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Literature has revealed that the leadership behavior of executives and upper level managers had a significant effect on organizational culture which offered members of the organization meaningful goals and purposes. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior of executives and upper level managers in American and Japanese multinational corporations.

The investigation was conducted using two instruments, Cultural Awareness Checklist and Leader Behavior Descriptive Questionnaire. The sample consisted of 256 employees: 117 executives and upper level managers and 139 middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions. Seventy American and Japanese parent and subsidiary companies participated in this study.

In order to investigate the purpose of this study, 41 hypotheses were developed. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA), t tests, and Fisher's Zr transformation were utilized.

It was found that a positive significant relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture and career positions.
of employees. The findings also indicated that a positive significant relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of American executive groups and the American middle managers group. While differences in the awareness of organizational culture did not exist between the American and the Japanese executive groups, a difference in the leadership behavior did exist between the American and Japanese executive groups.

In this study, no relationships were found to exist between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive groups and their leadership behavior. Further, no differences in the awareness of organizational culture with the leadership behavior were found to exist between the American and Japanese executive groups, the American and Japanese parent executive groups, and the American and Japanese subsidiary executive groups.

Interestingly, the results indicated that the Japanese parent executive group, who had high scores in leadership behavior and presented no difference in the awareness of organizational culture from the American executive group, exhibited a difference in the awareness of organizational culture between their middle managers groups.
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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Background of the Problem

For the past 100 years, America has been successful at developing new industries; and as a result, the country's superior management and leadership competencies have been ideal models for the world business enterprise. Since the late 1960s, however, America's economy has experienced a substantial decline in productivity growth and has faced a crisis in its long-held industrial leadership supremacy (Bronfenbrenner, 1985; Norsworthy & Malmquist, 1985; Ruch & Goodman, 1983; Wolfe, 1985). This decline in productivity growth and industrial leadership in the competitive world markets has provided an uneasiness among American business leaders about their management approaches and the effectiveness of their leadership. As a result of this uneasiness, conventional views of American management and leadership have been questioned (Hayes & Abernathy, 1980; Hickman & Silva, 1984; Ouchi, 1981b; Peters & Austin, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Ruch & Goodman, 1983; Sergiovanni, 1984).

Hayes and Abernathy (1980) not only questioned the vision and leadership of American managers, but also suggested an innovative managerial approach to the establishment of quality leadership. This approach, according to the authors, is one that is suited to a world characterized by rapid and unpredictable change, scarce energy,
global competition for markets, and a constant need for managerial innovation.

In the fields of management and business administration, leadership competencies are being challenged. Effective leadership requires persons with vision who can mentally journey from the known to the unknown and who are able to generate business strategies in accomplishing goals which involve locating, attracting, and holding customers (Hickman & Silva, 1984).

As American business leaders and organizational management theorists discussed productivity performance of domestic companies, they simultaneously reviewed productivity growth of the Japanese industry. This allowed the Americans to focus on the contrasting characteristics of American and Japanese companies, particularly noting the success of Japanese corporations regarding innovative management, adaptive organization systems, management practices, and the leadership competence of executives and managers.

The 1980s have brought about a challenge for both American and Japanese companies to use advanced technology to continuously supply customers with innovative products. It is apparent that in order to continue to compete and grow, leading companies must not only use advanced technology but must also utilize concepts that will strengthen the relationship of employees and their productivity. Takezawa and Whitehill (1981) explained that the most important factors for improving productivity in Japanese industry are:

- the timely and continuous application of technological innovations and refinements, aggressive investment policies, financial systems coordinated by major banking...
institutions, careful cultivation of both domestic and foreign markets, effective management structure and decision-making, and a highly qualified and motivated labor force. (p. 19)

In Japan, these challenges are grounded in the belief that leaders effectively utilize the energy of their employees through their involvement in the decision-making process. Japanese business leaders developed Japanese-style management that created the basis for "total participation" in achieving organizational goals. England (1983) noted that Japanese leaders have "the potential value of developing a management system that is internally consistent, that fits social norms and expectations and that obtains support from the major institutional actors in the world of work" (p. 131). The "Japanese-style" management system, therefore, has inculcated a pattern of behavior, thought, speech, and action on the employees' daily activities. This, in turn, provided employees with a feeling of security, social prestige, status in their society, and the creation of an internally consistent strong organizational culture.

The focus on the success of Japanese industries and business organizations has encouraged introspection in the American organizations and has, consequently, laid the foundation for self-evaluation (Schein, 1981). One perspective resulting from this reformation in American business organizations is the improvement of leadership competencies that strengthen the relationship of employees and their productivity in achieving their companies' goals.

The current quest for improved quality in leadership suggests a holistic approach which could determine the potential overall
efficiency of the organization. The impact of organizational culture on the success of Japanese industry lead authorities in the fields of management, business administration, and leadership to study the relationship between organizational culture and leadership effectiveness. A number of authorities (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Hickman & Silva, 1984; Ouchi, 1981c; Pascale & Athos, 1981; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985) have suggested that the effects of organizational culture are also visible and significant in successful American companies. Miller (1984) noted that the emergence of a new organizational culture resulted from the creation and acceptance of new values, visions, and the inspirations of leaders. He stated that "new cultures emerge when leaders proclaim and demonstrate those values through their own behaviors" (p. 13).

In order to produce successful involvement of employees in establishing and implementing the purposes of their organizations, the relationship between the superior and the subordinate is crucial. Ruch and Goodman (1983) noted that the image of top management affects employees' work attitudes. That is, employees' productivity is most influenced by how they perceive top management. Understanding the assumptions for deciphering the behavior and attitudes of employees is a central part of leadership competence. Likert (1961) stated:

The leadership and other processes of the organization must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in all interactions and in all relationships within the organization, each member, in the light of his background, values, desires, and expectations, will view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance. (p. 47)
A strong internally consistent organizational culture enables top management to direct and control the actions and behaviors of employees to higher levels of motivation and morality which is necessary for accomplishing organizational goals. Schein (1985) stated that "an examination of cultural issues at the organizational level is absolutely essential to a basic understanding of what goes on in organizations, how to run them, and how to improve them" (p. 30). In studies dealing with the effects of organizational culture on organizational performance, several authorities (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Hickman & Silva, 1984; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985) have suggested that leaders can utilize the strength of organizational culture in their leadership strategy while leadership competence can be viewed in the context of culture building phenomenon.

Leadership Definitions

Leadership is of particular importance to the success of an organization. In business organizations, executives and managers are held accountable for the behaviors of subordinates so that goals of the organization are achieved.

Some authorities (Boles & Davenport, 1975; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1983) defined leadership as a process, or series of actions, in which one or more persons exert influence, authority, or power over one or more others. This process, then, enables that one person to direct and control the actions and behaviors of others toward accomplishing goals in a given situation. While these authorities have provided theoretical input on the definition of
leadership, Burns (1979) reviewed leadership as a transformation and, subsequently, coined the phrase "transforming leadership." He defined transforming leadership as a process by which "one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 380). This form of leadership, according to Burns, has a transforming effect because it ultimately becomes moral on all concerned, thus raising the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both the leader and those being led. Therefore, leadership is not only an aspect of power but also a separate and vital process in itself.

In addition to the various definitions of leadership, Sergiovanni (1983) discussed leadership as an expression of culture by stating:

Leadership as cultural expression seeks to build unity and order within an organization by giving attention to purposes, historical and philosophical tradition, and ideals and norms which define the way to life within the organization and which provide the bases for socializing members and obtaining their compliance. (pp. 106-107)

Sergiovanni continued by insisting that "the effective leader needs to practice his or her profession from a foundation of concepts and ideas strong enough to stand the test of time and powerful enough to account for a variety of situations" (p. 160). Thus, Burns's (1979) "transforming leadership" and Sergiovanni's (1983) "cultural expression" appear to provide a solid definition for quality leadership. The impact of this definition on the quality of organizational
leadership in the 1980s emphasized a concept which has stressed the importance of organizational culture.

Organizational Culture

Organizational culture has been viewed from two perspectives: First, organizational culture is a subculture; therefore, the concept and definition are derived from the definition and concepts of culture. Second, many current comparative studies between Japanese and American companies examined the effects of culture on the management system (Drucker, 1981; Ishikawa, 1985; Kagomo et al., 1984; Ouchi, 1981c; Pascale & Maquire, 1980; Takezawa & Whitehill, 1981). These studies revealed that the theme of organizational culture cannot be discussed without considering the influence of a country's whole culture on the organization.

The whole culture is defined by Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1978) as follows:

Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other as conditioning elements of further action (p. 181)

This definition provides an understanding of a nation's culture. In addition, it incorporates the concept of organizational culture as it relates to a corporation which has its own culture. Organizational culture encompasses the totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, values, institutions, and all other products.
of employees' work and thought characteristics of that corporation (Morris, 1981).

Schein (1985) introduced his definition of organizational culture as:

a pattern of basic assumptions— invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration—that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 9)

Schein (1985) further contended that the term "organizational culture" refers to the deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization and that are unconsciously operative and taken for granted. Close attention and study of the concept of organizational culture provides an understanding of the assumptions underlying the behaviors and attitudes of employees.

According to Tichy (1986), organizational culture is considered a product of action; that is, a living record of leaders' strategies that have worked in the past. The essential core of culture can be detected from patterns of employees' behaviors and attitudes toward achieving the company's goals. The roots of distinct patterns of employees' behaviors and attitudes in the organizational culture are the characteristics of an organization and the psychological traits of a nation's social and cultural background (Drucker, 1981; Hickman & Silva, 1984; Iwata, 1982; Johnson & Ouchi, 1979; Nishida, 1984; Noguchi, 1984; Odaka, 1984; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1984). The concept of organizational culture then provides impetus
for quality leadership of executives and managers in multinational corporations.

The Leadership of Executives and Managers in Multinational Corporations

The problem of transferring a headquarter's goals and purposes to a subsidiary company with different cultural and ideological backgrounds has been a crucial topic for multinational corporations (Drake & Caudill, 1981; Jaegar, 1983; Johnson & Ouchi, 1979). In discussing the success of American and Japanese multinational corporations, one cannot ignore the significance of executives' and managers' leadership behavior and their effective handling of administrative situations.

Corporate leaders are the key personnel who conduct business by transferring the goals, purposes, and missions of their headquarters and by forming the characteristics of the parent organization to their subsidiary companies (Sherwin, 1983). Drake and Caudill (1981) stressed the quality of personnel and the leadership behavior of executives and managers from headquarters as well as the local managerial personnel in managing key foreign-based positions in their subsidiary companies.

When cultural backgrounds are extremely different, for example, between America and Japan (individualism versus collectivism), executives and managers must possess sensitivities and knowledge regarding the effects of cultural differences on the productivity of the employees. Developing an organizational culture in subsidiary...
companies requires considerable thought and careful examinations of
the existing organizational culture and requires contrasting evidence
of the two nations. Therefore, leadership competence depends on the
leader's awareness of organizational culture and of his or her lead-
ership behavior which provides a foundation of management strategy
and organizational culture (Hickman & Silva, 1984).

Summary

Literature has revealed that in the late 1980s and the 1990s,
effective leadership will require leaders with vision, who can men-
tally journey from the known to the unknown, and who are able to
generate business strategies in accomplishing goals which involves
locating, attracting, and holding customers. The success of excel-
lent companies in both America and Japan relies on the leadership of
executives and managers who can strengthen the relationship of em-
ployees and their productivity.

Based upon a review of background literature, it appears that an
internally consistent strong organizational culture enables top man-
agement to direct and control the actions and behaviors of employees
to higher levels of motivation and morality in order to accomplish
the organizational goals. The emergence of a new organizational
culture is the result of the creation and acceptance of new values,
visions, and spirits of leaders.

Investigations of the relationship between an awareness of the
organizational culture and the observed leadership behavior of execu-
tives and upper level managers by other employees have provided
empirical data for understanding that relationship and for developing a foundation for business strategy toward building a strong organizational culture.

The presence of a large number of American subsidiary companies in Japan and Japanese subsidiary companies in the United States permits the study of the establishment of a new organizational culture in the host country's culture. It appears that the problems that multinational corporations had in transferring a headquarter's purposes and goals to subsidiary companies in different cultures relied heavily on the executives' and upper level managers' awareness of the organizational culture and of their leadership behavior.

Purpose of the Study

Although there has been much literature dealing with culture as an anthropological and sociological entity, there has been a limited amount of empirical research which deals with organizational culture as a holistic approach to effective leadership behavior. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine the relationships of career positions of employees (executive group and middle managers group), nationalities of the companies (American and Japanese), and locations of the companies (parent and subsidiary) with the awareness of organizational culture and with leadership behavior.

Research Questions

The background literature pertaining to this study prompted several questions concerning the research problem. The specific
questions which were addressed in this investigation are listed under four major areas: (a) the relationships of career positions, nationalities of the companies, and locations of the companies to the awareness of organizational culture; (b) differences in the awareness of organizational culture; (c) differences in the leadership behavior of the executive group; (d) relationships between the awareness of organizational culture and the leadership behavior of the executive group; and (e) differences in the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior between the American and Japanese executive groups.

Relationships of Career Positions, Nationalities, and Locations to the Awareness of Organizational Culture

1. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group?

2. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the parent executive group and the parent middle managers group?

3. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the subsidiary executive group and the subsidiary middle managers group?

4. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and the American middle managers group?

5. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and the Japanese
middle managers group?

6. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American parent middle managers group?

7. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese parent middle managers group?

8. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the American subsidiary middle managers group?

9. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group?

**Differences in the Awareness of Organizational Culture**

10. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group?

11. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the parent executive group and the parent middle managers group?

12. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the subsidiary executive group and the subsidiary middle managers group?

13. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and the American middle managers group?
14. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and the Japanese middle managers group?

15. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American parent middle managers group?

16. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese parent middle managers group?

17. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the American subsidiary middle managers group?

18. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group?

19. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American subsidiary executive group?

20. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent middle managers group and the American subsidiary middle managers group?

21. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group?

22. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group?
Japanese subsidiary middle managers group?

23. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group?

24. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent middle managers group and the Japanese parent middle managers group?

25. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group?

26. Is there a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group?

Differences in the Leadership Behavior of the Executive Group

27. Is there a difference between the leadership behavior of the American executive group and the Japanese executive group?

28. Is there a difference between the leadership behavior of the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group?

29. Is there a difference between the leadership behavior of the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group?

30. Is there a difference between the leadership behavior of the American parent executive group and the American subsidiary executive group?
31. Is there a difference between the leadership behavior of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group?

Relationships Between the Awareness of Organizational Culture and the Leadership Behavior of the Executive Group

32. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and their leadership behavior?

33. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and their leadership behavior?

34. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and their leadership behavior?

35. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and their leadership behavior?

36. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and their leadership behavior?

37. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and their leadership behavior?

38. Is there a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and their leadership behavior?
Differences in the Awareness of Organizational Culture With the Leadership Behavior

39. Is there a difference in the awareness of organizational culture with leadership behavior between the American executive group and the Japanese executive group?

40. Is there a difference in the awareness of organizational culture with leadership behavior between the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group?

41. Is there a difference in the awareness of organizational culture with leadership behavior between the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group?

Outline of the Study

Chapter II is a review of selected literature; and presented in Chapter III are the definitions, subjects, instruments, research design, and procedures used for this study. An analysis and summary of the results appear in Chapter IV. Described in Chapter V is the summary of the study including limitations, conclusions, and implications and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Presented in Chapter II is a review of empirical and authoritative literature related to the problem under investigation: an examination of the relationship between an awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior regarding the career positions of employees, nationalities of the companies, and locations of the companies.

The review of literature is divided into nine categories: (a) organizational culture as a tool for understanding organizational phenomena; (b) culture: definition and conceptual discussion; (c) organizational culture: definition and conceptual discussion; (d) leadership behavior as artifacts and creations of organizational culture; (e) strength of organizational culture on leadership strategy; (f) organizational culture building and leadership behavior; (g) comparison of organizational variables between American and Japanese companies as they relate to organizational culture; (h) importance of leadership behavior between parent and subsidiary company as it relates to organizational culture; and (i) summary of literature review.

Organizational Cultures as a Tool for Understanding Organizational Phenomena

Recently, the effort to improve the quality of leadership has initiated a notion which stressed the importance of organizational
culture and of generating organizational strategies in accomplishing the goals of an organization (Cummings, 1984; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; DeFrank, et al., 1985; Denison, 1984; Hickman & Silva, 1984; Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Martin & Siehl, 1983; McMillan, 1985; Ouchi, 1981b, 1981c; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985; Schwartz & Davis, 1981; Sergiovanni, 1982, 1984; Vancil & Green, 1984; Wilkins, 1983). According to authors McMillan (1985), Schein (1985), and Sergiovanni (1982, 1984), organizational culture not only provides symbolic meaning that leaders can use in communicating their values to others but also produces confidence and a commitment toward work by the employees. The notion of organizational culture which based on its formulation as culture provides a comprehensive analysis for the components of the organizational phenomenon which encompasses the totality of organization. The basic theme of organizational culture is that it is a product of leadership strategies, employees' actions, and a way of looking at the totality of organizational phenomena of all employees in the past, present, and future.

Hoy and Miskel (1987) noted that the popularity of the term organizational culture is in a large part of successful business corporations which display strong and distinctive corporate cultures. They noted that Ouchi's (1981b, 1981c) Theory Z was one of the first of the contemporary analyses that emphasized the function of an organizational culture on the success of effective corporations in Japan and America. Peters and Waterman (1982) indicated that organizations identified as being excellent have developed strong cultures which have incorporated the values and practices of leaders and founders.
For example, the success of Japanese industry appears to be a further allurement toward looking at company culture (Wilkins, 1983).

An awareness of the strength of organizational culture by business leaders challenges them to observe the organization from a global perspective and to integrate the known and unknown, the significant and insignificant, the Western and Eastern philosophies of managing business organization, and generating business strategies in accomplishing the goals of their companies.

In the late 1980s, as well as the 1990s, an understanding of organizational culture will be absolutely essential to the vision and leadership of executives and managers in strengthening employees' productivity. Although each company establishes its own organizational culture, there is a common characteristic displayed by companies that share the same cultural background. This results in the behaviors of executives and managers becoming more apprehensible and predictable when the concept of culture is introduced. Although American business leaders have introduced a holistic approach to the organizational phenomena and leadership behavior, the concept of organizational culture is still new to the American theorists and, therefore, requires an understanding of its concept.

Culture: Definition and Conceptual Discussion

Definition of Culture

A thorough literature research by Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1973) cited 164 definitions of culture. These definitions synthesized the
recurrent elements and represents a definition of culture. This central idea is formulated by most social scientists as follows:

Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behavior acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievement of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e., historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other as conditioning elements of further action. (p. 181)

This definition of culture has provided a basis for the following conceptual discussion.

Conceptual Discussion

Harris's (1951) statement that the "whole" culture is a composite of varying and overlapping subcultures and that these subcultures may be regional, economic, status, occupational, clique groups—or varying combinations of these factors feeds into the theory of culture by Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1978). These authors further theorized that subcultures seem to be primarily traceable to the temperamental similarities of participating individuals. It would appear then, that the characteristics of organizational culture can be traced by the behavior patterns of employees' corporate activities. These ideas support the notion that a company's organizational culture is one of subcultures of a nation's culture, which is represented by the company's employees. Therefore, in order to fully understand organizational culture concepts, the characteristics of culture concepts must be studied.
Characteristics of Culture

Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1978) identified five characteristics of culture useful in conceptualizing the nature of organizational culture. First, culture is a general category of nature and expresses human nature. Therefore, culture is both substantial and explanatory that "the totality of human culture includes the cultural phenomena of all peoples, times, and places insofar as these phenomena are known or knowable" (p. 185).

Second, culture is produced and changed concretely by individuals, and each distinctive lifestyle is the product of a group; culture is an intervening variable between the human "organism" and the "environment." It is further maintained that culture is created by individual organisms and by organisms operating as a group. Cultural experiences are internalized by individuals and become part of their environment through the medium of other individuals and of cultural products. These cultural acts take place in time between persons, and in space in an environment partly made up of other persons. Since cultural acts take place in time, it is apparent that the past continues to influence the present and future.

Third, "cultures are systems (that is, are organized) because the variables are interdependent. All systems appear to acquire certain properties that characterize the system's qua system rather than the sum of isolable elements" (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1978, p. 189). It is further concluded that "any culture is a system of expectancies; culture influences how individuals behave toward other
individuals and equally what is expected from them" (p. 157).

Kroeber and Kluckhohn explained that:

What kinds of behavior the individual anticipates being rewarded or punished for; what constitute rewards and punishments; what types of activity are held to be inherently gratifying or frustrating. For this and for other reasons (e.g., the strongly affective nature of most cultural learning) the individual is seldom emotionally neutral to those sectors of his culture which touch him directly. Culture patterns are felt, emotionally adhered to or rejected. (p. 157)

Fourth, "the logical construct, culture, is based upon the study of behavior and behavioral products" (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1978, p. 189). Part of culture consists in norms for, or standards of behavior, but not behavior, nor the investigation of behavior in all its concrete completeness.

Fifth, "every culture includes broad general principles of selectivity and ordering ('highest common factors') in terms of which patterns of and for and about behavior in very varied areas of culture content are reducible to parsimonious generalization" (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1978, p. 189).

Goodman (1967) emphasized the significance of cultural patterns that channel and establish form, boundaries, and part relationship. She noted that a culture pattern is both mold and modality that connotes standardization of behavior. She noted further that "there is adherence to the extent that modalities in behavior are evident to the observer, and many are persistent over time; they are customary behavior" (p. 39).

Therefore, culture is a patterned way of behaving, feeling, and reacting that is both "explicit" and "implicit." Goodman (1967)
stated that "patterns of the explicit are likely to be formal in the sense that they are well established, widely accepted, and important in the 'system of expectancies' familiar to members of a society" (p. 40). She further stated that "patterns of the implicit are likely to be complex, undefined and largely a matter of 'feeling'" (p. 40). It was noted that "premises," the most important of these implicit patterns, are unstated and often unrealized; and further, this implicit culture greatly differs between nations, societies, and subcultures.

Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1978) noted that:

One group unconsciously and habitually assumes that every chain of action has a goal without conscious reactions ... when this goal is reached tension will be reduced or disappear. To another group, thinking based upon this assumption is by no means automatic. They see life not primarily as a series of purposive sequences but more as made up of disparate experiences which may be satisfying in and of themselves, rather than as means to ends. (p. 157)

While a discussion of culture has provided a basis for understanding the concepts, the differences of "implicit" and "explicit" culture between nations and, to a greater extent, the differences between companies have also been stressed. Kroeber and Kluckhohn's (1978) explanation of implicit and explicit culture has reinforced the recognition of a nation's cultural differences as an attempt to understand the organizational cultures of American and Japanese companies, and as such makes it necessary to examine the various effects of organizational culture on multinational companies.
Definitions of Organizational Culture

Kroeber and Kluckhohn's (1978) definition of culture incorporates the concept of organizational culture, which encompasses the totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, values, and all other products of employees' work. This includes the result of entrepreneurial activities by company founders, and the leadership strategy of top managers.

In studies dealing with organizational theory and managerial administration (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Ouchi, 1981c; Pascale & Athos, 1981; Schein, 1985), the interpretation of organizational culture differs greatly. Hoy and Miskel (1987) stated that "the notion of culture brings with it conceptual complexity and confusion" (p. 246). Thus, numerous diverse definitions are found. Schein (1985) identified six common meanings that are often used in the literature to discuss organizational culture: (a) the observed behavioral regularities during interaction (Goffman, 1959, 1967; Van Maanen, 1979b), (b) the norms that evolve in working groups (Homans, 1950), (c) the dominant values espoused by an organization (Deal & Kennedy, 1982), (d) the philosophy that guides an organization's policy toward employees and/or customers (Ouchi, 1981c; Pascale & Athos, 1981), (e) the rules of the game for getting along in the organization—"the ropes" (Ritti & Funkhouser, 1982; Schein, 1968, 1978; Van Maanen, 1976, 1979b), and (f) the feeling or climate that is conveyed in an
organization (Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968).

Hoy and Miskel (1987) identified additional meanings: (a) symbols, ceremonies, and myths that communicate the underlying values and beliefs of that organization to its employees (Ouchi, 1981c) and (b) a pattern of beliefs and expectations shared by the organization's members that produces norms that powerfully shape the behavior of individuals and groups in organizations (Schwartz & Davis, 1981). Schein (1985) presented his view of organizational culture by stating that "all these meanings and many others, do in my view, reflect the organization's culture, but none of them is the essence of culture" (p. 6). Accordingly, he defined organizational culture as:

a pattern of basic assumptions—invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration—that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 9)

This definition of organizational culture has provided a foundation for the following conceptual discussion which emphasized these basic assumption as the essence of culture.

**Conceptual Discussion of Organizational Culture**

Some writers have suggested that organizational culture is created by leaders, and that leadership competence is the creation and management of organizational culture (Hickman & Silva, 1984; Martin & Siehl, 1983; Peters & Austin, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985). Several authorities (Hickman & Silva, 1984; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985) have also suggested that organizational
 culture is the result of entrepreneurial activities by company founders, leaders of movements, institution builders, and social architects. There is little question that organizational culture, which is said to include three levels, imposes a powerful influence on the behavior and attitude of executives and managers (Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Schein, 1985) and as such its influence must be investigated.

Schein (1985) argued that the meanings which were identified in the literature reflect the organization's culture but not the "essence" of organizational culture. Schein's definition of organizational culture also introduced a concept that emphasized a pattern of basic assumptions which provide organizational members with a clear understanding of leadership behavior, organization's norms, beliefs, principles, and guidelines, and which also offer meaningfulness to the organization.

Hoy and Miskel (1987) stated that "the most penetrating definitions of culture emphasize the deepest level of human nature" (p. 254). These "cultural" definitions are advocated by theorists, and the discussion of the basic assumptions at the functional level are labeled as academic rather than practical. Hoy and Miskel suggested that those definitions of culture which focus on behavioral norms, or a segment or reflection of the culture, seem to be more penetrating in practice but they are less useful because they seem to ignore the more fundamental bases of culture, i.e., basic tacit underlying assumptions.

In addition, Hoy and Miskel (1987) and Schein (1985) introduced an approach that views organizational culture at different levels.
They maintained that there are three levels of organizational culture which show the interaction and the importance of these basic under­lying assumptions.

Levels of Organizational Culture

Schein (1985) introduced the three levels of organizational culture as: Level 1, artifacts and creations; Level 2, values; and Level 3, basic assumptions, while Hoy and Miskel (1987) called the three levels norms, values, and tacit assumptions.

Rokeach (1979) noted that leadership behavior may be viewed as a manifestation of and values and attitudes. The leadership behavior and values of executives and managers are outcomes of basic assump­tions and are transmitted to the members of organizations through their interactions. Thus, the levels of organizational culture provide members with meaningful reasons for the observed leadership behavior at Level 1, artifacts and creation in their organization.

Leadership Behavior as Artifacts and Creations of Organizational Culture

Level 1: Artifacts and Creations

Level 1: artifacts and creations--visible and audible behavior patterns, technology, and art. Schein (1985) explained that "this level of analysis is tricky because the data are easy to obtain but hard to interpret" (p. 3).

According to several authors (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; DeFrank et al., 1985; Hickman & Silva, 1984; Schein, 1985; Schwartz & Davis,
1981), leadership behavior becomes visible and audible behavior patterns and can be observed at Level 1 as "artifacts and creations" of the organizational phenomena.

During the past years, leadership behavior and factors affecting leaders' behavior have been studied and the effect of organizational variables on organizational performance have been reviewed (Argyris, 1974; Getzel & Guba, 1957; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Likert, 1967; McGregor, 1960; Tannenbaum, 1961). For example, McGregor's (1960) Theories X and Y and Argyris's (1974) infancy management assumptions suggested that human behavior in organizations is what management perceives it to be and not a consequence of inherent human nature. In support of management assumptions, Tannenbaum (1961) noted that "effectiveness in leadership is a function of the dynamic interrelationship of the personality characteristics of the leader, personality characteristics of the follower, and the characteristics of the situation within the field of each individual" (p. 31). Tannenbaum further explained that leadership is always exercised in a situation that includes such influential elements as physical phenomena, other persons, the organization, the culture, and a complexity of goals--personal, groups, and organizational.

Getzel and Guba (1957) have taken these points further by discussing administrative and supervisory behavior within the context of the social system. In presenting the Social System Model, Getzel and Guba explained that a given social act is an outcome of an inextricable combination of role and personality factors. This system model attempts to articulate the normative and personal dimensions of
behavior in a social system. Observed behavior in a social system is always a function of the interaction between these two dimensions. The normative dimension of behavior is conceived of as arising in institutional goals and fulfilling role expectations, and the personal dimension of behavior is conceived of as arising in individual goals and fulfilling personal needs.

Structurally, administration is considered to be a series of superordinate-subordinate relationships within a social system. Functionally, this hierarchy of relationships is the basis for allocating and integrating roles, personnel, and facilities to accomplish organizational goals. Operationally, the process occurs in person-to-person interactions (Getzel & Guba, 1957).

In providing a comprehensive analysis for organizational characteristics, Likert (1967) presented three organizational variables identified as causal, intervening, and end-result variables. Likert's "causal" variables are said to be independent variables which can determine the course of developments within an organization and can be changed by the organization and its management. This includes business and leadership strategies, skills, values, and behavior which can be observed as artifacts and creations of organizational culture. The second "intervening" variables reflect the internal state and the organizational health. The third "end-result" variables are the dependent variables which reflect the goals and intentions of the organization (p. 29). The impact of Likert's causal variable on the management practices determines the characteristics of organization. For example, Likert's System 4 management
creates supportive relationships by the use of group decision making and supervision, and obtains high performance goals through strengthening the relationship of employees and their productivity. Likert emphasized further that both the behavior of the superior and the employee's perceptions of the situation must be such that the subordinate, in the light of his background, values, and expectations, sees the experience as one which contributes to his sense of personal worth and importance, and one which increases and maintains his sense of significance and human dignity.

The behavior of leaders is said to consist of two fundamental dimensions: (a) initiating structure and (b) consideration (Halpin & Winer, 1957). Initiating structure is referred to as

the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between oneself and the members of his group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done. Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in relationships between the leader and members of the group. (p. 1).

Likert (1967) and Halpin (1956) indicated that these two dimensions are two important aspects of any leadership situations.

Studies (Argyris, 1974; Getzel & Guba, 1957; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; Likert, 1967; McGregor, 1960; Tannenbaum, 1961) have supported the concept that organizational variables such as management assumptions, personality characteristics of the leader and the follower, a complexity of goals, and social systems, determine the behavior of managers and affect organizational characteristics. These characteristics are identified as motivation, communication, decision making, goal setting, performance, interaction,
and perceptions of all employees. At this level, artifacts and creations of organizational culture, leadership behavior patterns then become visible and audible and can be observed by the interactions of leaders and followers.

**Level 2: Values as a Link Between Artifacts and Creations and Basic (Tacit) Assumptions**

Level 2: values—testable in the physical environment and testable only by social consensus. The values often govern behavior and explain the reasons why members behave the way they do; yet, the underlying reasons for their behavior remain concealed or unconscious.

The concept of values (Level 2) is the link between artifacts and creations (Level 1) and basic assumptions (Level 3). Rokeach (1968) defined values as "abstract ideals, positive or negative, not tied to any specific object or situation, representing a person's beliefs about modes of conduct and ideal terminal goals" (p. 124). He stated that "values thus are global beliefs that transcendentally guide actions and judgments across specific objects and situations" (p. 160). Values of organizational culture are said to reflect the founder's values and is ultimately transmitted to leaders.

Through the process of exercising leadership, a leader not only exerts influence, authority, or power over followers but also he or she links artifacts and creations with basic assumptions of organizational culture. If the leader's objectives are obtained, and the group has a shared perception of that success, the leader's
values will gradually start a process of transformation into beliefs and, ultimately, into basic assumptions. Further, as assumptions are increasingly taken for granted, they drop out of awareness. Therefore, if one wants to achieve the understanding of basic assumptions (Level 3), and artifacts and creations (Level 1), one can attempt to analyze the central values (Level 2) that provide the day-to-day operating principles. Thus, employees of companies possess a greater level of awareness of values, which provides them with a cultural guide for their behaviors.

Through the followers' observations of leader's behaviors and managerial attitudes, leadership behaviors become describable; and the values of the founders and leaders are transmitted to the employees' performances in order to obtain the goals of the organizations. With reference to Kroeber and Kluckhohn's (1978) concept of culture, values are the products of employees in organizations and are felt as intrinsic, the structural essence of organizational culture. Sherwin (1983) contended that businesses operate according to the values of their leaders. And thus, the values that govern the conduct of businesses, carry out that purpose and are constrained by it. Excellent companies, according to Peters and Waterman (1982), seem to have developed cultures that have incorporated values and practices of the leaders; and thus, those shared values can be seen to survive for decades after the passing of the founders.
Level 3: Basic Assumptions as the Essence of Organizational Culture

Level 3: basic assumptions—relationship to environment, nature of reality, time and space, nature of human nature, nature of human activity, and nature of human relationships. These basic (tacit) assumptions are looked upon as the essence of what culture really is, and values and behavior patterns are treated as observed manifestations of the organizational cultural essence (Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Schein, 1985).

The concept of basic assumptions is recorded as the "essence" of organizational culture, which provides an insight into the organizational interactions. Schein (1985) explained that basic assumptions are congruent with what is identified as "theories-in-use," the implicit assumptions that actually guide behavior, that tell group members how to perceive, think, and feel about things (Argyris, 1976; Argyris & Schon, 1974). Schein's (1985) definition of culture reveals that culture at its deepest level is the collective manifestation of basic (tacit) assumptions (Hoy & Miskel, 1987).

Schein (1985) noted that the basic assumptions are taken for granted in the employees' daily activities because assumptions are unconsciously operated and used repeatedly and reliably. He emphasized that basic assumptions are responses that members of an organization learn in order to cope with a group's problem of survival in its external environment and its problem of internal integration.

Basic assumptions are congruent with Kroeber and Kluckhohn's (1978) implicit culture. The authors maintained that the patterns of
implicit culture are "thematic principles which the investigator introduces to explain connections among a wide range of content and form that are not obvious in the world of direct observation" (p. 170).

The prime concern for leader competence is the interrelationships between the patterned forms of Level 1: artifacts and creations in the organization and Level 3: basic assumptions. The recognition of implicit culture is a challenge for developing leader competence because the underlying assumptions are unconsciously operated and are taken for granted and eventually drop out of awareness. Assumptions which are taken for granted, as stated previously, determine how employees perceive, think, and feel.

Thus, "the key to understanding organizational culture is to decipher the tacit [basic] assumptions shared by members and to discover how these assumptions fit together into a cultural pattern or paradigm" (Hoy & Miskel, 1987, p. 247). The three levels of organizational culture interact and provide members with meaningful reasons for the embodiment of leadership behavior and in leaders' values, thought, speech, action, and artifacts. The quest in the 1980s for the improvement of quality in leadership behavior has highlighted the strength of organizational culture in productivity (Schein, 1981; Wilkins, 1983).
There is a growing body of literature dedicated to the study of organizational culture as a strategy toward strengthening employees' productivity (Cummings, 1984; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; DeFrank, Mattock, Schweiger, & Ivancevich, 1985; Denison, 1984; Hickman & Silva, 1984; Martin & Siehl, 1983; Peters & Austin, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985; Schwartz & Davis, 1981; Sergiovanni, 1984; Wilkins, 1983).

Currently, the strength of organizational culture is visible in excellent companies, which demonstrate the quality necessary for a world characterized by rapid and unpredictable change, scarce energy, global competition for markets, and a constant need for managerial innovation (Hickman & Silva, 1984; Vancil & Green, 1984). Rokeach (1979) identified four dimensions relating to organizational effectiveness by citing Connor et al. (1973), which have provided a foundation for a strong culture. These dimensions are identified as: (a) efficiency, (b) quality of output, (c) quality of work environment, and (d) responsiveness. Each is explained briefly as follows:

**Efficiency** includes financial and administrative variables such as labor productivity, profit, waste control, proportion of capacity used, elimination of dysfunctional procedures, improved work flows, and appropriate information systems. **Quality of output** refers both to goods produced and to services rendered by the organization. **Quality of work environment** is reflected in member satisfaction with the organization as a whole, the job being performed, supervision, or interpersonal relationships with organizational colleagues. **Responsiveness** is the ability of the organization to adapt to its external environment and to maintain flexibility to adjust its internal operations to meet changing circumstances. Responsiveness therefore is
the coping mechanism which increases the capacity of potential of the organization to survive and prosper over the long range under conditions of uncertainty. (p. 79).

Hickman and Silva (1984) presented three components of organizational culture that provide a foundation for a strong culture and an understanding for the basic assumptions which are observed in excellent companies. These components are identified as: (a) commitment to a common purpose, (b) competence to deliver superior performance, and (c) consistency in perpetuating culture by attracting and keeping the right people. Hickman and Silva also presented three elements of leadership strategy: (a) satisfying customer needs, (b) gaining advantage over competitors, and (c) capitalizing on company strengths. These authors emphasized that when both leadership strategy and organizational culture work harmoniously together, the organization can sustain excellent performance. This can be accomplished through the mutual interactions between leaders and followers. Based upon these mutual interactions, organizational cultures are transmitted, formed, and changed (Hickman & Silva, 1984; Schein, 1985), which will reflect the course of development a company takes in achieving its goals.

Schein (1985) further maintained that in developing the strength of organizational culture, leadership strategy must include the following components: (a) Organizational culture is a product of all employees, including the interaction between the employees of the organization and is "the result of entrepreneurial activities by company founders, leaders and social architects" (Schein, 1985, p. xi); (b) organizational culture is produced and changed by
employees; and (c) organizational culture provides a system of expectancies that sets norms and a standard of behavior for employees, thereby, providing meaningfulness of the leadership behavioral assumptions.

The strength of organizational culture can be approached from a multivariable viewpoint by examining McKinsey's 7-S Framework (Peters & Waterman, 1982) of organizational variables.

**McKinsey's 7-S Framework**

In order to explain the nature of the relationship between strategy, structure, and management effectiveness, Peters and Waterman (1982) introduced a multivariable model called the McKinsey's 7-S Framework. The 7-S framework identifies seven organizational variables as structure, strategy, people, management style, systems and procedures, guiding concepts, and shared values. According to the authors, these organizational variables together can produce organizational changes in large institutions.

Peters and Waterman (1982) emphasized that if the goal of the organization is to become more innovative, adaptive, and to continuously supply customers to meet with their demands, organizational structure must follow organizational strategy. They also maintained that managers should synthesize these seven organizational variables and treat them interdependently if they wish to implement an innovative managerial approach. The importance of the chief executives' and leaders' role is to manage the shared values which is the core of the seven organizational variables. Of the seven organizational
variables discussed by Peters and Waterman, shared values stands out as closely resembling Schein's theory of values (Level 2) of organizational culture.

Rokeach (1979) noted that "values are global beliefs that transcendently guide actions and judgments across specific objects and situations" (p. 72). Peters and Waterman (1982) discovered that companies identified as being excellent developed strong cultures which incorporated the values and practices of leaders and founders of the organizations. The shared values in the organization can be seen to survive for decades in the managerial approaches of such leaders, and the qualities necessary for leaders to establish a strong organizational culture can be examined in Sergiovanni's (1982) 10-principles (10-P) model of leadership.

Sergiovanni's 10-P Model

Sergiovanni (1982) presented the 10-P model as a cognitive map for the requirements of quality in leadership. He stressed that the present theories in leadership emphasize "too much what leaders actually do and how they behave and not enough of the more symbolic aspect of leadership—meanings they communicated to others" (p. 330). Leadership acts have been characterized as expressions of culture and as such, seeks to build unity and order within an organization by giving attention to purposes, historical and philosophical tradition, and ideals and norms which define the way of life within the organization and which provide the bases for socializing members and obtaining their compliance. (pp. 106-107)
Sergiovanni's (1982) 10-principles model identified as its major components: leadership skills, leadership antecedents, leadership meanings, and leadership as cultural expression. The 10 principles that are identified for each include the following: (a) pre-requisites, (b) perspective, (c) principles, (d) platform, (e) politics, (f) purposing, (g) planning, (h) persisting, (i) peopling, and (j) patriotism. All together these suggest the qualities necessary for excellence in leadership. It was also noted by Sergiovanni that when leadership skills, antecedents, and meanings are articulated into practice, leadership behavior can be seen as a cultural expression.

Sergiovanni (1982) emphasized that organizational culture provides organizational members with a clear understanding of the organization's norms, beliefs, principles, and guidelines and offers meaningfulness to the organization and to leadership. These components represent a strong bond which brings members together to work on behalf of the organization to attain its goals and which in turn contribute to a strong organizational culture. Therefore, developing and passing a company's philosophy, purposes, missions, or intentions from founders to past leaders and to employees create symbolic meanings for leadership behaviors of executives and managers. Sergiovanni further noted that organizational culture not only provides the symbolic meanings that leaders use in communicating their values to others, but emphasizes strategic requirements: for quality leadership behavior, which in turn increases 'patriotism' in employees and strengthens employee productivity.
Peters and Waterman (1982) and Sergiovanni (1982) demonstrated the relationship between the organizational variables and leadership behavior in a context of organizational culture.

Organizational Culture Building and Leadership Behavior

Creating Awareness of Organizational Culture

When the topic of leadership as a strategic builder is discussed, authors (Hickman & Silva, 1984) stressed the importance of assessing existing organizational culture as a key element in leadership requirements. Hickman and Silva noted that this requires an awareness of the strength of organizational culture.

In an attempt to discuss man's capacity for self-determination and the decisive factors in making his choices, Goodman (1967) indicated by citing Fromm (1964) that man's capacity and his choice lie in his awareness. Further, the following decisive factors concerning man's awareness are listed as follows:

1. awareness of what constitutes good or evil;
2. which action in the concrete situation is an appropriate means to the desired end;
3. awareness of the forces behind the apparent wish; that means the discovery of unconscious desires;
4. awareness of the real possibilities between which one can choose;
5. awareness of the consequences of the one choice as against the other;
6. awareness of the fact that awareness as such is not effective unless it is accompanied by the will to act, by the readiness to suffer the pain of frustration that necessarily results from an action contrary to one's passions. (pp. 132-133)

Effectively assessing an existing culture not only allows executives to understand the assumptions for deciphering the behavior and attitudes of employees (Level 1: artifacts and creations of
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organizational culture) but also allows them to adopt and modify culture over time as the environment and organization evolve (Hickman & Silva, 1984; Schein, 1985).

An awareness of the strength of organizational culture not only challenges business leaders to observe the organization from a global perspective by introducing a way of looking at the totality of organizational phenomena, but also provides the first step in changing that organization. However, an awareness of the strength of the culture often slips away from employees because they are taken for granted in their daily activities (Hickman & Silva, 1984; Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1978; Schein, 1985). An awareness of existing organizational culture, according to Hickman and Silva, must always precede understanding, developing, and changing cultures.

Developing and Changing Organizational Culture

Hickman and Silva (1984) suggested that organizational culture can be developed, changed, and also adopted as the environment and the organization evolve.

Two kinds of organizational cultural changes were identified by Tichy (1986) as revolutionary and incremental. The revolutionary cultural change occurs when there is often a crisis that needs a drastic change in the total organizational system. Incremental cultural change requires demonstration of many symbolic leadership actions and subtle cultural changes of attitude and behavior. Hickman and Silva (1984) identified three cultural changes as: (a) growth, holding strategy and culture together; (b) crisis, radically altering
strategy and culture; and (c) evolution, fine-tuning strategy and culture. They noted that "growth" often brings innovative strategies that may demand a new culture; "crisis" occurs when organizations face serious crises; and "evolution," when living, changing, growing organizations are constantly evolving to insure their survival. Further, they noted that leaders must follow a constructive guideline toward building culture. Goodman's (1967) discussion of the process of culture individualization in a given society provides leaders with an insight into the process of cultural individualization in a company. This process includes the following three major components: (a) The employees are exposed to the patterns, premises, and systems of expectancies of the cultural features and form as they stay with the company; (b) this, in turn, produces the individualization of a company's culture, and (c) the individual employee "reflects" his or her company's culture. Goodman stated that "in passing that individualization of culture accounts for much of cultural change" (p. 38).

Cultural Awareness and Strengths of Cultural Components for Building Culture

Hickman and Silva (1984) presented a constructive guideline for building culture in a company. The authors maintained that cultural building consists of selecting, motivating, rewarding, retaining, and unifying good employees. The cultural building of employees requires three steps: instilling commitment, rewarding competence, and maintaining consistency. First, there must be an instillation of
commitment to a common philosophy and purpose, recognizing that employees' commitment to a corporate philosophy must coincide with both individual and collective interests. Second, one must develop and reward competence in key areas, keeping in mind that greater competence will be fostered by focusing on one or two key skills at a time rather than by addressing a host of skills all at once. Third, consistency perpetuates commitment and competence by attracting, developing, and keeping the right people.

Developing and changing organizational culture are apparent when there is a drastic change in the total organizational system. Hickman and Silva (1984) noted that culture building requires leaders with visions, leaders who can observe the organization from the global perspective and who can integrate the unknown and known. Organizational culture is an intervening variable between a company's employees and the environment; therefore, the internal systems of management including strategy, structure, skills, systems, leadership behavior, and employees must reflect the external environmental conditions. Miller (1984) stressed the importance of strategy and the responsibility of top managers in developing and changing organizational culture. Kagono et al. (1984) defined an organization's strategy by citing Hofer and Schendel (1978) as "the basic characteristics of the match the organization achieves with its environment" (p. 4).

The role of executives and top managers in developing and changing organization culture can be observed from stories about International Business Machines (IBM) and General Electric (GE). These
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stories presented by Vancil and Green (1984) explained the different histories of how IBM and GE developed their organizational cultures.

IBM's culture stemmed from the legacy of Thomas J. Watson and his son, who between them sat in the top officer's chair for nearly 60 years. During those years, the company was admittedly paternalistic toward its employees and developed many of the familiar characteristics of today's much-admired Japanese companies. By 1980, the company might have been described as an extended family, and the CMC [Corporate Management Committee] as the linchpin that held the family together. Although no present-day CEO will ever have the personal force of the Watsons, the CMC is in some sense a father figure, a leader pointing the way to the future which also being concerned about the current well-being of each member of the family.

Members of a family respect their ancestors and recognize the need to nurture and develop future generations. They share an almost unspoken set of beliefs about appropriate behavior, both among themselves and in dealing with outsiders. At IBM, the external ethic, captured in their phrase "pursuit of excellence," articulates the deeply held belief that, by fulfilling customers' needs superbly well, the family will continue to prosper. This prospect lengthens the managerial time horizon of the currently ruling members because a family is not a transient entity—it will be around for a long time.

Internally, IBM's "respect for the individual" affects all employees and sets the tone for the way that senior managers work together. Loyalty and trust are essentially two sides of the same coin. Managers must demonstrate both an ability to understand what actions are in the best interests of the family and a willingness to make personal sacrifices toward that end. In exchange, such managers are trusted by their colleagues, given increased autonomy, and protected against the occasional failure of a well-intended effort.

GE's culture was a meritocracy in the best American sense of that term. It offered immense opportunity, encouraged rugged individualism, rewarded individual performance, and permitted rapid upward mobility. Accordingly, the role of the CPB [Corporate Policy Board] was to depersonalize the management process by allocating resources on the basis of rigorous analysis and ignoring the background and characteristics of the managers involved. To overdraw the distinction somewhat, the CPB at GE had a brain, but the CMC at IBM also had a heart. (p. 71)
Developing a Strong Organizational Culture

The process of cultural change and leadership strategy building has been illustrated by the Chrysler Corporation's success story and its concept of "equality of sacrifice" (Chrysler Corporation, 1986). The "stop concept" at Ford plants (Yates, 1984) also provides excellent examples of how companies are able to develop strong cultures. These examples can be observed from the success stories of American and Japanese industries.

The Success of an American Industry

Recently, the Chrysler Corporation's experience became a symbol of what an American company can accomplish with risk-taking leaders. Chrysler's innovative managerial approach not only raised its workers to higher levels of motivation and productivity, but its management as well. Management, employees, labor unions, and government agencies worked together to improve and increase productivity in a rapidly changing marketplace. A speaker from the Chrysler Corporation Speaker's Bureau (Chrysler Corporation, 1986) spoke about a lesson learned from the dark days at Chrysler, when 3 billion dollars were lost in a period of 3 years. The speaker explained that Chrysler undertook a series of difficult and painful steps until its "pride was back."

Along with all the strategies developed, Chrysler Corporation also invented a new concept in American corporate life; the concept of "equality of sacrifice." It was explained that this concept of
equality of sacrifice brought everybody together. Union and nonunion workers made salary and benefit sacrifices; suppliers gave Chrysler more time to pay its bills; several states chipped in with new loans, and over 100 banks and financial institutions allowed the company to restructure its debt. With this new concept, everybody united, put their thoughts together, and were willing to help save Chrysler and the 600,000 American jobs that were at stake. As a result, Chrysler made a tremendous recovery, and in 1986 earned 4.7 billion dollars.

It was mentioned further (Chrysler Corporation, 1986) that Chrysler's comeback also included dramatic improvement in the quality of its products. The seeds of this new product philosophy were sown back in the fall of 1977, when Chrysler introduced America's first front-wheel-drive subcompacts priced lower than any other American-made car, and even lower than any comparably equipped Japanese car. An explanation of how Chrysler could produce the quality product at the lowest price was given. The company used the same strategy for product improvement that it used to increase pride in the company: equality of sacrifice. Chrysler was successful in achieving the cooperation from management, labor, suppliers, dealers, and the government, which helped lower costs enough to make the subcompact model possible.

A second example of America's industrial success was illustrated in Business Week (Yates, 1984) as the "stop concept" which was introduced at Ford plants in 1979. This concept established the most extensive and successful worker participation process and played a major role in improving product quality. Thousands of teams of
workers and supervisors at 86 of Ford's 91 plants and depots met weekly to deal with production, quality, and work-environment problems. Through the introduction of a process called employee involvement (EI), Ford reduced production costs and absenteeism. This EI process played a major role in what one outside expert called "an industrial miracle" in the improvement of product quality. Business Week (Yates, 1984) reported that the stop concept was "only the most visible symbol of a near-revolution in labor-management relations ... and has since become entrenched" (p. 80).

These examples of American success stories illustrate that each American company has its own way of developing and changing its organizational culture to produce the successful involvement of employees in establishing and implementing their organization's purposes.

The Success of Japanese Industry

An example of Japan's industrial success of organizational culture is the utilization of a quality control circle in management. This success was due to the fostering of a spirit of collectivism of the group and incorporating it into their business organizations.

According to Wilkins (1983), Japanese companies are more concerned than American companies with developing and passing on the strength of organizational culture, while establishing and implementing purposes of the organization to suit the demands of the world. He expressed that "the Japanese have been successful in their way of 'doing organization' which is a further allurement to look at company
culture" (p. 25). One example of their doing organization is illustrated in the following example.

After World War II, Japan began to emphasize and implement the nation's strategy for producing quality products at a low cost. For instance, one of the strategies to produce quality products at low cost was utilizing a quality control circle (SQC) in Japanese management. Juran (1970) defined quality control (QC) as "the entire collection of activities through which we achieve fitness for use, i.e., carry out the company's quality function" (p. 5). Ishikawa (1985), Japan's foremost authority in quality control, explained how the quality control circle started in Japan. In 1946, a private organization formed by engineers and scholars and named Japanese Scientists and Engineers (JUSE) established the Quality Control Research Group (QCRG) with members drawn from universities, industries, and government. Its aim was to engage in research and dissemination of knowledge of quality control.

In July 1950, JUSE held a seminar with Dr. W. Edward Deming, a recognized scholar in the field of sampling, who introduced a statistical quality control process for managers and engineers. A special one-day seminar for company presidents and top managers took place, enabling top-level managers to realize the importance of utilizing quality control for their companies. Ishikawa (1985) noted that while modern quality control or statistical quality control became fashionable in Japanese factories, top and middle-level managers did not show much interest. In July 1954, however, Dr. J. M. Juran's visit to Japan marked a transition in Japan's quality control
activities. He conducted seminars for top and middle-level managers and emphasized the roles played in promoting QC activities. Ishikawa (1985) expressed that "there is a limit to statistical quality control which has engineers as its prime movers" (p. 19). Juran's visit created an atmosphere in which QC was to be regarded as a tool of management, thus creating an opening for the establishment of total quality control as it is known today.

This strategy by Japanese business leaders produced the successful involvement of employees in establishing and implementing their organization's purposes (Ishikawa, 1985; Nixon, 1984). Thus, the widespread understanding of the nation's purpose and principles were transformed by the executives and managers of the organizations and became vital motivational factors for employees.

The management strategy described was compatible with the nature of "Japanese-style" management. Ishikawa (1985) stated that "total quality control, Japanese style, is a thought revolution in management" (p. 1). He noted further that Japanese business leaders were eager to learn advanced management techniques from the Western world after World War II; however, only quality control was naturalized to become Japan's very own. Through the utilization of the quality control circle in Japanese management has moved in the direction of "total participation," involving all divisions and all employees.

Japanese leaders have effectively utilized the cultural factor "collectivism" in their business organizations, have created group-centered pattern of value orientations, and have modified the management system (Odaka, 1984). The group-centered pattern of value
orientations contributing to formalizing unique characteristics of the "Japanese-style" management system emphasized the following: egalitarian mentality, harmonious and cooperative relations (Wa), age-grade pay systems, total participation, long-term secured employment, and prosperity of the workers (Iwata, 1982). These qualities strengthen the relationship of employees and their productivity. Iwata (1982) explained that once these management techniques are incorporated compatibly into the overall system, formalized, and recognized as working rules, they become established in the thought patterns of the employees. They are then incorporated into the management system.

Iwata's (1982) formation process of the Japanese management systems illustrated how organizational culture is created and established (see Figure 1). This formation process shows that Japanese management systems are founded on the cultural factor which have modified the management system while harmoniously utilizing management techniques with aspects of organizational culture. The leadership strategy of top management activates the process. Behavior, thought, speech, and action of the top management inculcate and create behavior patterns in their corporate activities. As the process continues, the initial stage of struggles and strategy of top management will be forgotten and their behavior patterns will be taken for granted in daily activities and passed on to the next generations. Iwata emphasized that the roots of the Japanese management systems are "the distinct psychological traits of the Japanese people" (p. 15).
When executives and upper level managers attempt to attain their company's business objectives by implementing their management system, the creation of any new management system must be studied in the context of the potential overall efficiency of that total mechanism. At the same time, the reactions from the members of the organization must also be taken into full account. Iwata (1982) emphasized that
if the organization seeks to achieve its objectives, "it must be equipped with management systems that effectively foster order in the reactions of its members and that can bring together these reactions with the aim of accomplishing the objectives" (p. 14).

To clarify this concept further, Iwata (1982) stated that: The top management's concept of man will be strongly reflected in the formation process of management systems. . . . What is important here is the fact that both the top management and the rank-and-file organization members have formulated their personality in a given society, with a given cultural and social environment. In other words, at the base of the idea that each society gives birth to its own unique management style is the existence of various psychological traits that are recognized among the population of that society, and it is these traits that have a pervasive and lasting impact on the formation of systems. (p. 14)

Japanese literature and studies on management and leadership have not commonly used the terminology "organizational culture"; however, it does suggest that the Japanese business leaders have utilized the cultural factors in their formation of management systems and leadership strategy. Iwata's (1982) formation process of the Japanese management systems presented a view that the establishment of organizational culture at the management systems level has incorporated the cultural factor with strategy of top management. Comparison of American and Japanese organizational variables will provide an insight into the characteristic differences of organizational culture between the American and Japanese companies.
Comparison of American and Japanese Organizational Variables as They Relate to Organizational Culture

The current most popular topic that has been discussed among business people and theorists is the comparative strengths of the American and Japanese management practices, organization, and leadership behavior. Through the discussion of this topic, it is expected that executives and managers might learn from one another concerning the enhancement of the industrial quality and quantity; however, this has not been the case (Anderson, 1984; Drucker, 1981; Hayes & Abernathy, 1980; Rehder, 1981).

Iwata (1982) noted that a comparison of management systems is a comparison of the reflection of the leadership behavior of executives and top managers and the reaction of employees in companies and in given societies. Takezawa and Whitehill (1981) agreed by maintaining that "the whole range of values indigenous to each culture shaped and molded the worker's perceptual framework, therefore, the influence of social, economic, and political context, both past and present, had to be taken into account" (p. 5). Workers' perceptions, according to these authors, can be influenced by the dynamics of environmental and cultural values. The perceptual changes of workers, as well as changes in environment and values, can be expected, in turn, to contribute to evolving patterns of industrial relations in each society.

Many authorities of comparative studies between American and Japanese corporate managements (Drucker, 1981; Ishikawa, 1985; Iwata,
1982; Mehtabdin, 1986; Sato & Hoshino, 1984; Takezawa & Whitehill, 1981) stressed the importance of the effect of the nation's environmental and cultural values on the leadership behavior of top management and workers' perceptions.

Nishida (1984), Iwata (1982), and other authorities of Japanese management (Mehtabdin, 1986; Sato & Hoshino, 1984; Takezawa & Whitehill, 1981) stressed the importance of Japan's unique social and cultural factors, especially "collectivism" of the group, which is often used in contrast to "individualism." Through an examination of the cultural factors, Nishida (1984) and Iwata (1982) demonstrated the significance of collectivism of the group on the development of "Japanese-style" management (Ishikawa, 1985; Odaka, 1984).

Individualism Versus Collectivism

Moloney (1973) emphasized the effects of two distinct cultural concepts affecting both the individual and national culture of peoples. While the Americans strive for individualism, the Japanese insist upon collectivism. Moloney stated that "the Japanese insist upon the 'insignificance of the individual,' . . . while American political theory stresses individualism" (p. 3). He explained these cultural conceptual differences between American and Japanese by citing Muramatsu, while drawing upon his knowledge of the Tokugawa era (1603-1867). The traditional difference between the development of American and Japanese national goals and the difference between the character structure of the Japanese adult and the American adult was emphasized:
Americans were emphasizing individuality, spontaneity, efficiency, progressivism, rationalism and mutual cooperation in a "gesellschaftlich" or "contractual" relationship between individuals. In contrast the Japanese were still stressing the concept of society as a unit under the direction of a single authority uniformity, in each defined status, the insignificance of the individual, with conservatism, conventionalism, traditionalism and loyalty in a "gemeinschaftlich" or "family" relationship between individuals. (Muramatsu, 1949, p. 3)

Mehtabdin (1986) further explained the influence of these conceptual differences which are reflected in American and Japanese companies as follows:

The single most important difference between American and Japanese corporate management is simply the difference between groupism [collectivism] and individualism. To put it another way, it is the difference between the United States corporation being regarded by most of its employees as a cold, impersonal, economic unit, whereas the Japanese corporation is often regarded as a community with a common destiny. (p. 85)

Sato and Hoshino (1984) explained further that the group-oriented behavior of the Japanese, combined with corporate capitalism, results in a strong loyalty that exists between the people and the corporation, namely, corporate collectivism. This is in sharp contrast to individualism which is the basis of the Western society.

Many authorities of comparative studies between American and Japanese corporate management (Ishikawa, 1985; Iwata, 1982; Mehtabdin, 1986; Sato & Hoshino, 1984; Takezawa & Whitehill, 1981) have suggested that individualism and collectivism cultural conceptual differences create fundamental differences in the establishment of organizational culture in American and Japanese organizations.

A comparative summary of organizational variables from American and Japanese organizations is presented by Rehder (1981) and Sato and
Hoshino (1984). These variables have also been identified in McKinsey's 7-S Framework as: structure, system, staff, skills, and strategy. The variables identified tend to provide a holistic approach to the organizational effectiveness and together with the environment, goals, and objectives of the corporations produce an interwoven pattern for understanding the characteristics of organizational culture. The organizational variables are examined though each country's traditional system (Rehder, 1981).

**Organizational Structure**

Traditional American system: hierarchical bureaucracy with specialized and highly structured functions and positions; duties and responsibilities clearly defined in writing for each individual organization built around individuals.

Traditional Japanese system: hierarchical organization with loose, broad general functions and informal job descriptions with strong reliance on internalized work group norms of cooperation, consensus seeking, and high group achievement standards. Organization built around groups.

**Management Systems**

Centering management philosophy and expectations. Traditional American system: Maximized return on investment through technological and individual efficiency. Employees dislike work but may be motivated by money if tasks are closely supervised. Organization goals therefore believed to be incongruent with employee goals.

Traditional Japanese system: People seen as most valuable asset in order to achieve company goals, that is, increasing their share of international markets. Organization and employee group goals are therefore seen as congruent to group goals.
**Decision-Making System**

Traditional American system: Decision-making system is highly centralized, top down, written, with extensive post decision verbal communication to seek compliance.

Traditional Japanese system: Decision-making system is highly decentralized, bottom up, informal, with verbal communications used to seek consensus and written system (Ringi) used as post confirmation.

**Management-Employees Relationship and Control System**


**Staff: Selection, Compensation, and Promotion**

Traditional American system: Employees selected primarily on basis of job related formal education and/or practical experience and skills for specialized specific job with little or no employment security. Promotion and rewards primarily based on productivity as determined by management.

Traditional Japanese system: Employees selected directly from school based on academic achievement, corporate examinations, and extensive screening program including familial relationships and school ties for lifetime. Promotion and compensation function of education, tenure, sex, and family responsibility until age 55. Broad group evaluation criteria.
Skills: Human Resources Training Development

Traditional American system: human resources potential seldom fully recognized. Human resources training and development not carefully planned but intermittent with high levels of functional and technological orientation to improve individual performance. High career/job specialization [personal predisposition is specialist].

Traditional Japanese system: human resources seen as invaluable lifetime investment. Continuous in-house training and development key to both organization loyalty and technical development. Less job and career specialization with broader skills and management development as team member. Technical adaptation and development traditionally very well developed [personal predisposition is generalist]. (Rehder, 1981, p. 67)

Management Strategy

Sato and Hoshino (1984) pointed out several different characteristics concerning management strategies between American and Japanese firms.

American firms are more flexible in their strategic development of resources and that they emphasize short-term resource utilization, while Japanese firms emphasize long-term resource accumulation and are slow to follow a withdrawal strategy.

American firms emphasize head-on competition and cost-efficiency, while Japanese firms stress finding their "niche" and strategies of product differentiation in order to gain competitive advantage.

Japanese firms' mode of strategy formulation differs from the American mode in that the latter emphasizes an analytical approach and takes a wider range of information into account, while the former emphasizes the judgment of experienced executives. (p. 41)
Environment and Objective of Corporations

Sato and Hoshino (1984) stated the differences of environment and objectives between American and Japanese companies by citing Kagono et al., "The American environment features diverse and remote relationships, as well as rivalry among competitors, while the Japanese environment is homogeneous and has a rather cooperative relationships with competitors. The objective of American companies is to maximize profitability and stockholders' gains; in Japan, corporations have multiple objectives with a special emphasis on growth" (p. 6).

In observing the characteristic differences between American and Japanese organizational variables, it is noted that a comparative study provides a global perspective for understanding organizational culture. The characteristics of this global perspective demonstrates the importance of leadership behavior and provides the information needed for the establishment of organizational culture in parent and subsidiary companies of multinational corporations.

The Importance of Leadership Behavior Between Parent and Subsidiary Companies as it Relates to Organizational Culture

The problems of transferring a headquarter’s goals and purposes to a subsidiary company with different cultural and ideological backgrounds have been a crucial topic for multinational corporations (Drake & Caudill, 1981; Jaeger, 1983; Johnson & Ouchi, 1974). The executives and upper level managers become key personnel in
transferring the parent company's goals and objectives to its subsidiary company. Leadership in multinational corporations requires sensitivity to the subsidiary company's organizational culture, which includes the ability to assess the existing organizational culture in the subsidiary companies, and to change and adopt that organization's culture in order to carry out the missions of the parent company.

The leadership behavior and values of the top management are outcomes of their "basic assumptions" of the organizational culture in their parent companies. These leadership behaviors and values of personnel are transmitted to subsidiary companies, which in turn reflect their nation's culture. When cultural backgrounds are extremely different, for example, between America and Japan (individualism versus collectivism), executives and managers must possess sensitivities and knowledges for the cultural differences of the two countries. Tsurumi (1978) noted that the difficulties of establishing a new culture in subsidiary companies often occur due to the differences of characteristics between American and Japanese organizational culture. Tsurumi listed seven major sources of conflict between Japanese and American managers in subsidiary companies: (a) mismatch of expected leadership style; (b) formal versus informal organization; (c) verbal versus written communication; (d) lifetime versus mercenary employment; (e) avoidance of confrontation; (f) management and rank-and-file dichotomy; and (g) size, accommodation, and conflict.

Developing an organizational culture in their subsidiary companies requires executives and managers' understanding and sensitivity
for the problematic aspects of a harmonious relationship. Moran (1983) identified four aspects that are required by top management in developing cultural synergism.

(1) consciously accepted values and mores that are part of each individual's previous environment, (2) consciously agreed-upon values and mores that require discussion and compromise by either one or both, (3) unconsciously agreed-upon values and mores that are aspects of one of the partners' environment and are accepted by the other without notice or compromise, and (4) unconsciously agreed-upon values and mores that develop as one partner reacts to the other. (p. 29)

Leadership competence depends on the leader's awareness and sensitivity for the strength of organizational culture and of his leadership behavior which provides a foundation of management strategy and of organizational culture (Hickman & Silva, 1984).

The interest by American managers is especially great in those Japanese multinational corporations who successfully transplanted their subsidiaries to America. Tsurumi (1978) noted that there are a few firms which have successfully adapted the Japanese management systems to the American environment; however, the majority are struggling to establish new organizational cultures.

For example, Mitsubishi Corporation (1978), one of Japan's biggest multinational trading firms (Sogo Shosha), reported that its three corporate philosophies of corporate responsibility to society, integrity and fairness, and international contribution through trade advocated by the founder still ran through the company and provided a strong sense of mission, giving unity and loyalty among 10,000 employees. These philosophies were reflected in their wholly owned subsidiary, Mitsubishi International Corporations (MIC) in New York.
Nakamura, general manager of the General Administration Division of Mitsubishi International Corporation, expressed that MIC's goal was to bring the elements of Japanese and American management system in order to create the fully integrated and localized subsidiary company. This was accomplished through personnel policies and guidelines which developed capable American managers, who could effectively work with the Japanese managers in an environment where a mixture of U.S.-Japanese management styles prevailed.

Many of the Japanese subsidiary companies expressed an urgent need to "blend-together" to form a new corporate culture in America. In order to establish a new corporate culture in America, many of the Japanese subsidiaries reformed their internal systems of management to reflect the external U.S. environment. They often had to adopt dual management systems—one designed for rotating Japanese employees and the other for nonrotating U.S. employees.

In order to be successful in America, the Japanese subsidiaries developed more capable American managers, because the Japanese dominated management hinders the future development of the American customers oriented business and endangers the existence of the core business.

Tichy (1986) stressed the strength of organizational culture when incorporated in the strategy of multinational corporations. The establishment of organizational culture in a subsidiary of a multinational corporation is critical to the success of that corporation. The leadership behavior of top management is extremely important because of the effects of their leadership behavior on the modes and
quality of interactions between the headquarters and their subsidiary companies (Jaeger, 1983).

Summary of Literature Review

A review of pertinent empirical research and theoretical literature has provided evidence that the effort to improve the quality of organizational leadership emphasized a concept which stressed the importance of organizational culture. Organizational culture not only provides the symbolic meaning that leaders use in communicating their values to others, but also produces confidence and a commitment to work by employees (Schein, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1982, 1984).

The literature cited has indicated that the organizational culture challenges the business leaders to observe the organization from the global perspective and to integrate the unknown and known, insignificant and significant, and Western and Eastern philosophy of managing organizations. The organizational culture is a product of leadership strategies and acts of employees, and a way of looking at the totality of organizational phenomena and all employees in the past, present, and future.

There has been a limited amount of research that deals with the definition and conceptual discussion of organizational culture. Kroeber and Kluckhohn's (1978) definition of culture incorporates the concept of organizational culture which emphasized that organizational culture as a subculture shares the notion of a nation's culture. The concept of organizational culture is still new to American business leaders; however, the literature indicates that
organizational culture imposes a powerful influence on the behavior and attitudes of executives and managers (Cummings, 1984; DeFrank et al., 1985; Denison, 1984; Schwartz & Davis, 1981) and provides a holistic approach to the organizational phenomena and leadership behavior.

A new organizational culture emerges when leaders proclaim and demonstrate values through their own behavior and when they follow constructive steps. This requires leaders with new values, visions, and spirit, and an awareness of the existing organizational culture that must always precede understanding, developing, changing, and perfecting a culture (Hickman & Silva, 1984; Miller, 1984). The examples of American and Japanese industry suggested that the effects of organizational culture are visible and significant. In a world characterized by rapid and unpredictable change, global competition for markets, and a constant need for managerial innovation, developing organizational culture in the 1980s and 1990s requires quality leadership which will create an internally consistent strong culture. An internally consistent and strong organizational culture enables top management to direct and control the actions and behaviors of employees to higher levels of motivation and morality toward accomplishing the organizational goal.

The review of literature also focused on the contrasting characteristics of American and Japanese organizational variables. This focus provided an observation of the organization from the global perspective and increased a self-insight into an organization's effectiveness.
In the discussion of successful American and Japanese multinational corporations, literature revealed that the success of multinational corporations relies on the leadership of top management who has a sensitivity and an awareness of the nation's existing culture. These qualities are necessary for developing new organizational cultures in their subsidiary companies which can be achieved by transmitting the parent companies' principles, values, and philosophy to their subsidiary companies. Therefore, the leaders' awareness of organizational culture in the subsidiary companies must precede understanding, developing, changing, and perfecting a culture to suit the conditions of the host country and the world characteristics as well.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationships of career positions of employees (executive group and middle managers group), nationalities of the companies (American and Japanese), and locations of the companies (parent and subsidiary) with the awareness of organizational culture and with leadership behavior.

Described in Chapter III are the method and procedures used in this study. Included are (a) operational definitions, (b) a description of the subjects taking part in the study, (c) research hypotheses to be tested, (d) instrumentations used in collecting the data, (e) the data collection process, (f) data analyses, and (g) a summary of the chapter.

Operational Definitions

**Executives and upper level managers:** presidents, vice presidents, and upper level managers who have responsibilities that include policy making and implementation.

**Manager:** a person who supervises one or more individuals and who gets things done through the work of others.

**Middle level manager:** a manager who is between the upper level and lower level of managerial positions.
Lower level manager: a manager at the first level of a managerial position.

Other employees: employees without a title or those who do not hold managerial positions.

Parent company: an American or Japanese company that produces or generates another company.

Subsidiary company: an American or Japanese company that has more than half of its stock owned by another company, specifically, the parent company.

Multinational corporation: a company having operations (subsidiaries) in America or in Japan.

Executives' and upper level managers' observed leadership: the observed description of executives' and upper level managers' leadership behavior as indicated by middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions, and as indicated by the total and cluster scores on the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire.

Awareness of organizational culture: the total scores obtained on the Cultural Awareness Checklist.

Executive group: executives and upper level managers.

Middle managers group: middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions.

Subjects

To initiate the planning stage of the study, lists of American and Japanese companies and their background information were
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compiled. Lists of American companies located in Michigan were obtained from the following sources: (a) Directory of Michigan Companies, (1986), Kalamazoo Area Manufacturers and Processors Directory (1985), and (c) Kalamazoo County's Top Industrial Employers (1985). In addition, a list of Japanese companies located in Michigan was obtained from the Michigan Department of Commerce in Lansing, Michigan, and lists containing the names of American and Japanese parent and subsidiary companies were also obtained from the following: (a) Standard & Poor's Register (1986), (b) The Directory of Foreign Business in Japan (1986), and (c) Directory of Foreign Corporations (1985).

From the gathered information obtained from each company, specific companies were identified as possessing the accessible population of employees based upon the companies' size and the numbers of employees.

The sample for this study consisted of employees from 40 American companies (25 parent companies located in America and 15 subsidiary companies located in Japan) and 30 Japanese companies (18 parent companies located in Japan and 12 subsidiary companies located in America) with an approximate total employee population of 231,330. Individuals who participated in the investigation \( n = 259 \) included: (a) executive group: 117 executives and upper level managers, and (b) middle managers group: 139 middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions. A number of companies was selected for the purpose of testing each null hypothesis.
Research Hypotheses

The methods described in this study were designed to address 41 research hypotheses for the following major four areas: (a) relationships of career positions, nationalities of the companies, and locations of the companies to the awareness of organizational culture; (b) differences in the awareness of organizational culture; (c) differences in the leadership behavior of the executive group; (d) the relationships between the awareness of organizational culture and the leadership behavior of the executive group; and (e) differences in the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior between the American and Japanese executive groups.

The research hypotheses were nondirectional in nature because of the following reasons:

Literature review indicated that the success of Japanese industry was due to the strong organizational culture (Wilkins, 1983); however, the literature also suggested that the strengths of organizational culture are taken for granted and slips away from the employees' awareness in their daily work. Because of the nature of the awareness of organizational culture, the researcher has chosen nondirectional hypotheses.

Relationships of Career Positions, Nationalities, and Locations to the Awareness of Organizational Culture

1. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group.
2. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the parent executive group and the parent middle managers group.

3. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the subsidiary executive group and the subsidiary middle managers group.

4. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and the American middle managers group.

5. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and the Japanese middle manager group.

6. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American parent middle managers group.

7. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese parent middle managers group.

8. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the American subsidiary middle managers group.

9. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group.
Differences in the Awareness of Organizational Culture

10. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group.

11. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the parent executive group and the parent middle managers group.

12. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the subsidiary executive group and the subsidiary middle managers group.

13. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and the American middle managers group.

14. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and the Japanese middle managers group.

15. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American parent middle managers group.

16. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese parent middle managers group.

17. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the American subsidiary middle managers group.

18. There is a difference between the awareness of
organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group.

19. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American subsidiary executive group.

20. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent middle managers group and the American subsidiary middle managers group.

21. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

22. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group.

23. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group.

24. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent middle managers group and the Japanese parent middle managers group.

25. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

26. There is a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group.
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Differences in the Leadership Behavior of the Executive Group

27. There is a difference between the leadership behavior of the American executive group and the Japanese executive group.

28. There is a difference between the leadership behavior of the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group.

29. There is a difference between the leadership behavior of the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

30. There is a difference between the leadership behavior of the American parent executive group and the American subsidiary executive group.

31. There is a difference between the leadership behavior of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

Relationships Between the Awareness of Organizational Culture and the Leadership Behavior of the Executive Group

32. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and their leadership behavior.

33. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and their leadership behavior.

34. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and their leadership behavior.
35. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and their leadership behavior.

36. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and their leadership behavior.

37. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and their leadership behavior.

38. There is a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and their leadership behavior.

Differences in the Awareness of Organizational Culture With the Leadership Behavior

39. There is a difference in the awareness of organizational culture with leadership behavior between the American executive group and the Japanese executive group.

40. There is a difference in the awareness of organizational culture with leadership behavior between the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group.

41. There is a difference in the awareness of organizational culture with leadership behavior between the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.
Instrumentation

Two measurement instruments were used to collect data in this investigation: (a) Cultural Awareness Checklist (Hickman & Silva, 1984) and (b) Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (The Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board College of Administrative Science). Each instrument is discussed below:

Cultural Awareness Checklist

The awareness of organizational culture was one dependent variable in this study and was measured by the Cultural Awareness Checklist. This 33-item checklist is divided into three cultural components: (a) commitment to a common purpose, (b) competence to deliver superior performance, and (c) perpetuating commitment and competence. By circling one of four adverbs: always, often, seldom, or never, the respondent indicates the frequency with which he or she is aware of the described cultural items.

The Cultural Awareness Checklist was developed on the basis of 10 years of management consulting and training experiences, utilizing hundreds of large and small organizations. Since its development in 1984, this survey instrument has been used on numerous occasions to assess the strength of an organization's culture.

For the purpose of this study, a selected portion of the Cultural Awareness Checklist was administered to middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions (middle managers group). Due to the job responsibility of these employees,
items on the Cultural Awareness Checklist relating to executives and upper level managers were excluded (see Appendix A).

This instrument was chosen for several reasons: (a) It measures multifacet components of organizational culture, (b) it is easy to administer, and (c) it is widely used with industrial organizations.

**Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ)**

The leadership behavior of corporate executives and upper level managers was the second dependent variable in this study and was measured by the LBDQ (see Appendix A). Halpin and Winer (1952) identified two dimensions of leadership behavior as: (a) initiating structure and (b) consideration. Initiating structure refers to the leadership behavior in delineating the relationship between oneself and the members of his group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, communication channels, and ways to accomplish the goals and objectives of the organization. Consideration refers to leadership behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the group.

The LBDQ contains 40 items; however, in this study, only 30 of the 40 were scored: 15 for each of the two dimensions. Each of the items on the LBDQ describes a specific way in which a leader may behave. By circling one of five adverbs: always, often, occasionally, seldom, or never, the respondent must indicate the frequency with which he or she perceives the leader to engage in each type of the described behavior.
According to the Bureau of Business Research (1957), the LBDQ is a highly reliable instrument with an estimated reliability by the split-half method of .83 for the initiating structure scores and .93 for the consideration scores when corrected for attenuation. Halpin and Winer (1952) reported that the content and construct validity of LBDQ was obtained from a number of empirical studies in industry, military, and educational settings (e.g., Fleishman, 1953, Fleishman & Harris, 1956; Halpin, 1955; Harris & Burt, 1956, Stogdill & Coons, 1957).

The reasons for selecting the LBDQ for use in this study were (a) the LBDQ provides a fairly reliable method for measuring leadership behavior, (b) the LBDQ is widely used by industries in empirical studies, and (c) ease of administration and scoring.

Data Collection Process

The collection of data was conducted in two stages and locations from May to December, 1986. The collection of data from Japanese parent companies and American subsidiary companies in Japan was conducted in Tokyo, Japan, between May and August 1986. The collection of data from American parent companies and Japanese subsidiary companies in the United States was conducted in Kalamazoo, Michigan, between September and December 1986.

Data Collection From Japan

1. In May 1986, the researcher traveled to Tokyo, Japan, to investigate the availability of the population and to perform the
data collection.

2. The Cultural Awareness Checklist and the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire were translated into Japanese by the researcher, three Japanese university English professors, and two business professionals in Japan.

3. Contact was made with the Japanese parent companies and American subsidiary companies, including those who had already received an agreement from their subsidiary companies in Michigan to participate in the study.

4. The name of a person who was in charge of customer service in administration office was obtained from each of the companies, and the following material was sent to each contact person: (a) a letter introducing the investigator and the proposed research, (b) a letter seeking permission to perform the study, (c) a letter of inquiry seeking background information regarding the company, (d) the questionnaires, and (e) self-addressed stamped envelopes (see Appendix B).

5. After receiving permission to perform the study, and with the assistance of the contact person and background information of each company, the numbers of executives and upper level managers and middle and lower level managers and employees not holding managerial positions were identified.

6. Questionnaires were delivered and/or sent to the contact person to distribute to the other members.

7. Fifteen days after the mailing the questionnaires, follow-up letters were sent to those companies who had not returned their
responses by the specified date (see Appendix B).

8. As a result of these procedures, data were collected from 18 Japanese parent companies and 15 American subsidiary companies. These subjects included 67 executives and upper level managers (executive group, $n = 38$ in Japanese parent companies and $n = 29$ in American subsidiary companies), and 90 middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions (middle managers group, $n = 59$ in Japanese parent companies and $n = 31$ in American subsidiary companies).

Data Collection From America

1. In September 1986, the researcher returned to Kalamazoo, Michigan, and began the data collection from American parent companies and Japanese subsidiary companies.

2. The name of a contact person was obtained from each company. The procedures followed during this period were the same as those followed during the data collection procedures in Japan.

3. As a result of the aforementioned procedures, data were collected from 25 American parent companies and 12 Japanese subsidiary companies which included 50 executives and upper level managers (executive group, $n = 24$ in American parent companies and $n = 26$ in Japanese subsidiary companies), and 49 middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions (middle managers group, $n = 27$ in American parent companies and $n = 22$ in Japanese subsidiary companies).
4. As the questionnaires were returned to the researcher, all 256 responses were coded on scanning sheets and transferred to the VAX computer at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan. The statistical analyses were conducted by the Center of Statistical Analysis at Western Michigan University, utilizing the Statistical Analysis System (SAS).

Data Analyses

Once the data were collected according to the procedure described earlier in this chapter, each of the four areas to be studied were analyzed with appropriate statistical techniques.

To test the nine null hypotheses in the first area, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient $r$ was computed for each of the hypotheses to determine the relationships of career positions, nationalities of the companies, and locations of the companies to the awareness of organizational culture. For the second area, the repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to Hypotheses 10 through 12 to determine if there was a significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group. For the remaining 14 hypotheses, the $t$ test was performed to determine if there was a difference in nationalities of the companies and the locations of the companies. For the third area, the $t$ test was computed to ascertain the differences in the leadership behavior of the executive group, as observed by the middle managers group between nationalities of the companies and locations of the companies. For the fourth area, the
Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was applied to Hypotheses 39 through 41 for the purpose of determining the relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and their leadership behavior as observed by the middle managers group. For the fifth area, Fisher's $Z_r$ transformation was used to test Hypotheses 35 through 37 to ascertain the differences in the awareness of organizational culture with the leadership behavior between the American and Japanese executives groups.

Summary

The major components of the research design have been described in Chapter III. The sample selection process, instrumentation, data collection, and data analyses were outlined in detail.

Data were collected in two phases. In the first phase, the data collection was conducted in Tokyo, Japan. As the result, 18 Japanese parent companies and 15 American subsidiary companies participated in this study. In the second phase, the data collection was conducted in the United States. This produced the participation of 25 American parent companies and 12 Japanese subsidiary companies. A total of 256 responses were collected from the 70 companies.

The instruments used and the procedures followed for carrying out the study were discussed. The use of the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient $r$, the repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA), the $t$ test, and Fisher's $Z_r$ transformation were discussed in the data analysis section.
The results and interpretation of the research will be presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationships of career positions of employees (executive group and middle managers group), nationalities of the companies (American and Japanese), and locations of the companies (parent and subsidiary) with the awareness of organizational culture and with leadership behavior.

Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent (1975) indicated that the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, symbolized by $r$, serves the purpose as an indicator of "the goodness of fit" of the linear regression, and as a measure of association indicating the strength of the linear relationship between the two variables. They noted that if the value of $r$ is close to zero, there is little or no linear relationship between the two variables. If the value of $r$ approaches $+1.0$ or $-1.0$, there is a strong linear relationship. In addition, Drew (1980) noted that although the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient $r$ does not imply a cause-effect relationship between the variables, it is possible to make an accuracy of predictions concerning the results.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to determine the strength of relationship between the awareness of the organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group. Further, the correlation was calculated using the awareness
of organizational culture scores of the executive group and the leadership behavior scores to determine the strength of the relationship between the American and Japanese (parent and subsidiary) groups.

A repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used in computing the difference of effects of the nationalities of the companies and the locations of the companies on an awareness of organizational culture. Norusis (1985) explained that the repeated measures analysis of variance is used to examine "the relationship of the dependent variable and the conditions under which it is measured when the same dependent variable is measured on more than one occasion for each subject" (p. 255). Also, Norusis noted that it is used "to identify the variables that contribute to differences between the treatment conditions" (p. 255). In addition, t tests were performed to determine the differences of effects of nationalities of the companies and locations of the companies on the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups and the leadership behavior of the executive group. Further, the significance of the difference between two correlation coefficients for independent samples, the correlations from the awareness of organizational culture and the leadership behaviors for the American and Japanese executive groups, were tested using Fisher's $Z_r$ transformation (Ferguson, 1966).

Chapter IV is divided into three parts: (a) description of the survey responses; (b) demographics of respondents; and (c) null hypotheses testing, results of the analyses, and summary of the findings.
Survey Responses

The sample for this study consisted of employees from 40 American companies and 30 Japanese companies. A total of 256 employees participated in the study: (a) 117 executives and upper level managers and (b) 139 middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions.

Table 1 depicts the number and percentage of questionnaires sent and returned.

Demographic Data on Respondents

The demographic profile represented 117 executives and upper level managers and 139 middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions in 40 American and 30 Japanese companies.

Of particular interest is the number of female employees in career positions and locations of the companies. The number of female executives and upper level managers who participated in the study consisted of five in American parent companies and two in American subsidiary companies. There were no female executives and upper level managers in Japanese parent companies; however, there was one female executive in a Japanese subsidiary company in America.

In contrast to the number of females employed as executives and upper level managers, a much higher number of females were employed as middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions. These consisted of 9 in American parent
Table 1
Number of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total no. of companies</th>
<th>Employee career positions&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Questionnaires sent</th>
<th>Questionnaires returned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American parent company (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>E/U 53</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M/L/O 56</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American subsidiary company (Japan)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>E/U 36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M/L/O 38</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese parent company (Japan)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>E/U 58</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M/L/O 70</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese subsidiary company (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>E/U 46</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M/L/O 48</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Employee career positions: E/U = Executive group: executive and upper level managers. M/L/O = Middle managers group: middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions.

companies, 17 in American subsidiary companies, 16 in Japanese parent companies, and 6 in Japanese subsidiary companies. Table 2 provides demographic data on the respondents.

In this study, the average age for executives and upper level managers is 44 years in American parent companies, 44 years in...
Table 2
Demographics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic variables</th>
<th>American company</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese company</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent (U.S.A.)</td>
<td>Subsidiary (Japan)</td>
<td>Parent (Japan)</td>
<td>Subsidiary (U.S.A.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E/U</td>
<td>M/L/O</td>
<td>E/U</td>
<td>M/L/O</td>
<td>E/U</td>
<td>M/L/O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. E/U = Executive and upper level managers. M/L/O = Middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions.
American subsidiary companies, 45 years in Japanese parent companies, and 44 years in Japanese subsidiary companies. The average age for middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions was 38 years in American parent companies, 33 years in American subsidiary companies, 32 years in Japanese parent companies, and 37 years in Japanese subsidiary companies.

Results of Analyses

The 41 null hypotheses were divided into five areas: (a) relationships between career positions, nationalities of the companies, and locations of the companies to the awareness of organizational culture; (b) differences in the awareness of organizational culture; (c) differences in leadership behavior of the executive group; (d) relationships between the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior of the executive group; and (e) differences in the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior between the American and Japanese executive groups.

The null hypotheses in the first and fourth areas were tested by utilizing a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and the second was measured by a repeated measures analysis of variance and t tests. The third area was computed by t tests. And the fifth area was tested by using Fisher's Z transformation. These hypotheses were tested at the alpha level of .05. The results of each null hypothesis are presented.

The rationale for stating nondirectional hypotheses is the scarcity of empirical studies concerning the awareness of organizational
culture and its relationship with the leadership behavior in the American and Japanese multinational corporations. Literature indicated that American and Japanese companies are inclined to exhibit differences in organizational culture. Further, Ouchi (1981c) and Wilkins (1983) indicated that Japanese companies are more concerned than American companies with developing and passing on the strength of organizational culture. However, the term organizational culture was originated in America and became popular at the beginning of 1980s in the American business world. Hoy and Miskel (1987) and Peters and Waterman (1982) indicated that the successful American companies also displayed strong and distinctive culture. The current popularity of the topic has influenced the awareness of top managements in American companies. Another rationale for stating nondirectional hypotheses is the problematical nature of organizational culture, that the awareness of the strength of the culture often slips away from employees because they are taken for granted in their daily activities (Hickman & Silva, 1984; Schein, 1985). Therefore, factors for the directional hypotheses were not confirmed by the literature.

Relationships of Career Positions, Nationalities of the Companies, and Locations of the Companies With the Awareness of Organizational Culture

**Null Hypothesis 1**

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group.
Using 34 American and Japanese parent and subsidiary companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to determine the presence of a relationship. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of .48 with a p value of .0043 and N = 34. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected, since the p value was less than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis was accepted. A statistically significant relationship did exist between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group.

**Null Hypothesis 2**

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the parent executive group and the parent middle managers group.

Using 19 American and Japanese parent companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture by the two groups. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of .47, with a p value of .0402 and N = 19, which was less than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. A statistically significant relationship did exist between the awareness of organizational culture of the parent company executive group and the parent company middle managers group.
Null Hypothesis 3

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture by of the subsidiary executive group and the subsidiary middle managers group.

Using 15 American and Japanese subsidiary companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of .47, with a p value of .0785 and N = 15. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis could not be supported. Consequently, no statistically significant relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the subsidiary executive group and the subsidiary middle managers group.

Null Hypothesis 4

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and the American middle managers group.

Using 17 American parent and subsidiary companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of .58, with a p value of .0156 and N = 17, which was less than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected.
A statistically significant relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and the American middle managers group.

**Null Hypothesis 5**

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and the Japanese middle managers group.

Using 17 Japanese parent and subsidiary companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of .29, with a $p$ value of .2520 and $N = 17$, which was greater than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the null hypothesis was retained, and the research hypothesis could not be accepted.

This indicated that no statistically significant relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and the Japanese middle managers group.

**Null Hypothesis 6**

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American parent middle managers group.

Using 9 American parent companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the
two groups. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of .60, with a p value of .0901 and N = 9. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. The research hypothesis could not be accepted.

This indicated that no statistically significant relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American parent middle managers group.

Null Hypothesis 7

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese parent middle managers group.

Using 10 Japanese parent companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of .38 with a p value of .2752 and N = 10. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis could not be accepted.

This indicated that no statistically significant relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese parent middle managers group.
Null Hypothesis 8

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the American subsidiary middle managers group. Using 9 American subsidiary companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of .60 with a p value of .0901 and N = 9. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis could not be accepted.

The results indicated that no statistically significant relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the American subsidiary middle managers group.

Null Hypothesis 9

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group. Using 8 Japanese subsidiary companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of .08 with a p value of .8641 and N = 7. Therefore, the null hypothesis
was retained since the $p$ value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis could not be supported.

The results indicated that no statistically significant relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group.

**Differences in the Awareness of Organizational Culture**

**Null Hypothesis 10**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group.

The repeated measures analysis of variance was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a $p$ value of .0018 for the career positions of the two groups. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected since the $p$ value was less than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis was supported. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 3. Cultural awareness mean score for the executive group was 49.23 and was 45.25 for the middle managers group. This indicated that the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group was higher than that of the middle managers group.
Table 3
Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance of the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the Executive Group and the Middle Managers Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>283.70</td>
<td>283.70</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>.0018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1048.44</td>
<td>25.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1332.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05.

The researcher concluded that a statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group.

**Null Hypothesis II**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the parent executive group and the parent middle managers group. A repeated measures analysis of variance was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a p value of .0045. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected since the p value was less than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis was supported. Cultural awareness mean score for the executive group was 50.22 and was 45.30 for the middle managers group. This indicated that the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group
was higher than the middle managers group. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance of the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the Parent Executive Group and the Parent Middle Managers Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>229.14</td>
<td>229.14</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>.0045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>364.25</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>593.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

The researcher concluded that a statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the parent executive group and the parent middle managers group.

Null Hypothesis 12

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the subsidiary executive group and the subsidiary middle managers group.

The repeated measures analysis of variance was used to determine if there was a difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a p value of .0831. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis...
could not be supported. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance of the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the Subsidiary Executive Group and the Subsidiary Middle Managers Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.43</td>
<td>85.43</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.0831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>315.25</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>400.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher concluded that no statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the subsidiary executive group and the subsidiary middle managers group.

Null Hypothesis 13

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and the American middle managers group.

The t test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a p value of .1575. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level.
Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. Table 6 presents the results.

Table 6
The t Test for the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the American Executive Group and the American Middle Managers Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive group</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49.557</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle managers group</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47.174</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that no statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and the American middle managers group.

Null Hypothesis 14

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and the Japanese middle managers group.

The t test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a p value of .0024. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected since the p value was less than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis was supported. Table 7 presents the results.
The results suggested that a statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and the Japanese middle managers group. The mean score for executive group was higher than the mean score for the middle managers group, which suggested that the executive group had a higher awareness of organizational culture than the middle managers group.

Null Hypothesis 15

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American parent middle managers group.

The t test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a p value of .3765. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level.
Thus, the research hypothesis could not be supported. Table 8 presents the results.

Table 8
The $t$ Test for the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the American Parent Executive Group and the American Parent Middle Managers Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive group</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50.093</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>.3765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle managers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48.112</td>
<td>1.570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that a statistically significant difference did not exist between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American parent middle managers group.

**Null Hypothesis 16**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese parent middle managers group.

The $t$ test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a $p$ value of .0014. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected since the $p$ value is less than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis was supported. Table 9 presents the results.
Table 9
The $t$ Test for the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the Japanese Parent Executive Group and the Japanese Parent Middle Managers Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive group</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50.348</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.0014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle managers group</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42.493</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$_{p} < .05$.  

The results indicated that a statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese parent middle managers group. The mean score for the executive group was higher than the mean score for the middle managers group, which suggested that the executive group had a higher awareness of organizational culture than the middle managers group.

Null Hypothesis 17

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the American subsidiary middle managers group.

The $t$ test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture by the two groups. The analysis yielded a $p$ value of .0576. Therefore, the null hypothesis was
retained since the $p$ value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis could not be supported. Table 10 presents the results.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive group</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49.254</td>
<td>1.583</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.0576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle managers group</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44.127</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that no statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the American subsidiary middle managers group.

**Null Hypothesis**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group.

The $t$ test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a $p$ value of .5445. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the $p$ value was greater than the .05 alpha level.
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Thus, the research hypothesis could not be supported. Table 11 presents the results.

Table 11
The \( t \) Test for the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the Japanese Subsidiary Executive Group and the Japanese Subsidiary Middle Managers Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive group</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.234</td>
<td>1.551</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>.5445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle managers group</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46.596</td>
<td>2.034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that no statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group.

Null Hypothesis 19

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American subsidiary executive group.

The \( t \) test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a \( p \) value of .5924. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the \( p \) value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. Table 12 presents the results.
Table 12
The t Test for the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the American Parent Executive Group and the American Subsidiary Executive Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent executive group</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49.69</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.5925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary executive group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.78</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that no statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the American subsidiary executive group.

Null Hypothesis 20

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent middle managers group and the American subsidiary middle managers group.

The t test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a p value of .1705. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. Table 13 presents the results.
Table 13

The t Test for the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the American Parent Middle Managers Group and the American Subsidiary Middle Managers Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent middle managers group</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.70</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.1705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary middle managers group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.66</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that no statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent middle managers group and the American subsidiary middle managers group.

Null Hypothesis 21

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

The t test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a p value of .6248. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. Table 14 presents the results.
Table 14

The $t$ Test for the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the Japanese Parent Executive Group and the Japanese Subsidiary Executive Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent executive group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49.19</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>.6248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary executive group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.17</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that no statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

Null Hypothesis 22

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group.

The $t$ test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a $p$ value of .0001. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected since the $p$ value was less than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis was supported. Table 15 presents the results.
The results indicated that a statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group. The mean score for the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group was higher than the mean score for the Japanese parent middle managers group, which suggested that the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group had a higher awareness of organizational culture than the Japanese parent middle managers group.

Null Hypothesis 23

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group.

The $t$ test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a $p$ value of .68. Therefore, the null hypothesis was
retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. Table 16 presents the results.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American parent executive group</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>49.69</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>.6800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese parent executive group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.34</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that no statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group.

Null Hypothesis 24

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent middle managers group and the Japanese parent middle managers group.

The t test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a p value of .0002. Therefore, the null hypothesis was
rejected since the p value is less than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis was supported. Table 17 presents the results.

Table 17

The t Test for the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the American Parent Middle Managers Group and the Japanese Parent Middle Managers Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American parent middle managers group</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.70</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>-5.27</td>
<td>.0002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese parent middle managers group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.34</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

The results indicated that a statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent middle managers group and the Japanese parent middle managers group. The mean score for the American parent middle managers group was higher than the mean score for the Japanese parent middle managers group, which suggested that the American parent middle managers group had a higher awareness of organizational culture than the Japanese parent middle managers group.
Null Hypothesis 25

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

The \( t \) test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a \( p \) value of .62. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the \( p \) value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. Table 18 presents the results.

Table 18

The \( t \) Test for the Awareness of Organizational Culture of the American Subsidiary Executive Group and the Japanese Subsidiary Executive Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American subsidiary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.78</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.6200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese subsidiary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.17</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>executive group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that no statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.
Null Hypothesis 26

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group. The \( t \) test was performed to determine the difference between the awareness of organizational culture of the two groups. The analysis yielded a \( p \) value of .0545. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the \( p \) value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. Table 19 presents the results.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American subsidiary middle managers group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.66</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.0545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese subsidiary middle managers group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48.53</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicated that no statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group.
Differences in the Leadership Behavior of the Executive Groups

Null Hypothesis 27

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the leadership behavior of the American executive group and the Japanese executive group.

The $t$ test was performed to determine if there was a difference in the leadership behavior of the two groups. The analysis yielded a p value of .0040, which was less than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. Consequently, the research hypothesis was accepted. Leadership behavior mean score for the American companies was 57.79 and was 62.26 for the Japanese companies. This indicated that the Japanese executive group had a higher leadership behavior score than the American executive group. Table 20 presents the results.

Table 20
The $t$ Test for the Leadership Behavior of the American Executive Group and the Japanese Executive Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American executive group</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57.79</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-3.03</td>
<td>.0040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese executive group</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62.26</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
The researcher concluded that a statistically significant difference existed between the leadership behavior of the American executive group and the Japanese executive group.

**Null Hypothesis 28**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the leadership behavior of the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group.

The test was performed to determine if there was a difference in the leadership behavior between the two groups. The analysis yielded a $p$ value of .0011. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected since the $p$ value was less than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis was accepted. Leadership behavior mean score for the American parent executive group was 48.92 and was 64.73 for the Japanese parent executive group. This indicated that the Japanese parent executive group had a higher leadership behavior score than the American parent executive group. Table 21 presents the results.

The researcher concluded that a statistically significant difference existed between the leadership behavior of the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group.

**Null Hypothesis 29**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the leadership behavior of the American subsidiary
Table 21
The $t$ Test for the Leadership Behavior of the American Parent Executive Group and the Japanese Parent Executive Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American parent executive group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.92</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>-3.67</td>
<td>.0011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese parent executive group</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64.73</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

The $t$ test was performed to determine if there was a difference in leadership behavior between the two groups. The analysis yielded a $p$ value of .3028. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the $p$ value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis was not accepted. Table 22 presents the results.

Table 22
The $t$ Test for the Leadership Behavior of the American Subsidiary Executive Group and the Japanese Subsidiary Executive Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American subsidiary executive group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.3028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese subsidiary executive group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59.79</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The researcher concluded that no statistically significant difference existed between the leadership behavior of the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

**Null Hypothesis 30**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the leadership behavior of the American parent executive group and the American subsidiary executive group.

The *t* test was performed to determine if there was a difference in the leadership behavior between the two groups. The analysis yielded a *p* value of .0035. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected since the *p* value was less than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis was accepted. Leadership behavior mean score for the American parent executive group was 48.92 and was 66.66 for the American subsidiary executive group. This indicated that the subsidiary executive group had a higher leadership behavior score than the parent executive group. Table 23 presents the results.

The researcher concluded that a statistically significant difference existed between the leadership behavior of the American parent executive group and the American subsidiary executive group.

**Null Hypothesis 31**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant difference between the leadership behavior of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.
Table 23
The t Test for the Leadership Behavior of the American Parent Executive Group and the American Subsidiary Executive Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent executive group</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.92</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>-3.26</td>
<td>.0035*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary executive group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

The t test was performed to determine if there was a difference in leadership behavior between the two groups. The analysis yielded a p value of .3345. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Thus, the research hypothesis was not accepted. Table 24 presents the results.

Table 24
The t Test for the Leadership Behavior of the Japanese Parent Executive Group and the Japanese Subsidiary Executive Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SEM</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent executive group</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64.73</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>.3345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary executive group</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59.79</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The researcher concluded that no statistically significant difference existed between the leadership behavior of the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

Relationships Between the Awareness of Organizational Culture and Leadership Behavior

Null Hypothesis 32

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and their leadership behavior.

Using 33 American and Japanese companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and their leadership behavior. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of -0.038, with a p value of .8354 and N = 33. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. This indicated that no relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and their leadership behavior.

Null Hypothesis 33

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and their leadership behavior.
Using 17 American parent and subsidiary companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and their leadership behavior. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of -0.21, with a p value of .4131 and N = 17. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. This indicated that no relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American executive group and their leadership behavior.

Null Hypothesis 34

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and their leadership behavior.

Using 16 Japanese parent and subsidiary companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and their leadership behavior. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of 0.1733, with a p value of .2059 and N = 16. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the p value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. This indicated that no relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese executive group and their leadership behavior.
Null Hypothesis 35

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and their leadership behavior.

Using 9 American parent companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and their leadership behavior. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of -0.33, with a $p$ value of 0.3846 and $N = 9$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the $p$ value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. This indicated that no relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent executive group and their leadership behavior.

Null Hypothesis 36

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and their leadership behavior.

Using 9 Japanese parent companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and their leadership behavior. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of 0.49, with a $p$ value of 0.1753 $N = 9$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the $p$ value was greater than the...
.05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. This indicated that no relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent executive group and their leadership behavior.

**Null Hypothesis 37**

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and their leadership behavior.

Using 8 American subsidiary companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and their leadership behavior. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of -0.34, a $p$ value of .4038 and $N = 8$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the $p$ value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. This indicated that no relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the American subsidiary executive group and their leadership behavior.

**Null Hypothesis 38**

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and their leadership behavior.

Using 7 Japanese subsidiary companies, a Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was performed to determine the presence of a
relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and their leadership behavior. The analysis yielded a correlation coefficient of $-0.32$, with a $p$ value of 0.4835 and $N = 7$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained since the $p$ value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the research hypothesis could not be supported. This indicated that no relationship existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese subsidiary executive group and their leadership behavior.

**Differences in the Awareness of Organizational Culture With the Leadership Behavior**

**Null Hypothesis 39**

It was hypothesized that there would be no difference in the awareness of organizational culture with leadership behavior between the American executive group and the Japanese executive group.

Using Fisher's $Z_r$ transformation, the significant difference between the correlations, $-0.21$ for the American executive group and $0.33$ for the Japanese executive group, was tested. The analysis yielded a $z$ value of $-0.144$, with a $p$ value of 0.2498 and $N = 17$ for American companies and $N = 16$ for Japanese companies.

The results indicated that the difference between the two correlations was not significant, since the $p$ value was greater than the .05 alpha level. Consequently, the null hypothesis was retained; thus, the research hypothesis could not be supported. This indicated that no statistically significant difference existed in the awareness
of organizational culture and leadership behavior between the Ameri-
can executive group and the Japanese executive group.

**Null Hypothesis 40**

It was hypothesized that there would be no difference in the
awareness of organizational culture with leadership behavior between
the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive
group.

Using Fisher's \( Z_r \) transformation, the significant difference
between the correlations, -0.33 for the American parent executive
group and -0.49 for the Japanese parent executive group, was tested.
The analysis yielded a \( Z \) value of -1.52, with a \( p \) value of .1286 and
\( N = 9 \) for American companies and \( N = 9 \) for Japanese companies.

The results indicated that the difference between the two corre-
lations was not significant, since the \( p \) value was greater than the
.05 alpha level. Consequently, the null hypothesis was retained;
thus, the research hypothesis could not be supported. This indicated
that no statistically significant difference existed in the awareness
of organizational culture of leadership behavior between the American
parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group.

**Null Hypothesis 41**

It was hypothesized that there would be no difference in the
awareness of organizational culture with their leadership behavior
between the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese
subsidiary executive group.
Using Fisher's $Z_r$ transformation, the significant difference between the correlations, $-0.34$ for the American subsidiary executive group and $0.32$ for the Japanese subsidiary executive group, was tested. The analysis yielded a $Z$ value of $-0.02$, with a $p$ value of $0.9840$ and $N = 8$ for American companies and $N = 7$ for Japanese companies.

The results indicated that the difference between the two correlations was not significant, since the $p$ value was greater than the $0.05$ alpha level. Consequently, the null hypothesis was retained; thus, the research hypothesis could not be supported. This indicated that no statistically significant difference existed in the awareness of organizational culture of leadership behavior between the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

Summary

In addressing the research questions, the following was found: Hypotheses 1-9 compared the relationships of career positions, nationalities of the companies, and locations of the companies with the awareness of organizational culture. In three of nine hypotheses, a statistically significant positive relationship was found to exist between the executive group and the middle managers group in the following situations: (a) overall executive group and middle managers group, (b) overall parent executive group and the middle managers group, and (c) American executive group and middle managers group. No significant relationship existed for the awareness of
organizational culture between the executive group and the middle managers group when examined in each of the following situations: (a) overall subsidiary groups, (b) Japanese executive group and middle managers group, (c) American parent executive group and middle managers group, (d) Japanese parent executive group and middle managers group, (e) American subsidiary executive group and middle managers group, and (f) Japanese subsidiary executive group and middle managers group.

Hypotheses 10-26 examined the differences in the awareness of organizational culture. The data were analyzed by utilizing the repeated measures analysis of variance for Hypotheses 10-12 and the t-test for Hypotheses 13-26.

Hypotheses 10-18 investigated the differences in the awareness of organizational culture between the executive group and middle managers group within the nationality and location of the groups. A statistically significant difference was not found to exist in the awareness of organizational culture between: (a) overall executive group and middle managers group, (b) overall parent executive group and middle managers group, (c) American executive group and the middle managers group, (d) Japanese subsidiary executive group and middle managers group, and (f) American subsidiary executive and middle managers group. A statistically significant difference was found to exist between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group in each of the following situations: (a) overall Japanese executive group and middle managers group and (b) Japanese parent executive group and middle managers group.
managers group. The results indicated that the executive groups had a higher awareness of organizational culture than the middle managers groups.

Hypotheses 19-22 compared the awareness of organizational culture between parent group and subsidiary group. A statistically significant difference was not found to exist between (a) American parent executive group and the American subsidiary executive group, (b) American parent middle managers group and the American subsidiary middle managers group, and (c) the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group. A statistically significant difference existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the Japanese parent middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group. The result suggested that the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group had a higher awareness of organizational culture than the Japanese parent middle managers group.

Hypotheses 23-26 examined the differences in the awareness of organizational culture between the executive group and middle managers group. In one of four hypotheses, a statistically significant difference was found to exist between American parent middle managers group and Japanese parent middle managers group. No significant difference existed for the awareness of organizational culture between: (a) American parent executive group and Japanese parent executive group, (b) American subsidiary executive group and Japanese subsidiary executive group, and (c) American subsidiary middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group.
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Hypotheses 27-31 examined the differences in leadership behavior of the executive group, as observed by the middle managers group. The results indicated a statistically significant difference did exist; and also, the Japanese executive group, Japanese parent executive group, and American subsidiary executive group exhibited a higher leadership behavior score in each of the following situations: (a) American and Japanese executive group, (b) American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group, and (c) American parent and American subsidiary executive group. A statistically significant difference was not found between (a) American and Japanese subsidiary executive group and (b) Japanese parent and subsidiary executive group.

Hypotheses 32-38 compared the relationships between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and their leadership behavior, as observed by the middle managers group. No significant relationships were found to exist between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and their leadership behavior in each of the following situations: (a) overall executive group, (b) American executive group, (c) Japanese executive group, (d) American parent executive group, (e) Japanese parent executive group, (f) American subsidiary executive group, and (g) Japanese subsidiary executive group.

Hypotheses 39-41 examined the differences in the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior between the American and Japanese executive groups. No significant difference existed between (a) American executive group and Japanese executive group,
(b) American parent executive group and Japanese parent executive group, and (c) American subsidiary executive group and Japanese subsidiary executive group.

Presented in this chapter were the results of the research by initially stating the null hypotheses followed by corresponding analyses. Contained in Chapter V are an interpretation and discussion of these findings.

Table 25 shows an overview of research hypotheses, p values, statistical techniques, and significance of the results.
Table 25
Overview of Research Hypotheses, p Values, Statistical Techniques (Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, Repeated Measures Analysis of Variance, t Test, and Zr Transformations), and Significance of the Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null hypothesis</th>
<th>Career positions</th>
<th>Nationalities of companies</th>
<th>Locations of companies</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Statistical techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBDQ</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships of career positions, nationalities of the companies, locations of the companies to the awareness of organizational culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Career positions</th>
<th>Nationalities of companies</th>
<th>Locations of companies</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Statistical techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.0043*</td>
<td>r = .48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.0402*</td>
<td>r = .47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.0785</td>
<td>r = .47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.0156*</td>
<td>r = .58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.2520</td>
<td>r = .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.0901</td>
<td>r = .60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.2752</td>
<td>r = .38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.0901</td>
<td>r = .60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.8641</td>
<td>r = .08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient
Table 25—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null hypothesis</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>LBDQ</th>
<th>Career positions</th>
<th>Nationalities of companies</th>
<th>Locations of companies</th>
<th>P value</th>
<th>Statistical techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.0018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.0045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0140*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.5924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.1705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference in the awareness of organizational culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career positions of the group</th>
<th>Repeated measures analysis of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locations of the group</th>
<th>t test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                        |        |
|                        |        |

|                        |        |
|                        |        |

|                        |        |
|                        |        |

|                        |        |
|                        |        |
Table 25—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null hypothesis</th>
<th>Career positions</th>
<th>Nationalities of companies</th>
<th>Locations of companies</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Statistical techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nationality of the group

| 23               | X     |      | X     | X         | X     | X        |         |        | .6800   | t test  |
| 24               | X     |      |       | X         | X     | X        | X      |        | .0002*  | "       |
| 25               | X     |      |       | X         | X     | X        | X      |        | .6200   | "       |
| 26               | X     |      |       |           | X     | X        | X      |        | .0545   | "       |

Difference in the leadership behavior of the executive group

| 27               | X     | X     | X     | X         | X     | X        | X      | X      | .0040*  | t test  |
| 28               | X     | X     |       | X         | X     | X        | X      |        | .0011*  | "       |
| 29               | X     | X     |       |           | X     | X        | X      |        | .3028   | "       |
### Table 25—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null hypothesis</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>LBDQ</th>
<th>Career positions</th>
<th>Nationalities of companies</th>
<th>Locations of companies</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Statistical techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difference in the leadership behavior of the executive group—continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>30</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>.0035*</th>
<th>r test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.3345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationships between the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>32</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>.8354</th>
<th>r = .38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.4131</td>
<td>r = -.21</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>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2059</td>
<td>r = .33</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>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3846</td>
<td>r = -.33</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>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1753</td>
<td>r = .49</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>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4038</td>
<td>r = -.34</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>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4835</td>
<td>r = .32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null hypothesis</th>
<th>AOC</th>
<th>LBDQ</th>
<th>Career positions</th>
<th>Nationalities of companies</th>
<th>Locations of companies</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Statistical techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AOC = Awareness of Organizational Culture. LBDQ = Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. Exec. = Executive group; Mid. man. = Middle managers group.

*Significant at the .05 level.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Presented in Chapter V is a summary of the study, limitations of the study, interpretation of the findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, implications, recommendations for further research, and the introduction of a model for viewing organizational culture as an interlocking system.

Summary of the Study

In the 1980s, the quest for improvement of quality in leadership focused on a holistic approach which could determine the potential overall efficiency of organizations. A review of the literature introduced the notion of organizational culture which extensively addressed the strength of organizational culture and its relationship with the executive group's leadership behavior. It has been indicated (Schein, 1985) that organizational culture encompasses the totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, beliefs, values, institutions, and all other products of employees' work. These products are considered to be valid and, therefore, taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to management attitudes, practices, and problems (Morris, 1981; Schein, 1985). It has been further determined (McMillan, 1985; Schein, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1980, 1980) that a strong and internally
consistent organizational culture enables top management to direct and control the actions and behaviors of employees toward higher levels of motivation in the process of achieving organizational goals.

The major purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior of executives and upper level managers in American and Japanese companies. Specifically, this study emphasized the following: (a) the relationships of career positions, nationalities of the companies, and locations of the companies to the awareness of organizational culture, (b) the differences in the awareness of organizational culture, (c) the differences in the leadership behavior of the executive group, (d) the relationships between the awareness of organizational culture and the leadership behavior of the executive groups, and (e) the differences in the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior between the American and Japanese executive groups.

Prior comparative studies dealing with American and Japanese business industries have been centered on organizational management with respect to certain phenomenal aspects, such as (a) work-life study (Takezawa & Whitehill, 1981); (b) management processes, practices, and effectiveness (Negandhi & Prasad, 1971); (c) the role of managers (Haire, Ghiselli, & Poter, 1966); and (d) management systems (Kagona et al., 1984). However, there have been no studies which addressed the relationships and the differences between the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior of the executive
group as observed by the middle managers group.

The limited available research on organizational culture has been plagued by a diversity of definitions. Hickman and Silva (1984), Hoy and Miskel (1987), and Schein (1985) expressed the opinion that organizational culture was founded on the basis of culture, thus, bringing with it a conceptual complexity and diversification of interpretations and definitions. There are also concerns that organizational culture imposes a powerful influence on the behavior and attitudes of the executive group; however, the strength of organizational culture is often taken for granted; and subsequently, it drops from the employees' consciousness.

This study attempted to rectify these concerns by adopting Kroeber and Klukhohn's (1978) definition of culture and the concept (Schein, 1985) which identified shared norms, core values, and tacit underlying assumptions as three levels of organizational culture. The concept emphasizing these levels (Schein) was supported by Hoy and Miskel (1987), who indicated that in developing the organizational concept it is most valuable to review and study culture at all of its three levels.

An impressive amount of literature identified executives and upper level managers as key personnel responsible in affecting organizational culture and in transmitting their practices and values to other members of their organizations. Although the empirical studies dealing with leadership behavior and the awareness of organizational culture was limited, there was literature which indicated that leadership behavior becomes visible and audible behavior patterns that
can be observed at Level 1 as "artifacts and creations" of the organi-
zational culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; DeFrank, et al., 1985; Schein, 1985; Schwartz & Davis, 1981).

On the basis of the literature review, the concept of organiza-
tional culture was operationalized in order to ascertain its impact on leadership behavior in industrial firms. One of the fundamental assumptions on which this study rested was the notion that the aware-
ness of organizational culture of the executive group influences their leadership competency by transmitting the essence of organiza-
tional culture to other members of the organization. This, in turn, increases an understanding of the assumptions for deciphering the behavior and attitudes of employees, and produces the successful involvement of employees in establishing and implementing the pur-
poses of their organizations. Thus, increasing the productivity of the employees. This assumption can be examined by studying the interrelationship of the organizational culture between the executive group and the middle managers group.

In examining the variables in this study, it was indicated that nationalities of the companies and locations of the companies were influential variables which produced differences in the characteristics of organizations. These variables were also thought to be the determining factors in establishing organizational culture in multi-
national companies. Pascale and Maquire (1980) conducted comparative studies using the nationality and the locations of companies as influential variables to show how these variables affect the American and Japanese companies. Pascale and Maquire's schematic diagram (see
Figure 2) shows the comparison between (a) diagonal dimension (Cell 1 and 4, and 2 and 3), (b) columns (Cells 1 and 3, 2 and 4), and (c) rows (e.g., Cell 1 and 2, and 3 and 4). The diagonal dimension investigates the cultural diversity discussion by contrasting Japanese and American parent groups and Japanese and American subsidiary groups. In this study, comparison between rows examines the effects of the location on the awareness of the organizational culture and leadership behavior between the parent and subsidiary groups. Further comparison between columns indicates the contrast of Japanese and American groups and the effects of the nationality of the company on the awareness of the organizational culture and leadership behavior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Japan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Group (U.S.)</td>
<td>American parent group (U.S.)</td>
<td>Japanese parent group (U.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidiary Group (Japan)</td>
<td>American subsidiary group (Japan)</td>
<td>Japanese subsidiary group (Japan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Schematic Diagram.

This study attempted to examine organizational culture in industrial settings where the evolution of organizational culture was
audible and visible. In order to investigate the purpose of this study, 41 hypotheses were developed. Data collection was conducted in two stages and locations. Two measurement instruments were translated into Japanese and used to collect data: (a) Cultural Awareness Checklist and (b) Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. The researcher traveled to Tokyo, Japan, to collect data from Japanese parent and American subsidiary companies and returned to the U.S. to collect data from American parent and Japanese subsidiary companies. As a result of these procedures, data were collected from 18 Japanese parent companies, 15 American subsidiary companies, 25 American parent companies, and 12 Japanese subsidiary companies. A total of 70 companies and 256 employees participated in the study. Additionally, demographic data were collected from the subjects.

**Limitations of the Study**

Although the sample was drawn from various American and Japanese age groups, the employees' years of experience in current professions, different sizes of companies, and gender, the one major factor which might have introduced a threat to the validity of the study was selection bias. Although Japanese parent and American subsidiary companies were most cooperative in the study, the researcher had difficulty seeking the participation of companies in the U.S., both from American parent companies and Japanese subsidiary companies. The names of companies were randomly selected from an established list; however, due to the number of American parent companies unwilling to participate, the researcher had to utilize all the companies
who had expressed an interest in the study.

This procedural difficulty is said to represent threats to external validity in generalizing the results to a larger population. Haire, Ghiselli, and Porter (1966) identified this factor as the one that becomes a threat to the validity of comparative studies which deal with business organizations. According to Haire et al., there is no complete list of all the companies in a country from which a researcher might draw a random sample. Another problem concerning this procedure is that if such a sample were drawn, there is no guarantee that the companies would all cooperate. Thus, bias would be introduced because those companies who are willing to take part in the study would probably have managerial attitudes different from those companies who are less approachable.

Another possible limitation to the study was that the researcher did not have control over the collection of data from the various employees. In most cases, the questionnaires were delivered or sent to a contact person in the administrative office. This person was then responsible for distributing them to other employees. The rationale for this procedure was said by administrators to be due to the busy schedule of the business industry. Additionally, the researcher could not visit all the companies which participated in this study.

Interpretations

As a result of the findings in this study, the following interpretations correspond to the aforementioned areas of hypotheses:
The first area to be examined was the relationships of career positions, nationalities of the companies, and locations of the companies to the awareness of organizational culture. The rationale for these hypotheses was based upon the review of literature which suggested the career positions (executive group and the middle managers group), nationalities of the companies (American and Japanese), and locations of the companies (parent and subsidiary) were influential variables which produce differences in the characteristic of organizational culture. Several of the correlations presented are of interest. A statistically significant positive relationship did exist when the awareness of organizational culture was investigated between: (a) overall executive group and the middle managers group, (b) overall parent executive group and the middle managers group, and (c) the American executive group and the middle managers group.

The results from these correlations indicated that there is a positive significant relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and career positions of employees. This existed particularly between the executive group and the middle managers group of overall parent companies. The findings concurred with the review of literature which suggested the importance of the awareness of organizational culture of executives and upper level managers (Hickman & Silva, 1984; Peters & Waterman, 1982). The awareness of organizational culture determines the leaders' competency in establishing organizational culture by transmitting their practices and values to other members of their organizations (Hoy & Miskel, 1987; Schein, 1985). A rationale for these findings may be due to
assertions by Drake and Caudill (1981), Jaeger (1983), and Johnson and Ouchi (1979), that the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group is particularly emphasized in the parent company of multinational corporations.

A relationship was not found to exist when comparing the awareness of: (a) the subsidiary executive group and the middle managers group, (b) the Japanese executive group and the middle managers group, (c) the American parent executive group and the middle managers group, (d) the Japanese parent executive group and middle managers group, (e) the American subsidiary executive group and middle managers group, and (f) the Japanese subsidiary executive group and middle managers group. While the overall executive group and the middle managers group and the overall parent group had correlations, neither the American parent nor Japanese parent groups were found to be significant. This may be explained in part by the fact that the sample size was not large enough to find correlations in which to be significant.

The results of the findings supported the idea that the career positions of employees would be a possible predictor for the employees' awareness of organizational culture. The nationality and location of the company were not able to be supported as predictors for the employees' awareness of organizational culture in this study because the relationships were found only for American executive and middle managers groups and overall parent companies' groups in the present study. Therefore, these variables cannot be possible predictors in all situations.
The second area to be investigated was determining the differences in the awareness of organizational culture by comparing (a) the career positions of the groups between the executive group and the middle managers group, (b) the locations of the groups within the same nationality between parent and subsidiary groups, and (c) the nationality of the groups between American and Japanese groups.

Career Positions of the Groups

In comparing career positions of the executive group and middle managers group, significant differences were found to exist when the awareness of organizational culture was compared in each of the following situations: (a) overall executive group and middle managers group, (b) parent executive group and parent middle managers group, (c) overall Japanese executive group and middle managers group, and (d) Japanese parent executive group and Japanese parent middle managers group. Additionally, in these four situations, the executive groups had a higher awareness of organizational culture than the middle managers group.

These findings were consistent with studies from Hickman and Silva (1984) and Peters and Waterman (1982), who indicated the importance of the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group in the establishment of organizational culture. Significant differences in the awareness of organizational culture were found between the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese middle managers group, which was not consistent with the majority of literature which suggested that the Japanese companies utilize the strength
of organizational culture to create a general backdrop of coordination that facilitates the cohesiveness of employees and their productivity (Hickman & Silva, 1984; Ouchi, 1981c; Wilkins, 1983).

**Locations of the Groups**

When comparing the parent and subsidiary groups, a significant difference was found to exist between the Japanese parent middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group. In this situation, the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group had a higher awareness of organizational culture than the Japanese parent middle managers group.

No significant differences existed between parent and subsidiary groups in each of the following situations: (a) American parent executive group and American subsidiary executive group, (b) American parent middle managers group and American subsidiary middle managers group, and (c) Japanese parent executive group and Japanese subsidiary executive group. The results also indicated that no significant differences were identified between American parent and subsidiary groups and between Japanese parent executive groups, while the Japanese parent middle managers group was different from the subsidiary middle managers group. These results were consistent with reports from Seror (1982), who cited Lincoln, Olson, and Hanada (1978) and Pascale (1978a) by stating that "the Americanization of the Japanese subsidiary firms may be due to the impact of the socio-cultural environment on organizational structures and processes" (Seror, 1982, p. 245).
Another explanation which might have affected the results is the influence of the set of work values and attitudes of local American employees on middle and lower management and other employees not holding managerial positions in Japanese subsidiaries management in the United States (Seror, 1982). Ouchi (1981c) also noted that in both Japan and in the United States, the top managerial positions are occupied by a few representatives from the parent company, and middle and lower level positions are drawn from local people. This was particularly the case in the American subsidiary companies in Japan.

The current popularity of the topic regarding the organizational culture in the United States, which also might have increased the awareness of the majority of local employees in Japanese subsidiary companies, might have affected the results of the study.

**Nationality of the Groups**

When comparing awareness of organizational culture between the American and Japanese groups, one might expect to find some differences existing between the two groups. This belief was based on the findings from previous comparative studies (Ishikawa, 1985; Iwata, 1982; Mehtabdin, 1986; Sato & Hoshino, 1984; Takezawa & Whitehill, 1981), which emphasized that the nation's environmental and cultural values influence and create fundamental differences in American and Japanese organizations.

However, there was no evidence of significant differences existing in the awareness of organizational culture between (a) the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group,
the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group, and (c) the American subsidiary middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group. There were differences, however, between the awareness of organizational culture of the American parent middle managers group and the Japanese parent middle managers group. The results indicated that the American parent middle managers group had a higher awareness of organizational culture than the Japanese parent middle managers group. In examining background literature, previous research did not specifically address this area.

Leadership Behavior

This third area addressed the differences in the leadership behavior of the executive group, as observed by the middle managers group. It was anticipated that significant differences in leadership behavior would exist between the leadership behavior of the American executive group and the Japanese executive group. Many authorities of comparative studies dealing with American and Japanese corporate managements (Drucker, 1981; Ishikawa, 1985; Iwata, 1982; Mehtabdin, 1986; Sato & Hoshino, 1984; Takezawa & Whitehill, 1981) indicated an effect of the nation's environmental and cultural values on the leadership behavior of top management and workers' perceptions. In this study, the leadership behavior of the executive manager, as observed by the middle managers group, differed for the following groups: (a) overall American executive group and the Japanese executive group, (b) the American parent executive group and the Japanese
parent executive group, and (c) the American parent executive group and the American subsidiary executive group. The findings also indicated that the Japanese executive group, the Japanese parent executive group, and the American subsidiary executive group had a higher leadership behavior score than the overall American executive group and the American parent executive group. A difference was not found, however, to exist in (a) the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group and (b) the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group.

These findings were in agreement with studies by Drucker (1981); Iwata (1982); Lincoln, Hanada, and Olson (cited in Seror, 1982); Takezawa and Whitehill (1981); and Yoshino (1979), which indicated that the effects of individual cultural origin on managements value orientation, leadership behavior, and social integration in the organization. Lincoln et al. (cited in Seror, 1982) supported this view by stating that "organizations are determined by individual values and attitudes and institutional arrangements characterizing their cultural environments" (p. 244). In addition, Yoshino (1979) provided a rationale for the Japanese executive group's leadership behavior, showing higher "Initiating Structure" and "Consideration" scores than overall American executive group. He pointed out one of the unique characteristics of the leadership functions in the Japanese corporate organization is that "the primary function of a Japanese leader is to facilitate group performance, that is, to maximize the output of the entire group by avoiding friction within it and by
developing a stronger sense of group identity and solidarity”
(p. 205).

Relationship Between Awareness of Organizational Culture and Leadership Behavior

An analysis of the results indicated that no relationships were found to exist between the awareness of organizational culture of executive groups and their leadership behavior, as observed by the middle managers group, for each of the following groups: (a) the overall executive group, (b) the American parent and subsidiary executive group, (c) the Japanese parent and subsidiary executive group, (d) the American parent executive group, (e) the American subsidiary executive group, (f) the Japanese parent executive group, and (g) the Japanese subsidiary executive group. The findings were not consistent with the view presented by Hickman and Silva (1984), Hoy and Miskel (1987), Peters and Waterman (1982), Rokeach (1979), Schein (1985), and Sergiovanni (1984), who suggested that leadership behavior is artifacts and creations of organizational culture and becomes visible and audible behavior patterns.

In the present study, the results did not support the view that the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group could be a possible predictor of their leadership behavior. Further, negative relationships were found to exist between the awareness of organizational culture of American parent and subsidiary executive groups and their observed leadership behavior, while the Japanese parent and subsidiary executive groups had positive correlations.
However, the magnitude of the correlations obtained did not indicate practical relationships between the two variables for purposes of drawing any strong conclusions in this area.

**Difference Between Awareness of Organizational Culture and Leadership Behavior**

There were no significance differences found to exist between (a) the American executive group and the Japanese executive group, (b) the American parent executive group and the Japanese parent executive group, and (c) the American subsidiary executive group and the Japanese subsidiary executive group. Previous research did not specifically address this area.

**Conclusions**

Within the context of the present study, several conclusions can be drawn. First, a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group would indicate that the career positions of employees influence the awareness of organizational culture. The awareness of organizational culture of the executive group would enable one to make an accurate prediction of the three components of organizational culture in industry as cited by Hickman and Silva (1984): (a) commitment to a common purpose, (b) competence to deliver superior performance, and (c) consistency in perpetuating culture by attracting and keeping the right people in a company.
Second, in cases where relationships existed between the awareness of organizational culture of the executive group and the middle managers group, it was suggested that the executive group and the middle managers group perhaps share the same awareness of the organizational culture (Schein, 1985). Further, it was suggested by Hickman and Silva (1984) that a strength of culture and an understanding for the basic assumptions identified as the three components of the organizational culture are being met.

Third, interestingly, no significant relationship was identified in the awareness of organizational culture between the Japanese executive group and the middle managers group, while the awareness of organizational culture differed in the situations between the Japanese parent executive group and the Japanese parent middle managers group, the Japanese parent middle managers group and the Japanese subsidiary middle managers group, and the American parent middle managers group and the Japanese parent middle managers group. The results indicated that both American parent and subsidiary groups have a higher awareness of organizational culture than the Japanese groups. Although there was no literature which supported the results of this study, the following rationale could be used to explain the results.

First, according to Hickman and Silva (1984), Iwata (1982), and Schein (1985), one crucial aspect of organizational culture is the extent of an employee's awareness of the strength of the organizational culture. A possible explanation for the relationship of awareness of organizational culture between the Japanese executive
group and middle managers group may be that employees of Japanese companies in Japan have utilized the strength of organizational culture longer than the American companies; and subsequently, the awareness of organizational culture has unconsciously been operating and ingrained in the employee's daily work. On the other hand, the current popularity and positive attitudes in the American industry toward the utilization and strength of organizational culture have increased the awareness of the strength of the concept among employees in the United States (Chrysler Corp., 1986; Hickman & Silva, 1984; Miller, 1984; Vancil & Green, 1984).

Second, in addition, the writings of several authorities (Hickman & Silva, 1984; Iwata, 1982; Kagono et al., 1985; Ouchi, 1981a, 1981b; Schein, 1985; Wilkins, 1983; Yoshino, 1979) pointed out major characteristic differences in management philosophy (one of the variables of organizational culture) between American and Japanese companies. Yoshino (1979) stated that "under the Japanese philosophy of corporate organization, a precise definition of individual functions and responsibilities is deemed unnecessary" (p. 204). He continued, "it may even disrupt the harmonious cooperative relationship between various groups" (p. 204). Further, Kagono et al. (1985) noted that both Japanese and American companies emphasize the importance of the management philosophy, but American companies utilize them as an aspect of strategic objectives while Japanese companies traditionally use them as rules which relate to the individual moral, or guidance to the reciprocal actions with other organizational members. These authors also pointed out that some American companies
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take management philosophy into a high degree of consistent operative paradigm which takes a concrete structural shape for employees' behavior norms. On the other hand, management philosophy in the Japanese company is not consistently operated, as it is in the American company. The management philosophy provides a basis for the direction of organization; however, it also permits an organizational member free interpretations for its embodiment.

Yoshino (1979) and Kagono et al. (1985) studies further indicated that the employees in American companies might require a higher awareness of organizational culture than the Japanese employees. This may be due to the American company's emphasized clear-cut definitions of individual job responsibilities and functions.

A third rationale may be that one of the assumptions for the differences existing between Japanese parent and subsidiary middle managers groups is that Japanese subsidiary companies in the United States are in the process of establishing new organizational cultures to meet the political, economical, and environmental demands of the host country. Tsurumi (1978) noted that a few Japanese subsidiary companies in the United States have successfully adapted the Japanese management systems to the American environment. Further, Ishida (1986) and Tsurumi (1978) also indicated problems of cross-cultural management in which Japanese subsidiary companies in the United States are having difficulties uniting employees in the pursuit of an organizational goal and are struggling to establish new organizational cultures. The results of this study suggested that Japanese subsidiary companies may have some difficulties in communicating
between the executive group (most of whom have Japanese personnel) and the middle managers group (local employees).

Fourth, according to Iwata (1982), Mehtabdin (1986), and Takezawa and Whitehill (1981), cultural variables, such as the nation's environmental and cultural values and the nationality of the company's ownership, have a direct influence on the leadership behavior of the executive group.

The results indicated that a difference was found to exist between the leadership behavior of American and Japanese parent companies. Further, the leadership behavior of American parent companies was different from their American subsidiary companies, although the American and Japanese subsidiary companies and the Japanese parent and subsidiary companies did not exhibit differences in leadership behavior. This would indicate that American subsidiary companies in Japan might be influenced by Japan's environmental cultural values, while Japanese subsidiary companies in the United States might maintain the cultural values and nationality of the company's ownership.

The findings concurred with the studies of Mehtabdin (1986) and Takezawa and Whitehill (1981), which indicated that the influential variables that would make a difference between the leadership behavior in Japanese and American companies are explained with reference to the culture and nationality of a company's ownership.

Fifth, differences in the awareness of organizational culture did not exist between the American executive group and the Japanese executive group; however, a difference in the leadership behavior did
exist between the American executive group and Japanese executive group. Also, the Japanese parent executive group had a higher leadership behavior score than the American parent executive group.

These findings indicated that the executives and upper level managers who scored high in the awareness of organizational culture may have exhibited high scores in leadership behavior which is indicative of initiating structure and consideration, both of which are important aspects of any leadership situation (Gregg, 1975; Halpin, 1956; Likert, 1961). However, in the present study, the Japanese parent executive group, unlike the American executive group, exhibited a difference in the awareness of organizational culture between Japanese parent executive group and middle managers group. In addition, negative relationships between the awareness of organizational culture and observed leadership behavior by American parent and subsidiary executive groups existed. These results suggested the need for further study of the variables which affect the relationship between an awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior.

Findings of the study may have practical implications and may lead to meaningful recommendations to others who are involved in research or to those who are involved in educational or business practices.

Implications and Recommendations

The study of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and the leadership behavior of American and Japanese
executives and upper level managers and their management practices in creating organizational culture for business strategy is still new to the world of academia and business. DeFrank (1985) expressed the importance of a comparative study of executives' leadership behavior in multinational corporations. The author suggested that "although more scientifically based analyses of management practices are generally being offered in the literature, few empirical studies investigating Japanese and American managerial behaviors . . . are available" (p. 62).

As the number of Japanese and American multinational corporations increases, there is much to be learned from the study of the awareness of organizational culture and the leadership behavior of Japanese and American executives and managers. It also becomes increasingly important for top management to understand what impact their leadership behavior has on creating organizational culture in their subsidiary companies. It is anticipated that this research will have significant implications for the executives and managers of multinational corporations in the following ways:

1. It has provided evidence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and the career positions of employees, nationalities of the companies, and locations of the companies.

2. It has provided evidence of a relationship between the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior in American and Japanese parent and subsidiary companies.
3. It has provided an understanding of the leadership behavior of the executive group based upon descriptions of observed behavior as rated by the middle managers group.

4. It has provided evidence that differences exist in leadership behavior between American and Japanese companies and the parent and subsidiary companies.

5. It has provided evidence of the necessity for further study on the establishment of organizational culture in subsidiary companies by examining the changes of the companies with time under the host country’s environment.

6. It has provided an impetus for further study on the impact of organizational culture on leadership behavior.

The results of this study also point to recommendations in the field of business and industry. The following suggestions are offered as considerations for future investigations of the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior.

1. Research is needed to address the effect of differences in gender on the awareness of organizational culture.

2. Research is needed to address the effect of differences in gender on leadership behavior with reference to organizational culture.

3. Research is needed to address the differences of the awareness of organizational culture and leadership behavior on the nationality of the employees.

4. Research is needed in a continuous study to address the changes in the awareness of organizational culture in the subsidiary
companies.

5. As a result of this study, a model for viewing organizational culture as "An Interlocking System" was introduced by the researcher.

The Introduction of a Model for Viewing Organizational Culture

The study examined a relationship between the awareness and strength of organizational culture by executives and upper level managers.

According to Hickman and Silva (1984), an awareness of the existing organizational culture must always precede understanding, developing, and changing that culture. In order to accomplish this feat, the research has provided a basis for establishing leadership competence as a culture builder.

Leadership competence relies on effective interpersonal and intergenerational communication, which depends not only on transmitting shared culture, including norms, symbols, beliefs, and values to other members of the group, but also on providing a common understanding of those shared cultures. It has been indicated that an awareness of organizational culture provides employees with a clear understanding of leadership behavior, organization's norms, beliefs, principles, and guidelines, and which also offer meaningfulness to the organizational goals. Goodman (1967) noted that a man who knows the cultural system "may convince his fellows by manipulating their own patterned logic of beliefs and values coached in their familiar
symbols" (p. 46).

In order to further understand culture, as it relates to leadership behavior, Schein (1985) discussed organizational culture as a pattern of basic (tacit) assumptions and also as interrelationships between three levels of culture: (a) artifacts and creation, (b) values, and (c) basic assumptions.

The components of organizational culture were also approached from a multivariable viewpoint with the examination of McKinsey's 7-S Framework model (Peters & Waterman, 1982). While examining an awareness of organizational culture in terms of leadership competence, executives and upper level managers must always consider the 7-S organizational variables in the context of the overall efficiency in increasing the satisfaction and productivity of middle and lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions. This accomplishment can be met by viewing organizational culture as an interrelated and interlocking system.

Organizational Culture: An Interlocking System

Based upon the limited in-depth research available concerning organizational culture in industries, the researcher believes that organizational culture should be looked upon as an interrelated and interlocking system. The researcher is in agreement with Schein (1984), who identified organizational culture as an interrelated system which consists of three patterns of organizational levels.

In an attempt to provide a more comprehensive model of organizational culture, the researcher offers the following interlocking
Level 1 (artifacts and creation) is interpreted as leadership behavior patterns which can be observed by the interactions of leaders and followers. Level 2 (values) is said to govern behavior and help to explain the reasons for the behavior of members, while the underlying reasons for the behavior remain concealed or unconscious. Level 3 (basic assumptions) is interpreted as the core of the system. The researcher believes that as a nucleus it is the originating factor in developing a more consistent and strong organizational culture. It consists of the founders' and past leaders' leadership strategies, ideas and values, and employees' actions, all of which serve as conditioning elements for further action.

Figure 3. Organizational Culture: An Interlocking System.
The entire system then is interrelated and interlocked by the interaction of McKinsey's 7-S multivariables (Peters & Waterman, 1982): structure, strategy, system, staff, style, and skills. The 7-S variables (shared values) differs from other models in that in Figure 2 it is a composition of the entire system. It is the outer core that holds the entire system together, and each variable and each level then becomes as one entity—organizational culture.

Therefore, the researcher offers the following as a definition of organizational culture: a system of interrelated and interlocking levels and variables which provides an organization with the necessary patterns and behaviors for establishing and transmitting culture to members in a given group.
Appendix A

Instruments

Executive group: Executives and upper level managers
   Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
   Cultural Awareness Checklist

Middle managers group: Middle and lower level managers and others
   Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire
   Cultural Awareness Checklist

English

Japanese (Translation)
Executives and Upper level managers

Please read the instructions carefully before answering the questions. Your frank and honest answers will be greatly appreciated. The number in the upper right hand corner of this questionnaire is for follow-up purposes only. As questionnaires are returned, numbers will be checked off and names and identifying numbers will be destroyed. All responses given on this questionnaire will remain strictly confidential. After completing the questionnaire, please return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

I would appreciate your returning the questionnaire(s) to me by ____________.

1. What is your sex? (Circle one)
   1. Female  2. Male

2. What is your age?

3. Years of experience in current profession

4. Your position

5. Size of your company
   1. No. of employees ______
   2. Sales Amount ______
   3. (Circle one)
      A. large    B. medium    C. small
**CULTURE AWARENESS CHECKLIST**

**DIRECTIONS:**
- READ each item carefully.
- THINK about how you view each item.
- DECIDE whether your response is (4) always, (3) often, (2) seldom or (1) never.
- DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the four numbers (4 3 2 1) following the item to show the answer you have selected.
  
  4 = Always  3 = Often  2 = Seldom  1 = Never

- MARK your answers as shown in the example below.

  **Example:** Often acts as described
  
  4 3 2 1

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can you state your organization's purpose, philosophy, or central theme in one clear sentence?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do all employees in the organization fully grasp your purpose?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do 90 percent or more of your people display commitment to the common purpose?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do individual employees perceive personal benefits from committing themselves to the common purpose?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you know which employees fail to grasp or display commitment and why?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Can you measure the level of individual and collective commitment to the common purpose?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you recognize the warning signals associated with an employee's decline in commitment?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you take action on employees who are not yet committed?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are you genuinely committed to the common purpose yourself?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you consider the impact on the organization's common purpose when you evaluate strategic and operational alternatives?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Does your organization develop a distinctive competence with one or more business skill, such as marketing, R and D, or distribution?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Can every employee recognize the organization's areas of distinctive competence?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Are people committed to maintaining distinctive competences at any cost?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Does the organization pay attention to its areas of distinctive competence?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Are new employees sufficiently trained and developed to have the competence to deliver superior performance?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do you act to enhance and improve areas of distinctive competence?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Do the organization's distinctive competences operate consistently over time, despite environmental changes?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do your organization's areas of distinctive competence produce superior performance?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Do your employees recognize the superior performance delivered by the organization?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Do customers, competitors, and observers value your organization's superior performance?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Do you recognize competence?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Do you recognize superior performance?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Is the organization's commitment to a common purpose and its competence to deliver superior performance emphasized and discussed throughout the organization?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Will the current degree of commitment and competence remain at a high level?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Do employees consistently communicate their commitment and demonstrate their competence to their peers and new employees?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Do you thoroughly screen candidates for employment to ensure a match with the organization's commitment and competence?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Are new employees sufficiently motivated and stimulated to commit themselves to the organization's common purpose?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Do you deal swiftly with a new employee's lack of commitment by providing additional development or terminating that employee?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Are veteran employees who lose their commitment to the common purpose quickly retrieved or terminated?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Is your organization able to attract and keep the right kind of people?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Do you carefully consider the impact of new strategic or operating directions on your people?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Do employees in your organization readily recognize the difference between committed and uncommitted employees?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Do you perpetuate your own commitment and competence daily?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. PLS state three of your organization's purpose(s) or mission(s)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. What were the founder's goal(s) or intention(s) for your company?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***** Thank you *****
MIDDLE, lower level managers and others

Please read the instructions carefully before answering the questions. Your frank and honest answers will be greatly appreciated. The number in the upper right hand corner of this questionnaires is for follow-up purposes only. As questionnaires are returned, numbers will be checked off and names and identifying numbers will be destroyed. All responses given on this questionnaire will remain strictly confidential. After completing the questionnaire, please return it to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

I would appreciate your returning the questionnaire(s) to me by ____________________.

1. What is your sex? (Circle one)
   1. Female  2. Male

2. What is your age?

3. Years of experience in current profession

4. Your position

5. Size of your company
   1. No. of employees
   2. Sales Amount
   3. (Circle one)
      A. large    B. medium    C. small
LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behavior of your supervisor. Each item describes a specific kind of behavior, but does not ask you to judge whether the behavior is desirable or undesirable. This is not a test of ability. It is simply asks you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behavior of your supervisor.

Note: the term, "group," as employed in the following items, refers to a department, division, or other unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

The term "members," refers to all the people in the unit of organization which is supervised by the person being described.

******************************************************************************
DIRECTIONS:
A. PLEASE READ each item carefully.
b. THINK about how frequently the leader engages in the behavior described by the item.
c. DECIDE whether he/she always, often, occasionally, seldom or never acts as described by the item.
d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the five letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

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

1. Does personal favors for group members. A B C D E
2. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group. A B C D E
3. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group. A B C D E
4. Tries out his/her new ideas with the group. A B C D E
5. Acts as the real leader of the group. A B C D E
6. Is easy to understand. A B C D E
7. Rules with an iron hand. A B C D E
8. Finds time to listen to group members. A B C D E
9. Criticizes poor work. A B C D E
10. Gives advance notice of changes. A B C D E
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Speaks in a manner not to be questioned.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kept to himself/herself.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Looks out for the personal welfare of individual group members.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Assigns group members to particular tasks.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Is the spokesperson of the group.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Schedules the work to be done.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Maintains definite standards of performance.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Refuses to explain his/her actions.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Keeps the group informed.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Acts without consulting the group.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Backs up the members in their actions.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Emphasizes the meeting of deadlines.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Treats all group members as his/her equals.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Encourages the use of uniform procedures.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Is willing to make changes.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Makes sure that his/her part in the organization is understood by group members.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Is friendly and approachable.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Fails to take necessary action.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Makes group members feel at ease when talking with them.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Lets group members know what is expected of them.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Speaks as the representative of the group.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Puts suggestions made by the group into operation.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Sees to it that group members are working up to capacity. 
36. Lets other people take away his/her leadership in the group. 
37. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members. 
38. Gets group approval in important matters before going ahead. 
39. Sees to it that the work of group members is coordinated. 
40. Keeps the group working together as a team. 

** Always = 4 Often = 3 Seldom = 2 Never = 1 **

41. Can you state your organization's purpose, philosophy, or central theme in one clear sentence? 
42. Do all employees in the organization fully grasp the organization's common purpose? 
43. Do 90 percent or more of your people display commitment to the common purpose? 
44. Do individual employees perceive personal benefits from committing themselves to the common purpose? 
45. Are you genuinely committed to the common purpose yourself? 
46. Does your organization develop a distinctive competence with one or more business skill, such as marketing, R and D, or distribution? 
47. Can every employee recognize the organization's areas of distinctive competence? 
48. Are new employees sufficiently trained and developed to have the competence to deliver superior performance?
49. Do customers, competitors, and observers value your organization's superior performance?  
   Always Often Seldom Never  
   4  3  2  1

50. Do you recognize competence?  
   4  3  2  1

51. Do you recognize superior performance?  
   4  3  2  1

52. Is the organization's commitment to a common purpose and its competence to deliver superior performance emphasized and discussed throughout the organization?  
   4  3  2  1

53. Do employees consistently communicate their commitment and demonstrate their competence to their peers and new employees?  
   4  3  2  1

54. Are new employees sufficiently motivated and stimulated to commit themselves to the organization's common purpose?  
   4  3  2  1

55. Do employees in your organization readily recognize the difference between committed and uncommitted employees?  
   4  3  2  1

56. Do you perpetuate your own commitment and competence daily?  
   4  3  2  1

*****

57. Please state three of your organization's purpose(s) or mission(s)?  
   1.  
   2.  
   3.  

58. What were the founder's goal(s) or intention(s) for your company?  
   1.  
   2.  
   3.  

***** Thank you *****
管理職の方

調査用紙

アメリカと日本の企業のリーダーシップに関する比較調査

ウエスタンミシガン大学リーダーシップ教育学部の支援をいただき企業におけるリーダーシップを比較検討するために、この度、日本とアメリカの企業のかたに御協力をお願い致します。この結果はウエスタンミシガン州立大学での私の博士号論文作成の資料として使わせていただきたく存じます。提供資料はコンピューター上の数字としてのみ現われ、記入者名等は一覧に名記されません。

この調査の主旨をご理解いただきまして、ご協力をお願い致します。

昭和51年7月20日

ウエスタンミシガン州立大学 リーダーシップ教育学部

鳥 井 元子

ご多忙のところ、まことに恐縮ではございますが以下の質問にそれぞれ解答下班いますようお願い致します。まず問1以下問7までは該当事項を（　）に記入するか、該当する番号をOで囲んでください。問8以下問40までは四つの答えの内から（ALWAYS「4」、OFTEN「3」、Seldom「2」、Never「1」）いずれか一つを選んで（　）の中

にその番号を記入して下さい。また問41と問42に対する答えは一行程度にまとめてお書き下さい。

問1. 性別 1. 男 2. 女
問2. 年令（　）
問3. 職種（　）役職名（　）
問4. 総経年数（　）年
問5. あなたの企業の本社所在地はどこですか？
　1. 日本 2. アメリカ
問6. あなたの企業は、次のどれに属しますか？
　1. 大企業 2. 中企業 3. 小企業
問7. 従業員は何名いらっしゃいますか？（　）人
※ 関8以下問40までは四つの場合内から（ALWAYS'4J、OFTEN'3J、SELDOM'2J、NEVER'1J）いずれか一つを選んで（）の中にその番号を記入して下さい

問8 あなたの会社の目的、企業理念、あるいはテーマを一言で
述べることができますか

問9 あなたの会社の従業員はその目的を十分に理解していますか

問10 従業員のうち90%以上が会社の共通の目的に向かってまい

問11 従業員一人一人が共通の目的に專心することで個人的に得る
ものがあると感じていますか

問12 あなたはどんな従業員がその目的を把握できなかったり、達
行する姿勢を示さないのか分かりますか

問13 あなたは会社の目的に対する個人及び集団での専念度を計る
ことができますか

問14 あなたは従業員の企業目的への専念度の低下を示す影響を感
じ取ることができますか

問15 あなたはまだ専心従業しない従業員に何らか対処しますか

問16 あなた自身は会社の共通の目的に向かって誠実に仕事をし
ていますか

問17 あなたは経営や業務の方針を発表する際、企業目的に
及ぼす影響を考慮しますか

問18 あなたの会社はたとえばマーケティング、R&D
（研究と開発）従業といったように特色ある能力を開発し
ていますか

問19 従業員一人一人がその能力を開発する分野を知っていま
すか

問20 またそれを維持することに力を入れていますか

問21 会社はその能力を開発する分野に注意を払っていますか

問22 新入社員、新規した業務を行える十分な訓練をうけていま
すか

問23 あなたは会社のその能力を開発する分野を高め、改善を
計りよう努めていますか

問24 会社のその能力は、環境の変化にもかかわらず常に効
果をもたらしますか

問25 あなたの会社のその能力は優れた結果をあげていますか

問26 従業員は会社の優秀な業績を認識していますか

問27 お客様や競争相手、部外者もあなたの会社の優秀な業績
を評価していますか

問28 あなた自身はあなたの会社の能力を認めていますか
あなた自身はあなたの会社の優秀な業績を認めていますか

会社の共通の目的に即応する意欲や、優秀な業績を上げることを社内で強調し討論していますか

現在の企業の目的への寄与度と企業の能力は将来も高いレベルを保つでしょうか

従業員は同僚及び新入社員に常に企業の目的に寄与することを伝え自分たちの能力を示していますか

あなたは雇用の際には、企業の目的に寄与し、その能力が合致し、発揮できる人材を十分に選別していませんか

新入社員は企業の目的に寄与するように十分に見直していますか

新入社員の内で企業の目的に寄与出来ないものは早く解雇するかあるいは解雇して対処しますか

企業の目的に寄与することを失ったベテランの社員に対しては緩速に助成するかあるいは解雇して対処しますか

あなたの企業は通した人材を引き付け内部に維持することが出来ますか

あなたは新しい選択方針や選択方針があなたの従業員に及ぼす影響を深く考慮しますか

あなたの会社の従業員は企業の目的に寄与しているかどうか継続に見分けられますか

あなたは自分の寄与と能力を毎日続けられていますか

あなたの企業の目的の内、特に大切なものとしてどんな目的を考えていますか

職に3つ列記して下さい

1.
2.
3.

あなたの企業の創立者のモットーの内、主なものを3つあげて下さい

1.
2.
3.
社員の方

調査用紙

アメリカと日本の企業のリーダーシップに関する比較調査

ウェスタンミシガン大学リーダーシップ教育学科の支援をいただき企業におけるリーダーシップを
比較検討するために、この度、日本とアメリカの企業のかたに協力をお願い致します。この結果は
ウェスタンミシガン州立大学の私の学位論文作成の資料として使わせていただく存じます。
提供資料はコンピューター上の処理としてのみ現われ、記入者名等ははっきり名記されません。
この調査の主旨をご理解いただきまして、ご協力をお願い致します。

昭和51年7月20日
ウェスタンミシガン州立大学 リーダーシップ教育学科
無本 榎子

ご多忙のところ、ささに恐縮ではございますが以下の質問にそれぞれ解答下さいますよう
お願い致します。まず問1以下問7までは該当項目を（　）に記入するか、該当する番号を
0で囲んでください。問8以下問47までは五つの答えの内から（ALWAYS「5」、
OFTEN「4」、OCCASIONALLY「3」、Seldom「2」、Never「1」）
いずれか一つを選んで、また問48以下問53までは四つの答えの内から（ALWAYS「4」、
OFTEN「3」、Seldom「2」、Never「1」）いずれか一つを選んで（　）の中
にその番号を記入して下さい。また問54と問65に対する答えは一項目程度にまとめてお書きいれ
下さい。

問1． 性別 1. 男 2. 女
問2． 年令 （　）
問3． 部屋 （　） 役職名 （　）
問4． 勤続年数 （　） 年
問5． あなたの企業の本社所在地はどこですか？
1. 日本 2. アメリカ
問6. あなたの企業は、次のどれに属しますか？
1. 大企業 2. 中企業 3. 小企業
問7. 雇用員は何名いらっしゃいますか？（　）人
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問8 部、難あつた酒はグループのメンバーに個人的にひいきをする

問9 グループに姿勢をはっきり示す

問10 グループのメンバーに思いを Pourすることをする

問11 グループと共に新しい考えを試みる

問12 グループの本数のリーダーとして行動する

問13 理解しやすい

問14 優しく押さえつける

問15 グループのメンバーに耐を崩す時間を作る

問16 失敗を非難する

問17 欠席の後を前もってする

問18 資質を受けない態度で話をする

問19 人と変わらない

問20 グループのメンバー一人一人の個人的問題に心を配る

問21 グループのメンバーを特別な仕事に付ける

問22 グループの代弁をする

問23 仕事がうまくおけるように計画をくむ

問24 事業結果の明確な水準を維持する

問25 行動を説明することを拒むする

問26 グループに報告する

問27 グループに相談せずに行動する

問28 グループの仕事は裏で支える

問29 期限間に合う事を強調する

問30 全てのメンバーを対等に扱う

問31 崩れるような手続きの使用を奨励する

問32 崩れた事を上役に依頼して通るようにしてくれる

問33 快く変更する

問34 難題に会社での自らの役割をグループのメンバーが理解しているようにする

問35 親切で近づきやすい

問36 グループのメンバーに基本的な規則などに従う様にする

問37 必要な対処を忘る

問38 グループのメンバーと話をするときメンバーが話しくすること

問39 グループのメンバーに何を求めているかはっきり知らせている

問40 グループの代表者として話す
| 問41 | グループの提案を仕事に取り入れる | ( ) |
| 問42 | グループのメンバーが能力を発揮出来る様に気をつける | ( ) |
| 問43 | グループの中で他の者にリーダーシップを取りすのを許す | ( ) |
| 問44 | 上司にグループのメンバーのためになるようにしてもらう | ( ) |
| 問45 | 重要な事は事前にグループの承認を得る | ( ) |
| 問46 | グループのメンバーの仕事がかみあう様に気をつける | ( ) |
| 問47 | グループを一つのチームとして一緒に仕事をするようにする | ( ) |

※また問48以下問63までは四つの答えの内から(ALWAYS「4」、OFTEN「3」、Seldom「2」、NEVER「1」)いずれか一つを選んで( )の中にあなたのご意見の番号を記入して下さい

| 問48 | あなたの会社の目的、企業像、あるいはテーマを一生で | ( ) |
| 問49 | あなたの会社の従業員はその目的を十分に理解していますか | ( ) |
| 問50 | 従業員のうち90％以上が会社の共通の目的に向かってまい | ( ) |
| 問51 | 従業員一人一人が共通の目的に専心することで個人的に持る | ( ) |
| 問52 | あなたの自身は会社の共通の目的に向かって誠実に仕事をして | ( ) |
| 問53 | あなたの会社はたとえばマーケティング、R&D (研究と開発) 流通といったように特色ある能力を開発していますか | ( ) |
| 問54 | 従業員一人一人がその能力を開発する分野を知っていますか | ( ) |
| 問55 | 新入社員は優れた業績を行える十分な訓練をうけていますか | ( ) |
| 問56 | お客様や競争相手、業者もあなたの会社の優秀な業績を評価していますか | ( ) |
| 問57 | あなたの自身はあなたの会社の能力を認めていますか | ( ) |
| 問58 | あなたの自身はあなたの会社の優秀な業績を認めていますか | ( ) |
| 問59 | 会社の共通の目的にまい遂げる要務や、優秀な業績を上げることを社内で強調し討論していますか | ( ) |
| 問60 | 同僚及び新入社員に常に企業の目的に専心することを伝え自分たちの能力を示していますか | ( ) |
| 問61 | 新入社員は企業の目的に専心するために十分に誠意を | ( ) |
| 問62 | あなたの会社の従業員は企業の目的に専心している | ( ) |
問53 あなたは自分の専心と能力を毎日続けていますか ( )

問54 あなたの企業の目的内、特に大切なものとしてどんな目的を考えていてか すべて3つ選んで下さい
1.
2.
3.

問55 あなたの企業の創立者のモットーの内、主なもの3つ選んで下さい
1.
2.
3.
Appendix B

Correspondence

1Introductory letter
Letters accompanying questionnaires
Cover letter for questionnaires to company
Cover letter for Permission Form
Permission Form
Follow-up letter
Dear

Ikuko Torimoto is a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership Department at Western Michigan University. She is presently engaged in dissertation research, and seeks information necessary for her comparative study of effectiveness in management and leadership of American and Japanese companies.

We appreciate your cooperation and hope that you will have the interest and the time necessary to provide the information for her study.

Sincerely,

Dr. Charles C. Warfield
Doctoral Committee Chair
Dear Sir:

I am in the process of writing a dissertation and am in need of information concerning American and Japanese companies.

Please send me any information regarding your company and parent company; such as the locations and the history of the companies, the number of employees, the organizational chart which includes the names of the directors, executives, and managers.

I shall be calling your company to ask a permission to conduct a survey for my study. Therefore, I will be very appreciated if you would supply me with a name of a contact person in your company.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ikuko Torimoto
Doctoral Candidate
Dear

Ms. Ikuko Torimoto is a doctoral student at Western Michigan University engaged in the process of writing her dissertation. She is making a comparison of Japanese and American multinational corporations by examining executives' leadership behavior and organizational culture.

Her study will have significant implications for multinational corporations by providing evidence of interaction between leadership behavior and organizational culture and an understanding of the executives' leadership and the managers' perceptions toward that leadership.

Therefore, I would like to ask your cooperation in granting her permission to perform the study in your company, and to assure you that she has my support for her study.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Charles C. Warfield
Doctoral Committee Chair
Dear Sir:

I would like to request your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaire(s) which are being sent to approximately 300 executives, managers and others in companies located in America and Japan. It is being conducted under the direction of the Western Michigan University, Educational Leadership Department, in Kalamazoo, Michigan as a part of my doctoral research study.

It is my belief that the results from this study will be helpful in providing empirical data on the relationship between leadership behavior and organizational culture. Your response to the questionnaire(s) is critical to the success of this study.

The code number on the questionnaire is to assist in follow-up and in organizing the data analysis. The information you provide will be reported only in the form of statistical summaries. Individual responses will be strictly confidential.

I would appreciate your returning the questionnaire(s) to me by ___________. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. If you have any question concerning the survey or its procedure, you may contact me at the address listed below.

Your urgent reply will be appreciated. Thank you for your cooperation and participation in this study.

Western Michigan University
Educational Leadership
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008
(616) 383-1997

Sincerely,

Ikuko Torimoto
Doctoral Candidate

encls.
Dear

I am writing to ask your permission to conduct a survey of American and Japanese parent and subsidiary companies to compare leadership behavior and organizational culture. This study is being conducted under the direction of the Western Michigan University, Educational Leadership Department. It is my belief that the results from this study will be helpful in providing empirical data on the relationship between executive leadership and organizational culture.

Therefore, I am requesting your consent to allow executives and managers to participate in this study by completing a short survey. The survey will explore executive leadership behavior and cultural awareness as well as the managers' and other employees' observations of the executive leadership. I have enclosed copies of the questionnaires for your review. I would like to administer the questionnaires to all executives, managers and other employees not holding managerial positions. It should take no more than twenty minutes to complete.

Please sign the attached permission form and return it to me by __________. A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. If you have any question, concerning the survey or its procedures, you may contact me at the address listed below.
The results of this research will be available upon your request. Please indicate your preference by checking the survey request at the bottom of the permission form. Thank you for your cooperation. Your urgent reply will be appreciated.

Western Michigan University
Educational Leadership
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008
616-383-1997

Sincerely,

Ikuko Torimoto
Doctoral Candidate

Dr. Charles C. Warfield
Doctoral Committee Chair
PERMISSION FORM

I hereby give permission for the executives, managers, and other employees not holding managerial positions of this corporation to complete "The Cultural Awareness Checklist" and in addition, for the middle, lower level managers and other employees not holding managerial positions both "The Cultural Awareness Checklist" and "The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire ".

I realize that this information gathered will be used in completing Ms. Torimoto's doctoral research.

Signature ____________________

Name ____________________

Title ____________________

Survey results: Yes___ No___
Dear

Recently I sent you questionnaires seeking data on the relationship between leadership behavior and organizational culture of American and Japanese companies. I have not received your response yet. Since I sent out only a limited number of these questionnaires, your response is very valuable to the accuracy of my survey.

I realize that this is a busy time of year for most business people, but I would appreciate it if you would take the time to complete the questionnaire(s) and return it to me by December 15, 1986. I have enclosed another copy of the questionnaire and a stamped, addressed envelop for your convenience.

If you have already filled out and returned the first questionnaire, please disregard this letter. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Ikuko Torimoto
Doctoral Candidate

encls.
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