

Aycan, Z. (2004). In Lane, H., Mendenhall, M. & Maznevski, M. International Handbook of Management (pp. 406-423). NY: Blackwell.

Managing Inequalities: Leadership and Teamwork in the Developing Country Context

Zeynep Aycan

Koç University, Istanbul, Turkey

Effective leadership and teamwork is the key to organizational success. However, criteria as well as determinants of effectiveness are culturally determined. A leadership approach or a teamwork practice that yields excellent results in a particular cultural context may create resentment and demotivation among employees in another. In this paper, we will discuss leadership and teamwork in a developing country context. We will present research-based evidence to compare the ‘actual’ and ‘ideal’ leadership profiles. Within the leadership framework, we will also discuss employee expectations and effective motivational techniques. A section follows this on teamwork and communication where we will try to explain the barriers to effective teamwork, and suggest the ways to overcome them. Finally, we will outline the challenges and opportunities that await global leaders who function in developing countries. Without the proper understanding of culture, it is difficult to appreciate and comprehend the organizational dynamics. We will, therefore, devote the first section to the description of the socio-cultural context in developing countries.

The Socio-Cultural Context

The socio-cultural environment consists of prevailing and shared values, norms, assumptions, belief systems, and behavioral patterns in a society or a cultural group (cf. Hofstede, 1980). Economic and political environment as well as historical events shape culture. It is beyond the scope of this paper to describe the interactions among various forces that influence culture, but similar cultural characteristics that are observed within the group of

developing countries seem to be attributed to their similar historical background (e.g., autocratic ruling, colonialism, etc.), subsistence system (e.g., reliance on agriculture), political environment (e.g., volatility and instability, improper law and enforcement system), economic conditions (e.g., resource scarcity, insufficient technological infrastructure), and demographic makeup (e.g., young workforce, unequal opportunity to access high quality education) (see, Abdalla & Al-Homoud, 2001; Adler & Boyacigiller, 1995; Austin, 1990; Hickson & Pugh, 1995; Hofstede, 1980; Kanungo & Jaeger, 1990).

What follows is a brief summary of research on cultural characteristics of developing countries. This summary is based on findings of large-scale cross-cultural research by Hofstede (1980), Sagiv and Schwartz (2000), Trompenaars (1998), and House et al. (1999), as well as work of others including Triandis (1994), Hall and Hall (1995), Ronen and Shenkar (1985), Glenn and Glenn (1981), Jaeger and Kanungo (1990), J.B.P. Sinha (1995), Kao, Sinha, and Wilpert (1999), Puffer (1996), Hickson (1997), Aycan and Kanungo (2001), Adler (1997), Lane, DiStefano, and Maznevski (1997), and Thomas (2002).

Developing countries represent almost 80% of the world population. With such a large and diverse group of countries, it is almost impossible to arrive at a unified portrayal of cultural characteristics to represent the entire group. There are three caveats that should be underlined in interpreting the following findings. First, there may be significant differences across developing countries. Therefore, it is wrong to put countries into distinct categories such as individualistic versus collectivistic. We know from research that many of the developing countries are collectivistic but not to the same extent and not in every social context. Second, there are individual (e.g., based on the education, socio-economic status, or age), sub-cultural (e.g., regional, ethnic), and organizational differences within developing countries. For example, values, beliefs and behaviors of a highly educated manager working in a subsidiary of a multinational firm in India would be surprisingly similar to the values of a

US manager compared to someone with a low educational background working in a family-owned firm. Sub-cultural variations exist in every country, but the magnitude of such differences seems to be much higher in developing countries compared to the developed ones (Negahdi, 1983). Finally, there are seemingly conflicting value orientations that co-exist in developing countries that may confuse global managers (e.g., Sinha & Kanungo, 1997). For example, one may observe modesty and status-consciousness at the same time. Such paradoxical dualities will be highlighted whenever possible. The following should be treated as a 'guideline', rather than a set of rules that is subject to confirmation through careful observations.

- *Relationship Orientation.* One of the most salient cultural characteristics in developing countries is the importance of relationships and networking. Interdependence in a trusting relationship serves a critical role in reducing uncertainties and getting the maximum benefit where resources are scarce. Harmony within the group is preserved at all cost. Relationships and networks supersede rules and procedures in every aspect of social, political and economic life. The universalistic rules are known but not applied for everyone under every circumstance. Relationship-based organizational practices (e.g., staffing, rewarding, performance evaluations, promotions, etc.) may give rise to favoritism and nepotism among the in-group members, whereas discrimination, alienation and withdrawal among the out-group members. Family and relatives are natural in-group members. In-group membership is also extended to those from the same ethnic, religious or caste group, as well as close friends. Getting in and also getting out of the in-group is difficult. Loyalty, as the glue to keep the in-group intact, is the second most important determinant of membership status; acceptance to and dismissal from the in-group depend on the level of loyalty.

- *Family orientation.* Family is very important in every society's livelihood. In

developing countries, however, family – both nuclear and extended - is the primary focus in people's lives. Work and family spheres are closely interrelated. Work is perceived as a duty done in service of the family. An achievement at work is not as much valued as a means to increase one's sense of personal accomplishment as it is valued as a means of satisfying family needs and increasing family's status in society. Family ethos are also created in organizational context. First of all, organizations are expected to take care of workers as well as their families. Some organizations institutionalize practices such as offering health and educational services for employees' spouse and children, contributing to their housing and heating, and providing them with financial assistance when needed. Moreover, employees feel entitled to absent themselves from work for family-related reasons. Work always comes next to family, and there is nothing more natural than this. Second, the subordinate-superior relationship resembles that between parent and child. Superiors treat their employees like their children, and this is a very common practice that is referred to as 'paternalism' (we will describe it in more detail in the leadership section).

- *Performance orientation.* Developing country members do not attach a high value to job performance and its outcomes. In human resource management practices such as staffing and performance evaluation, in-group favoritism plays a more important role than job-related competencies. The criteria used for selection and performance evaluation include harmony in interpersonal relations as well as loyalty and obedience towards superiors. In fact, performance evaluations serve the purpose of perpetuating the power structure, and instill loyalty (Sinha, 1994). Because contracts are emotional and psychological than transactional, meeting contractual obligations does not fully represent 'good performance'. Getting along is more important than getting ahead (Abdalla & Al-Homoud, 2001). In fact, those who get ahead and 'stand out' in their group inculcate jealousy and disturb group harmony. The paradox is that those who are bright and have the potential to excel in their careers are almost

afraid of performing well because of such cultural barriers. Also, low performers are tolerated on the basis of compassion (Abdalla & Al-Homoud, 2001), and *intention* is weighted more than the actual outcomes achieved (Ali, 1999).

- *Control orientation.* Partly due to turbulence, instability and unpredictability in social, political and economic life, and partly collective responsibility sharing, authoritarianism and paternalism in cultural life, individuals have low sense of control and low self-efficacy. Feelings of ‘helplessness’ and fatalism are common cultural traits (Aycan & Kanungo, et al., 2000). People who have low self-efficacy have a tendency to attribute causes to external reasons. Sometimes this is used as a way to get rid of responsibility for making long-term plans, meeting deadlines and setting goals. Because interdependence is fostered as a cultural value, self-reliance has a negative connotation as it is deserting the group (Abdalla & Al-Homoud, 2001). Due to low self-efficacy belief, individuals are refrained from being proactive and taking initiative, which may increase risks and uncertainty in the environment. The status quo is not challenged and mediocrity is readily accepted as ‘destiny’. As such, there is resistance to change.

- *Communication pattern.* The pattern of communication in organizations is indirect, non-assertive, non-confrontational, and usually downwards. This is problematic in performance evaluations where superiors, subordinates and peers avoid giving negative feedback to one another. Negative feedback is viewed as a ‘destructive criticism’ rather than a constructive remark for further improvement. Because personal and work lives are intertwined, negative feedback is also misconstrued as an attack to the person rather than on the observed behavior (Mendonca & Kanungo, 1996). Self-presentation, that is the way in which a person is perceived by others, is extremely important. Negative feedback has the potential to tarnish one’s reputation and honor in the eyes of others. It also implies losing face to the employer and the supervisor to whom the person feels indebted and loyal. Moreover,

due to low self-efficacy and high fatalism, people are reluctant to accept responsibility and blame for mistakes. In a highly personalized work relationship, negative feedback is considered as harmful to group integrity and harmony. Usually, negative feedback is given in an indirect and subtle manner with the involvement of a third party. In a high power distant cultural context, subordinates refrain from giving performance feedback to their superiors. Finally, in developing countries, there is strong preference for face-to-face communication, rather than through technology. Also, the context determines the way in which information is coded and understood. As such, there is much room for subjective interpretation of the 'intent' and the 'content' of the message.

- *Authority orientation.* Respect, loyalty and deference towards the authority are among the most salient cultural characteristics in developing countries. People respect 'authority' rather than 'rules'. Obedience to authority is a prescribed norm in some religions and belief systems like Islam and Confucian ideology. Authority is rarely challenged and questioned. The person holding the power and authority is trusted for his/her knowledge, expertise and achievements. S/he is entitled to have certain privileges that others don't have. Many of the paradoxical dualities exist in the superior-subordinate relationship. First, there is high respect but also high affection towards the superior. As such, there is an element of love and fear in this relationship. Being an in-group member, s/he is considered as 'one of us', but being a person with higher status, s/he is 'unlike us'. Superiors have close relationships with the subordinates and are involved in all aspects of their lives, but this does not translate to an informal 'friendship' relationship. Instead, the subordinate-superior relationship is formal and distant.

"In Venezuela, you cannot be distant if you are the boss, you cannot sit in an office like an executive...you have to be out there with them so that they feel you are their equal whilst, at the same time, making them recognize that you are the boss and know more than they do" (Granell, 1997, p.37).

Leadership and Motivation

The socio-cultural context has a great impact on leadership and motivational practices. The review of the cross-cultural literature on leadership and motivation in a developing country context concurs that prevalent leadership traits and behaviors reflect the cultural characteristics that are outlined in the previous section. That is, the most salient leadership practices involve personalized relationships with the subordinates and exercise of power and authority. However, research also reveals that there is a significant gap between the 'actual' and the 'ideal' leadership characteristics (cf., House et al., 1999). Let us first review the prototypical leadership style, which will follow the preferred leadership and motivational practices.

Relationship Orientation in Leadership. One of the most striking characteristics of leaders in developing country organizations is that they place great importance in establishing close interpersonal relationships with subordinates as well as people in higher authority. Subordinates expect personalized relationships, protection, close guidance and supervision (Kanungo, 1990; Sinha, 1990). Leaders, on the other hand, are willing to assume responsibility for the followers (Abdalla & Al-Homoud, 2001; Puffer, 1996), and in return, they seek loyalty. The interaction between leaders and followers resemble parent-child relationship in traditional cultures. This prevalent leadership style is referred to as 'paternalism' in developing countries (Aycan & Kanungo, in press). Paternalism is one of the most salient leadership characteristics of Pacific Asian, Middle-Eastern, and Latin American cultures. The underpinning of paternalism is the traditional value of familism with a strong emphasis on patriarchal, patrilocal, and patrilineal relationships within the family unit (Kim, 1994). In time, paternalistic relationships went beyond family boundaries, and vertical relationships in the family were extended to those based on seniority and gender in the workplace and social life (Kim, 1994, Redding & Hsiao, 1995).

The paternalistic relationship is hierarchical, the superior assumes the role of a ‘father’ who protects and provides for the subordinate, whereas the subordinate voluntarily renders to the superior, and shows loyalty and deference. The leader is assumed to ‘know better’ for the subordinates. As such, he guides the subordinate in every aspect of his/her life. The paternalistic leader gives advice (often times unsolicited) and guides employees in personal, professional (e.g., make career planning on their behalf), and family-related matters (e.g., do marriage counseling, resolve disputes between husband and wives, etc.); shows concern for the well-being of the subordinate as well as his/her family; attends congratulatory (e.g., weddings) and condolence (e.g., funerals) ceremonies of employees *as well as* their immediate family members; when in need, provides financial assistance to employees (in form of donations or sometimes as loans) in, for example, housing, health-care, and educational expenses of their children; allows them to attend personal or family-related problems by letting them leave early or take a day off; acts as a mediator in interpersonal conflicts among employees, and even talks to the disputed party on behalf of the other (without his knowledge or consent) to resolve the conflict.

Employee loyalty and deference is manifested in various forms such as engaging in extra-role behavior or working overtime (unpaid) upon the request of the supervisor; not quitting the job (even if one receives a much better job offer) because of loyalty; following the paternalistic superior to another organization if s/he quits the company; not questioning nor disagreeing with the superior in decisions regarding the company or the employee (e.g., performance evaluations, career-planning, etc.); doing personal favors for the superior when needed (e.g., helping him during the construction of his house); putting extra effort in the job and working hard, so not to lose face to the superior.

“When something goes wrong or when only a part of the project is completed, our western partners leave the next day. But we cannot do it. We lose face to our company if something goes wrong. We cannot leave until we make sure that everything is fine. Our

superiors trust us. How can we possibly fail them?" (A Kazak employee working in an American plant in Kazakhstan).

Paternalism is a leadership style that is strongly criticized in the Western industrialized countries. Involvement in personal life is perceived as intrusive and invasive of an employee's privacy. Close guidance and supervision go against the Western cultural tradition that supports autonomy, self-reliance and self-determination. Assumed superiority of the leader is also challenged on the grounds of egalitarianism. Moreover, the emotional bonding is considered 'unprofessional' in a business relationship. What Western scholars and business people fail to understand, however, is that there is a reciprocal consent for this relationship. In fact, employees feel resentment and rejection if their managers are not involved in their personal lives and let them make the important decisions by themselves.

A Mexican worker's letter to his brother: "Things got tough around here after the American expatriate boss has arrived. He seems that he has no time for us. Can you imagine, he never asks about our families or our health – unless it interferes with our work efficiency. He, on the other hand, never mentions about his wife or family. Life is just work for him, and we pity him for this...He also does not care about our careers. When we ask for his advice, he says that we are the best judges for our own lives. How can we know better than him what is good for us. Apparently, he does not take any interest in our future in this plant." (modified from Kras, 1989).

"I told you; I knew that there was something wrong in the office. My supervisor did not hug and kiss me yesterday morning!" (A clerk working in a Turkish state library).

However, the dark side of paternalism is that it may create differential treatment among workers. Sinha (1995) attributes this increasing size of the organization as well as employer's liking of some members better than others: "The differential love and care [of the paternal boss] are generally reciprocated by similar feelings and acts. The loved and cared ones get increasingly close to the father [the paternal figure] while others are distanced....The leader indeed starts believing that so-and-so is really bright and dynamic and therefore, in good faith, tends to extend favors to him" (p.78). In such cases, paternalism paves the way to nepotism and favoritism. The ones who are not 'loved' and 'cared', on the other hand, may be

deprived of some privileges. That is why paternalism is sometimes referred to as 'discrimination without the expression of hostility' (Jackman, 1994, p.10). It also elevates sibling-like rivalry and jealousy among employees.

The importance of relations goes beyond organizational boundaries. Leaders are also expected to establish good interpersonal relations with people in higher authority in government, supporting institutions, and negotiation parties (Hardy, 1990; Miles & Snow, 1978). In order to protect the institution and draw political, technical and financial support, leaders invest a substantial amount of time and effort to networking. As such, networking and diplomacy are among the common characteristics of effective leaders in developing countries.

Power Orientation in Leadership. Another salient leadership characteristic in developing countries is leader's desire to exercise power (Puffer, 1996). The duality that is difficult to comprehend is that leaders wish to maintain good interpersonal relations with the subordinates on the one hand, and act in an authoritative way on the other. A paternalistic leader is someone "...who is nurturant, caring, dependable, sacrificing and yet demanding, authoritative, and a strict disciplinarian" (Sinha, 1990, p.68). The Western management literature addresses this paradox by describing paternalism as 'benevolent dictatorship' (Northouse, 1997, p.39). In the family context, too, father is 'caring' but at the same time 'authoritative' in developing countries. An authoritative attitude on the part of the leader involves discipline and control for the benefit of the subordinate.

However, it is also very common that leaders use their status and power for personal benefits. For instance, high level managers clearly favor their in-group members in personnel decisions such as staffing. In some extreme cases, one can find many workers with the same family name in the organization. However, such practices, which are at the root of corruption, are severely criticized in developing countries. For example, Prophet of Islam Mohammad

says “When a person assumes authority over people and promotes one of them because of personal preferences, God will curse him forever (quoted in Al-Fingary 1996).

“There is nothing wrong in the top officials’ favoring their relatives. If your relatives and caste-fellows do not benefit from the authority you possess, what use are you to your society?” (Gupta, 1999, p.108).

“The deleterious effects of tradition are compounded by the practice of appointing a family member as head of the organization without any regard to the individual’s competence, so creating a unique management style derisively referred to as ‘management by chromosomes’” (Mendonca & Kanungo, 1990, p.237).

Leaders are highly status conscious. They may resist change so as not to lose power or relinquish authority. They want to remain in power at all cost to maintain their and their families’ status in society. Despite close and good interpersonal relationships with workers, they demand formality and respect. Workers are strongly discouraged to bypass authority.

“Promotions are valued not for a better careers but to get a better match for a daughter, or for the pride it would bring to their family” (Kalra, 1981).

The decision making process reflects the power inequality. Usually, the process is centralized, and the decisions are made unilaterally. This is partly because the leaders do not want to relinquish power by being participative. Subordinates also expect the leader to be decisive, not only because they trust his wisdom, knowledge and competencies, but also they are afraid of taking risk and responsibility by getting involved in the decision making process.

“No one wants to say, ‘Boss, are you sure that’s the way you want to do it?’ They don’t want to help you make decisions; they want to agree if you have an opinion. It is harder to find leaders with risk taking attitudes in Mexico”. (Stephens & Greer, 1997, p.110).

Leaders do not invest effort to prepare subordinates for participative decision making, because they assume that employees lack confidence and competence, and that they are not willing to exercise autonomy and accept responsibility for problem solving (Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996). The image of a strong leader is someone who knows it all, and who is a

hero and a savior. A leader who goes along with employees' suggestions is perceived as weak and incompetent.

Although leaders are not participative, they are consultative. In fact, consultation is encouraged by, for example, the Quran, which attests reward for consultation. But because it also states "Obey God...and those charged with authority among you (4: 59)", there is great tension between the consultative approach on one hand, and the authoritative approach on the other. (Ali, 1999). Consultation is usually done to show that employee opinions are valued. Employees expect that the leader seeks their opinion but gives the final decision unilaterally.

"You see this pen? Suppose that my manager decided to buy it. He comes to us and asks whether or not he should buy it. Does he not know what he should do? Of course, he does. He made up his mind even before coming to us. But, he shows courtesy by taking our opinion. That is what makes him a great guy!" (A human resource manager in a big-size manufacturing company in Eastern Turkey).

Preferred Leadership Characteristics and Motivational Practices. Robert J. House and 170 local investigators completed major cross-cultural research on leadership and organizational effectiveness. A total of 62 countries representing all continents participated in this major undertaking, the GLOBE project (Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness). According to the preliminary findings (Hartog, House, Hanges, et al., 1999), the most preferred leadership characteristics in all countries (developing and developed alike) involve charisma, participation, and team integration. In fact, all these leadership qualities are important and relevant particularly for developing countries.

Charismatic leadership, which is also referred to as transformational leadership, has been investigated for the last 25 years in the Western management literature (e.g., Bass, 1985; House, 1977; Shamir, House & Arthur, 1993; Yukl, 1998). The most important characteristics of charismatic/transformational leaders include their emphasis on change and transformation through a strong vision and sense of mission for the organization, intellectual stimulation (i.e., helping followers to recognize problems and solutions), individualized consideration (i.e.,

giving followers the support, attention, and encouragement needed to perform well), and inspirational motivation (i.e., communicating the importance of the organization's mission and relying on symbols to focus their efforts). According to the Conger-Kanungo Model of Charismatic Leadership (Conger & Kanungo, 1998), there are three critical stages in leadership. First, the leader should evaluate the present status-quo by assessing environmental resources and follower needs. Second, the leader formulates and articulates the organizational goals. Finally, the leader determines the means to achieve the goals. Kanungo and Mendonca (1996) assert that charismatic leadership is particularly relevant to and effective in the developing country context, which is characterized by high complexity and uncertainty, low predictability and instability, and low employee self-efficacy. Kanungo and Mendonca (1996) outlined charismatic leadership behavior for developing countries (see, Table 1). In this framework, charismatic leaders are encouraged to utilize the existing cultural characteristics to motivate employees (e.g., loyalty, family metaphor, respect and support to the superiors), while removing cultural barriers that prevent effective functioning (e.g., dependency-proneness and sense of helplessness, favoritism, manipulative ingratiation, etc.).

Insert Table 1 about here

Employees in developing countries - especially the young and well-educated generation - seek more participation in the decision-making process. They prefer participation in issues that concern them. The Nurturant-Task (NT) Leadership Model proposed by Sinha (1980) increases employee participation by combining performance orientation with paternalism. An NT leader 'cares for his subordinates, shows affection, takes personal interest in their well being, and above all is committed to their growth' (Sinha 1980: 55). The difference between paternalistic and NT leadership is that the paternalistic leader's nurturance is contingent upon loyalty, whereas the NT leader's nurturance and care is contingent upon

the subordinate's task accomplishment. As such, the NT leader is more performance-oriented than the paternalistic leader. In Sinha's model, the nature of the subordinate-superior relationship changes over time. Initially, the subordinate relies heavily on the superior for guidance. As s/he gains more experience, knowledge and skills about the job, s/he develops self-confidence and needs less direction and guidance. At this point, the leader grants more autonomy and responsibility while maintaining the supporting and nurturing relationship with the subordinate with constant encouragement. When the subordinate's level of 'preparedness' increases (i.e., less preference for dependency and personalized relationship with the superior, and more acceptance of his/her own status as competent and knowledgeable), the superior involves him/her fully in the decision-making process. The process, therefore, gradually progresses from a strongly NT style to a fully participative one through an intermediary stage of a mixture of NT and participation. Similar to the charismatic approach, the process is empowering for the subordinate, which is particularly important for developing countries.

An ideal leader is also a 'team integrator'. As will be discussed in detail in the next section, effective teamwork may be difficult in developing countries. Leaders who are able to overcome the cultural barriers to motivate and mobilize employees to do teamwork are considered to be highly effective.

In conclusion, the ideal leader profile in developing countries is:

- Transformational and empowering.
- Participative, but also decisive.
- Trustworthy: Knowledgeable, skillful and administratively competent.
- Nurturant/paternalistic and also performance-oriented.
- Fair and just, especially in interpersonal relationships.
- Diplomatic.
- Status conscious, but at the same time modest and humble.

- Team integrator.

Effective motivational techniques include:

- Increasing the feeling of security (job security as well as feeling of belonging and acceptance).
- Providing opportunities for personal and professional development.
- Recognizing individual performance by one's superior (preferably not publicly).
- Showing interest and care for the well-being of the employees as well as their families.
- Listening and understanding employee concerns and suggestions.
- Being fair and just; not discriminating between in-group and out-group members.
- Reinforcing the feeling of loyalty, affection and respect for the superior.

“Personal bonds with the superior determine whether or not workers come to work everyday and are willing to do overtime or work industriously” (Forest, 1996, p.293).

Teamwork and Communication

“People like to work with others...you find that there are few who stay by themselves in the office...they are always with someone else...that does not mean, though, that they are working as a team...” (German expatriate working in Ghana).

Some of the socio-cultural characteristics of developing countries may not be elusive to effective teamwork. Relationship-orientation may be perceived as an asset for teamwork, but the nature of relationships and in-group dynamics may hinder effectiveness. The barriers to teamwork effectiveness are outlined in the following.

1. *Team formation and member composition:* In most of the organizations, team members are appointed on the basis of their task-related knowledge and competencies. However, because of the strong in-group and out-group differentiation in developing countries, it is difficult to persuade people to work with those who are perceived to be an out-group member. In fact, if given the chance to self-select the team members, teams are formed on the basis of friendship relationships. Interpersonal harmony in teams weigh more

than task accomplishment. As such, team members find it very difficult to work with someone who they 'don't know' or 'don't like'. Members who have the potential to disturb in-group harmony are not wanted no matter how competent they may be.

In her first year of teaching back at home, a US-educated Pakistani professor randomly assigned senior students into teams for their final class projects by drawing a lottery. This was a common practice back in the US. To her, it was an excellent opportunity for students to practice and learn how to work with different people in 'real life'. Soon after, a student came to her office in tears saying that "Professor, you put me in the same team with someone who I have not been talking since we were 8 years old. Under the circumstances, I have to drop the course". The professor was in shock. Which one was worst? Was it that the student blamed the teacher for this sheer coincidence, or that the student was not talking to someone for more than 10 years, or that she dropped the course because of this?"

2. *Team cohesion.* Teamwork requires egalitarian relationships and cohesiveness.

Some status-conscious members may be reluctant to cooperate or share information with others to maintain their powerful position in the team. This not only hurts team cohesiveness, but also delays task completion.

"There is a real fear about someone else taking over your job...These feelings result in the control and retention of information...people get hold of information hoping that this makes them indispensable" (from Granell, 1997, p.21).

Also, in-group rivalry may occur to get the praise and recognition of the superior. To the other extreme, excessive team cohesiveness may easily result in 'group thinking', because some members may be reluctant to voice their disagreements not to risk their position in the team.

3. *Performance feedback:* Team members who do not perform at the expected level rarely receive negative feedback from others. If a member receives negative feedback, s/he takes it personally and takes offense. Criticisms that are done publicly or that represent a group's opinion are especially hurtful to people's public image and honor. The member who receives such feedback may leave the group immediately and may even try to sabotage the process. It

is not appropriate or common for team members to give performance feedback to one another in an open manner. It is also not appropriate to report the low performing team member to the higher management. Such an act of ‘whistle blowing’ is considered as unethical and immoral. Therefore, often times, the low performing members hide in the group and go unnoticed.

4. *Division of responsibility*: Social loafing is more likely to occur in teams where there is no consequence of low performance, as explained above. Team members feel compelled to protect one another from reprimands of the management. Reliance on ‘backing up’ among team members increases social loafing. Another factor that increases social loafing is the members’ need for clear role differentiation and task assignments. Lack of clarity in task assignments may sometimes be used as an excuse not to take on extra responsibility.

“This is a story of ‘everybody’, ‘somebody’, ‘anybody’ and ‘nobody’ working in a Zimbabwean firm: There was some very important work to be done and everybody was sure that somebody would do it. Anybody could have done it but nobody did it. People were very angry because it was everybody’s job. Everybody thought that anybody could have done it, but nobody realized that somebody wasn’t doing it. The story ends with everybody blaming someone when nobody did what anybody could have done.” (modified from Granell, 1997, p.36)

5. *Evaluation apprehension*. Self-representation is an important concern for people in developing countries. Team members may hesitate to participate in group discussions because of the concern on how they are perceived and evaluated by others. Others’ perceptions and evaluations are important as they determine whether or not the group accepts or rejects the individual. Evaluation apprehension exists especially when a member has to present a counter-argument, or brings a new perspective to the group’s attention. This, obviously, is a serious barrier to innovation and creativity in teams.

In order to improve teamwork and communication effectiveness in developing countries, the following suggestions could be useful.

- Teamwork effectiveness is enhanced if there is a leader who is skillful in both maintaining good interpersonal relations and setting high performance standards. Leaderless or autonomous groups are less likely to succeed in a developing country context.
- Leaders must be sensitive to feelings of insecurity among members. Leaders have to spend considerable time and effort to inculcate feelings of acceptance and indispensability among team members to minimize in-group rivalry and increase group cohesiveness.
- In order to decrease uncertainties and social loafing, individual roles and responsibilities should be clearly stated. In addition, team's goals have to be well-defined and articulated clearly by the management.
- Members will benefit greatly from training in effective teamwork where they will acquire knowledge and skills about performance management and communication in teamwork.
- Before starting to work together, the team should establish norms on how to handle difficult team members as well as on the ground rules in meetings. Once the group sets these norms jointly and agrees upon the repercussions for violating them, team members who receive negative performance feedback are less likely to take it personally and withdraw from the group.
- In forming the team, members' compatibility in terms of interpersonal relations should be given special attention. That is not to say that only 'close friends' should work in teams, but it should be remembered that interpersonal conflicts do interfere with effective teamwork functioning.

- Social activities that will improve interpersonal relationships among team members should be organized to increase cohesiveness. People need time to get to know one another before working together.
- Team members' performance evaluations should not be done individually. However, poor performers should be monitored through either periodical and anonymous peer evaluations, or careful observations in group meetings. It should be the manager or the team leader who gives the negative feedback in a private meeting. Team success should be rewarded as a group.

Conclusion: Global Leadership Challenges and Opportunities

“A developing country may be defined as one in which too many opportunities go unexploited, undeveloped, unrealized. And the entrepreneurial manager seeks out, exploits, and develops these opportunities” (Mendoza, 1997, p.71).

Indeed, the cultural context in developing countries may present too many opportunities for global leaders. Loyalty, trust and affection for the leader; importance of harmonious interpersonal relationships; desire to learn and motivation to develop; self-sacrifice for the well-being of the ‘in-group’; and flexibility are workforce characteristics that have great potential to enhance organizational performance, if utilized effectively. On the other hand, the global leader will be challenged to gain acceptance as an in-group member, motivate employees for higher performance, improve communication effectiveness, overcome the sense of insecurity, helplessness and dependency proneness, and administer participative decision-making. For Westerners, turning barriers into opportunities is a journey that takes time, patience and courage. To many, however, this journey has been immensely rewarding spiritually and professionally.

References

Abdalla, I.A. & Al-Homoud, M.A. (2001). Exploring the Implicit Leadership Theory in the Arabian Gulf States. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50(4), 506-531.

Adler, N.J. & Boyacigiller, N. (1995). Going Beyond Traditional HRM Scholarship. In R.N. Kanungo (Ed.), Employee Management in Developing Countries (pp.1-13). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Adler, N.J. (1997). Organizational Behavior. Ohio: South-Western College Publishing.

Ali, A.J. (1999). The Evolution of Work Ethic and Management Thought: An Islamic View. In H.S.R. Kao, D. Sinha & B. Wilpert (Eds.), Management and Cultural Values: The Indigenization of Organizations in Asia (pp.139-151). New Delhi, India: Sage Publications India Pvt Ltd.

Austin, J.E. (1990). Managing in Developing Countries: Strategic Analysis and Operating Techniques. New York: The Free Press.

Aycan, Z. & Kanungo, R.N. (2001). Cross-Cultural Industrial and Organizational Psychology: A Critical Appraisal of the Field and Future Directions. In N.Anderson, D.S.Ones, H.Kepir-Sinangil, Viswesvaran, C. (Eds.). International Handbook of Work and Organizational Psychology (pp.385-408). London: Sage.

Aycan, Z. & Kanungo, R.N., Mendonca, M.; Yu, K., Deller, J.; Stahl, G.; Khursid, A. (2000). Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A ten country comparison. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49(1), 192-220.

Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations. New York: The Free Press.

Conger, J.A. & Kanungo, R.N. (1998). Charismatic Leadership in Organizations. California: Sage Publications.

Glenn, E. S., & Glenn, C. G. (1981). Man and mankind: Conflict and communication between cultures. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Gupta, R.K. (1999). The Truly Familial Work Organization: Extending the Organizational Boundary to Include Employees' Families in the Indian Context. In H.S.R. Kao, D. Sinha & B. Wilpert (Eds.), Management and Cultural Values: The Indigenization of Organizations in Asia (pp.102-120). New Delhi, India: Sage Publications India Pvt Ltd.

Hall, E.T., & Hall, M.R. (1995). Understanding cultural differences. Yarmount, ME: Intercultural Press.

Hardy, C. (1990). Leadership and Strategy making for institution building and innovation: the case of a Brazilian university. In A. M. Jaeger & R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), Management in Developing Countries (pp.83-100). London: Routledge.

Hartog, D.N., House, R.J., Hanges, P.J., et al. (1999). Culture Specific and Cross Culturally Generalizable Implicit Leadership Theories: Are Attributes of Charismatic/Transformational Leadership Universally Endorsed? Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), 219-256.

Hickson, D.J. & Pugh, D.S. (1995). Management Worldwide: The Impact of Societal Culture on Organizations around the Globe. London: Penguin Books.

Hickson, D.J. (1997) (Ed.). Exploring Management Across the World. London: Penguin Books.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values. Beverly Hills: Sage.

House, R.J. (1977). A 1976 theory of Charismatic Leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Lawson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting Edge (pp.189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

House, R.J. et al. (1999). Cultural Influences on Leadership and Organizations. Global Leadership, 1, 171-233.

Jackman, M. R. (1994). The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations. California: University of California Press.

Kalra, S.K. (1981). Family Life of High Achievers - A Study of Business Organization. Indian Journal of Social Work, 42(3), 252-263.

Kanungo, R.N. & Jaeger, A.M. (1990) (Eds.). Management in Developing Countries. London: Routledge.

Kanungo, R.N. & Mendonca, M. (1996). Cultural Contingencies and Leadership in Developing Countries. Sociology of Organizations, 14, 263-295.

Kanungo, R.N. (1990). Work Alienation in Developing Countries: Western Models and Eastern Realities. In A.M. Jaeger & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), Management in Developing Countries (pp.193-208). London: Routledge.

Kao, H.S.R., Sinha, D. & Wilpert, B. (1999). Management and Cultural Values: The Indigenization of Organizations in Asia. New Delhi, India: Sage Publications.

Kim, U. M. (1994). Significance of paternalism and communalism in the occupational welfare system of Korean firms. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), Cross-Cultural research and methodology series: Vol.18. Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications (pp.251-266) California, USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lane, H.W., DiStefano, J.J., & Maznevski, M.L.(1997). International Management Behavior. Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Mendonca, M. & Kanungo, R.N. (1990). Performance Management in Developing Countries. In A.M. Jaeger & R.N. Kanungo (Eds.), Management in Developing Countries (pp.223-251). London: Routledge.

Mendoza, G.A. (1977). The Transferability of Western Management Concepts and Programs: An Asian Perspective. In S. Lawrence, J. Coleman, & J. Black (Eds.). Education

and Training for Public Sector Management in Developing Countries. New York: Rockefeller Foundation.

Miles, R. & Snow, C. (1978). Organizational Strategy, Structure, and Process. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Negandhi, A.R. (1983). Management in the Third World. Asian Pasific Journal of Management, 1(1), 15-25.

Northouse, P. G. (1997). Leadership : Theory and Practice. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Puffer, S. M. (1996). Understanding the Bear: A Portrait of Russian Business Leaders. In S. M. Puffer (Ed.), Management Across Cultures (pp.300-322). Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Redding, S. G., & Hsiao, M. (1990). An empirical study of overseas Chinese managerial ideology. International Journal of Psychology, 25, 629-641.

Ronen, S. & Shenkar, O. (1985). Clustering Countries on Attitudinal Dimensions: A Review and Synthesis. Academy of Management Review, 10(3), 435-455.

Sagiv, L. & Schwartz, S.H. (2000). Value priorities and subjective well-being: Direct relations and congruity effects. European Journal of Social Psychology, 30(2), 177-198.

Shamir, B., House, R.J. & Arthur, M.B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. Organization Science, 4(4), 577-594.

Sinha, J.B.P. & Kanungo, R.N. (1997). Context Sensitivity and Balancing in Indian Organizational Behaviour. International Journal of Psychology, 32(3), 93-105.

Sinha, J.B.P. (1980). The Nurturant Task Leader. New Delhi: Concept Publishing House.

Sinha, J.B.P. (1990). Work Culture in the Indian Context. New Delhi: Sage.

Sinha, J.B.P. (1995). The Cultural Context of Leadership and Power. New Delhi, India: Sage Publications.

Stephens, G.K. & Greer, C.R. (1997). Doing Business in Mexico: Understanding Cultural Differences. In H.W. Lane, J.J. DiStefano & M.L. Maznevski, International Management Behavior (Eds.) (pp.107-124). Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Thomas, D.C. (2000). Essentials of International Management: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. New Delhi, India: Sage Publications.

Triandis, H. C. (1994). Cross-cultural industrial and organizational psychology. In H. C. Triandis, M. D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, 2nd ed. (Vol. 4, pp.103-172). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Trompenaars, F. (1998). Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Global Business. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Yukl, G. (1998). Leadership in Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Table 1. Charismatic Leadership Behavior for Developing Countries.

Step 1: Assess the environment:

- identifying factors that facilitate or hinder achievement of organizational goals
- assessing minimum conditions needed for implementing short and long term goals
- determining the key stakeholders and nature of transactions

Step 2: Visioning and Responding to Environment:

- Establish dominant goal and direct efforts to achieve it
- Move from pilot testing to implementation on a larger scale
- Mobilize demand
- Develop support network

Step 3: Means to achieve:

- Establish affective reciprocity relationship
 - Confidence in follower's ability for task accomplishment
 - Nurture follower self-efficacy through coaching, modelling, encouraging and rewarding
 - Idealize organizational and work values
 - Discourage manipulative ingratiation relationships
 - Avoid lording behavior and 'pulling of ranks'
 - Avoid negativism
 - Avoid favoritism
 - Promote performance based reward system
 - Promote loyalty to organization and work values rather than loyalty to people in position power
 - Recognize dependence of subordinates for developing task competence versus dependence for material gain. Be supportive of subordinates in the former case
 - Use a family metaphor for organizations
 - Be fair and firm to all members
 - Be open, available and accessible
 - Be sociable and collegial to members (use existing rites and rituals as occasions for relating to members)
 - Show constant concern for improving quality of life of members as one would do for own self
 - Groom second line in command
 - Show respect and support for other's position and authority
 - Promote information sharing, participation and communication
-

Source: **Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996.**