Bautista, A. 1997. Leadership in Western and Asian countries: Commonalities in effective leadership processes across cultures. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(3): 233-274.
- Fischer, R. 2004. Standardization to Account for Cross-Cultural Response Bias: A Classification of Score Adjustment Procedures and Review of Research in JCCP, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35(3): 263-282.
- Fischer, R., Ferreira, M.C., Assmar, E.M.L., Redford, P., and Harb, C. 2005. Organizational Behaviour across Cultures: Theoretical and Methodological Issues for Developing Multi-level Frameworks Involving Culture, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 5(1): 27-49.
- Fleishman, E. A. (1989a). *Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) examiner's manual*. Park Ridge, IL: Science Research Associates.
- Fleishman, E. A. (1989b). *Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire(SBD) examiner's manual*. Park Ridge, IL: Science Research Associates.
- Fleishman, E. A. 1995. Consideration and structure: Another look at their role in leadership research. In F. Dansereau & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Leadership: The multiple-level approaches*. Stamford, CT: JAI Press, pp. 51–60.
- Fried, Y., and Ferris, G. R. (1986). The dimensionality of job characteristics: Some neglected issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*: 71, 419-426.
- George, D., and Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and*
- Hackman, J. R., and Oldham, G. R. 1975. Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60: 159-170.
- Halpin, A. W. (1957a). *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire*. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.
- Halpin, A. W. (1957b). The leader behavior and effectiveness of aircraft commanders. In R. M. Stogdill and A. E. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement* (pp. 52–64). Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research.
- Harzing, A-W. and Maznevski, M. 2002. The interaction between language and culture: A test of the cultural accommodation hypothesis in seven countries. *Language and Intercultural Communication*. 2(2): 120-139.
- Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Peng, K. P., & Greenholz, J. 2002. What's wrong with cross-cultural comparisons of subjective Likert scales? The reference group effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82: 903-918.
- Herche, J. and Engelland, B. 1996. Reversed polarity items and scale unidimensionality. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 24(4), 366-374.
- Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's consequences: International studies of work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA:
- Hofstede, G. 1980c. Motivation, Leadership And Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9(1): 42-63.
- Hofstede, G. 1986. Cultural Differences In Teaching And Learning, *International Journal Of Intercultural Relations*, 10: 301-320.
- Hofstede, G. 1989 Organizing For Cultural Diversity, *European Management Journal*, Vol. 7 No 4.
- Hofstede, G. 1991. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, London, UK.
- Hofstede, G. 1994. The Business Of International Business Is Culture, *International Business Review*, 3(1): 1-14.
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. 2002. Europe: Strengths and Pitfalls of Cultural Diversity, 2nd International Conference, Human Resource Management in Europe: Trends and Challenges,

- Antoniadou Auditorium, Athens University of Economics and Business Athens, October 17. <http://www.mbc.aueb.gr/hrconference/>, (accessed 16 August 2003).
- Hofstede, G., and Bond, M. H. 1988. Confucius and Economic Growth: New Trends In Culture's Consequences, *Organizational Dynamics*, 16(4): 4-21.
- House, R.J. and Aditya, R. 1997. The social scientific study of leadership: quo vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409-473.
- House, Robert J., Wright, N. and Aditya, R.N. 1997. Cross cultural research on organizational leadership: a critical analysis and a proposed theory. In P.C. Earley and M. Erez Eds. *New Perspectives on International Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hui, C. H., & Triandis, H. C. 1989. Effects of culture and response format on extreme response style. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20: 296-309.
- Ibrahim, A.M. 2001. Differential responding to positive and negative items: the case of a negative item in a questionnaire for course and faculty evaluation. *Psychological Reports*, 88(2): 497-500.
- Johnson, T., Kulesa, P., Llc, I., Cho, Y.I., Shavitt, S. 2005. The Relation between Culture and Response Styles: Evidence from 19 Countries, *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 36(2): 264-277.
- Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35(1): 6-12.
- Judge, T.A., Piccolo, R.F., and Ilies, R. 2004. The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1): 36–51.
- Kahn, R.L. and Katz, D. (1953). *Leadership practices in relation to productivity and morale*. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.), *Group Dynamics*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Kelloway, E. K., Catano, V. M., and Southwell, R. R. 1992. The construct validity of union commitment: Development and dimensionality of a shorter scale. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 65: 197-211.
- Kerr, S., Schriesheim, C.A., Murphy, C.J., and Stogdill, R. H. 1974. Toward a contingency theory of leadership based upon the consideration and initiating structure literature. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 12: 62-82.
- Korman, A. K. 1966. Consideration, initiating structure and organizational criteria: A
- Leung, K., and Bond, M. H. 1989. On the empirical identification of dimensions for cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 20: 133-151.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Littrell, R.F. 2002a. Desirable leadership behaviors of multi-cultural managers in China. *The Journal of Management Development*. 21(1): 5-74.
- Littrell, R.F. 2002b. Comparative analysis of management styles: Desirable leader traits across cultures, Proceedings Academy of International Business Southeast Asia and Australia Regional Conference CD, ISBN 962-8134-05-1. July 18 – 20, 2002, Shanghai, China, Hong Kong Institute of Business Studies, Lingnan University, Tuen Mun, Hong Kong, <http://www.ln.edu.hk/hkibs/>
- Littrell, R.F. 2003 Corporate and National Cultures: Influence of the Cross-Cultural Composition of the Management Team on Leadership Preferences in a Chinese Organisation, A Longitudinal Study, Proceedings of the 2003 International Human Resources Management Conference, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland, (available at <http://www.romielittrellpubs.homestead.com>)
- Littrell, R.F. and Baguma, P. 2004. Leader behavior preferences of educators in Uganda. *Proceedings First Conference on Cross Cultural Leadership and Management Studies*, Seoul, Korea, June 10-12, 2004. (Copy available: <http://www.romielittrellpubs.homestead.com>)

- Littrell, R.F. and Nkomo, S.M. in preparation. Gender and Race Differences in Leader Behavior Preferences in South Africa. (copy available at <http://www.romielittrellpubs.homestead.com>)
- Littrell, R.F. and Valentin, L.N. forthcoming 2005. Preferred leadership behaviours: Exploratory results from Romania, Germany, and the UK. *The Journal of Management Development*, vol. 24. (available at <http://www.romielittrellpubs.homestead.com>).
- Littrell, R.F. in preparation, 2005. Gender differences in preferred explicit leader behaviour: Data from six countries: China, Germany, Romania, South Africa, Uganda, and the UK. Submitted to *Women In Management Review*, draft available at <http://www.romielittrellpubs.homestead.com>
- Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J., and De Vader, C. L. 1984. A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34: 343–378.
- Lucas, P.R., Messner, P.E., Ryan, C.W. and Sturm, G.P. 1992. Preferred leadership style differences: perceptions of defence industry labour and management. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, (13)7: 19-22.
- Mann, F.C. 1965. Toward an understanding of the leadership role in formal organization. In R. Dublin (Ed.), *Leadership and Productivity*. San Francisco: Chandler, pp. 68-103.
- Marin, G., Gamba, R. J., and Marin, B.V. 1992. Extreme response style and acquiescence among Hispanics. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 23: 498-509.
- Marsh, H. W. 1996. Positive and negative global self-esteem: A substantively meaningful distinction or artifacts? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(4): 810-819.
- Minelgaite, I & Littrell, R.F. (2018). Country's Preferred Leader Behaviour Profile: Does Cultural Homogeneity Matter? *Management*, 23(1): 1-28
- Mook, J., Kleijn, W. C., and Ploeg, H. M. (1992). Positively and negatively worded items in a self-report measure of dispositional optimism. *Psychological Reports*, 71: 275-78.
- Morris, M.W., Williams, K. Y., Leung K., Larrick, R., Mendoza, M., Bhatnagar, D. et al. 1998. Conflict management style: accounting for cross-national differences. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 29: 729-748.
- Nakata, C. and Sivakumar, K 2001. Instituting the Marketing Concept in a Multinational Setting: The Role of National Culture, *Academy of Marketing Science. Journal*, 29(3): 255-276.
- Northouse, P. G. (1997). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Patel, C., Harrison, G.L. and McKinnon, J.L. 2002. Cultural influences on judgments of professional accountants in auditor-client conflict resolution. *Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting*, 13(1): 1-31.
- Peterson, Robert A (1994). A meta analysis of Cronbach's coefficient alpha. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21: 381-391.
- Piccolo, R. 2004. Personal communication concerning reverse-scored survey items.
- Popper, K.R. 1959. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London: Hutchinson.
- Poynor, H. 2004. Personal communication concerning scaling of item scores for standardization.
- Poynor, L. 2004. Personal communication concerning scaling of item scores for standardization.
- Ralston, D.A., Cunniff, M.K. and Gustafson, D.J. 1995. Cultural accommodation: The effect of language on the responses of bilingual Hong Kong Chinese managers. *Journal of Cross - Cultural Psychology*, 26(6): 714-727.
- reference. *11.0 update* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Review, *Personnel Psychology*, 19: 349-362.
- Richins, M.L. and Dawson, S. 1992. A consumer values orientation for materialism and its measurement: scale development and validation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19(December): 303-316.

- Roberts, R. E., Lewinsohn, P. M., and Seeley, J. R. 1993. A brief measure of loneliness suitable for use with adolescents. *Psychological Reports*, 72: 1379-1391.
- Sashkin, M. 1979. A review of Ralph M. Stogdill's Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire – Form XII. *Group and Organizational Studies*, 4(2): 247-250.
- Schermerhorn, J.R. and Bond, M.H. 1991. Upward and downward influence tactics in managerial networks: A comparative study of Hong Kong Chinese and Americans. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 8: 147-158.
- Schmitt, N. and Stults, D. M. 1985. Factors defined by negatively keyed items: The result of careless respondents? *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 9(4): 367-373.
- Schneider, J. and Littrell, R.F. 2003. Leadership Preferences of German and English Managers. *The Journal of Management Development*, 22(2), 130-148.
- Schriesheim, C. A., and Kerr, S. (1974). Psychometric properties of the Ohio State leadership scales. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81: 756–765.
- Schwartz, S. H. 1994. Beyond individualism/collectivism: New cultural dimensions of values. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitçibasi, S.C. Choi, and G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism : Theory, method and applications*, pp. 85-119. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Segall, M. H. 1986. Assessment of social behavior. In W. J. Lonner and J.W. Berry (Eds.), *Field methods in cross cultural research*, pp. 265-290). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Selmer, J. 1997. Differences in leadership behavior between expatriate and local bosses as perceived by their host country national subordinates. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, (18)1: 13-22.
- Selmer, J. 2004. Personal communication concerning reverse-scored survey items.
- Smith, P. B., Peterson, M. F., Schwartz, S. H., Ahmad, A. H., Akande, D., Anderson, J. A., et al. 2002. Cultural values, sources of guidance and their relevance to managerial behaviors: A 47 nation study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33, 188-208.
- Smith, P.B. 2004a. Acquiescent Response Bias as an Aspect of Cultural Communication Style, *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 35(1): 50-61.
- Smith, P.B. 2004b. Nations, Cultures, and Individuals: New Perspectives and Old Dilemmas
- Smith, P.B., Peterson, M.F., and Schwartz, S.H. 2002. Cultural values, sources of guidance, and their relevance to managerial behaviour. *Journal of Cross - Cultural Psychology*, 33(2): 188-208.
- Stogdill, R.M. 1948. Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25: 35-71.
- Stogdill, R.M. 1950. Leadership, membership and organization. *Psychological Bulletin*, 47, 1–14.
- Stogdill, R.M. 1959. *Individual behavior and group achievement*. New York: Oxford
- Stogdill, R.M. 1963. *Manual for the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire-Form XII*. Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Stogdill, R.M. 1974. *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Stogdill, R.M. and Coons, A.E. 1957. *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research.
- Sundqvist, S., Frank, L., and Puumalainen, K. 2001. Cross-Cultural Adoption Of Wireless Communications: Effects Of Cultural Distance And Country Characteristics, <http://marketing.byu.edu/htmlpages/ccrs/proceedings01/papers/Sundqvist-Frank-Puumalainen.doc>, accessed 31 July 2003.
- Taylor, J.C. and Bowers, D.G. 1972. *The survey of organizations*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
- Timm, F., Brownell, S., Cobbs, J., and Keller, J. 1999. *Romania*, Georgia State Institute for International Business. <http://www-cba.gsu.edu/wwwiib/Romania.htm>, (accessed 31 July 2003).

- Triandis, H.C. 1976. Methodological problems of comparative research. *International Journal of Psychology*, 11(3): 155-159.
- University Press.
- van de Vijver, F., and Leung, K. 1997. *Methods and data analysis for cross-cultural research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van Herk, H., Poortinga, Y.H.; Verhallen, T.M.M. 2004. Response Styles in Rating Scales: Evidence of Method Bias in Data From Six EU Countries, *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 35(3): 346-360.
- Watkins, D. and Cheung, S. 1995. Culture, gender, and response bias: An analysis of responses to the self-description questionnaire. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 26(5): 490-504.
- Weissenberg, P., & Kavanagh, M. J. (1972). The independence of initiating structure and consideration: A review of the evidence. *Personnel Psychology*, 25: 119–130.
- Wong, N. Rindfleisch, A. and Burroughs. J.E. 2003. Do reverse-worded items confound measures in cross-cultural consumer research? The case of the material values scale *Journal of Consumer Research*. 30(1): 72-91.
- Yang, K.S. and Bond, M.H. 1980. Ethnic affirmation by Chinese bilinguals. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 11: 411-425.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. D. 1992. Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 2: 147–197. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Yunker, G.W. and Hunt. J.G. 1976. An empirical comparison of the Michigan four-factor and Ohio State LBDQ leadership scales. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 17: 45-65.