Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2008

The influence of cultural perspectives and conflict resolution on employee perceptions of leadership effectiveness

Cynthia Lorraine Owens

THE INFLUENCE OF CULTURAL PERSPECTIVES AND CONFLICT

RESOLUTION ON EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP

EFFECTIVENESS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

in

Psychology:

Industrial/Organizational

by

Cynthia Lorraine Owens

March 2008

THE INFLUENCE OF CULTURAL PERSPECTIVES AND CONFLICT

RESOLUTION ON EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF LEADERSHIP

EFFECTIVENESS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Cynthia Lorraine Owens

March 2008

Approved by:

Dr. Mark Agars, Chair, Psychology	3/4/08 Date
Dr. Jan Kottke	
Dr. Jean Peacock	

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine how cultural values and conflict resolution influence the perceptions employees form about their managers. The sample for this study included 118 participants representing various organizations from the United States. The research design of this study was a survey design, and utilized hierarchical regression to test a predictive model.

A four-step hierarchical regression model analysis was performed to examine the relationship between manager effectiveness and seven predictors: liking, similarity, cultural perspective (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, femininity/ masculinity), and conflict resolution. The findings of the current study revealed that cultural perspective was not a predictor of perception of manager effectiveness, whereas liking, similarity and conflict resolution did significantly predict an employee's perception of manager effectiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

There is an abundance of research that focuses on
leadership and culture within organizational settings.
Much of the previous research in the domain of culture has
examined culture across national boundaries (Suzuki, 1998;
Triandis & Gelfand, 1998; Hanges, Lord & Dickson, 2000;
Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Hofstede, 1980). National
culture, however, may migrate into the subcultures within
an individual country. This is particularly true in
countries such as the United States because of the diverse
backgrounds in which the people have origins. In other
words, most everyone in the United States has national
origins that stem from other countries whether the
relation is recent or historical. Consequently, this
diversity of cultural backgrounds can also be observed
within organizational settings and these subcultures are
an important to the way culture should be considered.

Cultural differences affect the relationships that
people form within the workplace (Cox, 1991). Therefore,
before we can truly understand why people interact
differently with one another, awareness of differences in
cultural beliefs and the impact that culture has on

individuals must occur. Individual employees have personal values and beliefs about the ideal organization and perceptions of organizational reality (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1989). These values and beliefs held by the subordinates impact the perceptions they hold about their managers (Hui & Lee, 2000). With the proliferation of globalizing businesses, cultural awareness is increasingly important for organizations (Cox, 1991). Consequently, culture has become a popular topic in social science and in business research. Organizations that embrace and learn to cope with the cultural differences within their businesses will prosper in the global business arena (Cox, 1991). Continued research on cultural aspects can only benefit the understanding and awareness of cultural issues in both scientific and applied settings. In addition, an increased understanding of cultural perspectives may increase knowledge about perceptions employees hold about their supervisors.

In addition to understanding and being aware of cultural differences, it is beneficial for organizations to understand how managers are perceived by their employees. This comprehension of the perceptions about the manager can be instrumental in understanding what causes the behaviors exhibited by employees within the workplace.

A manager's ability to influence his or her subordinates is commonly linked with how effective the manager is perceived to be (Yukl & Tracey, 1992). It is reasonable to believe that the actions of a manager will consequently affect the way this manager is viewed. The influence tactics used and the perception of manager effectiveness are likely to vary considerably dependent upon the culture in which the leader is functioning (Pasa, 2000). The relationship between culture and the way managers are perceived by their subordinates is increasingly important as more and more organizations join the global market.

A part of the job description that is typical for manager performance is conflict resolution or conflict management. Ideally, conflicts are dealt with prior to crises however this is not always the case. This situational factor could likely have an effect on the perceptions that subordinates have about their managers. Consequently, it is relevant to understand how managers resolve conflict and how this changes the perceptions that their subordinates have toward them. Previous research indicates that employees perceive their manager's effectiveness differently in crisis versus non-crisis situations (Mulder et al., 1986).

The purpose of the current study is to explore the relationship between cultural values and perceptions of manager effectiveness. In addition, the study will investigate how an interaction between manager's conflict resolution and culture can impact this relationship. The employee's interpretation of a situation within the organization will be strongly influenced by the cultural values in which he or she holds (Bhagat et al., 2002). Therefore, this study investigates the impact of an individual's culture on his or her interpretation of his or her manager's actions and how effective they perceive the manager to be. Specifically, this study will explore if a person's cultural perspective can predict perception of manager effectiveness and if that relationship is further explained by an interaction between cultural and the manager's ability to resolve conflicts within the organization.

This paper begins with exploration of differences in cultural values and the importance that culture holds in organizations. Subsequently, this paper examines literature on perceptions of manager effectiveness and ways that managers resolve conflicts in organizations.

Cultural Values

Culture is defined in many ways but all the definitions articulate culture as a set of shared values, beliefs and practices (van Oudenhoven, 2001). National culture refers to beliefs, practices and values of the majority of people from a particular nation (van Oudenhoven, 2001). These cultural values vary in importance from person to person and transcend specific situations (Schwartz, 1990). In other words, these differences in cultural values can be conceptualized as individual differences (Wagner, 1995) and a person's cultural values strongly influence the way a situation is interpreted (Bhagat et al., 2002). Cultural differences exist between nations, but also exist within a single country and not just across national borders (Bhagat et al., 2002). Robert and Wasti (2002) also support cultural values as being present not only at the societal level but also at the individual level. This is important because if culture can be conceptualized as an individual difference, as individuals interact within organizations, culture has an impact on the perceptions held by these employees. Additionally, this conceptualization supports that because of individual level differences in cultural values, it is important for organizations to have heightened awareness

5

of cultural differences when selecting employees for particular job assignments. This is especially critical in selection for expatriate assignments but can impact organizations in all aspects of business practices.

Hofstede (1980) defines four dimensions of cultural values for national culture which can be conceptualized at the individual level. First, power distance is the degree of decision making power that a manager gives to his/her subordinates. Second, uncertainty avoidance is the level of flexibility of the rules that is used when dealing with ambiguous situations. Third, the individualism/ collectivism dimension is defined as the level of freedom a person has to take his or her own approach. In other words, the level of importance placed on one's personal goals versus the goals of a collective group. Last, Hofstede's masculinity/femininity dimension relates to the degree of dominant values possessed such as highly assertive values versus illustrating concern for others. However, the masculinity/femininity dimension of cultural values is characterized by gender role differences (Hofstede, 1980). In addition, there is empirical support for the Hofstede's cultural dimensions at the individual level (Wagner, 1995). Aycan et al. (2000) also explain

that individual level values are influenced by the societal level of culture.

Power Distance

Hofstede (1980) identifies power distance as the amount of respect and difference between those in superior and subordinate social positions. In an organizational setting, power distance is the level or degree of power one has compared to others in the organizational hierarchy. This is conceptualized as the relational differences that exist between a superior and his subordinates. Hofstede also notes that individualism/ collectivism and power distance are treated as separate dimensions but that these two dimensions are strongly and negatively correlated with each other. For example, the United States is characterized by high individualism and low power distance. This dimension is important at the individual level because of the need to understand how people perceive distributions of power.

In a study by Van Oudenhoven (2001) researchers examined perceived versus desired level of power distance. Van Oudenhoven reports that in all the countries studied, the respondents would like to have much less power distance than what they perceive there to be. One example his study portrayed was a sample that recently transformed

from authoritarian systems and how their differences between perceived and desired level of power distance were larger than in democratic systems. This is important because in order to effectively manage people in organizations, there must be an understanding of both internal and external factors that influence the different levels within organizations (Aycan et al., 2000). Individuals are influenced by societal and organizational cultures and both managers and their employees have perceptions about how to behave based on the societal norms (Aycan et al., 2000). According to Hofstede, this is explained by different norms for power distances that are found both within groups and between groups within a particular society.

Smith et al. (1998) explain that in handling disagreements, there is a difference in perceived effectiveness of the manager that is dependent on the level of power distance within the culture. For example, in low power distance society's there is a stronger dependence on subordinates and co-workers when disagreements arise. In contrast, in high power distance society's there is stronger dependence on policies and procedure. Smith et al. (1998) provide evidence for predicting relationships at the nation level of cultural

differences. They also report that power distance has
continuing validity in predicting the prevalence of an
extensive range of behaviors at the level of the
individual. This may be beneficial to organizations in
trying to gain understanding of employee behaviors.

Uncertainty Avoidance

This dimension of culture is defined as level of
inflexibility placed on rules and regulations used to
handle ambiguous situations (Hofstede, 1980). This is the
uncertainty found in situations that are being managed
through rules and procedures put in place to be followed
by members of the organization. Subordinates perceive
management differently depending on the situation at hand
(Mulder et al., 1986). In addition, the values of the
subordinates will vary in importance from person to person
(Schwartz, 1990). In other words, each individual employee
will have different values and a different perspective of
the situation. These individual differences will also
affect each subordinate's level of uncertainty avoidance.

One example of how uncertainty affects individuals is
that culture is embedded and transmitted through both
unspoken and precise open messages such as formal
organizational statements, design of office space, and
training by managers (Schein, 1984). Cultural analysis has

been used for examination of perceptions and interpretative processes within organizations (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1994). According to Hofstede (1980) uncertainty avoidance is dependent on the perceptions of the individual employees within an organization and the level of tolerance for uncertainty each subordinate accepts, and people possess different levels of tolerance. According to Shockley-Zalabak and Morley (1994) culture is reflected in the interpersonal relations within organizations and can be examined to understand organizational interactions and to establish the homogeneity of the members in a business. This ties to the current study because the perception of uncertainty and the tolerance one holds for uncertainty can affect the perception a subordinate has about the effectiveness of his or her manager. There are three indicators of uncertainty such as rule orientation, employment stability and stress (Hofstede, 1980). All of these aspects together make up the index that Hofstede used to measure uncertainty avoidance.

One aspect of uncertainty within organizations is that the way rules are communicated within an organization. Communicative processes of rules have influence on understanding and perceptions of behavior

(Schall, 1983). The rules are the unspoken organizational values and beliefs that are identified and evaluated by organizational members (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1994). Shockley-Zalabak and Morley explain that these rules regulate the behaviors expected on a day to day basis within an organization. The uncertainty involved in how rules are communicated by the manager may impact the employees' perceptions of the organization. The current study will examine how these perceptual changes affect the perceptions employees have about the effectiveness of their managers.

Another aspect of uncertainty avoidance conveyed by Hofstede is employment stability. Employment stability can be operationalized as the level of perception of job security and the anticipation of organizational changes (Hui & Lee, 2000). They go on to explain that a need for certainty and strive for control play important roles in perceptions of stability and outcomes such as job satisfaction, motivation, organizational commitment, job performance, absenteeism and symptoms of stress. Shockley-Zalabak and Morley (1989) report that individual employees have personal values and beliefs about the ideal organization and how work should be conducted. They explain that these individuals repeatedly contrast their

ideals against their perceptions of organizational reality. These perceptions are related to satisfaction and overall organizational effectiveness (Hui & Lee, 2000). Although job satisfaction is not the focus of the current study, it was important to note that it is a principal outcome linked with uncertainty within the organization and may have an impact on the perceptions a subordinate holds about his or her manager's effectiveness.

Stress as an indicator of uncertainty avoidance can be operationalized by consideration of two role stressors, ambiguity and conflict. Role ambiguity is typically defined by unpredictability about performance consequences and by information deficiency regarding behavioral expectations for that role (O' Driscoll & Beehr, 1994). Role conflict is defined as the incompatibility of demands with which an individual is faced (Jackson & Schuler, 1985). Role conflict occurs when there are incongruent expectations of behaviors perceived by the subordinates and those perceived by the managers (Jackson & Schuler, 1985). Uncertainty from the stressors, role ambiguity and role conflict, is a predicting factor that has influence on an employee's perceptions of his or her manager's behaviors (O' Driscoll & Beehr, 1994).

All of these aspects of uncertainty are used in the cultural dimension of uncertainty avoidance. Clearly, this dimension is important in understanding perceptions held within the organization. Uncertainty can have a dramatic effect on the outcomes of organizational changes and when uncertainty is encountered within the organization one of the major outcomes is dissatisfaction (O' Driscoll & Beehr, 1994). They go on the purport that dissatisfaction can be associated with other negative experiences such as reduction of organizational commitment and increased turnover. With the increase of change within organizations, a better understanding of perceptions held by employees about their superiors would likely help organizations reduce costly negative outcomes which in turn could increase productivity.

Individualism versus Collectivism

Individualism is characterized as a person's identity defined by personal choices and achievements (Hofstede, 1980). In contrast, Hofstede rationalizes collectivism as a person's identity being clarified by the collective groups to which the person is permanently attached. The level of individualism or collectivism of a person will lead to formation of values and in turn affects the way the person perceives information and his or her subsequent

13

behaviors (Bhagat et al., 2002). Smith and Bond (1998) report that differences exist between individualistic and collectivistic cultures and that this difference is one of the specific reasons that people vary in their behaviors and beliefs. Hofstede (1980) purports that the relationship between an individual person and the society in which he or she lives is linked through the societal norms of the person's environment. In other words, a person forms his or her own value system through experiences and influence from the society in which they live.

According to Schwartz (1994) many recent studies have used the individualism/ collectivism (I-C) dimension as a dichotomy. In other words, a person is either an individualist or a collectivist. However, this dichotomy is an oversimplification of the values within this cultural dimension (Schwartz, 1994). Hofstede (1980) used words such as "degree of" when discussing his cultural dimension indicating that the dimensions are continuous not dichotomous factors. The I-C dimension has support as both an individual difference variable (Moorman & Blakely, 1995) and as a characteristic within the dimensions of national culture (Hofstede, 1980). In other words, a person within a given society may be influenced by his or

her national culture but each individual holds a unique set of cultural values. Bhagat et al. (2002) support that within-country cultural differences exist and that the I-C dimension is not dichotomous. The current study will take this perspective, looking at cultural values at the individual level as dimensions along a continuum.

The I-C dimension of cultural difference can be clarified through theoretical foundations such as social identity theory and social influence theory. The beliefs and feelings that a person has toward the groups they see themselves as belonging to is defined as social identity (Kendrick et al., 1999). A person can also be influenced by others which are distinct social influences (Kendrick et al., 1999).

Social identity theory is the foundation that people manage their social identity by comparison of other groups to the groups in which they belong (Kendrick et al., 1999). Triandis and Gelfand (1998) explain this in terms of individualism vs. collectivism. Individualistic cultures define self-identity as independent from in-group membership. In contrast, collectivistic culture is illustrated as interdependent on in-group membership. Markus and Kitayama (1991) have illustrated a number of consequences of self-conceptions. These self-conceptions

are believed to be critical in the influence of leader behaviors on subordinate reactions (Hanges, Lord, & Dickson, 2000). First, the type of information that is remembered is affected. Collectivists remember more information about the actions and behaviors of others than individualists do. Second, the emotions exhibited are affected. For example, collectivistic people frequently display sympathy and shame whereas individualists tend to exhibit anger, frustration and pride. Last, self-concepts affect motivational processes. For instance, collectivists tend to be motivated by needs such as need for affiliation, nurturance and similarities. However, these collectivistic motivations are also somewhat linked to influence processes.

Social influence theory is defined as changing overt behavior caused by pressure from others whether the pressure is real or perceived (Kendrick et al., 1999). Socio-cultural roles and norms involved in within group communication is the emphasis of the social influence theory (Workman, 2001). A manager's behavior can influence his or her employees having an effect on their self-concept and cultural values through socio-cultural events (Hanges, Lord, & Dickson, 2000). According to Saks and Ashforth (1997), strong norms are created to

16

forcefully influence the desired behaviors of group members. The social influence theory assumes that ideas among in-group members should be in agreement and may depend on group cohesion (Workman, 2001). In other words, cultural differences are influenced by a person's level of individualism/ collectivism. However, all the dimensions of culture that have an effect on a person's individual values.

Masculinity and Femininity

The masculinity/femininity dimension of cultural values is characterized by gender role differences (Hofstede, 1980). This relates to the degree of dominant values possessed such as highly assertive values typical for men versus women more characteristically illustrating concern for others (Hofstede, 1980). Gender role differences are commonly learned through socialization. According to Hofstede, there is a correlation between perceived goals of organizations and potential occupations that men and women possess. This is due to individual perceptual differences regarding the characteristics inherent of men and women (Luthar, 1996).

Luthar (1996) reports that one reason for difference in status and income between men and women is that the management styles of male and female authorities are

perceived as different by the employees within the organization. Women often receive unjust evaluations on measurements of leadership ability and performance due to gender stereotypical ideologies (Luthar, 1996). Consequently, Luthar (1996) asserts that when a female authority engages in an autocratic style of managing, her position tends to be devalued as compared to men. And, he argues that since the democratic style of leadership is observed as more preferable, women's social-oriented characteristics are actually more favorable than men's attributes. Hofstede (1980) proclaims that the perceptions and evaluations that subordinates hold about their managers are affected by the manager's sex.

Although, there is legislation that guarantees equal employment opportunity and equal pay for both men and women, data unequivocally supports that differences in attitudes and beliefs continue to exist in today's society regarding different standards for male and female authorities (Knoke & Ishio, 1998). Consequently, even though women have been increasingly joining the workforce and are being promoted into higher positions, their rates of pay, benefits, promotional opportunities and other economic rewards continue to be lower than those of men (Knoke & Ishio, 1998). These differences are influenced by

18

perceptual differences of men and women held by
organizational leaders and may have an impact on the
perceptions that subordinates hold about their supervisors
within the organization.

Zaccaro, Craig, and Quinn (1991) suggest that
authority member's behaviors do affect the work attitudes
and the perceptions held by subordinates. These attitudes
and behaviors are gender related due to the stereotypes
placed on both men and women. There are several
explanations for gender related perceptual differences of
leaders. These explanations are supported through previous
research on attribution theory, gender-role theory and
role congruity theory.

One of the explanations for gender related perceptual
differences in leadership is attribution theory (Luthar,
1996). This theory emphasizes that females attribute high
performance to external factors such as luck while males
may attribute a comparable performance to internal factors
such as ability or specific skills (Cash, Gillen, & Burns,
1977). Various studies have supported these findings.
These attributes can be perceptions of one's self ,
however an individual that holds these self-attributions
will likely have the same perceptions for comparable
others (Luthar, 1996). In other words, men and women often

attribute the success of women to external factors such as luck and the success of men to internal factors such as ability. This is a theorem, which impacts many of the evaluations a person makes due to socialization. In other words, prior social learning usually alters the perceptions appropriated toward attitudes within the workplace. Luthar (1996) reports those causal attributions for performance related to attribution theory may be critical in decision-making including employee selections, terminations and promotions. These attributions may also impact the perceptions that employees hold about his or her managers.

Another explanation of the perceptual differences between men and women is gender-role theory. This theory accentuates gender appropriate expectations for both men and women (Sapp, Harrod, & Zhao, 1996). These expectations determine that men display task-oriented characteristics and women emphasize social mannerisms. For example, men are stereotypically perceived with characteristics such as high self-confidence, low emotionality and more aggressive behavioral tendencies, which are traditionally interpreted as more strongly reflective of competent attributes of leadership (Lewis & Fagenson-Eland, 1998). Task-oriented behaviors may result in the subordinate having a better

understanding of his or her role requirements and more efficient use of resources (Sapp, Harrod, & Zhao, 1996). In contrast, women are typically perceived as high in social-oriented characteristics such as nurturance, high emotionality and kindness (Lewis & Fagenson-Eland, 1998). Social-oriented behaviors typically illustrate caring about a subordinate's feelings, building a relationship with the employees and increasing cooperation and participation (Sapp, Harrod, & Zhao, 1996). These characteristics are congruent with traditional perceptions that men are "better" at leadership positions due to stereotypically held views on what characteristics define a strong effective leader.

Gender-role theory suggests that acting in accordance with these shared expectations, both men and women strengthen the emergence of males into leadership positions (Sapp, Harrod, & Zhao, 1996). Aguinis and Adams (1998) support these research findings, reporting that gender-based differences in influence behaviors and perceptions result from gender role expectations. Johnson (1993) asserts that when female leaders enter an organization it is likely that they will be re-socialized by male leaders and subordinates to portray a more masculine style of authority. Another study by the same

author (Johnson, 1994) affirms that because women have been implicated as "powerless", when in positions of power they are more likely to use the more dominant language typically used by men.

This theory suggests that groups establish leadership by supporting task-oriented characteristics with higher status than person-oriented characteristics (Sapp, Harrod, & Zhao, 1996). This rationale concludes different expectations are defined for each gender. Because males have conventionally postulated roles of authority and competence has been evaluated with respect to male performance, men are expected to assume leadership positions based on task-oriented resources (Sapp, Harrod, & Zhao 1996). In contrast, females are not typically expected to assume leadership roles. Leadership emergence for women typically only transpires in female homogeneous groups (Johnson, 1994).

Another theory that offers explanation into the perceptual differences between men and women is the role congruity theory. This is a theory of prejudice and discrimination towards female leaders that results from the associations (i.e., consistencies or inconsistencies) between the characteristics of members of a social group and the requirements of the social roles (Eagly & Karau,

2002). Eagly and Karau (2002) argue that as a result of
inconsistencies between the female gender role and the
leader role, individuals have a tendency to form less
positive beliefs about female leaders than male leaders.
This is congruent with the gender role theories discussed
earlier.

The attribution, role congruity and gender role
theories predict that women are perceived to be less
likely to climb the corporate socio-economic ladder due to
gender based psychological and social barriers (Aguinis &
Adams, 1998). These artificial barriers are known as the
glass ceiling effect. Although more women are achieving
managerial positions, they are lower management or
supervisory positions rather than upper level placements
(Knoke & Ishio, 1998). This research supports that the
glass ceiling effect continues to hinder the advancement
of women into upper management.

As we can see, the role of the masculinity/femininity
dimension is supported through research on gender
differences. Traditionally, women and men have been
socialized into gender-roles that are congruent with
societal views. This socialization has affected the
perspectives held about individuals in all their roles
including their role in the workplace. In other words,

gender is a factor that influences the perceptions held by subordinates about their managers.

Leadership and Perceptions of Manager Effectiveness

Leadership is described as an influence process in which a manager is organizationally designated to have influence on one or more subordinates (Pasa, 2000). It is also important to note the manager's effectiveness will depend on the success of the manager in influencing his or her subordinates (Pasa, 2000). According to O'Driscoll and Beehr (1994) a supervisor is the most important person to the subordinate in the context of work and may impact both work and personal outcomes subordinates gain from their jobs. Therefore, if we understand what influences the subordinate's perceptions about his or her manager we will gain insight into how to effectively influence these outcomes.

There are several factors supported in previous studies to impact the perceptions a subordinate holds about his/her manager. These factors include the individual level cultural dimensions discussed in the previous sections of this paper, style of leadership, illustrating emotions and the situational contexts in which managers interact with their subordinates. Several

approaches have been taken in previous research to illustrate how managers' traits and behaviors influence the way subordinates perceive the manager's effectiveness (House & Aditya, 1997). In addition, some approaches suggest that there is an interaction between behaviors, traits and situational factors. In other words, many factors have an effect on the employee's perceptions about his or her manager.

One aspect that influences employee perceptions is the differences in the techniques utilized within organizations to manage workers. The effectiveness of a particular leadership style varies and can be dependent on the national culture and the individual employee's perceptions. Previous research demonstrates that subordinates perceive their managers differently dependent on the situation at hand (Mulder et al., 1986). One factor to how subordinates perceive the effectiveness of their managers is whether the situation is non-crisis or a crisis (Mulder et al., 1986). In other words, whether the situation is non-crisis like with normal day to day activities or if a crisis has developed. There is no one perfect style of management across all situations and leaders should adapt their style of managing to the situation. As a result, it is important to understand the

perceptions held by subordinates in order to be an effective manager.

In a study by Lewis (2000) the emotional factor of leader perceptions when the authority is exhibiting emotion was investigated. Her study purports that negative emotions can impact the follower's motivational level and can also affect the perceptions of leader credibility and competence. In other words, when followers observe emotion in their leaders it is suggested to directly impact the perceived competence of the authority. Therefore, if a negative emotion is displayed it can be established to elicit a negative response from the follower resulting in a decrease in perceived abilities of the authority. Johnson (1993) asserts that managers have a great deal to gain by illustrating positive emotional behavior rather than negative emotions. This promotes group solidarity and the subordinate typically conveys that they perceive the authority as more effective and more competent.

In addition to all of these factors that affect subordinates perceptions of their manager's effectiveness, the actions that a manager takes in conflict situation will also have an effect. In the current study, the belief is that the way a manager resolves conflict will moderate the way the employee perceives the manager's

effectiveness. In the next section of this paper we discuss the effects of conflict in more detail.

The Effects of Conflict

The diversity of the workforce is increasing and has become a predictable feature in organizations (Elangovan, 1995). There has been a movement toward globalizing business on both the national and industrial level. This diversification has led to changing values and attitudes of individuals within the workplace. Conflicts occur among employees across many issues such as performance, responsibilities, and company policies (Lissak & Sheppard, 1983). Therefore, management of conflict is a component of effectively managing cultural differences and is becoming progressively more important for organizations.

One common approach to dealing with conflict between employees is directly between the disputants. However, it is often necessary for managers to step in to resolve disputes between their subordinates (Elangovan, 1995). Lissak and Sheppard (1983) found that supervisors tend to value aspects such as fairness, getting all the facts, maximizing resolution of the conflict, expediting resolution and reducing the probability of similar conflicts in the future. In order to accomplish this,

managers need to understand the values and attitudes of their employees. Incidentally, this comprehension can evolve from understanding the perceptions held by the subordinates.

Managers that effectively handle conflict situations are typically perceived as competent communicators and capable leaders and those unable to effectively handle conflict situations will likely have difficulty reaching organizational goals (Gross & Guerrero, 2000). In addition, these managers will also have trouble maintaining positive relationships and cohesiveness with and among their subordinates (Gross & Guerrero, 2000). Conflict management skills are fundamental to perceptions of leadership effectiveness (Korabik, Baril & Watson, 1993). The issue of what style to use for conflict resolution can be dependent on many factors such as cultural values. In other words, a supervisor needs to be aware of the way subordinates perceive him/her due to cultural values. According to Hofstede (1980) there are several relevant points to make about conflict strategies from a cultural perspective.

In high power-distance situations, subordinates are more likely to accept hierarchical decisions and accept the status quo (Adler, 1986). In addition, they are less

likely to oppose their managers or question their decisions. In contrast, employees in low power-distance cultures question the actions of their managers and more often communicate disagreement. Therefore, more conflict is displayed in low power-distance cultures compared to high power distance cultures. This means that a manager in a high power-distance culture would be perceived as more effective when using a dominating or autocratic style to solve conflict. However, this issue is much more complex in low power distance cultures such as the United States. There is not one single style that will be relevant in all situations. Therefore, managers in low power distance settings often need to employ a mediating style to resolve conflicts (Hofstede, 1980).

Uncertainty avoidance is a prime example of how conflicts escalate. In cultures with high uncertainty-avoidance there is typically less tolerance for ambiguity than in high low uncertainty-avoidance settings (Hofstede, 1980). In other words, in cultures with low uncertainty avoidance, subordinates are more willing to accept resolving conflicts themselves and the managers are more accepting of delegating responsibility and authority (Elangovan, 1995). Knowing how much

uncertainty is perceived by subordinates can be instrumental to a leader when managing conflict.

Knowing the level of disputants' positioning on the individualism-collectivism continuum can be important in selecting a way to resolve a conflict (Elangovan, 1995). For example, subordinates with collectivistic perspectives are more likely to be open to allowing other employees not involved in the conflict to be involved in the resolution process. In addition, conflicts between employees in collectivist cultures are likely to be less frequent than between employees in individualist cultures (Elangovan, 1995). With the movement toward globalizing business and increasing diversification within organizations knowing the cultural values held by employees will aid in what strategy to use when solving a conflict (Elangovan, 1995).

The Masculinity/Femininity dimension is important in understanding the perspectives held by subordinates (Hofstede, 1980). According to Hofstede, employees with high masculinity typically value assertiveness and acquisition of resources. In contrast employees with feminine perspectives have greater concern for people, maintaining positive relationships, and quality of life (Hofstede, 1980). Therefore, the degree of masculinity or femininity underlying a certain perspective may have

implications for how managers should interact with their subordinates involved in the dispute (Elangovan, 1995).

In summary, there are many factors that go into successful resolution of a conflict. The way a conflict is resolved will affect the perceptions that subordinates hold about the effectiveness of his or her manager. The current study will explore how conflict impacts these perceptions.

Purpose of the Present Study and Hypotheses

The purpose of the present study is to examine how cultural values and conflict resolution influence the perceptions employees form about their managers. In other words, we are exploring subordinates' values and beliefs and how these perspectives impact perceptions held about management. Previous studies support that employees have personal values and beliefs about the ideal organization (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1989) and these values and beliefs impact the perceptions they hold about their managers (Hui & Lee, 2000). Therefore, it is instrumental to understand employee perceptions in order to understand behaviors exhibited in the workplace.

According to Cox (1991) with the proliferation of globalizing businesses the issue of culture awareness is

31

increasingly important for organizations. Companies that embrace and learn to cope with the cultural differences within their businesses will prosper in the global business arena (Cox, 1991). Cultural values can be conceptualized as individual differences (Wagner, 1995) and a person's cultural values strongly influence the way a situation is interpreted (Bhagat et al., 2002). Therefore, in the present study we explore cultural dimensions at the individual level, examining factors such as amount of power distance, individualism/collectivism, level of uncertainty avoidance and masculinity/femininity.

In the present study we examine power distance to get a better understanding of why employees behave in certain ways. According to Aycan, et al. (2000) in order to effectively manage people in organizations, we need to understand all factors that influence the different hierarchical levels, and cultural norms affect perceptions of how to behave. Smith et al. (1998) report that power distance has continuing validity in predicting an extensive range of behaviors at the level of the individual within the organization. They also explain that there is a difference in perceived manager effectiveness that is dependent on the level of power distance. Therefore, in the present study we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1A: Subordinates higher in power distance will perceive their manager as more effective than subordinates that are lower in power distance.

Uncertainty avoidance is important because it affects perceptions of rule orientation, employment stability and stress (Hofstede, 1980). Uncertainty avoidance can have a dramatic effect on the outcomes of organizational changes and when it is encountered within the organization one of the major outcomes is dissatisfaction leading to increases in turnover and reductions in organizational commitment. Within the increase of change in organizations, it is important to understand perception of uncertainty. Therefore, in the present study we examine uncertainty avoidance and hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1B: Subordinates that have high uncertainty avoidance will perceive their manager as less effective than subordinates that have lower uncertainty avoidance.

Another dimension that affects perceptions of manager effectiveness is level of individualism or collectivism of an employee. According to Bhagat et al. (2002) a person's level of individualism or collectivism leads to formation of values and affects the way the person perceives information and the way they behave. A person within a given society may be influenced by his or her national

culture but each individual holds a unique set of cultural
values. In addition, the behaviors of a manager can
influence his or her employee's self-concept and his or
her cultural values through socio-cultural events (Hanges,
Lord & Dickson, 2000). Therefore, it is important to
understand the subordinate's individual values and in
turn, the perceptions they hold about their manager. We
explore the dimension of individualism/collectivism in the
present study and hypothesize:

Hypothesis 1C: Subordinates higher in collectivism will
perceive their manager as more effective than subordinates
that are higher in individualism.

Luthar (1996) reports that one reason for difference
in status and income between men and women is that
management styles of male and female authorities are
perceived as different by the employees within the
organization. Cultural values are characterized by
perceived gender role differences and the perception of
the degree of dominant values possessed by the manager
(Hofstede, 1980). These perceptions of masculinity/
femininity can be perceptions of one's self, however an
individual that holds these self-attributions will likely
have the same perceptions for comparable others (Luthar,
1996). Therefore, it is important to understand the level

of masculinity or femininity that an employee has in order to understand the way it affects his or her perceptions of management. Consequently, in the present study we investigate the subordinate's level of masculinity/femininity hypothesizing:

Hypothesis 1D: Subordinates higher in masculinity will perceive their manager as more effective than subordinates that are higher in femininity.

Another aspect that influences the perceptions that employees have about the abilities of their managers is how the manager resolves conflict. Conflict management skills are fundamental to perceptions of leadership effectiveness (Korabik, Baril, & Watson, 1993). There are many factors that go into success resolution of a conflict and how conflict is resolved will affect the perception that subordinates hold about the effectiveness of their managers. Incidentally, in the current study we explore how conflict impacts perceptions of manager effectiveness and we hypothesize:

Hypothesis 2: Conflict resolution success will predict perceptions of manager effectiveness.

Conflicts occur among employees across many issues such as performance, responsibilities, and company policies (Lissak & Sheppard, 1983). The issue of what

style to use for conflict resolution can be dependent on many factors such as cultural values (Korabik, Baril, & Watson, 1993). Conversely, management of conflict is a component of effectively managing cultural differences and is becoming progressively more important for organizations. Consequently, this relationship between conflict resolution and cultural perspectives leads to the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 3: There will be an interaction between conflict resolution and power distance on perceptions of manager effectiveness. Specifically, for supervisors lower in conflict resolution, perceptions of manager effectiveness will be low in high power distance but high in low power distance. With supervisors high in conflict resolution, perceptions of manager effectiveness will be high regardless of power distance.

Hypothesis 4: There will be an interaction between conflict resolution and individualism/ collectivism on perceptions of manager effectiveness. Specifically, with supervisors lower in conflict resolution, perceptions of manager effectiveness will be low in high individualism but higher in high collectivism. With supervisors high in conflict resolution, perceptions of manager effectiveness

36

will be high regardless of level of individualism/collectivism.

Hypothesis 5: There will be an interaction between conflict resolution and level of uncertainty avoidance on perceptions of manager effectiveness. Specifically, with supervisors lower in conflict resolution, perceptions of manager effectiveness will be low in high uncertainty avoidance but high in low uncertainty avoidance. With supervisors high in conflict resolution, perceptions of manager effectiveness will be high regardless of level of uncertainty avoidance.

Hypothesis 6: There will be an interaction between conflict resolution and masculinity/femininity on perceptions of manager effectiveness. Specifically, with supervisors lower in conflict resolution, perceptions of manager effectiveness will be low in high masculinity but higher in high femininity. With supervisors high in conflict resolution, perceptions of manager effectiveness will be high regardless of level of masculinity/femininity.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

Participants

The full sample of this study included 118 adult
participants. However, some respondents were missing data
on one or more variables including, 2 conflict resolution,
1 individualism/collectivism, and 6 manager effectiveness
and there was one univariate outliner. After evaluation of
missing data and all the assumptions the major analyses
were performed on data from 110 adults. Of the 110
respondents 70 were female (63.6%) and 40 were male
(36.4%). The gender of the manager the participant was
thinking of while responding to the questionnaire were 64
male (58.2%) and 46 female (41.8%). Of the 110
respondents, 75 were Caucasian (68.2%), 20 Latino American
(18.2%), 9 African American (8.2%), 4 Asian American
(3.6%), 1 Native American (.9%), and 1 respondent reported
an "other ethnic group" (.9%). The ethnicity of the
manager the participant was thinking of while responding
to the questionnaire were 91 Caucasian (82.7%), 13 Latino
American (11.8%), 3 African American (2.7%), and 3 Asian
American (2.7%). Of the 110 respondents, 24 were age 18-25
(21.8%), 25 were 26-35 years old (22.7%), 27 were 36-45

years old (24.5%), 26 were 46-55 years old (23.6%) and 8 were 56 years old or greater (7.3%). The sample for this study included employees representing various organizations from throughout the United States. Participants in this study responded from Maine, New Hampshire, New York, Michigan, Arizona and California. The majority of participants lived and worked in California and Arizona. Participants were recruited in classrooms on campus and through the friends and family of the researcher.

According to Cohen (1992) with an estimated medium effect size of .15, power of .80 and alpha of .05 this study required a minimum of 102 participants. The respondents were from various business settings. The main criterion for respondents was that the participant be employed for a minimum of 20 hours a week and have worked under the current manager for a minimum of one month. Participation in this study was voluntary. However, in the case that working students were used for the sample, participants received extra credit for their participation.

Procedures

The research design of this study was a survey design. The questionnaire developed was administered in multiple locations with the same written instructions administered for all participants. Some participants completed the questionnaire in the classroom while at school. Other respondents were given a questionnaire and completed it either in their home or the place of work. The participants in the classroom were given the paper-and-pencil measure, asked to respond and return it to the researcher. The other participants completed the questionnaire and returned it in a self-addressed, stamped envelop which was attached with the measure. The approximate time for completion of the questionnaire was 20 to 30 minutes.

Measures

A survey instrument was constructed using scales from different sources for the purpose of the present study [See Appendix A]. Most of the scales were obtained through previous research and modified for this study. The scales were modified to a 7-point Likert scale. For Section 1 (Cultural dimensions), Section 2 (Liking and Similarity) and Section 4 (Conflict resolution) the scales were

measured with "Strongly Disagree" as 1 and "Strongly Agree" as 7. For Section 3 (Manager effectiveness) the items were measured with 1 as "Almost Never" and 7 as "Almost Always".

Cultural Dimensions

Each of the four cultural variables (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, and masculinity/femininity) were measured using modified versions of the Dorfman and Howell's (1988) scales. The scales include a six-item power distance scale with reported reliability of .67, a six-item individualism-collectivism scale with reliability of .66, a five-item masculinity-femininity scale with reliability of .62, and a five-item uncertainty avoidance scale with reliability of .85. All of the cultural dimensions were measures on a 7-point Likert scale. High values on the power distance scale indicated higher levels of perceived power distance between the manager and the subordinate. High values on the individualism-collectivism scale indicated higher levels of collectivism of the participant. High values on the masculinity-femininity scale indicated higher levels of masculinity of the participant. High values on the uncertainty avoidance scale indicated higher levels of perceived uncertainty avoidance.

41

Similarity and Liking

The liking and similarity variables were used as control variables. These scales were adapted from two separate four item scales for the purpose of controlling for the true significance of the cultural dimensions. The four item liking scale is a modified version of the Wayne and Ferris (1990) liking for subordinate scale that was adapted for use to measure liking of a manager. The alpha reliability for the liking scale was .90 and the type of scale was a 7-point Likert scale. High values on the liking scale indicated higher levels of liking by the subordinate for manager.

The four item similarity scale is an adapted scale from Turban and Jones (1988). The reliability of this scale was .90 and the type of scale was also a 7-point Likert scale. High values on the similarity scale indicated higher levels of perceived similarity by the respondent to his or her manager.

Leadership Effectiveness

For leadership effectiveness, a modified version the Leadership Effectiveness Survey (LES) was used. The LES was originally constructed by Dr. Clinton McLemore of Relational Dynamics, Inc. Psychometrics on the LES was performed by Dr. Richard Gorsuch. The reliability of this

modified version was .97. Manager effectiveness was measured on a 7-point Likert scale. High values on the scale indicated higher levels of agreement with the statements made about the relationship between the respondent and his or her manager.

Conflict Resolution

The conflict resolution scale was adapted from the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument (TKI). The reliability of the TKI was .83 and the instrument was adapted by changing the scaling and adapting the questions to fit with the 7-point Likert scale. Conflict resolution was measured on a 7-point Likert scale. High values on the scale indicated higher levels on conflict resolution were displayed by the leader.

Demographic Questions

At the end of the questionnaire, participants completed a few of demographic questions which were adapted for our purposes. We asked the respondent's gender, age, and ethnicity. In addition, the respondent was asked the gender and ethnicity of the manager the respondent was thinking of while answering the questions in this questionnaire. In addition, we requested responses to work experience questions.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Data Screening

Prior to conducting the main statistical analysis, all study variables were examined for missing data, univariate and multivariate outliers, and for the assumptions of linearity, homoscedasticity, normality and homogeneity of regression. For the analysis and data screening, manager effectiveness was considered as the dependent variable, while the other seven test variables were treated as independent variables. During the data screening process, evaluation of assumptions was performed using SPSS for frequencies and regression analyses.

The full data set contained responses from a total of 118 adults. However, some respondents were missing data on one or more variables including, 2 conflict resolution, 1 individualism/collectivism, and 6 manager effectiveness. Power distance, uncertainty avoidance, femininity/ masculinity, liking, and similarity all had complete data. The missing data appeared to be random and due to the minimal nature, seven cases were deleted from this study.

Using a criterion of $z = 3.33$, $p < .001$ one univariate outlier was detected in this study. Case twelve

44

was an outlier due to very low perception of his/her manager's conflict resolution. This case was deleted from the study. There were no multivariate outliers detected with a Mahalanobis distance critical value = 24.32, $p < .001$.

The assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were examined through assessment of scatter plots of residuals and predicted scores and through analysis of skewness and kurtosis. Using the criterion of $Z = 2.96$, $p < .001$ there were no violations of normality due to kurtosis. However, using the criterion of $Z = 2.96$, $p < .001$ there were violations of normality due to significant skewness for the following variable: liking, similarity, femininity/masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance. Transformation of these variables was performed for correction. After the transformations, the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity were met. The assumptions of multicollinearity and singularity were assessed by examination of correlation matrix and these assumptions were met. After evaluation of all the assumptions the major analyses were performed on data from 110 adults.

Main Analysis

In order to test all the study hypotheses, a four-step hierarchical regression model analysis was performed to examine the relationship between manager effectiveness and seven predictors: liking, similarity, cultural perspective (power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, femininity/ masculinity), and conflict resolution. The first step consisted of the control variables liking and similarity. The second step added power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/ collectivism, and femininity/masculinity. The third step consisted of adding conflict resolution. The fourth step was to add the interactions between conflict resolution and power distance, conflict resolution and uncertainty avoidance, conflict resolution and individualism/collectivism, and conflict resolution and femininity/masculinity.

Table 1 depicts the raw score means, medians, standard deviations and minimum and maximum dispersions. Table 2 illustrates the correlations, means and standard deviations reported by the descriptive statistics in this analysis. Table 3 contains the results from the multivariate analysis. A model containing the control variables liking and similarity, does significantly

predict perception of manager effectiveness [R = .79, R^2 = .62, Adj. R^2 = .61, F (2,107) = 86.86, p < .01]. Sixty-two percent of the variance in manager effectiveness is accounted for by liking and similarity combined. Both liking (β = .40) and similarity (β = .23) produced significant standard beta coefficients (See Table 3).

Hypothesis one "cultural perspective will significantly predict an employee's perception of manager effectiveness" was not supported in this research study. Manager effectiveness was not predicted by adding the cultural perspective variables: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, and femininity/masculinity to a model that contains liking and similarity [R^2_{Change} = .01, $F_{inc.}$ (4,103) = .61, p = .66 (See Table 3)].

Hypothesis two "successful conflict resolution will predict perceptions of manager effectiveness" was supported in this research. Manager effectiveness can be significantly predicted by adding conflict resolution to a model that contains liking, similarity, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, and femininity/masculinity combined. R^2_{Change} = .04, $F_{inc.}$ (1,102) = 13.77, p < .01. Conflict resolution

produced a significant standard beta coefficient [β = .31 (See Table 3)].

Hypotheses three, four, five and six "there will be interactions between conflict resolutions and factors of cultural perspective on perceptions of manager effectiveness" were not supported by this research. Prediction of manager effectiveness was not significantly increased by adding the interactions between power distance and conflict resolution, individualism/ collectivism and conflict resolution, uncertainty avoidance and conflict resolution, and masculinity/ femininity and conflict resolution to a model that contains liking, similarity, power distance, individualism/collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity/femininity and conflict resolution [R^2 Change = .01, $F_{inc.}$ (4, 98) = .58, p = .68] (See Table 3)].

In summation, cultural perspective was not a predictive factor of perception of manager effectiveness. In addition, interactions between power distance and conflict resolution, uncertainty avoidance and conflict resolution, individualism/collectivism and conflict resolution, femininity/masculinity and conflict resolution were not predictive of perception of manager

effectiveness. However, the control variables liking and similarity were predictive of an employee's perception of manager effectiveness. And additionally, conflict resolution was predictive of perception of manager effectiveness. Nevertheless, in the current study cultural perception was not a predictive factor. Therefore, the findings of the current study revealed that cultural perspective was not a predictor of perception of manager effectiveness, whereas liking, similarity and conflict resolution did significantly predict an employee's perception of manager effectiveness.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

A supervisor is perhaps the most important person to a subordinate in the context of work, as he or she may impact both work and personal outcomes subordinates experience at their jobs (O'Driscoll & Beehr, 1994). Therefore, if we understand the factors that influence a subordinate's perceptions about his or her manager we gain insight into how to affectively influence these outcomes. Bhagat et al. (2002) stated that an employee's interpretation of a situation within the organization will be strongly influenced by the cultural values he or she holds. It is also important to understand how managers resolve conflict and how this changes the perceptions that their subordinates have toward them (Lissak & Sheppard, 1983). In other words, both cultural perspective and conflict resolution influence the how employees perceive the effectiveness of their manager. Consequently, the current study was conducted to gain understanding of how cultural perspectives and conflict resolution influence employees perceptions of their manager's effectiveness.

The present study used a survey design to examine the impact of cultural perspective (i.e., power distance,

50

uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, and femininity/masculinity (Hofstede, 1980)) and conflict resolution on perceptions of manager effectiveness. Two variables, liking and similarity, were also selected as control variables. Similarity and liking are important controls because they are characteristics of the leader-member exchange model (Phillips & Bedian, 1994), which articulates an important role for these variables in affecting the perceptions between leaders and subordinates. According to Pulakos and Wexley (1983), the more similar the subordinate and manager are, the more positive the perceptions that they hold for each other. Therefore, if the employee's cultural perspective is similar to the manager, they are likely to have more favorable perceptions of his or her manager. Liking has also been found to be a predictor of the leader-member exchange (Wayne & Ferris, 1990). Therefore, these control variables were selected so that the influence of the cultural dimensions on perceptions of manager effectiveness could be examined for their unique impact. Finally, the interactions between conflict resolution and cultural perspective were predicted to further explain perceptions of manager effectiveness. Although some findings were supportive of the anticipated role of

perceptions of manager effectiveness, the current study does not in large part support previous research or the expected relationship between culture and manager effectiveness.

The data from the present study did not support hypothesis one, that cultural perspective would significantly predict perception of manager effectiveness. According to Cox (1991) cultural differences affect the relationships that people form within the workplace. However, the current study revealed non-significant results for cultural perspective, as measured by Hofstede 1980. In addition, the interaction hypotheses (hypothesis 3-6) which predict that the interaction between conflict resolution and cultural perspective would further predict perceptions of manager effectiveness also were not supported. These findings could be in part due to the contributory factor of the control variables liking and similarity. In the current study, these control variables (liking and similarity) accounted for 62% of the variance in perception of manager effectiveness. Liking and similarity could be overlapping with the cultural variables causing the insignificant results of cultural perspective and the interactions. This could be due to the similarity of respondents for demographics such ethnic

background, gender and the manager's ethnic background.
For example, the majority of both the managers and the
respondents were Caucasian. Because of this speculation, a
regression of the data was rerun using subgroups of
supervisor-subordinate commonalities based on gender and
based on ethnicity. The pattern of results displayed
within each group matched the results described using the
overall data set.

Another purpose of the current study was to examine
how conflict resolution influenced the perceptions that
employees form about their manager's effectiveness. This
lead to the second hypothesis, that conflict resolution
success will predict perceptions of manager effectiveness.
Hypothesis 2 was supported in the current study. Conflict
resolution when added to a model that contained liking,
similarity and cultural perspective did significantly
predict perceptions of manager effectiveness. This finding
is consistent with much of the previous research.
According to Korabik, Baril, and Watson (1993), conflict
management skills are fundamental to perceptions of
leadership effectiveness. For example, when a situation
arises in the workplace between two employees, if the
supervisor steps in and resolves the problem the
supervisor will likely be perceived as an effective

leader. In other words, managers that effectively handle conflict situations are typically perceived as competent communicators and capable leaders and those unable to effectively handle conflict situations will likely have difficulty reaching organizational goals (Gross & Guerrero, 2000). In addition, the manager's ability to influence his or her subordinates is commonly linked with how effective the manager is perceived to be (Yukl & Tracey, 1992). In other words, to be perceived as an effective manager one must know how to successfully resolve conflict situations. The current study supported the relationship between conflict resolution and perception of manager effectiveness. As noted earlier, however, the interactions between conflict resolution and cultural factors did not explain additional variance.

In summation, the current study did not support previous research or yield the expected relationship between culture and perceptions of manager effectiveness. On the other hand, 'the role of conflict resolution was supported in the current study and consistent with previous research as predictive of perceptions of manager effectiveness. Despite the limited significant findings, the variables in the current study warrant future research.

Future Research and Implications

The results of this study revealed several interesting outcomes, though not all were consistent with prior research. Notable findings include that individual differences in cultural perspective were not predictive of perceptions of manager effectiveness, nor was the interaction between conflict resolution and cultural perspective. This is important because most previous research supports that culture is a contributory factor of an individual's perceptions and that cultural differences will impact a person's perceptions (Elangovan, 1995). Cultural differences exist between nations, but also exist within a single country and not just across national borders (Bhagat et al., 2002). In other words, there are subcultures within an individual country. In addition, with the proliferation of globalizing businesses, cultural awareness is increasingly important for organizations (Cox, 1991). Therefore, future research should be conducted on the influence of cultural perspective on the perceptions of manager effectiveness in organizational settings. Such research should include both single country studies and international samples.

In the current study, the control variables liking and similarity were added so that the influence of the

cultural dimensions on perceptions of manager effectiveness could be examined for their unique impact. The leader-member exchange theory (Phillips & Bedian, 1994) supports that liking and similarity will have an effect on interactions between a superior and a subordinate within an organization. Therefore, people with similar cultural perspectives are likely to have more favorable perceptions of one another. In the current study with liking and similarity included, cultural perspective did not add significantly to the prediction. The relationship between liking, similarity and cultural perspective is powerful and interesting. To better understand these results, future research could benefit from the exploration of liking and similarity using these same cultural dimensions. In addition, future research could benefit from liking and similarity research in organizational settings with both single country and international samples. This research could assist organizations in better understanding the impact that liking, similarity and cultural perspective have on the relationships between managers and subordinates.

Supported by both the current study and consistent with previous research, it is apparent that successful conflict resolution impacts perceptions of manager

effectiveness. Managers that effectively handle conflict

situations are typically perceived as competent

communicators and capable leaders and those unable to

effectively handle conflict situations will likely have

difficulty reaching organizational goals (Gross &

Guerrero, 2000). Therefore, the way a conflict is resolved

will affect the perceptions that subordinates hold about

the effectiveness of their manager and this was found in

the current study. One factor that influences how

subordinates perceive the effectiveness of their managers

is whether the situation is non-crisis or a crisis (Mulder

et al., 1986). This situational factor could likely have

an effect on the perceptions that subordinates have about

their managers. In addition, an employee's interpretation

of a situation within the organization will be strongly

influenced by the cultural values in which he or she holds

(Bhagat et al., 2002). Therefore cultural values and their

influence on perceptions of manager effectiveness yield

several future opportunities for both research and

practitioners. First, future research could benefit from

similar studies of the current study using participants

across international samples. This could expand

understanding of the influences of cultural perspective on

perceptions of manager effectiveness if the samples were

taken from dissimilar national cultures. Second, future

research could gain from exploration of conflict

resolution and perceptions of manager effectiveness in

organizational settings. This could increase knowledge for

the organizations of the perceptions that employees' hold

about their manager's effectiveness dependent on the

conflict situation. Third, with the knowledge that

conflict resolution does impact the perceptions of manager

effectiveness, organizations would benefit from training

at the supervisory level on both crisis management and

general conflict resolution techniques. This would allow

managers to develop stronger conflict resolution skills

and in turn employees would likely have more positive

perceptions of their managers.

Limitations

One of the limitations of this study may be in the

way in which culture was operationalized. Although

Hofstede's (1980) dimensions are well represented in the

field, the aspects of cultural perspective that may impact

leader perceptions may not be captured using these scales.

Further, the variability of culture in this study was

limited, which likely contributed to the non-significant

findings. However, using different cultural scales could yield different results.

Most of the limitations of this study can be contributed to the sample and sampling distribution. First, the sample in the current study was limiting because the sample came primarily from the West (California and Arizona). This is a limitation because the cultural environment within the United States is different regionally such as West coast, Mid-west and East coast. As the U.S. Census (2000) suggests, people that are migrating to the U.S. and settling in Arizona and California are typically from Mexico. In addition, people in the Northeast and other regions of the United States tend to migrate from other countries. Therefore, this Census (2000) data suggests the possibility of differences in cultural backgrounds and perspectives regionally within the United States. This limited the variability of the cultural dimensions of the current study. In addition, there is limited variance in the cultural perspective variables which may have limited the results of this study. However, by exploring the greater United States we might find more variability in cultural perspectives.

Secondly, the sample was confined to only participants in the United States. This impacted the

ability to generalize across international borders. Cultures within the United States are similar compared to cultural perspectives internationally such as Japan, China, Middle East and Central American (Hofstede, 1980). This is an important factor to take into account when looking at the proliferation of globalizing business (Cox, 1991). The current study was impacted by not being ability to generalize to a larger population.

Third, the questionnaire was distributed through people known by the researcher. This limited the study by narrowing the differences of the participants because we tend to associate with similar others. This could have impacted the results of the current study by limiting the variability of the responses from the participants.

Conclusion

The current study produced both significant and non-significant findings. The results of the current study were not significant when examining the influence of cultural perspective on perceptions of manager effectiveness. This could be because the respondents in this study were primarily from Arizona and California which limited the variability of the cultural dimensions. On the other hand, the results were significant when

examining the impact of conflict resolution on the perceptions of manager effectiveness. It is through research encompassing both significant and non-significant results that we can advance understanding of cultural perspectives, conflict resolution and perceptions of manager effectiveness. With the proliferation of globalizing businesses, cultural awareness is increasingly important for organizations (Cox, 1991). In addition, both the current study and previous research revealed that conflict resolution does influence perceptions of manager effectiveness. As business practices and the diversity of the workforce continue to change, it is important to continue to examine these variables within organizational settings. Through future research, organizations can be more successful at meeting their organizational goals by gaining better knowledge of how cultural perspectives and conflict resolution influence perceptions of manager effectiveness.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Section One

Directions: Below are several statements about various **characteristics**. For each item, please indicate the extent to which you believe each statement **characterizes your beliefs**.

1. I believe that managers should make most decisions without consulting subordinates.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

2. I believe it is frequently necessary for a manager to use authority and power when dealing with subordinates.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

3. I believe that managers should seldom ask for the opinions of employees.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. I believe that managers should avoid off-the-job social contacts with employees.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

5. I believe that employees should not disagree with management decisions.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

6. I believe that managers should not delegate important tasks to employees.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

7. I believe that it is important to have job requirements and instructions spelled out in detail so that employees always know what they are expected to do.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

8. I believe that managers expect employees to closely follow instructions and procedures.

☐ Strongly Disagree | ☐ Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Disagree | ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Agree | ☐ Agree | ☐ Strongly Agree

9. I believe that rules and regulations are important because they inform employees what the organization expects of them.

☐ Strongly Disagree | ☐ Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Disagree | ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Agree | ☐ Agree | ☐ Strongly Agree

10. I believe standard operating procedures are helpful to employees on the job.

☐ Strongly Disagree | ☐ Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Disagree | ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Agree | ☐ Agree | ☐ Strongly Agree

11. I believe that instructions for operations are important for employees on the job.

☐ Strongly Disagree | ☐ Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Disagree | ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Agree | ☐ Agree | ☐ Strongly Agree

12. I believe that the group welfare is more important than my own individual rewards.

☐ Strongly Disagree | ☐ Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Disagree | ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Agree | ☐ Agree | ☐ Strongly Agree

13. I believe that group success is more important than my own individual success.

☐ Strongly Disagree | ☐ Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Disagree | ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Agree | ☐ Agree | ☐ Strongly Agree

14. I believe that being accepted by members of your work group is very important.

☐ Strongly Disagree | ☐ Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Disagree | ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Agree | ☐ Agree | ☐ Strongly Agree

15. I believe that employees should only pursue their goals after considering the welfare of the group.

☐ Strongly Disagree | ☐ Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Disagree | ☐ Neither Agree nor Disagree | ☐ Somewhat Agree | ☐ Agree | ☐ Strongly Agree

16. I believe that managers should encourage group loyalty even if individual goals suffer.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

17. I believe that individuals may be expected to give up their goals in order to benefit group success.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

18. I believe that meetings are usually run more effectively when they are chaired by a man.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

19. I believe that it is more important for men to have a professional career than it is for women to have a professional career.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

20. I believe that men usually solve problems with logical analysis; women usually solve problems with intuition.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

21. I believe that solving organizational problems usually requires an active forcible approach which is typical of men.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

22. I believe that it is preferable to have a man in a high level position rather than a woman.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Section Two

Directions: Below are several statements about the **relationship between you and your manager**. For each item, please indicate the extent to which you believe each statement **characterizes this relationship**. If you have more than one manager, please select the manager that has the most influence on your job, such as an immediate supervisor.

23. I like my manager

☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐
Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree

24. I get along well with my manager

☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐
Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree

25. Having this manager as a boss is a pleasure

☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐
Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree

26. I think this manager would make a good friend

☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐
Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree

27. This manager and I see work in much the same way

☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐
Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree

28. This manager and I are alike in a number of ways when it comes to work

☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐
Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree

29. This manager and I handle work problems in similar ways

☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐
Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree

30. This manager and I are alike in terms of coming up with a similar solution for a work problem

☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐
Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither Agree nor Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree

<u>Section Three</u>

Directions: Below are several behavioral statements about various characteristics describing managers. Please indicate how frequently you perceive **your manager** shows each of the behaviors. If you have more than one manager, please select the manager that has the most influence on your job, such as an immediate supervisor. Please try to avoid letting how much you "like" or "dislike" your manager influence your responses.

31. My manager inspires commitment in others
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
    Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often as Not Often Very Often Almost Always

32. My manager schedules unnecessary meetings
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
    Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often as Not Often Very Often Almost Always

33. My manager keeps me informed about the company's goals and directions
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
    Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often as Not Often Very Often Almost Always

34. My manager is strongly committed to the success of the company
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
    Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often as Not Often Very Often Almost Always

35. My manager shows appreciation for work well done
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
    Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often as Not Often Very Often Almost Always

36. My manager focuses attention on the most important tasks
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
    Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often as Not Often Very Often Almost Always

37. My manager fails to seize new opportunities
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
    Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often as Not Often Very Often Almost Always

38. My manager tells me how company changes affect me
    ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
    Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often as Not Often Very Often Almost Always

39. My manager evaluates risks and benefits before making decisions

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often Very Often Almost
Often as Not Always

40. My manager stays informed about what competitors are doing

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often Very Often Almost
Often as Not Always

41. My manager listens openly to feedback

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often Very Often Almost
Often as Not Always

42. My manager clearly defines goals and objectives

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often Very Often Almost
Often as Not Always

43. My manager helps me understand new policies and procedures

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often Very Often Almost
Often as Not Always

44. My manager upholds high performance standards

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often Very Often Almost
Often as Not Always

45. My manager welcomes my input

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often Very Often Almost
Often as Not Always

46. My manager takes appropriate risks

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often Very Often Almost
Often as Not Always

47. My manager helps me understand how my work contributes to the company's success

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often Very Often Almost
Often as Not Always

48. My manager concentrates more on solving problems than on placing blame

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
Almost Never Not Often Sometimes About as Often Very Often Almost
Often as Not Always

48. My manager understands the concerns of external customers

☐ Almost Never ☐ Not Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ About as Often as Not ☐ Often ☐ Very Often ☐ Almost Always

50. My manager encourages me to use my own judgment

☐ Almost Never ☐ Not Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ About as Often as Not ☐ Often ☐ Very Often ☐ Almost Always

51. My manager works hard to accomplish company goals

☐ Almost Never ☐ Not Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ About as Often as Not ☐ Often ☐ Very Often ☐ Almost Always

52. My manager refuses to admit his/her mistakes

☐ Almost Never ☐ Not Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ About as Often as Not ☐ Often ☐ Very Often ☐ Almost Always

53. My manager tells us about changes occurring in the business

☐ Almost Never ☐ Not Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ About as Often as Not ☐ Often ☐ Very Often ☐ Almost Always

54. My manager thinks of value to the customer when making decisions

☐ Almost Never ☐ Not Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ About as Often as Not ☐ Often ☐ Very Often ☐ Almost Always

55. My manager requests feedback from others when appropriate

☐ Almost Never ☐ Not Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ About as Often as Not ☐ Often ☐ Very Often ☐ Almost Always

56. My manager quickly addresses problems

☐ Almost Never ☐ Not Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ About as Often as Not ☐ Often ☐ Very Often ☐ Almost Always

57. My manager considers issues from the external customer's point of view

☐ Almost Never ☐ Not Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ About as Often as Not ☐ Often ☐ Very Often ☐ Almost Always

58. My manager supports workforce diversity

☐ Almost Never ☐ Not Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ About as Often as Not ☐ Often ☐ Very Often ☐ Almost Always

59. My manager clearly states his/her expectations for my performance

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Almost Never   Not Often   Sometimes   About as Often as Not   Often   Very Often   Almost Always

60. My manager refuses to listen to new ideas

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Almost Never   Not Often   Sometimes   About as Often as Not   Often   Very Often   Almost Always

61. My manager helps make work fun

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Almost Never   Not Often   Sometimes   About as Often as Not   Often   Very Often   Almost Always

62. My manager gets things done

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Almost Never   Not Often   Sometimes   About as Often as Not   Often   Very Often   Almost Always

63. My manager provides constructive feedback

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Almost Never   Not Often   Sometimes   About as Often as Not   Often   Very Often   Almost Always

64. My manager is willing to take the risk of trying new things

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Almost Never   Not Often   Sometimes   About as Often as Not   Often   Very Often   Almost Always

Section Four

Directions: Below are several statements about various **characteristics of how managers deal with conflict**. For each item, please indicate the extent to which you believe each statement characterizes the actions of **your manager in conflict situations**. Please use the same manager when answering these questions that was used for answering section two.

65. My manager lets others take responsibility for solving the problem, rather than negotiating an agreement between the conflicting people.

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Neither Agree nor Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Agree   Strongly Agree

66. My manager tries to find a compromise solution, attempting to deal with all of the concerns of both people involved.

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Somewhat Disagree   Neither Agree nor Disagree   Somewhat Agree   Agree   Strongly Agree

67. My manager attempts to get all concerns and issues immediately out in the open and tries to soothe the feelings of his/her employees in order to preserve working relationships.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

68. My manager tries to immediately work through differences and tries to find a fair combination of gains and losses for the employees involved.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

69. In approaching negotiations, my manager tries to be considerate of others' wishes and always leans toward a direct discussion of the problem.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

70. My manager tries to find a position that is intermediate between the conflicting employees and he/she asserts his/her wishes.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

71. My manager consistently seeks the help of others in working out a solution while trying to do what is necessary to avoid useless tensions.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

72. My manager minimizes differences and typically proposes a middle ground when dealing with conflict.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

73. My manager tries to postpone the issue until he/she has had some time to think it over.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

74. My manager tries to show the logic and benefits of his/her position while trying to be considerate of others wishes during negotiations.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Section Five

Directions: Please answer the following questions as they pertain to you.

75. My ethnic background is:

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Asian American/   **Native American/**   **African American/**   **Latino American/**   **Caucasian/**
Pacific Islander   **Alaskan Native**   **Black**   **Hispanic/Latino/Spanish**   **White**

       ☐ **Other ethnic group:** _____

76. Because you could identified with multiple ethnic backgrounds, please indicate which ethnic background you most identify with: _____

77. My gender is:

☐   ☐

Male   **Female**

78. The gender of the manager I was thinking of while answering the questions in sections two, three and four:

☐   ☐

Male   **Female**

79. The ethnicity of the manager I was thinking of while answering the questions in sections two, three and four:

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Asian American/   **Native American/**   **African American/**   **Latino American/**   **Caucasian/**
Pacific Islander   **Alaskan Native**   **Black**   **Hispanic/Latino/Spanish**   **White**

       ☐ **Other ethnic group:** _____

80. My age is: _____ years of age.

81. How long have you been employed? _____ Years _____ Months

82. For what length of time have you been working for your current employer?
_____ Years _____ Months

83. What is your level within the organization

☐   ☐   ☐

Employee   **Manager**   **Leader**

84. In what type of industry do you work? _____

Thank you for your participation!

APPENDIX B

TABLES

Table 1. Raw scores for Means, Medians, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Dispersion of all Study Variables

Variable	Means	Medians	Standard Deviations	Minimum	Maximum
1. Manager Effectiveness Scale (ME)	5.05	5.35	1.12	1.74	6.85
2. Similarity to Manager (Similarity)	4.77	5.00	1.39	1.00	7.00
3. Liking for Manager (Liking)	5.40	5.75	1.25	1.50	7.00
4. Individualism/ collectivism (IC)	4.52	4.67	0.90	2.17	6.00
5. Masculinity/ femininity (MF)	2.49	2.00	1.33	1.00	6.40
6. Power distance (PD)	3.19	3.17	0.94	1.50	6.17
7. Uncertainty avoidance (UA)	5.75	5.80	0.73	3.40	7.00
8. Conflict Resolution (CR)	4.51	4.60	0.93	1.90	6.20

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-Correlations of all Study Variables

Variable	Mean (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. **Manager Effectiveness Scale (ME)**	5.05 (1.12)											
2. **Similarity to Manager (Similarity)**	1.89 (0.38)	0.69*										
3. **Liking for Manager (Liking)**	1.98 (0.38)	0.76*	0.72*									
4. Individualism/ collectivism (IC)	0.00 (0.90)	0.09	0.08	0.10								
5. Masculinity/ femininity (MF)	0.00 (0.41)	-0.11	-0.17*	-0.17	0.22*							
6. Power distance (PD)	0.00 (0.94)	-0.09	-0.01	-0.07	0.10	0.44*						
7. Uncertainty avoidance (UA)	0.00 (0.24)	0.24*	0.20*	0.28	0.21*	0.23*	0.22*					
8. **Conflict Resolution (CR)**	0.00 (0.93)	0.68*	0.59*	0.63	-0.08	-0.11	-0.12	0.17*				
9. **Conflict Resolution _X_** Individualism/ collectivism	-0.06 (0.88)	0.15	0.15*	0.24	-0.15	0.05	-0.19	0.02	0.26*			
10. **Conflict Resolution _X_** Masculinity/ femininity	-0.04 (0.41)	-0.05	-0.13	-0.02	0.05	0.02	-0.11	-0.01	0.12	0.16*		
11. **Conflict Resolution _X_** Power distance	-0.10 (0.96)	-0.02	-0.13	0.03	-0.18*	-0.11	-0.22*	-0.23*	0.04	0.23*	0.35*	
12. **Conflict Resolution _X_** Uncertainty avoidance	0.04 (0.22)	-0.02	-0.08	-0.03	0.02	-0.01	-0.25*	0.08	0.05	0.23*	0.16*	0.20*

Note: N = 110. * = alphas > .05.

Table 3. Regression Results for Predicting Employee's Perception of Manager Effectiveness

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Similarity to Manager (+)	0.90	0.25	0.31*
Liking for Manager (+)	1.56	0.25	0.53*
Step 2			
Similarity to Manager (+)	0.94	0.26	0.32*
Liking for Manager (+)	1.51	0.26	0.52*
Individualism/Collectivism	-0.01	0.08	0.00
Masculinity/Femininity	0.19	0.20	0.07
Power distance	-0.11	0.08	-0.09
Uncertainty avoidance	0.19	0.31	0.04
Step 3			
Similarity to Manager (+)	0.70	0.25	0.24*
Liking for Manager (+)	1.14	0.27	0.39*
Individualism/Collectivism	0.05	0.08	0.04
Masculinity/Femininity	0.12	0.19	0.04
Power distance	-0.07	0.08	-0.06
Uncertainty avoidance	0.15	0.29	0.03
Conflict Resolution	0.35	0.09	0.29*
Step 4			
Similarity to Manager (+)	0.67	0.26	0.23*
Liking for Manager (+)	1.16	0.28	0.40*
Individualism/Collectivism	0.04	0.08	0.04
Masculinity/Femininity	0.17	0.19	0.06
Power distance	-0.10	0.08	-0.08
Uncertainty avoidance	0.17	0.31	0.04
Conflict Resolution	0.38	0.10	0.31*
Conflict Resolution _X_ Individualism/Collectivism	-0.09	0.08	-0.07
Conflict Resolution _X_ Masculinity/Femininity	-0.15	0.18	-0.05
Conflict Resolution _X_ Power distance	0.03	0.08	0.03
Conflict Resolution _X_ Uncertainty avoidance	-0.03	0.31	-0.01

Note: N = 110. Step 1 r^2 = .62, Step 2 r^2 change = .01, Step 3 r^2 change = .04, Step 4 r^2 change = .01. *=Significant Beta's (p < .05).

REFERENCES

Adler, N. (1986). *International dimensions of organizational behavior*. Boston: Kent.

Aguinis, H., & Adams, S. K. R. (1998). Social-Roles versus structural models of gender and influence use in organizations. *Group & Organization Management, 23,* 414-446.

Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R. N., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G., & Kurshid, A. (2000). Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A 10-country comparison. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49,* 192-221.

Bhagat, R. S., Kedia, B. L., Harveston, P. D., Triandis, H. C. (2002). Cultural variations in the cross-border transfer of organizational knowledge: An integrative framework. *Academy of Management Review, 27,* 204-221.

Cash, T. F., Gillen, B., & Burns, D. S. (1977). Sexism and "beautyism" in personnel consultant decision-making. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 29,* 80-85.

Clugston, M., Howell, J. P., & Dorfman, P. W. (2000). Does cultural socialization predict multiple bases and foci of commitment? *Journal of Management, 26,* 5-30.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 155-159.

Cox, T. (1991). The multicultural organization. *Academy of Management Executive, 5,* 34-47.

Dorfman, P. W., & Howell, J. P. (1988). Dimensions of national culture and effective leadership patterns: Hofstede revisited. *Advances in International Comparative Management,* 3, 127-150.

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review,* 109, 573-598.

Elangovan, A. R. (1995). Managerial conflict intervention in organizations: Traversing the cultural mosaic. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 6,* 124-146.

Gross, M. A., & Guerrero, L. K., (2000). Managing conflict appropriately and effectively: An application of the competence model to Rahim's organizational conflict styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 11,* 200-226.

Hanges, P. J., Lord, R. G., & Dickson, M. W. (2000). An information-processing perspective on leadership and culture: A case for connectionist architecture. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49,* 133-161.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work related values.* Beverly Hill, CA: Sage Publications.

House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management, 23,* 409-473.

Hui, C., & Lee, C. (2000). Moderating effects of organization-based self-esteem on organizational uncertainty: Employee response relationships. *Journal of Management, 26,* 215-232.

Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 36,* 16-78.

Johnson, C. (1993). Gender and formal authority. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 56, 193-210.

Johnson, C. (1994). Gender, legitimate authority, and leader-subordinate conversations. *American Sociological Review, 59,* 122-135.

Kendrick, D. T., Neuberg, S. L., & Cialdini, R. B. (1999). *Social Psychology: Unraveling the Mystery.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Knoke, D., & Ishio, Y. (1998). The gender gap in company job training. *Work and Occupations, 25,* 141-167.

Korabik, K., Baril, G. L., & Watson, C. (1993). Managers' conflict management style and leadership effectiveness: The moderating effects of gender. *Sex Roles, 29,* 405-420.

Lewis, A. E., & Fagenson-Eland, E. A. (1998). The influence of gender and organization level on perceptions of leadership behaviors: A self and supervisor comparison. *Sex Roles, 39,* 479-502.

Lewis, K. M. (2000). When leaders display emotion: how followers respond to negative emotional expression of male and female leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21,* 221-234.

Lissak, R. I., & Sheppard, B. H. (1983). Beyond fairness: The criterion problem in research on conflict intervention. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 13,* 45-65.

Luthar, H. K. (1996). Gender differences in evaluation of performance and leadership ability: Autocratic vs. democratic managers. *Sex Roles, 35,* 337-361.

Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognitions, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224-253.

Moorman, R. H. & Blakely, G. L. (1995).

    Individualism-collectivism as an individual

    difference predictor of organizational citizenship

    behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16,*

    127-142.

Mulder, M., de-Jong, R. D., Koppelaar, L., & Verhage, J.

    (1986). Power, situation, and leaders' effectiveness:

    An organizational field study. *Journal of Applied*

    Psychology, 71, 566-570.

O'Driscoll, M. P., & Beehr, T. A. (1994). Supervisor

    behaviors, role stressors and uncertainty as

    predictors of personal outcomes for subordinates.

    Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15, 141-155.

Pasa, S. F. (2000). Leadership influence in a high power

    distance and collectivist culture. *Leadership and*

    Organizational Development Journal, 21, 414-426.

Phillips, A. S., & Bedian, A. G. (1994). Leader-follower

    exchange quality: The role of personal and

    interpersonal attributes. *Academy of Management*

    Journal, 37, 990-1001.

Pulakos, E. D., & Wexley, K. N. (1983). The relationship

    among perceptual similarity, sex, and performance

    ratings in manager-subordinate dyads. *Academy of*

    Management Journal, 26, 129-139.

Rahim, M. A. (1985). A strategy for managing conflict in complex organizations. *Human Relations, 38,* 81-89.

Robert, C., & Wasti, S. A. (2002). Organizational individualism and collectivism: Theoretical development and an empirical test of a measure. *Journal of Management, 28,* 544-566.

Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Organizational socialization: Making sense of the past and present as a prologue for the future. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51,* 234-279.

Sapp, S. G., Harrod, W. J., & Zhao, L. (1996). Leadership emergence in task groups with egalitarian gender role expectations. *Sex Roles, 34,* 65-80.

Schall, M. S. (1983). A communication-rules approach to organizational culture. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 28,* 557-581.

Schein, E. H. (1984). Culture as an environmental context for careers. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 5,* 71-81.

Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21,* 139-157.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50,* 19-45.

Shockley-Zalabak, P., & Morley, D. D. (1989). Adhering to organizational culture: What does it mean? Why does it matter? *Group and Organization Studies, 14,* 483-500.

Shockley-Zalabak, P., & Morley, D. D. (1994). Creating a culture: A longitudinal examination of the influence of management and employee values on communication rule stability and emergence. *Human Communication Research, 20,* 334-355.

Smith, P. B., & Bond, M. H. (1998). Social psychology across cultures (2nd ed., pp. 25-27, 198-231). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Smith, P. B., Dugan, S., Peterson, M. F., & Leung, K. (1998). Individualism: Collectivism and the handling of disagreement. A 23 country study. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22,* 351-367.

Suzuki, S. (1998). In-group and out-group communication patterns in international organizations-implications for social identity theory. *Communication Research, 25,* 154-183.

Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74,* 118-128.

Turban, D. B., & Jones, A. P. (1988). Supervisor-subordinate similarity: types, effects, and mechanisms. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73,* 228-234.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *U.S. Census Data*. Retrieved January 17, 2008, from http://www.census.gov

Van Oudenhoven, J. P. (2001). Do organizations reflect national cultures? A 10-nation study. *International Journal of Inter-cultural Relations, 25,* 89-107.

Wagner, J. A. (1995). Studies of individualism-collectivism: Effects on cooperation in groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 152-170.

Wayne, S. J., & Ferris, G. R. (1990). Influence tactics, affects, and exchange quality in supervisor-subordinate interactions: A laboratory experiment and field study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75,* 487-499.

Workman, M. (2001). Collectivism, individualism, and cohesion in a team-based occupation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 58,* 82-97.

Yukl, G., & Tracey, J. B. (1992). Consequences of influence tactics used with subordinates, peers, and the boss. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 77,* 525-535.

Zaccaro, S. J., Craig, B., & Quinn, J. (1991). Prior absenteeism, supervisory style, job satisfaction, and personal characteristics: An investigation of some mediated and moderated linkages to work absenteeism. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50,* 24-44.