The impact of national culture on Self-Leadership

A Research Report

Presented to the

Graduate School of Business Leadership

University of South Africa

In partial fulfilment of the
Requirements for the

MASTERS DEGREE IN BUSINESS LEADERSHIP,

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

By

P. S. KAWONDERA

30 November 2007

Abstract

The theory of self-leadership is gaining credibility and support in the era of globalisation and knowledge workers. As with many leadership theories, culture has been proposed to have a major impact on leadership processes. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent that self-leadership is correlated with national culture dimensions. Self-leadership was measured through the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire developed by Houghton and Neck (2002). The cultural values were measured through the use of Hofstede's Value Survey Module 94 (VSM94). Hypotheses were formed regarding relationships between national culture background and Self-leadership practice. Pearson r, Chi-square test with cross tabulation and multiple regression were used to determine the associations. The results from the statistical tests showed associations between national culture values and self-leadership dimensions. PDI and UAI showed a positive relationship with visualising successful performance but a negative relationship with self-talk both aspects of constructive thought pattern strategies. MAS had a positive relationship with self-talk while negatively correlated to visualising successful performance. IDV had positive relationships with behaviour-focussed strategies, natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies. Long-term orientation had a strong negative relationship with behaviour-focussed and natural reward strategies and a very weak negative association with behaviour focussed strategies.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to numerous people who have in one way or the other been involved in the process of completing my research report. I express my gratitude and appreciation for the support and contribution.

Specifically, I offer many thanks to my research supervisor, Professor Stella Nkomo for the guidance and support in this journey.

I also express gratitude to some of my group members particularly Kebabonye Kuswani for their encouragement and support over the past few years.

My gratitude also goes to Dr J. Pansiri from the University of Botswana without whose assistance with statistical analysis the completion of this study would have been impossible.

Finally I express my deepest gratitude to my family for their support in completing this goal. I thank my daughter Tariro and my son Tanaka for their understanding when I absent for long hours and weeks. I especially thank my husband, Tonderai for his support, devotion and encouragement in fulfilling this aspiration.

List of Tables

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE: ORIENTATION

1.0 Introduction

The social-scientific history of the concept of leadership like many other concepts in social sciences oscillates like a pendulum from enthusiasm to disillusionment. The 1970's have been marked by an abandonment of the concept from scholars like Kerr and Jermier (1978) and Miner (1975). The 1980's and 1990's reflected some enthusiasm around "strong leadership" as reflected in transformational and charismatic leadership theories from authorities like Bass (1985) and Burns (1978) (Shamir 1999). According to Shamir (1999), the end of 1990's have witnessed increased prominence of team concepts in management, computer mediated technologies and development of more flexible and boundary less organisational forms that rejects "strong leadership" theories of the 1980's and 1990's. An appropriate theory of leadership for the post bureaucratic and boundary less organisation has not been developed yet. Shamir (1999) however suggests an identity-based theory of leadership defined by individuals and social collectivities in relation to a larger social context.

Up until recently, leadership scholars have tended to focus on leadership as a one-person process engaged in influencing followers. This approach placed emphasis on vertical influence related processes that is top-down in which subordinates are controlled, influenced and managed by a single leader. This has been the prevalent paradigm over many decades. Recently the views on leadership have changed and people are empowered to replace or enhance the traditional formal leadership styles (Carmell, Meitar & Weisberg 2006). Given the paradigm shift in leadership theories from the traditional top-down command and control leadership style to a focus towards internal leadership skills that can make individuals make smart decisions in the absence of traditional external leadership, Self-leadership has emerged as one way to achieve organisational success. Knowing and influencing oneself has become a fairly common leadership theme in recent years (DiLiello and Houghton 2006). "Weak

Leadership" theories appearing under names like "Self-leadership", "Shared Leadership", and "Substitutes for Leadership" have become more attractive due to implication of reduced power distance and greater equality among organisational members (Shamir 1999). Such theories, according to Shamir (1999) seem more suitable for "flattened and transient systems that employ remote, virtually connected and temporary members" (pg 50).

The theme of employee empowerment has been a subject of great consideration in many organisational restructuring efforts. The advent of globalisation has made it necessary to engage individuals at a higher level in managing their own work or as part of teams. Empowering leadership is therefore intended to encourage followers to take initiative and to manage and control their own behaviour (Yun, Cox & Sims 2006). Self-leadership is "considered pivotal to employees' enthusiasm for, commitment toward and performance in empowering organisations" (Prussia, Anderson & Manz 1998 pg 523). The self-influence that is characteristic of self-leadership is made more salient in empowered work environments. According to Shamir (1997), the modern view of the organisation has shifted from lines and boxes to connections, which reflect "informal division of labour, information networks, adhocracies, flat structures, decentralisation, professional autonomy, loose couplings, team work and self-regulation" (pg 52).

Self-leadership has been linked to earlier self-influence theories from psychology as well as to some personality traits. The cultural link to self-leadership has however not been established empirically even though a plethora of conceptual self-leadership literature exists. The perceived importance of national culture as an antecedent to behaviour is now currently on the upswing and has been viewed as the missing link to understand dynamics of organisational behaviour (Chao and Moon 2005). Research analysing the application of leadership theories across cultures suggest that leadership practices are culturally bound. The culture-bounded nature of leadership is explored through self-leadership orientations as depicted by staff of different nationalities from selected

organisations. The purpose of this study is therefore to establish whether self-leadership orientation is influenced by national culture and to what extent. Understanding cultural differences has often been cited in various literatures as critical to international business success.

1.1 Statement of the problem

The study is conducted in selected organisations to investigate a correlation between an individual's self-leadership views through the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (RSLQ) and determine the impact of national culture by employing Gert Hofstede's Value Survey Module 94 (VSM 94) Questionnaire.

The following sub problems will be addressed:

1. What are the components of Self-leadership?
2. How do Hofstede's national culture dimensions link with self-leadership components?
3. How does national culture influence one's self-leadership view?

1.2 Objectives

The objectives of the study are:

1. To examine the concept of self-leadership and its components.
2. To explore national culture identity among employees from different nation states.
3. To establish the extent to which national culture background influences an individual's style of self-leadership.

1.3 Assumptions of the study

The following assumptions have been made:

1. The selected organisations have a wide range of focussed groups of nationalities, which makes them ideal places to investigate cross-cultural influences on self-leadership within the country.
2. Self-leadership is a very useful concept in an organisation and

management of the twenty first century organisational set up.

3. National culture background is largely responsible for an individual's orientation to self-leadership views.

1.4 Delimitation of the study

The study has not attempted to investigate on the other factors that might be responsible for differences in orientations to self-leadership but strictly tries to establish the extent of national culture influence on self-leadership. The other possible influences on self-leadership practice like organisational culture, individual characteristics, foreign country influences which are certainly potential candidates as contingencies of self-leadership and other outcome variables are acknowledged but not analysed in this study.

1.5 Importance of the study

The study tests the relevance and meaning of the self-leadership concept in different cultures. From a practical perspective the study can help organisations to develop further their management processes by bringing out learnings of some of the elements that can help in development of new theories and organisational processes that can lead to greater effectiveness. Given the global changes and the continuously changing environments, it is vital for an organisation to develop ways to alter and enhance its approaches to management. This can only be achieved through digging deeper into the underlying problems that can hinder the efforts. This research therefore helped to validate Self-leadership behaviour in different cultures and reveal new aspects of behaviour that are relevant for effective leadership. As self-leadership literature has concentrated on conceptual development, an empirical study helps to bring out to light some of the suggested propositions. Like many other studies of cross-cultural research, the study also helps to define the etic and emic factors of self-leadership leading to greater understanding of the universal and unique characteristics within individuals, groups and nations. This understanding further enhances the efforts of structuring relevant self-leadership training programmes. Self-leadership training can help prepare the workforce for the ever-changing challenges of the twenty

first century work environment like diversity management and goal performance (DiLiello and Houghton 2006).

1.6 Report layout

From the introduction presented in this first chapter, the report moves on to address the theoretical foundation of the study in chapter two to lay the framework on which the study is based. Chapter three gives an extensive literature review critically analysing the theoretical framework and relevant empirical studies. Propositions and Hypothesis emanating from the reviewed literature is also be presented here. Chapter four begins by restating the problem and its sub problems and gives the full exposition of how the study will be done giving special focus on sampling strategy, measuring instruments, the procedure of data analysis and the limitations of the study. Results are presented in chapter five and some interpretations given. Chapter six fully discuss the outcome of the study with cross-references as covered in the literature review. Potential implications of the study are also discussed in this chapter and an outline of recommendations for further research concludes the chapter. Chapter seven gives a summary of the research report in an article format.

1.7 Definition of Terms

1. **Culture:** is a "collective mental programming: it is that part of our conditioning that we share with other members of our nation, region, or group but not with members of other nations, regions or groups" (Hofstede, 1980; 2001)
2. **Self leadership:** is a process through which individuals control their own behaviour, influencing and leading themselves through the use of specific sets of behavioural and cognitive strategies. (Manz and Neck, 2004)
3. **Shared leadership:** involves dynamic, interactive influence processes among and between individuals in teams. (Pearce and Conger, 2003)
4. **The GLOBE Project:** is a longitudinal cross-cultural research constituting four phases. The acronym stands for Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour effectiveness. (Dickson et al 2003)

5. **Strong/Weak Leadership:** The extent of influence a salient individual (a leader) or a small group of individuals (a leadership group) exert on their social environment (Shamir 1999)
6. **Self Management:** is the “degree to which an individual takes responsibility for the managerial aspects of his or her job above and beyond the mere execution of traditional role responsibilities such as working toward pre-set goals and the self administration of consequences such as rewards and punishments” (Bligh, Pearce and Kohles 2006)

CHAPTER TWO: Foundation of the study

2. Introduction

The theoretical foundations for this study lie in two broad streams of literature: (a) that of Self-leadership and (b) National Culture. The concepts of Self-Leadership and national culture are of great importance in the 21st century leadership and organisational processes. With the advent of globalisation and technological advances, the use of traditional hierarchical leadership styles has waned down. New forms of leadership are being tried out and one such type that seems to fit well with modern day organisational set up is that of self-leadership as each individual manages their own work more. Diversity management is part and parcel of the globalisation trend and national culture is one diversity aspect, which needs to be taken into consideration. National culture influences on leadership styles and personality traits have been of great interest to many academics and practitioners in the field of leadership at both the conceptual and empirical levels. A study of national culture influences on self-leadership practices will bring out important aspects that can enhance organisational management processes.

2.1 The development of Self-Leadership

Self-leadership has been used to describe a comprehensive set of self-influence strategies that can have potential for application in the twenty first century organisation. Simply stated, Self-leadership is often described as a self-influence process by which people achieve self-direction and self-motivation necessary to perform (Manz and Neck 2004). The Behavioural and cognitive strategies that make up self-leadership has generally been grouped into three categories, which are behaviour-focussed strategies, natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies (Neck and Houghton 2006). The behaviour-focussed strategies are intended to heighten an individual's awareness to facilitate management of one's behaviour. Natural reward strategies are intended to manage perceptions

through motivating and rewarding individuals by building more pleasant and enjoyable tasks into an activity. Constructive thought patterns facilitate the formation of habitual ways of thinking that positively impact on performance. The popularity of Self-leadership has been evidenced by a large number of books and articles on the topic as well as being incorporated in training programs designed to increase self-leadership skills and behaviours in the workplace (Neck & Houghton 2006).

The concept of self-leadership has its roots in clinical self-control theory that has been inspired by Kerr and Jermier's (1978) notion of substitutes for leadership. According to Kerr and Jermier (1978), various attributes of the subordinates, the task and the organisation may serve as substitutes or neutralisers for leader behaviour. Leadership substitutes theory identifies aspects of the situation that reduces importance of formal leadership by introducing two kinds of situational variables: substitutes and neutralisers. Substitutes make leader behaviour unnecessary and redundant. They include individual characteristics; tasks and organisational environment that can make subordinates more involved and independent hence highly motivated and satisfied. Neutralisers emanate from the task or organisational characteristic that can prevent a leader from acting in a specified way and hence nullifies the effects of leader's actions (Yukl 2006).

The leadership substitute theory has conceptual weaknesses that have made it difficult to be tested empirically. The greatest contribution of the theory has been to provide a different perspective on leadership. According to Yukl (2006), leadership substitutes theory de-emphasised the importance of formal leaders, which could be substituted by work design, reward systems, informal peer leadership and self-management. The theory has therefore advanced a systems perspective on leadership processes within organisations.

The theory of self-regulation on which self-leadership seem to have been built

upon, states that human behaviour is regulated by sensors in the environment which monitors performance with the objective of reducing discrepancy between actual performance levels and the standard or goal (Neck and Houghton 2006). Carver and Scheier (1981) presented an insightful view of self-regulating processes which involve input perceptions of existing conditions, comparison of perception with an existing reference value or standard, output behaviours to reduce discrepancies from standard and the consequent impact on the environment. This view suggests that in the course of attempting to achieve a given standard or a set goal, an individual employee would operate within a closed loop of control in order to minimise deviations from standards in existing performance.

A hierarchy of goals is presumed by the self-regulation theory that ranges from “a globalised sense of the idealised self, to overarching principles of what a person wants to be, to more specified programs of behaviour that indicate what a person should do in order to conform to higher level principles, and finally to specific sequences of behaviour that facilitate program goal attainment” (Neck and Houghton 2006 pg 276). These goals at various hierarchical levels function simultaneously to shape behaviour with a natural upward drift toward higher levels of goal abstraction as one becomes more comfortable with his/her behaviour. A complementary downward drift can also be experienced as difficulties of maintaining behavioural regulation within the context of higher levels of goal abstraction is experienced (Carver and Scheier 1998).

A key component of self-regulation theory is the concept of confidence and hope as manifested in performance related expectancies (Neck and Houghton 2006). Self-regulatory theory therefore is a broad description of human behaviour that explains how behaviour happens. While self-leadership operates within the broader theoretical framework of self-regulation for understanding behaviour, it goes further to prescribe specific behavioural and

cognitive strategies that can enhance individual self-regulatory effectiveness. Thus self-leadership strategies can enhance self-regulatory effectiveness by improving self-focus, goal setting, goal valence and saliency, feedback processes and task related confidence (Neck and Houghton 2006).

Self-leadership has also been largely informed by intrinsic motivation theory. Individuals are said to be intrinsically motivated when they feel that they have an impact on the environment, are responsible for deciding their own actions and have autonomy (Alves, Lovelace, Manz, Matsypura, Toyosaki and Ke 2006). This view implies the satisfaction one obtains from having an opportunity to act with purpose. Intrinsic motivation enhances natural rewards as it increases feelings of competence and self-determination. Feelings of competence and self-control or self-determination are central to self-leadership's conceptualisation of natural rewards (Manz and Neck 2004). Natural reward strategies seem to be generally more rewarding but can be enhanced by self-reward strategies from external reward contingencies in situations lacking natural or intrinsic rewards.

Self-leadership also operates within the context of social cognitive theory that explains human behaviour as a triadic reciprocal relationship between internal influences, external influences and individual behaviour that tends to reduce dysfunctions (Bandura 1977). The reciprocal determinism provides other major conceptual framework upon which self-leadership strategies are based such as processes of self-monitoring, self-judgements and self-reactions. The basic assumption here being that, individuals have control over setting their own performance standards. Three types of self-influences have been cited as mediating the relationship between goals and performance are self-satisfaction, self-efficacy and regulation of internal standards, which is what social cognitive theory primarily focuses on. Self-efficacy can influence an individual's aspirations, effort and thought (Neck and Houghton 2006). A major objective of all self-leadership strategies is the enhancement of

self-efficacy perceptions in advance. In a study by Frayne and Latham (1987) a positive relationship was established between self-management training and self-efficacy for reducing absenteeism.

Self-leadership can also be viewed as an extension of self-management. Self-management has also been founded upon the concept of self-control originally developed in clinical psychology. Self-management has been described as a process through which an individual chooses a less attractive but perhaps a more desirable behaviour among short run alternatives (Neck and Houghton 2006). From self-control literature, strategies like self-observation, self-goal setting, cueing strategies, self-reinforcement, self-punishment and rehearsal have been adapted to organisational setting and relabelled “self-management”. The same strategies for self-control and self-management have become the basis for self-leadership behaviour focussed strategies (Manz and Neck 2004). Unlike self-management, self-leadership however focuses on the reasons for behaviour and incorporates both cognitive and behavioural strategies to represent a much higher level of self-influence.

Neck and Houghton (2006) have concluded that while related to and predicted upon similar psychological processes, self-leadership is a unique normative concept that operates within theoretical frameworks provided by more descriptive theories which include self-regulation, social cognitive, intrinsic motivation and self-control. They further asset that the uniqueness of self-leadership and its value for understanding and shaping one’s behaviour should be investigated further empirically.

2.2 Culture

The term culture originates from Latin “cultura” and stems from the verb colere that means tending or maintaining. Today definitions of culture are multiple and diverse but all refer to “commonly shared processes like shared

ways of thinking, feeling and reacting; shared meanings and identities; shared socially constructed environments; common ways in which technologies are used; and commonly experienced events including the history, language and religion of their members" (House, Wright and Aditya 1997 pg 538). A study by Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1967) found 164 different definitions which they categorised as follows: (a) contains several components (enumerative-descriptive aspect); (b) refers to social heritage and traditions (historical aspect); (c) comprises ideas and expected behaviours (normative aspect); (d) is based on adaptation to environmental conditions, learning and behaviour (psychological aspect); (e) regulates human social life (structural definitions); (f) is reflected in ideas, symbols and artefacts (results based aspect) and (g) incomplete definitions falling into one of the prior classes. "Definitions of culture are generally so broad and they include almost anything and everything in the environment of human beings that is not immutably determined by nature" (House et al 1997 pg 539).

Understanding culture is not an easy task since culture is an abstraction and not an entity to be measured (Christie, Kwon, Stoeberland and Baumhart 2003). Understanding culture becomes more complicated when one embarks on cross-cultural comparative analysis. Geert Hofstede (1980, 2001) introduced a model of national culture that has since become the most widely used framework in cross-cultural research. Hofstede (2001, pg 9) defines culture as " the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another". The programming manifests itself in the values and beliefs of a society. Hofstede's cultural typology constitutes five dimensions, which are Individualism versus Collectivism (IDV), Power Distance (PDI), Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI), Masculinity versus Femininity (MAS) and Long term versus short-term orientation (LTO). Hofstede focussed on national culture despite regional differences within a particular nation because he asserts that some ways of thinking that most inhabitants' share are still distinguishable and can be

considered part of their national culture or national character. This typology of cultural dimensions has been repeatedly validated over time in dozens of countries (Christie et al 2003), and as such was used as the framework for this study.

The Power Distance dimension describes the values held in society with respect to the importance of distribution of power, wealth and other factors. High Power Distance societies accept inequality more than low Power distance societies. Individualism/Collectivism dimensions refer to the degree to which people in a country define themselves in terms of group membership. Individualist societies regard the needs of an individual and that of very close family members first before considering group membership. Collectivist societies have a great concern for group membership. Uncertainty Avoidance is the degree to which members in a society are uncomfortable in unstructured, ambiguous and uncertain situations and therefore create beliefs, norms and institutions to minimise the occurrence of or coping with such situations. Masculinity/femininity dimension describes the degree to which gender roles are clearly differentiated within a country as a result of the socialisation process. In masculine countries gender roles are very distinct and separate while in feminist countries gender roles overlap. The Long term/Short term future orientation dimension describe the choice of focus for people's efforts with regard to the present or future. This dimension was later added on after a Chinese Values Survey that included items about personal stability and respect for tradition, values that are common in Asian cultures and Confucianism (Alves et al 2006).

A review by Bass (1990) cited in House et al (1997) of over 100 cross-cultural leadership literatures reveals that Western leadership theories and the applicability to non-western states are often examined. The study also revealed a lack of theoretical cohesiveness and a dependence on existing standardised U.S instruments, which may not adequately capture

non-western or non-US conceptualisations of leadership. Other issues predominantly studied by cross-cultural leadership scholars have to do with inconsistence, interpretation and labelling of cultural dimensions. The scales of Hofstede's framework for instance are often criticised because of their item composition and inappropriate labelling (House et al 1997). The face validity of some items has also been criticised. Robustness of Hofstede's dimensions has however been attested as a result of independent replications in a number of studies (House et al 1997).

The value-belief theory that guides a number of cross-cultural studies assert that values and beliefs held by members of collectivities influence the behaviour of individuals and the degree to which certain behaviours are considered legitimate, acceptable and effective (House et al 1997). They further go on to explain "One explanation of the effects of cultural forces on individual behaviour is that psychological commonalities influence the valence individuals place on behaviours and events" (Pg 596). The valences in turn influence behavioural intentions that influence behaviour manifestation.

The other issue with cross-cultural research has to do with individual responses to questionnaires that can reflect commonly agreed values and not respondents' true attitudes. House et al (1997) also discuss methodological inconsistencies that usually manifest in sampling, which is done mostly on convenience rather than systematic basis. The results in unmatched samples may be affected by a host of possible confounds such as demographic variables, sub cultural variations, varying exposure to international communication, disparate organisational settings, industry types, different sectors and so on.

2.3 The Context of the study

Botswana has a large number of foreign nationals working within the country due to a critical skills shortage. A cross-cultural study on the impact of

national culture on self-leadership practices is therefore possible. The development sector constitutes a wide range of nationalities that comes in on bilateral agreements to provide technical support and other aid arrangements. There are several organisations sending development workers from America, Japan, Canada, and German who constitute a reasonable sample on which the study was based. Personnel from the United Nations and Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) were also used to augment the numbers from volunteer sending organisations.

CHAPTER THREE: Literature Review

3.1 Self-leadership and theoretical overview

The concept of self-leadership is deeply rooted in psychology literature from theories of self-influence. Self-leadership is however often depicted as a broader concept of self-influence that subsumes behaviour focussed strategies of self-regulation, self-control and self-management and the cognitive oriented strategies derived from intrinsic motivation theories, social cognitive theory and positive cognitive psychology (Alves *et al* 2006). Self-leadership is a process through which people influence themselves to achieve self-direction and self-motivation necessary to enhance one's performance in desirable ways (Houghton and Neck 2006). Self-leadership strategies have generally been grouped into three categories, which are behaviour focussed, natural reward and constructive thought pattern. The behaviour focussed strategies aim to increase individual awareness in order to facilitate behavioural management particularly with reference to unpleasant tasks (Manz and Neck 2004). Behaviour focussed strategies include self-observation, self-goal setting, self-reward, self-punishment and self-cueing. Self-observation of one's own behaviour can lead to an awareness of when and why one engages in certain behaviours, which in turn might lead to the identification of specific behaviours that should be changed, enhanced or eliminated (Houghton and Neck 2006). This kind of self-assessment, according to Houghton and Neck (2006) can result in individuals effectively setting personal goals that could lead to improved performance.

A large body of research has attested to the impact of setting and accepting challenging goals as highly motivating to individual performance. Reviews of literature have shown the importance of goal setting theory as one of the most scientifically valid and useful theories in organizational science (Locke, Latham & Perez 1988). The authors refer to the famous Hawthorne study, which provides evidence of how personal goals impact on performance. In the experiment, management goals were not aligned to individual goals hence resistance.

Self-rewards set at different levels when coupled with specific goals have been seen to significantly aid in bringing about the efforts required to achieving goals (Houghton and Neck 2006). Self-correcting feedback, like self-rewards can result in shaping desirable behaviour. This is achieved through positively framing and introspective examination of failures and undesirable behaviours, which get corrected in the process. The excessive use of self-punishment through self-criticism and guilt has been seen to be detrimental and therefore should be avoided. Self-cuing on the other hand has been seen to be an effective means of encouraging constructive behaviour while keeping at bay destructive ones. To sum up, behaviour focussed self-leadership strategies are designed to encourage positive, desirable behaviours that lead to successful outcomes while discouraging the negative undesirable behaviour that lead to unsuccessful outcomes.

Natural reward strategies occur when an individual simply engages in an activity for the intrinsic value derived and therefore is motivated by the task itself (Bligh, Pearce & Kohles 2006). There are two main natural reward strategies, which are first, building more pleasant and enjoyable features into a given activity in order that the task becomes naturally rewarding (Prussia, Anderson & Manz 1998). The second strategy is that of shaping perceptions through focussing attention away from the unpleasant aspects of the task so that it appears inherently rewarding. Natural reward strategies are therefore designed to help with creation of feelings of competence and self-determination. As a result, commitment to, belief in and enjoyment of the work itself can result through modification of perception and behaviours associated with task performance.

Constructive thought patterns are aimed at facilitating the formation of habitual ways of thinking that can positively impact on performance (Manz and Neck 2004). These habits include identifying and replacing dysfunctional beliefs and assumptions, developing mental imagery and positive self talk in order to envision successful performance of an activity in advance. Mental imagery refers

to a process by which individuals can symbolically make and experience virtual behaviours, which are similar to real ones. According to a meta-analysis study conducted by Driskell, Copper and Moran (1994), 35 empirical studies found a significant positive effect for mental imagery on individual performance (Neck and Houghton 2006). From the above discussion, it therefore becomes evident that "Self-leadership is a normative concept that provides certain behavioural and cognitive prescriptions while operating with and through theoretical contexts provided by self-regulation, social cognitive, self control and intrinsic motivation theories" (Neck and Houghton, 2006, pg 275). As such self-leadership is regarded as the all encompassing theory that provides enough justification to necessitate further investigation as it influences and prescribes ideas that could be adopted to resolve problems in the modern organisations which are faced with a multitude of problems of which no one individual can have solutions to.

3.2 Relationship between Self-Leadership and Other Organisational Constructs

A number of positive outcomes associated with application of self-leadership strategies have emerged and this strongly supports self-leadership as a powerful organisational tool. Self-leadership literature has suggested a number of predictable outcomes, which include creativity and innovation, commitment and independence, trust and team potency, positive affect and job satisfaction, & psychological empowerment and self-efficacy. Literature suggests that self-leadership skills can be trained and improved upon thereby enhancing work outcome. This therefore suggests organisations need to invest in developing self-leaders to improve the overall functioning of the organisation (Carmelli *et al* 2006). While self-leadership is usually conceptualised as learned behaviour as opposed to a fixed trait, proponents of self-leadership usually ignores other factors such as personality and individual differences as well as cultural influences. Awareness of cultural influences in development and practice of self-leadership can make organisations more aware of the kind of training required for different individuals within the organisation to achieve a common

purpose.

When employees are trained and empowered to perform as self-managed employees, supervisors can focus on longer-term issues because their role shifts away from detailed oversight and control. Empowering followers also help leaders to enlist the aid of many others as a way to cope with uncertainty beyond their own limits. Beyond business benefits, the changing expectations of the workforce must be considered. As Bill Gates state “In the new organisation, the worker is no longer a cog… but an intelligent part of the overall process” (Yun, Cox & Sims Jr 2006). Employees have begun viewing their jobs as a means of personal fulfilment and not just as a means of survival. This results in employees seeking control and influence over their own jobs to gain more autonomy. Positive affect and job satisfaction are two predictable self-leadership outcomes that have often been cited in literature. In a field study of a group of employees at America West Airlines by Neck and Manz (1996a) cited by Neck and Houghton (2006) found significant relationships between thought self-leadership training intervention and subsequent levels of affect (enthusiasm) and job satisfaction.

In their model DiLiello and Houghton (2006) have highlighted the relationships of self-leadership, innovation & creativity and environmental support. The model suggests that individuals with strong leadership skills tend to be more innovative and have higher creative potential. A growing body of knowledge on the interconnection of self-leadership and work outcomes has been established (Carmeli *et al* 2006). A recent study by Howell (2005) has established that only an individual who informally emerges to promote an idea with conviction, persistence and energy can ensure successful innovations. In essence self-leadership strategies can help to achieve such conviction and innovativeness. According to Nubert &Wu (2006), employee self-leadership practices can determine whether an individual performs well or fail. Self-leadership is also often considered critical in overcoming resistance to change when faced with inherent uncertainty and stress of dynamic organisations

(Neck, 1996). Self-leadership therefore is regarded as an important substitute or compliment for leadership from other sources.

Houghton, Neck and Singh (2004) conducted a study on a sample of 381 undergraduate students to examine the relationship between self-leadership and personality through an analysis and comparison of hierarchical factor structures. The results of the study suggest that personality traits and self-leadership dimensions are related but distinct concepts. The first interpretation of their results suggests that self-leadership dimensions merely describe the behavioural manifestation of personality. The second interpretation perceives a person's configuration of self-leadership tendencies to be identical with one's configuration of related personality traits before any exposure to self-leadership strategies but potentially distinctive after exposure.

Another study by Stedham and Yamamura (2004) measured the effect of national culture on gender differences between USA and Japan. The results of the study showed significant gender differences in two cultural dimensions for Japan that is PDI and IDV and in IDV for USA. For both PDI AND IDV dimensions men and women in Japan scored significantly differently with the mean score for women lower than the mean score for men. For IDV, the result for USA was similar to that of Japan with women scoring lower than men. No gender difference in PDI was seen for USA. No gender difference was observed for Japan and USA for MAS score. These results suggest that some cultural dimensions are not homogeneous across gender, which seem to suggest a revision of Hofstede's framework to address gender-based differences in culture.

While self-leadership has been likened to and associated with other self-influence theories and personality traits, not much has been done to link it to cultural influences empirically. It is the purpose of this study to establish whether national culture does have a huge take in determining one's orientation to self-leadership.

3.2 Criticism of Self-Leadership

The appeal of self-leadership conceptualisation as a potentially effective strategy to deal with 21st century organisational challenges has not been without criticism. The most common criticism has been that self-leadership is conceptually indistinct from and redundant with classic theories of motivation like that of self-regulation (Neck and Houghton 2006). The earlier discussion on self-leadership has however shown the distinction with other theories that is marked by normative and behavioural differences. As a normative concept, self-leadership is prescriptive and therefore provides advice for managing particular processes. In contrast, the behavioural theories that form the basis of self-leadership are descriptive and deductive in nature, seeking only to explain the basic operation of a phenomenon (Neck and Houghton 2006).

Self-leadership has also been criticised on the basis of conceptual development with relatively few empirical studies in organisational settings (Alves et al 2006). The lack of empirical research has been asserted, is due to absence of a valid, commonly agreed measuring instrument. The Revised Self-leadership Questionnaire (RSLQ) developed by Houghton and Neck (2002) require further investigations of its applicability to other nations other that the U.S, hence the reason of this current study. Preliminary applications of the RSLQ have proven effective with positive potential for facilitating additional empirical self-leadership research.

3.3 National Culture and self-leadership

When dealing with human behaviour, one is almost always confronted with cultural and value-related differences. The concept of culture is a complex one which has evolved throughout history. A number of definitions have emerged all broadly referring to commonly shared processes. A number of cross cultural leadership studies have tended to operationalise culture by using national/regional political boundaries as proxies for defining culture. This concept of culture is problematic for pluralist societies, which comprise multiple subgroups

and hence have subcultures. Recent culture studies have even begun to expand the thinking and now refer to “an individual’s unique collage of cultural identities yielding a complex picture of the cultural influences on that person” (Chao and Moon 2005 Pg 1128). This thinking has its theoretical base in chaos and complexity theories as well as network theory. Yet other studies have operationalised culture to follow the clustering approach as depicted in the Globe project and other studies. This approach classifies nations, groups and other units of analysis as proxies for cultures that are similar. Location of residence has also been used in yet other studies to demarcate cultural boundaries (House et al 1997). While acknowledging the weaknesses, the current study operationalised culture by using national or regional political boundaries as proxies due to the quick and easy way of determining nations.

Hofstede, House, Trompenaars, (1980; 1991; 1994) have developed typologies with some dimensions that are used as a measure for culture. The seminal study of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions point out to four theoretical constructs and later on added a fifth dimension. These dimensions as mentioned earlier on are power distance, uncertainty avoidance, collectivism versus individualism, masculinity versus femininity and long versus short time orientation. These constructs were chosen on the basis of works from other studies or a long-standing history in theoretical, anthropological and cross-cultural psychology literature. The major findings of Hofstede’s first and subsequent research are based on relative rankings for each dimension on a scale of 0 to 100 (Appendix 2). Hofstede’s theory asserts that behaviour of individual members is usually congruent with the values endorsed by a group as a whole. Robustness of findings from Hofstede’s study is based on the fact that the theoretical variables used are well conceived and relate to fundamental social problems of human behaviour (House *et al* 1997).

Another benchmarking typology of cultural difference is the work of Trompenaars, which is often considered to be an extension of Hofstede’s work. Trompenaars

(1994) came up with seven dimensions of culture, which are universalistic and particularistic, individualist/collectivist, neutralist/affectionist, specific/diffuse, achievement/ascription, sequential versus synchronic time orientation and internalist/externalist dimensions. The arguments follow the same path with that of Hofstede but on a wider categorisation.

The GLOBE program which is a cross cultural longitudinal research project that develops an empirically based theory to describe, understand, and predict the impact of specific cultural variables on leadership and organisational processes and the effectiveness of these processes is yet another theoretical framework on culture. The GLOBE project has also built upon and expanded Hofstede's dimensions and has included a larger country sample, which caters for comparing other nationalities not included in Hofstede's study. Nine cultural dimensions have been formulated with some dimensions from Hofstede altered in order to address criticisms. The dimensions assessed in the GLOBE include power distance, uncertainty avoidance, in-group collectivism, institutional collectivism, gender egalitarianism, assertiveness, humane orientation, performance orientation and future orientation. These dimensions were developed at both the societal and organisational levels (Dickson *et al* 2003). The GLOBE project has also come up with culture clusters in order to aid the interpretation of findings. The clusters often become useful in studies where the numbers for each national culture is too small to provide meaningful interpretation of results.

The theoretical base that guides the GLOBE research program is an integration of implicit leadership theory, value/belief theory of culture, implicit motivation theory and structural contingency theory of organisational form and effectiveness (House *et al* 1997: Dickson *et al* 2003). Project GLOBE differs from earlier cross-cultural leadership in that it uses multiple measures to empirically test the most meaningful methods. The most evident one is the development of three sets of measures to assess culture, which are: a) those based on shared values

of organisational or society members, b) those based on current organisational and societal practices, and c) unobtrusive measures (House et al 2004). The GLOBE project therefore seems to be more flexible and encompassing in its cross-cultural analysis. The project therefore stands a greater chance to improve on development of cross-cultural studies.

Without going into technical criticism on each theory above, the overall criticism laid against the conceptualisation of culture according to dimensions is the way the whole culture concept is explained through just a few factors which might not address all the important aspects of what culture really is. Another criticism is to do with the static nature of surveys done using these frameworks, which addresses a country's orientation at a particular point. However, culture is not static but is a constant interplay of culture and the environment as they are constantly evolving (Jacob, 2005). The rigidity of cultural boundaries according to nation states also need to be revised especially because of changes that have been brought about by globalisation. The issue of pluralist societies as well as cross-vergence are also not well addressed within the discussed frameworks. However the frameworks provided by these theories have provided the basis from which to continuously develop and improve on the measurement methods.

Gert Hofstede's definition and theoretical framework was used for the study because of its simplicity in understanding the theoretical variables used, which are well conceived and relate to fundamental social problems of human behaviour. Reference was also be made to the other frameworks since all of them seem to complement each other. Hofstede defines culture as "a collective mental programming of the mind that distinguishes members of one human group from another" (House, Wright & Aditya 1997 Pg 537). Hofstede is a central figure in development of the dimension based cultural variation assessment and classification. Hofstede and many other authorities have emphasised the cultural differences encountered due to differences in shared values.

Alves et al (2006) have come up with propositions that can be used to assess self-leadership within Hofstede's national culture framework that was the basis of this study. It is important to note at this point that self-leadership has its origin in the US and thus grounded in US cultural values as defined by Hofstede. However the authors believe this theory could be applied to most societies since self-leadership is a self-influencing process that has a set of strategies aimed at enhancing one's performance. The components of self-leadership are therefore analysed from a cross-cultural perspective in order to investigate the applicability of the theory to other nations. Given its importance to performance, research on self-leadership and the impact of national culture is of critical importance to managers to enhance employee potential in the twenty first century.

Hofstede has conceptualised culture according to certain dimensions. The first dimension from Hofstede is that of Power Distance, which refers to the extent to which the less powerful persons in a society accept inequality in power and consider it normal. Inequality exists within any culture, but the degree of it that is tolerated varies between one culture and another. Dickson et al (2003) asserts that power distance and hierarchical orientations impact management policies in organisations as well as influencing the preferences and attitudes of individuals. Power distance also determines employees' level of acceptance to supervision and their view of authority. The US culture for example from which the concept of self-leadership originates has a low power distance, which gives greater latitude for individuals to practice self-leadership. Some people however have suggested that self-leadership would not apply in high power distance cultures, which do not allow adequate space for one's individual autonomy. Alves *et al* (2006) however assert that this notion is misguided, as what may be different in these cultures is the nature of social relations and how they occur in practice. As such, self-leadership in high power distance cultures is likely to be shaped by social hierarchical forces than in low power distance cultures. The meta-analysis study by Dickson et al (2003) presents a number of studies on power distance. In one study, willingness to accept supervisory direction among Chinese (high PDI) and

US (low PDI) employees found out that Chinese valued consistency in supervisory direction and company policies while US employees displayed a dislike on supervisory direction. Another study also confirmed that high PDI societies reported higher use of formal rules and regulations as compared to low PDI countries. High power distance orientation is therefore likely to develop a more restricted and contingent form of self-leadership where the self-influence evident is independent of cultural expectations and norms. On the other hand cultures with low power distance will have a unique and autonomous form of self-leadership (Alves *et al* 2006).

The second dimension of culture from Hofstede is that of Uncertainty Avoidance, which refers to the degree to which society feel uncomfortable with ambiguous and uncertain situations and hence reduces uncertainty by the use of social interventions, rather than tolerating and coping with uncertainty. Uncertainty avoidance can also be seen as the extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by uncertain or unknown events (Dickson *et al* 2003). Empirical research suggests that societies with high uncertainty avoidance tend to be more controlling, less delegating and less approachable than low uncertainty avoidance societies. From a compilation of studies by Dickson et al (2003), career management activities compared between young managers in Germany (high on UAI) and the United Kingdom (low on UAI) found that British managers typically focussed on career mobility and generalisation while German managers spent greater lengths of time in one job and concentrated on development of specialised task related expertise. In another study, British managers were also seen to value resourcefulness and improvisation from subordinates where as German managers expected reliability and punctuality. Hofstede has concluded from his study that, there is no single explanation for differences in uncertainty avoidance but that it is a culmination of factors unique to each country (Dickson et al 2003). Given the complexity of uncertainty avoidance, Alves et al (2006) have suggested discussing the relationship of self-leadership and culture on a country-by-country basis. The conclusion therefore has been that self-leadership

in cultures high on uncertainty avoidance tend to focus on rational at the expense of non-rational processes such as self cueing and self image. Low uncertainty avoidance on the other hand relate with non-rational processes than rational processes. This then would be a new contribution to self-leadership as it has focussed more on rational processes.

Another dimension of culture is that of individualism versus collectivism. Cultures characterised by individualism assume that any person looks primarily after his/her own interest and that of his/her immediate family. On the other hand collectivist cultures show a tight social framework with strong and cohesive in-groups as opposed to out-groups. The essence of individualism/collectivism cultural dimension is independent versus interdependent behaviours. The link of IDV to leadership from the GLOBE study has been that, autonomy, uniqueness and independence have been found to contribute to outstanding leadership in some cultures but undesirable in others. Other research suggests that collectivist cultures also improve transformational leadership, charismatic leadership and more willingness by group members to let go of individual goals for the benefit of larger group goals (Dickson et al 2003). In individualistic cultures however people are expected to be self-motivated and satisfy their own interests.

While it would appear that self-leadership is not valid in collectivist societies, Alves et al (2003) asserts that people in those cultures do set and attain their goals within the confines of social rules and that they place more emphasis on relations rather than tasks. The meaning of 'self' tend to be regarded differently in individualist and collectivist cultures. In individualistic cultures it is considered to be the totality of all characteristic attributes, conscious and unconscious as well as mental and physical of the person. In collectivist cultures on the other hand 'self' refers not only to personal attributes but rights and duties associated with social positions of the person. The proposition from Alves *et al* (2006) is that "self-leadership in collectivist culture is grounded in social rules, norms and traditions, while in individualist cultures it is shaped more by personal interests

and material rewards" (pg 354). Clarity on the distinction between self-leadership in collectivist societies and shared leadership becomes paramount at this point. According to shared leadership theory, group performance with high levels of interpersonal influence will result in individuals within the group assuming leadership roles depending on the situation. Self-leadership in collectivist cultures however is concerned about individuals' performance whereby actions and thinking are guided by culture dependent expectations and not by other individuals but by culture dependent expectations associated with different types of relationships.

An investigation done by Neubert and Wu (2006) on generalizability of the Houghton and Neck Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire to a Chinese context revealed, " although Chinese employees are highly collective, they do also have a high performance orientation that suggests they are still likely to engage in some self-leadership practices, but possibly in a collective manner". In self-managed teams for example, self-leadership is a critical function of the collective processes like goal setting, visualising successful performance, self talk, self reward, self punishment and self rewards have been demonstrated to work in a collective environment like China (Neubert and Wu 2006).

The forth culture dimension from Hofstede is that of masculinity/femininity. According to Hofstede, masculinity implies the dominant values in society that emphasize assertiveness, being tough, acquisition of money and material objects, not caring for others and the quality of life. Feminine cultures on the other hand give emphasis to warm social relations and care of the weak (Dickson *et al* 2003). This culture dimension is explicitly linked with gender differences. With reference to leadership, Hofstede has pointed out that in feminist cultures, the ideal leader is intuitive and seeks consensus and cooperation whereas in masculine cultures the ideal leader is assertive, decisive as well as aggressive (Alves et al 2006) Because of its American origin, self-leadership reflects a degree of masculinity as evidenced from the natural rewards strategy of

self-leadership which focuses on tasks as opposed to relations. However people in feminine cultures are also likely to be interested in improving their own performance just as people in masculine societies.

The fifth dimension of future orientation was later on added to Hofstede's the culture dimensions. This refers to how far into the future individuals forecast their activities in a way that might influence present decisions. Cultures with long-term orientation value the mix between business and family, establishment of social positions and all the elements of long-term relationships. The opposite is true for short-term cultures that create a definite and clear boundary between family and business life and are more concerned with immediate results. This different visualisation of life in time orientations results in self-leadership developing in a different form in long-term orientation societies as opposed to short-term cultures (Alves *et al* 2006). Theory suggest that researchers ought to bear in mind that long-term oriented people may take time to implement any decision simply because they give different value to time. However the short-term orientation people regard time as money and therefore must not be wasted. The future orientation dimension must be considered together with other culture dimensions when used to evaluate self-leadership orientation as it relates very closely to other dimensions such as masculinity/femininity (Alves et al 2006). As such self-leadership can be exercised with different degrees of future orientation depending on cultural characteristics.

Two supporting theories of self-leadership can help to bring out the theoretical relationship between self-leadership and culture are the intrinsic motivation theory and the social cognitive theory (Alves *et al* 2006). The intrinsic motivation theory states that individuals are more internally as opposed to externally motivated. They want to feel their effect on the environment, determine their own actions as well as have more autonomy over themselves. The social cognitive influences behaviour that alternates the production with reduction of dysfunctions, and vice versa, tending towards equilibrium (Alves *et al* 2006).

These theories bring out the dimensions of self-leadership, which are cognitive, social and behavioural. The two theories seem to tally with Hofstede's definition on culture, whereby the "collective mental programming" is implied in the intrinsic motivation theory based on one's opportunity to act with purpose. The social cognitive theory on the other hand brings out "the collective mental program" through the interrelation that is brought about by social, cognitive and behavioural influences. As such the overlap of the theories indicates a strong link between self-leadership theory and national culture (Alves *et al* 2006).

House *et al* (1997) have compiled a number of empirical studies, which have come to interesting and differing conclusions about influence of culture on leadership. One such study is the one conducted by Hofstede, Bond and Luk (1993) cited in House et al (1997) in which group level analysis of dimensions of organisational culture produced different results at the individual level, which according to them tended to be influenced by what they termed the psychological culture. The point here is that the differing levels of analysis can provide different results. This observation therefore brings an interesting dimension to the study, which will establish whether individual self-leader orientations will reflect influence from cultural background when compared with results from Hofstede's Value survey Module that can be compared with his scores indicated in appendix 5.

A study by Thomas and Bendixen (2000) in the South African context brings in another dimension of how ethnicity can affect management effectiveness in diverse groups from within the same country. A total of 586 managers were interviewed using a quota control on race, ethnic group, sex and demographic region. The results of the study indicated considerable similarity in values across various ethnic groups of middle managers within South Africa. The similarity of the values measured using Hofstede's (1994) VSM94 with those of Northern European Countries was apparent in the study probably because of the influential role they played in the South African history. The study also found that both management culture and perceived effectiveness to be independent of the

dimensions of culture or race suggesting that both factors could still be improved through education and experience. The inadequacy of the VSM94 in addressing some of the values from the African context perspective has also been noted.

Peterson et al (1995) cited in House et al (1997) measured role stress issues in different cultures and reported that role stress varied more by country than by demographic or organisational characteristics. In contrast to Hofstede's uncertainty Avoidance, ecological analysis revealed instead that high Power Distance related to high role overload and low ambiguity. Another study by Shackleton and Ali also reported substantial effect of country of origin rather than current country values for Pakistan managers' in spite of being in the UK. This particular study has much more relevance to the current research as people from different nationalities residing in Botswana are assessed through survey instruments to determine the impact of national culture on self-leadership practices.

3.3 Propositions

The propositions of the study have their basis in cultural analysis of self-leadership components performed by Alves et al 2006. The propositions are as follows:

1. High power distance raises the importance of the symbolic value tasks and correspondent covert tasks
2. High uncertainty avoidance makes explicit non-rational intuition based thought processes.
3. Collectivism shows the relevance of social relations rather than tasks only
4. Femininity reiterates the importance of social relations and non-rational intuition processes.
5. Long time orientation makes time an explicit major factor.

3.4 Summary

This study investigated the link between self-leadership and culture. The concept

of self-leadership was explored first and then linked to that of national culture in order to investigate any correlations. As a concept grounded in US values according to Hofstede's categorisation, self-leadership is explored through Hofstede's framework to assess its applicability to other nations.

The concept of self-leadership is a result of an evolution of theories of self-influence. Self-leadership is however more encompassing and prescriptive in nature to yield a more useful tool in organisational leadership dynamics in the twenty first century. Self-leadership strategies are grouped into three categories as behaviour focussed, natural rewards and constructive thought pattern. Behaviour focussed strategies aim to increase individual awareness in order to facilitate behavioural management particularly with reference to unpleasant tasks. Natural reward strategies are designed to help with creation of feelings of competence and self-determination. Constructive thought patterns are aimed at facilitating the formation of habitual ways of thinking that can positively impact on performance. A number of positive outcomes associated with application of self-leadership strategies have been reported in a number of studies. These include enhancing creativity and innovation, commitment and independence, team and trust potency, positive affect and job satisfaction and psychological empowerment and self-efficacy.

The concept of culture can be explained through the use of Hofstede' cultural dimensions. Hofstede' theory asserts that behaviour of individual members is usually congruent with the values endorsed by a group as a whole. Other studies like the work of Trompenaars and the GLOBE project have followed along similar dimensions to complement Hofstede's study. The first culture dimension from Hofstede is that of Power Distance and refers to the extent to which the less powerful in society accept inequality in power and consider it normal. High power distance, as purported by Alves et al (2006) raises the importance of the symbolic value tasks and correspondent covert tasks.

The second dimension of uncertainty avoidance refers to the degree to which society feel uncomfortable with ambiguous and uncertain situations. High uncertainty avoidance makes explicit non-rational intuition based thought processes as asserted by Alves et al (2006). The third dimension is that of Individualism versus collectivism, which refers to a focus on personal interests at the expense of collective interests. The assertion here is that collectivism seems to show relevance of social relations rather than tasks only. Masculinity (Femininity) is the forth of Hofstede's dimensions. Masculinity implies that dominant values in society emphasise assertiveness, being tough, acquisition of money and material objects, not caring for others and achieving a high quality of life. Femininity on the other hand emphasise social relations and high level of caring for others. Femininity is therefore purported to reiterate the importance of social relations and non-rational intuition processes. The fifth dimension focus on time orientation and refers to how far into the future individuals focus their activities in a way that influences present decisions. Alves et al (2006) propose that long time orientation makes time an explicit major factor.

3.5 Hypothesis

A number of hypotheses generated from the discussion above relate self-leadership and national culture as follows:

H1 There is a significant relationship between PDI and self-leadership dimensions that are Behaviour focussed strategies, Natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies

H2 There is a significant relationship between IDV and self-leadership dimensions that are Behaviour focussed strategies, Natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies

H3 There is a significant relationship between MAS and self-leadership dimensions that are Behaviour focussed strategies, Natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies

H4 There is a significant relationship between UAI and self-leadership

dimensions that are Behaviour focussed strategies, Natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies

H5 There is a significant relationship between LTO and self-leadership dimensions that are Behaviour focussed strategies, Natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies

CHAPTER FOUR: Methodology

4.1 Research design

The approach of the study was quantitative and was done by use of survey research in which the data collected was utilised to test the adequacy of concepts developed in relation to self-leadership and national culture and how hypothesised linkages between these concepts emerged. Both self-leadership and national culture were measured by use of questionnaires to establish a correlation. Surveys are a systematic way of asking people to volunteer information about their attitudes, behaviours, opinions and beliefs (Polland1998; 2005). Survey research is more appropriate for the current study because the three conditions required to conduct survey are present: quantitative and qualitative data, information sought is specific and familiar to the respondents and the researcher has prior knowledge of responses likely to emerge from results of other previous studies and conceptual propositions that have been put forward by various academics. Survey research has the advantage of being able to generalise findings due to a large number of respondents. In view of the limitation of budget and time available to accomplish the study, the electronic survey was administered. The advantages derived from this method as reflected in most research findings include cost saving, more candid responses and it yields the highest response rate. The statistical techniques were also used to allow for accurate analysis. The main weakness of the survey is that it is a rather superficial way to approach social life as all subjects are treated in a unified way.

4.2 Sampling Strategy

The sample was drawn from the development sector in Botswana and included subjects from selected organisations which included United Nations (UN) agencies, Southern African Development Community (SADC) personnel, and volunteer sending organisations which are the US Pearce Corps volunteers, World University Service of Canada (WUSC) volunteers, DED volunteers from Germany, Japan Oversees cooperation volunteers (JOCV) and Skillshare International volunteers. The identification of the organisations was purposively

done in order to obtain the desirable culturally diverse sample. The size of the required sample was 120 and drawn by proportional stratified sampling by first identifying the nationalities represented from all the organisations and then grouping them into their relevant national groups and randomly select from each group.

The American, Canadian, Japanese, and Germany development workers constituted focussed national groupings, which could be found within each organisation. The UN, Skillshare International and SADC were also chosen for their large pool of different nationalities, which were used to augment the sample size and build up other national groupings not represented from the focused national groups. The total final sample was 86 constituting American (41), Japanese (25) and Botswana (20).

4.3 Research measures

1. To measure self-leadership, the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire was utilised. The Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (RSLQ) which is a survey instrument developed by Houghton and Neck (2002) as an improvement on earlier measures from Cox (1993) and Anderson and Prussia (1997). (See Appendix 1). The validity and reliability of the tool has been tested in a study by Houghton and Neck (2002), which came to the conclusion that the tool is a reasonably reliable and valid instrument for measuring self-leadership skills, behaviours and cognitions. The coefficient alphas for each of the nine subscales for the RSLQ were above the commonly recommended level of 0.70 ranging from 0.74 to 0.91 indicating greater reliability of its measurement. In addition Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) indicated an impressive stable factor structure with all factor loadings exceeding 0.35 with no cross factor loading greater than 0.35. The instrument is a 35-item questionnaire, which consists of nine factors that cover the three strategic areas of self-leadership as shown in

Table 1.

Table 1.

RSLQ sub-scales from Houghton and Neck 2002

Dimensions	Sub-scales	Scale items	Factor number
Behaviour-focussed strategies	• Self-goal setting • Self-reward • Self-punishment • Self-observation • Self-cueing	2,11,20,28,34 4,13,22 6,15,24,30 7,16,25,31 9,18	2 4 6 7 9
Natural Reward strategies	• Focussing thoughts on natural rewards	8,17,26,32,35	8
Constructive thought pattern strategies	Visualising successful performance • Self-talk • Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	1,10,19,27,33 3,12,21 5,14,23,29	1 3 5

Table 1 provides a summary of the relationships between the nine RSLQ subscales and the three self-leadership dimensions as presented by Houghton and Neck (2002) in their effort to test the construct validity of a revised self-leadership measurement scale. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was used to determine the factor structure of the RSLQ while Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was used to examine the extent to which the RSLQ fit a hierarchical model of self-leadership as specified by self-leadership theory.

2. To measure national culture, the Value Survey Module (VSM) 94 by Hofstede was utilised. (See appendix 2) The VSM 94 is the most recent version of the questionnaire originally used by Hofstede in 1980. The questionnaire consists of 20 questions to assess the five dimensions (individualism, power distance, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and long term orientation) and six demographic questions (i.e. age, sex,

nationality at birth, current nationality and occupational status). There are four items per subscale and three slightly different item formats. All items used five point scales. The first twelve ask for ratings of importance from of ‘utmost importance’ to ‘of very little or no importance’. The next two items ask for ratings of frequency, but use different response choices. The last six items ask for agreement from ‘strongly agree’ to strongly disagree’.

For each of the variables developed by Hofstede exist an index formula for calculating: for power distance the formula is PD = -35m(03) + 35m(06) + 25m(14) – 20m(17) –20, where, m (03) is the mean score for question 3, m (06) is the mean score for question 6, m (14) is the mean score for question 14, and m (17) is the mean score for question 17. For uncertainty avoidance the formula is UA = 25M(13) + 20M(16) – 50M(18) – 15M(19) + 120, where, m (13) is the mean score for question 13, m (16) is the mean score for question 16, m (18) is the mean score for question 18, and m (19) is the mean score for question 19. For individualism versus collectivism the formula is IVD = -50m(01) + 30m(02) + 20m(04) – 25m(08) + 130, where, m (01) is the mean score for question 1, m (02) is the mean score for question 2, m (04) is the mean score for question 4, and m (08) is the mean score for question 8. For Masculinity versus femininity the formula is MAS = 60m(05) – 20m(07) + 20m(15) – 70m(20) + 100, where, m (05) is the mean score for question 5, m (07) is the mean score for question 7, m (15) is the mean score for question 15, and m (20) is the mean score for question 20. For Long Term Orientation the formula is LTO = 20m(10) + 20m(12) 40, where, m (10) is the mean score for question 10, and m (12) is the mean score for question 12. For the long Term Orientation the formula has been revised to cover just questions 10 and 12 instead of the original 9, 10, 11 and 12. The revision was necessitated by experience in the first larger application of LTO questions in 15 European countries, which showed that only questions 10 and 12 produced country scores correlated with other LTO measures (

www.geerthofstede.nl accessed on 29 April 2007).

The coefficient alpha reported for the VSM 94 is 0.77 that is above the threshold (Christie, Kwon, Stoeberl & Baumhart 2003). Other studies however have reported varying Cronbach alphas. Ho and Chiu (1994) reported alphas among 10 different values that varied from 0.39 to 0.93 in a sample of Chinese from Hong Kong. Hoppe (1998) reported Cronbach ranged from 0.72 to 0.90. His study compared 18 countries within those found by Hofstede (1984). The data used was collected in 1980's and the samples were limited to Western Europe and USA. Hoppe's findings are closer to those of Hofstede because the time the data was collected and the sample on which the instrument was administered was similar to that of Hofstede's IBM sample (Bearden, Money & Nevins 2006). A study by Spector, Cooper and Sparks (2001) from 23 nations yielded Cronbachs below the threshold averaging from –0.46 to 0.57 with the exception of LTO which had an alpha 0.74. Bearden, Money and Nevins (2006) study also concluded unacceptable alphas ranging from 0.43 to 0.62. Hofstede (1980) himself considered scores exceeding 0.50 Cronbach alphas as reasonably stable. The differences in reliability and validity has been attributed to a number of factors to include the differences in level of analysis, sample composition, level of education, job, gender and continuous changes in cultural values (Bearden, Money and Nevins 2006). The VSM 94 has however demonstrated test-retest reliability to confirm the dimensions, which justifies its continued use to measure values and beliefs of different nations.

4.4 Data collection procedures

The RSLQ and the VSM 94 were sent electronically to selected participants. Information about potential respondents was acquired through identified gatekeepers from each selected organisation from whom the employee database was accessed and used as the sampling frame. Appendix 3 shows the proposed

request letter to the organisations. Mailed responses yield the highest response rate, covers a larger sample and has the lowest relative cost. An introduction letter (appendix 4) and request for response was mailed together with the questionnaires. The response rate was improved through periodic telephone contact to remind participants.

4.5 Data analysis

The primary analysis was correlation and multiple regression statistics. Quantitative data analysis was divided into two phases: Preliminary data analysis and hypothesis testing. In the preliminary phase raw data was cleaned up and inputted to generate Descriptive statistics, which included central tendencies, frequency distributions, correlations, mean, standard deviation, range and variance. For hypothesis testing Pearson's Product Moment Correlation and multiple regression were used to establish the degree of linear relationship between self-leadership and culture. Chi-squire was also used to analyse the relationship between self-leadership and nationality to show the degree of differences between self-leadership and different nationalities.

Five demographic variables were included in this study as presented from Hofstede's Value Survey Module 94. The gender, education level, job category and age were also correlated to the dimensions of both self-leadership and national culture to see how much influence it could have on each dimension. The categorical data was coded from the demographic section numerically as reflected in Appendix 7. Table 2 provides summaries of the data analysis procedures used in this study. Results of the analyses are presented in chapter five and discussions, conclusions and recommendations are presented in chapter 6.

Table 2

Summary of Data Analysis Procedures using SPSS for Windows version15

Frequencies	1. Gender 2. Nationality 3. Age 4. Education level 5. Job category
Statistics	Descriptive statistics 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis 2. Correlation 3. Chi-squire 4. Multiple regression analysis

CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH RESULTS

4.0 Introduction

The study was conducted among development workers and staff of various development organisations from USA, Japan, and a Botswana sample from across the organisations. A well-known validated instrument (Hofstede's Value Survey Module 1994) was used to measure cultural values of different nationalities. The Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire was used to measure the self-leadership aspect. The purpose of the study was to try and establish a relationship between national culture and self-leadership practice for different people from different nationalities. The study also strived to establish the views of self-leadership among different nationalities other than the USA from where the concept originates. The Hypotheses were developed along the relationship between culture dimensions and self-leadership dimensions.

A total of 120 sets of questionnaires were sent out through e-mail to selected candidates from different organisations of different nationalities. 98 questionnaires were received back representing an 81.6% response overall rate. Only three responses were received from the Canadian sample and nine from the German sample and hence the questionnaires were withdrawn from the overall analysis, as the numbers were too small to meet Hofstede's condition of at least 20 to measure culture and would be difficult to make any meaningful

interpretation. Only 86 questionnaires were therefore used in the study that reflected a 71.6% response rate.

The first part of the chapter will present some demographic data of the participants like age, education, gender, and job position. The demographic data was later correlated within, and with both self-leadership and national culture dimensions. Descriptive statistics for self-leadership and national culture dimensions was also done. The second part consists of statistical tests that included Chi-Square, correlation analysis, and multiple regression analysis to evaluate the relationships emerging between culture dimensions and self-leadership. SPSS for Windows, version 15 was used to compute the results.

5.1 Demographic information of Participants

One of the main problems in cross-cultural research is controlling the variance in the data that is truly attributable to cultural differences. Age, gender, education and job classification are among some of the variables that may influence the results. One way to minimise the demographic difference is to match samples as closely on as many variables as possible. In this study, a homogenous sample was attempted through the use of respondents from the development sector. Samples from three different nationalities were used as follows; USA had 41 respondents with 32 females and 9 males; Japan had 25 respondents with 10 females and 15 males; and Botswana had 20 responses made up of 12 females and 8 males. Table 3 represents a summary of the classification of the sample according to nationalities and gender. Statistical analysis was later used to control demographic variables.

Table 3.

Classification of sample according to nationalities and gender

Nationality	Male	Female	Total
USA	9	32	41
Japan	15	10	25

Botswana	8	12	20
Total	38	57	86

Age Categories

The sample was divided into 8 different age categories following Hofstede's demographic section of the VSM 94. The USA sample was divided as follows: 0 percent was the under 20 years old; 2.4 percent for 20-24 years old; 26.8 for 25-29 years old; 41 percent for 30-34 years old; 7.3 percent each for 35-39 and 40-49 years old; 2.4 percent for 50-59 years old and 12 percent for 60 and over years old. The Japanese sample had 0 percent for less than 20 years old; 4 percent for 20-24 years old; 24 percent for 25-29 years old; 40 percent for 30-34 years old; 4 percent for 35-39 years old; 12 percent for 40-49 years old and 8 percent each for both 50-59 and 60 years and over. The Botswana sample had 0 percent for less than 20 years old and for 25-29 years old; 20 percent for 30-34 years old; 40 percent for 35-39 years old; 35 percent for 40-49 years old; 5 percent for 50-59 years old and 0 percent for 60 years and over. The majority of the samples were between 25-49 age group ranges that represent a 91.8%. Table 4 represents a summary of the Age categories of the sample.

Table 4.

Classification of Age Categories

Nationality	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-49	50-59	60 or over	Total
USA	1	11	17	3	3	1	5	41
Japan	1	6	10	1	3	2	2	25
Botswana			4	8	7	1		20
Total	3	17	32	15	15	6	7	86

Education Categories

The sample was also divided into eight different years of education. The USA

sample was divided as follows: 0 percent had 11 years or less of education; 2.4 percent had 12 years education; 0 percent had 15 0r 16 years education; 24.3 percent had 16 years education; 19.5 percent had 17 years education and 53.6 percent had 18 years education. The Japanese sample was divided as follows: 0 percent had 12 years or below education; 4 percent had 13 years education; 16 percent had 14 years education; 0 percent had 15 years education; 56 percent had 16 years education; 12 percent had 17 years education, and 12 percent had 18 years education. The Botswana sample was divided as follows: 0 percent had 13 years or less education; 5 percent had 14 years education; 15 percent had 15 years education; 20 percent had 16 years education; 30 percent had 17 years education; 30 percent had 18 years education. There was no significant difference in the education levels of different national samples with highest numbers falling between 16 and 18 years of education. Table 5 summarises the classification of different education categories of the USA, Japan, and Botswana.

Table 5.

Classification of Different Education Categories

Nationality 11 years 0r less 12 years 13 years 14 years 15 years 16 years 17 years 18 years Total USA 1 10 8 22 41 Japan 1 4 14 3 3 25 Botswana 1 3 4 6 6 20 Total 2 1 5 5 28 17 37 95

Job Categories

The sample was also divided into seven job categories. For the USA sample, 2.4 percent was categorised under unskilled or semi-skilled manual worker; 4.8 percent were generally trained office workers or secretary; 51.2 percent were academically trained professionals or equivalent but not managers of people; 24.3 percent were managers of one or more subordinates and 17 percent were managers of one or more managers. The Japanese sample had 24 percent of generally trained office workers or secretary; 28 percent of vocationally trained craftsperson, technician and informatician; 16 percent academically trained professionals or equivalent but not managers of people; 28 percent managers of

one or more subordinates; and 4 percent of managers of one or more managers. The Botswana sample had 10 percent of generally trained office workers or secretary; 5 percent of vocationally trained craftsperson, technician and informatician; 30 percent of academically trained professionals or equivalent but not managers of people; 45 percent of managers of one or more subordinates; and 10 percent of managers of one or more managers. About 79 percent of the total sample belonged in the top three categories that consist of academically trained professionals or equivalent but not managers of people, managers of one or more subordinates, and managers of one or more managers showing that they had high profile positions. Table 6 summarises the classification of different job categories of the USA, Japan, and Botswana.

Table 6.

Classification of Different Job Categories

Category	USA	Japan	Botswana	Total
1	0	0	0	0
2	1	0	0	1
3	2	6	2	10
4	0	7	1	8
5	21	4	6	31
6	10	7	9	26
7	7	1	2	10
Total	41	25	20	86

Category Key 1= No paid job (Includes full time students), 2 =Unskilled or semi-skilled manual worker, 3 = Generally trained office worker or secretary, 4 = Vocationally trained Craftsperson, technician, informatician, 5 = Academically trained professional or equivalent (but not a manager of people), 6 = Manager of one or more subordinates, 7 = Manager of one or more manage

5.2 Analysis of Variables

5.2.1 National culture values (independent variable)

The mean scores of content questions for each national sample represented in the study were used to compute index values on five dimensions of national value systems using formulas provided by Hofstede in the VSM (94) manual. The mean scores and standard deviations for each question used to compute national scores are shown in appendix 6. The summarised results of the scores are

shown in Table 6. As expected, USA scored the highest value on individualism and masculinity, while Japan and Botswana had relatively lower scores on the same dimensions. Botswana had the highest scores in Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance while Japan's scores were also somewhat on the higher side. USA had the lowest scores for Power Distance and Uncertainty Avoidance. On Long Term Orientation dimension, Japan had the highest score followed by USA and Botswana had the least score. Two of my national samples were part of Hofstede's earlier work shown with results shown in appendix 7 and so I was able to compare the results on the five dimensions.

The results of the study showed significant differences on the PDI score for different nationalities and had high scores for IDV, MAS and UAI for all the countries except for USA that had a lower score on UAI. The LTO score was in the lower end for all the countries with Japan having the highest score at 52.4. The results of the scores in this study do not exactly match those of Hofstede shown in appendix 7 for USA and Japan except for the PDI score for Japan that was 54 in Hofstede's study while the current study had a score of 52.4. The rest of the scores only indicate a similar direction on the high or low end. Table 7 indicate the computed index values for the current study.

Table 7

Computed Index values on Hofstede's Cultural dimensions

	USA	JAPAN	BOTSWANA
Individualism (IDV)	125.7	77	91
Power Distance (PDI)	16.59	52.4	81
Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI)	46	66.6	69
Masculinity (MAS)	90	74.8	60.5
Long-Term Orientation (LTO)	45.4	50.4	43

5.2.2 Self-Leadership Practice (Dependent variable)

The self-leadership dimensions were measured according to three core categories that are behaviour focussed strategies, natural reward focussed strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies. Data reduction was done through exploratory factor analysis using principal component analysis (PCA) as the extraction method and varimax rotation with Kaiser normalisation to identify whether the different factors were driven by the same underlying variable as well as to reduce data set to a manageable size while retaining as much of the original information as possible (Field, 2005, pg619). In line with Field's (2000) recommendation, items with loadings below 0.512 were excluded hence items 5, 8, 29, 30, and 33 were excluded from the analysis. The summary of relationships between the nine RSLQ subscales and the three self-leader ship dimensions as per the current study are presented in Table 8. These results can be compared to those of Neck and Houghton (2002) represented in table 2. Table 9 gives a summary of the descriptive statistics, Eigen values, factor loadings and Cronbach alphas for the self-leadership dimensions. The Cronbach alpha values for all the components were in excess of the required 0.5 criteria for reliability, which according to Nunnally (1978) meets the requirements for basic survey research. Hofstede (2001) also agree to the 0.5 minimum criteria. The Cronbach alphas ranged between 0.6 and 0.9 showing a greater reliability. A Chi-squire test was also done by use of cross tabulations to establish the relationship between nationality and self-leadership. Recoding of data was done to preserve the original variables for the other statistical tests. Table 10 shows the results of the Chi-squire test.

Table 8.

RSLQ sub-scales as per current study

Dimensions	Sub-scales	Scale items	Factor number

Behaviour-focussed strategies	• Self-goal setting • Self-reward • Self-punishment • Self-observation • Self-cueing	11,20,26,28,32,35 4,13,22 6,7,15,24 16,25 2,9,18,31,34	1 6 5 8 3
Natural Reward strategies	• Focussing thoughts on natural rewards	17	9
Constructive thought pattern strategies	Visualising successful performance • Self-talk • Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	1,10,19,27 3,12,21 14,23	2 4 7

Table 9
Results of PCA with varimax rotation for overall self-leadership

	Self-leadership Dimensions	Mean	Standard Deviation	Eigen value	Cumulative % variance	Factor loadings	Cronbach α
1	**Self-goal setting**			9.903	28.294		0.858
	I consciously have goals in my mind for my work efforts	4.06	1.010			0.639	
	I work towards specific goals I have set for myself.	4.00	1.006			0.667	
	When I have a choice, I try to do my work in ways that I enjoy rather than just trying to get it over with.	4.17	0.843			0.718	
	I think about the goals that I intend to achieve in the future.	4.14	0.960			0.690	
	I seek out activities in my work that I enjoy doing.	4.30	0.882			0.603	
	I find my own favourite way to get things done.	4.16	0.795			0.747	
2	**Visualising successful performance**			4.238	40.403		0.922
	I use my imagination to picture myself performing well on important tasks.	3.48	1.195			0.849	
	I visualise myself successfully performing a task before I do it.	3.35	1.234			0.870	
	Sometimes I picture in my mind a successful performance before I actually do a task.	3.49	1.176			0.885	
	I purposefully visualise myself overcoming the challenges I face.	3.56	1.174			0.822	
3	**Self-cuing**			2.532	47.637		0.830
	I establish specific goals for my own performance.	4.08	1.031			0.546	
	I use written notes to remind myself of what I need to accomplish.	3.83	1.229			0.691	
	I use concrete reminders (e.g. notes and lists) to help me focus on things I need to accomplish.	3.95	1.116			0.762	
	I keep track of my progress on projects I'm working on.	3.85	0.952			0.710	
	I write specific goals for my own performance.	3.52	1.155			0.718	
4	**Self talk**			2.285	54.166		0.899
	Sometimes I find I am talking to myself (out loud or in my head) to help me deal with difficult problems I face.	3.74	1.238			0.833	
	Sometimes I talk to myself (out loud or in my head) to work through difficult situations.	3.80	1.225			0.882	
	When I am in difficult situations I will sometimes talk to myself (out loud or in my head) to help me get through it.	3.66	1.214			0.849	
5	**Self-punishment**			1.961	59.769		0.750
	I tend to get down on myself in my mind when I have performed poorly.	3.47	1.114			0.721	
	I make a point to keep track of how well I'm doing at work (school).	3.31	1.357			0.593	
	I tend to be tough on myself in my thinking when I have not done well on a task.	3.59	1.022			0.757	
	I feel guilty when I perform a task poorly.	3.60	1.130			0.780	
6	**Self-reward**			1.604	64.350		0.920
	When I do an assignment especially well, I like to treat myself to something or activity I especially enjoy.	3.66	1.174			0.820	
	When I do something well, I reward myself with a special event such as a good dinner, movie, shopping trip, etc.	3.43	1.288			0.919	
	When I have successfully completed a task, I often reward myself with something I like.	3.44	1.307			0.898	
7	**Evaluating beliefs and assumptions**			1.350	68.207		0.583
	I try to mentally evaluate the accuracy of my own beliefs about situations I am having problems with.	3.60	1.077	3.60	1.077	0.532	
	I openly articulate and evaluate my own assumptions when I have a disagreement with someone else.	3.60	0.871	3.60	0.871	0.753	
8	**Self-observation**			1.137	71.457		0.863
	I usually am aware of how well I'm doing as I perform an activity.	3.85	0.927	3.85	0.927	0.834	

	I pay attention to how well I'm doing in my work.	3.97	0.860	3.97	0.860	0.721	
9	**Focussing thoughts on natural rewards**			1.017	74.363		1
	I try to surround myself with objects and people that bring out my desirable behaviours.	3.87	1.082	3.87	1.082	0.730	

Table 10

Relationship between nationality and self-leadership

	Chi-Square	df
Behaviour focussed Strategies		
Self-goal setting	3.462	2
Self-reward	1.547	2
Self-punishment	20.489***	2
Self-observation	1.710	2
Self-cuing	2.353	2
Natural Reward focussed strategies		
Focussing thoughts on natural rewards	7.573*	2
Constructive thought pattern strategies		
Visualising successful performance	8.853*	2
Self-talk	9.104*	2
Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	2.741	2

*$p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$

The Chi-square results indicate partial relationship with behaviour-focussed strategies particularly with self-punishment, which indicates a very strong association with significance of $p<0.001$. Nationality was also seen to relate to natural reward focussed strategies with significant level of $p<0.05$. A much stronger relationship was established between nationality and self-leadership particularly on visualising successful performance and self-talk aspects both with significance level of $p<0.05$.

5.3 Relationship between culture and self-leadership dimensions

To test the relationships between culture and self-leadership dimensions Correlation and multiple regressions statistical analysis was done. The statements regarding self-leadership practice were used as the dependent variables and questions regarding national culture values were used as the independent variables. Table 10 shows the results of the Pearson correlation tests. A regression analysis was also done to further strengthen the result of the correlations through investigating any kind of outcome from predictor variables. Table 11 shows the summary of the multiple regression analysis

Table 11

Pearson correlation matrix for independent and dependent variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1 Gender	1																		
2 Nationality	.203	1																	
3 Job	.154	-.065	1																
4 Education	.164	-.226*	.252*	1															
5 Age	-.044	.189	.427**	.005	1														
6 Power Distance Index	-.219*	.998**	-.083	-.246*	.182	1													
7 Individualism	.327**	-.768**	.245*	.389**	-.082	-.806**	1												
8 Masculinity	.208	-1.000**	.070	.232*	-.187	-.999**	.779**	1											
9 Uncertainty Avoidance Index	-.289**	.928**	-.174	-.335**	.138	.949**	-.573**	-.934**	1										
10 Long-Term Orientation	-.235*	-.146	-.291**	-.299**	-.125	-.085	-.522**	.129	.234*	1									
11 Self goal setting	-.029	.048	-.178	.045	-.096	.057	-.127	-.051	.097	.132	1								
12 Visualising successful performance	-.125	.356**	-.004	-.104	.076	.353**	-.246*	-.355**	.314**	-.094	.212	1							
13 Self-cuing	.146	.020	.210	.115	.098	.003	.160	-.015	.084	-.273*	.098	-.266*	1						
14 Self-talk	.131	-.319**	.133	-.092	-.020	-.331**	.377**	.322**	-.373**	-.158	.547**	.118	.477**	1					
15 Self-punishment	.056	.092	.103	.104	.142	.061	.257*	-.084	-.105	-.520**	.554**	.172	.225*	.551**	1				
16 Self-reward	.098	-.069	-.056	-.053	-.031	-.076	.126	.071	-.106	-.103	.425**	.126	.158	.447**	.254**	1			
17 Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	.078	-.110	.223*	-.036	.098	-.110	.081	.110	-.100	.021	.476**	.106	.195	.488**	.293**	.940**	1		
18 Self-observation	-.069	.041	.128	-.157	.103	.043	-.047	-.042	.047	.018	.351**	.290**	.130	.252*	.233*	.279**	.292**	1	
19 Focussing thoughts on natural rewards	.231*	-.145	-.001	.310**	-.184	-.168	.353**	.151	-.275*	-.352**	.549**	.237*	.092	.373**	.350**	.400**	.431**	490**	1

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

5.3.1 Results for Pearson r test

There were not too many correlations observed within demographic variables except for job and education (r =. 252, p< 0.05) and job and age (r = .427, p < 0.01). Both some negative and positive correlations were observed between demographic variables and culture dimension variables. Power distance had positive correlations with nationality (r = .998, p<0.01) and negatively correlated to gender (r = -.219, p<0.05), and education (r = -.246, p<0.05) Individualism had positive relationships with gender (r =. 327,p<0.01), education (r =. 389, p<0.01), and job (r = .245,p<0.05). Individualism and nationality were negatively correlated (r = -.768, p<0.01). Masculinity was negatively correlated with nationality (r = -1.000, p<0.01 and positively correlated with education (r = .232, p<0.05). Long-term orientation showed negative correlations with and gender (r = -.235, p<0.05), job (r =-.291,p<0.01), and education (r =-.299, p<0.01).

Generally there were no major correlations established between demographic factors and self-leadership dimensions except for focussing thoughts on natural rewards and education(r =. 310 at p<0.01), evaluating self-beliefs and job (r =. 223 at p<0.05), nationality with visualising successful performance and self-talk. This result helped to strengthen the investigation on effects of national culture on self-leadership.

The correlations within cultural dimensions showed very strong associations except for long-term orientation and Power distance as well as long-term orientation with masculinity. The strong positive correlations were established between uncertainty avoidance and power distance (r = .949, p< 0.01) and masculinity and individualism (r = .779 p> 0.01). The negative correlations were also very strong between individualism and power distance, masculinity and power distance, uncertainty avoidance and individualism, long-term orientation and individualism, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity and long-term orientation and uncertainty avoidance all at significance levels of p< 0.01.

There was also a high degree of inter correlations within self-leadership dimensions particularly for self-goal setting with all the dimensions except for self-reward and self-punishment. Self-reward was negatively associated with self-punishment (r = -.266 at p< 0.05) while positively correlated to self-talk (r = .290 at p< 0.01) and evaluating beliefs and assumptions(r = .237 at p< 0.05). Self-punishment had a strong positive correlation with self-observation ((r =. 477 at p< 0.01). Self-observation also had positive associations with all the other dimensions except for self-reward. Self-cuing also had strong associations with all the other dimensions except for self-reward. Focussing thoughts on natural rewards had strong positive associations with all the other self-leadership dimensions except for self-punishment and self-rewards. Visualising successful performance was strongly correlated self-talk and evaluating beliefs and assumptions. Evaluating beliefs and assumptions was positively correlated to all the dimensions except self-punishment.

For the correlation between national culture and self-leadership dimensions, results indicate associations between Power distance, which was positively correlated to visualising successful performance (r = .353, p<0.01) and negatively correlated to self-talk (r = -.331, p< 0.01). Individualism was positively correlated to self-talk (r = .377, p< 0.01), self-punishment (r = .257, p<0.05) and focussing thoughts on natural rewards (r = .353, p< 0.01). Masculinity was negatively correlated to visualising successful performance (r = -.355, p<0.01) while positively correlated to self-talk(r = .322, p<0.01). Uncertainty avoidance was positively correlated to visualising successful performance (r =. 354, p<0.01) and self-punishment (r = .224, p<0.05) while negatively correlated to self-talk (r = -.253, p<0.05). Long-term orientations had strong negative associations with self-punishment (r = -.520 at p< 0.01), focussing thoughts on natural rewards (r = -.352 at p< 0.01), and self-cuing (r = -.273 at p< 0.05).

5.3.2. Multiple regression results

Table 12 show the results of multiple regression. PDI had no relationship with

behaviour focussed strategies and partial negative association with natural reward strategies ($p<0.05$). Strong relations emerged between PDI and constructive thought patterns (visualising successful performance, $p<0.001$; self-talk, $p<0.05$). IDV and behaviour-focussed strategies were partially related (self-punishment, $p<0.001$; self-cuing, $p<0.05$). Natural reward strategies had very strong relationship with individualism ($p<0.001$). Individualism also related strongly with constructive thought pattern strategies (visualising successful performance, $p<0.01$; self-talk, $p<0.001$). No relationship was established between masculinity and behaviour focussed and natural reward strategies. MAS only showed association with constructive thought pattern strategies (visualising successful performance, $p<0.001$; self-talk, $p<0.01$). Uncertainty avoidance had a weak association with behaviour-focussed strategies, no association with natural reward strategies and a strong association with constructive thought pattern strategies. LTO was strongly associated with behaviour-focussed strategies and natural reward strategies while slightly associated with constructive thought pattern strategies.

Table 12. Multiple regression results of national culture on self-leadership

	PDI		IDV		MAS		UAI		LTO	
b	*Beta*	*t*	b	*Beta*	*t*	b	*Beta*	*t*	b	*Beta*	*t*	b	*Beta*	*t*	*Dependent variable*
Constant	41.979		16.481	103.488		56.244	78.721		67.864	66.743		523.272	46.281		210.543			**Behaviour focussed strategies**
Self-goal setting	1.502	0.057	0.586	-2.788	-0.127	-1.506	-0.607	-0.051	-0.520	0.012	0.010	0.097	0.372	0.132	1.680*			
Self-reward	-2.000	-0.076	-0.781	2.761	0.126	1.494	0.847	0.071	0.726	-0.047	-0.036	-0.360	-0.289	-0.103	-1.309			
Self-punishment	1.615	0.061	0.630	5.634	0.257	3.044**	-1.005	-0.084	-0.862	0.292	0.224	2.273*	-1.463	-0.520	-6.617***			
Self-observation	1.128	0.043	0.440	-1.033	-0.047	-0.558	-0.499	-0.042	-0.428	0.044	0.033	0.339	0.050	0.018	0.227			
Self-cuing	0.075	0.003	0.029	3.510	0.160	1.897*	-0.179	-0.015	-0.153	0.118	0.091	0.921	-0.769	-0.273	-3.477**			
Natural reward strategies																		
Focussing thoughts on natural rewards	-4.440	-0.168	-1.733*	7.745	0.353	0.000***	1.815	0.151	1.555	-0.053	-0.041	-0.413	-0.991	-0.352	-4.483***			
Constructive thought pattern strategies																		
Visualising successful performance	9.338	0.353	3.645***	-5.405	-0.246	-2.920**	-4.262	-0.355	-3.653***	0.462	0.354	3.602**	-0.624	-0.094	-1.193			
Self-talk	-8.761	-0.331	-3.419**	8.273	0.377	4.470***	3.868	0.322	3.315**	-0.330	-0.253	-2.575*	-0.443	-0.158	-2.005*			
Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	-2.905	-0.110	-1.134	1.783	0.081	0.964	1.322	0.110	1.133	-0.140	-0.108	-1.095	0.060	0.021	0.272			
R Square	0.698		0.460	0.289		0.264	0.531											
df	9		9	9		9	9											
F	3.423		7.180	3.309		3.028	9.563											

b = unstandardised coeffients; df = degrees of freedom; *p<0.05, **p<0.01,*** p<0.001

5.4 Hypothesis Testing

This study followed a two-step procedure in testing the hypotheses. PCA was done first to establish the factor loadings and the grouping of self-leadership dimensions followed by statistical tests of chi-square, correlations, and multiple regressions. Chi-square was done by cross tabulation between nationality and self-leadership. Correlation and multiple regression analyses were run with culture dimensions (PDI, IDV, UAI, MAS, and LTO) as the independent variables. Dependent variables were the self-leadership dimensions ('self-goal setting', 'visualising successful performance', 'self-cuing', 'self-talk', 'self-punishment', 'self-reward', 'evaluating beliefs and assumptions', 'self-observation', and 'focussing thoughts on natural rewards'). These statistical tests chosen have been successfully utilised in similar studies.

The results from the statistical tests showed associations between national culture values and self-leadership dimensions. Hypothesis one was to test the relationship between Power distance and self-leadership dimensions. Correlation analysis showed positive association between PDI and visualising successful performance while negatively correlated to self-talk indicating a relationship with constructive thought pattern strategies. Results from the multiple regression further confirm that PDI has strong relationship with constructive thought strategies. A weak negative relationship was also indicated between PDI and natural reward strategies.

Hypothesis two was to test the relationship between Individualism and self-leadership dimensions. From the correlation analysis, IDV showed partial positive correlations with self-talk, self-punishment and focussing thoughts on natural rewards, all factors spanning across the three self-leadership dimensions. IDV also negatively correlated to visualising successful performance. Results from multiple regression showed stronger relationship between IDV and constructive thought patterns and IDV and natural reward strategies. There was a

very weak association with behaviour-focussed strategies.

Hypothesis three was to test masculinity and self-leadership dimensions. Correlation analysis showed a positive correlation between MAS and self-talk while negatively associated with visualising successful performance indicating a relationship with constructive thought pattern strategies. Multiple regression confirmed the relationship. There was absolutely no relationship between masculinity and behaviour-focussed strategies.

Hypothesis four was to test the relationship between uncertainty avoidance with self-leadership dimensions. UAI had strong positive correlations with visualising successful performance and self-punishment while negatively correlated to self-talk showing close association with constructive thought pattern strategies and very weak associations with behaviour-focussed strategies particularly self-punishment. Results from the multiple regression test confirmed the relationships reflected in the correlations. UAI had no relationship with natural reward strategies.

Hypothesis five was to test the relationship between Long-term orientation and self-leadership dimensions. Correlation analysis showed strong negative correlations with self-punishment, self-cuing and focussing thoughts on natural rewards indicating relationships with behaviour-focussed and natural reward strategies. Multiple regression showed very strong relationship between LTO and behaviour focussed strategies while showing a weak relationship with constructive thought pattern strategies.

5.5 Discussion

Demographic variables have often been cited as influencing culture dimensions. The present study noted positive associations between IDV and gender, education and job. This is in contrast to Stedman and Yamamura (2004) study in which IDV and gender were negatively correlated among the Japanese sample

but Power distance and gender yield similar results of negative correlations with the present study. The RSLQ subscales for the current study differ slightly from the ones from Neck and Houghton (2002) study basically because of the difference in sample size whereby Neck and Houghton's study had a sample size of over 700, the current study had a sample size of 86. This resulted in the shifting of variables and the removal of some items from the overall analysis because they did not meet the minimum required factor loading of 0.512. However the overall analysis yielded the same number of factors to maintain the same self-leadership dimensions. The Cronbach alphas from the exploratory factor analysis were very high to further indicate construct reliability. From the correlation analysis, there seem to be very little association between the demographic variables and self-leadership dimensions, which helps to narrow down the culture effects.

The culture scores differed only in three dimensions of PDI, UAI and LTO while the IDV and MAS for all the countries had similar scores on the high end. USA had a PDI score of 16.59, which is low, and both Japan and Botswana had high PDI scores of 52.4 and 81 respectively. The score for IDV were high for all the countries and UAI was low for USA at 46 and high for Japan and Botswana with scores at 66.6 and 69 respectively. Long-term orientation was also on the low side for all countries though Japan had a score of 50.4while USA had a score of 45.4 and Botswana 43.

The differences in culture scores for Hofstede's studies and the present study for USA and Japan can be explained by the fact that a long time has lapsed since the original and subsequent data were collected. Although Hofstede believed the national dimensions to be enduring and relatively stable over time, questions have arisen as to the possible obsolescence of these measures due to time. Some studies have even questioned the validity of certain dimensions in certain cultures or according to gender differences. The Chinese culture survey revealed some aspects, which were not in line with Confucian values that led to the

addition of the LTO dimension. Stedman and Yamamura's study on effects of national culture and gender differences between USA and Japan showed significant gender differences in PDI and IDV for Japan and for IDV, USA results were similar to that of Japan with women scoring lower than men. The most surprising result was the high IDV score for Botswana, which seem to contradict the widely held views of philosophers and management theorists who expound on African collectivism like Christie, Lessem & Mbigi (1993), Mbigi and Maree (1995). (Thomas and Bendixen 2000)

Krumbholz, Galliers, Coulianos and Maiden (2000) also did not find expected national differences when they examined the implementation of enterprise resource planning software among subsidiaries in different countries. They also speculated that Hofstede's measures might be outdated. Hofstede however mentioned that "culture change basic enough to invalidate country dimension index scores will need either a much longer period- say, 50-100 years or extremely dramatic outside events" (Hofstede 2001 pg 36). This statement helps to understand the disparity in Hofstede's scores and the current study in that the original study is over 30 years old, which is a long time. The effects of globalisation and continued economic, social, political and technological factors are in continuous change and can be considered to be extreme dramatic outside events' for virtually all the nations.

While self-leadership tend to be influenced by national culture dimensions, it has come out in the study that other factors other than national culture could impact on self-leadership practice. The factors include personality, gender, education, age and other contextual issues. The demographic factors did not provide any linkage to self-leadership in the current study except for education and job category. This results contrasts sharply to the results of a study by Kaizan and Earnest (2000a, 2000b) in which age was negatively related to self-leadership. Younger people were seen to engage in self-leadership more than older people that were explained by generational differences. In agreement to previous

studies, the current study realised no bearing of gender to a person's self-leadership. D'Intino, Goldsby, Houghton and Neck (2007) however suggest that gender may have a subtle effect on various aspects of the practice of self-leadership and have cited a study by Nolen-Hoeksema and Corte (2004) that suggests women are more likely than men to engage in negative obstacle thinking in response to negative emotions. Another laboratory study by Kurman (2001) also showed that women tended to choose easier performance tasks than men. The same study also suggested an interaction between culture, gender and self-regulation (D'Intino et al 2007).

The central research focus for this study was to investigate an association between self-leadership and national culture that was addressed by testing five hypotheses. The principal findings reflected the presence of association between national culture and self-leadership dimensions. Although a little empirical work has explicitly addressed the issue of cross-cultural impact on self-leadership as noted earlier, a few studies in the extant literature may be interpreted from a self-leadership perspective.

The predicted relationships between national culture dimensions and self-leadership strategies were supported to a great extend either partially or fully in some instances. The results are consistent with Alves et al's (2006) contentions that self-leadership practice is based on context and situations and as such individuals will put more or less effort into certain strategies as situations unfold. This means that the intensity and associations between components of self-leadership model is not fixed. The results of the present study reflected more similarities than differences across countries. The similarities established can be explained by the fact that all three nationalities represented in the samples presently reside in one country, work within the same sector with similar ideologies and principles and were mostly highly educated and had high profile positions. This led the researcher to speculate about the possible effects of host country, organisational setting, diversity and a host of other factors to be

responsible for the differences in expected national scores with various self-leadership dimensions.

Differences were shown in relation to self-leadership dimensions and nationality. Nationality showed relationships with natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies. Very little relationship was established between nationality and behaviour-focussed strategies. Within the constructive thought pattern strategies, USA showed a 58.5% low count for visualising successful performance and a 78% high count for self-talk. Japan and Botswana respectively had 64% and 80% high count for visualising successful performance and 56% and 50% low count for self-talk. For the natural reward strategies USA and Botswana had a high count of 61% and 60% respectively while Japan had a low count of 72%. These results agree with correlations and multiple regression analysis where power distance moved in tandem with visualising successful performance and had an inverse relationship with self-talk. The masculinity was positively associated with natural reward strategies and long-term orientation was negatively correlated to natural reward strategies. All three countries showed a high score on masculinity and also high percentage count on natural reward strategies except for Japan that had a low percentage count on natural reward strategies.

The relationship between nationality and behaviour-focussed strategies had a very weak relationship particularly with self-punishment. Japan had a 72% high count on the relationship between nationality and self-punishment while Botswana had 95% low count and USA had 51.2% high. Individualism and uncertainty avoidance were correlated positively with self-punishment while long-term orientation had a negative correlation with self-punishment. These results are in line with common stereotypes associated with each of the nationalities presented. The Japanese people for example have a reputation of being hard workers and high achievers and would tend to punish themselves more for under achievement. Houghton and Neck (2006) however states that the

excessive use of self-punishment through self-criticism and guilt can be detrimental to the development of self-leadership. All three countries also showed a high score on individualism. Alves et al (2006) contends that in individualistic cultures people are expected to be self-motivated hence the established correlations with self-talk, self-punishment and focussing thoughts on natural rewards.

The relationship between uncertainty avoidance and self-leadership dimensions show a strong relationship with constructive thought pattern strategies and a weak relationship with behaviour focussed strategies. USA had a low UAI score and also a low orientation on constructive thought patterns while Japan and Botswana who had a high UAI had a high percentage score on natural reward strategies. The long-term orientation for USA and for Botswana was high while Japan's score was high. LTO had strong negative associations with self-punishment, self-cuing and focussing thoughts on natural rewards indicating weak association with both the behaviour-focused and natural reward strategies.

CHAPTER SIX: Conclusions and Recommendations

6.0 Introduction

The study of national culture influence on self-leadership practices and how it influences the personal and organisational behaviour has become a great concern among researchers and managers around the world. Due to the process of globalisation, increased interaction between countries and the rise of knowledge workers, it is imperative more than ever those managers employ new forms of leadership like the concept of self-leadership. It is within this context that the current study was aimed at investigating the level of impact that national culture plays within an individual's practice of self-leadership.

The study concluded that national culture has some impact on self-leadership orientation. The cultural characteristics provide the context for standards of perception, evaluation, communication and behaviour in use by individuals. The hypothesised linkages between national culture and self-leadership yielded partial agreement to propositions made by Alves et al (2006).

It was the intention of this study to investigate if any correlations exist between cultural dimensions and self-leadership orientation among different nationalities residing within Botswana. The nationalities involved in the study were USA, Japan and Botswana. For managers and theorists alike, a greater understanding of how and why self-leadership is important to the 21st century organisational setting is important. The present study has linked the effects of national culture on self-leadership. This study contributes to the development of self-leadership concept in three important ways. First the self-leadership construct is discussed and its benefits explained particularly for the smooth functioning of organisations in a globalised environment. Second, the link with culture was investigated as the main factor affecting the individual practise of self-leadership by running correlations and multiple regressions to establish the extent of the effect. Thirdly,

this empirical investigation could be instrumental in the advancement of future empirical self-leadership research on a wider scale to ascertain generalizability.

6.1 Limitations

The findings of this study should be interpreted with an acknowledgement of the following limitations. The narrow focus of the study on national culture and self-leadership limits the generalizability of the findings, as there are more factors that could influence self-leadership other than culture such as gender, education. The number of cultures surveyed and the sample sizes are also inadequate to generalise the results on the relationship between national culture and self-leadership. The RSLQ has also not been universally accepted as a measurement scale for self-leadership. While it has been seen to be relevant in America and other countries with similar characteristics Chinese test revealed some aspects, which are not in line with Confucian values. Alves et al (2006) has also asserted the probable none applicability of some aspects of the questionnaire not to be in line with certain cultures.

Self-reliant data are subject to certain inherent weaknesses and limitations such as unreliability, response set biases, social desirability biases that could potentially heighten the interconnectedness of national culture and self-leadership. The reliance on self-report also data raises issues of the consistency motif and common method variance. Neck, Neck, Manz and Godwin (1999) define the consistency motif as the urge of respondents to maintain a consistent line in a series of answers. The intended sampling methodology could not be effectively carried out particularly with the Japanese sample that was available in small numbers.

Factor analysis resulted in some items to be removed from analysis because of the small number of respondents on each item that resulted in factors regrouping differently from the one done by Neck and Houghton (2002) who had a much bigger sample. This removal of items weakened the meaning of natural reward and constructive thought pattern strategies as the two dimensions were made up

of fewer items.

6.2 Implications

Despite the limitations, this study had important theoretical and practical implications. As organisational members at all levels are encouraged to take more and more responsibility for their own jobs and work behaviours, the ability of workers to successfully lead themselves has become increasingly critical. With emphasis on improving individual effectiveness, self-leadership strives to address a number of challenges that face organisations looking to thrive in the twenty first century. Given its importance in individual and team performance, cross-cultural research on self-leadership is of critical importance to managers who must understand and improve performance of employees within the global work environment.

Among the challenges addressed in the context of self-leadership research are the issues of diversity management and goal performance. It is important to emphasize the notion of diversity in the context of self-leadership and all its other forms, whether it concerns the most obvious form of cultural diversity or other forms such as gender, generation, background, competence, experience, expertise or religion. Evans (2006) quotes Carlos Ghosn in a videoconference in Japan stating that " where there is diversity, there is more professional and personal enrichment. There are greater opportunities for innovation, creativity, trust and higher performance. (Pg 317)

The concept of self-leadership also brings in the idea of empowered employees. Prussia, Anderson and Manz (1998) have stated that empowering employees is a key foundation of self-managed work teams and participative management to extend quality concepts in business firms. Their suggestion is an increased reliance on employee self-leadership as opposed to traditionally applied external leadership. They go further to indicate that the use of self-leadership strategies facilitates a perception of control and responsibility that positively affects

performance outcomes. The findings of the study have clear practical implications for organisations that wish to develop the flexibility that derives from an empowered workforce through the increased harnessing of self-leadership strategies through self-leadership training.

6.3 Conclusions and Future Research Orientations

Self-leadership merits increased research attention due to its potential positive implications for enhancing individual and team performance, adapting to organisational change and potential to substitute formal leadership (Nubert and wu 2006). Future self-leadership should therefore investigate specific relationships with the other possible factors that could have an impact on it. Empirical research efforts could also be directed on further examinations of the intercultural aspects of self-leadership, self-leadership contingency and outcome factors. Self-leadership has generally been portrayed as effective for improving self-focus, self-goal setting, goal valence and saliency and yet very little empirical research has examined these relationships.

Future self-leadership could also expand on the results of the current study to investigate the relationship between national culture and self-leadership using more national culture samples and larger matched samples to improve on the generalizability of emerging relationships. It would be interesting to see how the relationships would emerge when the study is conducted with nationalities residing in their own countries.

7.0 CHAPTER SEVEN: ARTICLE FOR PUBLICATION

The Impact of national culture on self-leadership

Authors:
Professor Stella Nkomo
Bateman Distinguished Professor of Business Leadership
Graduate School of Business
University of South Africa
Office phone: +27 11 652 0365
Mobile: +27 82 416 6308
Fax: +27 11 652 0240

Patricia Kawondera
P/Bag 00369
Gaborone
Botswana
Office phone: +267 3912176
Mobile: +267 71609727

Fax: +267 3912535

The Impact of national culture on self-leadership

Abstract

The theory of self-leadership is gaining credibility and support in the era of globalisation and knowledge workers. As with many leadership theories, culture has been proposed to have a major impact on leadership processes. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent that self-leadership is correlated with national culture dimensions. Self-leadership was measured through the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire. The cultural values were measured through the use of Hofstede's Value Survey Module 94 (VSM94). Hypotheses were formed regarding relationships between national culture background and Self-leadership practice. Pearson r, Chi-square test with cross tabulation and multiple regression were used to determine the associations. The results from the statistical tests showed associations between national culture values and self-leadership dimensions. PDI and UAI showed a positive relationship with visualising successful performance but a negative relationship with self-talk both aspects of constructive thought pattern strategies. MAS had a positive relationship with self-talk while negatively correlated to visualising successful performance. IDV had positive relationships with behaviour-focussed strategies, natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies. Long-term orientation had a strong negative relationship with behaviour-focussed and natural reward strategies and a very weak negative association with behaviour focussed strategies.

1. Introduction

The social-scientific history of the concept of leadership like many other concepts in social sciences oscillates like a pendulum from enthusiasm to disillusionment. The 1970's have been marked by an abandonment of the concept from scholars like Kerr and Jermier (1978) and Miner (1975). The 1980's and 1990's reflected some enthusiasm around "strong leadership" as reflected in transformational and charismatic leadership theories from authorities like Bass (1985) and Burns (1978) (Shamir, 1999). According to Shamir (1999), the end of 1990's have witnessed increased prominence of team concepts in management, computer mediated technologies and development of more flexible and boundary less organisational forms that rejects "strong leadership" theories of the 1980's and 1990's. An appropriate theory of leadership for the post bureaucratic and boundary less organisation has not been developed yet. Shamir (1999) however suggests an identity-based theory of leadership defined by individuals and social collectivities in relation to a larger social context.

Up until recently, leadership scholars have tended to focus on leadership as a one-person process engaged in influencing followers. This approach placed emphasis on vertical influence related processes that is top-down in which subordinates are controlled, influenced and managed by a single leader. This has been the prevalent paradigm over many decades. Recently the views on leadership have changed and people are empowered to replace or enhance the traditional formal leadership styles (Carmell, Meitar & Weisberg 2006). Given the paradigm shift in leadership theories from the traditional top-down command and control leadership style to a focus towards internal leadership skills that can make individuals make smart decisions in the absence of traditional external leadership, Self-leadership has emerged as one way to achieve organisational success. Knowing and influencing oneself has become a fairly common

leadership theme in recent years (DiLiello and Houghton, 2006). “Weak Leadership” theories appearing under names like “Self-leadership”, “Shared Leadership”, and “Substitutes for Leadership” have become more attractive due to implication of reduced power distance and greater equality among organisational members. Such theories seem more suitable for “flattened and transient systems that employ remote, virtually connected and temporary members” (Shamir, 1999: 50).

The theme of employee empowerment has been a subject of great consideration in many organisational restructuring efforts. The advent of globalisation has made it necessary to engage individuals at a higher level in managing their own work or as part of teams. Empowering leadership is therefore intended to encourage followers to take initiative and to manage and control their own behaviour (Yun, Cox & Sims, 2006). Self-leadership is “considered pivotal to employees’ enthusiasm for, commitment toward and performance in empowering organisations” (Prussia, Anderson & Manz, 1998: 523). The self-influence that is characteristic of self-leadership is made more salient in empowered work environments. The modern view of the organisation has shifted from lines and boxes to connections, which reflect “informal division of labour, information networks, adhocracies, flat structures, decentralisation, professional autonomy, loose couplings, team work and self-regulation” (Shamir, 1997: 52).

Self-leadership has been linked to earlier self-influence theories from psychology as well as to some personality traits. The cultural link to self-leadership has however not been established empirically even though a plethora of conceptual self-leadership literature exists. The perceived importance of national culture as an antecedent to behaviour is now currently on the upswing and has been viewed as the missing link to understand dynamics of organisational behaviour (Chao and Moon, 2005). Research analysing the application of leadership theories across cultures suggest that leadership practices are culturally bound. The culture-bounded nature of leadership is explored through self-leadership

orientations as depicted by staff of different nationalities from selected organisations. The purpose of this study is therefore to establish whether self-leadership orientation is influenced by national culture and to what extent. Understanding cultural differences has often been cited in various literatures as critical to international business success.

2. Theoretical Foundations

The theoretical foundations for this study lie in two broad streams of literature: (a) that of Self-leadership and (b) National Culture. The concepts of Self-Leadership and national culture are of great importance in the 21st century leadership and organisational processes. With the advent of globalisation and technological advances, the use of traditional hierarchical leadership styles has waned down. New forms of leadership are being tried out and one such type that seems to fit well with modern day organisational set up is that of self-leadership as each individual manages their own work more. Diversity management is part and parcel of the globalisation trend and national culture is one diversity aspect, which needs to be taken into consideration. National culture influences on leadership styles and personality traits have been of great interest to many academics and practitioners in the field of leadership at both the conceptual and empirical levels. A study of national culture influences on self-leadership practices will bring out important aspects that can enhance organisational management processes.

Self-Leadership

Self-leadership has been used to describe a comprehensive set of self-influence strategies that can have potential for application in the twenty first century organisation. Simply stated, Self-leadership is often described as a self-influence process by which people achieve self-direction and self-motivation necessary to perform (Manz and Neck, 2004). The Behavioural and cognitive strategies that make up self-leadership has generally been grouped into three categories, which are behaviour-focussed strategies, natural reward strategies and constructive

thought pattern strategies (Neck and Houghton, 2006). The behaviour-focussed strategies are intended to heighten an individual's awareness to facilitate management of one's behaviour. Natural reward strategies are intended to manage perceptions through motivating and rewarding individuals by building more pleasant and enjoyable tasks into an activity. Constructive thought patterns facilitate the formation of habitual ways of thinking that positively impact on performance. The popularity of Self-leadership has been evidenced by large number of books and articles on the topic as well as being incorporated in training programs designed to increase self-leadership skills and behaviours in the workplace (Neck & Houghton, 2006).

A number of positive outcomes associated with application of self-leadership strategies have emerged and this strongly supports self-leadership as a powerful organisational tool. Self-leadership literature has suggested a number of predictable outcomes, which include creativity and innovation, commitment and independence, trust and team potency, positive affect and job satisfaction, & psychological empowerment and self-efficacy. Literature suggests that self-leadership skills can be trained and improved upon thereby enhancing work outcome. This therefore suggests organisations need to invest in developing self-leaders to improve the overall functioning of the organisation (Carmelli *et al,* 2006). While self-leadership is usually conceptualised as learned behaviour as opposed to a fixed trait, proponents of self-leadership usually ignores other factors such as personality and individual differences as well as cultural influences. Awareness of cultural influences in development and practice of self-leadership can make organisations more aware of the kind of training required for different individuals within the organisation to achieve a common purpose.

In their model DiLiello and Houghton (2006) have highlighted the relationships of self-leadership, innovation & creativity and environmental support. The model suggests that individuals with strong leadership skills tend to be more innovative

and have higher creative potential. A growing body of knowledge on the interconnection of self-leadership and work outcomes has been established (Carmeli *et al* 2006). A recent study by Howell (2005) has established that only an individual who informally emerges to promote an idea with conviction, persistence and energy can ensure successful innovations. In essence self-leadership strategies can help to achieve such conviction and innovativeness. According to Nubert &Wu (2006), employee self-leadership practices can determine whether an individual performs well or fail. Self-leadership is also often considered critical in overcoming resistance to change when faced with inherent uncertainty and stress of dynamic organisations (Neck, 1996). Self-leadership therefore is regarded as an important substitute or compliment for leadership from other sources.

Houghton, Neck and Singh (2004) conducted a study on a sample of 381 undergraduate students to examine the relationship between self-leadership and personality through an analysis and comparison of hierarchical factor structures. The results of the study suggest that personality traits and self-leadership's dimensions are related but distinct concepts. The first interpretation of their results suggests that self-leadership's dimensions merely describe the behavioural manifestation of personality. The second interpretation perceives a person's configuration of self-leadership tendencies to be identical with one's configuration of related personality traits before any exposure to self-leadership strategies but potentially distinctive after exposure.

Another study by Stedham and Yamamura (2004) measured the effect of national culture on gender differences between USA and Japan. The results of the study showed significant gender differences in two cultural dimensions for Japan that is Power distance index (PDI) and Individualism (IDV) and in IDV for USA. For both PDI AND IDV dimensions men and women in Japan scored significantly differently with the mean score for women lower than the mean score for men. For IDV, the result for USA was similar to that of Japan with women

scoring lower than men. No gender difference in PDI was seen for USA. No gender difference was observed for Japan and USA for Masculinity (MAS) score. These results suggest that some cultural dimensions are not homogeneous across gender, which seem to suggest a revision of Hofstede's framework to address gender-based differences in culture.

While self-leadership has been likened to and associated with other self-influence theories and personality traits, not much has been done to link it to cultural influences empirically. It is the purpose of this study to establish whether culture does have a huge take in determining one's orientation to self-leadership.

National Culture

The concept of culture is a complex one which has evolved throughout history. A number of definitions have emerged all broadly referring to commonly shared processes. A number of cross cultural leadership studies have tended to operationalise culture by using national/regional political boundaries as proxies for defining culture. Understanding culture is not an easy task since culture is an abstraction and not an entity to be measured (Christie, Kwon, Stoeberland and Baumhart, 2003). Understanding culture becomes more complicated when one embarks on cross-cultural comparative analysis. Geert Hofstede (1980, 2001) introduced a model of national culture that has since become the most widely used framework in cross-cultural research. Hofstede (2001: 9) defines culture as " the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another". The programming manifests itself in the values and beliefs of a society. Hofstede's cultural typology constitutes five dimensions, which are Individualism versus Collectivism, Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity versus Femininity and Long term versus short-term orientation. Hofstede focussed on national culture despite regional differences within a particular nation because he asserts that some ways of thinking that most inhabitants' share are still distinguishable and can be considered part of their national culture or national character. This typology of cultural dimensions has been repeatedly validated over time in dozens of

countries (Christie et al, 2003), and as such is the framework for this study.

The Power Distance dimension describes the values held in society with respect to the importance of distribution of power, wealth and other factors. High Power Distance societies accept inequality more than low Power distance societies. Individualism/Collectivism dimensions refer to the degree to which people in a country define themselves in terms of group membership. Individualist societies regard the needs of an individual and that of very close family members first before considering group membership. Collectivist societies have a great concern for group membership. Uncertainty Avoidance is the degree to which members in a society are uncomfortable in unstructured, ambiguous and uncertain situations and therefore create beliefs, norms and institutions to minimise the occurrence of or coping with such situations. Masculinity/femininity dimension describes the degree to which gender roles are clearly differentiated within a country as a result of the socialisation process. In masculine countries gender roles are very distinct and separate while in feminist countries gender roles overlap. The Long term/Short term future orientation dimension describe the choice of focus for people's efforts with regard to the present or future. This dimension was later added on after a Chinese Values Survey that included items about personal stability and respect for tradition, values that are common in Asian cultures and Confucianism (Alves et al 2006). Trompenaars (1994) and House's (1991) The Globe project have also come up with similar typologies based on dimensions of culture that can be useful when analysing culture effects on leadership aspects.

National culture and Self-leadership

Alves et al (2006) have come up with some propositions about how self-leadership can be evaluated within Hofstede's national culture framework that has led to hypothesis development. The components of self-leadership have therefore been analysed from a cross-cultural perspective. The first culture dimension from Hofstede is that of Power Distance and refers to the extent to which the less powerful in society accept inequality in power and consider it

normal. High power distance, as purported by Alves et al (2006) raises the importance of the symbolic value tasks and correspondent covert tasks.

The second dimension of uncertainty avoidance refers to the degree to which society feel uncomfortable with ambiguous and uncertain situations. High uncertainty avoidance makes explicit non-rational intuition based thought processes as asserted by Alves et al (2006). The third dimension is that of Individualism versus collectivism, which refers to a focus on personal interests at the expense of collective interests. The assertion here is that collectivism seems to show relevance of social relations rather than tasks only. Masculinity (Femininity) is the forth of Hofstede's dimensions. Masculinity implies that dominant values in society emphasise assertiveness, being tough, acquisition of money and material objects, not caring for others and achieving a high quality of life. Femininity on the other hand emphasise social relations and high level of caring for others. Femininity is therefore purported to reiterate the importance of social relations and non-rational intuition processes. The fifth dimension focus on time orientation and refers to how far into the future individuals focus their activities in a way that influences present decisions. Alves et al (2006) propose that long time orientation makes time an explicit major factor.

Hypothesis

A number of hypotheses generated from the discussion above relate self-leadership and national culture as follows:

H1 There is a significant relationship between PDI and self-leadership dimensions that are Behaviour focussed strategies, Natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies

H2 There is a significant relationship between IDV and self-leadership dimensions that are Behaviour focussed strategies, Natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies

H3 There is a significant relationship between MAS and self-leadership

dimensions that are Behaviour focussed strategies, Natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies

H4 There is a significant relationship between UAI and self-leadership dimensions that are Behaviour focussed strategies, Natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies

H5 There is a significant relationship between LTO and self-leadership dimensions that are Behaviour focussed strategies, Natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies

Purpose of the study

The objectives of the study were threefold and focussed on first, examining the components of self-leadership to establish its importance as an organisational tool, secondly to discuss the link between self-leadership and national culture and thirdly to measure the impact of national culture on self-leadership. The study tested the relevance and meaning of the self-leadership concept in different cultures. From a practical perspective the study can help organisations to develop further its management processes by bringing out learnings of some of the elements that can help in development of new theories and organisational processes that can lead to effectiveness. Given the global changes and the continuously changing environments, it is vital for an organisation to develop ways to alter and enhance its approaches to management. This can only be achieved through digging deeper into the underlying problems that can hinder the efforts. This research therefore helps validate Self-leadership behaviour in different cultures and reveal new aspects of behaviour that are relevant for effective leadership. As self-leadership literature has concentrated on conceptual development, an empirical study helps to bring out to light some of the suggested propositions. Like many other studies of cross-cultural research, the study also helps to define the etic and emic factors of self-leadership leading to greater understanding of the universal and unique characteristics within individuals, groups and nations. This understanding further enhances the efforts of structuring relevant self-leadership training programmes. Self-leadership training

can help prepare the workforce for the ever-changing challenges of the twenty first century work environment like diversity management and goal performance (DiLiello and Houghton, 2006).

Methodology

The approach of the study was quantitative methodology done by use of survey research in which the data collected was utilised to test the adequacy of concepts developed in relation to self-leadership and national culture and how hypothesised linkages between these concepts emerge. Both self-leadership and culture were measured by use of questionnaires to establish a correlation. To measure self-leadership, the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire was utilised. The Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (RSLQ) that is a survey instrument developed by Houghton and Neck (2002) achieved coefficient alphas above the recommended 70 in each of the nine subscales. To measure national culture, the Value Survey Module (VSM) 94 by Hofstede was utilised. The VSM 94 is the most recent version of the questionnaire originally used by Hofstede in 1980. The questionnaire consists of 20 questions to assess the five dimensions (individualism, power distance, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance and long term orientation) and six demographic questions (i.e. age, sex, nationality at birth, current nationality and occupational status). The coefficient alpha reported for the VSM 94 is 0.77, which is above the threshold (Christie, Kwon, Stoeberl & Baumhart, 2003).

The sample was drawn from the development sector in Botswana and included subjects from selected organisations. The size of the required sample was 120 and drawn by proportional stratified sampling by first identifying the nationalities represented from all the organisations and then grouping them into their relevant national groups and randomly select from each group. The final sample constituted the Americans (41), Japanese (25) and Batswana (20) achieving a 71.6 response rate.

The primary analysis was correlation and multiple regression statistics. Quantitative data analysis was divided into two phases: Preliminary data analysis and hypothesis testing. In the preliminary phase raw data was cleaned up and inputted to generate Descriptive statistics, which included central tendencies, frequency distributions, correlations, mean, standard deviation, range and variance. For hypothesis testing Pearson's Product Moment Correlation and multiple regression were used to establish the degree of linear relationship between self-leadership and culture. Chi-squire was also used to analyse the relationship between self-leadership and nationality to show the degree of differences between self-leadership and different nationalities.

Results

The purpose of the study was to try and establish a relationship between national culture and self-leadership practice for different people from different nationalities. The results of the study showed significant differences on the PDI score for different nationalities and had high scores for IDV, MAS and UAI for all the countries except for USA that had a lower score on UAI. The LTO score was in the lower end for all the countries with Japan having the highest score at 52.4. The results of the scores in this study do not exactly match those of Hofstede for USA and Japan except for the PDI score for Japan that was 54 in Hofstede's study while the current study had a score of 52.4. The rest of the scores only indicate a similar direction on the high or low end.

The self-leadership dimensions were measured according to three core categories that are behaviour focussed strategies, natural reward focussed strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies. Data reduction was done through exploratory factor analysis using principal component analysis (PCA) as the extraction method and varimax rotation with Kaiser normalisation to identify whether the different factors were driven by the same underlying variable as well as to reduce data set to a manageable size while retaining as much of the original information as possible (Field, 2005, pg619). In line with Field's (2000)

recommendation, items with loadings below 0.512 were excluded hence items 5, 8, 29, 30, and 33 were excluded from the analysis. The summary of relationships between the nine RSLQ subscales and the three self-leader ship dimensions as per the current study are presented in Table 1.
Table 1 approximately here

Table 2 gives a summary of the descriptive statistics, Eigen values, factor loadings and Cronbach alphas for the self-leadership dimensions. The Cronbach alpha values for all the components were in excess of the required 0.5 criteria for reliability, which according to Nunnally (1978) meets the requirements for basic survey research. Hofstede (2001) also agree to the 0.5 minimum criteria. The Cronbach alphas ranged between 0.6 and 0.9 showing a greater reliability.
Place Table 2 approximately here

A Chi-squire test was also done by use of cross tabulations to establish the relationship between nationality and self-leadership. Recoding of data was done to preserve the original variables for the other statistical tests. Table 3 shows the results of the Chi-squire test.
Place Table 3 approximately here

To test the relationships between culture and self-leadership dimensions Correlation and multiple regressions statistical analysis was done. The statements regarding self-leadership practice were used as the dependent variables and questions regarding national culture values were used as the independent variables. Table 4 shows the results of the Pearson correlation tests.
Place table 4 approximately here

A regression analysis was also done to further strengthen the result of the correlations through investigating any kind of outcome from predictor variables. Table 5 shows the summary of the multiple regression analysis
Place table 5 approximately here

Results for the Chi-squire test

The Chi-squire results indicate partial relationship with behaviour-focussed strategies particularly with self-punishment, which indicates a very strong association with significance of $p<0.001$. Nationality was also seen to relate to natural reward focussed strategies with significant level of $p<0.05$. A much stronger relationship was established between nationality and self-leadership particularly on visualising successful performance and self-talk aspects both with significance level of $p<0.05$.

Results for Pearson r test

Generally there were no major correlations established between demographic factors and self-leadership dimensions except for focussing thoughts on natural rewards and education(r =. 310 at $p<0.01$), evaluating self-beliefs and job (r =. 223 at $p<0.05$), nationality with visualising successful performance and self-talk. This result helped to strengthen the investigation on effects of national culture on self-leadership.

The correlation between national culture and self-leadership dimensions, results indicate associations between Power distance, which was positively correlated to visualising successful performance (r = .353, $p<0.01$) and negatively correlated to self-talk (r = -.331, $p< 0.01$). Individualism was positively correlated to self-talk (r = .377, $p< 0.01$), self-punishment (r = .257, $p<0.05$) and focussing thoughts on natural rewards (r = .353, $p< 0.01$). Masculinity was negatively correlated to visualising successful performance (r = -.355, $p<0.01$) while positively correlated to self-talk(r = .322, $p<0.01$). Uncertainty avoidance was positively correlated to visualising successful performance (r =. 354, $p<0.01$) and self-punishment (r = .224, $p<0.05$) while negatively correlated to self-talk (r = -.253, $p<0.05$). Long-term orientations had strong negative associations with self-punishment (r = -.520 at $p< 0.01$), focussing thoughts on natural rewards (r = -.352 at $p< 0.01$), and self-cuing (r = -.273 at $p< 0.05$).

Multiple regression results

Table 5 show the results of multiple regression. PDI had no relationship with behaviour focussed strategies and partial negative association with natural reward strategies ($p<0.05$). Strong relations emerged between PDI and constructive thought patterns (visualising successful performance, $p<0.001$; self-talk, $p<0.05$). IDV and behaviour-focussed strategies were partially related (self-punishment, $p<0.001$; self-cuing, $p<0.05$). Natural reward strategies had very strong relationship with individualism ($p<0.001$). Individualism also related strongly with constructive thought pattern strategies (visualising successful performance, $p<0.01$; self-talk, $p<0.001$). No relationship was established between masculinity and behaviour focussed and natural reward strategies. MAS only showed association with constructive thought pattern strategies (visualising successful performance, $p<0.001$; self-talk, $p<0.01$). Uncertainty avoidance had a weak association with behaviour-focussed strategies, no association with natural reward strategies and a strong association with constructive thought pattern strategies. LTO was strongly associated with behaviour-focussed strategies and natural reward strategies while slightly associated with constructive thought pattern strategies.

Hypothesis Testing

This study followed a two-step procedure in testing the hypotheses. PCA was done first to establish the factor loadings and the grouping of self-leadership dimensions followed by statistical tests of chi-squire, correlations, and multiple regressions. Chi-squire was done by cross tabulation between nationality and self-leadership. Correlation and multiple regression analyses were run with culture dimensions (PDI, IDV, UAI, MAS, and LTO) as the independent variables. Dependent variables were the self-leadership dimensions ('self-goal setting', 'visualising successful performance', 'self-cuing', 'self-talk', 'self-punishment', 'self-reward', 'evaluating beliefs and assumptions', 'self-observation', and 'focussing thoughts on natural rewards'). The statistical tests chosen have been successfully utilised in similar studies like

The results from the statistical tests showed associations between national culture values and self-leadership dimensions. Hypothesis one was to test the relationship between Power distance and self-leadership dimensions. Correlation analysis showed positive association between PDI and visualising successful performance while negatively correlated to self-talk indicating a relationship with constructive thought pattern strategies. Results from the multiple regressions further confirm that PDI has strong relationship with constructive thought strategies. A weak negative relationship was also indicated between PDI and natural reward strategies.

Hypothesis two was to test the relationship between Individualism and self-leadership dimensions. From the correlation analysis, IDV showed partial positive correlations with self-talk, self-punishment and focussing thoughts on natural rewards, all factors spanning across the three self-leadership dimensions. IDV also negatively correlated to visualising successful performance. Results from multiple regression showed stronger relationship between IDV and constructive thought patterns and IDV and natural reward strategies. There was a very weak association with behaviour-focussed strategies.

Hypothesis three was to test masculinity and self-leadership dimensions. Correlation analysis showed a positive correlation between MAS and self-talk while negatively associated with visualising successful performance indicating a relationship with constructive thought pattern strategies. Multiple regression confirmed the relationship. There was absolutely no relationship between masculinity and behaviour-focussed strategies.

Hypothesis four was to test the relationship between uncertainty avoidance with self-leadership dimensions. UAI had strong positive correlations with visualising successful performance and self-punishment while negatively correlated to self-talk showing close association with constructive thought pattern strategies and very weak associations with behaviour-focussed strategies particularly

self-punishment. Results from the multiple regression test confirmed the relationships reflected in the correlations. UAI had no relationship with natural reward strategies.

Hypothesis five was to test the relationship between Long-term orientation and self-leadership dimensions. Correlation analysis showed strong negative correlations with self-punishment, self-cuing and focussing thoughts on natural rewards indicating relationships with behaviour-focussed and natural reward strategies. Multiple regression showed very strong relationship between LTO and behaviour focussed strategies while showing a weak relationship with constructive thought pattern strategies.

Discussion

The study of national culture influence on self-leadership practices and how it influences the personal and organisational behaviour has become a great concern among researchers and managers around the world. Due to the process of globalisation, increased interaction between countries and the rise of knowledge workers, it is imperative more than ever those managers employ new forms of leadership like the concept of self-leadership. It is within this context that the current study was aimed at investigating the level of impact that national culture plays within an individual's practice of self-leadership.

It was the intention of this study to investigate if any correlations exist between cultural dimensions and self-leadership orientation among different nationalities residing within Botswana. The nationalities involved in the study were USA, Japan and Botswana. For managers and theorists alike, a greater understanding of how and why self-leadership is important to the 21st century organisational setting is important. The present study has linked the effects of national culture on self-leadership. This study contributes to the development of self-leadership concept in three important ways. First the self-leadership construct is discussed and its benefits explained particularly for the smooth functioning of organisations

in a globalised environment. Second, the link with culture was investigated as the main factor affecting the individual practise of self-leadership by running correlations and multiple regressions to establish the extent of the effect. Thirdly, this empirical investigation could be instrumental in the advancement of future empirical self-leadership research on a wider scale to ascertain generalizability.

The central research focus for this study was to investigate an association between self-leadership and national culture that was addressed by testing five hypotheses. The principal findings reflected the presence of association between national culture and self-leadership dimensions. Although a little empirical work has explicitly addressed the issue of cross-cultural impact on self-leadership as noted earlier, a few studies in the extant literature may be interpreted from a self-leadership perspective.

The predicted relationships between culture dimensions and self-leadership strategies were supported to a great extend either partially or fully in some instances. The results are consistent with Alves et al's (2006) contentions that self-leadership practice is based on context and situations and as such individuals will put more or less effort into certain strategies as situations unfold. This means that the intensity and associations between components of self-leadership model is not fixed. The results of the present study reflected more similarities than differences across countries. The similarities established can be explained by the fact that all three nationalities represented in the samples presently reside in one country, work within the same sector with similar ideologies and principles and were mostly highly educated and had high profile positions. This led the researcher to speculate about the possible effects of host country, organisational setting, diversity and a host of other factors to be responsible for the differences in speculated national scores with various self-leadership dimensions.

Demographic variables have often been cited as influencing culture dimensions.

The present study noted positive associations between IDV and gender, education and job. This is in contrast to Stedman and Yamamura (2004) study in which IDV and gender were negatively correlated among the Japanese sample but Power distance and gender yield similar results of negative correlations with the present study. The RSLQ subscales for the current study differ slightly from the ones from Neck and Houghton (2002) study basically because of the difference in sample size whereby Neck and Houghton's study had a sample size of over 700, the current study had a sample size of 86. This resulted in the shifting of variables and the removal of some items from the overall analysis because they did not meet the minimum required factor loading of 0.512. However the overall analysis yielded the same number of factors to maintain the same self-leadership dimensions. The Cronbach alphas from the exploratory factor analysis were very high to further indicate construct reliability. From the correlation analysis, there seem to be very little association between the demographic variables and self-leadership dimensions, which helps to narrow down the culture effects.

The culture scores differed only in three dimensions of PDI, UAI and LTO while the IDV and MAS for all the countries had similar scores on the high end. USA had a PDI score of 16.59, which is low, and both Japan and Botswana had high PDI scores of 52.4 and 81 respectively. The score for IDV were high for all the countries and UAI was low for USA at 46 and high for Japan and Botswana with scores at 66.6 and 69 respectively. Long-term orientation was also on the low side for all countries though Japan had a score of 50.4while USA had a score of 45.4 and Botswana 43.

The differences in culture scores for Hofstede's studies and the present study for USA and Japan can be explained by the fact that a long time has lapsed since the original and subsequent data were collected. Although Hofstede believed the national dimensions to be enduring and relatively stable over time, questions have arisen as to the possible obsolescence of these measures due to time.

Some studies have even questioned the validity of certain dimensions in certain cultures or according to gender differences. The Chinese culture survey revealed some aspects, which were not in line with Confucian values that led to the addition of the LTO dimension. Stedman and Yamamura's study on effects of national culture and gender differences between USA and Japan showed significant gender differences in PDI and IDV for Japan and for IDV, USA results were similar to that of Japan with women scoring lower than men. The most surprising result was the high IDV score for Botswana, which seem to contradict the widely held views of philosophers and management theorists who expound on African collectivism like Christie, Lessem & Mbigi (1993), Mbigi and Maree (1995). (Thomas and Bendixen 2000)

Krumbholz, Galliers, Coulianos and Maiden (2000) also did not find expected national differences when they examined the implementation of enterprise resource planning software among subsidiaries in different countries. They also speculated that Hofstede's measures might be outdated. Hofstede however mentioned that "culture change basic enough to invalidate country dimension index scores will need either a much longer period- say, 50-100 years or extremely dramatic outside events" (Hofstede 2001 pg 36). This statement helps to understand the disparity in Hofstede's scores and the current study in that the original study is over 30 years old, which is a long time. The effects of globalisation and continued economic, social, political and technological factors are in continuous change and can be considered to be 'extreme dramatic outside events' for virtually all the nations.

Differences were shown in relation to self-leadership dimensions and nationality. Nationality showed relationships with natural reward strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies. Very little relationship was established between nationality and behaviour-focussed strategies. Within the constructive thought pattern strategies, USA showed a 58.5% low count for visualising successful performance and a 78% high count for self-talk. Japan and Botswana

respectively had 64% and 80% high count for visualising successful performance and 56% and 50% low count for self-talk. For the natural reward strategies USA and Botswana had a high count of 61% and 60% respectively while Japan had a low count of 72%. These results agree with correlations and multiple regression analysis where power distance moved in tandem with visualising successful performance and had an inverse relationship with self-talk. The masculinity was positively associated with natural reward strategies and long-term orientation was negatively correlated to natural reward strategies. All three countries showed a high score on masculinity and also high percentage count on natural reward strategies except for Japan that had a low percentage count on natural reward strategies.

The relationship between nationality and behaviour-focussed strategies had a very weak relationship particularly with self-punishment. Japan had a 72% high count on the relationship between nationality and self-punishment while Botswana had 95% low count and USA had 51.2% high. Individualism and uncertainty avoidance were correlated positively with self-punishment while long-term orientation had a negative correlation with self-punishment. These results are in line with common stereotypes associated with each of the nationalities presented. The Japanese people for example have a reputation of being hard workers and high achievers and would tend to punish themselves more for under achievement. Houghton and Neck (2006) however states that the excessive use of self-punishment through self-criticism and guilt can be detrimental to the development of self-leadership. All three countries also showed a high score on individualism. Alves et al (2006) contends that in individualistic cultures people are expected to be self-motivated hence the established correlations with self-talk, self-punishment and focussing thoughts on natural rewards.

The relationship between uncertainty avoidance and self-leadership dimensions show a strong relationship with constructive thought pattern strategies and a

weak relationship with behaviour focussed strategies. USA had a low UAI score and also a low orientation on constructive thought patterns while Japan and Botswana who had a high UAI had a high percentage score on natural reward strategies. The long-term orientation for USA and for Botswana was high while Japan's score was high. LTO had strong negative associations with self-punishment, self-cuing and focussing thoughts on natural rewards indicating weak association with both the behaviour-focused and natural reward strategies.

Limitations

The findings of this study should be interpreted with an acknowledgement of the following limitations. The narrow focus of the study on national culture and self-leadership limits the generalizability of the findings, as there are more factors that could influence self-leadership other than culture such as gender, education. The number of cultures surveyed and the sample sizes are also inadequate to generalise the results on the relationship between national culture and self-leadership. The RSLQ has also not been universally accepted as a measurement scale for self-leadership. While it has been seen to be relevant in America and other countries with similar characteristics Chinese test revealed some aspects, which are not in line with Confucian values. Alves et al (2006) has also asserted the probable none applicability of some aspects of the questionnaire not to be in line with certain cultures.

Self-reliant data are subject to certain inherent weaknesses and limitations such as unreliability, response set biases, social desirability biases that could potentially heighten the interconnectedness of national culture and self-leadership. The reliance on self-report also data raises issues of the consistency motif and common method variance. Neck, Neck, Manz and Godwin (1999) define the consistency motif as the urge of respondents to maintain a consistent line in a series of answers. The intended sampling methodology could not be effectively carried out particularly with the Japanese sample that was available in small numbers.

Factor analysis resulted in some items to be removed from analysis because of the small number of respondents on each item that resulted in factors regrouping differently from the one done by Neck and Houghton (2002) who had a much bigger sample. This removal of items weakened the meaning of natural reward and constructive thought pattern strategies as the two dimensions were made up of fewer items.

Implications

Despite the limitations, this study had important theoretical and practical implications. As organisational members at all levels are encouraged to take more and more responsibility for their own jobs and work behaviours, the ability of workers to successfully lead themselves has become increasingly critical. With emphasis on improving individual effectiveness, self-leadership strives to address a number of challenges that face organisations looking to thrive in the twenty first century.

Among the challenges addressed in the context of self-leadership research are the issues of diversity management and goal performance. It is important to emphasize the notion of diversity in the context of self-leadership and all its other forms, whether it concerns the most obvious form of cultural diversity or other forms such as gender, generation, background, competence, experience, expertise or religion. Evans (2006) quotes Carlos Ghosn in a videoconference in Japan stating that " where there is diversity, there is more professional and personal enrichment. There are greater opportunities for innovation, creativity, trust and higher performance. (Pg 317)

The concept of self-leadership also brings in the idea of empowered employees. Prussia, Anderson and Manz (1998) have stated that empowering employees is a key foundation of self-managed work teams and participative management to extend quality concepts in business firms. Their suggestion is an increased

reliance on employee self-leadership as opposed to traditionally applied external leadership. They go further to indicate that the use of self-leadership strategies facilitates a perception of control and responsibility that positively affects performance outcomes.

Conclusions and Future research orientation

While self-leadership tend to be influenced by culture dimensions, it has come out in the study that other factors other than culture could impact on self-leadership practice. The factors include personality, gender, education, age and other contextual issues. Future self-leadership should therefore investigate specific relationships with the other possible factors that could have an impact on it. Empirical research efforts could also be directed on further examinations of the intercultural aspects of self-leadership, self-leadership contingency and outcome factors. Self-leadership has generally been portrayed as effective for improving self-focus, self-goal setting, goal valence and saliency and yet very little empirical research has examined these relationships.

Future self-leadership could also expand on the results of the current study to investigate the relationship between national culture and self-leadership using more cultural samples and larger matched samples to improve on the generalizability of emerging relationships. It would be interesting to see how the relationships would emerge when the study is conducted with nationalities residing in their own countries

Table 1.

RSLQ sub-scales as per current study

Dimensions	Sub-scales	Scale items	Factor number
Behaviour-focussed strategies	• Self-goal setting • Self-reward • Self-punishment • Self-observation • Self-cueing	11,20,26,28,32,35 4,13,22 6,7,15,24 16,25 2,9,18,31,34	1 6 5 8 3
Natural Reward strategies	• Focussing thoughts on natural rewards	17	9
Constructive thought pattern strategies	Visualising successful performance • Self-talk • Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	1,10,19,27 3,12,21 14,23	2 4 7

Table 2
Results of PCA with varimax rotation for overall self-leadership

	Self-leadership Dimensions	Mean	Standard Deviation	Eigen value	Cumulative % variance	Factor loadings	Cronbach α
1	**Self-goal setting**			9.903	28.294		0.858
	I consciously have goals in my mind for my work efforts	4.06	1.010			0.639	
	I work towards specific goals I have set for myself.	4.00	1.006			0.667	
	When I have a choice, I try to do my work in ways that I enjoy rather than just trying to get it over with.	4.17	0.843			0.718	
	I think about the goals that I intend to achieve in the future.	4.14	0.960			0.690	
	I seek out activities in my work that I enjoy doing.	4.30	0.882			0.603	
	I find my own favourite way to get things done.	4.16	0.795			0.747	
2	**Visualising successful performance**			4.238	40.403		0.922
	I use my imagination to picture myself performing well on important tasks.	3.48	1.195			0.849	
	I visualise myself successfully performing a task before I do it.	3.35	1.234			0.870	
	Sometimes I picture in my mind a successful performance before I actually do a task.	3.49	1.176			0.885	
	I purposefully visualise myself overcoming the challenges I face.	3.56	1.174			0.822	
3	**Self-cuing**			2.532	47.637		0.830
	I establish specific goals for my own performance.	4.08	1.031			0.546	
	I use written notes to remind myself of what I need to accomplish.	3.83	1.229			0.691	
	I use concrete reminders (e.g. notes and lists) to help me focus on things I need to accomplish.	3.95	1.116			0.762	
	I keep track of my progress on projects I'm working on.	3.85	0.952			0.710	
	I write specific goals for my own performance.	3.52	1.155			0.718	
4	**Self talk**			2.285	54.166		0.899
	Sometimes I find I am talking to myself (out loud or in my head) to help me deal with difficult problems I face.	3.74	1.238			0.833	
	Sometimes I talk to myself (out loud or in my head) to work through difficult situations.	3.80	1.225			0.882	
	When I am in difficult situations I will sometimes talk to myself (out loud or in my head) to help me get through it.	3.66	1.214			0.849	
5	**Self-punishment**			1.961	59.769		0.750
	I tend to get down on myself in my mind when I have performed poorly.	3.47	1.114			0.721	
	I make a point to keep track of how well I'm doing at work (school).	3.31	1.357			0.593	
	I tend to be tough on myself in my thinking when I have not done well on a task.	3.59	1.022			0.757	
	I feel guilty when I perform a task poorly.	3.60	1.130			0.780	
6	**Self-reward**			1.604	64.350		0.920
	When I do an assignment especially well, I like to treat myself to something or activity I especially enjoy.	3.66	1.174			0.820	
	When I do something well, I reward myself with a special event such as a good dinner, movie, shopping trip, etc.	3.43	1.288			0.919	
	When I have successfully completed a task, I often reward myself with something I like.	3.44	1.307			0.898	
7	**Evaluating beliefs and assumptions**			1.350	68.207		0.583
	I try to mentally evaluate the accuracy of my own beliefs about situations I am having problems with.	3.60	1.077	3.60	1.077	0.532	
	I openly articulate and evaluate my own assumptions when I have a disagreement with someone else.	3.60	0.871	3.60	0.871	0.753	
8	**Self-observation**			1.137	71.457		0.863
	I usually am aware of how well I'm doing as I perform an activity.	3.85	0.927	3.85	0.927	0.834	
	I pay attention to how well I'm doing in my work.	3.97	0.860	3.97	0.860	0.721	

9	**Foccussing thoughts on natural rewards**			1.017	74.363	1
	I try to surround myself with objects and people that bring out my desirable behaviours.	3.87	1.082	3.87	1.082	0.730

Table 3

Relationship between nationality and self-leadership

	Chi-Square	df
Behaviour focussed Strategies		
Self-goal setting	3.462	2
Self-reward	1.547	2
Self-punishment	20.489***	2
Self-observation	1.710	2
Self-cuing	2.353	2
Natural Reward focussed strategies		
Focussing thoughts on natural rewards	7.573*	2
Constructive thought pattern strategies		
Visualising successful performance	8.853*	2
Self-talk	9.104*	2
Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	2.741	2

*$p<0.05$, **$p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$

Table 4

Pearson correlation matrix for independent and dependent variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1 Gender	1																		
2 Nationality	.203	1																	
3 Job	.154	-.065	1																
4 Education	.164	-.226*	.252*	1															
5 Age	-.044	.189	.427**	.005	1														
6 Power Distance Index	-.219*	.998**	-.083	-.246*	.182	1													
7 Individualism	.327**	-.768**	.245*	.389**	-.082	-.806**	1												
8 Masculinity	.208	-1.000**	.070	.232*	-.187	-.999**	.779**	1											
9 Uncertainty Avoidance Index	-.289**	.928**	-.174	-.335**	.138	.949**	-.573**	-.934**	1										
10 Long-Term Orientation	-.235*	-.146	-.291**	-.299**	-.125	-.085	-.522**	.129	.234*	1									
11 Self goal setting	-.029	.048	-.178	.045	-.096	.057	-.127	-.051	.097	.132	1								
12 Visualising successful performance	-.125	.356**	-.004	-.104	.076	.353**	-.246*	-.355**	.314**	-.094	.212	1							
13 Self-cuing	.146	.020	.210	.115	.098	.003	.160	-.015	.084	-.273*	.098	-.266*	1						
14 Self-talk	.131	-.319**	.133	-.092	-.020	-.331**	.377**	.322**	-.373**	-.158	.547**	.118	.477**	1					
15 Self-punishment	.056	.092	.103	.104	.142	.061	.257*	-.084	-.105	-.520**	.554**	.172	.225*	.551**	1				
16 Self-reward	.098	-.069	-.056	-.053	-.031	-.076	.126	.071	-.106	-.103	.425**	.126	.158	.447**	.254**	1			
17 Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	.078	-.110	.223*	-.036	.098	-.110	.081	.110	-.100	.021	.476**	.106	.195	.488**	.293**	.940**	1		
18 Self-observation	-.069	.041	.128	-.157	.103	.043	-.047	-.042	.047	.018	.351**	.290**	.130	.252*	.233*	.279**	.292**	1	
19 Focussing thoughts on natural rewards	.231*	-.145	-.001	.310**	-.184	-.168	.353**	.151	-.275*	-.352**	.549**	.237*	.092	.373**	.350**	.400**	.431**	490**	1

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed); ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 5. Multiple regression results of national culture on self-leadership

	PDI		IDV		MAS		UAI		LTO	
b	*Beta*	*t*	b	*Beta*	*t*	b	*Beta*	*t*	b	*Beta*	*t*	*Dependent variable*
Constant	41.979		16.481		103.488	56.244		78.721	67.864		66.743	
523.272		46.281		210.543								
Behaviour focussed strategies												
Self-goal setting	1.502	0.057	0.586	-2.788	-0.127	-1.506	-0.607	-0.051	-0.520	0.012	0.010	0.097
0.372	0.132	1.680*										
Self-reward	-2.000	-0.076	-0.781	2.761	0.126	1.494	0.847	0.071	0.726	-0.047	-0.036	-0.360
-0.289	-0.103	-1.309										
Self-punishment	1.615	0.061	0.630	5.634	0.257	3.044**	-1.005	-0.084	-0.862	0.292	0.224	2.273*
-1.463	-0.520	-6.617***										
Self-observation	1.128	0.043	0.440	-1.033	-0.047	-0.558	-0.499	-0.042	-0.428	0.044	0.033	0.339
0.050	0.018	0.227										
Self-cuing	0.075	0.003	0.029	3.510	0.160	1.897*	-0.179	-0.015	-0.153	0.118	0.091	0.921
-0.769	-0.273	-3.477**										
Natural reward strategies												
Focussing thoughts on natural rewards	-4.440	-0.168	-1.733*	7.745	0.353	0.000***	1.815	0.151	1.555	-0.053	-0.041	-0.413
-0.991	-0.352	-4.483***										
Constructive thought pattern strategies												
Visualising successful performance	9.338	0.353	3.645***	-5.405	-0.246	-2.920**	-4.262	-0.355	-3.653***	0.462	0.354	3.602**
-0.624	-0.094	-1.193										
Self-talk	-8.761	-0.331	-3.419**	8.273	0.377	4.470***	3.868	0.322	3.315**	-0.330	-0.253	-2.575*
-0.443	-0.158	-2.005*										
Evaluating beliefs and assumptions	-2.905	-0.110	-1.134	1.783	0.081	0.964	1.322	0.110	1.133	-0.140	-0.108	-1.095
0.060	0.021	0.272										
R Square	0.698		0.460		0.289	0.264		0.531				
df	9	9	9	9	9							
F	3.423		7.180		3.309	3.028		9.563				

b = unstandardised coeffients; df = degrees of freedom; *p<0.05, **p<0.01,*** p<0.001

References

1. Alves J. C, Lovelace K.J, Manz C.C & Matsypura, Toyasaki F, & Ke (Grace) Ke, 2006. 'A cross-cultural perspective of self-leadership' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 21 (4) pp 338-359
2. Bandura A, 1977. 'Social Learning Theory' Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
3. Bearden W. O, Money R. B, & Nevins J. L, 2006 'Multidimensional versus Unidimensional measures in assessing national culture values: The Hofstede VSM 94 example' *Journal of Business Research* 59 pp195-203
4. Bligh M. C, Pearce C.L, & Kohles J.C, 2006. 'The importance of self- and shared leadership in team based knowledge work: A meso-level model of leadership dynamics' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 21 (4) pp 296-318
5. Carmeli A, Meiter R, & Weisberg J 2006. 'Self-leadership skills and innovative behaviour at work' *International Journal of Manpower* Vol 27 (1) pp75-90
6. Carvier C. S & Scheier M. F, 1981. 'Attention and Self-regulation: A control theory approach to human behaviour' Springer-Verlag, New York.
7. Chao G.T AND Moon H. 2005 'The Cultural Mosaic: A Metatheory for Understanding the Complexity of Culture' *Journal of applied Psychology* Vol 90 (6) pp1128-1140
8. Christie P.M. J, Kwon I.G, Stoeberl P. A, Baumhart R 2003. 'A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Ethical attitudes of Business Managers: India, Korea and the United States' *Journal of Business Ethics* number 46 pp 263-285
9. Dickson M.W, Den Hartog D.N, & Mitchelson J.K 2003 'Research on Leadership in a Cross-cultural context: Making progress and Raising new questions' *The Leadership Quarterly* 14 pp 729-768
10. D'Intino R. S, Goldsby M.G, Houghton J.D & Neck C.P 2007 'Self-Leadership: A process for Entrepreneurial Success' *Journal of*

Leadrship and Organizational Studies Vol. 13, No. 4 pp105-120

11. DiLiello TC & Houghton JD 2006. 'Maximising organisational leadership capacity for the future: 'Toward a model of self-leadership, innovation and creativity' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 21 (4) pp 319-337
12. Field, A. P. 2005. *Discovering statistics using SPSS (and sex, drugs and rock 'n' roll)* 2nd edition, London: Sage
13. Field, A. 2000. *Discovering statistics using SPSS for Windows.* London: Sage publications
14. Forza C, 2002 'Survey research in operations management: a process based perspective' *International Journal of Operations and Production Management* Vol. 22 No. 2 pp 152-194
15. Hofstede G. 1980, 'Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values' Sage, Beverly Hills, CA.
16. Hofstede G. 2001, 'Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviours, Institutions and Organisations across Nations' Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
17. Houghton J. D, Bonham T. W & Neck C.P, Singh K, 2004 'The relationship between self-leadership and personality: A comparison of hierarchical factor structures' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 19 No. 4 pp 427-441
18. House R. J, 1998 'A brief History of GLOBE' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 13 issue ¾ pp230-240
19. House R. J, Wright N.S, & Aditya R.N 1997 'Cross-Cultural Research on Organisational Leadership: A critical analysis and a proposed theory' in: Earley P. C and Erez M, Ed (s) *New Perspectives on International Industrial/Organisational Psychology*. The New Lexington Press, San Francisco pp 535-625
20. Jacob N, 2005. 'Cross-cultural Investigations: Emerging concepts' *Journal of Organizational change management* Vol. 18 (5) pp514-528
21. Jose A, Lee S 2007 'Environmental Reporting of Global Corporations: A Content Analysis based on Website Disclosures' *Journal of Business Ethics* 72 pp307-321

22. Kelle U, 2006 'Combining qualitative and quantitative methods in research practice: purposes and advantages' *Qualitative Research in Psychology* No. 3 pp293-311
23. Lee T.W, 1999 'Using Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research' SAGE Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks, Carlifornia
24. Locke E. A, Latham G. P, & Erez M 1988 'The Determinants of Goal Commitment' *Academy of Management Review* Vol. 13 No. 1 pp23-29
25. Manz C.C AND neck C. P, 2004. Mastering Self-Leadership for Personal excellence, 3rd edition Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ
26. Nunnally, J. C. 1978 *Psychometric theory.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
27. Neck C. P & Houghton J.D 2002. 'The revised self-leadership Questionnaire: Testing a hierarchical factor structure for self-leadership' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 17 (8) pp672-691
28. Neck C. P & Houghton J.D 2004. 'Two decades of self-leadership theory and research: Past developments, present trends, and future possibilities' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 21 (4) pp270-295
29. Neck C. P, Neck H. M, Manz C. C, & Godwin J. 1999. 'I think I can I think I can: a self-leadership perspective towards enhancing entrepreneur thought patterns, self-efficacy and performance' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 14 (6) pp477-501
30. Neubert M. J and Wu Ju-Chien Cindy 2006. 'An investigation of the generalizability of the Houghton and Neck Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire to a Chinese context' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 21 (4) pp360-373
31. Polland R.J, 1998 'Essentials of survey research and analysis: A workbook for community researchers'
32. Prussia G. E, Anderson J. S, & Manz C. C, 1989 'Self-leadership and Performance Outcomes: The mediating influence of self-efficacy' *Journal of Organizational Behavior* Vol 19 pp523-538
33. Shamir B, 1999. 'Leadership in Boundaryless Organizations: Disposable or Indispensable?' *European Journal of Work and Organizational*

Psychology, Vol. 8 (1) pp 47-71.

34. Spector P. E, Cooper C. L, & Sparks K.2001 'An International study of the Psychometric properties of the Hofstede Values Survey Module 1994: A comparison of individual and country/province level results' *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 50 (2) PP269-281
35. Stedham Y. E, and Yamamura J. H, 2004. 'Measuring national culture: does gender matter?' *Women in Management Review* Vol. 19 No. 5 pp233-243
36. Trompenaars, F 1994 'Riding the waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business' McGraw Hill, New York NY
37. Yun S, Cox J & Sims H. P 2006. 'The forgotten follower: a contingency model of leadership and follower self-leadership' *Journal of Managerial Psychology* Vol. 21 (4) pp374-388
38. www.geerthofstede.nl accessed on 29 April 2007

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: The Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS: Read each of the following items carefully and try to decide how true the statement is in describing you. Click the button that represents your view according to the scale given below. To be able to click your responses you must exit the design mode on the box that appears on the bottom right hand corner.

1. = Not at all accurate
2. = Somewhat accurate
3. = A little accurate
4. = Mostly accurate
5. = Completely accurate

QUESTION	RATING
1. I use my imagination to picture myself performing well on important tasks.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
2. I establish specific goals for my own performance.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
3. Sometimes I find I am talking to myself (out loud or in my head) to help me deal with difficult problems I face.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
4. When I do an assignment especially well, I like to treat myself to something or activity I especially enjoy.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
5. I think about my own beliefs and assumptions whenever I encounter a difficult situation.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
6. I tend to get down on myself in my mind when I have performed poorly.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
7. I make a point to keep track of how well I'm doing at work (school).	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
8. I focus my thinking on the pleasant rather than the unpleasant aspects of my job (school) activities.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
9. I use written notes to remind myself of what I need to accomplish.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐

10. I visualise myself successfully performing a task before I do it.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
11. I consciously have goals in my mind for my work efforts.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
12. Sometimes I talk to myself (out loud or in my head) to work through difficult situations.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
13. When I do something well, I reward myself with a special event such as a good dinner, movie, shopping trip, etc.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
14. I try to mentally evaluate the accuracy of my own beliefs about situations I am having problems with.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
15. I tend to be tough on myself in my thinking when I have not done well on a task.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
16. I usually am aware of how well I'm doing as I perform an activity.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
17. I try to surround myself with objects and people that bring out my desirable behaviours.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
18. I use concrete reminders (e.g. notes and lists) to help me focus on things I need to accomplish.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
19. Sometimes I picture in my mind a successful performance before I actually do a task.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
20. I work towards specific goals I have set for myself.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
21. When I am in difficult situations I will sometimes talk to myself (out loud or in my head) to help me get through it.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
22. When I have successfully completed a task, I often reward myself with something I like.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
23. I openly articulate and evaluate my own assumptions when I have a disagreement with someone else.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
24. I feel guilty when I perform a task poorly.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
25. I pay attention to how well I'm doing in my work.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
26. When I have a choice, I try to do my work in ways that I enjoy rather than just trying to get it over with.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐

27. I purposefully visualise myself overcoming the challenges I face.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
28. I think about the goals that I intend to achieve in the future.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
29. I think about and evaluate the beliefs and assumptions I hold.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
30. I sometimes openly express displeasure with myself when I have not done well.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
31. I keep track of my progress on projects I'm working on.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
32. I seek out activities in my work that I enjoy doing.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
33. I often mentally rehearse the way I plan to deal with a challenge before I actually face the challenge.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
34. I write specific goals for my own performance.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
35. I find my own favourite way to get things done.	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐

Appendix 2: The Value Survey Module 94 Questionnaire

Please think of an ideal job, disregarding your present job, if you have one.
Please respond to items 1 through 14 using the following scale:

1. = Of utmost importance
2. = Very important
3. = Of moderate importance
4. = Of little importance
5. Of very little or no importance

1. Have sufficient time for your personal or family life	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
2. Have good physical working conditions (good ventilation and lighting, adequate work space, etc.)	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
3. Have a good working relationship with your direct superior	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
4. Have security of employment	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
5. Work with people who cooperate well with one another	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
6. Be consulted by your direct superior in his/her decision-making	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
7. Have an opportunity for advancement to higher-level jobs	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
8. Have an element of variety and adventure in the job	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
In your private life, how important is each of the following to you? (Please indicate one answer in each line across)	
9. Personal stability	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
10. Thrift	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
11. Persistence (Perseverance)	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
12. Respect for tradition	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐

13. How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?	Frame14 ☐ never ☐ seldom ☐ sometimes ☐ usually ☐ always
How frequently in your experience, are subordinates afraid to express disagreement with their superiors?	Frame15 ☐ very seldom ☐ seldom ☐ sometimes ☐ frequently ☐ very frequently

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements? (Please click one answer in each line across according to the scale below)

1. = Strongly agree
2. = Agree
3. = Undecided
4. = Disagree
5. = Strongly disagree

Most people can be trusted	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
15. One can be a good manager without having precise answers to most questions that subordinates may raise about their work	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
16. An organisation structure in which certain subordinates have two bosses should be avoided at all costs	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
17. Competition between employees usually does more harm than good	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
18. A company's or organisation's rules should not be broken, not even when the employee thinks it is in the company's best interest	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐
19. When people have failed in life it is often their own fault	1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐

Some information about yourself (for statistical Purposes)

21. Are you	☐ male ☐ female
22. How old are you?	☐ under 20 ☐ 20-24 ☐ 25-29 ☐ 30-34 ☐ 35-39 ☐ 40-49 ☐ 50-59 ☐ 60 or over
23. How many years of formal education (or its equivalent) did you complete (including primary school)?	Frame18 ☐ 10 years or less ☐ 11 years ☐ 12 years ☐ 13 years ☐ 14 years ☐ 15 years ☐ 16 years ☐ 17 years ☐ 18 years or over
24. If you have or have had a paid job, what kind of job is it/was it?	Frame19 ☐ No paid job (includes full time students) ☐ Unskilled or semi-skilled manual worker ☐ Generally trained office worker or secretary ☐ Vocationally trained craftsperson,technician, informatician, nurse, artist or equivalent ☐ Academically trained professional or equivalent (but not a manager of people) ☐ Manager of one or more surbodinates(non ☐ Manager of one or more managers

25. What is your nationality?	
What was your nationality at birth (if different)?	

Would you be willing to take part in a telephone interview to confirm or expand on your responses? ☐ yes ☐ NO

Contact telephone: ☐

Appendix 3 Request for permission from organization

Date

Dear Sir/Madam:

As part of the requirements for the degree of Master in Business Leadership at University of South Africa School of Business Leadership, Midrand South Africa, I intend to conduct a survey among personnel in a number of multicultural organisations in Botswana.

The purpose of this study is to establish any correlation between an individual's view to self-leadership strategies and national culture influences on such views. The identification of factors that influence self-leadership may be helpful in explaining individual behaviours in team based organizational work.

I am therefore requesting your cooperation in giving me access to the personnel database and email and telephone contacts of your personnel to enable me to mail validated questionnaires to measure the self-leadership orientation and national culture dimensions. The two questionnaires will take the participants about 40 minutes to fill out. The data will be kept confidential and results of the study will be available to your organization upon request.

All MBL 3 research is supervised and my study leader is:

Professor Stella Nkomo
Bateman Distinguished Professor of Business Leadership
Graduate School of Business
University of South Africa
Office phone: +27 11 652 0365
Mobile: +27 82 416 6308
Fax: +27 11 652 0240

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Patricia Shungu Kawondera
JICA/JOCV Botswana office
P/Bag 00369
Gaborone
Tel: 71609727

Appendix 4. Request for participation letter

Date

Dear Sir/Madam:

My name is Patricia Shungu Kawondera. As part of the requirements for the degree of Master in Business Leadership at University of South Africa School of Business Leadership, in Midrand South Africa, I intend to conduct a survey among personnel in a number of multicultural organisations in Botswana.

The purpose of this study is to establish any correlation between an individual's view to self-leadership strategies and national culture influences on such views. The identification of factors that influence self-leadership may be helpful in explaining individual behaviours in team based organizational work.

I am therefore requesting your cooperation in filling in the attached questionnaires to measure the self-leadership orientation and national culture dimensions. The two questionnaires will take you about 40 minutes to fill out. The data will be kept confidential and results of the study will be presented as aggregate summary data and no individually identifiable information will be disclosed or published. Please note there are no right or wrong answers.

If you wish, you may request a copy of the results of this research by writing to the researcher at:

Patricia Shungu Kawondera
JICA/JOCV Botswana office
P/Bag 00369
Gaborone
Tel: 71609727

Thank you for your cooperation.

Appendix 5: Numerical coding of Demographic Variables

Demographic Variable	Code
Gender	
• Male	1
• Female	2
Nationality	
• USA	1
• Japan	2
• Botswana	3
Age	
• 20 years and under	1
• 20-24 years	2
• 25-29 years	3
• 30-34 years	4
• 35-39 years	5
• 40-49 years	6
• 50-59 years	7
• 60 years and above	8
Education Category	
• 10 years or less	1
• 11 years	2
• 12 years	3
• 13 years	4
• 14 years	5
• 15 years	6
• 16 years	7
• 17 years	8
• 18 years or over	9

Job category • No paid job (includes full time students • Unskilled or semi-skilled manual worker • Vocationally trained craftsperson, technician, informatician • Academically trained professional or equivalent (but not manager of people) • Manager of one or more subordinates • Manager of one or more manager	 1 2 3 a 4 5 6

Appendix 6: Mean and Standard Deviations on Hofstede's cultural dimensi ons

	USA Mean (SD)	JAPAN Mean (SD)	BOTSWANA Mean (SD)
Individualism (IDV)			
• Have sufficient time for your personal or family life	1.63 (1.04)	2.56 (1.33)	1.60 (0.68)
• Have good physical working conditions (good ventilation and lighting, adequate work space, etc.)	2.44 (1.03)	2.72 (0.98)	1.65 (0.99)
• Have security of employment	2.56 (1.14)	3.12 (1.05)	1.70 (1.03)
• Have an element of variety and adventure in the job	1.88 (1.29)	2.76 (1.42)	1.70 (0.86)
Power Distance (PDI)			
• Have a good working relationship with your superior	171 (1.01)	2.00 (1.41)	1.55 (1.00)
• Be consulted by your direct superior in his/her decisions	2.49 (0.93)	2.80 (0.88)	3.25 (0.83)
• How frequently, in your experience, are subordinates afraid to express disagreement with their superiors?	2.73 (1.00)	3.76 (1.12)	3.70 (117)
• An organization structure in which certain subordinates have two bosses should be avoided at all costs	2.95 (1.14)	2.48 (1.22)	2.55 (1.23)
Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI)			
• How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?	3.15 (0.69)	2.84 (0.80)	3.25 (0.44)
• One can be a good manager without having precise answers to most questions that subordinates may raise about their work	2.71 (1.21)	2.40 (0.87)	3.05 (1.23)
• Competition between employees usually do more harm than good	2.73 (123)	2.56 (1.12)	2.80 (1.23)
• A Company's or organization's rules should not be broken- not even when employee thinks it is in the company's best interest	3.37 (0.97)	2.96 (1.02)	3.55 (1.10)
Masculinity (MAS)			
• Work with people who cooperate well with one another	2.71 (1.02)	3.00 (1.35)	1.95 (1.00)
• Have an opportunity for advancement to higher level jobs	1.78 (1.08)	2.92 (0.95)	1.40 (0.99)
• Most people can be trusted	2.88 (1.02)	2.88 (0.93)	3.90 (1.39)
• When people have failed in life it is often their own fault	2.78 (1.05)	2.92 (1.17)	2.95 (1.16)
Long-Term Orientation (LTO)			
• Personal stability	2.17 (1.07)	2.68 (1.14)	1.40 (0.94)
• Thrift	2.95 (0.89)	2.52 (0.91)	2.05 (1.10)
• Persistence (Perseverance)	2.00 (1.05)	2.64 (132)	1.75 (0.97)
• Respect for tradition	3.22 (1.15)	3.04 (1.14)	2.20 (0.77)

Note: 1=utmost importance, 2=very important, 3=moderate importance, 4=little importance, 5=very little or no importance

Appendix 7. Geert Hofstede Scores

Country	PDI	IDV	MAS	UAI	LTO
Arab World**	80	38	52	68	
Argentina	49	46	56	86	
Australia	36	90	61	51	31
Austria	11	55	79	70	
Bangladesh*	80	20	55	60	40
Belgium	65	75	54	94	
Brazil	69	38	49	76	65
Bulgaria*	70	30	40	85	
Canada	39	80	52	48	23
Chile	63	23	28	86	
China*	80	20	66	30	118
Colombia	67	13	64	80	
Costa Rica	35	15	21	86	
Czech Republic*	57	58	57	74	13
Denmark	18	74	16	23	
East Africa**	64	27	41	52	25
Ecuador	78	8	63	67	
El Salvador	66	19	40	94	
Estonia*	40	60	30	60	
Finland	33	63	26	59	
France	68	71	43	86	
Germany	35	67	66	65	31
Greece	60	35	57	112	
Guatemala	95	6	37	101	
Hong Kong	68	25	57	29	96
Hungary*	46	80	88	82	50
India	77	48	56	40	61
Indonesia	78	14	46	48	
Iran	58	41	43	59	
Ireland	28	70	68	35	
Israel	13	54	47	81	
Italy	50	76	70	75	
Jamaica	45	39	68	13	
Japan	54	46	95	92	80
Luxembourg*	40	60	50	70	
Malaysia	104	26	50	36	
Malta*	56	59	47	96	
Mexico	81	30	69	82	

Morocco*	**70**	**46**	**53**	**68**	
Netherlands	**38**	**80**	**14**	**53**	**44**
New Zealand	**22**	**79**	**58**	**49**	**30**
Norway	**31**	**69**	**8**	**50**	**20**
Pakistan	**55**	**14**	**50**	**70**	**0**
Panama	**95**	**11**	**44**	**86**	
Peru	**64**	**16**	**42**	**87**	
Philippines	**94**	**32**	**64**	**44**	**19**
Poland*	**68**	**60**	**64**	**93**	**32**
Portugal	**63**	**27**	**31**	**104**	
Romania*	**90**	**30**	**42**	**90**	
Russia*	**93**	**39**	**36**	**95**	
Singapore	**74**	**20**	**48**	**8**	**48**
Slovakia*	**104**	**52**	**110**	**51**	**38**
South Africa	**49**	**65**	**63**	**49**	
South Korea	**60**	**18**	**39**	**85**	**75**
Spain	**57**	**51**	**42**	**86**	
Surinam*	**85**	**47**	**37**	**92**	
Sweden	**31**	**71**	**5**	**29**	**33**
Switzerland	**34**	**68**	**70**	**58**	
Taiwan	**58**	**17**	**45**	**69**	**87**
Thailand	**64**	**20**	**34**	**64**	**56**
Trinidad*	**47**	**16**	**58**	**55**	
Turkey	**66**	**37**	**45**	**85**	
United Kingdom	**35**	**89**	**66**	**35**	**25**
United States	**40**	**91**	**62**	**46**	**29**
Uruguay	**61**	**36**	**38**	**100**	
Venezuela	**81**	**12**	**73**	**76**	
Vietnam*	**70**	**20**	**40**	**30**	**80**
West Africa	**77**	**20**	**46**	**54**	**16**

Source: www.geert-hofstede.com
***Estimated Values**

**** Regional estimated values**

'Arab world' = Egypt, Iraq, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates
'East Africa' = Ethiopia. Kenya. Tanzania, Zambia

'West Africa' = Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone

Country's name for more details

Key

PDI	Power Distance Index
IDV	Individualism
MAS	Masculinity
UAI	Uncertainty Avoidance Index
LTO	Long-Term Orientation