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Abstract

In this thesis, the leadership styles, exercised the most in France and Japan, were firstly examined. In the globalizing business area, it is useful to learn the tendency of managers’ behaviour towards subordinates in unfamiliar areas you may go in the future. Secondly, the relationships of each leadership style and effectiveness were examined. As management process, it is necessary to choose the most effective way to maximize the outcomes in scared resources. Different leadership styles are expected to bring different amounts of organizational effectiveness.

Thanks to our cultural differences in the research group members of this thesis, a questionnaire about leadership style based on MLQ (Multiple Leadership Questionnaire) Manual was conducted towards people who have working experience in France and Japan. The results from the survey in Japan and in France were quite similar: Transactional leadership style was observed most frequently in the both countries, although comparing relatively in two countries, Inspiration Motivation was observed more in France and overall transaction was exercised a little more frequently in Japan.

According to the results of the first questionnaire about leadership and second about effectiveness launched to the same respondents, the relationship between effectiveness and each leadership style was examined. Our results were significant and confirmed the MLQ theory: in order of higher effectiveness, (1) Transformational leadership, (2) Transactional leadership and finally (3) Passive Avoidant leadership. In our study, comparing two countries, French subordinates tend to find more effective than the Japanese, as Transactional leadership was observed more in Japan, although the other two leadership styles were observed mostly in the same frequencies.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Nowadays, the world competition between each company increases and the Human resource is becoming a strategic point to achieve effective managers who will lead well the team and increase the company’s profit. But in this global competition, the culture has a huge impact on the working behaviour. According to the work of Kanungo & Wright (1983), “a cross-cultural comparative study of managerial job attitudes”, there is a lot of differences between France and Japan in the perceived “respect and recognition”, “responsibility and independence”, “achievement”, “technically competent supervisor” etc.... Also, in the Japanese culture the team notion and the collectivism are really important at work meanwhile the French workers focused more on themselves and keep individual goals. Some big Japanese companies as Mitsubishi, Canon or Toyota set up new headquarter in France and are developing their business, but how do they deal with the cultural differences at work (structure, power distance, leadership style, working habits...)? How should they adapt their management style to be effective?

Thus we found it will be interesting to analyse the leadership style of this different cultures and to discover which one is the most common in Japan and France. To proceed we find interesting to get the opinion from the subordinates because they feel directly the impact of their management style on their working condition and performance.

Thus, our first problem will be: **What are the differences of managers’ leadership style between France and Japan in a company from the view of the subordinates?**

Secondly, it will be interesting to be focus on the effectiveness of the manager and make the link with the leadership style. Is one certain leadership style better than others or not? Thus, it will conduce us to our second problem: **Which leadership style leads to the higher manager’s effectiveness?**
1.2 Purpose

1st goal: identify the differences and the similarities of leadership between Japan and France.

2nd goal: Establish which leadership leads to the higher effectiveness.

1.3 Delimitations

WHAT?

We will discover and analyse the differences or similarities between Japanese and French managers leadership style through the view of their subordinates. Then we will measure their effectiveness perceived from their subordinates, to finish by being focused on the relation between leadership and effectiveness.

WHO?

Our investigation (survey) will be done on the subordinates but focus on their managers. In the first part of our survey the subordinates will describe us the leadership style in their companies and the second part is about the effectiveness of their main manager (the direct manager, the manager from who they receive directly orders).

Respondents of the survey are chosen randomly so as to collect different types of managers as much as possible. Their managers can be in different levels of positions, from middle managers to top managers, and in different industries (such as restaurant, publishing, airline, IT software), etc.

In addition we focus mainly on companies, just a few from public companies, but always with the same goal of increasing profit.

WHERE?

Thanks to our cultural differences in our group, we would like to use it as an advantage. Thus we will focus on Japan and France. By the way it is interesting to show the differ-
ences between an Asian and a European culture.

**HOW?**

To measure it, we will follow the MLQ (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, cf. definition 3.2) that’s mean made a quantitative study with 45 describing items (35 items for the leadership style and 10 items for the effectiveness).
2 Methodology

2.1 Research purpose

Our purpose in the research is to make generalizations about which kind of leadership style is used the most by French and Japanese managers. But also, and this is more difficult to generalize about which leadership style leads to the highest effectiveness. The last goal is more difficult because “effectiveness” is a large aspect, it doesn't have the same meaning according to the cultures and it's hard to measure it. To succeed in our goal, we have to be very rigorous on the process and handle the problem of the undermining because it is a sensitive topic. Out of several sort of leadership styles many researchers have defined, we choose to use the MLQ (Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) methodology with the new version from Bass and Avolio (1997) that has been approved all over the world by Businesses and Authors. This methodology identifies 3 kinds of leadership: transformational, transactional and passive-avoidant. Thus, we will use this theory to identify the kind of leadership and then we will ask to the same respondents to measure the effectiveness of their managers (without told them it's about it). When a manager is not effective, the subordinates feel directly the consequences, so we think it’s the best way to measure it.

Why MLQ methodology?

The goal of a manager is not only to increase the profit but it's also to encourage, to support and to transfer his knowledge to his team, and this is quite abstract to evaluate. There are many undermining around effectiveness for a manager and it's difficult to identify which kind of behaviour brings to a specific kind of leadership. Thus, we decide to use a collecting methodology already approved by companies and several authors: MLQ.

From the view of subordinates

We think, it will be interesting to analyze the behaviour of managers from an outside point of view, because it's always difficult to judge himself but judging another person seems sometimes easier. Also, to build a relevant sample, we need at least 45 persons by coun-
tries, actually we met some difficulties to find a lot of managers who will agree to participate in Japan compare to France, so our comparison will be not reliable. In addition, it will be more complicated because we had to compare French subordinates to Japanese subordinates and the same for the managers, so making the distinction between subordinates and managers will make our analysis too wide and we can loose in relevance if there is not the same sample size by categories in each country. So we prefer to focus only on subordinates.

2.2 Research approach

Quantitative Approach:
The features of quantitative research method are:

(1) Its results are assumed to be measurable and presentable in the form of numbers and statistics

(2) Compared to quantitative research, quantitative approach is more formalized, structured and controlled

(3) Few variables are usually studied, but on a large number of entities (Bryman & Bell 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Hussey & Hussey 1997). Quantitative approach is conducted systematically and analyzed with statistical summery, which clarifies the causal relationship between variables. That is to say; the result derived from quantitative method, that enables to gain the bigger number of samples of population involved, is qualified more than qualitative approach with fewer detailed cases out of whole population.

Qualitative Approach:
Qualitative research involves “any research that uses data that does not indicate ordinal values” (Nkwi, Nyamongo, and Ryan, 2001, p. 1). Its methods include focus group, in-depth interview and case study. The most common advantages of quantitative approach are following: First, it is not necessary to follow certain existing structures. Second, more detailed statements can be gained by being conducted focus groups or in-depth interviews.
Third, qualitative method allows researchers to bring their personal-self into the research along with their research-self. Disadvantage of qualitative research is that personal statement tends to be subjective due to their biases, different values and interests. Therefore, researchers carry out quantitative method on the same study to reinforce the validity of qualitative analysis.

In our research, the survey is compatible to conduct with quantitative method, although it is more persuasive to combine both quantitative and qualitative approaches, according to Byrman (1988). This decision is due to some obstacles. One of them is the geographic distances across the countries, France and Japan where our targets of the survey live and Sweden where we, the researchers, work this research. Focus groups or in-depth interviews, as qualitative methods, can be carried out on the phone or on Skype. These communication tools, however, provide our respondents with not as comfortable condition as face-to-face conversation to answer the questions. Moreover, it can be expected that on focus groups or in-depth interviews, people will hesitate to answer the questions about their managers and their effectiveness, since these questions are sensitive topics to answer honestly.

Instead conducting no quality method, quantitative research is exercised well deeply in this study. It is not only because MLQ methods require quantitative data collection, but also since we utilize the advantages of quantitative method that allows us to keep the respondents anonymous, which make the respondents more willing to answer the questions truthfully. Moreover, because this research attempts to identify the most common leadership style in each country, well-structured research data is necessary to validate with numerical figures. The questionnaires, we provided to the targets, consists of 45 questions about their managers' behaviour based on MLQ theory that has been exercised in a number of companies, and therefore well structured, with multiple-choice questions of five interval scales; from “not at all”, to “frequently, if not always”, and are divided in two parts, leadership and effectiveness, whose data is available to be transferred to statistical analysis.

Why a Deductive approach?
We choose a deductive approach, that’s mean we start from the theory to the data, the data demonstrates and argues our theory. This way is the most usual because it’s less risky to make mistake than the inductive approach because the theory is here to serve them. In the inductive approach we have to create a new theory from the data, and this is very difficult to be reliable without having bases about initial theory and also because you have to take in consideration the impact of all the others factors.

2.3 Data collection method

Firstly we decide to use the MLQ methodology in accordance to bring more reliable results on a study that lies on many abstract feelings and behaviour. Thus, according to MLQ we can use a survey or focus group.

A focus group could be interesting; it’s a kind of qualitative research where people are free to talk about their feelings, beliefs, and attitudes with others group members. The problem is that, we cannot make one properly, because of geographical distance. And also, a virtual one will not suit our topic, because it’s a very sensitive topic, especially in France, so people don’t want to be filmed and want to stay anonymous.

Thus a survey will be the best choice. Firstly because it suits the MLQ methodology and it is a quantitative collective method and it’s exactly what we focus on, because we would like to establish statistics from it. Secondly it is the most appropriate way considers the geographical distance, we will build one on the Internet and people will follow the instructions; it is cheap, easy to fill it for the participants and to collect for us. Also it stays anonymous and it is an appropriate way for asking about undermining and sensitive topic as our (behaviour of your manager). In addition, they are alone to fill it and they can fill it from their home where they are more at ease, also because we use a well-known method (MLQ) and we get a teacher sponsorship, it will trust us more and will be more confident.

Actually Internet is a relevant choice for the geographical distance but not only. Internet has many advantages: low costs, excellent speed of data collection, possibility of a widely dispersed sample, very flexible form, a fair response rate and control of interviewer effects.

Thus, we will use a Sample survey (a census survey takes to many times and is very expensive) by distributing the MLQ survey on Internet to our sample.
As a scientific research, we attempt to follow the strategies that reinforce rigorousness and relevance in this study. The survey is the primary data of this study and it is conducted with professional survey questionnaire, MLQ methodology and analyzed by SPSS, the most common analytical package. The theories included in MLQ methodology and cultural difference studies are searched from scientific resources as secondary data.

2.4 Data collection instrument (Operationalization)

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

While there have been some contributions to construct measurement tools to measure assess the transformational leaderships, Bass suggests MLQ (The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire) as the most widely accepted instrument to measure transformational leadership. According to Bass, its function is included assessment the Full Range of Leadership model (Burns, 1978) including laissez-faire leadership; the components of transactional leadership namely, management by exception and contingent reward was well as the components of transformational leadership (Bass, 2006). MLQ is also known as MLQ 5X short or the standard MLQ measures a broad range of leadership types from passive leaders (passive-avoidant), to leaders who give contingent rewards to followers (transactional), to leaders who transform their followers into becoming leaders themselves (transformational) ». There are 2 forms of MLQ, one focus only on managers’ respondents and the second one on the subordinates’ respondents. We choose the second form. This methodology was validated across cultures and types of organizations.

How we build the questionnaire?

In order to build a reliable and valid research we decide to personalize a bit the MLQ questionnaire by adding some questions about identification and health. Thus we decide to make two questionnaires: one about the leadership style where we add an identification part and the second one about the effectiveness of their managers and the health of the subordinate (the respondent).

The first questionnaire is composed of:

- Five identification questions: age, sex, study level, working time and working time under the order of the manager they describe.
Thirty-five descriptions statements listed about the leadership style: The respondent has to judge how frequently each statement fits the person they are describing ("not at all", "once in a while", "sometimes", "fairly often", "frequently, if not always").

It is important to add some identification questions because may be the "working time under the order of the manager" has an influence on the reliability of the answers. Or may be you don't judge on the same way your manager if you are 25 or 40 years old, if you are a woman or a man ... Thanks to this Information we can discover some factors that affect the point of view of the subordinates and it give us the possibility to segment our sample / target.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Person I Am Rating . . .**

5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise……………………………………………………………………………0 1 2 3 4

7. Is absent when needed……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………0 1 2 3 4

26. Articulates a compelling vision of the future………………………………………………………………………………………………0 1 2 3 4

13. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished………………………………………………………………………0 1 2 3 4

24. Keeps track of all mistakes………………………………………………………………………………………………………………0 1 2 3 4

Questions 5 & 7 correspond to Passive avoidant leadership

Questions 26 & 13 correspond to Transformational leadership

Question 24 corresponds to Transactional leadership

**The second questionnaire is composed of:**

- Five questions about the health of the respondents: The respondent has to judge how frequently each statement fits his health when he works. Essentially the statement represent health problem from stress and overwork.

- Ten descriptions statements listed about the effectiveness of their manager
The questions about the health permit also to detect if the subordinate work in a good working atmosphere and give us an overview of the impact of the pressure from their manager over them.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_The Person I Am Rating_ . . .

42. Heightens my desire to succeed........................................................................0 1 2 3 4
43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements........................................0 1 2 3 4
44. Increases my willingness to try harder ................................................................0 1 2 3 4

Questions 42, 43 & 44 were in the 2nd survey and correspond to effectiveness.

### 2.5 Sample Selection

#### Define population

The subordinates who are working now in a Company in Japan for a Japanese company and in French for a French company and who have at least job experience more than half an year.

We focus on the way of management, the behaviour of their leaders towards them. Thus, we agree on the nationality of the company is up to the nationality of the Country’s CEO.

#### Identify the sampling frame from which the sample will be selected.

It is a very sensitive topic, because many subordinates are afraid to loose their job if they speak about their managers. So, even if it’s anonymous and from an official collecting method data, the sample will be made from our personal relationship: family, friends who already work, Alumni business school network and professional contact from our last working experiences.

#### Decide on the sample size

It is the maximum as we can, but according to our teacher and the MLQ methodology we
should at least have 45 subordinates per country, so at least a sample of 90 persons in total.

### 2.6 Data analysis

The structure of the questionnaires with the online survey software and multiple-choice questions enables the respondents to answer and submit the survey easily and quickly. Furthermore, multiple-choice questions with interval scales prevent from specifying individuals identified by personal information and answers. The questionnaires are also conducted anonymously. Thus, the respondents will answer it with less concerns of their privacy. Artologik®, is the software used for the survey of this study. The software enables the researchers to secure a high response rate by distributing the survey by e-mail. It has, furthermore, a system that notifies each incoming answer of the questionnaires from participants with a certain mark so that the researchers are able to keep in track of which participants have submitted out of whom the researchers have sent the questionnaires to. Despite this advantage, the researchers are required to collect the e-mail address of each participant after asking if the people can participate in the survey, which requires the researchers and the respondents extra time.

On this study, the data collected from the survey is to be analyzed by IBM SPSS Statistics, one of the most common statistical analysis packages. This software addresses the entire analytical process, from planning to data collection to analysis, reporting and deployment. (IBM SPSS Statistics, 2013). With this tool researchers can avoid mistakes in the process of data analysis. This software has been used on a number of scientific researches and been developed since the first version has been released for more than 30 years.

### 2.7 Reliability and Validity

We will test the reliability and validity of our hypothesis and check the different correlations by using the IBM software SPSS. Thus, for the reliability we have to be focus on 3 values:

- Cronbach’s alpha: Alpha has to be superior to 0.6, 1 is a perfect reliability.
- Sig: should be as low as possible, but if it higher than 0.05 we have to exclude the value

Also, if we have missing value in the questionnaire but just a few, we will put the average value to optimize the validity of our result. The reliability and validity of our survey will also depend on the number of respondents, we hope to have at least 45 persons answering the two questionnaires from the French and the Japanese part; if it is not, we should put the result into perspective and take it in consideration in our conclusion.

In addition, to be reliable, we will use the official survey made by MLQ and distribute one in Japanese to our Japanese sample and one in French to the other sample. Then, we need to wait some days before distributing the next short survey of efficiency, actually because the 2nd questionnaire is about efficiency it’s better the respondents don’t remember what they say about the leadership style in order to have a good measure of the effectiveness. Moreover, Whitelaw (2001) describes the validity of MLQ as an appropriate measurement of leadership over the world that a rigorous research process has composed it over the past fifteen years. In a good manner of scientific research, some specific conditions, called Eight Hallmarks (Sekaran, 2010), should be met for reliability and validity and scientific measurements are required to satisfy them as well. The Eight Hallmarks are following; Purposiveness, Rigor, Testability, Replicability, Precision and confidence, Objectivity, Generalizability and Parsimony. According to Whitelaw, MLQ meets all of the hallmarks (Sekaran, U., 2010).

**Content validity: What has been done to maximize it?**

In addition, our topic is quite sensitive so for getting the real feeling of our respondents we insist on the legitimacy of our survey to increase their confidence by:

- Being sponsored by a doctor of our University
- Using special software: “Artologik”, more professional than Google or Survey Monki
- Putting the respondent in confidence, by sending a personal message before, explain well that is totally anonymous and don’t mention at all the notion of effectiveness but prefer health, insist on there is not bad or good answer, we don’t analyze the performance but just the kind of leadership use compare to other cultures.
- Using a MLQ questionnaire we have a validated and rigorous tool (but we didn’t
mention it to the respondents).

External validity

Comparing the results with the previous MLQ study on effectiveness. To avoid misunderstood and to bring validity and coherence to our research, it’s important to compare our result with the secondary data (theories and research already done by others authors). Like this we can see if we are on the right way or not.
3 Theory

3.1 What is Leadership?

As Enterprises have regarded leadership as important for management, the term leadership has ambiguous characteristics. Indeed, there are several definitions for it from different perspectives. Occasionally, the term leadership is associated with the term management, because fundamental functions of the both include planning, organizing, leading, and controlling organizational resources (Rahman, 2011). Yukl (2006, p.19) collected the basic definitions of leadership researchers have given. He concluded, "most behavioural scientists and practitioners seem to believe leadership is real phenomenon that is important for the effectiveness of organizations". Thus, according to his perspective, leadership influences organizational effectiveness.

3.2 Definition of the 3 types of MLQ's leadership


Background

James MacGregor Burns (1978) conceptualized leadership as either transactional or transformational. Then, new measurements tools were developed but the most accepted was the Multifactor leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) created by Bass and Avolio in 2000 and not cover only the two way of leadership identify by James MacGregor Burns (Transformational and Transactional) but also the Laissez-faire leadership.

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leaders stimulate and inspire followers to achieve high outcomes and in this process develop their own leadership capacity. They help followers grow and develop into leaders by responding to individual followers' needs by empowering them and by aligning the objectives and goals of the individual followers, the leader, the group and the larger organization.
Components of Transformational Leadership:

- **Idealized Influence (II)**
  
  There are two aspects: the leader’s behaviour and the elements that are attributed to the leader by followers. The leaders are a kind of model; they are admired, respected and trusted. Followers identify with them and want to emulate them. Their followers as having extraordinary capabilities, persistence and determination endow leaders.

- **Inspirational Motivation (IM)**
  
  Leaders behave in ways that motivate and inspire those around them by: providing meaning and challenge, team spirit, working with enthusiasm and optimism, getting involved in envisioning attractive future states.

- **Intellectual Stimulation (IS)**
  
  Leaders stimulate their follower's efforts to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems. Leaders encourage new ideas and concepts, want to try new approaches, thus they don’t criticize the idea in public and accept totally different ideas from followers compare to their ones.

- **Individualized Consideration (IC)**
  
  Leaders pay special attention to each individual follower's need and adapt themselves to the individual differences of their followers. For example, some will need autonomy, some confidence and some recognition.

**Transactional Leadership**

According to James MacGregor Burns, Transactional managers are those who lead through social exchange. “Exchanging one thing from another” like jobs for votes. In the same way, they offer financial rewards for productivity or deny awards for lack of productivity. So, transactional leadership occurs when the leader rewards or disciplines the follower according to his performance. This leadership depends on two concepts:
- Contingent Reward (CR)
  It involves the leader assigning or obtaining follower agreement on what needs to be done with promised or actual rewards offered in exchange for satisfactorily carrying out the assignment. This concept is linked to transactional when the reward is material (ex: bonus), while when it's psychological it can be transformational (ex: praise).

- Management by Exception Active (MBE-A)
  The leader arranges to actively monitor deviations from standards, mistakes and errors in the followers’ assignment and take corrective action as necessary.

Passive-Avoidant leadership
- Management by Exception Passive (MBE-P)
  The leader waits passively for deviations, mistakes and errors occur and then taking corrective action.

- Laissez Faire Leadership (LF)
  This kind of management is identified as the avoidance or absence of leadership. Concretely, it’s described as: necessary decisions are not made, actions are delayed, responsibilities are ignored. For example, the leader doesn’t want to be involved when important issues arise.

3.3 Effectiveness / Leadership

Effectiveness’ definition:
The traditional definition of Organizational Effectiveness derives from Etzioni (1964) describing the degree of achieving the outcomes the organization intends to produce.
According to Richard et al. (2009), Cameron & Whetten, after two decades, interprets it more in detail that it is “a broader construct that captures organizational performance, but with grounding in organizational theory that entertains alternate performance goals”. Richard et al. then clarify the meaning by distinguishing the two concepts: Organizational
Performance and Organizational Effectiveness. The former are measured by economic valuation, included corporate profits, shareholders equity etc. On the other hand, the latter relates not only organizational performance, but also the plethora of internal performance outcomes. Later on, operational effectiveness has been regarded as measurement of financial performance, customer outcomes, innovation, and internal processes, all of which are indicators of internal management and control (Richard et al., 2009). Thus, for our study we will refer “effectiveness” to the definition of Richard et al. (2009).

**MLQ’s leadership compare to Effectiveness:**

**Full Range Leadership Model © Bass and Avolio, 1997**

Bass and Avolio supports that transformational leadership is the most effective for several reasons:

1) **Meta-Analysis**

This hierarchic model support the model of Lowe Kroeck and Sivasubramaniam (1996), that was a completed meta-analysis of data for 2873 to 4242 respondents that showed the correlations between each component of the MLQ was consistent with the model.
In addition, Gasper (1992), he made another meta-analysis, he separated in two different composites Transformational leadership and Transactional leadership. For 20 studies, the mean corrected transformational leadership correlated respectively, .76, .71 and .88 with effectiveness, satisfaction and extra effort perceived by the followers. The corresponding corrected correlations with transformational leadership were .27, .22 and .32.

2) Commitment, loyalty and satisfaction of followers
Bass & Avolio demonstrates that Transformational leadership leads to more commit, loyal and satisfied followers. How? With a Charismatic-Inspirational behaviour: this manager articulates a vision and he increases the intrinsic value of goal accomplishment (he is going above the simple value of each goal). Also, by building on followers’ trust and promoting follower self-esteem and self-efficiency create more satisfied followers and also a greater sense of collective identity and so efficacy.

3) Transformational leadership vs Performance
Transformational leadership providing the tools to help followers cope with stress and crisis; increase their identification with the leader, Align goals and values, increase the creativity's followers, Implement change and can conduce to create and develop leaders. Thus the transformational way affects the group performance: leaders help develop followers to be better contributors to the group effort, more creative, more resistant to stress, more flexible and open to change.

Critics
Nevertheless, some others authors think that transformational leadership is more effective than the transformational. A common criticism is that, transformational leadership is “smoke and mirrors, a feel good type of leadership that leads to happy followers but does not affect the group performance”.

Globally critics perceive this leadership as elitist and antidemocratic. Weber (1947) and his successors emphasized the extent of the charismatic leader directed dependent followers out of crises with radical solutions to deal with their problems, inspirational lead-
ers were seen to be highly directive in their means and methods. According to Weber, as transformational, transactional leadership can be either directive or participative.

### 3.4 Cultures Differences between France & Japan

**Hofstede’s Model:**

According to Hostede’s definition, the term culture is “collective programming of mind that distinguishes the members of one group or society.” We assume that each person carries a certain amount of mental programming that is stable over time and leads to the same person’s showing more or less the same behaviour in similar situations. According to Hofstede, the courses of one’s mental programs lie within the social environments in which one grew up and collected one’s life experiences. Thus, the programming lasts within the communities ranged from the family, neighbourhood and school to workplace in one's lifetime (Hofstede, et al., 2010). While the theory of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions has spread and is used to compare an object by countries worldwide, we should use the theory with care because, as Hofstede himself (2010) mentions, nations are often the only feasible criterion for classification. Namely one nation is mere an aggregate of tiny communities that have different characters and backgrounds; one region of nation X has distinguished character rather than typical people in nation X, when it comes to one corporation whose the employees were gather from different countries and each has international background, it is not an appropriate way to describe the traits based on his theory. Nevertheless, as explained before, our behaviours are driven by experiences that occur several times in similar situations correlating with similar types of environment including people around us. Therefore, we will use this theory to hypothesize what dimensions can influence to compose managers’ leadership styles.

The latest version of six cultural dimensions shown on the official webpage is following:

- a) Power Distances
- b) Individualism vs Collectivism
- c) Masculinity vs Femininity
- d) Uncertainty Avoidance
e) Long-term Orientation
f) Indulgence vs Restraint

The first four dimensions; Power Distances, Individual/Collectivism, Masculinity/Femininity, Uncertainty Avoidance, were expounded based on a study of employees values by Hofstede from 1967 to 1973.

First dimension, **Power distance**, is the degree of how employees are afraid of their bosses, with feeling their authority. The more employees feel close to their bosses they express a preference for a consultative style of leadership (Hofstede, 2010). This fact is scored with questions such as “How frequently, in your experience, does the following problem occur: employees being afraid of express disagreement with their managers?”

Secondly coming **Individualism and Collectivism**. Individualism is expected to take care of themselves and their immediate family only, while collectivism takes “belonging”, or “in-groups” granted, thus collectivists tend to behave for what people can do for the group.

The third one is between **Masculinity and Femininity**. Whereas, in Masculinity society, achievement, heroism, assertiveness and material reward for success are focused on more, Femininity has traits of cooperation, modesty, caring for the weak and quality of life (Hofstede, 2013).

Forth, **Uncertainty Avoidance** is the degree to which the members of a society feel uncomfortable with uncertainty and ambiguity (Hofstede, 2013).

**“Long-term Orientation”**, the fifth dimension, was added by Michael Bond in 1991. In Long-term Oriented society, people believe that truth depends very much on situation, context and time. They show an ability to adapt traditions to changed conditions, whereas people rather with Short-term Orientation show respects to traditional ways by considering those ways are absolute truths (Hofstede, 2013).

In 2010, Michael Minkov then added the last dimension, **Indulgent vs Restraint**. Indulgent society allows people more free gratification to enjoy their lives and to have fun as the basic human drives, while Restraint society regulates the gratification of needs by means of strict social norms (Hofstede, 2013).
In 2010 Michael Minkov researched the dimensions extending the number of country scores to 93 (Hofstede, et al. 2010). However, the current version of rank scores in each dimension by country has different numbers of countries due to the different types of surveys. The first four dimensions were ranked within 76 countries in the World Value Survey, while the fifth and the last were ranked within 93 in the IBM database plus some extensions (Hofstede, et al., 2010). The website of Hofstede shows the correlations of each nation scores of each dimension. Below you can see the score in each dimension by the two countries, and square brackets show the rank score out of either 76 or 93.

**Figure 1 Hofstede’ cultural dimensions by country, France and Japan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power distances</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>(27-29/76) 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualism</strong></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(13-14/76) 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Masculinity</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(47-50/76) 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertainty Avoidance</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>(17-22/76) 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term Orientation</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(25/93) 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indulgent</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>(39-40/93) 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distinctive dimensions:**

In comparison by country within 76 and 93 countries, France has high scores in Power Distances, Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Short-term Orientation. The scores of Femininity and Indulgent are both in the middle. When it comes to Japan, of Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Long-term Orientation are remarkably in higher scores. The score of Individualism, Power Distance, and Indulgent are relatively low.

**Differences in the two countries:**
From the data, it can be said that employees in France are more afraid of their bosses than Japanese are. In French society, they would prefer to work on and be responsible for their task individually rather than Japanese working together in groups. In France more women widen their sphere of activity than Japan.

**Similarities in the two countries:**

The both of the two countries do respect certainty rather than uncertainty and ambiguity, and are flexible to adapt new ways, not as being stagnated in traditional ways. The two countries were ranked almost in the average in Indulgent, though its score in France is 6 points higher than that in Japan. For more in detail, the index for each dimensions calculated from the World Value Survey and IBM data set (Hofstede, et al., 2010).

**In workplace**

Of those differences, France has distinguished environment in workplace. Philippe d'Iribarnein involved with a research project of international management among Netherlands, the United States and France, comments: “The often strongly emotional character of hierarchical relationships in France is intriguing. There is an extreme diversity of feelings towards superiors: they may be either adored or despised with equal intensity. This situation is not all universal. (Hofstede et al., 2010, p. 73).” Employed persons in an individualist culture are expected to act according to their own interests, and work should be organized in such a way that this self-interests and the employer’s interest coincide, whereas employees in collectivist culture will act according to the interest of the in-group, which may not always coincide with their individual interest (Hofstede, 2010). Japan is one of most individual culture among Asian countries indeed. Nevertheless, Japan is located in collectivism group compared to other Western countries. Japan is the second place for Masculinity society, while France is moderately feminine in the IBM studies, ranked in 47 out of 76 countries. Thus this dimension is the most obvious difference between the two countries. As another source, The Global Gender Gap Report 2012 (Ricardo Hausmann, et al, 2012) shows the overall score table regarding gender gap by country including economic participation and opportunity, educational attainment, health and survival and political empowerment. In this ranking, France is located in the spot of 57 and Japan is in
101. One obvious example of higher Uncertainty Avoidance countries can be France. The suicide explosion at a company in France in 2009 is mentioned as “the stress of the restructuring became too high for the victims tolerance level.” More traits of high Uncertainty Avoidance are such as, the need for precision and formalization, while in low - countries tend to be tolerant for ambiguity and chaos, there are more self-employed people. Japan, as also high Uncertainty Avoidance, combined with another dimension, Collectivism, has rules implicit and rooted in tradition. The typical argument regarding this country is that the Japanese rightly argue that there are no formal rules preventing the foreign products form being brought in, but the Western would-be importers run up against the many implicit rules of the Japanese distribution system, which they do not understand (Hofstede et al., 2010). Long-term Orientation, can be found especially in East Asian countries, as first four countries of the Long-term ranking by IBM data accounts for Korea, Taiwan, Japan and China, who were called East Asian Dragons until being hit by the economic crisis in 1997. France is also very high in this dimension relatively to other countries. The characteristics of this dimension are such as appeal of knowledge and education rather than folk wisdom and witchcraft, learning from other countries, talent for applied concrete sciences rather than for theoretical abstract sciences.

**The GLOBE project:**

As another analytic model of cultural dimensions, the GLOBE study is frequently accepted in science research.

According to House et al. (2004), the GLOBE study, Global Leadership and Organizational Behavior Effectiveness, is a research program focusing on culture and leadership in 61 nations that are examined with nice dimensions, derived from Hofstede’s model. The distinct points of this study from Hofstede’s model are that it compares cultures and attributes of effective leadership and that cultures are compared by geographically divided areas, Latin Europe, Nordic Europe, Anglo, Southern Asia and etc.

**Nine dimensions of the GLOBE:**

1) Uncertainty Avoidance

2) Power Distance
3) Collectivism I: Societal Collectivism

4) Collectivism II: In-Group Collectivism

5) Gender Egalitarianism

6) Assertiveness

7) Future Orientation

8) Performance Orientation

9) Humane Orientation

When it comes to the two countries, France and Japan, Areas of Latin Europe and East Asia should be focused. The distinctive tendencies in the two countries are below.

Low score of Humane Orientation (France): Power and material possessions motivate people. Self-enhancement is a predominant value. Assertive styles of conflict resolution are preferred. People are expected (Javidan& House, 2001).

Low score of Assertiveness (Japan): Tends to prefer warm and cooperative relations and harmony rather than competition. They have sympathy for the weak and emphasize loyalty and solidarity.
4  Hypothesis

4.1  Comparison between France and Japan

These two countries are home countries of the researchers in this study. Nowadays, Asia is the heart of business world, and it is not anymore in a position of follower but goes ahead and creates and innovates constantly. For example, the “lean management” identified according to Hubert Siegfriedt, general director of lean training as “a production practice that considers the expenditure of resources for any goal other than the creation of value for the end customer to be wasteful, and thus a target for elimination” was inspired from the Toyota production System and presented as a new way to increase efficiency. It was definitely a new approach of management style compare to European car manufacturer as Renault or PSA. So, why Japanese companies as Toyota start to bit French companies? Which kind of management they use? Which leadership style is the most common in Japan? And this new management style has it an impact on the efficiency of their managers? We cannot say or find anymore if one country is more efficient than another one, because of the culture and structure differences. The efficiency is not base on the same values for French or Japanese managers. Nevertheless, we can analyze the differences in the way of managing and especially the leadership style.

From the cultural perspectives based on Hofstede’s Model, it can be anticipated that tendency of Femininity observed more in France and Masculinity in Japan as the most distinctive gab of 52 points in the index (see figure 1) influences the leadership style used the most in each country.

In Masculinity society, it is expected Contingent Rewards (CR) to be observed since material rewards, such as extra bonus, increasing salary, are concerned more than in Femininity society. Moreover, some of the traits of Masculinity; achievement and heroism might correspond to Idealized Influence (II) by showing clear vision and Inspirational Motivation (IM) by motivating subordinates with appropriate sources distributed. Assertiveness in Masculinity society may apply to Management by Exception Passive (MBE-P).
Femininity, on the other hand, has traits of cooperation, modesty, caring for the weak and quality of life. From those traits, it is expected that Management by Exception Active (MBE-A) and Intellectual Stimulation (IS) be rather exercised.

When it comes to the score of Assertiveness in GLOBE project, however, Japan is regarded in low in assertiveness, although, in Hofstede, Japan was one of the top Masculinity society which includes assertiveness. Therefore it is not appropriate to observe a country only with one perspective. When the low score of assertiveness in Japan based on the GLOBE project is taken accounted into hypothesis, it can be said Japanese be regarded rather with cooperation, modesty, caring for the weak and quality of life, as Femininity traits.

4.2 Leadership style / effectiveness

According to Bass and Avolio, the transformational leadership bring to a highest level of effectiveness than the transactional leadership. Different authors like Weber contradicted this idea. Thus it will be interesting to discover thanks to our survey which leadership seems the most effective. Also it will be interested to figure it with the culture differences, for example may be in France the persons who describe their manager with a transactional leadership style will be more effective than the other French person who describe their manager with a transformational leadership style. Also, it will probably be the contrary from Japanese respondents. Thus here our main problematic will be:

In France, which leadership style seems the most effective according to the subordinates?
In Japan, which leadership style seems the most effective according to the subordinates?

4.3 Other factors than Culture

Thanks to the identification information we can make other correlations: may be the youngest find their manager more effective than the oldest with more working experience. May be the perception of the leadership is different between woman and man. We are not going to analyze each point because we are really focus on the cultural factor here but we should take the other factors in considerations in our conclusion if we found a strong correlation.
Thus, these reflexions drive us to these hypothesis:

• Which kind of management they use? Which leadership style is the most common in Japan?

• This new management style has it an impact on the efficiency of their managers?

• Does a high level of masculinity drive also to a high level of Contingent Rewards leadership style?

• Does a high level of Feminity appear in Management by Exception Active style?

• In France, which leadership style seems the most effective according to the subordinates?

• In Japan, which leadership style seems the most effective according to the subordinates?

• Do other factors as age, working experience ... are correlated to the perception of the leadership style?
5 Analysis and Result

Firstly, to guarantee the validity of our results, the Cronbach's alpha was checked from the beginning of the analysis for the construction of summarized value. Also, the sig was checked when we were analysing the different correlations possible (it's more explained in the 5.3).

5.1 Sample Structure

a) The French sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Amount of work hours per week</th>
<th>How many years have you worked under the same manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,61</td>
<td>1,43</td>
<td>2,95</td>
<td>3,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>3,00</td>
<td>3,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,945</td>
<td>0,501</td>
<td>0,211</td>
<td>0,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
64% of the sample is 29 years old or under, so essentially we have a sample of young workers. Then the other part is mostly (29% left) between 30 and 49 years old. As we can see in the statistics, the age mean is between “29 years and under” and “30 – 39 years old”. Thus, we can make some conclusion and check the correlations on the young workers group but we don't have enough people up to 40 years old to generalize about them.

57% of the French respondents are man and 43% are woman. For the size of our sample, this repartition is representative because according to INSEE, in 2010 47,7% of women were working.
96% of our respondents have a university degree and only 2% a high school diploma, so our sample has a high level of education but then we don’t know if they have a Bachelor, Master or Ph.D. Considering our respondents are almost young workers, this is not really representative to the French population because according to Insee only 44% of young workers have a university degree in 2009.

The average of the amount of work is between 30 - 50 hours per week. 48% of our French respondents work more than 30h but less than 40h, this is coherent because the standard
working time in France is 35 hours per week. But we can be surprised that many persons
work more than the legal time: 30% between 40 – 50 hours per week, 16% between 50-60
hours per week and 2% more than 60 hours.

**Working time under the same manager**

Most of the sample worked more than 1 year but at least less than 3 years under the same
manager (43%). Then essentially, 34% of the respondents stay “1 year or less” and then
23% “more than 3 years”. This is coherent because most our sample are young workers
and didn't already change company and are not here this enough time to see the company
structure modification.

**b) The Japanese sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>How many years have you worked under the same manager</th>
<th>Amount of work hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1,30</td>
<td>1,68</td>
<td>2,92</td>
<td>1,68</td>
<td>4,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>3,00</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>4,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
80% of the sample is 29 years old or under, so essentially we have a strongly sample of young workers. Then the other part is mostly 14% between 30 and 39 years old and then 6% up to 40 years old. Thus, we can make some conclusion and check the correlations on the young workers group but we don’t have enough people up to 30 years old to generalized about them.

Sex
68% of the Japanese respondents are women and only 32% are men. It is the opposite of the French sample. Also, it is not really representative because especially in Japan, there are much more men workers than women.

**Education level**

![Pie chart showing education levels]

92% of our respondents have a university degree and only 8% a high school diploma, so our sample has a high level of education but then we don't know if they have a Bachelor, master or Ph.D. It is coherent considering our respondents are almost young workers. This repartition is almost the same as the French sample.

**Amount of work hours per week**

![Pie chart showing work hours]

- More than 20 h but less than 30 h: 34.0%
- More than 30 h but less than 40 h: 22.0%
- More than 40 h but less than 50 h: 34.0%
- More than 50 h but less than 60 h: 6.0%
- 60 h and more: 4.0%
The average of the amount of work is between 40 - 50 hours per week that is coherent because the maximum full-time working hours in Japan is 40 hours per week. In our Japanese respondents 74% work more than 40h per week and 3 persons work more than 60h. Comparing to the French sample, the Japanese subordinates work more time per week.

**Working time under the same manager**

Most of the sample worked less than 1 year (52%) and 32% “more than 1 year but at least less than 3 years under the same manager”. Then essentially, 16% of the Japanese respondents stay more then 3 years with the same manager. This is coherent because most our sample are young workers, and comparing to French respondents they work less time with the same manager then them, we can explain also that because the Japanese sample is younger to the French one.

### 5.2 First Problem: Leadership Style

Which leadership style is the most common in France and Japan?

What are the differences or similarities between the two countries for each leadership style?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IIA</th>
<th>IIB</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>N Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>MBE(A)</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>MBE(P)</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>Passive Avoidant Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3,0625</td>
<td>3,0966</td>
<td>3,5246</td>
<td>3,1591</td>
<td>2,892</td>
<td>0,15317</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,1432</td>
<td>3,3352</td>
<td>3,0341</td>
<td>3,1847</td>
<td>2,6534</td>
<td>2,0795</td>
<td>2,3665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>0,15317</td>
<td>0,10542</td>
<td>0,12541</td>
<td>0,13676</td>
<td>0,13091</td>
<td>0,10358</td>
<td>0,14124</td>
<td>0,11683</td>
<td>0,09074</td>
<td>0,13679</td>
<td>0,12022</td>
<td>0,11411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,7083</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>1,75</td>
<td>2,1875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1,01604</td>
<td>0,69929</td>
<td>0,83189</td>
<td>0,90716</td>
<td>0,86837</td>
<td>0,68708</td>
<td>0,93688</td>
<td>0,77495</td>
<td>0,60189</td>
<td>0,90736</td>
<td>0,79748</td>
<td>0,75694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>0,489</td>
<td>0,692</td>
<td>0,823</td>
<td>0,754</td>
<td>0,472</td>
<td>0,878</td>
<td>0,601</td>
<td>0,362</td>
<td>0,823</td>
<td>0,636</td>
<td>0,573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3,75</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>3,33</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>2,65</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>3,25</td>
<td>3,13</td>
<td>3,75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,67</td>
<td>1,25</td>
<td>1,25</td>
<td>1,75</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>1,75</td>
<td>1,88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>4,75</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores’ meaning:
1 = “Not at all”, 2 = “Once in a while”, 3 = “Sometimes”, 4 = “Fairly often”, 5 = “Frequently, if not always”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IIA</th>
<th>IIB</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>MBE(A)</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>MBE(P)</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>Passive Avoidant Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9833</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.325</td>
<td>3.1665</td>
<td>3.325</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2625</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.405</td>
<td>2.3675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of</td>
<td>0.12454</td>
<td>0.14863</td>
<td>0.14928</td>
<td>0.14109</td>
<td>0.14902</td>
<td>0.12537</td>
<td>0.1391</td>
<td>0.11693</td>
<td>0.10893</td>
<td>0.10113</td>
<td>0.11778</td>
<td>0.10452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>2.1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>2.1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.88063</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>1.05557</td>
<td>0.99765</td>
<td>1.05372</td>
<td>0.88648</td>
<td>0.9836</td>
<td>0.82685</td>
<td>0.77024</td>
<td>0.71507</td>
<td>0.83282</td>
<td>0.73904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scores’ meaning:

1 = “Not at all”, 2 = “Once in a while”, 3 = “Sometimes”, 4 = “Fairly often”, 5 = “Frequently, if not always”
a) **Transformational Leadership**

The managers within this survey were, in the average, regarded to exercise transformational leadership closely to “sometimes” in both countries (3.14 in France, 3.17 in Japan). Japanese subordinates relatively judged their managers, however, more variably; the deviations in the two countries were (.69 in France, .89 in Japan). The range of answer in the questions of transformational leadership is also more spread in Japanese result (from 1.30 to 4.60), whereas French has (from 1.75 to 4.40).

**Idealized Influence (IIA):**

While we hypothesized Idealized Influence should be observed more in Japan because of the factors of Masculinity, achievement and heroism, the level of how the subordinates judged their managers have a IIA management style is the same between France and Japan, For them their managers attitude in the way of IIA “sometimes” with the scores (3.06 in France and 3.05 in Japan). But, there are more disparities in the French result compared to Japan where the deviation from the mean is low.

**Idealized Influence (IIB):**

The level of how the subordinates judged their managers have IIB management style is similar in France and Japan. For them their managers behave in IIB way “sometimes” with following scores, (3.09 in France and 3.10 in Japan). But, there are more disparities in the Japanese result compare to France where the deviation from the mean is low (8.8).

**Inspirational Motivation (IM):**

The level of how the subordinates judge their manager has a IM management style is close between France and Japan, To French subordinates their managers behavior bring “fairy often” inspirational motivation (3.52) compare to Japan when it’s just “sometimes” (2.98). Also this idea is less homogeneous in Japan because the disparities in the answers are higher than 1.
**Intellectual Stimulation (IS):**

Compared to the subordinates in France, those in Japan felt their managers have IS leadership style more in the average (3.16 in France, 3.36 in Japan). While these scores mean approximately "sometimes", IS by Japanese managers were observed more closely "fairly often" compared to France.

**Individualized Consideration (IC):**

Regarding IC, the score of variance in Japan is high (.75 in France, 1.11 in Japan). Therefore it is too ambiguous to state Japanese managers have IC style. However, when it comes to the average, French respondents are less aware of Individual Consideration in their managers’ behaviour than Japanese.

**b) Transaction Leadership**

Transactional Leadership was observed less in France (3.184), compared to Japan (3.262), both of whose numbers are higher than Transformation and Passive Avoidant Leadership in both two countries.

**CR (Contingent Rewards):**

Both French and Japanese respondents answered their managers “sometimes” but more closely to “fairly often” show in advance what material rewards they would receive after competing a task (3.335 in France and 3.325 in Japan). Therefore, this leadership style is observed fairly often in both countries. To earn money seems one of the main reasons to work for most people. Meanwhile, when it comes to deviations, Both France and Japanese respondents answered a extendedly (.94 in France, .98 in Japan). Moreover, as the scores of range in both countries are high (3.50 in France, 3.75 in Japan), it can be said there are extremely opposite managers; some managers do not decide the amount of rewards depending on their subordinates’ performance, the other show exact rewards in advance or give the rewards afterwards.

**MBE-A (Management by Exception Active):**
MBE-A is seen from the managers’ behaviour in both countries “sometimes” or more frequently (3.03 in France, 3.20 in Japan). Furthermore, there are no huge difference between France and Japan in the scores of variance (.60 in France, .68 in Japan) and range (3.25 in France, 3.50 in Japan) regarding MBE-A. Therefore it is said that in this survey, there were in both countries some managers who frequently give caution to their subordinates in advance when some mistakes are anticipated to occur, and also some who do not give caution at all.

c) Passive Avoidant Leadership

Few of both French and Japanese subordinates judged that their managers act in the way of Passive Avoidance. According to the results below of MBP and LF, French managers exercise Passive Avoidant leadership less frequently than Japanese. The result of Passive Avoidant overall shows, however, almost the same average score between the two countries, (2.37 in France, 2.37 in Japan).

**MBE-P (Management by Exception Passive):**

MBE-P is observed more in French managers compared to Japanese. French respondents answered their managers’ behaviour of MBE-P more closely to “sometimes” (2.65), while the counterpart in Japan shows rather “Once in a while” (2.33). Compared to the score of MBE-A, French managers tend rather to leave their subordinates until an assignment completed along the way the subordinates think right. After some errors are found inside the completed assignments, they take actions to modify them. When it comes to the variance, the score in Japan is lower than France (.82 in France, .51 in Japan). Therefore lower ratio of Japanese managers was regarded to have MBE-P.

When it comes to the comparison of two countries regarding the above two types of MBE (MBE-A and MBE-P), managers’ behaviour in France was judged slightly more closely to MBE-P and the counterpart in Japan was closely to MBE-A, although MBE-A was observed more frequently in both countries.

**LF (Laissez Faire Leadership):**
As this type of leadership is regarded as a bad behavior generally, neither in France nor in Japan, its average score is relatively lower than the other types of leadership, (2.08 in France, 2.41 in Japan). Comparing the two countries, French managers exercise leadership and have responsibility in their position more than Japanese.

**Based on Hofstede’ cultural model.** France is regarded more as Femininity and Japan is more as Masculinity. Therefore it was hypothesized that the tendency of Management by Exception Active (MBE-A) and Intellectual Stimulation (IS) can be seen more frequently in French managers' behavior, whereas it was expected that CR, II, IM and MBE-P to be seen by managers in Japan. Nevertheless, the result was quite opposite. MBE-A and IS were observed among managers more in Japan. CR, IM and MBE-P were seen more in France, although the two types of II were almost the same scores between the two countries.

d) **Others factors**

*(Cf. appendix)*

As we explain in the hypothesis part, we were wondering if the other factor as the age, sex, education level, amount of work, working time with the same manager have an impact on the leadership style the most often observed by the subordinates. After checking the different correlations, only the age has a significant sig, for all the other the sig wasn't significant but it’s also because our sample is quite small.

By using the Tukey Bαb coefficient test, we found that there is a correlation between the age and the inspirational motivation leadership: It tend to be that more the subordinates become older more they judge their manager uses an inspirational motivation leadership style with a score of 4.30 for the respondents between 50 – 59 years old compare to 3.09 for the respondents under 29 years old. But we don't have enough respondent up to 29 years old to generalize this observation but still we detect a progression in the judgment *(cf. appendix)*.

5.3  **Second Problem: Effectiveness**

a) **Effectiveness’ overview**
In our sample of 74 respondents on the efficiency, the French subordinates report a higher effectiveness level of their manager than the Japanese:

**French:** Their manager is between "sometimes" and "fairly often" effective

**Japanese:** Their manager is between "Once in a while" and "sometimes" effective but closer to "sometimes".

This result is very subjective because our sample is not enough large; it is from the view of the subordinates, thus it differs according to many others factors (personal and professional) and also we have to take in consideration if some respondents make the link between the 1st and the 2nd questionnaire. Actually, for some respondents, especially French, some didn't respect the break of 1-2 weeks (around 10 persons) and answer the two questionnaire almost in the same time.

### b) Effectiveness / Leadership Globally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>3,1556</td>
<td>.79527</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>3,2261</td>
<td>.69398</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant Leadership</td>
<td>2,3670</td>
<td>.74343</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3,0878</td>
<td>1,13282</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Country code**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3,3456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2,8688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We already explained it in detail but globally our subordinates, French and Japanese, describe their manager with a transactional Leadership (score: 3,23 = between "sometimes and “fairly often”) followed very closely by the Transformational management (score: 3,16). About the effectiveness of their manager, the subordinates judge him “sometimes” effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Passive Avoidant Leadership</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.739**</td>
<td>-313**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.739**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant Leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.313**</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.747**</td>
<td>.534**</td>
<td>-.257*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Effectiveness / Transformational leadership**

There is a positive, strong and significant correlation between Transformational leadership and effectiveness because the sig = 0,000 and because the “pearson correla-
tion”=0,747 it’s closed to 1. That’s mean: The more the managers use the transformational leadership the more they are effective.

**Effectiveness / Transactional leadership**

There is a positive, medium and significant correlation between Transactional leadership and effectiveness because the sig = 0.000 and because the “pearson correlation”=0,534. That’s mean: The more the managers use the transactional leadership the more they are effective. But comparing to the transformational, the increase of using the transactional style increases only the effectiveness of 0,53 points instead of 0,747 points with the transformational style.

**Effectiveness / Passive avoidant leadership**

There is a negative, low and significant correlation between Passive avoidant leadership and effectiveness because the sig = 0,027, it’s under 0,05 so it is still acceptable but not as significant as the two other leadership. The “pearson correlation”=-0,257. That’s mean: The more the managers use the passive avoidant leadership the less they are effective.

**In detail...**

*(Cf. Appendix)*

If we check the correlation more in detail for each part of the transformational leadership, we can see that the higher correlation with the effectiveness is with the Inspirational motivation style (Pearson Correlation = 0,698) then come the Intellectual stimulation (Pearson Correlation =0,667) then Idealized Influence (Attributed) (Pearson Correlation 0,652) then Individualized consideration (Pearson Correlation = 0,632) and finally idealized Influence (Behavior) (Pearson Correlation = 0,510). So, in our survey inspire the motivation of the subordinates and Stimulate them intellectually tend to bring to the manager the higher effectiveness.

Nevertheless, the Contingent Reward style (part of the transactional leadership) has a stronger correlation with effectiveness than IIA, IC, IIB (Pearson Correlation = 0,661) and
arrives in third position after IM and IS style that is not in accordance with the theory of Bass and Avolio.

The MBE(A), part of transactional leadership and MBE(P), part of the passive avoidant leadership don't have a significant correlation with effectiveness in our study because the sig is up to 0.05. And the MBE(A) put strongly down the level of correlation of the transactional leadership.

The "Laissez faire" leadership has the strongest negative correlation with effectiveness. And this is really in accordance with Bass and Avolio’s theory that more you manage by the "Laissez faire" style, less you are effective.

c) Effectiveness vs Leadership per Country

(Cf. Appendix)

Per country, only the correlation of Passive Avoidant leadership is not significant so we can only focus on the others. The result are similar, the correlations with the effectiveness and transformational leadership is much higher than on the transactional way. The main difference is that the French subordinates tend to find more effective the transactional style than the Japanese with a score of 0.565 for the French to 0.495 for the Japanese.
6 Conclusion

What are the differences of managers’ leadership style between France and Japan in a company from the view of the subordinates?

Globally on the entire sample the most observed leadership style was Transactional, the subordinates judge their manager behaviour is between “sometimes” and “fairly often” like that. That means their reward or discipline the follower according to his performance. Generally, the leadership styles observed in Japan and in France were quite similar; nevertheless, in France the Inspirational Motivation leadership was more noticed by the subordinates. That means, the French managers tend to “fairly often” motivate and inspire their subordinates by providing team spirit, making some challenge or getting involved in envisioning attractive future states. Then the transactional management style was a bit more observed on Japanese than on French managers, but the difference is really low. The passive avoidant leadership was the less noticed in the two countries.

Which leadership style leads to the higher manager’s effectiveness?

Our results were really significant and confirm the MLQ theory between the effectiveness end the leadership style. We found that the transformational leadership, on the view of the subordinates, tend to bring the highest effectiveness. Then come the transactional leadership and finally the Passive Avoidant leadership tend to reduce the manager’s effectiveness. Nevertheless, the sig of the Management by Exception (Active) wasn’t significant and distort the result of transactional leadership. Per country, the only thing is that French subordinates tend to find more effective the Transactional style than the Japanese.

Limitations

One of the main limits was to build a representative sample. In our sample of 94 subordinates there is a non-representative age and working experience repartition comparing to the real workers. Also the size of 94 persons can only give us an overview but it’s not real-
ly valid to generalize this result to all the French and Japanese managers because of it and also because of the judgement of the subordinates can be subjective.

We cannot certify that we succeeded to avoid that the respondents make the link between the 1st questionnaire about leadership and the second one about the effectiveness. Even if most of the respondents answer with a break between the two questionnaires, it is difficult to know if the first survey has an impact on their answers in the second one because it is abstract and untouchable.

In addition, we met a lot of difficulties to find respondents because it is a sensitive topic but also because of the software. Actually, by using Artologik, only one unique and personal link is generated for each respondent and the administrator cannot see the link of each respondent. Thus, if one respondent lost his link we cannot send to him again. Also, because we need each e-mail address of each respondent, it’s harder to find some people because it’s easier in a company or in a network to send a global link and permit to use more platforms (facebook, linkedin, intranet...) and it’s more confidential. Nevertheless, the software was useful for us to follow the respondents’ answers and to link the respondents between the two questionnaires.

**Suggestions for future research**

What we can suggest for the people who would like to work on this topic is to try to have a larger sample. Also depending on your available time, we recommend to use only one questionnaire if your time is too short because if not you will not have enough respondents on the 2nd survey. If you decide to don’t use two questionnaires, we recommend to use “Survey Monki” for example because it generates only one global link that you can send easier to your sample and because you don’t need to tracing your respondents if you don’t make two surveys.
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Appendix

AGE IMPACT ON THE INSPIRATIONAL MOTIVATION

Inspirational Motivation

Tukey $B_{a,b}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Subset for alpha = 0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 years of lower</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3,0870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3,4389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,5556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 8,928.

b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.
## LEADERSHIP IN DETAIL vs EFFECTIVENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IIA</th>
<th>IIB</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>MBE(A)</th>
<th>MBE(P)</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealized Influence (Attributed)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,449&quot;</td>
<td>,689&quot;</td>
<td>,686&quot;</td>
<td>,698&quot;</td>
<td>,667&quot;</td>
<td>0,123</td>
<td>-0,210</td>
<td>-0,342</td>
<td>,652&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,236</td>
<td>0,042</td>
<td>0,001</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idealized Influence (Behavior)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,449&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,591&quot;</td>
<td>,599&quot;</td>
<td>,548&quot;</td>
<td>,642&quot;</td>
<td>,381&quot;</td>
<td>-0,127</td>
<td>-0,075</td>
<td>,510&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>0,017</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspirational Motivation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,689&quot;</td>
<td>,591&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,641&quot;</td>
<td>,538&quot;</td>
<td>,697&quot;</td>
<td>0,187</td>
<td>-0,245</td>
<td>-0,401</td>
<td>,698&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,011</td>
<td>0,004</td>
<td>0,002</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intellectual Stimulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,686&quot;</td>
<td>,599&quot;</td>
<td>,641&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,698&quot;</td>
<td>,764&quot;</td>
<td>,262&quot;</td>
<td>-0,291</td>
<td>-0,318</td>
<td>,667&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,251</td>
<td>0,197</td>
<td>0,051</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualized Consideration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,698&quot;</td>
<td>,548&quot;</td>
<td>,538&quot;</td>
<td>,698&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,783&quot;</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>-0,134</td>
<td>-0,202</td>
<td>,632&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,251</td>
<td>0,197</td>
<td>0,051</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contingent Reward</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,667&quot;</td>
<td>,642&quot;</td>
<td>,697&quot;</td>
<td>,764&quot;</td>
<td>,783&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,238&quot;</td>
<td>-0,095</td>
<td>-0,205</td>
<td>,661&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,021</td>
<td>0,36</td>
<td>0,048</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management by Exception (Active)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0,123</td>
<td>,381&quot;</td>
<td>,187</td>
<td>,262&quot;</td>
<td>0,12</td>
<td>,238&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0,047</td>
<td>0,046</td>
<td>0,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0,236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td>0,011</td>
<td>0,251</td>
<td>0,021</td>
<td>0,65</td>
<td>0,66</td>
<td>0,326</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management by</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exception (Passive)</strong></td>
<td>-0.210*</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.245*</td>
<td>-0.291**</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.623**</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.224</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laissez-faire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.342**</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.401**</td>
<td>-0.318**</td>
<td>-0.202</td>
<td>-0.205*</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.623**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.344**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.652**</td>
<td>0.510**</td>
<td>0.698**</td>
<td>0.667**</td>
<td>0.632**</td>
<td>0.661**</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>-0.344**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EFFECTIVENESS / LEADERSHIP PER COUNTRY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations - JAPAN</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Passive Avoidant Leadership</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,775**</td>
<td>-.283*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,775**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant Leadership</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.283*</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>,047</td>
<td>,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,757**</td>
<td>,565**</td>
<td>-.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>,000</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
## Correlations FRANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Passive Avoidant Leadership</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,672**</td>
<td>- ,363*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transactional Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,672**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- ,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passive Avoidant Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>- ,363*</td>
<td>- ,119</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>,750**</td>
<td>,495**</td>
<td>- ,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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